

**ARABS IN ISRAEL:
FRIENDS OR FOES?**

RAPHAEL ISRAELI



ARABS IN ISRAEL: FRIENDS OR FOES?

RAPHAEL ISRAELI



ACPR PUBLISHERS

ARABS IN ISRAEL: FRIENDS OR FOES?

By **RAPHAEL ISRAELI**

Translation: **JOSHUA SCHREIER**

Publisher: **ELIAHU GABBAY** and **ACPR PUBLICATIONS**

April 2008 / Nisan 5768

Copy Editor: **CHRISTOPHER BARDER**

Originally published in Hebrew, 2002

ISBN: 978-965-7165-78-2

Copyright © 2008 by **RAPHAEL ISRAELI**

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Published in Israel by
ACPR Publishers



THE KNESSET
MK ELIAHU GABBAY

בס"ד

The publication of this book in its English translation was made possible through the generous contribution of a family who is well-known for their love of the Jewish people, their caring support of Zionist causes, and their concern for the future of the State of Israel. May they continue to see the fruits of their labor in good health for many years to come.

ELIAHU GABBAY



CONTENTS

Foreword	9
The Continued Relevance of this Book to the Ongoing Israeli Arab Situation	11
Prologue	15
The Formation of the Arab Minority in Israel	20
The Arab as Israeli – An Inherent Contradiction	48
The Arab as a Palestinian – An Emerging Identity	77
The Israeli Arabs as Arabs – Supportive Nationalism	105
The Arab as Muslim – Provocative Zealotry	133
The Christians, the Druse and the Other “Collaborators”	163
Fears, Threats, Forecasts, Contentions and Reality	192
Selected Citations from the Writings and Statements of Israeli Arabs ..	226
1. Israeli Arabs before 1967	227
2. The National Renaissance (post-1967)	230
3. The Islamic Movement	234
4. Arab Politics	243
5. The First <i>Intifada</i> and Its Offshoots	255

6. The Second <i>Intifada</i> (al-Aqsa)	258
7. Arab Citizens Speak	267
8. Expressions in Arab Literature in Israel	280
What Can Be Done?	283
Summary – Questions and Answers, Difficulties and Solutions	321
The Matter of Refugees and Displaced Persons.	322
The Issues of “Racism”, “Discrimination”, “Apartheid” and Human Rights	326
The Issue of Revisionist History and Adoption of the False Arab Propaganda.	348
Index	353

FOREWORD

The problems with which our country struggles are numerous, especially after the failure of the sweet dreams of Oslo and the outbreak of the second *intifada*, which relies on rampant terrorism and which has killed many among us. However, its severity increases exponentially when it turns out that the Israeli Arabs, who constitute 20% of the country's population and demand to share its bounty with us, take practical steps to aid their Palestinian brethren and thereby declared that they are no longer "torn between their people and their country", as they used to claim, but decided to throw their lot with the enemies of Israel and thereby defined their status outside of society and the Israeli political existence.

Indeed, the deception cultivated by the Israeli Arabs over the years, according to which they are "loyal" citizens of the Jewish state and are therefore entitled to enjoy the benefits of the democracy, unparalleled in the rest of the Middle East countries: Generous welfare payments, a high standard of living and some of the most advanced social services in the world; however, at the same time, they are entitled to claim that they will not fulfill any civic obligations, will side with Israel's enemies and collaborate with them and will even take action to destroy the State by supporting the *intifada* and the "right of return". This deception has dissipated after the Israeli citizens, who wish to survive, finally woke up and understood the inherent contradiction with which they have been living all these years.

As, we are not dealing merely with a national minority, a minority that demands to shatter the Zionist dream through the demand to transform Israel into a bi-national state, but with a large isolationist group that vigorously takes action to accomplish a violent takeover of the state lands, cultivate ideological crime against it and, at times, even provide active subversive aid to its enemies seeking to destroy it. Just as any sensible country is unwilling to cease to exist, so too, the time has come for the Jewish people to look realistically at the harsh reality that we are facing, and come to its senses in time and bring about a reversal in our treatment of this painful, fateful issue.

That is what this book seeks to present. It points to the foundations of the development of the Israeli Arab problem from a social-cultural-religious problem into a national question with calamitous potential for Israel, both due to the rapid Arab demographic growth, which relies, among other things, upon the benefits that the State pays from funds collected from Jewish taxpayers, and which cancels out, in relative terms, Jewish immigration; it exposes the shortsighted policy of the Israeli governments throughout the generations, which, in their quest for the Arab vote, neglected the fundamental problems of Zionism, until it mercilessly blew up in our faces, and forces us to execute a complete about-face in our attitude towards the Arab minority.

The writing and publication of this book was made possible by the generosity of my dear friend **Haim Yehezkel**, for whom these issues are close to his heart.

This edition of the book has been translated from the Hebrew version. Though some of the tenses have been adjusted to reflect the timing, the facts presented here are correct as of 2001 and have not been updated.

Eliahu Gabbay
Publisher

THE CONTINUED RELEVANCE OF THIS BOOK TO THE ONGOING ISRAELI ARAB SITUATION

CHRISTOPHER BARDER

It would be easy to suppose, at least from the Western media, that the “al-Aqsa” *intifada* had long since passed and instead there was relative trust and calm inside Israel, even in the Arab sector there. Very little is reported about it. However, in January 2008, reading between the lines, it was still possible to go beyond the events reported on even by the Israeli media and detect a direct continuum between the issues raised in Professor Israeli’s book and contemporary events and attitudes.

By way of example, the Prime Minister’s Office communicated the following:

Approximately 20 Israeli Arabs from Jisr A-Zarka and the Wadi Ara region were recently arrested in a joint ISA-Israel Police operation on suspicion of involvement in illegally trafficking in weapons and munitions. Six of those arrested were indicted today (Sunday), 27.1.08. The principal accused is Hamza Masri, 24, from Kafr Kara, who is accused of trafficking in weapons and munitions with Shahar Hanina, 41, the head of the Tanzim in Kalkilya. It is alleged that in 2005, Masri acquired a pistol for Hanina, as well as a 15-kilogram bag of potassium for use in preparing explosives, Masri was fully aware of the intended use of the potassium.

Masri was arrested in 2005 and warned about his ties with Hanina, whom he knew headed the Al-Aqsa Martyrs Brigades in Kalkilya. Upon his release later that year, Masri continued his links with Hanina. Masri purchased tens of thousands of dollars’ worth of weapons and munitions for Hanina, including an M-16, a hunting rifle and a laser sight for an M-16.*

* January 27, 2008.

This was, however, the tip of a much bigger iceberg, so to speak.*

Over the past year, many cases were uncovered regarding ties involving arms between criminal elements in Israel and terrorist operatives in Judea and Samaria and in the Gaza Strip. Security forces are engaged in a constant war on the trade and smuggling of arms, including from IDF bases, and their sale to terrorist operatives in the Territories. These ties between terrorists and criminals holding Israeli identity cards facilitate the acquisition of arms and ammunition which ultimately are used in attacks against Israel. The danger inherent in these ties is seen in the case of Hamas operatives and arms dealers from Jabel Mukaber in East Jerusalem, who were ultimately arrested. They were found to have had ties with two Hamas operatives who carried out the shooting attack at the Sheikh Sa'ed checkpoint, in the separation fence around Jerusalem, in May 2007. One of the persons arrested provided the terrorists with a weapon a few hours before the attack, in which two security forces were injured, one of them seriously. The terrorists, who hold Israeli identity cards and live in Jabel Mukaber, were killed in an exchange of gunfire during the incident. Under questioning, the detainees admitted that they were involved in extensive trade in arms with criminal elements, Arab Israelis from the north, and also Hamas operatives from Hebron and Bido, a village in the Ramallah District. The questioning also revealed that one of the terrorists acquired the pistol used in the attack a few hours before the attack, and that he had received it from Anan Muhammad Halaila, 21, an arms dealer, and also a resident of Jabel Mukaber. His name came up with those of other detainees as persons who had been involved in attempts to steal weapons from IDF soldiers with the intent of selling them.

Another example occurred in March, when security forces uncovered a network of arms dealers from the Nazareth area, who sold munitions that had been stolen from the IDF to Palestinians in the West Bank. Among those arrested was Arkan Bashir, an IDF soldier in the standing army, who admitted under questioning that he stole munitions from the IDF and sold them to arms dealers,

* IMRA, January 27, 2008, extracted from the Israeli Security Agency Report (cited below).

who then sold them to Ahmad Boz, a Fatah operative from Nablus, who was also arrested.

An Israeli Security Agency Report for 2007 made clear the continued problem of Israeli Arab violence.

A prominent phenomenon that has appeared over the years, and was renewed in 2007, is the throwing of stones and Molotov cocktails at Israeli vehicles. In 2007, there were dozens of cases of stone-throwing inside Israel, with the major focal points being Route 443 and on roads in northern Israel and in the southern part of the country (the Beersheba area). Toward the end of the year, Molotov cocktails were also hurled at cars traveling Route 443.

In 2007, security forces carried out a number of actions in which they arrested and questioned dozens of Arabs who threw stones and Molotov cocktails at Israeli vehicles, civilians, and IDF troops, on a daily basis, endangering the lives of the passengers in the vehicles.*

In one recent survey the kinds of identity ambivalences highlighted by Professor Israeli became dramatically clear, thus demonstrating that Israeli Arabs continue to be predominantly and explicitly hostile towards settlement even of the Palestinian – Israeli territorial elements.**

Professor Nadim Ruchama, who conducted the poll, explained that these figures are clearly indicative of mistrust for the PA amongst Israeli Arabs.

Clearly, Israeli Arabs feel that the Palestinian Authority does not speak or act on their behalf. “Abbas addressed all the Palestinian populace at Annapolis Tuesday, but deliberately failed to mention the Israeli-Arab contingent,” said Ruchama.

This poll clearly indicates that Israeli Arabs do not find Abbas and the PA competent to make decisions on key issues that directly impact upon their futures. They clearly do not trust Abbas to make key concessions on their behalf in the same way that they did Arafat.

* The report may be found in full at <<http://www.mfa.gov.il/NR/rdonlyres/75FC2B98-A581-4C89-88AC-7C3C1D1BC097/0/Terrorism2007report.pdf>>.

** A survey conducted by the Mada-El-Carmel Institute, or the Arab Center for Practical Social Research, Roe Mandel, YNET, Published: 11.28.07, 21:48; Israel News, IMRA, November 28, 2007.

Ruchama went on to say that Israeli Arabs are especially fearful of PA recognition of a Jewish State of Israel. "Israeli Arabs are well aware of Israeli apprehensions regarding a 'two-state solution'. At the same time, they fear that the establishment of a Palestinian state and its recognition of the State of Israel would endanger their rights as Israeli citizens," he said.

"The Israeli Arab populace is essentially telling Abbas that he cannot make territorial swaps with Israel, nor can he officially recognize the Jewish state."

The above is nothing more than a small sample of the way in which the themes of the book echo down from the time of its original Hebrew edition to 2008 when the English edition is ready: The analysis remains absolutely relevant even though the details reflect the time when the book first appeared. The insights are as relevant today as ever they were.

PROLOGUE

In these days of “peace, peace when there is no peace”, of belligerence and expressions of hostility against Israel and the attempts of the Arab world in general to undermine Israel’s existence, the Jewish state again faces the need to rely on its few friends and to be wary of its declared and undeclared enemies, so that it can continue to defend itself. Because, it turns out that besides the regimes, organizations and rulers who hate us openly and joyfully and publicly seek our demise – like the violent people, who manage the affairs of Iraq and Syria, the governments notorious in their blind hatred of Jews in Iran and Saudi Arabia, the general Arab public opinion that gets excited by every attack against Israel and the Jews, terrorist organizations that embitter our lives on a daily basis and the media outlets in the Arab and Islamic world, which do not conceal their hatred for Israel and Zionism – in these times of crisis, enemies and provocateurs of a different sort and from different places, whom we have heretofore not counted on the long list of those seeking to do us harm, rise to the surface.

Famous among them is the list of European countries in which anti-Semitism has never been totally uprooted and which, when Israel finds itself in times of trouble, exchange their hatred for Jews, which is out of style, for blatant anti-Israel and anti-Zionist expressions, and therefore, they too stand, uncritically and without balanced deliberation, alongside our enemies. This has been the case since the establishment of the State and that, apparently, will be the case in the hard times ahead. However, since the outbreak of the second Palestinian *intifada* (called “al-Aqsa”, a name indicating that the struggle is over the Temple Mount), the anti-Jewish and anti-Israel expressions have multiplied, specifically throughout the democratic world, where anti-Semites can go wild virtually unhampered, to the point where it seems that we are in the midst of the process of internationalization and export of the conflict between us and the Arabs and Muslims to the entire world. The partners of the traditional anti-Semites, among them Palestinians and former and present Arab citizens of Israel, who now attack Israel and the Jews, are none other than members of the immigrant Arab and Muslim communities, legal and illegal, who join together with the

local enemies of Israel in order to disseminate terror and fear among the Jewish communities in those countries.

However, in all of Israel's wars that have transpired, there was never a fear or even a suspicion, lest the Arab citizens of Israel, whose governments throughout the generations naively treated them as "loyal" citizens, would also join our enemies without opting to leave the country. On the contrary, despite the fact that most of them have never actually engaged in combat in order to defend their country against their people, they displayed, in more than a few crises, identification with Israel during its difficult hours, volunteered to substitute at work for reserve soldiers who went to the front, donated blood for the wounded and expressed trepidation regarding the dangers facing the State, to whose fate they have decided to link their own. While now, things have changed: Not only is there no longer any desire to volunteer and publicly support the State of Israel, which is also supposed to be their state, but there are public attacks against it and even the brandishing of the flags of its enemies in the streets, at a time when Israel is fighting for its life.

These dramatic reversals in the Israeli Arabs' attitude towards their homeland did not come about suddenly, did not come as a surprise to anyone who has observed their conduct over the years and is not necessarily a product of the various Palestinian *intifadas* alone. They are tied to the dynamic of the development of the Arab minority in Israel since its inception; the huge rupture that began since the Six Day War; to the reversal that led to the first Land Day in 1976; the disintegration of the Israeli Communist Party, most of whose members were Arabs, since the dismantling of the Soviet Union; to the rapid growth of the Islamic Movement – sister party to Hamas and other zealous Islamic groups; and recently, the Palestinian *intifadas* that led to the ill-fated Oslo process and subsequently were sustained by it until its total exhaustion and demise. More than a little of this rotten fruit borne by Israeli policy towards its Arabs can be attributed to the naïve beliefs of our governments who were mistakenly delusional, cultivated vague and ambiguous language and refrained from bold decisions at appropriate times in order to correct the situation before it blew up in our face – in every sense.

In the following pages, an attempt will be made to survey the changes that took place in the radicalization process of the Israeli Arabs, with our authorities more than a little to blame, because in their quest to garner Arab votes on election days, they made baseless and irresponsible promises, and once there was no prospect of their being fulfilled, could only deepen the frustration and confusion followed by anger and hostility among the Arabs. Therefore, latent

in the patterns that were set by the founders of the State – most of which were based on mistaken assumptions, no less than the ideological and social qualities inherent in the Palestinian-Arab-Muslim among us – are the seeds of the trouble of our present-day conditions. Afterwards, we will examine the conflicting identities in the soul of the Israeli Arab, who is torn between his people and his state, between the demands that he accustom himself to the host state and his feelings that he is the host and the landlord. Of course, like symbiotic tools, to the degree that the Israeli Arabs' Palestinian-Arabic-Islamic identity grows, their ties to Israel contract.

Ostensibly, in light of the far-reaching achievements of the Israeli Arab as far as the level of his personal freedom is concerned, the welfare services to which he is entitled and the life expectancy that he enjoys, he should have no interest in toppling the foundations of the State, whose bountiful blessing he enjoys. However, in practice, that is not the way it is. After all, despite the fact that in response to a direct question, most Israeli Arabs will state that they wish to remain Israeli citizens, even if they were offered an alternative, in the same breath, they are enthusiastic supporters of the “right of return” for their brethren to Israel, which if it was implemented and would transform them into the majority in the country, would put an end to all of the benefits that they enjoy today. At the same time that they demand the right to full citizenship, they disavow their obligation to serve their country, isolate themselves in their institutions, aspire to cultural autonomy perhaps followed by political autonomy and adopt positions that are not only isolationist (a legitimate position in a democratic society) but are explicitly full of hate, antagonistic and even hostile, against which every state seeking to survive would battle in order to defend itself.

The present situation, in which all of the questions, fears and question marks have exploded into a substantial, profound and unbridgeable crisis, obligates the State of Israel to undertake a new, bold and determined thought process, in order to protect itself from the loss of its dream and its assets. This is no longer a warning and call for “courage for change before the calamity”, as in the well-known vision of Yitzhak Ben-Aharon in a different context, but rather an explicit handwriting on the wall, engraved in big letters for all to see, and cries out, in the final hour before slipping into the abyss, for courage for change **after** the calamity, which we allowed to befall us and which is destined to sweep us all to our demise, if we do not gather our wits to mobilize and take action quickly, resolutely and consistently. Because the demographic clock, upon which the Israeli Arabs place their hopes, is mercilessly, persistently ticking against our interests, to the point that even without the right of return it will overcome us,

when the sources of mass immigration, which are finite by their very nature, run out as opposed to the inherent infinity of the “war of the womb”, which we will not be able to survive in the long run.

Most of the material in this book comes from works written by the author himself and has been published in many books and articles over the years, specific analyses of defined aspects of Arab existence in Israel. Additional data, especially in terms of the quantitative modification of the findings, were gathered from governmental and Arab sources of recent years and united into one complete and comprehensive work infused with a mission of public service. Aside from my long-term personal interest in this unpleasant material, there are four additional factors that motivated me to set aside the rest of my interests in these difficult times and devote myself to the task:

1. The events of the *intifada* that broke out during the Days of Awe, in both senses, of Autumn 2000 and which stormily swept the Israeli Arabs in their wake to an identity crisis and to a spiritual and emotional upheaval that Israel did not anticipate;
2. The establishment of the commission headed by Justice Theodore Orr to investigate the events that led to the tragic killing, in violent riots, of 13 Israeli Arabs who went out to identify with their brethren in the events of the *intifada*. The extreme emotion that accompanied the testimony and the massive expectations that the Israeli Arabs cultivated regarding the commission findings that were, in their opinion, going to reinforce the sense of discrimination and plotting against them on the part of the Israeli authorities, signaled to me that it is necessary to place before the Israeli reader, in a timely fashion, a comprehensive survey of this complex and fateful matter. The commission’s generous invitation that I appear before it in order to say my piece encouraged me to gather the data and consolidate my thoughts into a unified, comprehensive point of view;
3. Many conversations that I conducted with professional colleagues and many debates in which I appeared together with Israeli Arabs of various hues, in the media, in academic discussions and in personal conversations, illustrated to me the depth of the abyss between us and the lack of hope in attempts to bridge the gap in pleasant ways that are antiquated. This is the source of my urgent sense that the time has come to raise our voices and sound the alert, even if my statements that aroused severe disagreement in the past, in the pre-calamity days, are all the more so liable to agitate in the midst of the events transpiring around us at present;

4. The unstinting encouragement of my friend and colleague, MK Eli Gabbay, who, from time to time, expressed before me his fears aroused by the sight of the events transpiring within the Arab sector in general, and especially upon hearing their belligerent statements of the Arab members of Knesset, which led him to thoughts about the urgent need to inform members of our people of the imminent dangers, and especially since the outbreak of the bloody events with which we are dealing. Ultimately, his considerate and determined persistence was as salutary as it was fruitful.

Jerusalem, Late Spring 2001

CHAPTER ONE

THE FORMATION OF THE ARAB MINORITY IN ISRAEL

There is a plethora of general and professional literature that traces the development of the Arab population in Israel, from the seventh century Arab conquest to this very day. Even if we disregard the waves of immigration from the neighboring Arab countries to Israel over the years, whose effects are still apparent in the names of families and places (al-Masrawah, from Egypt and the Mughrabi Quarter, from North Africa), we must deal with the watershed historical moment that is the UN Resolution of November 29, 1947 as the beginning of our story. Despite the fact that our ties to this land for thousands of years can be neither undermined or refuted, from our perspective as well as in terms of the proven, documented objective historical reality, the Arab residents of Israel do not necessarily view things in that way, for two reasons: First, in their eyes, the political and demographic reality before the establishment of the State of Israel, i.e. the Arab majority that existed in Israel for many generations, determines the fate of the dispute between us and them. Second, Palestinian myths, which have gained currency among more than a few Israeli Arabs, have developed recently, regarding the familial relations between them and the ancient Canaanites. The intention of the composers of these fabrications, which are totally baseless, is, of course, to combat our claims of priority and election in the dispute over our rights here, through a counterclaim of the same type, which establishes the expulsion of the Canaanites (their ostensible ancestors) in the course of the ancient Israeli conquest, as an introduction to modern Israel's "false claim" regarding its return to its ancestral homeland.

What cannot be contradicted and therefore is a determining factor in both our campaigns against the Arabs and our international struggles today, is the

situation on the eve of the UN Resolution, in which approximately two-thirds of the residents of Israel west of the Jordan were Arab-Palestinians; if we include the residents of Israel east of the Jordan, the Jewish minority would be even smaller. These fundamental facts are worth emphasizing because it is only by grasping the historic Greater Land of Israel (Palestine, in their vernacular), on both sides of the Jordan, as a land in dispute between us, that the opportunity for a resolution of the problems of both nations will be explicit and concomitantly the chance to find a cure for the gradually exacerbating problem of the Arab-Palestinian minority among us, may emerge, which we will discuss in the upcoming chapters. The numerical data indicate that on the day of the Partition Resolution there were more than a half-million Jews in Israel, while the Arab population in Western Israel was more than a million. Had the Partition Resolution been implemented, the overwhelming majority of the Jews would have remained along with a respectable number of the Arabs as a minority in the Jewish state, while the Arab state would have included more than a million citizens along with a negligible Jewish minority.

However, it is well known, that the Arabs rejected the Partition Resolution and invaded the designated Jewish territory. In the course of the battles in 1948-1949, the area under Israeli control expanded to the point that it included over half of the Arab population west of the Jordan; however since about 80% of them were uprooted, some by means of their removal from the battlefield, some in response to the Arab call to evacuate their villages to which they would return victorious and some who fled for their lives in fear of the war, only 130,000 remained in the Jewish state, to whom an additional 30,000 were added as the war abated and after the signing of the ceasefire agreements between Israel and the Hashemite Kingdom, which called for the repatriation of some of the displaced persons. In other words, when the borders of the new country were set and the Arab displaced persons ceased their wandering, there were only 160,000 Arabs under the rule of the new Israeli government, most of them still in their homes, where they remain today. About one-fifth of them lost their previous places of residence, whether because they were destroyed in the course of the war, intentionally or unintentionally, in preparation for or as a result of the battles, or because the State refused to allow them to return to their villages for security reasons (Ikrit and Biram, for example). Most crowded into cities and existing villages, because in contrast to neighboring countries that absorbed Palestinian refugees from the Land of Israel (Syria, Lebanon and Jordan), or from Judea, Samaria and the Gaza Strip that came under Jordanian and Egyptian rule, where “temporary” refugee camps were set up until the “return”, Israel did

not establish refugee camps and therefore the displaced persons who remained in Israel settled in their new permanent residences.

The most prominent incident illustrating this process, that involved much human suffering, although the political and moral responsibility rests on the shoulders of the Palestinian and Arab leadership, which rejected the partition suggestion, occurred in the flourishing city of Nazareth, a city since the era of Crusader rule, when it was the seat of the Archbishop of the Galilee, through the Ottoman Empire, when it was an assembly point for the Turkish and German armies before the fateful battle at Megiddo during World War I until the British Mandatory Government which made it a district capital and base for its army in northern Israel. With the outbreak of the battles in 1948, Kaukaji's Arab Liberation Army, which invaded from Syria to assist the Palestinians, chose Nazareth as its headquarters from which he conducted his attacks on Mishmar Ha'Emek, which resulted in the migration of many Arabs from the surrounding villages to seek shelter in a city considered to be safely under the rule of a friend. In July 1948, the IDF embarked upon "Operation Dekel" which rebuffed the invading Arab forces and liberated the Lower Galilee. In those fateful days, during which the existence of the State hung in the balance, the Prime Minister of the provisional government, David Ben-Gurion, found the time to order the establishment of a special management board to govern the city, with a mandate to avoid friction with the residents and prohibit damage to the holy places there. The population as a whole, like all of the other Arab residents who remained within the borders of the Jewish state, was placed under a military government.

In the course of the war and in its immediate aftermath, more than 10,000 refugees congregated in Nazareth and thereby increased its population by 50% and also contributed, as most were Muslims, to the transformation of the predominantly Christian city into an evenly divided city and subsequently, over the years, into a city with a Muslim majority. In the broader national context, there are varying, contradictory statistics: There are those who claim that since approximately 90% of those who left Israeli territory were Muslims, the rest (approximately 60,000) were Christians; and there are those who determine that since the relative number of Christians who fled was much smaller than the number of Muslims, in the wake of the war, the percentage of Christians increased to 20%. In any case, the total number of Arabs was 247,000 in 1961, as the proportion between Muslims and Christians remained largely constant; however since 1967 the proportion has deteriorated due to the Christian emigration overseas, either due to the rise in their standard of living which led

to a decline in their birthrate, or because the unification of Jerusalem brought to the area under Jewish rule a significant number of additional Muslims. Thus, in the 1990s, the percentage of Christians among the Arab population dropped to 12%, although their absolute numbers almost doubled (to about 110,000) and thereby their relative number within the Arab population was restored to its level at the end of the British mandate before the onset of the refugee problem. The upshot is that the Muslim population grew much faster, primarily because of its accelerated birthrate, despite the increase in its standard of living, but also because of the increase in life expectancy, the improvement in social services and the addition of the East Jerusalem residents to their ranks. At the start of the new century, their number grew to more than a million (more than six times since the establishment of the State) and it is approaching 20% of the population of the State, almost the same size as it was in 1949 after the signing of the ceasefire agreements, the stabilization of the remaining Arab population and the absorption of the trickles of new immigrants prior to the later great waves of immigration.

This matter is critical to the future of the Jewish state in the Land of Israel because ultimately, it is the “war of the womb” that will determine majority and minority in this country. The large waves of immigration in the 1950s, 1960s and 1990s have already run their course and it is doubtful whether they will ever recur to resuscitate the Zionist enterprise. It is not because its allure has faded but rather because the large reservoirs of potential immigration, from the Arab countries and the Communist Bloc, which were primarily immigrations motivated by distress, have almost completely dried up, and our brethren who live in the affluent countries refuse to come. On the other hand, the potential growth of the Arab population among us is unlimited and will ultimately overcome us, even without the implementation of the right of return, which is supported by the Israeli Arabs. Every Jewish wave of immigration only temporarily delays the movement of the center of gravity to the developing Arab majority. The proof is – all the waves of mass immigration have succeeded in merely, more or less, preserving the ratio between Jews and Arabs and it will hereafter get gradually worse for the Jews, unless we take it into consideration when planning for the future.

True – not all members of the Arab minority are homogeneous. Among them are Christians who adopt one of two extremes: There are those who rally around the extreme nationalist pole, like the founders of the Israeli Communist Party and the leaders of the New Communist List once, and the leaders of the National Democratic Assembly today, who aspire to prove to their fellow Arabs

that they are no less combative and anti-Israeli than their Muslim brethren; and there are those who prefer to emigrate so as not to undergo the ordeal of seeing their Christian cities and villages transformed into Muslim cities and villages, which is what happened in Nazareth (and in Bethlehem under Palestinian rule); and there are some who move to mixed cities like Haifa and Jaffa, where they can integrate into the general population without drawing Muslim attention and hostility. Potentially, these are foundations that could lead them to equality and to fidelity to the State of Israel and if they do so we will reduce by a significant percentage the numbers of those who hate us from within. The Druse, too, who numerically are equal to the Christians, although they have a higher birthrate, were recognized as a denomination with equal rights, which fulfills its obligations to the State and can be counted among its loyalists. There are also those who seek to include the Bedouins in this loyalty march, as a minority of them faithfully serves the State and their number also approximates the numbers of Christians and Druse, although their birthrate is even higher than the Arab average in Israel. However, it is important to remember that they, like most Israeli Arabs, are Muslims and therefore they are subject to ambient pressure to fall into line with the general hostile Arab, Muslim policy. In any case, even if we subtract from the Jewish-Arab demographic balance these friendly populations, to whom we can add the negligible Circassian minority, the ever-increasing threat of the overwhelming majority of the Arab/Muslim population in Israel, whose number is approaching a million, remains intact.

However, we would be guilty of generalization if we think in non-discerning, stereotypical terms of the Arab population in Israel, without getting into a detailed analysis of the nuances and the fine distinctions that exemplify not only each religious denomination, but also various communities within each denomination. For example, within the Muslim community, there are more than a few Arabs who consider themselves part of the State of Israel and take steps to be integrated within it. At the same time, there are Christians and even Druse who speak out against the State and even verbally abuse it and join together with the most extreme nationalists. In addition, the consequential differences within each denomination are conspicuous: Between the rural and the city-dwellers; between homogeneous and heterogeneous villages; between the minority among them that preferred to become almost totally integrated in the Israeli way of life and the majority that cultivates its heritage, language, culture and uniqueness; between the various clans in each village; and between the political parties, which drive to the margins personalities and groups that could have coexisted under other circumstances. We saw, for example, that the Bedouins are considered a

sector in and of themselves within the Muslim denomination, although many of them are adherents of the Islamic Movement, who vociferously condemn the service of the members of their sect in the IDF. Furthermore, inter-tribal jealousies and personal or regional loyalties have also had an impact on their conduct. However, no sector can compare to the Christians who are divided into so many different sects and sub-groups that it is difficult to speak of them as a homogeneous denomination with a common foundation. These schisms among the various denominations are also rooted in the situation that was extant prior to the establishment of the Jewish state and was interrupted midstream after its establishment, as well as in the various positions taken by various political and spiritual centers, beyond the State's borders, from which the Israeli Arabs have never severed ties.

Several examples will clarify the matter for the reader. For the Bedouin tribes in the Negev, who had familial, commercial, lifestyle and tribal ties with their counterparts in Sinai and in Jordan along the Arava prairie, it was difficult to accept the establishment of an artificial international border that separated them. For them, drugs and weapons trade, smuggling connections or crossing borders to find brides for youths that come of age are natural and legitimate acts that are not necessarily directed against the State, although formally it is in violation of its laws. The State's attempts to resettle the Bedouin tribes in permanent cities, in order to provide them with educational, health and welfare services, are perceived by many of them as restrictions on their freedom to wander in the desert as they please, or as eviction from "their lands" – State lands that were never registered in their names although they camped there with their tribes and grazed their flocks there. For others, the opportunity for advanced education, urbanization and openness to the wide world is so attractive that it diminishes within them the sense of resentment and discrimination. Another example: Since the Israeli Arabs are Palestinians as well as Arabs and Muslims (or Christians or Druse), most of whose groups of attribution are situated outside of Israel, of necessity this leads to the development of ties that are not always consistent with the country of which they are citizens. We will deal with the multiple identities in the coming pages, but here it will suffice if we internalize the huge variety of beliefs, opinions and feelings intrinsic to all denominations of Israeli Arabs. If we add to those the political and ideological loyalties that supersede borders, like, for example, the international communist movement in its glory days, which brought with it extended stays in those countries for the purpose of professional training accompanied by ideological indoctrination; or on a different note, the ties of the Islamic Movement in Israel with its sister "Muslim Brotherhood"

organizations in Egypt, Jordan and the Palestinian Authority; or the ties of the Israeli Druse with their brethren in Syria and Lebanon; or the burgeoning political connection between Israeli Arabs and the hubs of their nationality in Syria and the Palestinian Authority, we will understand the entangled fabric in which they function and in which they weave their emotional, psychological, social and even political affiliation.

The Christians, whose factionalism into 24 sub-groups and embarrassingly variegated loyalties has a multi-faceted history, are especially prodigious. The largest faction among them is the Greek Orthodox whose Patriarch resides in Jerusalem and which changed its leadership over time from native Greek to local Arab. The Russian Church is the historic patron of this faction and it purchased numerous properties and built many churches, monasteries and schools back in the 19th century. That is the source of its great power today as the largest owner of real estate in Israel. The second most significant community is the Greek Catholic, which already during the British Mandate, when the legendary Archbishop Hakim whose activity was centered primarily in northern Israel, identified with the political struggle of the Palestinians and took extensive action, especially in the Vatican, to promote their interests. Hakim even attempted to unite politically all of the Christian denominations in Israel in order to harness them to the Palestinian cause. The third group is (Roman) Catholic, headed by the Latinate Patriarch in Jerusalem, who claims Crusader roots, although his predecessors were forced to relocate in Acre when Jerusalem was conquered by Saladin in 1187, and were forced to leave there too in 1291; ultimately the Patriarchate was reestablished in the 19th century. Under its auspices, there are groups of Dominican, Jesuit, Franciscan, Carmelite and Benedictine monks who run schools and relief institutions especially in Jerusalem and in northern Israel. In contrast to the other two, this community focused on its relations with the Vatican, to which it owed its loyalty. Recently that trend has changed, with the appointment of the Palestinian Michel Sabah as Patriarch. Archbishop Capucci's involvement in smuggling arms for the Palestinians after 1967 is also not forgotten. Beyond these communities, the others are too small to warrant treatment in this context. The reference is to Maronites, Armenians, Copts and a large assortment of Protestants. The involvement of the State of Israel in their affairs relates to their conflicting claims, which sometimes escalate into bloody skirmishes between them, over the rights to preserve and protect the sites sacred to Christianity and from the fact that some of their leaders are foreign nationals, under the auspices of foreign governments, despite the fact that most of their adherents are full-fledged Israeli citizens.

This unholy mixture of identities, rivalries, cultures, religions and loyalties among the Israeli Arabs, if we add to it the great diversity within the Jewish majority, which itself consists of various immigrants and from the fusion of disparate, distant fringes, is what makes the cultural-social environment in Israel so fascinating and unique, but also difficult for both the majority and the minority. As on the one hand, one may claim that it is the plethora of identities that enables each group to preserve its distinctiveness and to function as a separate collective, but on the other hand it is clear that the great Jew-Arab schism, with the State in a state of war or at least in a state of perpetual tension and hostility, prevents every sub-group or tribe from standing alone against the rest; rather it obligates them to solidarity on both sides of the great divide between Jews and Arabs, which distinguishes and defines, and only on the margins is there room for internal friction within each camp. Nevertheless, these margins are wide enough to sustain enough cultural and political disputes within each sector and certainly between the different sectors. Thus, in the present state of tension between Israel and its neighbors, it is only natural that the sectarian violence within Israel will increase. The bloody events of the High Holidays of the year 2000, when the Arab masses, supported by the Palestinians in the territories, rioted against their government, will attest to this. At the same time, the internal split among the Israeli Arabs has never been so intense, for reasons of both ideology and interpersonal, intertribal and inter-communal competition, a situation that makes it difficult for them to present a united front against the State of Israel.

One of the great paradoxes is that while with the establishment of the State, once they were unable to liquidate it as they promised, the leaders of the Israeli Arabs fled abroad and left behind a leaderless public, lacking confidence and lacking direction, which overnight became a minority in its land, it was the State of Israel that – with its openness and standards of freedom, of the education and representation that it provided them – that restored their self-confidence, enabled their reorganization and facilitated the growth of a young, better educated and more daring leadership, to battle unstintingly for their rights and subsequently to struggle against it. Another paradox: While originally a military government was imposed on the Israeli Arabs, which involved limiting their movement, restricting their activity and refusing to allow the displaced persons (the internal refugees who abandoned their villages but did not go or were not sent outside the borders of the State) to return to their villages, it was specifically when the military government was dissolved and the Arabs granted their freedom in 1965, their criticism of the State, its institutions and government, increased,

their language regarding discrimination against them became more virulent and the tenor of their protests against the State intensified, as it is manifest on Land Day, the day of the *Naqba* (“catastrophe”) (Israeli Independence Day) and their public identification with the Palestinians and the rest of Israel’s enemies. We will see below that these paradoxes will be explained by the profusion of identities active in the soul of nearly every Israeli Arab, not only between his village, community, religion and tribe and other parallel local identities, but primarily in his attitude towards his land as an Israeli, Palestinian, Arab and Muslim. One of the ways in which they avoid confronting the reality of life as a minority in a land in which they were a majority, is to repress the present demographic reality, which provides the Jews with the majority for the time being and to draw comfort from the vision that a day will come in the not too distant future in which they will reassume the position of majority due to their much more accelerated birthrate than that of the Jews, with which even massive waves of Jewish immigration can hardly keep up.

During the massive wave of Russian Jewish immigration, many of the leaders of the Israeli Arabs protested to the authorities in Russia because they were allowing their Jews to immigrate to Israel, while Arab refugees had been wasting away in their camps for decades awaiting implementation of the right of return. This sounds fantastic in light of their incessant complaints about their “suffering” in the State of Israel, their “repression” within it and the “discrimination” with which they are treated. After all, if it is so terrible, why would they want to include more of their people living in “freedom” abroad in their suffering? Recently, matters have become clearer as the leaders of the Israeli Arabs are publicly calling for the right of return for the Palestinians in general and insist, as did Yasser Arafat, that the returnees, approximately three and a half million of them, who are descendants of the seven hundred thousand (to quote the highest figure) who fled in 1948-1949, become full-fledged Israeli citizens. It is not that the PLO and its supporters have been overcome by Zionist feelings and are rushing to strengthen the Jewish state by bolstering its population. Rather, this is public defiance on the one hand, and an unsophisticated and unconvincing attempt to halt at all costs the meteorically successful process of consolidation and strengthening of the Jewish state, on the other. Defiance, to what purpose? Because along with its negation of immigration as one of the foundations of Zionism, for an ostensibly “humanitarian” reason, they are also challenging the rest of the dreams and principles of the Jewish state like settlement, security, ties to the Jewish people, democracy and economic growth, even though they are well aware that they accrue far-reaching benefits

from the realization of those aspirations. We will discuss these challenges in the following pages.

There is no reason to elaborate about the significance of immigration as it is the sole factor that has so far offset the natural growth of the Israeli Arab population and prevented them from utilizing their numbers to take over from within. Although this balance will not last forever, as was mentioned above, the Arabs are in a rush to realize their potential majority, whether by means of reinforcement by returnees from without or by undermining its Jewish foundations – with the courteous assistance of some of our fellow Jews who mean well and perform evil – and by the imposition of a “state of all its citizens” upon it so that its symbols, objectives and resources will be accepted by those who negate its existence. When one apprises them of the prospective consequences of the Arabization of the State, i.e. that if the Jewish majority that established its values, built its economy, instilled freedom and democracy in it and enhanced its power was lost, it will immediately be transformed into another poor, backward, corrupt and autocratic Arab country, as was the case in Gaza. They object to the “racist” statement, which questions the Arab ability to establish and sustain a progressive, open and thriving state, although they are unable to produce an example or precedent for a state of that sort among their 22 countries and the 200 million Arab brethren. Once they told us that the Palestinians were different, and that were they to achieve independence they would establish a bona-fide democratic state. We saw and were not convinced. We were also not convinced that those returning from the refugee camps would bring with them any governmental, economic or ethical message with which we are not already familiar. Nevertheless, it seems that it is much more important to the Israeli Arabs to bring their state down to the level of the rest of the Arabs – as long as they get rid of the Jewish majority and its innovations that make them jealous, even if by doing so they will lose its benefits – than to be absorbed as a minority with equal rights and obligations in the flourishing, progressive Jewish, Zionist state, and to accept their status within it.

This is also connected to the total Palestinian refusal to recognize the Jewish people’s right to self-determination and to freedom. In fact, one of the paragraphs in the infamous Palestinian Charter, which, to date, has neither been abrogated nor revised, contrary to the promises that were extorted from the Palestinians to do so, determines that the Jewish people is not a nation, a fact confirmed by its dispersal among the nations, and they, unlike the Palestinians are therefore undeserving of a state of their own. Their desire to implement the right of return, a right supported by the Israeli Arabs, as mentioned above, is precisely intended

to dilute the Jewish state to the point that the Jewish right to independence will self-implode. Our wise men who concocted the Oslo Accords paid no attention to this matter, although they were warned by more than a few of us. Therefore, they failed to raise the reasonable, obvious and egalitarian demand before the Palestinians that in exchange for our recognition of their right to self-determination, which was justified in the context of reciprocity, they would have to repay us in kind. We did not proffer that demand, they did not volunteer to be fair and meet that demand and therefore we remained with our unilateral recognition of their right, while they seek to eradicate our parallel, equal and reciprocal right, by inundating us with Arabs who will put an end to that right by democratic means. Incidentally, had we insisted on that simple reciprocity, not only would we have earned the world's approbation, but we would have thereby, for all intents and purposes, divested paragraph 20 of the Charter of its meaning and rendered it moot. Thus, the Israeli Arabs, in their refusal to accept their status as a permanent minority, their opposition to immigration, their defiance of the Jewish state whose declared identity they seek to dissolve and in their support of the right of return of their brethren to within the borders of Israel, are actually declaring blatantly and loudly that the Jews have no right to self-determination and at the same time are pressuring their government to implement the Palestinians' "natural and incontrovertible right" to it.

The same is true of the Zionist component of the State, which the Israeli Arabs, along with the rest of the Palestinians, are categorically demanding that it pass from the world. Once again the ineptitude of the wise men of Oslo, who recognized the PLO as the national liberation movement of the Palestinian people, is plain for all to see. That would have been proper and understandable had it been mentioned in the context of reciprocity, and had they demanded in return, in equality and reciprocity, that the PLO recognize its counterpart – Zionism. Again, had we demanded something so basic and fair, the entire world would have stood by our side. Instead, we granted the PLO legitimacy at the same time that it, the rest of the Arabs and all haters of Israel, continue to sully Zionism as racist, "Nazi" and other vitriolic epithets. Furthermore, the Palestinian Charter does not only attack Israel, but also attacks all of the political, economic, military and cultural manifestations of the "Zionist entity", in exterminatory terms that were phrased with much effort in 15 of its 33 paragraphs. Therefore, that was an opportunity to demand and achieve Palestinian recognition of Zionism – its historical rival. That, in and of itself, would have brought about the liquidation of the Charter and the abrogation of the anti-Zionist paragraphs within it, sparing us the need to demean ourselves and beg that it be revised.

Even when the issue of revisions of the Charter was raised, Israel demanded that all paragraphs opposing the existence of the State or alternatively those opposing Oslo be removed. However, in actuality, there were no paragraphs of that sort, as the Charter's attacks are against Zionism, not against Israel, and in Oslo the matter of Zionism was never raised because we never asked that it be raised. Thus we eased the way for the Palestinians, including the Israeli Arabs, to continue their attacks against Zionism and to demand the de-Zionization, if the de-Judaification did not satisfy them, of Israel.

The amateurish and naïve manner in which our leaders and the purveyors of bad advice working alongside them allowed themselves to be tricked and manipulated into a situation of give and take without the take, is positively astonishing. They accepted, in their simplistic and unsophisticated perception, recognition of Israel, which they heard directly from the PLO, as a fitting return for their recognition of the PLO. It is not, as when the Palestinians agreed to state explicitly the ineffable words "recognition of Israel" and not of the Jewish people or of Zionism, as mentioned above, they accepted upon themselves a non-Jewish non-Zionist State of Israel, whose Palestinian citizens are already challenging those foundations; therefore after their reinforcement by means of implementation of the right of return, in which the returnees will be neither enthusiastic Jews nor Zionists, in the future an Arab majority will be formed, which will utilize its democratic right to transform Israel into another Arab country, which could also change its name to "Free Palestine". Thus, while Israeli recognition of the Palestinian people and the PLO (which was manifest in a contractual commitment) as distinct from Palestinian recognition of the Jews and of Zionism – which was never sought and therefore never provided – was an irrevocable, binding declaration, Palestinian recognition of Israel, and not of the Jewish state and Zionism, is by its very nature temporary and given to interpretation and therefore does not obligate anyone over time. The Palestinian raising of the right of return at the crucial stages of Camp David and Taba negotiations, provides overwhelming evidence as to the Arab agenda. The declarations of Palestinian leaders, including those of the "moderates" like the late Faisal Husseini, during the *intifada*, regarding the ultimate objective of imposing their sovereignty over the entire Western land of Israel, and certainly the declarations of the members of Hamas, who demand the territory of the Jewish state due to its sanctity as *waqf* land, are decisive proofs of this orientation.

Settlement was always the primary bone of contention that caused the greatest friction with the Arab minority and even led to the inception of the first Land Day in late March 1976. As to the extent that Jewish settlement grows, becomes

established and expands, not only does it signal to the Arabs that the Jews are indeed putting down roots in their land, but it also comes, in their eyes, at the expense of their lands that were confiscated over the years in order to establish additional Israeli settlements, even if they were established on state lands and not on their private property. Even worse, from their perspective, is that the broadening of Jewish settlement means putting aside to their dream of return, as the potential settlement expanse is being completely overtaken. Thus, despite the fact that Israeli agriculture has increased the Arab agricultural output ten-fold – through learning – and immeasurably improved their crop-dusting, mechanization and marketing alignments – through imitation – this blessing was a curse in their eyes. Modern agriculture, which adopted new crops, new processing methods and at times production quotas dictated by the agricultural production councils, was loathsome in their eyes and came at the expense of the crops and lifestyles to which they were accustomed. The Israeli Arabs' opposition and bitterness rises every time new agricultural settlements are established in their vicinity, like the Galilee kibbutzim and outposts, because they consider them an invasive way of life that flaunts, in their proximity, a role model likely to teach work, behavior and openness methods that will harm and "corrupt" their youth. All the more so when urban settlements are established on the outskirts of their villages and cities (Upper Nazareth, Carmiel, etc.) which underscore even more blatantly – and therefore arouse jealousy – the gaps in standard of living, in the pace of life and in their results. In addition, in most of the instances, the Arabs point out that the new Jewish cities have an element of restricting their actions and strangling their settlements as they are left without expanses to live and develop.

Land Days, therefore, which began on March 31, 1976 and have been held annually since, at times with displays of violence against the authorities, are not only a symbol of resistance against land confiscation, but primarily an attempt to establish a boundary for Jewish settlement. Recently, the organizers have threatened violence and even bloodshed if the security forces dare enter their villages in order to impose order. Can anyone imagine what would be our fate if some violent gang were to threaten law enforcement authorities with bloodshed if they enter their turf in Beersheba or Ramat Gan? And the Israeli Police, subject to criticism by the Arab leaders, the media and politicians who seek to curry favor with the Arabs in the futile hope to win their votes, refuses to engage in confrontations. Instead, they "negotiate" and have "discussions" with those threatening them instead of putting them on trial; thus the scale of the demonstrators' demands gets progressively greater from year to year.

The authorities report that Land Day “passed peacefully” and even praise the “restraint” of the demonstrators, even when it turns out that the “restraint” also included brandishing flags of the PLO, Hamas and Hizbullah (all well-known “friends” of Israel and the Jews), calls for the sacrifice of soul and blood in order to gain redemption of the Galilee (from whom exactly?) and sometimes to top it off, calls to slaughter the Jews. In recent years, this extreme “restraint” has been tied to the “restraint” of the Palestinians in the territories and both have banded together, cooperating in the planning and the actual demonstrations, against their common “enemy”. These fulminations have borne fruit in the past and therefore there is no reason why they should not continue. Proof is the “Stars” program planned by the Israeli Government in the past in order to interrupt the continuum of Arab control in the Eron Valley, due to the very real threat that it poses to traffic between northern Israel and its center, and due to the isolation that it imposes on distant Jewish settlements, was abandoned by other governments that sought to win the hearts of the Arab voters.

The problem of the settlements has another aspect that has come about in recent years. Under the rubric of “preserving the Arab heritage”, or “restoration of the sites sacred to Islam”, much activity is underway in Israel of listing, restoring and commemorating all of the sites of Arab settlement that were destroyed in the course of the War of Independence, while exerting pressure on the State to permit their resettlement. Everyone anticipates a decision on the matter of Ikrit and Biram in order to create a precedent and subsequently to petition the courts about the discrimination against those places where resettlement would not be permitted. The Israeli Arabs well understand that the courts rule on the basis of justice and equality before the law, in private, specific cases that are brought before them – as became clear in the recent ruling in the matter of the Arab purchase of a lot for settlement in Kazir – and not on the basis of long term political considerations, which place on the scales the survivability of the Jewish state. The listing and commemorating are not historical/museum actions of memorializing the past, but rather a tool to revive the past and perpetuate it, by teaching children that they are residents of a settlement or village which has not existed for more than 50 years, by taking groups of tourists to their previous homes and thereby restoring their ties to those places and by going in the middle of the night to refurbish a cemetery overgrown with grass or a destroyed mosque. In this way, the repeated call at the Arab demonstrations in Israel regarding “redemption of the Galilee”, or other areas, takes on concrete, practical and immediate meaning. An additional meaning, no less immediate and threatening, is the connection between the revivification of the Arab settlement

map of yesteryear to the Palestinian right of return of tomorrow, which they wholeheartedly support. In other words, the places designated for the returnees have already been located, identified and to whatever degree possible are in the process of rehabilitation and restoration, ready to receive the joyous returnees to their homeland and lands. The fact that in the meanwhile new lives have taken root in these places neither deters them nor cools their enthusiasm.

Perhaps the security problem, the apple of the Israeli population's eye, which devotes the best years of its life to serve it, is also that which arouses the most primal opposition among the Israeli Arabs. Not only on the immediate, personal plane, according to which they see no need, and certainly no obligation, to set out to defend the State, in which they claim citizenship with equal rights, but primarily on the fundamental level of the right of Israel to security; as according to their point of view, Israel is always the aggressor, even when it is defending itself, because it does not have the right to defend that which it acquired by means of robbery, dispossession, abolition of rights, repression and discrimination. The Arabs are forever the victims, even when they attack, terrorize, murder, liquidate, detonate and threaten. There is no question here of investigating each case individually, in order to discern with a watchful eye who was the aggressor and who was his victim, because aggression is part of the Jewish essence and the Israeli way of life, while absolute justice is always on the side of the Arabs. Therefore, when Israeli Arabs react to an infuriating terrorist attack against their country – especially if one of them is involved as a terrorist or a victim – they will always condemn the “act” or the “incident”, just like the Palestinians from the territories, as if it were a natural disaster rained down from the heavens. They will not condemn the perpetrators, even if they explicitly identify themselves and even boast of their actions. Because it is inconceivable that Arab perpetrators, who are only defending against Israeli aggression, will be condemned for their act of heroism and sacrifice.

Israel's security, therefore, is an annoyance in the eyes of its Arabs, and as a result they will do nothing to enhance it. When the opportunity presents itself, they will take action to compromise it. A few years ago, when the issue of guard duty at student dormitories arose, the Arab students refused to participate in that task, claiming that “they have no one from whom they need to defend”. As if the terrorist, who comes to attack their dormitories, has any way of distinguishing between them and the other students, unless they had prior consultations with the terrorists, or even abetted them, to attack these students and spare those. As far as they are concerned, let Israel lose all of its security assets, because every fighter plane and tank that it purchases, not only comes at the expense

of the allocations of which the State deprives them, but they also delay the realization of the right of return that they so desperately desire to see in the near future. Therefore, any manifestation of contribution to Israeli security on the part of minorities, whether Druse, Bedouin or Christian volunteers, is met with outpourings of hatred from the general Muslim population, who were it not for fear of the authorities, would actually take action to hurt them. Those minorities who serve are accused of “collaboration”, heaven forbid, with the defenders of their country, and therefore there is no Muslim cleric who will agree to pray for the souls of those who were killed in action. After all, a traitor has no expiation and it is preferable that the community, which is so intent on struggling to gain rights in its state, disassociate itself from him and even ostracize him once he so impudently took part in fulfilling his obligations as well. Not to speak of Palestinians or Lebanese who aided Israel during its times of trouble and continues to protect them as a token of gratitude; however the Israeli Arabs distance themselves from them in contempt, do not welcome them into the community, condemn them and banish them and refuse to let their children play with the children of the “traitors”. As if defending Israel or assisting in its defense will always be fundamentally unacceptable while provoking it and undermining its existence is a sign of heroism and national pride. What country in the world would silently abide by such insubordinate and destructive behavior?

The security matter is also tied to the general conflict between Israel and the Arab and Islamic world. Israeli Arabs, witnessing Israel’s massive power, which was always implemented against the Arab countries, obviously cannot accept that and align with its supporters; on the contrary, they criticize it whenever it is implemented, align against it and even preach to us that “the policy of force will not succeed”, as if Israel would survive even one day without its military strength. Hence its collective categorical refusal to serve in the security forces, the Israeli Arabs’ pointed criticism of the volunteering of individuals among them and of the general Druse commitment to serve as a sect that has tied its fate to the State. In contrast to the years preceding the Six Day War, during which the Arabs contributed blood and a work force during the State’s time of distress, today service or volunteering of that sort are considered actual treason. In other words, to the degree that the Israelization of the Israeli Arabs increased, their reservations concerning having any involvement in its security activities also increased. And that was not only due to their refusal to be seared in the fire of someone else’s war (even though they are ostensibly “loyal” citizens) and their recoiling from participating in the rout of their people, but primarily so as to avoid seeing first hand the glory of the IDF, the revered defender of the

State, whose defeat they would like to witness, or at the very least not witness its victory.

All Israeli governments in the past and the present repeated the fabrication of the “loyalty” of most Israeli Arabs, except for those exceptions who are, every so often, caught committing serious security violations. Thus, of course, they are freeing the Arabs from the onus of proof and even from the reason to consider the disloyalty inherent in their constant, blatant affiliation with its enemies, ignoring any security constraints. The loyalty test of which we are speaking is not a passive concept whose popular meaning is: Anyone not placing bombs in the streets is considered loyal. This definition suffers from two shortcomings: First, many Arabs would like to place bombs or throw stones or Molotov cocktails at Israelis, but refrain from doing so due to lack of courage or fear of the legal authorities; however there are sufficient thousands among them who have killed Israeli soldiers and citizens, were violent towards the law enforcement personnel, placed explosive devices or car bombs in our cities, blocked traffic arteries, collaborated with terrorists from without or incited against Jews and their country beyond any accepted levels in defensive democracies and other similar crimes that will be surveyed extensively in the chapter about Arabs as Israelis. Today, the “work” is done by Palestinians who sow destruction, devastation and death in the streets of Israel while the Israeli Arab leadership – and presumably their rank and file brethren – applaud them unimpeded. Second, we would say, according to this litmus test, that the ultra-Orthodox Jews who do not stand at attention on memorial days, treat the State flag with contempt, evade military service and declare their anti-Zionism are also “loyal” as they do not place bombs in the streets. The proof is that the State is tolerant of them even when they act violently towards it, riot in the streets and hurl stones at passing cars on the Sabbath and the like. Even *Neturei Karta* (Guardians of the City) who are openly hostile to the State, do not observe its laws and are not partners in its frameworks, would be deserving of our respect due to their loyalty, because they do not take action against the State’s security.

Loyalty is an active concept of willingly taking part in the yoke of obligations imposed by the State and not merely silent attachment to its udder and unimpeded suckling from it. It means accepting its values, identity with its objectives, learning its language, taking part in its national holidays, respect for its symbols, service in its army and willingness to defend its existence and to fight when the need arises. The majority of the Arab population does not pass most of these tests. It is within its rights because it cannot identify with a Jewish, Zionist state. However, we must cease to delude ourselves as to its “loyalty” and

it must cease to demand full civil rights, at the same time that it is undermining the very foundation of the State, rejecting its values, dissociating itself from its contours, loathing its goals and siding with its enemies in sentiment and in action. Therefore, under the rubric of security we include internal security, which protects us from plots and threats from within. We see that every time the State confiscates land (even from Jews) for public needs (roads, training sites, development, industrialization, etc.), or seeks to enforce zoning laws that are blatantly trampled in the Arab sector, or to reassert control over state lands that were illegally occupied, the matter nearly escalates into war. The Arab leaders stand and violently obstruct the implementation of the law with their bodies, challenge and undermine the legal authorities and transform matters of civilian planning and law enforcement into chaos mixing criminal activity and politics, media and provocation of the state whose citizens they are. Not to mention the violent, murderous demonstrations, against their state and in identity with its enemies, in which part of the Arab Israeli citizens participate. This casts a giant shadow over not only their loyalty and their refusal to assume their proportional part in the security burdens incumbent upon the State, but also on the additional security burden that they impose on the shoulders of the State due to their conduct towards it and against it. In addition, the continuing ties between the State and the Jewish people in the Diaspora are an annoyance in the eyes of the Israeli Arabs. Every so often, we hear complaints from them that the State prefers to bring within its borders, under the Law of Return, Jews who never set foot here and even more so non-Jews whose only connection to the Land is utilitarian and not emotional, while at the same time rejecting the inherent right to return of the Palestinians, who were residents of the area. They are aware of the fact that the war between the parties is not about justice or humanity, but rather about history and nationalism. Historically, it was they who not only rejected the compromise proposal and the partition that was conceived by the UN and would have brought the conflict to an end, but they also tried to impose upon the Jewish state its solution of liquidation. Failing that, their pride was wounded, their anger erupted and their frustration grew. Furthermore, Israel, despite its minuscule dimensions and sparse population, dared to emerge victorious over all of the Arab armies, though even today it continues to refuse to apologize for doing so and to take responsibility for the Arab refugee problem and for the transformation of the Israeli Arabs, who were supposed to be the lords of the land, into a minority within it. Of course the Arabs have no share of the responsibility; they are the innocent, unfortunate victim to whom everyone owes everything. Nationally, because this land, that

was supposed to satisfy the rights of self-determination of the two peoples, has become a wrestling arena in which the rejectionists, who sought everything while attempting to cast their rivals aside, always lost, while the compromisers, who displayed willingness to partition, compromise and conduct neighborly relations, always won. That is what they find unbearable.

Little Israel, which survived the War of Independence by the skin of its teeth, became a transient phenomenon in the eyes of the Arabs after the war. They prepared for another round of war and then another, because the small, besieged, weak, fragile Jewish state, which in their eyes lacked vitality, would not be able to defend itself over time. Then it turned out that the Jewish people in the Diaspora, not only came to its assistance during the war, but continued to help expand its population and support it politically and economically afterwards. Above all, the Jews of the Diaspora served as a reservoir of potential immigration, the Arab opposition to which we discussed above. Therefore, it is no coincidence that despite the sanctimonious contentions of the Arabs in general that they have no dispute with Jews but only with Zionists, they themselves confuse the two and add the State of Israel to the confusion. They always detested Zionism and Jews when they fought against Israel, always meant Jews when they hurled invectives against Zionism and Israel and always despised Israel, the product of Zionist Jews. Therefore, it should come as no surprise that in all of their battles with Israel, they sounded slogans of “slaughter the Jews”, even before the establishment of the State – in the massacre of the Jews of Hebron (1929), in the massacre of the Hadassah convoy (1948) and also in the uprising in Umm-al-Fahm (2000). The political platforms of the Arab and Islamic movements, like the PLO and Hamas, as well as political speeches and religious sermons, street conversations among Arabs as well as schoolbooks that they use to educate their youth, mention Israel, Jews and Zionists in one breath and with the same degree of animosity. This points to the continuing connection in their eyes between Israel, its Judaism and its Zionism; hence the war that it wages against all three.

The struggle of the Israeli Arabs to de-Judaize (by implementation of the right of return) and de-Zionization (by abandoning its symbols, values and ideological platform) the State, is intended to separate Israel from the sources of its vitality and hope. Their hope is that the processes of Arabization of the land, to which they aspire demographically, culturally and politically, will ultimately deter the potential immigrants from the West, who are the final repository of potential Jewish immigration, which will ease the way for them to become the majority in the near future and gain control of the land by democratic means. Therefore, it is strange, not to mention unfortunate, that some Jewish organizations in

America have recently been afflicted by “guilt” feelings because they “neglected” the problems of the Israeli Arabs during the years of their support, investment and mobilization for Israel and began considering promoting educational and developmental projects for that “neglected” sector. They do not understand that this support, if it is realized, will only bolster Arab hopes, in this period of conflict between them and the Jewish majority, that they are close to severing this Gordian knot between Israel and the Jews of the world, by encouraging the Jewish Diaspora to support them and not their enemy, Zionist Israel. As far as they are concerned, they are probably smiling under their mustaches to find that the united Jewish front that always opposed them is crumbling before their eyes. This will not encourage them, as per the delusion of the American Jews, to greater moderation or an attitude of solidarity and loyalty to their Jewish state, but, on the contrary, it will instill within them new expectations that their aspirations will be soon realized.

Even the Israeli democracy, under which they are, apparently, freer than any other Arab group that does not live in the West, is under fire by the Israeli Arabs. Ostensibly, that is surprising because it is precisely that minority population, protected by the principles of the liberal Israeli democracy and which the judicial system acts like a watchdog so that nothing untoward happens to it, is the most contrary, the loudest, most violent and most destructive force against that system. They accuse it on a daily basis that it is not a real democracy, that it is discriminatory, racist and repressive and do not understand that they are actually describing themselves as they do not give any indication that they have internalized what is democracy. It is difficult to blame them for not comprehending the real meaning of democracy; however one must certainly blame them for their failure to learn what they do not understand. After all, the only Arabs in the world who have experienced a taste of democracy, with the exception of those in the West, live in Israel. However, instead of appreciating its merits, to attempt to improve themselves through its principles and to thank the Lord that they have been given this unique opportunity, they seek to distort it to fit their needs and to teach the Israelis what is “true” democracy, as if they invented it and are not merely immature students desperately, and unsuccessfully, attempting to grasp its implications. According to them, democracy exists in Egypt as well and some of the greatest advocates of democracy among them returned from their visits to murderous Damascus inspired by the monarchical republic in which the cruel bloody reign is passed down from father to son. In contrast, within Israeli democracy, which for the first time granted them the right to vote and be elected, they continued to operate, over the years, the Bolshevik

regime of their communist party in its various incarnations, the clan system that grants priority to dignitaries and ancestry over the talents of the educated youth, unbridled rhetorical fulmination over responsible civilian productivity, and the Islamic order that prefers (like Israeli ultra-Orthodox Jews) sheiks (rabbis) at the expense of secular elected officials.

If a slow and blessed change has taken place in this gradually changing political behavior, it is only thanks to the democratic culture that they are slowly beginning to internalize, by means of the state educational system, the free press, the judicial system and the political system, to which they owe a considerable debt regardless of how much they attempt to deny it and renounce it. However, they have a long way to go as do other Israeli populations, who also have little experience in the recent past in purely democratic traditions. They believe, or at least they behave as if democracy came into being so that they could receive allocations, participate in elections, act riotously in the streets and the Parliament, act violently against law enforcement officials as they please, receive rulings that meet their expectations and say whatever comes to mind with no constraints. They do not understand that democracy must also keep law and order, demand fulfillment of civil and security obligations, insist on the protection of its institutions and civil servants from violence and abuse, sometimes subjugate the will of the minority to the needs of the majority, educate for civic responsibility and demand loyalty to the State as mentioned above. They do not grasp, for example, that they cannot anticipate state perquisites for their youth if they continue to run wild on the campuses in protest against the State's existence instead of going to fulfill their obligations and defend its borders; it is beyond their comprehension that they cannot demand equal rights, allocations, participation in running the State and protection by the State and its institutions while they fail to fulfill even their most fundamental obligations (for example: national service and payment of real taxes), and instead they openly identify with its enemies, attack witnesses in the courtrooms, incite the public with their speeches and writings (see below, the chapter about the Arab as Muslim, and quotations from their statements), hurl stones and Molotov cocktails at policemen and passers-by, burn fields and inflame violent demonstrations against the very same state.

In a democracy, citizens take part in promoting the general well-being and the assumption is that if things are good for the general population, things are also good for the individual citizen and vice-versa. However, the opinion and belief has taken root in the Israeli Arab public that general well-being means the well-being of the Arab population while the good of the State has never entered their

mind or agenda. This is manifest in their sectarian ethnic/national/Palestinian/Arab concerns and in their political organization within Israel. For example, in their public pronouncements, the Arab leaders have never once expressed concern over the economic, tourism, security, unemployment, water, balance of trade or foreign currency difficulties encountered by the State. They are exclusively concerned with those matters relating to the Arab sector or the welfare of the rest of the Arabs or the Palestinians. Even when several Arabs served as deputy ministers or in other positions in the government service, they dealt with Arab matters and as a rule, showed no general interest in the plight of the State. When there was a Deputy Minister of Education or Deputy Minister of Health, he never cared for, made declarations about, tended to, showed any interest in or took into consideration the general needs of the State within his ministry's realm of responsibility. As far as he was concerned, providing for the Arab needs justifies his existence because he "serves those who sent him" according to his statements, and is not entrusted with serving the general public. However, when a Jewish minister or deputy minister is suspected, even unjustifiably, of giving preference to Jews, then the Arabs are the first to sound a complaint. After all, the benefits that they enjoyed during the Rabin-Aloni administration, like reverse discrimination in education, construction of schoolrooms and generous budgetary allocations to the local governments, were accomplished by and at the initiative of Jewish ministers, who saw to the needs of the general population and with a comprehensive national perspective decided to give specific preference to the Arabs, in order to compensate for the gap that had accumulated over the years. Is it at all possible that an Arab minister would manage the matters relating to the Israeli population, employing national considerations, while granting specific priority to Jews if the need arose? I wonder.

The sectarian focus of the Israeli Arabs has a destructive effect on democracy from another perspective: The State has an overabundance of political parties ranging from the so-called Right to the extreme Left. Had the Arabs opted to function within existing frameworks, like a British citizen of Pakistani or Indian origin does when he joins the Conservative or Labor Parties and successfully climbs the party ladder and reaches high ranking positions, then they would not have to bang on the doors to get one of their own appointed minister. Why only one minister (or one Supreme Court Justice) and why not any more than one minister? After all, we do not want a quota system that will only perpetuate the separation and the distinctions. We must enable each person who rises up through the ranks due to his personality, his skills and his affiliation with the general political configuration, to display his unique strengths and to play a role

in society, for the greater good, including, of course, Arab citizens. An example of this is Minister Salah Tarif, who was chosen by the Labor party to represent it in the government, not as an “Arab minister”, but rather as a representative of the movement, who was able to win over the hearts of its voters with his personal qualities. However, the rest of the Arabs, who establish exclusively Arab parties and function within their framework and as their representatives, send a clear message that they have no interest in being integrated into the fabric of the Israeli political parties. It is as if the Muslims or the Jews in the United States or Great Britain were to establish their own parties instead of being absorbed into the existing party establishment. It is not only that some of these Arab parties are blatantly hostile towards the State, one of them (BaLa”D, the National Democratic Covenant) whose acronym also has nationalist overtones (*bilad* = land or homeland), and also the word “national” means, of course, the Palestinian and not the Jewish homeland, transmits a message of separation and not one of integration.

Of course, the freedom of political organization in Israel allows its Arabs to form associations and parties the likes of which are not permitted to function in the Arab countries and regimes, which they so revere and admire. In the “democracies” of Egypt and Jordan, for example, Islamic parties may not participate in elections, not to mention in the dictatorships of Syria and Iraq where any party that is not the monolithic ruling party cannot even announce its existence. In Israel, on the other hand, six mayors of cities and villages who head their local Islamic Movement chapters were elected. The southern faction of the Islamic Movement (see the chapter on Israeli as Muslim below) joined together with another Arab party in order to run for the Israeli Knesset and to place two of their representatives there. After all that, we hear from them about repression, suppression and discrimination to which they are subject in the State of Israel, which is tolerant to the point of placing itself in jeopardy. But these elected officials fail to understand how destructive, both personally and in terms of the State whose full citizenship they demand, is the separatist doctrine that they are cultivating. As, first of all, they are losing, or at least they are distancing themselves, from the power centers; since by being elected separately they are not only blatantly anti-establishment, but are also explicitly or implicitly anti-Israeli. Second, they thereby sentence themselves to the margins of society, because the Jewish majority will always dissociate themselves from them, will not want to associate with them and will prefer to unite the Jewish Right and Left over humiliating dependency on their votes. Third, the Arab elected officials have no chance to gain what they promised their voters from

the outside and will be always dependent on the goodwill of the various Israeli governments; were they to opt to work from the inside, within the existing establishment, which they despise and with which they refuse to cooperate, and were they to display interest in the general problems of the State of Israel and not only in what happens in their own backyard, then their influence and accomplishments would grow immeasurably. In contrast to their isolationist and sectarian positions, all Israeli governments over the generations took care of the Israeli Arabs, some more and some less, and saw to their advancement and their integration into the State. Had the Arab leadership assisted them with a constructive and productive approach, with the desire to integrate and identify instead of to segregate and seethe, there is no doubt that the present feelings of alienation, which that leadership promotes and stokes, would moderate and even disappear.

Democracy is not implemented only in the central government, which, for most of the citizens of the State, is distant and at times disengaged, but first and foremost on the local level, which every citizen and resident deals with on a daily basis. In the Arab sector, the act of democratic election, of a mayor or municipality head – personally and the members of the municipality in a party list, has moved new and young forces, which replaced the dignitaries and the traditional clan lists. The mayor of Umm-al-Fahm, for example, who was elected by an 80% majority of his city's electorate, could not have won so decisive a majority just from his clan (one of four in the city), or even only from the supporters of the Islamic Movement in the city. His vigor, his modest lifestyle, his concern for the matters of the city and its individuals are what have made him so popular, well-liked and well-received. No doubt, therefore, that he and many others like him, some young and educated, who have drawn democracy and democratic management principles from the surrounding Israeli society, or in its schools, have brought about a revolution in municipal representation and in the function of local government in the Arab sector. In practice, there are two types of government there: The old and clannish, which continues to cry before the central government about discrimination, displays for all to see the "sewage flowing in the streets", which has become a proverbial mockery, organizes demonstrations against the government in its backyard while at the same time doing little to make tax collection and the bloated apparatuses more efficient, was unsuccessful in liquidating corruption and the politics of nepotism and continues to prefer relatives in appointments. In contrast – the new regime, whose most outstanding representatives are members of the Islamic Movement, who, with vigor, imagination, frugality and efficiency harnessed the energy to change the

face of their cities, mobilizing volunteers, gathering contributions of money, building materials and work hours in order to renovate, fix and build without requiring gifts from the government. They have achieved real accomplishments and changed the face of their cities. But they also transformed them into Islamic enclaves within the State of Israel, which live their lives totally disconnected from it and slowly are exchanging the law of the State, which they do not care for, with municipal bylaws that enable them to prohibit alcohol (and drugs) in their cities, to build separate bus stops for the two genders and to separate the pre-teen boys and girls in the state schools within their boundaries.

In other democracies that knew how to defend themselves, in the United States and Great Britain, immeasurably harsher measures than the “discrimination” ostensibly practiced by Israel *vis-à-vis* its Arab citizens were taken. In Britain, for example, the Home Secretary was authorized, during World War II, to order the apprehension of anyone whom he had a basis to suspect a threat to state security; and in the United States all citizens of Japanese descent were incarcerated by order of the Supreme Court, which determined that the State is allowed to take steps in its defense that are consistent with anticipated (not real) threats. All that, when no British or American citizen did anything that even hinted at an act of terrorism or violence against his country and when, at least in the United States, no danger existed to the existence of the country, because all of their wars were far from home and no act of war took place in its territory. After the war, the United States suffered through the Senator McCarthy episode, which led to the firing, interrogation, incarceration and even the stripping of the citizenship of many who were suspected of theoretical sympathy for communism. Has Israel taken, or even come close to taking, steps of this sort, even while fighting for survival and while its Arab citizens were undermining its foundations, denying its right to exist, siding with its enemies, damaging its facilities and attacking its law enforcement personnel? We all know what would have befallen us had we dared and desired to follow in the footsteps of the great democracies. We are quite fortunate that thoughts of that sort never entered our minds even during our most difficult hours, except for some deviations (like Kafr Kasseem) that were handled by the legal system. These volitional and moral restrictions that the State, justifiably and unilaterally accepted upon itself, are not acknowledged or appreciated by the Israeli Arabs, although under any Arab regime they would not have enjoyed anything similar, but rather they serve as an impetus for them to disparage the State, to rebel against it and to revile it.

Even the economic aspect, which more than any other should have been quantifiable, neutral and unbiased, reveals the intentions of the Arabs in Israel.

Was any one of them deprived of the ability to initiate, invest, invent, raise capital, take chances and succeed? The few that dared and took initiative experienced significant success. The others do not ask themselves why they are not initiating and succeeding but rather blame the discriminatory government policy – but do not say in what way was it discriminatory. What do they want? That their villages be granted border settlement status, with its concomitant tax relief, while they claim that they are not in danger from any terrorists or any Arab country and they therefore see no obligation to defend the country? They were provided with electricity, water, roads, telephones, educational institutions, culture and health as well as an unprecedented democratic electoral system for their councils and cities of a much higher quality than they could receive in any of the Arab countries that are the object of their dreams. Did that diminish their hatred? Not at all – they remained devoted to placing responsibility on the State and on the “discrimination” with which it treats them, with the exception being the six cities and councils that are under the rule of the Islamic Movement, to which Nazareth will soon be added, that organized their society and resources differently (as we will see in the chapter on The Israeli as Muslim), did not anticipate favors from anyone and established voluntary mechanisms, which compensated – and more than compensated – for the shortfall in government support. The others prefer to remain in the mode of unfortunate victims, who, instead of rolling up their sleeves and beginning to work, redirect the blame in the direction of the State. How convenient, appealing and captivating!

The Israeli Arabs never stopped to ask themselves why they find themselves in the lower levels of Israeli economic development and why their percentage of unemployed is higher than the national average. They are so caught up in their world of complaints against the State that they also do not take into account the construction, expansion, rise in standard of living and the introduction of modernity into their lives that has taken place under Israeli rule. This rule has moved them centuries ahead and has brought them closer to the standards current in Israel, in contrast to the villages of their brethren that remained light years behind them, under non-Israeli rule in the other parts of the Land of Israel. Have they asked themselves why Herzliya is wealthier and more flourishing than Or Akiva, or Ramat Aviv than the Florentine neighborhood in Tel Aviv or Beersheba than Sderot? After all, they are all Jewish cities and neighborhoods. Have any of them screamed vociferously about state discrimination? Furthermore: Are Rahat and Tel Sheva like Turan and Beka? If there is discrimination, why are all of the Arab settlements not abject and all of the Jewish settlements prosperous? It seems that this is a problem that transcends the ethnic-national borders in Israel

and the explanations and solutions are in the socio-economic realm, which no one challenges. After all, every society contains people who are rich and poor, talented and untalented, industrious and slothful, ambitious and shiftless. In wealthy New York, are Fifth Avenue and Park Avenue the equivalent of Seventh Avenue or Tenth Avenue? Boston and Detroit? California and Alabama? And the result is – if the Israeli Arabs insist on separate Arab education, which provides them with fewer matriculation certificates and less eligibility to enter university than their percentage of the population; and if they refuse to join the army and go through the crucible that every Israeli undergoes; and if they choose to isolate themselves within their parties and conduct their policies of alienation instead of integrating into the existing political frameworks; and if they establish their own “national” bodies like the Arab Mayors Forum or their Monitoring Commission that also includes the Arab members of Knesset; in short they prefer conflict and hostility with their State over identification with it and battling against it over battling together with it, they should not be surprised if they are shunted to the margins of society in every sense, including the economic one.

When the crisis broke out in Nazareth in 1997, when the Islamic Movement entered the courtyard of the Church of the Annunciation by force and illegally established a tent mosque, in order to gain possession of the territory that was designated for work to absorb the masses of pilgrims anticipated in the year 2000, this author was appointed as a member of the governmental commission of inquiry that was supposed to trace the roots of the inter-communal confrontation and to recommend ways of escaping the dead end. In the coming chapters, we will detail this decisive episode in State relations with the Islamic Movement and with its Christian minority. However, for our purposes here, we will note that when the Islamist leaders were warned by the commission that their continued illegal occupation of the area would render futile the efforts to promote the city’s development, which were the joint initiative of the municipality and the Ministry of Tourism with the objective of welcoming the record tourism anticipated in the year 2000; and that the citizens of the city themselves, most of whom are Muslims and make their living from tourism, would be the first and immediate losers, they resolutely stated that establishing the mosque in the courtyard was much more important to them than the economic gains anticipated if they dismantle the tent and halt their violence. That choice that preferred an ideological religious success over economic gain should not be surprising and even has an aspect that evokes respect and admiration. But it also provides an overwhelming answer, an answer that was confirmed by other Muslim leaders that all those who believe that economic development will lower

the level of fundamentalism, and that raising the standard of living necessarily leads to a decline in religious motivation and to the disappearance of complaints of discrimination, not only knows not of what he speaks, but he also adopts a patronizing, offensive and insulting approach as it assumes that tossing a pile of dollars at religious groups committed to their tradition, will lead them to change their ways or will put an end to their claims. It has been proven, contrary to the common stereotype, that it is not only the penniless youth, bereft of hope, lost, lacking familial and social anchors and uneducated that are drawn to the Islamic extremes of Arab society in Israel and in general; but it is also older men with families, educated, professional and whose income is not bad at all. Therefore, the economic matter in the attitude of the Israeli Arabs is so marginal a consideration that they are willing to suffer, to be abused and to lose as long as they get what they want, or at least succeed in dragging Israel down from the heights of its success.

Thus, there are many facets to the existence of the Arab minority in Israel, from the governmental, economic and security perspectives as well as the attitude of that sector to the fundamental values and assets of the Jewish state like immigration, settlement, Zionism, symbols and the like. In the coming chapters we will discuss the crucial question of the identity affiliation of the Israeli Arabs, whose fragmented souls go back and forth between being Israeli, Palestinian, Arab and Muslim. We will discover that their identity affiliation always combines several of those elements, with emphases on one element or another or total submission to one or the other, in accordance with the events taking place around him. Therefore, the parameters of this identity are not only complex and entangled, but they are also individual for each person or affiliated group within the Arab community; and most important, they are not static but rather they are dynamic both in the soul of each individual and also in the consciousness of the entire collective. Let us see.

CHAPTER TWO

THE ARAB AS ISRAELI – AN INHERENT CONTRADICTION

The Israeli Arab's most difficult dilemma relates to his Israeli citizenship, which is in direct, immediate, confusing and painful confrontation, not only with the fact that he is Arab and Palestinian in a historical and cultural sense and not only because he belonged to a majority that became a minority, with all of the implications thereof regarding his national pride and regarding his attitude towards refugees and displaced persons among his people who are no longer with him, but primarily because of the conflicted world in which he is compelled to live and forced to confront on a daily basis. They tell him that he is an Israeli with equal rights, however he also knows that he will not be able to get a job in the Aircraft Industry or in the nuclear reactor, and his son could never even dream of being an air force pilot, or a general in the IDF (unless he is a Druse). If that is the situation, what kind of equality is that, he wonders to himself. It makes no difference to him that he also opposes serving in the IDF and that it is impossible to go directly to the second floor if you do not first lay the foundation and build the first floor. Thus, when it comes to rights, he resolutely demands them, because, after all, he is a citizen, but when obligations, or at least integration into Israeli society for his own good, are mentioned then he is backed into a corner and he distressfully murmurs: "But I am a Palestinian/Arab/Muslim." The Druse, as a sect and other Israeli Arabs as individuals, resolved this perplexing contradiction, which does not have a uniform answer appropriate for everyone, by deciding to serve in the army and thereby to put an end to their quandary. But the overwhelming majority, following its leaders, finds no respite from the horns of the dilemma. Therefore, it is not only the problem of the minority, which has difficulty finding its place, but rather it is the problem of the State of Israel, which also

will not arrive at peace and tranquility until it finds a solution acceptable to the opposing parties.

The beginnings of this complication lie in the fact that all Israeli governments to date have never adopted a decisive, clear and long-term policy in order to regulate relations between the State and its Arab citizens and the relations between the Jewish majority and the Arab minority. There has been a patchwork policy to meet short-term needs, referred to by its implementers in the office of the Adviser to the Prime Minister for Arab Affairs as “buying calm” in the hope to “slow the deterioration”. In all liberal democratic regimes, the tendency of governments to act as firefighters, in order to douse local conflagrations until the next elections is well known. To that end, they make contradictory promises to different segments of the public, as long as they amass enough votes to return them to power in the next round of elections. Long-term planning does not interest them. They leave that to the long-lasting authoritarian regimes, which do not need to report to their non-voting constituency. However, it is rare indeed that democratic governments have neglected interests vital to their country like the Israeli governments have done regarding the matter of the Arabs. As the very statement that the objective is to slow the deterioration, is based on the fatalistic assumption that there is nothing to be done and that it is a decree of fate that cannot be halted, and that inherently frees the policymakers from deliberating over it and finding solutions, or at least directions towards a solution. In order to slow the deterioration, one pays a kickback, makes some appointments and provides some benefits, promises unrealistic things whose realization is impossible, but the deterioration is showing no signs of slowing. Therefore, they unveil bombastic plans to “close gaps” and “reverse discrimination”, express remorse, ask forgiveness and promise that “this time” it’s serious. Meanwhile, until implementation, which certainly will never come, with no master plan or objective, they “buy calm” with payments, hugs, threats, pressure and more promises. Well, for how much time can calm be bought? Is buying calm a substitute for policy? They do not give any thought to the simple fact that one who wants to buy calm, the implication is that he acknowledges the unrest and the subterranean currents, that one day are liable to burst and ignite a great conflagration. It is possible to delay temporarily the inevitable decree but not to prevent it completely.

In the early 1980s instructive statistics were published that attempted to show that the root of the trouble is the “discrimination” practiced by the State of Israel *vis-à-vis* its Arab citizens. It was said, for example, that despite the fact that the Arabs were “one out of six” of the population of Israel, only one out of

every seventeen members of Knesset was Arab, and only one out of every 300 academics or members of university faculties belonged to the Arab minority in Israel. It would be possible to add to this whining deficit, that according to this scale there also should have been 3-4 Government Ministers, 2 Supreme Court Justices, 4-5 Director-Generals of government offices, several directorships, Arab Deputy Chairwomen of WIZO and the Organization of Working Mothers, Arab Deputy Chairmen of the Jewish Agency, the Jewish National Fund and the like. And if that is true for the Arabs, then why should the immigrants from Georgia, Bessarabia and Poland get any less? Can anyone imagine what would happen if this country was to institute a system of quotas like the one in Lebanon? We would suffer through a much worse version of Lebanonization. The fact is that the situation has improved immeasurably since then, both in the Knesset and in academia, without having to resort to the disreputable path of ethnic representation that was drilled into our heads by bleeding heart critics, who neglected to mention that along with that statistical "inequity" there were impressive achievements among the Israeli Arabs in life expectancy, standard of living, productivity per tract of land, per capita income, pace of modernization and social services. And if, heaven forbid, Israel were to adopt that foolish policy, it would bring about an irreparable rupture not only between the State and its Arab citizens, but especially between the various ethnic groups in Israel, who would also demand their portion in appointments and in the division of the national pie and would thereby lead this country to oblivion. That is not to say that there were not then, and that there are not today, sectarian and factional parties, both Arab and Jewish, but the central current in society and politics remains primarily a meritocracy and most of the parties include within them all of the ethnic groups, including Arabs, and in them each individual makes his way based on merit and not on affiliation.

Totally by chance, the most recent Israeli governments have included a balanced number from all of the Jewish ethnic groups in the key positions of Foreign Minister, Defense Minister and Finance Minister, but still no Arabs, with the exception of the Sharon government in 2001. And all those who served in the government, including the first Arab to fill that role, were chosen by the Prime Minister or by their parties because of their personal qualities. Calculate how many Arabs could have served in Israeli governments had they gone with the central stream and had not taken the destructive path of fiery separatism as was explained in the previous chapter. According to the strategy that they chose to follow, being an Israeli citizen means to demand and to receive, and if they do not get what they want, then the State becomes a punching bag in which

they find an outlet for their anger and frustration. In other words, being an Israeli to them is only a matter of convenience and not a matter of identification. They spend their days drawing comparisons right and left between their villages and the neighboring kibbutzim and cooperative settlements, instead of with the villages in Judea, Samaria and Gaza; between their poor neighborhoods in the mixed cities and the neighborhoods where the rich reside and not with the poor people closer to them socially and economically, and their frustrations are reaching new heights as they vocalize their feelings of “injustice”. It is hard for them to understand that they will never be able to measure up completely to the Jewish sector in one leap, as they entered the process of modernization late. It is beyond their comprehension that Jewish society, which they so hate and of which they are so jealous, for whose defense and well-being they do not lift a finger, but rather are concerned exclusively with themselves, is also in no hurry to help them and will not support them in their demands for rights without obligations. Jewish society is sensitive enough to human rights, civil equality and good neighborliness, when the one issuing those demands does something for them as well. However they will avoid Arab restaurants, will not visit Arab villages and will not spend their money in Arab grocery stores, as they remember the atrocities that those same Arabs perpetrated during the High Holidays of the year 2000.

Jews belonging to the central stream will not support the Arabs in their demands for rights, not because they are “racist”, as per the oversimplification removing from the Arabs all responsibility for these developments, but rather because their eyes saw and their ears heard the destruction, the devastation, the unrestrained rioting, the violence against security forces, the attacks, the siege on isolated Jewish settlements, the brandishing of the flags of Hamas and Hizbullah, who, as far as we can tell, are not among the world’s righteous Gentiles and the murders of Jewish passers-by, which sowed bewilderment and fear, shock and mistrust among the entire Jewish population in Israel. How do they expect that Jews who, with their own ears, heard the calls “Slaughter the Jews!” during the riots, will come to dine together with those that seek to kill them? Had they studied a little history they would know that many Arab villages attacked Jews on their way to Jerusalem, when the nascent State was fighting for its existence. Who, today, knows about Colonia, the Castel, Beit Mahsir and Dir Ayub? Where are they? In contrast, the village of Abu-Ghosh, which treated the Jews equitably, has not only maintained its size but has grown and flourished, and has become an Israeli favorite in its music festival held on the Shavuot holiday and Israelis have become their bread and butter (quite literally)

with their restaurants filled with Israelis night and day. Are the residents of Abu-Ghosh less Arab than the residents of Umm al-Fahm? What happened to the well-known Israeli “racism”? The answer is simple: Those acted like wild animals and those like human beings and the Jews treat each in the appropriate manner. And another thing that Jewish public opinion cannot bear is the way the Israeli Arabs’ wailing disingenuousness that their rights are being negated and that they are “being discriminated against”, and there are even some pure-of-heart Jews with good intentions who are willing to fall into that trap and mobilize to the aid of the “discriminated”. However, the sober Israeli public understands what is going on: The Arabs seek to create, a little more than 200 years after the French revolution, a new aristocracy in Israel, which enjoys manifest, inherited rights, immunity before the law (because they dare not touch them), hides behind the shield of “Arabism” that attests to the blue blood in their veins and takes its equal portion of the prosperity that it did not create, the plenty that it did not bring, the democracy that it did not initiate and the State that it did not establish; however it leaves to the population of Jewish “suckers” to pay real taxes, to be killed on the borders, to protect them from enemies, to go to war, to worry about the budget, to invest money and to chop wood and draw water for everyone. It multiplies as it pleases, demands an ever-growing portion of the expanding cake, despite the fact that it hinders, and does not assist, this paradise to perpetuate, to exist and serve it.

These parameters, which have been chiseled into the identity and behavior of the Israeli Arabs, are not a new or sudden phenomenon. When the State was established, the Arabs that remained, with isolated exceptions, were among its enemies. And nevertheless, it had the generosity to invite them publicly to remain within its borders, declared them equals among equals in their Declaration of Independence and even agreed to absorb tens of thousands of them when the battles abated, taking an enormous risk, whose dimensions are only today becoming clear. However, from the onset, it turned out that the heart of these Arabs, who were left without their leadership, who were the first to flee during the war, remained, understandably and as expected, with their brethren who fled, were displaced or became refugees. There were also some cases in which this population harbored “infiltrators” from across the border, who came to visit their villages that had been destroyed and their fields that had been seized by the Jewish state. Therefore, the military government over the Israeli Arabs that had originally been established to last until the end of the war, in the belief that then there would be peace, became a permanent fixture over the entire Arab population and imposed upon it great hardship in terms of making a living,

freedom of movement, education and all areas of life. Paradoxically, it was specifically during that difficult period of poverty, humiliation, demoralization and scarcity that the Arab minority, cut off from the rest of the Arab world, adjusted to its new living conditions, accepted the State of Israel as an immutable fact to which they would have to grow accustomed, learned Hebrew, sought and received employment in the Jewish sector and began to weave a fabric of permanent life in this new, strange manner. The primary difficulty was psychological, as the transformation from being members of the majority to being members of the minority in Israel was unbearable, even if previously they were not citizens of the British government, while now they were citizens of an independent country. In their eyes, it was preferable to continue under the rule of the British occupation than to bear the humiliation of being a citizen in a Jewish state, that alone achieved independence while the Palestinian majority remained scattered, displaced and without hope.

However, a whole array of dual complexities and complexes are tied to life under Jewish rule: The historically inferior status of Jews in Arab and Islamic countries, which was the “natural way” in the world of yesteryear, while now, in the new world, the roles were reversed; and the Islamic commandment requiring every adherent to reside in an Islamic country, something whose validity was questionable during the Mandate, despite the Muslim majority, but is certainly no longer in effect as a minority under Jewish rule. If in the past it was possible to bear the humiliation of British rule, both because it was temporary and because it represented the enormous British Empire to which many nations were subservient, how can they proudly hold their heads up high, as a singular instance in the history of Islamic peoples, under the rule of the erstwhile despicable and downtrodden Jews? The status of the Jews in the Islamic countries, where the quantitative and qualitative majority of the Jewish people lived until the late Middle Ages, was decreed by Islamic law commandments that established that Jews (and Christians) within their borders would be treated as “protected peoples” (*dhimmim*), who are shackled to multiple and multifarious material and class restrictions, known as the *Dhimma* Law. It is true that the inferior status of the Jews in Islamic countries was immeasurably better than their status under the Christian yoke in Europe, as the moment that they accepted the *Dhimma* status and the accompanying head tax (*gizia*), it guaranteed, at least *de jure*, their lives and property, while in the Christian world they had no such protection. However, the *dhimmim* were designated for humiliation in any case and the great arbiters of Islamic law, even the moderates among them, ascribed them restrictive and humiliating classifications juridically, economically, socially

and politically. Of course there were exceptions, for better and for worse, in the status of the Jews, ranging from the well-known Golden Age in which the Jews created, flourished, climbed the ladder of success and became an inseparable component of the Arab-Muslim cultures in which they lived, to the vicious attacks, pogroms, mass murders, forced conversions and extreme repression during the reign of the cruel Mamluk rulers in the Middle East and the Mwahad rulers in North Africa.

The sudden transformation that took place with the independence of the Jewish people in its land, was not merely a national, individual and territorial tragedy for the Israeli Arabs, but it also challenged the foundations of faith as the *Dhimma* status that existed for over a thousand years was turned on its head; as the Hamas charter characterizes it: "Slaves became masters", the downtrodden arose and the order of the universe that had developed into fixed, standing laws of nature were expunged without a trace. That is hard to digest and hard to accept. Especially, as mentioned above, because the Israeli Arabs were living securely in a Muslim country, meaning that it was liberated in the process of *Futuh* (Islamic conquests), which transformed it into *waqf* (Muslim consecration) land for all future generations (see a more detailed discussion in the chapter; Israelis and Muslims below). Thus, to the matter of the humiliation in the transformation of an ethnic-national (Arab) majority into a minority, the profound rupture inherent in the Jewish people, which itself was humiliated, quite literally, under the Islamic boot, taking control of consecrated Muslim territory, was added. After all, the Muslims are commanded to live in an Islamic land, because there alone can they express their religion unhindered and also utilize the Islamic country to protect the Muslim adherents. As long as they have freedom of worship, the Muslims could always claim that their lives are not intolerable to the point that they would be forced to leave and move to a different territory under Muslim rule. This legal ambiguity is decided, to a large extent, by both the assumption/belief/hope that the Jewish rule is temporary and that it will ultimately end just like the Crusader rule in Israel; and by the cultivation of the nationalistic value of *sumud* (taking a firm stand), of holding onto the land at all costs in order to continue to establish a challenge of presence and continued demographic growth before the ephemeral Jewish government. Moving to another place, in order to revel in the atmosphere of Islam, would be interpreted, therefore, as submission to the Jewish expansionist aspirations and as betrayal of the national value of taking a firm stand.

Meanwhile, the distress is great. Because, if there is no possibility to identify with the Jewish state, how is it possible to demand equal rights within it, as if

they granted legitimacy to its continued existence? And if its continued existence is accepted as a given, so how can their strong desire to bring their Palestinian brethren back to the land so that the Arab majority can be restored and put an end to Jewish rule, be explained? And another muddle: How can they continue to demand that all of the returnees resort to Israeli citizenship, and how can they themselves refuse to move to the territory of a Muslim-Palestinian state, if it were to be established, while at the same time claiming that they and their faith are discriminated against, humiliated and persecuted in the Jewish state? Difficult dilemmas, whose resolutions are pragmatic according to the whims of the Muslims, who differentiate, for the purpose of daily living, between the dream affirmed by all and the requirements of existence and convenience of preserving the status quo, latent in the heart of each individual. Meanwhile (and it could be forever), they demand rights, enjoy the freedom, the democracy, the prosperity, the representation, the expression, the organization, speak of autonomy and a state of all its citizens, multiply demographically, identify with their Palestinian brethren and the rest of the Arabs, freely curse the State, withdraw into their Arab/Muslim enclaves within their towns and villages, disengage from the Jewish state by severing transportation arteries whenever they please, hurt the Jewish majority's bodies and property in order to terrorize them and everything proceeds calmly with the exception of occasional outbursts of violence here and there for which they blame the authorities, like their Palestinian brethren, for utilizing "exaggerated force" with no provocation, while they themselves emerge strengthened and unscathed. At the same time, they harbor dreams, it is unclear to what extent and when they want them to be realized, like the right of return to Israel for their brethren, or even the restoration of the Arab majority by means of their womb, or combined with reinforcements from without or the realization of a state of all its citizens which we will discuss below. Everything is legal and legitimate and the Jewish public is dormant, indifferent, does not understand, does not believe or is enchanted by the dangerous slogans designed to undermine it and bring about its personal and national demise "willingly", "democratically", "peacefully", "through natural development" and "inevitably".

In the summarizing chapter, we will speak of what the State must do in order to preserve its values and existence in the face of these challenges. But it is already possible to elaborate on the dilemmas with which it is struggling: With all the desire to guarantee the rights of its Arab minority, how is it possible to include an architect in the construction of our house who does not accept the Jewish and Zionist parameters of the State and is even trying to undermine them? How can a state tell its citizens that they have equal rights when it knows that they

do not, and under present circumstances can not? Why does a country governed by the rule of law, refrain from enforcing its laws on the Israeli Arabs in fear of what will they say abroad or even worse, due to threats of bloodshed if the police was to intervene in evacuating squatters or arresting rioters, inciters or people engaged in violence? Why does a proper country need to obligate legally all of its citizens and later to release from those laws (like military service) segments of the population? Why must the State create and preserve so many gray areas lacking clarity and certainty, determination – non-determination, citizen – non-citizen, equality – inequality, rights – non-rights, obligations – non-obligations? Why are there not clear, equal rules of the game for all citizens, and equal rewards for all those who fulfill their obligations? And thus, the Arab citizens of Israel find themselves in a perpetual state of ambiguity, of fear of tomorrow, of insecurity regarding their future, of uncertainty as to what they must do and what they must avoid doing so that their lives will be anchored on solid ground. Every human being wants to know what tomorrow will bring, how to educate his children, what is demanded or expected of him, what is the punishment or reward for his actions and what does the state want from him and what does it provide for him. Our governments have avoided over the years, as mentioned above, precisely those clear determinations, unambiguous formulations and resolute performance instructions and preferred to twist in the wind, to decide and then reconsider, to improvise, plug holes, extinguish fires all in accordance with the timing of the previous or upcoming election day. And then, instead of adopting a position and sticking with it, instead of choosing a path and follow it vigorously, instead of adopting a policy and enforcing it resolutely, everything remains wide open and given to the moods of one minister or another, or to the arbitrariness of one bureaucrat or another, as will be explained below.

A great and ominous lacuna remains, for example, from the establishment of the State through today, in the Israeli educational system in general and as far as it relates to the Arabs within it in particular. It was said that there would be state education for all, but immediately different sectors began leaving it rendering it a travesty: State-religious, ultra-Orthodox, Arab, kibbutz all state-funded, that also required it to plan different curricula, in different languages, with different educational content and emphases. How did the genius minds of those planners think that from a potpourri of different curricula and emphases it is possible to distill a uniform system of basic values and transmit it to all of the children? In France there is also a centralized educational system like ours, and there too are Arab, Muslim and other minorities, and there too are children of religious families of all the faiths. However, it does not enter anyone's mind to provide

each denomination with education as it wishes or in its own language. On the contrary, there they even went too far, beyond the acceptable in liberal societies and compelled Muslim girls to remove their head coverings as a condition for their acceptance into state schools and no one complained about “racism” or “discrimination” or “degradation”. One can assume that all of those epithets would have been hurled at the Jewish state, both by Arabs and by others, had it dared to enforce uniform dress in that way. However France, and the United States too, along with the uprooting of Christian fundamentals not universally accepted, insisted that the uniform secular symbols of the State, which supplies the funds and the study materials and which was elected democratically by the majority in order to also deal with, among other things, education, would become part of the curriculum. Thus, they brandish the national flag and play the national anthem in order to develop respect and awe among the students for them. Similarly, everything is taught in the State language, in accordance with a curriculum that glorifies its past, explains the connection between the present and the past and opens portals before the students to the cultural, religious, assets of the nation, its history, its national ethos, its place among the nations and its aspirations for the future. At the same time, it is incumbent upon the State to teach the fundamentals of science, the human experience in general and to prepare the students in its charge to take their place in the ever-changing, competitive, ever-specializing modern world that demands both education and work capacity.

Seemingly in principle, these are precisely the things that the State of Israel does not resolve to do. Had it succeeded in its improvisational approach to date, we would all have saluted its resourcefulness and innovation and praised it for new breakthroughs in education. However, in general, and as far as the education of the Arabs among us is concerned in particular, we enumerate the unsavory fruits of the approach: We do not teach them or accustom them to respect the State symbols and then wonder why these children in adolescence burn flags at their demonstrations and as adults demand complete elimination of the flag and its replacement with a flag that would be more acceptable (with a green crescent? A verse from the *Qur'an*? The Ba'ath flag? Perhaps the PLO flag in preparation for the return?). Would an Arab in America or France dare to demand such a thing? And if they would proffer such a demand, it would be treated with contempt and dismissed, despite the fact that those two flags, and even more so the national anthems tied to them, relate the history of those lands, have no emotional or associational relevance for the Arabs, and nevertheless they respect it. And only here do they whine, “How can we sing

and identify with ‘a Jewish soul longs?’” And what of the longing French soul in the “Marseillaise”? That is good enough to respect and sing? They say that the Land of Israel is their land; that it was once Palestine, and it was the Jews who introduced those symbols and imposed them on the Arabs. Respectable Jewish communities resided in Babylonia, Persia, Yemen, Morocco and Egypt for many years prior to the Arab and Islamic conquests; and in spite of that, when the Muslims did come and conquer a land that was not theirs, the Jews accepted their authority and their symbols, and only when they could no longer bear the (genuine) discrimination and persecution, they rose en masse and returned to their original homeland. They never demanded the replacement of the symbols and flags of those lands, despite the fact that they could not identify with them, because had they made that demand, nothing would have remained of them (not the flags). And had the invaders treated the Jews the way that the State of Israel treats its whining Arabs, then they would still be there today, and it would be much easier for the Arabs here to become the majority and pave the way for return and the descent of their land, their progress and their prosperity into the backward and dictatorial pan-Arab swamp.

Education in the Arab sector has also failed to transmit other extremely important values and skills, not only to the inquisitive youth in order to get to know his state and its culture, but also for the developing youth in order to acquire the best possible education and training available to him in this land if he was to study instead of throwing rocks and learn the scientific and spiritual material that will enable him to survive in our ever-changing world instead of descending into primitive nationalist or fundamentalist incitement. Had the Israeli Arabs displayed dazzling accomplishments in those areas that would be a sign that the present educational system has succeeded and then of course, there would be a need to perpetuate and even augment it. However, since we are faced with the fact that the gap between Jewish and Arab schools is significant, the Arab matriculation results leave much room for improvement and the Arab youth that reach institutions of higher learning are generally unprepared, it seems that the system has failed irreparably. For example, how can one expect an Arab youth to be fluent in the language of the Hebrew universities if the language of instruction that he chose was Arabic? Had he intended to continue his education in Arab universities, wonderful; then his language preparation is optimal. However, if he seeks to enjoy from the prestige and the quality of the universities in Israel, and he is welcome to do so, then he should do himself a favor and prepare himself properly in his high school education and thereby spare himself and his teachers bitterness and frustration. In America and France, an

Arab youth who wants to enter the outside world, does not even contemplate going unprepared, at least in terms of language. Here, even though they do not meet the minimal requirements, Arabs are often accepted to prevent people from talking – and in many competitive departments, places are set aside for them. And still, there is much complaining about discrimination. Their frustration over failure is great and, of course, the blame is always directed at Israel – the teachers, the system, etc. – at anyone but themselves.

Had Arab youths been more devoted to the Hebrew language, independent thinking and analysis instead of the rote learning to which they are accustomed, rebellion against convention and paving new paths, instead of self-negating obedience to the people of authority, strict scientific discipline instead of emotion and whims, textual criticism instead of blindly accepting the written word, their path to higher education would have been much smoother, with fewer difficulties. No one is doing them a favor by having them curled up in their shells, studying nationalist Arab poets in the original and listening to Muslim preachers whose messages are much closer to incitement than to instruction, all at the expense of the science, history, geography, government, sociology, economy and culture of their country that is primarily Jewish (what can we do, sorry we're here), just as an Arab in America or France would hungrily devour all of those studies about his land, in order to prepare himself for the future and not while away his days in the study of hatred that is of no use and no value to him. This does not prevent him, of course, like any Arab, Muslim or Jew, in America or France, from completing, in private night lessons or on weekends, everything he needs, he is lacking, he desires, meets his parents' wishes or satisfies the surrounding social pressure, regarding religion, language, heritage, literature, *Qur'an*, Bible or even the Talmud so that he can learn that the nonsense, forgeries and fabrications that he is taught and that he reads in the Arab propaganda that is his primary source of information, is totally baseless. Of course, an Israeli Arab who wants to grow as a creative, constructive Israeli, who is a good neighbor and a good friend, a citizen devoted to his land and possessing the talent to make his way on his own and not thanks to his ethnic affiliation, cannot forge new paths as an individual with limited power. This is an area in which the State must provide the option to every worthy person, who wishes his country well, and therefore it is incumbent upon it to initiate the educational revolution, as will be detailed in the summarizing chapter.

A direct consequence of that education should be the awareness of the Arab youth regarding his rights and obligations in the State and towards it. He must

be educated, like all other Israeli children that rights are connected to obligations, and that he cannot expect the State's protection or services, if he does not contribute something towards its existence and prosperity like everyone else. When he witnesses an injustice, a violation of the law, disavowal of the State, discrimination, an act of repression he must complain to the State and not against it. When there is something lacking in society, he is supposed to initiate volunteerism in order to cover that which the State is unable to provide and not focus exclusively on his own sector; and then he can expect other sectors to treat him the same way when he is in distress. During crises – political, security or social – it is not the proper time to proffer demands but rather to mobilize for the greater good. A civil society worthy of its name is one that seeks to fill vacuums, not create them, to find solutions to problems and not exacerbate them. For example, when the State is struggling with difficulties in absorbing immigrants, it should mobilize, along with others, to adopt new immigrants, to help them with their errands instead of complaining that they are supposedly “stealing his job”. It has been proven over the years that the State has only profited from the waves of immigration that have contributed to its wealth, its development and the great accomplishments that it has reached. He must understand that had the population not grown through immigration, then he, his ancestors and descendants would be the citizens of a small, wretched and impoverished state that would have long ago been overcome by its enemies. In his present mode of thinking, perhaps that would make him happy, but that is precisely the time to completely transform his manner of thinking and to begin to think of the State as his state and his ally, and that its well-being that is manifest in immigration, security and settlement, is good for him as well. He has witnessed that all of his years of opposing the values and assets of the State were ineffective; on the contrary, he suffered as a result of his hatred and alienation more than he caused suffering; more than he deprived the State, he deprived himself; the State will manage without him but he cannot manage without it; a decisive fact is that more than it complains about him, he complains about it and the friction between him and the State is gradually increasing and the common ground is decreasing. All of these things cannot be taught in a separate Arab school system, but rather in a state school system designed to serve Jews and Arabs, religious and secular, residents of villages and kibbutzim, towns and cities and everyone interested in assimilating into the State and becoming part of it, just like in France and the United States.

In the absence of values common to all of the residents, the State moves to thoughts about bi-nationalism whose primary initiators and promoters are

the Arabs of Israel. If their desires were fulfilled, we would all be on our way to becoming Lebanon or Bosnia and Kosovo in all of which a multi-national regime collapsed and led their populations into bloody wars, to devastation and destruction, to solutions imposed from without and to temporary lulls in the storm that last until it strikes again more powerfully. We are not a large country like Canada, in which the dialogue between the French speakers and the English speakers is possible because each has enormous expanses in which they live, and neither one has other focal points of identity to which they would like to be annexed or from where their salvation will come. We are also not Lebanon, in which everyone is an Arab who speaks Arabic and are distinct only in their faith, or Ireland where everyone is Irish and the only difference between them pertains to one shade or another of Christianity. Here, like in Bosnia and Kosovo, the rival groups are nationalist; however in contrast to them, the Jews lack any national territorial base other than Israel, while the Arabs in the State will be ever linked to the Palestinian, the Arab and the Muslim, like the Serbians to Serbia and the Orthodox Church, the Croatians to Croatia and the Catholic Church and the Albanians to Albania. In other words, while the Arabs in Israel can connect to the bi-national idea and their dream to be annexed to a larger political entity in the future (Palestinian, Arab or Islamic), small, fragile Israel will always remain in a limited area and within hard to defend borders. Furthermore, had Israel submitted to this idea, or had been dragged into it unwillingly, it would be an indication that although the Palestinians, for all intents and purposes have two states (in Jordan where they are a majority and now in Judea, Samaria and Gaza) and also demand half of Israel in the framework of bi-nationalism and the Arab nation has title to 22 different Arab countries and the Muslims have 56 different countries, each of which has the potential to expand and merge, the Jews remain without the right to self-determination, as is evident by the Palestinian National Charter. Even the pittance of their minuscule state is desired by others and destined to re-division or to the Jews regaining minority status, perhaps a *dhimma* minority, if the new masters of the land provide them with patronage or defense, instead of annihilating them as they threatened to do and were close to doing on more than a few occasions.

In order to sweeten the pill, the Arabs and their supporters within the Jewish public market it to us as “the state of all its citizens”, a seemingly innocent phrase. Just like the “right of return” with which they attempted to seduce us into leading the Jewish state to oblivion. Both slogans are entwined like Siamese twins: If the returnees are added to the state of all its citizens and massively bolster the Arabs who already comfortably reside there as masters of the land, it will very

quickly be transformed into a third Palestinian state, which will merge with the other two. No vestige will remain of the Jewish state, with all of the implications thereof regarding its democracy, its status, its progress and its prosperity; and if for the time being returnees are not added, then in a bi-national state, the Arabs would be able to determine the rate of immigration, to realize the de-Judaization and de-Zionization of the State and over time become the majority within it and cause the Jewish Zionist state to cease to exist. Paradoxically, the Arab population in Israel expresses its concern, when it comes to promote the state of all its citizens, lest they be forcibly transferred across the border, or that the democracy that affords them the only opportunity to overcome the Jewish majority and rule the land will be abrogated or that portions of Israel populated by Arabs will be annexed to Palestine in some future agreement. In any case, the "state of all its citizens", more than it is an idea that builds a bridge to a solution, it has become the crux of an additional dispute with the Jews who are worried, in a genuinely primal manner, about the annihilation of their state, while the Arabs consider it the optimal way to arrive at full civil equality and they even demand to change its designation from a state of the Jewish people or a Jewish state into a state of all its citizens. Their Jewish supporters in the need to change the designation of the State, propose a compromise that would include the two formulations, in other words, a Jewish state and a state of all its citizens, but by doing so they bring down upon us another complication, as that classification is inherently contradictory, it will become a kind of Security Council resolution that everyone will continue to interpret according to his own orientation until the end of days, while in the interim there is no agreement and the dispute intensifies.

The innate contradiction in the formulation is clear: The question is what takes precedence and when: The first part over the second part or vice-versa. Of course, as long as the Jews constitute the majority, they can democratically ensure the double formula by anchoring it in writing, in a constitution or in a Basic Law. However, once an Arab majority is formed, it can also change the law, just as Arabs in general revise their "constitutions" frequently with the ascension of a new despot, they will certainly expunge the designation of the State as Jewish as it will no longer have any relevance. Thus, anyone seeking to guarantee the continued democratic nature of the State, and the Arabs should have an overwhelming interest in this as well, must preserve its Jewish majority, as only then will the Jewish state be able to exist. If its Jewish character is eroded, with all sorts of watered-down formulas, then its Jewish designation is threatened. And there is a need to emphasize, that in contrast to the Arabs

and other denizens of the universe, who consider the Jews nothing more than members of the Mosaic faith and therefore see no problem with a “state of all its citizens” in which Jews and members of other faiths will live in equality as it is manifest in the democratic world, that is not the way Jews perceive themselves. The Zionists who returned to their land, did not come in order to actualize the Mosaic faith, which can easily be implemented in the Diaspora, but rather to carry out a social and political revolution that would liberate the Jewish **people** from dependency on others and to establish a state like all other states in the sense of the State of Israel for the Jewish people just like France is for the French, regardless of their faith, or America for the Americans. In other words, adopting the formula of a state of all its citizens negates, by definition, the right of the Jewish **people** to self-determination, a right belonging to all nations, and not the right of Jews to worship their God. Therefore, the Palestinians established in their charter the negation of Judaism as a nation, and consequently its right to a state, as explained above, and in their expansive generosity offered that “Jews, Christians and Muslims”, in other words, members of different faiths, and not “Jews and Arabs”, which would have indicated the existence of two rival and disparate nationalities, would be able to live together in a “secular, democratic” state (we’ve already seen the democracy of which they are capable), obviously under the benevolent and tyrannical auspices of the Arab-Palestinian state. Thus, the formula of a state of all its citizens contains all of the necessary components for the liquidation of the Jewish state and at best leaving the members of the Mosaic faith as citizens ostensibly with “equal rights”, in the Arab country, something that one may consider skeptically based on the *dhimmi* past as well as the “democratic” present of the nascent Palestinian state.

There are more moderate formulations of the bi-national state, marketed by Jewish and Arab intellectuals, who are so concerned about democracy in the State of Israel that it seems they are willing to knowingly put an end to the Jewish state as long as the democracy remains. They therefore propose different kinds of democracy for the Arabs that will afford collective expression for the Arab minority. By its very nature, autonomy – political or otherwise – especially under conditions where the country is in conflict with its neighbors, from the moment that a community organization is recognized, the road to separatism and division is paved over time, while the demographic clock continues to mercilessly tick and the numbers will necessitate the transformation. Therefore, the primary question is whether democracy means granting full civil rights to individuals or also consideration for different groups that have an intellectual/ethnic/cultural basis to demand their representation and recognition of their collective organization

even if it leads to the dismantling of the State. For if they recognize those types of rights, then the members of the Shas party, the Masons or members of the Agricultural Center could demand a similar autonomy that expresses their "needs". The miners in England, the restaurateurs in France or the Arabs and the Muslims in Europe and the United States could also have demanded in order to express their autonomous aspirations. If so, what would become of us? We can understand Arab intellectuals who make these demands, not because of their moral zeal, but because they are only too happy to dismantle the Jewish state anyway and seek "moral" pretexts to do so. It is interesting that they did not voice their "morality" and certainly did not attempt to implement it *vis-à-vis* the minorities suffering under the yoke of the surrounding Arab dictatorships (Copts in Egypt, Kurds in Iraq, Christians in Syria, Bahai in Iran, etc., not to mention the Jews that fled for their lives from there). Therefore, when those moral people proffer their magical formula of "a state of all its citizens", something which for all intents and purposes already exists as the Arabs are already citizens, there is more than a little suspicion that they actually are referring to a bi-national state in which the Arab national collective will manifest itself on a par with the national collective.

It is much more difficult to understand the motives of the Jews, who support this inane, catastrophic idea that undermines their existence and the existence of their country. If during the optimistic days brought about by the Oslo process, it was still possible to claim that in an era of peace, when Israel is no longer threatened, it could afford to be more generous towards its Arab citizens and allow them to realize their aspirations within it as if it did not constitute a contradiction, after the predictable collapse of the entire process and amplified agitation of the aggression and violence, certainly every sentient Jewish being, who wishes to stay alive, must distance himself from these ideas as he would from fire. It is just that for intellectuals, who were the most passionate advocates and supporters of Oslo, perhaps more than with others, it is very difficult to admit a mistake, which means the nullification of their entire career, which sustained them throughout their lives, upon which they raised generations of students and which they vehemently defended as if what mattered was what they thought, and not what was happening in the real world. We can plainly see that while our wise men are arguing over the morality of autonomy, cultural or territorial, the Israeli Arabs have already established institutions that will lead them there, unless the State takes steps to halt the deterioration, immediately and resolutely. They have, as mentioned above, the Committee of Arab Mayors and Council Heads, which along with the Monitoring Committee that includes within it the

council heads and the Arab members of Knesset, for all intents and purposes constitutes their national, local (council heads) and political (with the inclusion of the heads of the Arab parties) leadership. There are other specific matters under their practical control, like the administration of the separate, state-funded educational system, an independent Arab media that is no different in its attacks on the State than the media in the Arab countries. They even attempt to conduct their own foreign policy, sponsoring violent outbursts against their democratic government in order to compel it to adopt the positions of foreign Arabs or Muslims and in forging contacts with foreign powers in order to lobby them to take political and other actions against their government. Thus, the Jewish advocates of autonomy for Arabs, though their intentions are good and intended to promote integration and cooperation between the majority and the minority, actually lead the way to segregation and calamitous separation.

Another index of the increase in the divisive tendencies among the Israeli Arabs can be found in their private approach to the Jewish establishment and the Jewish state, beyond the actions and decisions made by their national representative organizations. That is in the area of crime in the State, especially what can be referred to as “ideological crime”, which is undertaken not for personal profit, which is the usual motive in crime, but rather as a form of defiance and aggression towards the despised state, which they seek to harm, even at risk of their lives. Of course, if it was a state to which they felt allegiance, they would have no desire to harm it. According to police statistics, the percentage of crime among Israeli Arabs is almost twice their percentage in the population (32% – 18% in statistics of 1993-1994). If the high percentage of children in the Arab sector, due to the high birthrate, is taken into account, then adult crime reaches even higher percentages. The uniqueness of ideological crime is that even though it is punishable by law, it does not necessarily seem to be negative in the eyes of the perpetrators or the onlookers, because it satisfies national, ethnic or religious needs or desires. Of course the topic here is not “regular” crime for profit, which is common to both Jewish and Arab criminals, despite the fact that there too can be lack of clarity in the boundaries stemming from the criminal’s motivation: For example, if an Arab murders another Arab from his village, it will be treated as a crime within the family, the clan or the community; however, if an Arab murders a Jew, there will always be uncertainty in those cases where the circumstances are not absolutely clear, whether the nationalist factor played a role. The Jew and the Arab could commit identical crimes, sometimes together, however if it is a bank robbery, for example, it seems like a standard crime for the Jewish criminal, for the Arab it could have anti-establishment, anti-Zionist

and anti-Israeli overtones. If the boundaries are blurred in “hard-core” crimes like those all the more so when dealing with “soft-core” crimes that do not involve murder or manslaughter, like theft, illegal construction, breaking the law under everyday conditions, smuggling, forgery, tax evasion about which they could always claim, or there is room for suspicion, that they were done against the “others” and not only because of the profit that they could have afforded the perpetrators. And indeed, at times, crimes of that type, that the establishment combats and punishes, can be accepted forgivingly or even with a supportive wink, within the Arab public, and the offender is likely not to be considered a criminal but rather a folk hero who “showed them”, mocked them or took from them his due.

However, when dealing with obviously ideological crimes, the picture is much clearer and it is possible to distinguish between nationalist and religious crimes. In both, the expressions are hostile and violent; for example, murders, placing explosive devices, setting fires in forests and fields, oral and written incitement, abetting terrorists, violent demonstrations, etc., and even civil disobedience and tax crimes performed in order to hurt the “Zionist enemy”. However, the motives are many and diverse: One criminal simply wanted, on the most basic level, to identify with other Arabs or Palestinians, a situation that could certainly pass or subside when the political situation and the general atmosphere are peaceful; another is motivated by his passionate faith that knows no limits and is not affected by transient events like a peace process. Ideological crime is, to a large extent, sustained by the demographic ratio between the majority and the minority, as the larger the minority, the higher their expectations, and if the culture of the host majority does not meet those expectations, the minority can turn to the path of violence and even challenge the foundations of the State. Thus, activity against the State is criminal from the perspective of the authorities even if it is considered a heroic act by the minority. It is worth noting that any intelligent being could have assumed that with the progression of the peace process, after Oslo, the ideological crime of the Israeli Arabs should have ended or at least have significantly diminished. But the opposite happened: Car thefts, for example, which were a terrible problem even before, increased after Oslo, as the thieves were then able to transfer the stolen cars to the Palestinian Authority that was desperate for stolen cars. In any case, even before the first *intifada* that sharpened the ideological tension, the Arabs “specialized” in crimes of an ideological hue. For example, in 1987 the Arabs paid only 40% of what they owed the National Insurance although they continued to demand and receive full stipends for their children, their elderly and their disabled, just like

they continued to evade National Service (although that was not classified as a crime due to the exemption they received from the Defense Minister), while demanding full civil rights. In 1996, the tax authorities raided broad sectors that were known as tax evaders, and especially Arab contractors, and that was characterized in press reports as crimes against the State of Israel.

Since the outbreak of the *intifada* in 1987, ideological crime among Israeli Arabs has been elevated to a new level. In 1989 alone, for example, the number of crimes of that type doubled relative to the previous year (989 as opposed to 446), including 92 cases of incitement to sedition (as opposed to 37 cases the year before), 109 cases of throwing stones at Israeli traffic (as opposed to 25), 90 cases of setting fires (as opposed to 13), 387 cases of disturbing the public peace (as opposed to 342) and 19 cases of hurling Molotov cocktails at passing cars (as opposed to just 2 in 1988). At least 196 of the cases, which included brandishing PLO flags that was illegal at the time, the perpetrators were characterized as “nationalists” in the police statistics and others were identified as “fundamentalist Muslims”. Many of these crimes drew encouragement and praise from outside the country. For example, when the massive forest fire was raging in Israel, a fundamentalist Palestinian-Muslim newspaper published a blessing for “the hands that set fire to the forests of Palestine (not Israel, heaven forbid) and thereby caused the enemy to lose millions of dollars and decades of effort”. In 1988, security forces apprehended a group of youths from Umm al-Fahm, who clandestinely amassed storehouses of explosives and ammunition collected from IDF training areas. The police also reported during that period about an increase in tax crimes and forgery of drivers’ licenses among Israeli Arabs, which can also be interpreted as revolt against the authorities and of constructing an anti-state infrastructure, in order to undermine the “Zionist rule”, which is the legitimate democratic government of the land. Thus, Israel builds and they demolish; it plants and they burn; it preserves and they destroy; it cultivates and they obliterate; it defends, they kill; it organizes and arranges and they sow chaos; and they call it “love of the homeland”. Where do they want to return, if they destroy the land that was built with much hard work, the rights to which they seek? And who would agree to their demands for equality while they are busy setting fires and are engaged in acts of destruction? And who will believe their declarations of loyalty if they disseminate fear throughout the land and its inhabitants?

The severity of crime among Israeli Arabs can be classified in five levels in which the proportion between the severity of the crimes and their number is predictably, reversed; in other words: To the degree that the crimes and their punishments are severe, fewer criminals are willing to risk committing them:

1. At the bottom, there are the white collar crimes, that are ideological in nature, like tax crimes, forging licenses, intentional bankruptcies, illegal construction etc., that ostensibly de-legitimize the authorities;
2. Next come crimes like car thefts, robberies from the houses and cars of Jews, sexual assault of Jews, whose “justifications” are ideological;
3. Severe disturbance of the public order, like oral or written incitement, attacking policemen and disobeying them while they are on duty, illegal demonstrations and violent riots as well as brandishing the PLO flag, when it was illegal;
4. Acts of terrorism and violence against private, and especially public, property because of the rebellion inherent in those acts. This type of crime employs ideological “justifications” in order to burn fields and forests, fires and other property or to destroy and uproot vegetation, to damage agricultural equipment, building sites and industrial production facilities;
5. At the top of the scale of severity, even if the crimes are less common than the above categories, stand personal terrorism and the murder of Israeli civilians and soldiers, by throwing Molotov cocktails, shootings, stabbings, all motivated by ideology. Abetting terrorists, dealing and smuggling arms and membership in a terrorist organization are included in this category.

For a partial demonstration of these generalizations, we will note that, for example, in 1993, the year of Oslo, 29 murders were recorded in the Arab sector, only four of which were identified as “ideological”, and 22 the following year as opposed to 43 and 54 respectively in the Jewish sector. If we take into consideration that Israeli Arabs then constituted 18% of the population, but committed about 50% as many murders, we will conclude that their relative share in these crimes is twice the national average. In the category of attempted murder, the gap is even more dramatic: In the Arab sector there were 38 cases in 1993, two identified as “ideological” and the following year there were 45 attempts, among them seven ideological, which is almost identical to the number in the Jewish sector (37 and 47 respectively), indicating that that crime among the Arabs was four times the national average. In the category of stolen cars, the police attributed between two-thirds and three-quarters of the thefts in 1993 and the following year to Arabs. The same is true of stolen auto parts, and in both cases most of the thefts were smuggled into the Palestinian territories. The same is true regarding arson; the Arabs took part in half of the incidents (167 out of 375 in 1993 and 155 out of 311 in 1994). The Arabs especially “excelled” in stealing agricultural machines, an indication of the great technological gap that

remained between them and the Jews from whom they stole: 240 incidents in 1993 and 202 in 1994 in contrast to lower **absolute** numbers in the Jewish sector despite the fact that it is four times the size of the Arab sector.

If these numbers are indicative of the Israeli Arab's attitude towards their state in the midst of the Oslo process and under the Rabin and Peres governments, during which hopes for an agreement skyrocketed, calculate how the situation is liable to deteriorate even more when we are at the peak of a violent murderous *intifada*, in which the Palestinians embitter our lives on a daily basis, and many Israeli Arabs, or at least their leaders, publicly express support for these terrorist acts, or we are being attacked constantly, as in Sderot. It is sufficient to have detachedly witnessed the atrocities committed by those Arabs in Umm al-Fahm, Nazareth and the Galilee during their outbursts in the past, in order to get a hint of what will happen here in the coming months. Everyone anticipated the findings of the Orr Commission, and they are already convinced that it and events like it, will adopt their position, will accuse the police of murder and will silently overlook all the violence, hatred and identity with the enemy that they displayed. Despite the opportune make-up of the commission from their point of view: An impeccably honest Supreme Court Justice, a senior orientalist, who has always expressed opinions sympathetic to the Arabs, and an Arab judge, they violently attacked, again and again, witnesses who appeared before the commission whose testimony was not to their liking. Because it is a foregone conclusion for them that they, as a minority, are always right and their actions are beyond reproach, and anyone who dares touch them will always be the aggressor even if he is only attempting to defend himself. In other words, if they do not get everything that they want, presumably they will strike out again, perhaps with even greater intensity, against Israeli citizens and their government, and will thereby elevate their series of crimes against the State to a new level. This danger is even more threatening, especially if Palestinian violence, which they support and with which they identify, will exacerbate in the coming months; then Palestinians on both sides of the border are liable to combine their campfires into a large conflagration.

The separatist behavior of the Israeli Arabs is in no small part a consequence of the forgiving approach of the Israeli governments over the years and the irresponsible behavior of the parties on the eve of elections, when, instead of carefully enforcing the law, in all sectors, under all circumstances and in all places, allowed the violent to prevail, shut their eyes before the destructive consequences of alienation, prevented the police from resolutely intervening in restoring order, and when the police did intervene they did not receive support but rather they

were chastised. On the eve of the elections the parties promised piles of fantasies in order to win the Arab votes, however not only did it not bring them closer to the State, but it also taught them the secret of power politics through which it is possible to bend the law, the will of the voters and the rules of democracy. The establishment of the Arab parties with a purely Arab platform designed to satisfy their sectarian-national will and has nothing in common with general Israeli issues despite the fact that elected representatives of the parties serve in the Knesset that represents all the residents of Israel, added, as mentioned above, alienation and separation. Those who believe that the very participation of the Arabs in the State's rules of the game implies acceptance of those rules and that it is a sign of their integration into society and its political system, are mistaken. To tell the truth, they participate in the democratic processes only in order to utilize them for their own good, just like the Islamists in Algeria and Jordan participated in the elections just in order to express their strength and form the government. There is an additional decisive aspect in this separatism: The political and ideational debate among the Israeli Arabs generally deals with internal disagreements between the personalities and their parties and is never directed towards illuminating the State's problems or towards dialogue between them and the State as is the practice in other parties. The alienation from and the disregard of Israeli society, with all of its political, security, social and economic problems and focus on the lists of those traveling to Damascus or on the Hajj, or in interpersonal struggles that produce ephemeral parties and covenants on a daily basis, the competition who will be the first to get to the ear of the "President" (Arafat, of course, not the President of Israel), the obsession to recount the Palestinian suffering and torment at the hands of Israel (not, heaven forbid, the opposite) during the *intifada*, the alacrity in dispatching emissaries to express condolences and offer support to the families of the casualties (the Palestinians, not the Israelis), are all indications that that which is taking place in the heart of their country does not interest them at all. They are, though, willing, it goes without saying, to identify with the enemies of their state in its time of distress. In return they still expect that the State will repay them good for evil, will feel their pain and suffering, will fight for their rights, will allow them to trample their laws without interference and will quietly and submissively bear their harassment, because it is their "right".

For a brief moment, under the government of the late Yitzhak Rabin and Shulamit Aloni (1992-1995), there was a renaissance in the status of the Arabs in the wake of that government's decision to invest extensive resources in order to narrow the gaps and to implement a policy of affirmative action in education,

housing, and allocations to local councils. Furthermore, the government was forced to freeze development and Judaization programs for densely populated Arab areas, which were in effect during the tenure of Ariel Sharon, the Housing Minister in the Shamir Government, which was perceived as heavy-handed towards the Arabs. The generosity of Rabin and his government was not a result of the tortured consciences of the members of Meretz (the left-wing party then headed by Shulamit Aloni), but rather became a necessity due to the political arithmetic, which more than it provided the Prime Minister a majority upon which to rest his “peace” policy, provided him with an “obstructing bloc” before the Right, which could not form a government without the parliamentary support of the Israeli Arabs. Thus, without including them in his government and in order to repay them for their non-inclusion despite the fact that they, motivated by their own Arab interests, supported him, he was forced to go quite a distance in order to pave the way for their support and he did so with massive payments and with far-reaching political and strategic concessions. The Arabs viewed this as a sign of their ascendant political power that transformed them into the decisive faction in the Knesset, and beyond that to the decisive force in prime ministerial elections, once the short-lived and ill-fated direct election system was implemented in 1996. Those elections ended in a near deadlock only because of the massive support of the Israeli Arabs for the candidate Shimon Peres, whose election was prevented due to the return to their senses of the Jewish voter, who witnessed the Arab voter’s takeover of the governmental systems in Israel and provided a sufficient, albeit slim, majority for the candidate who was “good for the Jews” according to the testimony of the supporters of candidate Netanyahu. However, that tight election was accompanied by the chaos of parties subdividing and the increasing power of the marginal parties at the expense of the two central powers, which enhanced the bargaining power of the small, among them the Arab, parties.

With the generous and loyal assistance of the Arab parties, Netanyahu was compelled to call for early elections in 1999 and once again, the Arab vote became the object of vigorous pursuit by the contenders on both the Right and the Left. Both contenders, Netanyahu and Barak, quickly consolidated a vigorous strategy to pursue those votes. At first, Barak, who positioned himself as “Rabin’s heir and successor”, represented a new hope for the Arabs to increase the Prime Minister’s dependence on them and even began dreaming of joining his government after the elections. This provided them with the audacity to approach him with a series of demands far beyond anything the State had experienced until then, that had they been even partially realized, they would have brought

about a genuine revolution in the status of Arabs in the State. These demands were articulated in a series of “understandings” that were submitted by the Arab parties to Barak on the eve of the 1999 elections, once they understood very well that there was no prospect to negotiate similar demands with Netanyahu. On April 12, 1999, a memorandum of “understandings” was sent by the United Arab List, in which, for the first time, the southern faction of the Islamic Movement (see details in the chapter on The Arab as Muslim) participated, to the candidate Barak that included the declaration that since the State of Israel belongs equally to its Jewish and Arab citizens, the following are the steps that need to be taken in order to ensure equality between the two populations:

- A. A new constitution must be formulated, one which recognizes the Israeli Arabs as a national minority. This means, of course, that the State of Israel would become a bi-national state, with all of the verge-of-explosion power latent therein; like Canada or Belgium in the best case scenario or like Bosnia in the worst case scenario. More severe is the determination implied therein regarding the legislative relinquishment of the Jewish right to self-determination and to a state.
- B. In the sensitive field of education, the document demands that the Arabs be educated in accordance with their values of loyalty to their people (The Arab-Palestinian people, of course), and that their separate educational system would shift to their administration. The implication is that the Jewish-Zionist state must pay teachers who will cultivate hatred for Jews and Zionists among their children, negate the country’s right to exist and justify the insurrection of their people against their country. All this thanks to and under the patronage of the constitution, as mentioned above;
- C. The Arabs also demanded equal representation on the Planning and Building Commissions throughout the country. The implication is that not only would a system of quotas, whose shortcomings were discussed above, be adopted, but the Arabs would have the right to veto every development plan proposed by the State, allotment of IDF training areas or construction of army or intelligence facilities, which the Arabs would always oppose, especially in areas where they constitute a majority or a significant minority. Reckon what the ramifications in terms of planning would be if the Arab council heads, whose tasks would include being the heads of the local Planning and Building Commissions, would receive a free hand to do whatever they please within their jurisdiction;
- D. An additional insistent demand was for full Arab representation in the

Broadcasting Authority, for radio and television and in the Phone Company as well as proportional representation in all of the government companies. That does not mean that they wanted to participate in managing the State's assets for the good of all of the residents, but rather to get their foot in the door of the national infrastructures in order to demand the relative portion that they "deserve" by "right". This assumption is based on the fact that in the list of assets they did not seek to include the military and security facilities, because as far as they are concerned, the equality ends there, and calls demanding that they fulfill their obligations to the State were liable to be voiced;

- E. Israel also was confronted with the demand to recognize the Muslims as an official community and that their judges are to be recognized and allowed to act in accordance with their religious philosophy. In other words, the Muslim community would demand for itself the right to adjudicate, not only matters related to personal status, a right they already have, but also other matters that would be removed from the jurisdiction of the State judicial system. Similarly the document demands, apparently at the insistence of the Islamic Movement, to have exclusive control of all *waqf* interests, the mosques and the Muslim cemeteries, so that all management rights and judicial authority would be transferred to them without state supervision;
- F. The Arabs also demanded that all of their sons aged 18-21 receive unemployment benefits, something for which Jewish youths are ineligible as they are supposed to serve their country in the army. In other words, not only would the Arab youths be exempt from the army, they will also be rewarded for it;
- G. Another Arab demand that would have led to chaos throughout the land, was to exempt them from laws pertaining to demolishing illegal buildings and retroactive legalization of all of the buildings constructed against the law. Of course, an arrangement of that sort would have not only made a mockery of the principle of equality before the law, but would have also encouraged more illegal construction to be approved retroactively;
- H. The state was also faced with the demand to restore, at its expense, all of the Muslim and Christian holy places, especially those located in existing Jewish settlements or in destroyed Arab villages. This would give the *waqf* authorities, who are exempt from state supervision, the right to intervene in every settlement throughout the land or to resettle destroyed Arab villages and a legal opportunity to oppose any development activity that they would consider "offensive to their holy sites";

- I. The Arabs also demanded that a special commission for the planning of the Arab villages be established and funded by the State, but that would be subject to the authority of the Committee of Arab Mayors and Council Heads. That, of course would have not only provided a tool of government to a committee of council heads that the State does not officially recognize, but also would have been tantamount to government recognition of it and would advance the Israeli Arabs as a collective in the direction of secession from the State;
- J. The demand to recognize Nazareth as a separate administrative district and as a central city that would control all social, educational and cultural problems of the Arab minority in general, was also designed, of course, to prepare a semi-autonomous territorial basis for Arab-Israeli self administration. Their demand that an Arab university also be established there lends credence to that assumption. Furthermore, the Arabs demanded that two other secondary regional centers be established, one in the Triangle (in Umm al-Fahm or Kafr Kasseem) and the second in Rahat for the Bedouins in the south. They also demanded that the Bedouins be granted equal rights in the design of the bi-national capital of the Negev in Beersheba. They demanded a genuine series of territorial outposts in which they would be able to actualize their program of secession from the State or its joint administration on the basis of equality, until the demographic situation that would improve in their favor produces more radical solutions.

Fortunately, the Arab contacts with the heads of the Labor Party never developed into any sort of agreement or commitment. However, judging by the intensive negotiations between the parties on the eve of the elections and the willingness of Barak's representatives to discuss the memorandum whose salient points were detailed above, one can assume that the Arab negotiators were led to believe that some of their demands are achievable. Indeed, after the elections, the new Barak government approved, for example, the demand of the Muslims in Nazareth to allow them to build a provocative mosque in the courtyard of the Church of the Annunciation, which they illegally occupied on Christmas Eve 1997. This episode and its events will be recounted in the chapter concerning The Israeli Arab as Muslim, but we can already mention here that that unfortunate surrender by the Barak government created unnecessary problems between Israel and the Christian world and imposed upon the succeeding Sharon government the difficult task of sidestepping that governmental commitment. It is worth noting that in late April, approximately only two weeks before the May 1999 elections,

a similar memorandum was sent to the candidate Barak by the Democratic Front for Peace and Equality (Hadash), in which there was an insistent demand to recognize the Arab minority as a national minority, to develop tourism to Arab-Christian sites in Nazareth and Kafr Kana, to cultivate among the Arabs their national identity and even to abrogate the mandatory conscription of the Druse denomination in Israel. This innovative paragraph is perhaps the most severe of all because, not only does it demonstrate again the indifference of the Arabs *vis-à-vis* the security of the State in which they seek equal rights, but they also demand to liquidate the irksome precedent of non-Jewish citizens who serve their country lest they be forced to follow in their footsteps one day. One way or another, they expressed the wishes of two different Israeli Arab political streams that they be allowed to follow their separate path.

It should, therefore, come as no surprise, that it was specifically during the Rabin administration that the term “Jewish majority” gained currency within the political system in Israel. It is true that even previously, with the outbreak of the first *intifada* (1987-1992) and the many manifestations of hostility and aid to the Palestinians that were revealed among the Israeli Arabs that accompanied it, a process of mistrust of the Arab community in general began due to the pro-Palestinian positions adopted by the Arab leadership in Israel. But now, when the Arabs became the political key to the adoption of the government’s peace plan, both *vis-à-vis* the Palestinians and on the Syrian front, the national camp voiced the demand that fateful matters like those not be decided by the Arab votes, since the Israeli interest is of no concern to them and they automatically support all concessions to the Arabs. That position led to the legislation to bolster the Golan and Jerusalem laws, lest, much to the chagrin of the Jewish majority, the votes of the Left and the Arabs would rid the State of its assets. From the Arab perspective, this is discrimination between the Arab and Jewish members of Knesset and between the citizens of the Jewish majority and those of the Arab minority and accusations of “racism” were exchanged inside the Knesset and in the streets. But for many Jews, Israeli Arabs, who showed no signs of loyalty to their state in its time of distress during the *intifada*, and some even collaborated against them, and who do not share the security burden that is generally obligatory and is liable to exacerbate if the government’s peace initiative proves futile, should certainly not have any part in the fateful decisions of state that are liable to involve war and peace. Then, instead of considering their actions and concluding that they are not included within the general Israeli consensus, not because they are Arabs, but because they dodge their obligations and identify with the enemies of the State. The Arabs have aggravated the

situation by demanding the abrogation of the Law of Return and citizenship laws that maintain the Jewish character of the State and the liquidation of national institutions like the Jewish Agency and the Jewish National Fund, that provide the tools to ensure that majority. Therefore, the intensification of the struggle of the Israeli Arabs against the Jewish state, its symbols and its institutions, not only fails to bring them closer to achieving the equality incorporated in being a genuine, consensus Israeli, but also distances them from that vision, leading to a vicious cycle of increasing bitterness.

CHAPTER THREE

THE ARAB AS A PALESTINIAN – AN EMERGING IDENTITY

Palestinian identity among Israeli Arabs becomes more and more significant as Israeli identity becomes more and more problematic. Like two interdependent objects, as one rises the other plummets, especially in the midst of an armed conflict between their land and their people, in which the Israeli Arabs adopt the Palestinian positions, lock, stock and barrel. At the same time, they are aware of the contradiction between their combativeness on the side of their brethren and their complaints that the Israeli authorities and police treat them as if they were enemies and not bona-fide Israeli citizens. When it is explained to them that the Jewish Israeli citizens, even when they get carried away and engage in acts of violent belligerence during demonstrations, they do not cross the lines and join the enemy, they do not brandish the flags of Hizbullah, PLO and Hamas, with whom their country is at war, they do not hurl stones and kill passers-by, do not lay siege to Jewish (or Arab) settlements and they do not confront IDF soldiers or set off bombs, the Israeli Arabs continue to pretend that their conduct in the course of their riots is beyond reproach. Even when they are confronted with comparisons to other places – for example, if in a time of war, citizens of Japanese or German origin would oppose the government and identify with the enemy in the great democracies of Great Britain and the United States, it is clear what their fate would be – it does not impress the Israeli Arabs, because they contend that they are the landlords and therefore the others have to fall in line with them and not the other way around. Therefore, in their opinion, there is no dissonance in their cries on Land Day to “slaughter the Jews”, or “we will redeem the Galilee/Palestine with our souls and our blood”, an explicit cry for war against their country, with which they find no problem, despite the revulsion and disgust that it causes

among the Jewish majority in the land. In other words, they may, just like the Palestinians in the territories, burn down state institutions and banks, obstruct traffic arteries, engage in illegal construction, hurl Molotov cocktails at police officers, curse their state, support its enemies, challenge its sovereignty over the regions in which they reside – and the Jews are supposed to accept everything, swallow hard and continue along, business as usual just because the Arabs feel anger and frustration. That is precisely the behavior model that we find among the Palestinians in the territories.

There is no doubt that the Israeli identity of the Israeli Arabs reached its peak prior to 1967, when they were disconnected from their brethren. They gradually accepted their situation and were on their way to becoming more integrated into society. The subsequent meteoric rise of combative Palestinian nationalism – under the leadership of Yasser Arafat, and the internationalization of the Palestinian issue until, by means of the television screens it became the subject of daily conversations in every household around the world – along with the opening of Israel's borders to allow free movement between its territory and the new territories that it now ruled in Gaza, Judea, and Samaria, opened new horizons for an intellectual and movement-wide renaissance for the Israeli Arabs. Because, paradoxically, it was specifically with its decisive victory in that war that Israel began to decline in the international arena just as the prestige of the PLO was on the ascent. That is because before the war, minuscule, pioneering, besieged Israel that was fighting for its life against the entire Arab world, received more than a little support around the world. After the glorious victory of the Jewish state that coincided with the rise of militant Palestinian nationalism, Israel was transformed, in the eyes of many, into an imperialist, belligerent conqueror while the unfortunate Palestinians, landless and conquered, received the increasing sympathy of world public opinion. That is the wave that the Israeli Arabs rode as they began to enhance their connection to their brethren in the territories and together develop a consciousness of one people. This connection is multi-faceted and manifested itself in cooperation in marking memorial days, like the day of the “catastrophe” and Land Day, in plotting and perpetrating crimes, both ideological and monetary, in adopting political positions including the absurd program to implement the right of return, as was explained above, in joining the *intifada* and even in the negation of the right of the Jewish people, Zionism and the State of Israel to exist. We will survey below some of the outstanding aspects of that connection, which, for all intents and purposes, situates the Israeli Arabs on the same side of the

divide as their Palestinian brethren and against their legal government, in whose election they also participated.

In late May 2001, a survey was conducted by the researchers of the Institute for the Study of Peace located in Givat Haviva, the upshot of which is that the level of Israeli Arab identification with the *intifada* skyrocketed, with 60% of them declaring that it increased its alienation from Israel and a similar number even emphasized that their leaders, who identified with and even encouraged the riots, acted responsibly in doing so. Only 42% of those surveyed estimated that their leaders had acted irresponsibly (whether that was positive or negative – was not said) and thereby harmed the interests of the Israeli Arabs. Correspondingly, the number of Arabs planning on supporting general (non-Arab) parties in Israel in the upcoming elections dramatically diminished from 30% in the previous Knesset elections in 1999 (in contrast to the personal support for Prime Minister Barak that reached 95% of the Arab vote, as the representative of the Left), to just 20% (Meretz and Labor – approximately 7.5% apiece and all the rest – 5%). If we recall that only two elections earlier, about half of the Israeli Arabs supported Arab parties while the rest voted for general parties, we will grasp the depth of the rupture and the magnitude of the avalanche that the political tendencies of the Israeli Arab citizens underwent in the wake of the *intifada* and its consequences. It is worth paying even closer attention to the fact that while the Democratic Front for Peace and Equality (Hadash) and the United Arab List (Raam – that included the two members of the Islamic Movement), maintained their strength in these predictions, i.e. each one would garner about one-third of the Arab vote, the radical National Democratic Assembly (Balad) would increase its power, apparently due to the extreme positions adopted by its leader – Azmi Bishara, who voices support for Hizbullah and the *intifada*, is a regular visitor in Damascus and negates the right of the Jewish people to self determination.

It is impossible to measure the intensity of the alienation caused by the *intifada* without analyzing the polarization that was created in Israeli public opinion regarding the performance of the government. While the percentage of supporters of the Sharon government and its performance reached unprecedented levels among the Jewish population (about 70%), it was mistrusted by more than half of the Arabs according to this survey. Furthermore, regarding the Barak government, which ascended to power, in no small measure, on the waves of Arab sympathy and support, the survey indicated major disappointment as over 65% of the Arab voters accused it of causing their situation to deteriorate. That is only because it was during Barak's tenure that the *intifada* erupted, which

caused a conflict between the authorities and the Israeli Arabs, an event which they blame for “causing their situation to deteriorate”, while in fact, in light of the far reaching concessions that Barak promised prior to his election and the plans of the Barak-Ben-Ami-Vilnai team for massive allocations to close the gaps between the Jewish and Arab populations, their situation would have remarkably improved, had it not been for the *intifada*. This attests to the dramatic impact of those violent events on the Israeli Arab mode of thinking. In a similar survey of Israeli Arabs, conducted prior to the 1999 elections, more than 76% of Israeli Arabs contended that the outgoing Netanyahu government had worsened their condition, leading to their expectations from Barak that were frustrated by the *intifada*. Therefore, the percentage of Arabs in this survey who were willing to fly the Israeli flag on Independence Day dropped from one-half in 1995 to one-quarter in 2001. The number of those negating the right of the State of Israel to exist at all rose from 7% in 1995 to 16% in 2001. The number of those negating its existence as a Jewish, Zionist state rose in the same period from one-quarter to one-half of the Arabs in Israel. Even more significant was the expression of the hopes of one-third of those surveyed, including residents of Tayibe and Umm al-Fahm, that the Arab villages in the Triangle be appended to the Palestinian state when it is established. The trend was especially notable among the Bedouins in the Negev, specifically that sector considered by many of the political leaders in Israel as extremely “loyal”, almost half of whom negated the right of Israel to exist at all, as opposed to the national average of 15% among Israeli Arabs. Of course the radicalization of the positions of the Israeli Arabs has been on the rise since the assassination of Yitzhak Rabin, who was perceived as their benefactor and with the introduction of radical forces like the Islamists and Balad, to the political arena. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that when the second *intifada* forced them to make the stark choice between their loyalty to Israel, which was always problematic, and their brethren involved in conflict and in danger, they had no hesitation in tipping the scales in favor of their people.

Thus, the oft-quoted slogan that “Israeli Arabs are conflicted between their country and their people” was unequivocally resolved by this *intifada* and most Israeli Arabs are no longer conflicted. They were aided in their decision in no small measure by the blatant support of segments of the Israeli Left that – despite the fact that it rejects Arafat’s use of violence, unlike the Israeli Arabs, some of whom took part in the violent actions – remained inclined towards the fundamental Palestinian positions regarding a Palestinian state, putting an end to what they consider to be occupation of the entire areas of Judea, Samaria

and the Gaza Strip, uprooting settlements or at least causing them to die a natural death by freezing their growth and the growth of their surroundings, relinquishing parts of Jerusalem including the Temple Mount and other similar positions that encourage the Israeli Arabs to think that they are not alone in their Palestinian struggle. This is of tremendous significance for them, not only in providing theoretical support for what they consider to be right and appropriate, but primarily in providing Israeli support for Palestinian positions from inside Israel, in sowing discord between them and the Jews and in granting legitimacy for their militant struggle within their land for their people. However, to the chagrin of the Israeli Arabs, most of the Israeli Left, other than its most extreme margins, forcefully voiced their opposition to the right of return as a red line, beyond which they will not go under any circumstances. Once the “peace camp” realized that in exchange for its willingness to cede everything, as it was manifest during Barak’s tenure, it received an *intifada* directed at Jaffa and Haifa, it was shocked and remained directionless. It attempts to bridge the abyss that was created between them and the Palestinians by adopting, with greater fervor, all of the other Palestinian positions about which there is no dispute and by insisting on the resumption of the peace process as if in that context, the right of return, which had already caused the collapse of the entire process, will not be tabled again.

Thus, torn between their foothold in the Left, which supports their Palestinian positions (and equal rights within Israel and a state of all its citizens) and the rejection of the right of return by most of that Left, the Israeli Arabs attempt to avoid dropping the golden egg of left-wing support for the rest of their demands while at the same time to avoid alienating them by publicly insisting on the right of return. They hope to bridge that gap by garnering sympathy through their portrayal as “victims” of the Israeli police during their demonstrations of identity with the *intifada*. Since those unfortunate events of the High Holidays of the year 2000, the episode of the deaths of 13 Israeli Arab citizens, who initiated the violence and inundated wide areas of the country with that violence, has become the main topic of every conversation, symposium, convention, lecture, discussion and speech in the Arab sector in Israel, just like, on a much different plane, the Kafr Kassem episode when it took place. Surrounding those discussions, sustained by the accusations, fulminations and tirades of the leadership of the Arab sector, a tapestry of skyrocketing expectations was woven, into which the Israeli Left was also drawn, regarding the total innocence of the Arabs and the indictment of the police for the cold-blooded “acts of murder” of their brethren as part of the dark plans of the Israeli authorities to punish the Arabs, who had

done no wrong. The fact that these confrontations took place during the tenure of a left-wing government that was supposed to be more receptive to both the needs of the Palestinians who were revolting against them and to the aspirations of the Israeli Arabs who supported those Palestinians, exacerbated their rage due to the “treachery” latent therein after the massive support that Barak received from the Arabs that brought him to power. This rage was manifest during testimony before the governmental commission of inquiry, when the relatives of the dead violently and emotionally attacked the witnesses who, as far as they were concerned had already been judged and convicted, regardless of what the results of the investigation might eventually be. Just like their Palestinian brethren, everything is phrased in terms of good and evil, justice and injustice, oppressors and oppressed, murderers and victims, black and white, without nuances and sub-nuances, without shady or gray areas, with no sharing of blame.

In the infamous Palestinian Charter, which has been neither amended nor abrogated despite all of the fireworks surrounding it, the PLO claims the right to exclusive representation of the entire Palestinian people wherever they may be, everywhere and always. That includes, of course, the Israeli Arabs, who consider themselves and are considered by the rest of the Palestinians an integral part of the Palestinian people. Thus, on the one hand, they share the dream of all other Palestinians to establish an independent state and to implement the right of return, but, on the other, by doing so, they act against the declared policy and best interests of their state, not only due to the chunk of territory that they seek to bite from its capital (Jerusalem, whose territorial integrity is protected by law), but particularly because the very implementation of the law of return will lead to the end of the State in its present form. They, on the one hand, played no role in the establishment of the PLO, in the formulation of its combative ideology (with the exception of certain individuals like Mahmoud Darwish, who crossed the lines) and in its armed struggle (with the exception of certain individuals who were apprehended as active collaborators in that struggle). On the other hand, however, they accept its charter, its platform and the principles of its struggle, which directly challenges Zionism; they negate the right of the Jews to self-determination and sanctify the armed struggle against them. They are not members of the PLO institutions (with the exception of those few who crossed the lines) and are not supposed to assume official positions, nevertheless one of them (Ahmed Tibi) was Arafat’s official adviser over the years, which is tantamount to a British volunteer volunteering to serve as Hitler’s adviser or an American of Japanese descent serving as an adviser to the Japanese Emperor during the World War; and that same Tibi persists in unofficially maintaining

that position since his election to the Knesset, which is tantamount to a British Member of Parliament or an American congressman serving as unofficial advisers to the rulers of Germany and Japan during the World War. As Israel took no steps to prevent this or to punish the wayward one, the world accepted this scandalous anomaly that would not have been accepted in any democracy which seeks to survive. Furthermore, the leaders of the Israeli Arabs routinely volunteer to mediate between the Israeli authorities and the enemy and even intervene in settling disputes between the PLO (that was, and is again, a terrorist organization) and Hamas (that was, and remains, a terrorist organization) and both are pariahs in the eyes of Israeli law due to their killing of Jews.

In this situation, where Arab Members of Knesset revered Arafat, despite his war against the State authorities and sought his advice (some say his instructions) regarding their vote in the Israeli elections, there is unseemly intervention in the internal affairs of the State, which gives practical force to the manifestation of his power over the Palestinians in Israel, even though this symbiotic relationship is officially denied. The Arabs in Israel would, perhaps, want their issues to be raised in discussions between Israel and the Palestinian Authority and to be themselves involved in the future of the Palestinian Authority, but at the same time they display no willingness to move to Authority territory in order to actualize that dream. They sit in Israel and relish the freedom and democracy extant within it, but at the same time they harshly criticize both Israel because its police force is flawed and it is not genuinely democratic, in other words, because it is unwilling to commit suicide by agreeing to the Palestinian demands of dissolution and the Palestinian Authority, whose corruption, disdain for human rights and dictatorship they condemn. Therefore, they consider neither to be good and both are not democratic enough in their eyes. Both Israel and the Palestinian Authority, along with all other people of the world, are waiting with bated breath to see the Israeli Arabs gain control of their own state and/or the Palestinian state, and, finally, be the bearers of the gospel of democracy and freedom that has been withheld from them to date. Many of them claim that they have yet to internalize and digest the principles of democracy; how do they seek to bequeath it to others? The Israeli Arabs' contradictory demands and expectations (of others, of course, never of themselves), especially their ultimatum that they be recognized as a national minority under these conditions of animosity, are precisely the best reasons to prevent those benefits from them, because if they fail to do so, Israel will, by its own hand, build the foundation for the irredentism that will ultimately join together with the neighboring Palestinian Authority to undermine the existence of the Jewish state.

The questions regarding the Palestinian conduct of the Israeli Arabs in the events of the al-Aqsa *intifada*, increased within the Jewish public especially because they came so soon after Barak's extremely far-reaching concessions in the Camp David negotiations, which had they been ratified, as everyone hoped, by Arafat and his comrades, the Israeli Arabs would have been among their major proponents and first to rejoice. The Israeli concessions were clear to them, even if they did not receive support in the government, the Knesset and by the general public. Therefore, it seems surprising, why they waited for a signal in the form of riots by their Palestinian brethren in order to riot together with them, instead of calming things down, convincing the Palestinian leadership to accept that which Barak had given, to stand alongside its unprecedentedly peace-loving government and not to follow the Palestinian promoters of dispute and quarrel like a child who lost his way. But they preferred to accept the weak excuses provided by the Palestinians, who are, of course, incapable of error or insanity, and took the path of violence with the same uncompromising blindness that guided Arafat and his people. We could conduct a detailed event analysis, step by step, of what led to this wretched *intifada*, from which neither the Palestinians nor the Israeli Arabs derived any benefit but rather it only brought upon them tragedies and destruction. Even after the *intifada* was formally declared and the Palestinians announced that they would not relent, in other words there was an admission on their part about their uprising and revolt, the Israeli Arabs, as rioting Palestinians, continued to accuse Israel of aggression. What did they show by means of that conduct? Falling in line with Palestinian aggression, with no thought and no independence and baseless, senseless and hopeless justification of all of Arafat's mistakes; Arafat, who was so close to achieving his primary objective, and sabotaged that opportunity on his own. The Israeli Arabs "helped" him commit suicide and took him by the hand to the precipice, knowing full well that his accusations against Israel were groundless. Is their destructive Palestinian inclination so powerful that it overcomes the flow of free information to which they are exposed and which they cannot ignore and the desire to live together within the State of Israel that has ultimately benefited them? The answer is beyond our comprehension.

The Israeli Arabs contend, in an exact and uncritical copy of the Palestinian contentions, that the provocation involved in Sharon's September 28th visit to the Temple Mount caused the "spontaneous" riots. If they were spontaneous, why did the rioters wait until the following day, September 29, before initiating the violence? Spontaneity is an uncontrollable reaction that takes place as a direct, immediate consequence of the provocation. If the riff-raff goes home,

cools off and comes with renewed strength the next day in order to forcibly confront the police, it is hard to call that spontaneous; there is, rather, more than a little suspicion of premeditation. Let us assume for the purposes of our investigation that there was a “provocation”. Are the Palestinians retarded children who cannot control their actions and are willing to set fire to an entire state and cause hundreds of victims, just because someone “provoked” them? If that is the prevalent logic, then all of the real provocations, perpetrated by the Palestinians, that took place in the land by means of all of the acts of terrorism and murder directed against Israeli citizens, should have engendered, proportionally, total destruction of those Palestinian cities from which the Palestinians emerged. Had that actually happened, the reactions would have been measured and limited, because the common man utilizes judgment, responsibility and a sense of proportion. No civilized person believes that a provocation, even if it did take place, permits everything, with no limitations and considerations. There were Arabs who claimed that they were “frustrated” and, as a result, everything is permitted, even raining destruction upon others and especially upon themselves. Had the Israelis acted in that manner out of frustration over the actions of the Palestinians and the Israeli Arabs, then there would have remained no remnant of either. The Palestinians “buy” these primitive excuses and even create other similar ones, because that is what they are told in their totalitarian media. How is it that even the more advanced and more sophisticated Israeli Arabs, who are exposed to a free media and a tradition of freedom and democracy, will be taken in by this nonsense? It is only, once again, that their Palestinian inclination has overcome their sensibility and they will not allow any fact to confuse their a priori resolute positions.

More on this matter: The following is the testimony of the then Minister of Internal Security, Shlomo Ben-Ami, who is not suspected of harboring hostility towards the Palestinians or the Israeli Arabs, or of particular feelings of affection for Sharon; he publicly explained, aware of the sensitivity of the matter, that he coordinated the visit with the heads of Palestinian security, and they promised him that they would see no problem in the visit as long as Sharon does not enter the mosques; he did not enter, despite the fact that he was permitted to do so as will be explained below, and he was nevertheless accused of provocation. If so, why were the Palestinians concocting the story of the “provocation” and the Israeli Arabs were repeating it robot-like unless their intention was to set the entire area ablaze? Support for this assertion can be found in Arafat’s visit to the Islamic countries immediately after Camp David in order to lay the groundwork for support of the violent struggle that was about to break out;

and especially the declaration of Ammad Falugi, member of the Palestinian leadership, speaking before the residents of the refugee camps in Beirut that the riots had been premeditated by the Palestinians and was not at all the result of a spontaneous outburst. Another indication became public later: the Palestinians ordered, immediately after the collapse of the Camp David summit, massive amounts of lamb meat from New Zealand, apparently in anticipation of the blockade expected in the wake of the riots. Thus, the Arab residents would enjoy their customary portions of meat, while at the same time complaining that because of the “Israeli blockade”, that came about because of the riots and not as their cause, they were “suffering the humiliation of famine”. Genuinely heart-rending. The Israeli Arabs witness all of these fabrications and, without batting an eyelash, repeat them as an imposed mantra, without deliberation and without question, with no investigation and without comment, as long as they can contribute to the defamation of Israel in the eyes of the world. That is really an exemplary act of loyalty to their state.

And that is not all. The Israeli Arabs are well aware, despite the flood of lies and distortions with which their Palestinian brethren inundate them, that the Jews have a connection to the Temple Mount at least as genuine as that of the Palestinians if not more so. They also know, that in contrast to the Arab close-mindedness and zealotry, which never allowed the Jews to visit the sites sacred to them when they were under Muslim control (see the Cave of the Patriarchs, and the tombs of Rachel and Joseph, for example), the Jews displayed generosity and after 1967, allowed the Muslims to continue to conduct their prayers, both in the Cave of the Patriarchs and on the Temple Mount, despite the fact that they could have done otherwise and in fact, the Arabs expected the Israelis to act as they themselves had and divest the Arabs of their rights at the site. In this case, the failure of the Israeli Arabs is twofold: They did not support the Israelis during the attempt to divest them of any right to the Temple Mount, despite the fact that they learned the history and were familiar with the truth regarding the powerful, long standing connection of the Jews to that site and despite their generous, tolerant and considerate conduct regarding Muslim rights there in the present; and they consider the visit of an Israeli, any Israeli, whoever he may be, to be a “provocation” instead of fighting for his right to visit there, just like a Muslim has the right to enter the area of the Mount. They have forgotten that in order to have others act with tolerance and understanding towards them, they have to employ the same criteria in their conduct towards others, especially when those others are the Jewish majority in whose midst they seek to live in equality and peace. Getting caught up in the web of these lies spun for them

by the Palestinians, repeatedly accusing their countrymen of provocation and implicitly, if not explicitly, supporting the dispossession of the Jews from any rights to the Temple Mount are not things that will score them points in their long term struggle against the Jews. Were they to clean up their own act and wake up to see the dark corners into which their Palestinian brethren are pushing them, it would certainly be for the better.

Then the Temple Mount events ensued, the delayed detonation of the violent outburst and that “spontaneity”. The Israeli Arabs, motivated by identification with the Palestinians to the point of distorting their own sense of reason, repeatedly recount the story of the killing of the 7 Arab worshippers on the Temple Mount on September 29, and subsequently, in the same breath, about the “murder” of Israeli Arab protesters by the police the following day as if it was an intentional plot by Israel to kill both groups despite their innocence. The mention of the results of the two harsh incidents, without speaking of the circumstances leading to the killing indicates an Israeli Arab falling into line with the Palestinian accusations against Israel, and therefore it requires analysis. As opposed to the justification of the Palestinians’ actions on the Temple Mount during the ostensible “provocation” of Sharon’s visit, it is astounding to reveal that in the opinion of the Israeli Arabs, the killing of Palestinians on both sides of the Green Line by security forces, was not preceded by any provocation as it is exclusively Israel that is expert at provocations and therefore all murder accusations are placed at its doorstep. In their opinion, the “violation” of the site sacred to Muslims the day before “justified” the outburst the following day; however they do not explain what violation took place from a Jewish perspective, including Sharon. The violation is of the Jews, owners of the site, its builders and sanctifiers, who not only treated historically baseless Muslim claims to the site with respect but are considered by the Muslims as invaders of a site to which they have no connection and “defilers” of the sanctity of that sacred mountain. What Jew could bear the humiliation of that provocation? And nevertheless, security forces have never evicted a Muslim from there for defiling the site. And they certainly never shot or rioted against Muslims who defiled the site but rather they bore with patience and restraint all of the Islamic abuse, invective and provocations and instead of evacuating Muslim rioters, who routinely throw stones at Jewish worshippers at the Western Wall, they evacuate, oh the shame, the Jewish worshippers in order to “prevent bloodshed”. They prevent Jewish groups, who seek to pray on the Temple Mount, to exercise their right to do so, which is in no way inferior to the Muslim right to freedom of worship, again in order to “prevent bloodshed”. The implication is: Muslim hooliganism and

violence pays, the Jews charged with keeping the peace will always surrender to it and the reward for this extreme, unnecessary and incomprehensible indulgence is the accusation that the Jews are “defiling” the Temple Mount and attacks against Jewish worshippers.

That is what happened on September 29, when Arab youths, insulted to their very core by the “impurity” that Sharon brought to the holy mountain, frustrated that the Jews had the audacity to ascend to their sacred site on the Temple Mount and irate at the “provocation” of Sharon and the security forces that came to protect him as he was exercising his right, began rioting and throwing stones at the policemen and then at the Jewish worshippers who were once again evacuated in order to “prevent bloodshed”. Of course, according to the Arabs, all rioting on their part is justified because they are the “frustrated”, “occupied” and “oppressed”, while the Israelis are prohibited from reacting. They must suffer the stones, be killed, evacuate the mountain and apologize. If they defend themselves they are always going too far, employing disproportionate power, aggressors. Had Sharon ascended the Temple Mount alone, it is clear that he would have been torn to shreds; when he is protected to prevent he and his entourage from being lynched, the police brought “thousands of police officers” in order to provoke the Palestinians and incite riots. Instead of evacuating all Muslims from the mountain on the day of Sharon’s visit and closing it on the following days in order to “prevent bloodshed”, because that would have been the right thing to do, once again the police acted with destructive generosity (because there is no one to show appreciation for the gesture) and allowed the masses, including the Israeli Arabs, to stoke the atmosphere at the site and to incite against Sharon and the security forces and the rest is history. In the face of stone-throwing by hundreds and thousands of Arab youths, the police reacted with extreme restraint, but when the police were in danger of being wounded or even killed by the stones or of being lynched by thousands of rioters, it fired, again with restraint and self-control, to specific targets in order to stop the rioters; had they not done so, hundreds of the Arabs would have been wounded if the police had indeed intended to “massacre” them as per the accusation against them. The following day, the Arabs of Umm al-Fahm, who were incited for months prior in the mass al-Aqsa rallies staged by Mayor Raad Salah, one of the leaders of the Islamic Movement, that the Jews are ostensibly “going to undermine the foundations of the Temple Mount mosques”, went out to the intersection of their city, burned Israeli flags and brandished in their place Hizbullah and Hamas flags, set banks and government institutions on fire, toppled traffic lights, obstructed the main traffic artery to the North,

threw stones at the police and threatened to vent their wrath on anyone who stood in their way. What is their memory, which they repeatedly voice, of those events? The police, who again acted with almost superhuman restraint in order to prevent a genuine massacre of thousands of rioters, “murdered” two of them. They did nothing, they were saintly and holy, innocent and pure, and with no pretext, simply because the police were bored on that bitter, violent day, it came out to “hunt” Arabs for fun.

This bleak picture repeated itself in other places, until the number of “murdered” Arabs reached 13. No self-examination or investigation took place among the Israeli Arabs in order to see where they and their brethren, who rioted on the Temple Mount, had done wrong because the guilty parties had already been marked and they had already arrived at the immutable conclusion that the police are “murderers”. As a result, the talented, devoted commander of the Police Department Northern District, who stood bravely at the eye of the storm and without whose resoluteness and sensitivity throughout his years of service in that district, the Galilee would have moved even farther from being subject to the State’s authority, must be fired. This is a precise repetition of the whining contentions of the Palestinians ever since they initiated the al-Aqsa events, in other words, they are entitled to initiate violence and everything is legitimate in their eyes, but woe unto the repressive Israeli authorities if they dare to react, in any shape, manner or form. Let us assume that the police would have reacted to the Palestinians on the Temple Mount or to the Israeli rioters in the Galilee with stones and not with gunfire and some of them would have been killed by the stones (as has been the case with Jews in other places in Israel and in the territories); would they then have refrained from accusing the police of “murder”? The result is the determining factor and not the means employed in achieving that result. They are always just “demonstrating” justly against “oppression”, and the law enforcement personnel are the unjustified “murderers” and “conspirators”, regardless of how they conduct themselves, unless they extend their necks to be slaughtered. This reaction model, that is repeated in riots on both sides of the Green Line, does not stem exclusively from the sense of victim that the Palestinians develop in general in order to excuse their absolute inactivity in improving their lot, preferring to blame others for their troubles, but also from coordination on the street between the two parts of the Palestinian people. Indeed, with the outbreak of riots in the Triangle, leaders of the West Bank *Tanzim* came and distributed manifestos in the Arab villages and even participated in the riots and their spread. In any case, Palestinian media reports made no distinction between the blood that was shed and counted

as one the “martyrs” that fell by Israeli gunfire on both sides of the border, demonstrating the unified struggle on both sides and the completion of the process of Palestinization of the Israeli Arabs, if anyone continued to harbor doubts regarding that issue.

The confused government, for whom these events came as a surprise while it was preoccupied with the *intifada*, first declared the establishment of a commission to look into the incidents, however, due to the pressure caused by the upcoming elections, it was forced to relent to the Arab demand for the appointment of a Governmental Commission of Inquiry, indicating that this was a pivotal event, extraordinary and of supreme importance on the agenda and it was crucial that it be investigated by a panel led by a Supreme Court justice. In the course of the political activity and in a desperate attempt to win the votes of the frustrated Arabs, the outgoing Prime Minister and his people made all of the tried and true mistakes that had been made in the past: They marched into all of the Arab villages and explained the “dangers” that they could anticipate if there is a change in government; once again, promises were made about the good days ahead; again allocations were unfrozen and plans were formulated; again emissaries were dispatched to appease, calm and mitigate the tragedy with verbiage. The Prime Minister went the furthest; he not only expressed his apology – and by doing so acknowledged that the government was at fault, even as commission of inquiry was in the midst of its deliberations, and delivered a slap in the face to the police that was left on its own to defend itself before its detractors – but he also agreed to meet with the members of the Monitoring Committee, the unofficial national leadership of the Israeli Arabs, and thereby provided unprecedented legitimacy to their representation before the authorities. However, most egregious was the government’s agreement to establish the Governmental Commission of Inquiry, not because there was nothing to investigate or because the State had something to hide, but rather because of the fundamental misunderstanding engendered by its empanelling and consequently the skyrocketing expectations that it aroused among the Israeli Arabs. If, from the government’s perspective, the commission was empaneled in order to clarify the ambient conditions that led to those violent clashes, in other words, it was possible that some of the blame could be directed to the instigators of the riots, the Arabs disregarded the generalized formulation and understood that it was empanelled solely to clarify the circumstances of the “murder” of the 13 Arabs and nothing more. Therefore, from the outset, the expectation was that the police and the government would be convicted and their “victims” would be compensated. If that was not to be the case, latent

in those expectations is the threat of additional violent outbursts, together with or independent of the Arabs of the territories, with whom they are now irrevocably tied.

The Israeli Arabs' Palestinian connection has become so established that at the height of the *intifada*, one of the Arab leaders in Nazareth expressed an opinion that the two rivals in the race for Prime Minister "are not Right and Left", because there is no difference between them as they both have "murdered enough Arabs". Others stated that only if Barak was to sign an agreement that would satisfy the Palestinian demands regarding Jerusalem, the settlements and the return of the refugees, would they agree to vote for him in the elections. Others said that if an agreement with the Palestinians was reached in Taba, would they consider the matter of their support for Barak. In other words, they themselves have no positions or programs regarding issues on the public agenda, and "anything that Arafat signs would satisfy them", meaning that more than they identify with principles and more than they have demands and aspirations, they fall in line behind Arafat's mistakes, whatever they may be. When the Taba talks collapsed, one of the Arab members of Knesset, without checking whose fault it was or at what point and why the talks collapsed, determined that instead of participating in the fast approaching elections, he and his colleagues would console the families of the Arab "murder victims" in the riots or stand at the head of the effort to dispatch food packages to the "besieged Palestinians". Despite all that, the Israeli Arabs are still careful to refrain from declaring their official enlistment to the *intifada*, both because of the consequences that they are liable to bear as a result of a declaration of war of that sort and also as an implied message that even if they support their brethren in the territories and identify with them in every aspect of life and even if Arafat sets their agenda much more than the Israeli authorities do, they are still able to gain much more from their shabby Israeli citizenship than they could from their danger-laden stance and from an explicit challenge to the Israelis whose patience is gradually running out. Instead, they call their riots and their enhanced Palestinian consciousness a "people's renaissance" in other words, liberation from fixed, anachronistic thought patterns and the audacity to mobilize their ranks to act with impudence against the authorities, not an armed struggle in which they would not have a chance, but rather a kind of extended civil disobedience that will place them at the center of the public dialogue in Israel while at the same time prove to the rest of the Palestinians that they are not downtrodden but rather are proud of their Palestinian nationality and are struggling for its actualization.

At the height of the riots, the Galilee Arabs' "Radio 2000", under the watchful

eye of the authorities, became not only a forum to accuse Israel and to broadcast speeches of incitement and invective by the Arab members of Knesset, but also a means of warning and defense against steps taken by law enforcement officials in the North. It was a carbon copy of "Voice of Palestine". That station broadcast warnings regarding the location of police positions and patrols throughout the Galilee so the rioters would be able to avoid them. Many Arab reporters were supplied with cellular phones in order to report directly from the "front" as if they had been dispatched to an enemy land. According to the testimony of Arab radio broadcasters, Arab listeners expressed their anger that Jewish and Israeli personalities, specifically those sympathetic to the Arabs, were interviewed in Hebrew, which desecrated the continuity of broadcasts in pure Arabic that became a symbol and a means of expression for the struggle against loathsome Israel and the Jews. Even a song of peace sung together by a Jewish singer and an Arab singer was met with vigorous protests because they dared perform it in the reviled Hebrew, although the license to operate that Arab station in the Galilee was issued in concise Hebrew by the Second Broadcast Authority. The authority regained its senses and threatened not to renew the operating license due to the invective and incitement to violence against the State that were sounded in the broadcasts, however the broadcasters continued to claim that they were the ones who calmed things down and had it not been for their "moderate" broadcasts, the violence would have been many times worse. Arab businessmen, apparently among those "unfortunate", "oppressed" and "exploited" in our land, were so impoverished that they offered to cover the station's debt, which was in the millions and guaranteed sufficient income so that the station would remain in operation in the future as well. The operators threaten that if the license was not renewed it would be a sign of stifling freedom of expression that would harm the "spirit and their soul" of the Israeli Arabs, to the extent that the Arab masses, the real owners of the station, would themselves come to the station's defense. An additional threat of violence? What difference does it make? It will come as no surprise if the Israeli Government will again cave in, prostrate themselves, and approve the renewal, despite, and maybe because of the threat of violence.

The operation of the radio station was not the only sign of the complete Palestinization of the Israeli Arabs during the riots. In addition, agencies for gathering information and disseminating them among foreign reporters were established by Israeli Arabs in order to disparage the name of their government and their land throughout the world; that same government and land from whom they demanded to investigate the events, of which they were the ostensible

victims. Furthermore, these agencies feed the Palestinians “authorized” inside information and consciously abet the Palestinian propaganda war over the sympathy of the international media outlets and world public opinion. If that is not collaboration with the enemy, which the Israeli authorities choose to silently tolerate, then it is necessary to redefine the meaning of that concept. This group, in cooperation with the “Equality” organization that seeks to achieve equal rights (but of course not equal obligations) for the Arabs within Israel, also approaches foreign embassies and supplies it with trickles of vitriol against the State, in a style and magnitude that in other places, other times and in other societies with survival instincts would aptly be characterized as treason. One of the active editors of this “Information” (e-Alam) group, a resident of Nazareth and a graduate of an Israeli university, was even quoted as having said that she rejoiced seeing that the Arab population of Israel was finally mobilizing in support of the Palestinian people (that is at war with her country), and from her perspective, all this is proper and natural. Predictably, this hostile propaganda organization is supported by Israeli left-wing groups, including the New Israel Fund, whose funds are supplied by American Jewish donors. In its opinion, the Israeli media is mistaken in characterizing the victims of the riots as “fatalities” instead of calling them by the appropriate name – “murder victims”. Again, without waiting for an investigation, it was already determined that the violent rioters did not do anything, but rather exercised their “right to freedom of speech”, that is to say that destroying traffic lights, throwing stones at police, brandishing enemy flags and setting fire to buildings are all included in the definition of freedom of speech. New definitions are truly required in this Kafkaesque world view in which there is no connection between cause and effect.

And there is one more important mental aspect, in which the Israeli Arabs identify with the rest of the Palestinians, and that is their perception of the past and the recording of their “virtual” history. The intellectual, Ernest Renan, once commented, that a nation is a group of people united in their misconception of its past and hatred of its enemies. In that respect there is no doubt that the Israeli Arabs and the Palestinians are one. It is not as if the Palestinians are a *tabula rasa* with no history, but rather it is a mythical “history that was fabricated and pieced together for the purposes of the struggle against Israel and became the heritage of the Israeli Arabs as well, despite their years of study in the awful Israeli school system – especially as far as education in the Arab sector is concerned, and for that reason alone it requires a complete and fundamental reordering. First, let us deal with the history, without quotation marks, of the Palestinian people that the Israeli educational system should have passed on to all Israeli children. During

the Ottoman Empire, Palestine was divided into three sub-districts, which were subdivisions of the Damascus district, in other words, they were not recognized as one united, political entity. Therefore, before the Mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin al-Husseini, raised the banner of Palestinian nationalism in the 1920s, against the British and the Zionists, there did not exist here a separate Palestinian identity, which the Israeli Arabs are so anxious to adopt today. The residents of the land were primarily families who owned large estates, city dwellers, were affiliated with nomadic tribes or were recent immigrants from Syria or Egypt (like, for example, the “Masarwah” – Egyptian, whose descendants populate the land even today). No individual or group among this entire potpourri considered themselves “Palestinians”, because no such concept existed. People were identified according to their village, tribe, Ottoman nationality and/or religion. That is not to say that a nation cannot crystallize in the modern era, even without longstanding national roots. The Palestinian national movement did indeed arise and came into being; it is alive and breathing today and it is vital enough in order to base its demands on facts and on historical events, without resorting to fairy tales whose entire purpose is to attack the Jews.

Here we are dealing with rewriting history, or with creating a history that never happened, as part of the struggle against Israel on both sides of the Green Line. We found manifestations of this in the Palestinian media, in statements of Palestinian intellectuals, genuine and virtual, in their textbooks through which the Palestinian Authority transmits the fake “history” to its students and in the public discourse, part of which dons the cloak of academic respectability. To this end, of course, the Palestinians are the ostensible heirs of the Canaanites and Jerusalem is the capital of the “Jebusite Arabs”. Jesus of Nazareth is a Palestinian citizen whose Jewish identity is totally expunged, and then it is possible to evict the Jews from their entire history and reject their heritage as a false contention with no historical basis. In that way, the path is clear to establish the ancient origins of the Palestinians and the Arabs, without bothering to provide documentation or proof, for if one repeats the same fabrication over time, if one injects it into the minds of the youth and public servants and if it proves itself an effective tool in dispossessing the Jews from their history and to enhance the strength of the Palestinian struggle against them, all the better. Thus, for them the territory of Israel is “occupied” and thus, internal Palestinian logic leads them to call the Israeli Arabs the “Palestinians of 1948”, and leads the Arabs in Israel to shout at the top of their lungs that they will “redeem the Galilee/Acre/Haifa etc.” from their oppressors. As proof, Palestinian intellectuals point to “findings” of archeological excavations conducted by Israel, which “prove”, “beyond a

doubt”, the Palestinians’ Canaanite roots. One of the Palestinian newspapers outdid them all when it printed a whole series of these “scientific” articles in 1996 as a prelude to the “Sebastia Festival” in which Palestinian youths, under the auspices of their Education Authority, wore traditional Canaanite garb and marched in formation behind war-carriages hitched to horses, similar to those found by Israeli archeologists in the Megiddo excavations.

At the same time those youths, wearing Canaanite clothing, put on a play depicting the battle between *Baal*, god of the heavens and fertility in the Canaanite pantheon against the god *Death* of the netherworld. Of course the Canaanite deity was victorious, with the play’s narrator heaping praise upon the loyalty of the Canaanite-Palestinian tribes, like the Emorites, the Girgashites, the Jebusites, the Perizites who battled valiantly against the Hebrew invaders from across the Jordan River. This play, whose symbols and its application to the present day struggle are astounding in the degree of imagination and daring contained therein, leaves the viewer with his mouth agape in the face of the numerous citations from the *Qur’an* regarding Allah’s bequeathing of the land to the Jews and especially in the use of a pagan god in a society saturated with Islam, like the Palestinian society. Apparently all is fair when it comes to divesting the Jews of their historical heritage. Of course, this use of fabricated and imaginary history raises several questions. The first is the definitive manner in which these baseless fabrications are injected into the brains of children as an incontrovertible historical truth, as their history without criticism, proofs or sources, as if the statement creates the “facts”. This fantasy world is not unprecedented in the Arab world in which Saddam Hussein masquerades as the heir of Hamurabi, Sadat as the successor of the Pharaohs and the rulers of Jordan as the keepers of the ancient tradition of the Emorites, the Edomites, the Ammonites and even the Romans. Latent in all of these is the desire to gain legitimacy for their autocratic regimes that lack it, by building a bridge between them and the ancient world. Why, therefore, not the Palestinians? All this would have remained the concern of the heroes who seek to flee the bitter present to the paeans of the glorious past, in order to enjoy a scintilla of it, if it did not involve a campaign of de-legitimization of Jewish Israel, a campaign that the antagonistic Israeli Arabs join in the streets of their cities and villages, in the Israeli Knesset, in the squares of Damascus and Amman and slowly but surely in the ears of anti-Israel foreigners, who avidly listen to it, as well. In the course of plumbing all of the dark corners of ancient history, the 1,000 years of the existence of Jewish rule, including both Temples are erased as if they never happened and receive no mention, not even negative. It is as if pages of

the history book were intentionally ripped out and the remaining pages were renumbered, in order to prevent delay or arouse embarrassing questions regarding the uninterrupted flow of history.

The Palestinians, along with the Israeli Arabs, who generally accept these theses lock, stock and barrel, could have constructed themselves myths to their hearts' content, without disregarding the history of the other people, by claiming that they are ostensibly Canaanites, the Jews conquered them and now, by the authority of historical justice, it is now their turn to once again take what is theirs. But they do not do that and prefer to stretch the bridge back to the Canaanite past over a historical abyss, apparently due to the suspicion that if they were to acknowledge Jewish rule after the Canaanites, they would thereby endanger their path to the far end of the bridge. The disregard of the Jews on the one hand and the attachment to the Canaanite myth on the other seem to be an inherent contradiction: If the Palestinians are the descendants of the Canaanites, then the temporary Israeli rule in the land does not ruin that family tree anyway. By ignoring the Jews, the suspicion arises that perhaps the myth makers themselves do not really believe the myth that they concocted; and perhaps they tacitly admit that the basis for their claim is fragile to the point that it forces them to challenge their rivals who are standing on much more solid historical ground than they are. If the heat is uncontrollable, it is possible to simply break the thermometer and liquidate the embarrassing evidence of the fever. Thus, in the ancient Arab tradition of singing songs of praise for the poet's tribe and speaking words of reprimand about the rival tribes, the Palestinians praise themselves and their past, real and fabricated quite a bit and hurl accusations and rage at their rivals/enemies (for details see the next chapter, "The Israeli Arab as Arab").

This exalted and imaginary Palestinian self-image, alongside the stereotypical condemnations and invective that they hurl at Jews, Zionists and Israel are passed down to the younger generation of Palestinians and to a large extent to the Israeli Arab youths as well, both in the media and the textbooks of the Palestinian Authority, which have become popular for incitement more than for information, for the Arab population in Israel. For example, when great publicity was accorded in those media outlets to the fabrications regarding ostensible Israeli use of depleted uranium in its ammunition in order to bring about the destruction of the Palestinian people, or the accusation of the Palestinian representative to the UN Human Rights Commission that Israel ostensibly injected 300 Palestinian children with the AIDS virus in order to bring about the infection of the entire Palestinian population; or when they accuse Israel of dispensing poisonous candies

in order to destroy innocent Palestinian children; or when the wife of Chairman Arafat publicly accuses Israel of poisoning Palestinian food, land, air and water; or when Israeli authorities are blamed for violence that they did not initiate; or when Palestinians attack Israel for, ostensibly, poisoning Palestinian girls in order to render them “barren” and thereby mitigate the potential Palestinian demographic advantage over Israel; these accusations, nonsensical though they may be, are accepted by the Israeli Arabs as well. Even if some of them do not attach credibility to these falsehoods, there is no case in memory where Arab leaders took a stand against the abuse of their countrymen by their Palestinian brethren and certainly not with the same measure of determination with which they mobilize to the assistance of their brethren when someone dares to falsely accuse them in Israel. In any case, the official seal of approval that these libels against Israel receive through repetition by Palestinian leaders, Israeli Arabs or Arab and Palestinian media outlets, paves the way towards their use as a pretense to take action against Israel. There is no need to detail the many cases in which Israeli Arab citizens directly initiated terrorist acts in their country, or abetted acts of that sort by other Palestinians, due, among other reasons, to the this libelous brainwashing against the Jews and the State of Israel.

The most blatant incident of Israeli Arab submission to harsh Palestinian propaganda, without even an attempt to distance themselves from it, took place in 1983, when dozens of girls began fainting in a school in Jenin and subsequently hundreds more in other areas of Judea and Samaria. The accusation was raised against Israel that it had “poisoned” them. All residents of Judea and Samaria, who were not yet then autonomous, and the Israeli Arabs, were in an uproar. Palestinians outside of Israel as well as other Arabs and Muslims, joined the “festival” of condemnations of Israel for its “conspiracy” to destroy the Palestinian people. It was not long before the entire Third World, the UN, world leaders and the international media joined the vitriolic campaign against the Jews, “who suffered through the gas chambers” and now they are “doing the same thing to innocent Palestinian girls”. As was his wont, Arafat went the farthest, fantasizing about the poisoning of Palestinian girls by Israel in order to render them “barren” and thereby ward off the Palestinian demographic wave threatening it. All of the intelligent Israeli attempts to explain that there was no poisoning by anyone but rather that the girls suffered from a mass hysteria syndrome, were mockingly rejected by the Palestinians and the rest of the world, who further accused Israel of a laughable attempt to “cover up its crimes”, as if a crime of that sort, had it indeed been committed, could be covered up. Only after exacting international investigations were conducted that adopted

the Israeli explanation, did the issue slowly subside, however no one recanted or apologized for the false accusations against Israel that had sunk to the depths of a blood libel. During those difficult days, when Israel stood alone, distressed and embarrassed, before the entire world, and when only it and its residents knew the truth, no voices were heard from among the Israeli Arabs to support it in its time of isolation and ostracism. The Israeli Arabs knew full well that the best doctors in Israel, on whose doors they knock in order to receive medical assistance, are free of any taint of politics. Nevertheless, they did not come to their defense before their slanderers, a type of tacit collaboration against their land, which had done no wrong.

There is no area with as much potential for violent or criminal activity against the State of Israel by the Arabs within it, inspired by or in cooperation with the Palestinians, than the realm of ideological crime, which was already mentioned in the previous chapter. Because here we arrive at a contradiction based on the determination that along with the ostensible improvement in relations between Israel and the Palestinians after the start of the peace process, the assumption was that the Israeli Arabs' grievances against the State would diminish to the point where it would have an alleviating effect on the ideological crimes committed against it. It turns out that the opposite took place, perhaps because the official Israeli recognition of Palestinian nationalism strengthened, rather than weakened, the claims of the Israeli Arabs, who consider themselves Palestinians in every sense. Recognizing them as a separate nationality within the State of Israel implies the acceleration of the realization of their dream of a bi-national state here, which, with the actualization of the right of return, will also become an exclusive Palestinian property, as promised by the Palestinian National Charter. Ironically, it is specifically the rationale of the left-wing governments that hastily signed the Oslo Accords in order to "nullify the threat of a bi-national state in the Land of Israel", is liable to be turned on its head and to actually accelerate that horrible process, under the auspices of Oslo. The Turkish Government, accustomed to these fears, prevents Kurdish independence in the districts of Iran and Iraq for precisely the same reason: Lest the nationalism and the independent consciousness spill over into its sovereign territory in which 20% of the residents are "mountain Turks" (perish the thought of mentioning the word "Kurds"), just like the proportion between the Israeli Arabs and the Jewish population in Israel. In other words, the rise of Palestinian nationalism within Israeli territory, in the wake of the separate existence of a Palestinian entity with which the Arabs from within identify, is itself a guarantee that the ideological crime, with cooperation on both sides of the border, will increase.

And indeed, the findings in practice already confirm those suspicions. The public is well aware of the ever increasing cases of murders, terrorist acts, including car bombs, arson of fields and forests that were directly performed during the Oslo years by the Israeli Arabs, referred to by the legal authorities as “nationalist crimes”. Similarly well known are the many cases where Israeli Arabs provided assistance, transportation or sanctuary for Palestinian terrorists who came from across the border, and there are also more than a few cases where the security services thwarted the perpetration of similar crimes in their early stages. We also extensively detailed the spillover of the *intifada* into Israeli territory, which was manifest in the bloody events of October 2000, during which 13 Arabs lost their lives, after they violently threatened police, citizens and property, and had it not been for the extreme forbearance of the security forces, the number of casualties would have been significantly higher. However, the ideological crimes that are committed in Israel on an almost daily basis are brought to the attention of the public much less: For example, acts of robbery and theft, especially of cars, and drug smuggling, perpetrated by Israeli Arabs in cooperation with their brethren across the border. In these “joint enterprises”, the Israeli Arabs provide the familiarity with the lay of the land, the local language and the living patterns of their countrymen as well as hideouts and escape routes, while the Palestinians provide the initiative, the patronage, a refuge to which to flee and especially, a market for the stolen goods. In a situation of joint activity, sustained by a fervent anti-Jewish and anti-Zionist ideology, they lay the groundwork for irredentism *vis-à-vis* part or all of Israeli territory. For example, auto thefts from Israeli territory dramatically increased since Oslo and especially since the Palestinian Authority received territories in which they could find shelter and provide refuge for criminals.

Another example: When Israeli Arabs set fire to a forest, in 1989, they received support and encouragement from the Palestinians in the territories, who blessed “the hands that set fire to the forests of Palestine [not Israel, heaven forbid] and thereby caused millions of dollars worth of damage and send dozens of years of hard work to oblivion”. The upshot is that it is also legitimate to liquidate jewels of nature, which they took no part in cultivating in the first place, but rather destroyed them when the land was in their possession for hundreds of years and still today continue to claim their right to it, as long as the Zionist effort to benefit the land is frustrated. What intelligent people would thus abuse a land and its beauty especially in a land that they presume to love, simply to punish the Zionist foe and to frustrate its efforts? The implication of all this is that everything that the Jews plant, the Arabs may burn; everything that they sow, the

Palestinians will uproot; everything that they build, the Arab heroes are called to destroy. Truly an exemplary love of homeland. Here, though, the conclusion, upon which we will elaborate in the next chapter about Israeli Arabs as Arabs, is obvious: It is much more important for the Arabs, in general, to drag Israel down into the abyss than to improve their own situation. Because by its very existence and actions (like planting groves and beautifying the landscape, in which indeed they invested dozens of years of labor), it exposes their wretchedness, their neglect and their destructiveness, as they allowed a once flourishing land to become a desolate desert and a malaria-ridden swamp, and herded their flocks of goats to consume every green patch and every luxuriant tree. And then to allow the despicable Zionist foe to both completely reverse this process and to attach a mark of disgrace to the Arab forehead – that will not come to pass! This is the source of the destructive inclination that pulses inside them, even if they will once again be its first and most negatively affected victims.

Even before Oslo, as mentioned above, Israeli Arabs developed different and larger patterns of crime than the scale of crime in the general Israeli population. Even before the 1987-1992 *intifada* and despite the friction and the feelings of frustration and alienation that were extant among the Israeli Arabs *vis-à-vis* the Jewish majority, they as a rule, refrained from committing ideological crimes of terrorism, with the exception of isolated cases that attracted much attention. Thus, despite the fact that already then the Arabs had become expert in “soft” crimes like tax evasion, illegal construction, traffic accidents and forgery of documents, like drivers’ licenses, they covered the whole variety of “conventional” crimes: Drugs, robbery, theft and murder and the like, like standard Jewish criminals and sometimes in cooperation with them. However, since the *intifada*, there has been an escalation. In March 1988, Jewish security forces apprehended a group of youths from Umm al-Fahm (see the broader context in the chapter on Israeli Arabs as Muslims) for having accumulated ammunition and explosive materials that they had collected, illegally and in opposition to what “loyal citizens” would have allowed themselves, from IDF training areas. Presumably, the broad support of segments of the Israeli Arabs, particularly the Islamic Movement, which will be discussed below, for the *intifada*, created an appropriate atmosphere for gathering weapons for the day of reckoning and an ambient approval for the youth to create the tools to strike in the heart of the Zionist foe in the future. According to police reports, “soft” crimes increased among Israeli Arabs during that period, like tax evasion and forgery of drivers’ licenses, which could be interpreted as rebellion against the sovereign and creation of an apparatus for the anti-state in the future. Therefore, there should be no doubt that had the State,

then and certainly since, been subject to the anguish of a threat to its existence, not only would the Arabs have refrained from lifting a finger in its defense, but they would have also joined their enemies without batting an eyelash, once they had laid the emotional groundwork for doing so.

For the time being, as the October 2000 events and their lessons have proven, the Israeli Arabs are still concerned that if they adopt in practice the Palestinian violence against Israel in all its intensity, it is liable to boomerang, and harm them. They have already fallen victim to the spontaneous boycott imposed by the Jewish public on their villages covering visits, shopping, dining and auto repairs. They are also aware that taking the path of violent confrontation, like the rest of the Palestinians in the territories, against Israelis and state institutions, will at once endanger all of their great accomplishments that they have accumulated here in terms of freedom, democracy, social benefits, social and technological progress and the privileges of rights without obligations, despite their incessant whining about the discrimination to which they are subject. It is worth noting that the most profound disagreements among them, ideological (religious, secular, communists, Israeli vs. Arab identity and the like), ethnic (Muslims, the various fundamentalist sects, Christians, Druse, Bedouins) as well as personal and tribal, prevent them, at present, from uniting in a violent front against Israel; however if an opportunity was to present itself in the near future to triumph over their state, the sense is that they would unite in order to join its enemies and overcome it, before returning to the business of their internecine animosities. The brief period of goodwill engendered by Oslo – which was tied to the hope that meeting the national needs of the Palestinians would have satisfied the Israeli Arabs as well, who would then turn to total integration into their state, with all of the consequent rights and obligations and abandon the ideological crimes against it – proved false once Oslo collapsed after it ignited the flame of Palestinian nationalism on both sides of the border. Meanwhile cooperation remains intact between the various factions among the Israeli Arabs and their counterparts across the border (for example between the fundamentalist factions and Hamas, between the different levels of nationalists here and their like-minded counterparts there), and it threatens in the continued projection of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict on the conduct of the Israeli Arabs in the future. Add to this the family ties between the Israeli Arabs and those in the territories, the freedom of movement of the Arab members of Knesset to and from the territories, the need for free access of Israelis, including Israeli Arabs, to and from the settlements, despite the curfews and in between them – then you have ample opportunity for a continued enhancement of connections,

including those that are anathema in the eyes of the State, between the two parts of the Palestinian people.

Thus, it is no wonder that the Israeli Arab cities and villages have become sites for visits by various Palestinian emissaries, who also blatantly intervene in the voting patterns of their brethren in Israel. Of course, certain governments in Jerusalem were more comfortable with Arafat than others, and he was able to exercise significant pressure on and offer incentives to Arabs here to submit or withdraw their candidacy, to support or negate support from certain parties or individuals, Jews and Arabs alike, and even to determine the nature of the coalition government in a situation where the political disputes in Israel create new factors that tip the political scales on a daily basis. These visits also constitute opportune occasions to coordinate demonstrations, Land Days and other events, as one entity on both sides of the border, in order to increase pressure on Israel, which neither prohibits these contacts nor prevents them. Of course one cannot rule out the possibility that these contacts also include activation of terrorist cells from within Israel, or recruitment of Israeli collaborators for Palestinian cells. Consequently, and as a result of the bloody events of October 2000 and the popular Israeli embargo on Arab settlements, which has already caused them heavy economic losses, a *de facto* separation has formed between the Jewish territories and those populated by Arabs, who converge into their own enclaves and whose connection to the State is restricted to the absolutely necessary. There is also a fear among Israeli Arabs that if they happen by Jewish areas or settlements during a terrorist attack that they would be harmed and they therefore stay away from there as much as possible. Although many of the Arabs who earned their livelihoods by providing hospitality, food and tourism services to the profligate Israelis, and who are watching their life's enterprise going down the tubes due to this situation, raise doubts as to whether "all this was worth it" from their perspective, none dares to publicly challenge the radical elements that sustain these tensions and will not express reservations regarding the Palestinian violence that produced those tensions.

True, the most direct and significant losers among the Arab businessmen seek to restore the status quo ante. In Sakhnin, for example, they demanded the cancellation of the memorial services planned for the two youths killed in the riots and that were liable to reignite the disturbances and further endanger their bankrupt businesses. The Arab workers in the tourism branch of the Jewish sector, which was paralyzed due to the events, also longed for the good days in which their livelihoods were bounteous and Jewish visits to their settlements were welcomed. However, there are many others who claim that that which is

transpiring among and against their brethren in the territories and in Israel is much more important than livelihood problems experienced by these or other individuals. And no less important than the economic woes is the mutual feeling among these two strife-riven populations that their paths have parted and that they are no longer destined to live together, but they reject each other, hate each other and suspect each other. There is even a sense of adjustment to this new situation, which pushes the Arabs to identify with their Palestinian brethren across the border more than ever before and to alienate themselves more than ever before from the state that rejected them and alienated them, as these matters are constantly manifest in the Arab media in Israel and in the public statements of their leaders. The identification with the Palestinians in the territories among Israeli Arabs has grown to such an extent that they have begun adopting their terminology. For example, they refer to the Jewish boycott of their villages as a “closure”, the reaction of the security forces against them as “cold blooded murder of innocents”, their economic losses as an “economic siege” and the Jewish avoidance of their areas as a “conspiracy” initiated by the authorities in order to damage their interests. There is no need to again mention their raucous calls for the “redemption” of the Galilee or other parts of the State of Israel, which echo that which we hear from Hamas and other Palestinian groups during anti-Israeli demonstrations there.

Another expression of alienation, identified with their Palestinian side, was the political reaction of the Israeli Arabs when they boycotted the February 2001 elections for Prime Minister. Indeed, many of them were incensed over what they considered Ehud Barak’s false promises on the eve of the elections (see the previous chapter) and they therefore decide to punish him by boycotting him. Others, who were profoundly affected by the Left’s slanderous campaign against the candidate Sharon, were certainly not enthusiastic about voting for him. However, the “moral” force of the elections boycott stemmed from the reservations of the families of the Arab fatalities who were killed in the riots and who said publicly that the Zionist parties, who constitute the foundation of Israeli democracy, are all the same and therefore illegitimate in their eyes; the implication is a total, sweeping de-legitimization of Zionism qua Zionism, just as the Palestinian Charter did, and continues to do. One of the primary Arab leaders even wrote that the boycott is intended not only to protest against the government, but also to raise the Palestinian problem to the center of the political discourse in Israel and stated that “our interest, as part of the Palestinian people, is to deepen the leadership crisis in Israel and not to rescue the Israeli leadership from its difficulties”. Truly an exemplary civic position of citizens loyal to the

State, consistent with Arafat's aspirations. A manifesto disseminated in the Arab villages during the elections threatened to execute those who defy the boycott and vote in the "Zionist elections". Another shining example of "democratic" conduct, of incitement and alienation from the State and especially the threat to employ violent tactics in order to undermine the election process, a threat condemned by the Attorney General as undermining the foundations of the regime in the land.

Thus, if the events of 1948 are today at the center of the Israeli Arab discourse, who classify the independence of their land as a tragedy, join in the demand for the right of return of their Palestinian brethren and attack the Zionist foundations of the state in which they reside, then there remain no principles that distinguish them from the rest of the Palestinians and on the contrary, their outlooks unite them in their common struggle against Israel. What intelligent Jew would, under these circumstances, give the Israeli Arabs the standing to claim equality and a place in the governmental infrastructure? Would it be in order to assist them in perpetrating their schemes? There are Jews among us, who are entranced by the bewildering and destructive post-Zionism and are prepared to confer legitimacy on all contentions of the Israeli Arabs including reinforcing their Palestinian character that espouses hostility towards Israel. However to their chagrin, they have not succeeded in emerging from the extreme margins of Israeli society. Most of the Israeli Left has seen the light in the current crisis and also understands that the far-reaching demands of the Israeli Arabs are unacceptable. Meanwhile, in their times of trouble, upon seeing that support for them in the Israeli public had dwindled, groups within the Israeli Arab community organized themselves in order to request international institutions to intervene in compelling Israel to grant them their rights and even demanded that international sanctions be imposed on their state until it acquiesces to their demands. Several Arab leaders, like the Palestinians in the territories, even called upon foreign countries, foreign diplomats serving in Israel and international bodies hostile to Israel, to dispatch forces in order to "protect the Israeli Arabs".

In other words, they declare the State of Israel to be a hostile state as the Israeli Arabs' road to transformation into Palestinians has reached its end. Where do we go from here?

CHAPTER FOUR

THE ISRAELI ARABS AS ARABS – SUPPORTIVE NATIONALISM

While the Israeli Arabs share their lives with Israel and their nationalist identity with the Palestinians, they perceive their culture, their language, their history, their pride and their aspirations through their Arab identity. That is not obvious, a result of the fact that they speak Arabic and are nostalgic for their Arab tradition, but rather it is a complete, active and demanding framework of life, which imposes upon them a certain manner of thinking, outlines for them given frameworks of affiliation, provides them with fixed values and loyalties, dictates to them behavior patterns from which they may not waver and harbors expectations that they are unable to meet. In their Arab identity, the Israeli Arabs also find hope and comfort for their situation that reversed, from a decisive majority in the Land of Israel over the last few centuries, to a minority under Jewish rule over the last six decades. For them, it is an intolerable situation of degradation and humiliation that not only points to the cruelty of their fate but also exposes their shame in public as they were unable to defend themselves, made all possible mistakes, missed all opportunities and became a burden upon themselves, their neighbors and the world. The huge Arab world that surrounds them, with its 22 countries and population of more than 200 million, provides, therefore, a sense of belonging to the massive power that will yet intervene and restore their lost honor and meanwhile affords them a sense of security and hope. However, these ties that bind them to the Arab world, also instinctively obligate them to defend the positions of their Arab brethren, for better or for worse, to accept as self-explanatory manners of conduct that appear to us anomalous, to adhere to the propaganda of the Arab countries against Israel, even if their invective against it are intolerable from our perspective, and to fall into line behind everything that other Arabs say

and do to Israel, with no constructive criticism and no independent thought. Thus, they are able to criticize Israeli democracy, whose atmosphere they enjoy, while they at the same time exaggeratedly praise dark regimes like the one in Damascus. They accept with “understanding” Arab military actions against their country, but vehemently oppose any of its attempts to defend itself as “acts of aggression”.

Of course, the Israeli Arab patterns of thinking and conduct were shaped by the extensive tensions and the quarrels between the Arabs and the Jews who resided in Arab countries throughout history, when the members of the Mosaic faith were oppressed, helpless, on the defensive and tolerated in the best case and required protection in the worst, while the Arabs were their “benevolent” masters in the better situations or their tormentors in the worse. However, the most negative influence on these relations was the tortuous and lengthy conflict between the renewed Jewish settlement in the land and subsequently the Jewish state, and the Arabs in general. At no stage of the conflict was there any doubt regarding the allegiance of the Israeli Arabs, i.e. total, blind support, sometimes expressed and sometimes concealed, for the Arab positions, ranging from the paean of glory to the 1973 Egyptian crossing of the Suez Canal, when the “Third Temple” was in danger of annihilation to the cries of encouragement for Hizbullah and Hamas, voiced on a virtually daily basis in the Israeli Knesset and in their media outlets. It is clear to all that in a situation of bloody conflict like this, one cannot expect the warring parties to love each other or cultivate closeness or empathy for each other; however even within the vast Arab hatred of Israel and the Jews that produced distortion of their image and contempt for them, it was reasonable to anticipate a modicum of respect for reality and the facts, that if it is not maintained, the slanderers will not only begin to hallucinate, but will also do a disservice to themselves because they do not understand their rival and project their own imperfections upon him and thereby does nothing to hasten the end of the conflict. This is precisely the spot where the Israeli Arabs, who live among us and understand the reality better than their brethren across the border, could make a contribution. However instead of becoming an access bridge in order to explain the Jewish state to the rest of the Arabs and to minimize the distortions that their fertile imagination have created about it, they are drawn after the propaganda of their brethren and repeat the same exact nonsense that any logic filter should have sifted out.

It is not merely defamation and perversity in the style of the propaganda of Goebbels, who consciously asserted that repetition of lies would ultimately transform them into routine and accepted “truth” and not even distortion of

facts in order to negate historical rights from rivals, but rather the creation of an imaginary world that has nothing in common with the truth and does not even provide any long-term benefit. That was the case regarding the legend that the Arabs contrived over the years regarding the map that was hanging on the Knesset wall that clearly “proves” the Israeli aspiration to expand to the borders of the Tigris and the Euphrates and also in the “evidence” that they found in the fact that the two light blue lines in the Israeli flag that ostensibly represented the two rivers. The Israeli Arabs, who, like all other citizens, had access to the Knesset building all those years and knew that there was no such map there, did not take any steps to refute the fabrication, but felt comfortable within the Arab consensus, even though it was based on a lie. The same was true of the far-fetched Arab reports during the Six Day War, which boomeranged to harm them. Nasser’s early statements in 1967, which were a reflection of his heart’s desire alone, that he had destroyed the Israeli Air Force while his armies were in the midst of the greatest defeat in their history; Sadat’s declaration during the Yom Kippur War that the American Army fought alongside Israel when it launched its counterattack in Sinai – are among the fantasies that are concocted and rise higher and higher in the narrative hierarchy until they create a completely distorted picture that ultimately strikes out at those who created it and the statesmen who rely on it. This explains the perpetual state of frustration and rage in the political discourse and conduct of the Arab community in general, since those with especially active imaginations have sustained them and the belligerent hopes that it aroused within them, have been slammed to the ground with a thunderous roar. The Israeli Arabs, with the exception of those who have internalized the Western culture of realism and who rely on what they see and analysis of the existing situation more than on joyous words and optimistic exaggerations, are also infected by these moods and prefer to see the fruits of their imagination rather than the real world surrounding them.

There are two sides to these distortions: On the one hand, a tendency to underestimate the enemy, to relate to him with disregard and contempt, but on the other hand to attribute to him supernatural demonic powers, which is the only way that his successes can be explained, in light of the fact that he is despicable by his very nature. If a tendency to join the forces of evil in the world, like the great powers that provide it with weapons inaccessible to the Arabs, is attributed to them, then it is easier to explain their failures to themselves and the world and also to bear the disgrace of defeat by so despicable an entity as Israel. In a culture of shame, there is a natural yearning to prefer denial of unpleasant facts, over bearing the humiliation of acknowledging them. For

example, throughout the Arab world, every anti-Israel demonstration reaches its climax with the burning of the Zionist flag, as if speech, declaration and diatribe against a passive, helpless piece of cloth come in place of a physical attack against a powerful enemy that is liable to defend itself and cause damage. Along with the despised Israeli flag, they also burn the American flag, from which Israel derives its satanic power. Instead of the burnt flags, the fake buses and the effigies of Israeli and American leaders that are burnt with repulsive cries of joy – that after they have been overcome and vaporized represent the victory over oppression and evil – they brandish the flags of hope of the PLO, Hamas and Hizbullah and issue calls for help and salvation from the great warriors who will come to the rescue, whether it was Saddam Hussein or Sheik Nasrallah, or any other charismatic leader who can recreate the heroic acts of Saladin against the new Crusaders, Jews and Christians, in the Muslim world. This is the pattern followed by the Arab masses in their times of trouble, and the Israeli Arabs adopt more than a few of these behavior patterns. If the attacked enemy dares to defend himself, then he, of course, is the aggressor, which confirms the satanic stereotype tied to it, on a daily basis. And in that way, Bin-Laden can attack Americans everywhere, and Hizbullah, Israel and the Jews, however, any attempt on the part of the victims to apprehend the criminals or punish them is immediately categorized as “cruel acts”, “Nazi aggression”, “collective punishments” and use of “exaggerated force” against “innocents” and schoolchildren who have “done no wrong”.

This being the situation, that Jews are, by their very nature, human scum, cruel, lacking any human sentiment, deceitful and money and power hungry as is their state – their own creation, everything subhuman that can be possibly attributed to them is feasible and realistic. Therefore, there is no end to the delusional stories that they disseminate about Israel: From injecting the AIDS virus into Palestinian children, disseminating poison candies among Arab children, poisoning wells and lands in order to harm the Arabs and utilization of the weapon of depleted uranium against them, through intentional “provocations” to blow up Israeli soldiers in order to blame Palestinians for those actions, culminating in devising plagues and attributing them to the Israelis or incessant accusations of “Nazi” behavior intended to engender a comprehensive genocide against the Arabs in general and the Palestinians in particular. These rumors, lies, accusations and libels are also disseminated among Israeli Arabs, who not only do nothing to refute them, but they add their own fabrications to them: For example, that Israel is the one responsible for the arson at the al-Aqsa Mosque in the summer of 1969, or that the Jews are excavating beneath the mosques

in order to topple them and many other false charges. These are not necessarily lies that are concocted in propaganda offices, but rather daydreams in a world in which imagination and reality, facts and wishes are indistinguishably integrated. As, what they are unable to accomplish in the world of action becomes a virtual *fait accompli* as soon as the imaginer so desires. There is nothing easier than disseminating these falsehoods and have them gain currency, as the more powerful the rage and more profound the frustration, the tendency to project the blame on Israel and the Jews intensifies. The Arab public in general, including the Israeli Arabs, is ready and willing to accept anything negative said about the Jews and their country. It is difficult to catch an Israeli Arab, and all the more so any other Arab, who will rejoice and celebrate the successes of his country, whether scientific, sporting or cultural and most certainly political, military and even economic.

The horrifying descriptions that we read about, hear or watch on a daily basis, whether in textbooks, in speeches by leaders, in the media outlets of the Arab countries and the Arab population in Israel are not necessarily the product of conscious, intentional malice, but rather the result of the faith that seeks to view the enemy as the personification of evil in order to make him a target fit for attack or liquidation. This is the way that the Arabs construct this harsh picture before their children, people, soldiers, refugees, clerics, politicians and state-run and supervised media outlets. The blood libel, for example, whose champion these past 20 years has been Syrian Defense Minister Mustafa Tlas, has become commonplace and accepted in the Arab world, including in Egypt more than 20 years after its peace agreement with Israel. Its acceptance without the slightest skepticism enables the Palestinians to claim that Israel poisons its wells and its young girls and enables the Israeli Arabs to visit Syria regularly, to meet with the most outstanding anti-Semites there, including the president, who in his outstanding erudition and shining insightfulness, determines that Zionism is worse than Nazism. As far as we know, no Israeli Arab ever demanded that his hosts moderate these slanderous allegations and certainly never made his visit conditional upon the renunciation of this spine-tingling invective. The same is true regarding the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, still printed and distributed publicly in all Arab countries without hindrance and read there voraciously, Holocaust denial and honoring of revisionist historians who deny the Holocaust or dissemination of other anti-Semitic writings there. Even this is done without malice, but rather with absolute faith in the veracity of the libelous documents that they create, distribute and educate in their “light” (or more correctly, darkness); we have never seen or heard of Israeli Arabs, who are

supposed to be educated to Israeli values and pursuit of truth, confronting this flood of anti-Semitism in order to assist its state in rebuffing it. In other words, once again, the pan-Arab consensus is more important to them than both the truth and the image of their state.

Some of these indictments are based on Islamic sources, which ascribes them sacred and eternal validity in the eyes of God-fearing Muslims (see the next chapter), especially the fundamentalists among them, like Hamas and Hizbullah, which will be discussed below, and also in the eyes of religious and non-religious leaders like Yasser Arafat was and the leaders of the Islamic Movement in Israel, who were caught more than once uttering blatantly anti-Semitic statements based on their faith. However, some of these other writings are based on Western Christian anti-Semitic literature that was imported to the Arab countries by Christian Arabs who found in it a springboard for their Arab nationalism absent the Islamic foundation, for example, the blood libel and the legend regarding the international Jewish conspiracy to take over the world, expressed in the infamous Protocols. None of these require research or proofs and it is enough for a politician, cleric, journalist or any shaper of public opinion to state them in order to have them become a popular mantra repeated as a factual certainty, whose generators and certainly its listeners throughout the Arab and Islamic world, relate to it as an established fact. The assumption is that if these statements, in which the Israeli Arabs are involved as well, correspond to the demonic personality of the enemy, they must be accurate and established. If they are true, then it is certainly necessary to apprise the world about them. Thus, the frequent campaigns negating any connection between the Jewish people and the Land of Israel, and especially Jerusalem and the Temple Mount, in which some of the shapers of Arab public opinion take an active role. The Arabs are also terrified of any positive action on the part of Israel that is liable to shed a positive light on its evil personality. For example, if it aids the Africans, it is merely because it seeks to dominate them; if it manages an exemplary agricultural farm in Egypt, it is actually there to poison Egyptian agriculture; if Israel extends medical assistance to the victims of the *intifada*, on both sides of the Green Line, it is merely an attempt to obfuscate their crimes against them. The fact that the Palestinians flew their wounded to Iraq and Jordan when excellent medical treatment was available, nearby and in proximity to their homes, is proof of this. These matters are internalized by the Israeli Arabs and contribute to their sense of animosity towards and alienation from the State.

One of the most egregious distortions about Israel that was internalized by its Arabs through the aggressive anti-Israeli discourse in the Arab and Islamic world

and which causes them the most severe damage in the eyes of many Israelis, is the facile and routine use of the cliché accusing Israel of racism, bordering on Nazism. There is no need to belabor the point regarding the extreme and justified sensitivity in Israel in particular and for Jews in general, to those chilling epithets. Perhaps that is the reason that Arab discourse in general, resorts to them so regularly. That is not only an indicator of extreme ignorance and lack of sensitivity, but it is a manifestation of malice with the intent to provoke, demean and hurt, in most cases, unnecessarily. Every speech, interview, declaration or other innocent statement that the Arabs do not like, in Israel or beyond its borders, the accusation of “racism” is immediately employed against it. That is perhaps the most common epithet employed by the representatives of the Arab parties and Arab personalities in general against the Israeli government and against their Jewish colleagues in the Knesset. If they enforce construction or other laws against violators, the accusation of racism is immediately sounded. As if the Arabs are permitted to do whatever they see fit, under the auspices of the fear of being labeled racist, and the authorities are indeed afraid to intervene lest they be accused, heaven forbid, of racism. Here too, several absurdities are exposed: When the Arabs are suspected of anti-Semitism, which is a severe manifestation of real racism, they claim that they cannot be anti-Semites because they are Semites, in other words, racist hatred could not possibly exist between them and the Jews; however, any suspicion that they raise regarding discrimination by the Jews, is immediately greeted with a plethora of racist accusations. Of course, the racist images in Israel increased when they received the infamous 1975 UN seal of approval, in which it was determined that Zionism was a form of racism. Thus, the Arabs in general and the Israeli Arabs in particular, who are ruled directly by the Zionists, are the victims of racism that was condemned to eternal disgrace by the UN.

The condemnation of Zionism as racism, had another aspect that profoundly influenced the Israeli Arabs, who declared their identification with the Palestinian National Charter, as the charter contains in 15 of its 33 paragraphs an explicit declaration of the Palestinian aspiration to liquidate the military, political, cultural, social and economic manifestations of Zionism in the Land of Israel. The aspiration of the Palestinians, who were not demanded by our wise men in Oslo to abrogate it as a condition for Israel’s recognition of them, thereby received the UN seal of approval explicitly and that of Israel tacitly, for their assertion of the racist nature of Israel. Then, why should the Israeli Arabs cease to consider it racist? Incidentally, even when the UN abrogated that resolution in 1991, it was the Arabs, including the Palestinians who expressed their reservations regarding

the revised resolution and remained committed to the provocative resolution that preceded it. The Arabs in general and the Palestinians in particular, while disregarding the collaboration between some of their leaders and the Nazis and Hitler, attack Israel and accuse it of Nazi conduct (for example, the Hamas Charter repeats that term explicitly and often). There are intellectuals among them who understand the distortion and the incoherence of the equation, as Israel has not systematically destroyed a people, did not establish concentration camps, did not poison with gas and incinerate in ovens, did not cultivate an ideology of genocide and preserved a non-Jewish minority within its borders, while there are several Arab countries in which a Jew can not legally reside. Nevertheless, they absolve themselves of all racism, as they are Semites, concerned about human rights, as we know – and they conduct themselves in accordance with exacting principles of democracy that leave no room for discrimination, unlike dictatorial Israel, which discriminates and oppresses, whose every step is racism and Nazism. This extreme, distorted prattle, which has been internalized by the Arab world and used widely in their media outlets on a daily basis, including in “moderate”, “peace-loving” Egypt, certainly had an impact on the Palestinians, including the Israeli citizens among them, when they attack Israel or engage in violent confrontation with its security forces during riots, in Israel as well as in the territories.

Since there is no harsh reaction in Israel, and in light of the indifference of the rest of the world to this racist discourse against it in the Arab world, not only do they have no reason to desist from that conduct, but they consider it part of their daily routine and self-explanatory. The racist images that they, including the Israeli Arabs, utilize are so deeply embedded in their culture and their consciousness that there is no point in demanding that they put an end to their statements in the knowledge that breaking the thermometer will not cure the fever. In our contacts with the Arabs and the peace talks that we have conducted with them, they faced the demand that they put an end to the incitement and anti-Semitic diatribes and even to declare the end of their dispute with us. In other words, their excuses to incite against us are gone. However, it turns out that they are unable to rid themselves of the calumny imprinted in their blood, in their faith and in their mode of conduct. Anyone who doubts this, will please review the Egyptian, Jordanian and Palestinian press, press with the seal of peace upon it, not to mention the Syrian and Iraqi press – and he will see with his own eyes that after more than 20 years of peace with Egypt, there is no decrease in the slander against Israel. The infrastructure for hatred of Israel is set and ready in the entire Arab and Islamic world, including the Israeli

Arabs, and anytime someone is willing to believe all of the fabrications and passing fancies that will be released, whether motivated by ignorant innocence or by vengeful malice, someone will arise from among them in order to take action against those Jews and their State. It is well known that rhetorical delegitimization of a rival/victim, always precedes aggression against him and its justification, at times after the fact. The Israeli Arabs do not live in a cultural bubble, but they are connected by their umbilical cord to the Arab world, with its verbal attacks, its tendencies, its defamation and incitement against the Jews. They also learn and take to heart that the attacker is not forced to bear any punishment or payment, neither the Arabs within Israel and all the more so the Arabs outside of Israel, because Israel continues along with its routine agenda, as if nothing happened at all.

When MK Azmi Bishara returned from his controversial visit to Damascus (June 18, 2001), where he attacked his country and fell into line with the worst of our enemies, he cried out before the cameras the simple, clear message of an Arab-Palestinian-*Christian* living in Israel: “I am a Palestinian patriot, not Israeli; for me Syria is not an enemy land and even if they *crucify* me, it will not change my feeling.” The implication is that Bishara, as a Palestinian, chooses the Palestinian side when there is a conflict between his country and his people, but as an Arab, he cannot consider an Arab country an enemy, even if it declares war against his country. That, in brief, is the entire premise. It is important to remember this dual aspect, so as not to get caught up in the delusion popular here and abroad as if the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is the “heart of the problem” and with its resolution, the redeemer will come to Zion, as the Israeli Arabs will feel comfortable in their state and all of the issues in the region will be removed from the agenda. This falsehood was cultivated by the Palestinians and the rest of the Arabs after the Six Day War, when they came to realize that in the then conventional equation of the Israeli Arab conflict, small, pioneering Israel, surrounded and threatened by a huge Arab ocean, with many countries and rich in personnel and resources, was the beneficiary of more than a little Western sympathy; while in the wake of that war in which Israel won praise and conquest, the formula for the Israeli-Palestinian conflict was reversed, with the generous help of our own people. Then it was the Palestinians who were small, occupied, stateless and threatened, while imperialist Israel occupies, oppresses and threatens. Of course under those circumstances, it is the Palestinians who are the beneficiaries of support and sympathy, while Israel, land of the Holocaust survivors and the refugees from the Arab countries, that just yesterday did not have a leg to stand on, and today proved to the world its abilities and its

durability, and the fact that it was no longer necessary to worry about its future. The transfer of the center of gravity to the Palestinians influenced not only the world consciousness of the need to resolve their problem but also accelerated the Palestinization of the Israeli Arabs, as we saw in the previous chapter.

However, it turns out, especially since the Second Gulf War (1990-1991) in which Iraqi missiles were fired towards Israel, with no connection to the Palestinian issue, although it was met with much Palestinian rejoicing, that the Arab threats against Israel are independent of what transpires in Judea, Samaria, Gaza or in the PLO. When faced with the depth of the hatred for Israel, which has neither faded nor abated since, not in Egypt two decades after the peace treaty and certainly not in Syria and Iraq with whom there is no peace, it is certain that the old Israel-Arab equation is still valid in terms of the long term strategic threats. Thus, the cardinal significance of Bishara's cry, as a parable, saying that the Palestinian problem is no longer the only issue calling for a solution by Israel and at its expense, but there are additional Arab countries waiting in line whose wishes need to be met as well; failure to do so means there will be no solution. The two are interdependent, not only according to Bishara, who speaks for the Israeli Arabs that follow him, but also from the perspective of Yasser Arafat, who precisely on the day that Bishara returned to Israel, announced at the convention of the Arab foreign ministers in Amman that there will not be peace until Israel withdraws from all Arab lands, not only Judea, Samaria and Gaza, and fully implements the right of return. The implication is that Bishara, representing his constituency, his admirers and his greeters upon his return to Nazareth, was falling into line with the policies coordinated between Arafat and Assad, proudly declaring his identity as both a Palestinian and an Arab. This deadly combination between full implementation of the right of return and the demand in the form of an ultimatum for an unconditional Israeli withdrawal from all Arab territories, when it is also sounded from people with resolute, courageous opinions like Azmi Bishara, whose Balad Party is on the rise in polls conducted among Israeli Arabs, if it expresses the general mood, then it drives another nail in the coffin of Jewish-Arab coexistence in this land.

The burgeoning Arab identity of the Israeli Arabs is also manifest in the manner in which they perceive the Israeli Arab conflict, its causes, its progress, its objectives and the ways it can be resolved. They do not view the differences of opinion as requiring a solution of compromise, by means of negotiations as is common in the world at large, but rather as a struggle between one party that is the oppressor, has no rights and is aggressive and the other that consists of the pure, innocent people who have been oppressed, robbed and been rendered

victims for which they must be compensated. While the Israelis have a modest objective – to be accepted by the Arab world and to live beside it in peace and security, the Arabs demand victory, justice, restoration of the Arab grandeur and re-establishment of the glory days of Arab hegemony. In achieving this objective, from their perspective, all is fair: From holy war, unconventional war, war to liquidate Israel through the use of children as human shields, utilization of mosques, hospitals and residences for cover until lies, incitement, slander and oppressing and mistreating their people. Truth be told: Israel is sometimes also drawn, with no alternative and due to the need to defend itself, into acting in some of those improper and ugly ways, however, at least, the sense of morality is preserved to every possible extent: Soldiers and citizens who deviate from humane treatment and from the fair principles of justice are put on trial, irregular cases are investigated and at times punishments are meted out for particularly upsetting crimes, while the Palestinians always rejoice when they harm Israelis and the criminals are always considered heroes. When Baruch Goldstein perpetrated his despicable act, there was no political organization in Israel, from one end of the political spectrum to the other, that did not condemn the man and his action in the harshest possible manner – and justifiably so; however, when Israel locates murderers or their dispatchers and removes them from the field of play, as was the case with Yihya Ayyash (“the Engineer”), the murderer becomes a national hero and a *shahid*, the leaders of the Palestinian Authority participate in his family’s mourning and his funeral and they overwhelm him with honor and tribute. Of course the Israeli Arabs raced to harshly condemn Goldstein, but they also dispatch delegations to the territories in order to console the families of the Arab heroes who fell. In other words, the general Arab concept that holds that anything that they do to Israel is always just and necessary and everything that Israel does is always belligerent and extraneous has become the norm among Israeli Arabs as well.

In order to resolve this behavioral dissonance, the Israeli Arabs, like the rest of their relatively moderate Arab brethren and they do exist, condemn attacks against civilians “on both sides”, as if attacking Israeli soldiers is permissible and as if there are two sides to this battle. True, there have been cruel murderers in Israel who have committed acts of violence against Arabs, like Ami Popper and Goldstein, or individual settlers who have illegally mistreated blameless Palestinians. However, they were punished by the judicial system and were condemned by the Israeli political system. In any case, no organization exists in Israel that has a stated ideology of killing Arabs qua Arabs and therefore, you will not find among them people setting off bombs, blowing up buses or ambushing

Palestinian passers-by; there is no political or religious leadership in Israel that will provide patronage or encouragement or even give tacit approval in the face of actions of that sort. Jewish undergrounds have existed and they have been arrested and quickly judged and their threat was nipped in the bud; while among the Arabs, since everything done against the Jews is legitimate and justified, then they do not punish the criminal. Even when these crimes took place among the Israeli Arabs, as detailed above, we never found among their leaders a clear, harsh condemnation of the criminals, but rather tepid formulations of condemning the actions “on both sides”, as if there ever were Jews who set off bombs or ambushes in Arab villages or set fire to Arab institutions or ignited fields and forests in Arab areas. Israeli Arabs walk around our cities safely, fill our hospital beds, congregate in our universities and make their livelihoods by our employers, but Jews are afraid to enter Arab villages in the State of Israel and avoid them. Thus, the whole myth about “two sides” has no basis in fact here just as it has no basis in our relations with the rest of the Arabs. Both Palestinians and other Arabs, who visit us, move around freely wherever they please while Israelis, who come to them, are not always certain that they will emerge from there alive.

Israeli Arabs, like the rest of the Arabs, complain about “collective punishment” that Israel imposes upon them by checking them at checkpoints, imposing curfews during severe riots, in airports and in necessary searches that take place occasionally, and they disregard the collective punishment that they imposed upon us and the rest of the world since they initiated terrorism, airplane hijackings and blowing up buildings and the people inside them in Israel and around the world. Ever since, all domestic and international travelers have been required to undergo revealing inspections that invade the privacy of the individual in airports and to pay their costs, while at the entrance to public institutions in Israel and in many other places around the world, they rummage through our bags and delay us. The public usually relents willingly, because it understands that it is preferable to be delayed than to be blown up. And the generators of this chaos complain that they too are subject to these searches? After all, they recall the days of euphoria after the Six Day War, when there were no roadblocks on any road, there were no searches and our land, our beaches and our hotels were filled with Arabs from all over the Arab world, who came to satisfy their curiosity about Israel and no one stopped them or rummaged through their belongings. However, once terrorism began, of which we, and not the Arabs, are its primary victims, then certainly the need arises to intensify the inspections despite the ancillary discomfort and the Arabs as a collective have no right to

characterize these security measures collective punishment. What then? They have the right to kill, punish, kidnap, detonate bombs and sow destruction because they are the oppressed and frustrated unfortunate ones and anyone who dares to defend against them is the desperate aggressor. Even when students in our university dormitories were required to perform guard duty at night because of robbers and terrorists, the Arab students scornfully rejected the offer that they too bear their share of the burden. They, as we know, have only the right of residence but they have no obligation to maintain security as all of the potential Arab terrorists are not their enemies and therefore they have nothing or no one against whom to defend. Just like the Christian Bishara, who is incapable of considering Syria an enemy country, even if the Jews were to “crucify” him, as if he was the new version of Jesus the Palestinian.

This Arab perception of privilege as their exclusive domain, to which no one besides them has any claim, leads to a manner of conduct that is difficult for an open, fair-minded Western public to bear. In Israel, the Arabs have access to all of the media outlets, government and private, and they express themselves freely there, just as they do in the Knesset; every event in the Arab sector is covered extensively and includes interviews with Arab leaders. Incidentally, the same is true of Arab leaders in general, including Palestinians, and even in the midst of hostile acts against Israel. At the time, the BBC prohibited the interviewing of leaders of the IRA, to rob them of a forum through which to attack the London government and most certainly, during World War II. When no Nazi or fascist element was given access to the government broadcasts there. In Israel, even during the *intifada*, Palestinian spokesmen starred on every news and talk program aired on all of the Israeli media outlets and there was no event that transpired in which the Palestinian side was not presented, with all of the suffering and pain included therein, alongside the Israeli version and the free, objective analysis of the various reporters, for and against. The same is true regarding events in the other Arab countries, whether or not they have diplomatic relations with Israel. The official Arab representatives residing in Israel were also pampered not only by a plethora of invitations and personal friendships but also by interviews and commentaries in the Israeli media. On the Arab side, there is no vestige of this kind of openness, as the Arabs believe that they have the monopoly on justice and no criticism should be heard, certainly not by the enemy. Thus, the Arab media outlets in Israel will not take the trouble to interview, quote or host a Jewish writer unless he is committed to their point of view; while the Palestinians do not report what they perpetrate against Israel at all and they always have before them exclusively the official

version of the incidents, with no nuances, interrogations or hosting of critical Israeli personalities. The Israeli representatives posted in Arab countries remain, as a rule, isolated in their offices and shunned, no one interviews them and few attend their official functions for fear that they will be harmed. Because the Arab rights are so obvious that there is no desire to have them undermined by undesirable guests; while the rights of the Jews are so shallow and fragile that there is no Arab obligation to provide them with a forum and they certainly are unworthy of protection and a fair hearing by the Arabs.

The Arab concept *haq* means both right and obligation and also truth and propriety; in other words, if the Arabs believe that they have a right in any matter, the obligation of the other is to accept it in its entirety without challenge, it is not dependent upon reciprocity or fulfillment of any conditions, because it is also the truth that must be stated and accomplished. The Islamic Movement in Israel calls its newspaper *Zaut al-Haq (wal-Huriyya)* meaning the Voice of Truth/Rights (and Freedom), and anyone who fails to understand that call for rights, which is absolute, belongs to the world of injustice. Thus, when the Israeli Arabs demand their rights, they do not consider that those rights are liable to collide with the rights of others, and they therefore expect their full and immediate realization. They are irate and frustrated when it does not turn out that way and they therefore accuse others of oppression, discrimination, mistreatment, cruelty and racism. The same is true of the other Arabs, who demand of Israel realization of all of their expectations, for if they fail to do so they only understand the language of force, they are racist, imperialist, covet the property of others, cruel and uncontainable. Thus, the basis of this Arabism provides a common language and a uniform manner of thinking to the demands of all the Arabs *vis-à-vis* Israel, because only they are permitted to raise demands and it is obligated to obey and deliver until all of their desires are satisfied. This absolute concept of their rights (like the right to land, to armed struggle and the right of return) is what leads to the fact that even the most extreme concessions by their rivals will not be met with reciprocity and acknowledgement. The proof is – Israeli governments were willing to make substantial concessions to both the Syrians and the Palestinians, however in return they received fire and sulfur, actual from the Palestinians and verbal from the Syrians. The Syrian unwillingness to “humiliate” themselves by sending their president to decisive negotiations with the Israeli Prime Minister in the United States, and even more so the refusal of their Foreign Minister to shake the hand of the most senior Israeli political leader, or to even speak to him directly as if he was a leper, should have signaled the Israelis regarding their negative attitude towards any agreement

that will not restore them to the June 4, 1967 borders, and who knows what they would have plotted next had they gotten what they sought?

The problem of rights is connected, for the Arabs, to the concept of justice, which is usually articulated in “just peace” and “doing justice” regarding their demands, in other words, getting everything they want. As far as they are concerned, their justice is absolute and it overcomes any other demand for justice that clashes with theirs, as if justice was not a relative concept depending on the eye of the beholder, just like beauty, taste and wisdom. In Arabic, the word is *adal* or *adallah*, which is also the name used by the group of Arabs in Israel, who battle for its sectarian rights, not for the rights of all of the citizens or residents. As Orientalist scholars have showed, the word’s original meaning is the “balance” of the sacks on the camel’s back; without perfect balance between them, the animal would be unable to walk through the desert comfortably. The same is true of one who feels hurt and cannot calm down or function until his balance is restored to its rightful place, his honor is restored to its pedestal, in other words, his ability to protect his property and his wives will be on display for all to see; failure to do so will leave him feeling disgraced since his shame, his embarrassment and his weakness have been publicly revealed. Only when justice is done, meaning that the honor has been completely restored to its owner in its entirety, will the person be able to once again function in a normal manner. Therefore, the diminution of his honor is generally tied to loss of property or violation of the modesty of women, and restoring the lost honor involves restoring this loss to its owners together with an appropriate payment of reparations and an apology by the one who harmed the victim. Therefore, the Arab demand for the return of lands “to their last grain of sand”, as Sadat said at the time, or for the restoration of the Arab refugees to their land has nothing to do with the benefit or the misery of the refugees, but rather to the restoration of honor involved in their situation. Failure to do so would constitute a miscarriage of justice. Clearly, determining ownership over a tract of land or a right that was robbed, or the sense that injustice was done, is absolutely subjective and is not subject to any pragmatic give and take or objective consideration. In other words, resolution of a dispute over honor does not involve finding a fair, considerate compromise formula that will meet the needs of all of the parties to the dispute, but rather in the total and unconditional restoration of rights. For example, when the Arabs rampage in riots in Israel, it matters not what they may have done in order to elicit the harsh reaction of the police force, what matters is what was done to them; as justice is on their side, as they were robbed and exploited; all they did was to restore the lost item to themselves in order to

save their honor; therefore the police are the ones who are always deserving of punishment for exercising force, not them. Their expectations are always high that their justice will be done, in other words that they will be exonerated and the Israeli authorities will be convicted. Failure to do so will exacerbate the bitterness and the demand for justice and rights will again be unleashed.

In practical political terms, the absolute Arab demands, supported by the Israeli Arabs, mean that the Arabs must first achieve total satisfaction, in accordance with their feelings and their aspirations, and only after their demands are acknowledged and recognition of those demands is announced, will they perhaps exhibit generosity and give up something of theirs as an act of goodwill. Until then, they will not compromise on what they deserve and certainly not what was taken from them by force, in their opinion. In Sadat's 1977 Knesset speech, in subsequent negotiations with Syria and again in statements by Hizbullah in Lebanon and now by the Palestinians, they all insistently demanded total Israeli withdrawal, or at least a commitment to such a withdrawal, before the negotiations enter into their practical stages. It is not that they seek to determine the outcome of the negotiations even before they begin, but it is rather a declaration that as far as their property and honor are concerned, they are unwilling to compromise one iota and therefore the negotiations will be conducted over the manner in which the Israeli withdrawal will be implemented, not on its magnitude, its stages or its essence. For everything that belongs to them, from their perspective, is not subject to any negotiation, because it is theirs, period. That is the reason that according to the Arabs, the negotiations must conclude with their victory, not in compromise and therefore, that is the reason that any time negotiations with Israel reach advanced stages, they seem to ostensibly retreat from those negotiations. Actually, once they see results from their pressure for totality, they adhere to their original positions. That is what happened with the Syrians after Israel agreed to relinquish the Golan in its entirety to them, that was the case with Egypt that insisted on the return of Sinai in its entirety to its possession, that was the case with the Lebanese, who decided to demand the Shaba Farms after Israel had, for all intents and purposes, withdrawn from all Lebanese territory and that was the case with the Palestinians in Taba, on the eve of the 2001 elections that brought about Ehud Barak's removal from office. The Palestinians, with the active support of the Israeli Arabs as well as the rest of the Arabs, feel in their deepest consciousness that the Land of Israel and Jerusalem in particular, including the Holy of Holies and the Temple Mount within it, were given to them as an eternal legacy (regarding the Islamic aspects – see the

next chapter) and they therefore did not agree to the partition of the land in 1947 and are unwilling or unable to relinquish it now either.

Thus, the result is, that while Israeli negotiators and Western observers are astounded that “the Arabs again never miss an opportunity to miss an opportunity”, for the Arabs, it is preferable to wait for the whole, even if it carries, in order to satisfy their sense of justice, than to prostrate themselves in the humiliation entailed in accepting only part, which would mean agreeing to an act of injustice. As mentioned above, justice is complete and indivisible and if they cannot achieve it today, they will educate their children to demand it until the end of days and to reject any enemy counterclaims. Therefore, the subject matter transmitted in Arab schools everywhere regarding the full restoration of rights, including the completeness of the land and the right of return, which many Israeli Arabs support totally, should come as no surprise. Meanwhile, one should refrain from fraternizing with thieves or normalizing relations with them, but rather contacts with them should be restricted to the necessary evil. In “moderate” Egypt and Jordan, for example, they make life difficult for those seeking to visit Israel, shun professional organizations that maintain ties with Israel or who write in favor of those ties and stage mass demonstrations against normalization with the Jewish state. Even in Israel, there are Arabs, who prefer to stick to their own villages rather than having extensive ties with the Jews, whom they consider enemies as was manifest in the violent demonstrations; or they even boycott elections in Israel, as if they are doing Israel a favor by participating in them. What enables the defeated Israeli Arabs and Palestinians to act like winners and to proffer audacious demands is the fact that so many Arabs stand behind them. Arafat had pretenses of representing them all in his struggles against Israel, including the Israeli Arabs and including the Christians among them, after appointing himself as the trustee of all Arab sites, both Christian and Muslim, in the Land of Israel. The Jews did not have the nerve to say that only under their auspices could there be unfettered access to all of the holy places and therefore the Arabs came along and raised that pretension. Therefore, their demand is the one on the international agenda and not the more natural and understandable Israeli one, which was never placed on the agenda.

Thus, even though Jesus of Nazareth was a Jew, who moved from one synagogue to another, from one Jewish city to another, he was naturalized by the Arabs, who transformed him into an Arab and even into a Palestinian and consequently his Christian heritage belongs to them and they are responsible for its preservation in the Land of Israel. Symbolically, Arafat could even claim that his marriage to Christian Suha and the fact that he is the father of a “mixed”

child, Muslim-Arab and Palestinian-Christian, consecrated his trustee status, in the name of all Arabs, over the Christian and Muslim heritage in the entire Land of Israel including the heritage of the Israeli Arabs, Muslim and Christian. Israel, of course, cannot be charged with the preservation of that culture, not only because it is Jewish, but because it is a transient phenomenon, just like the ephemeral Crusader Kingdom, that will ultimately pass from the land. These contentions, voiced by the Arabs in general, can also be found in the writings of nationalist and fundamentalist-Muslim intellectuals among the Israeli Arabs, as we will see in the next chapter. From the vantage point of Arab history, the Jews seem to be an abnormal religious minority, destined to be scattered among the nations, which lacks the necessary qualities to be a nation and therefore are unworthy of a state, or even of Arab recognition as a national entity. The Jews are so problematic from the Arab perspective, due to the enormous and, for them, incomprehensible gap between their despised image in Arab eyes throughout the generations that has rendered them cursed by Allah and by history, and their stunning success in the modern era, despite the minority status that has stuck with them, despite the persecution that has destroyed them over the generations and despite their lack of geographic rootedness in any land for two thousand years and beyond. Even more incomprehensible for them is the status of Jewish communities in Western democracies, where they have flourished and garnered influence beyond their meager numbers relative to the host population. Therefore, the Arabs, including the Israeli Arabs, always resort to the anti-Semitic “explanation” of the “international Jewish conspiracy” and Jewish control of the media, the corridors of government and the international financial centers, etc., and thereby evade dealing with the inherent contradiction between that international Jewish domination and the images of obsequiousness, fear, cowardice, submission, helplessness and inaction, their relegation to ghettos, the hatred that they harbor for the Gentiles and humanity, the curse resting upon them and their natural and justified exclusion from human society as a whole.

The fact that the Arab communities in the West, which very often outnumber the Jewish communities in the same locale, are far inferior to the Jews in terms of societal status and accomplishments and in terms of excellence in the areas of economics, science, media, academia and politics, is especially difficult for the Arabs – and in particular for the Israeli Arabs, who recognize and internalize these phenomena first hand. This explains the attempt to “rationalize” the Jewish breakthroughs in the aforementioned anti-Semitic terms, on the one hand, and on the other hand the Arabs cultivate grudge against the West for enabling the

Jews to excel within its boundaries and to thereby “humiliate” the Arabs. That is the reason that the Jews are so intimately connected to the West in the eyes of the Arabs and particularly to the injustices that were caused the Arabs during the colonialist and imperialist years. At times they have an uncontrollable, disproportionate anti-Semitic outburst and there are those who even thank Hitler, who saw the danger latent in the Jews and vented his rage against them, but they also complain that he was unable to finish the job and spare the Arabs and the rest of the world from the punishment of dealing with them. Even more difficult for the Arabs is the fact that they lag behind Israel in their material, technological and scientific accomplishments after beginning at the same point of departure 50 years ago and the gap continues to widen, to the point that the per capita income in hated Israel is many times greater than the dwindling income of the Arabs in general, as was detailed above. The paradox is that the Israeli Arabs, who, to a large extent, enjoy the standard of living in their country, do not enjoy that situation but point to the gaps between them and the Jewish majority, complain about discrimination against them and there are even those among them who desire the disappearance of their country by means of implementation of the right of return for their brethren, even if that will bring about the end of the advancement of the State, whose bounty they enjoy. Thus, instead of understanding that in every country there are social strata that lag behind because of their social, cultural, educational and economic attributes and find the energy to improve their lot, they, like the rest of the Arabs, prefer to find a scapegoat for their frustrations and their inaction and place the blame on Israel and the Jews.

The political, identity-related and economic support that Western Jews provide Israel, for which it is difficult to find comparable examples among the Arabs in exile *vis-à-vis* their countries of origin, also arouses jealousy among the Arabs in general and the Israeli Arabs in particular. As a result, like in the case of their desire to destroy Israel because they cannot match its accomplishments, the Arabs expend efforts to sever the ties between the Jews of the world and Israel, or at least to weaken the Western Jews so that their assistance to the Jewish state will decrease, and it will then be easier for the Arabs to restore it to “its natural size” as they like to put it. This explains their desire to first limit the extreme influence of the Jews in those countries, then to bring about parity with the Arab influence and finally to liquidate and replace it. We have witnessed that during the al-Aqsa *intifada*, the Arab communities in the democratic world, in cooperation with local anti-Semites, initiated an outbreak of violence unprecedented since World War II, against local Jews, from Canada to South Africa, from Germany to

Brazil, from England and France to Australia and New Zealand. The reference is not to isolated spontaneous incidents, but rather to planned, coordinated and orchestrated acts of violence, in the dozens and the hundreds, and conducted with outside coordination that included setting fire to synagogues and other Jewish institutions like schools, restaurants and businesses as well as desecration of cemeteries in scope and with malice unprecedented in the Western world since *Kristallnacht* in 1938 and with continuity and persistence that was seen only in the areas of Nazi conquest (1938-1945). There was also invective, threats, abuse and vilification directed at passers-by, at worshippers on their way to synagogue, at children on their way to Hebrew school, orally and by means of telephone and posters. The police in those democratic countries were unable to prevent, stop or punish the criminals who ran amok during those terrible days in late 2000. All this was done out in the open, while denouncing local Jews and Israel and burning Israeli and American flags in the streets of Paris, Sydney, Sao Paulo, Montreal, Moscow, Manchester, Berlin and Lyon as well as on campuses in those countries and especially on hate sites on the internet that were full of twaddle and hatred, that it is doubtful that those countries themselves would have tolerated them had they been directed against churches or even against mosques. All this took place to the great joy of the local Arabs in each location, whose souls rejoiced seeing the proud Jewish communities wallowing in their blood and licking their wounds in silence, without revenge, almost in submission.

In many places in the democratic world, like Canada, Western Europe and Australia, the Arab citizens significantly outnumber the Jewish citizens, meaning that from an electoral perspective, their influence is already great today and will get still greater, both because of continued immigration (legal and illegal) and primarily because of the quick demographic growth of the poor immigrant communities before they settle in and adjust to the Western lifestyle and decrease the birthrate. Already, one can see the courting by leaders up for election in those countries, including President Bush Jr. during his election campaign, of the Arab vote and the Arab lobbyists, who, of course demand a price for their support, in terms of commitments that will be submitted for fulfillment after the elections. One can add to these pressures, of course, huge economic interests tied to the oil trade with Arab countries or with Arab investments in Western economic institutions, which provide political validity and physical reinforcement for the gradual migration of the political support of elected officials in the Arab direction. Support for this process also came from the thought process among some of the Arab leadership in Israel that since they constitute 20% of the

population, they “deserve” that percentage of the State of Israel’s income from abroad, and they unashamedly appeared at the American State Department and the UN institutions in order to demand that their “portion” be paid to them directly. This is not only de-legitimization of the official state institutions, which have the exclusive mandate to negotiate in the name of the state in matters of foreign affairs, but also a reprehensible attempt to gain control of the budgets earmarked for defense aid to Israel, which they oppose in principle and play no role in its undertaking. However, the embarrassing thing in all of this is the role of Western Jews, particularly American Jews, in introducing the Israeli Arabs into the equation of their aid to Israel. During the numerous excursions of the American Jewish leaders in Israel, they have met, heard, expressed interest and investigated the Israeli Arab allegations regarding ostensible Israeli discrimination against them. Therefore, they are in a hurry to “ameliorate” that situation by providing monetary and technical assistance directly to the Arab sector in order to compensate for the years of “neglect”, as they put it, *vis-à-vis* that population. What they fail to understand is that by doing so they are laying another brick in the years-long Arab attempt to weaken the connection between the Diaspora Jews and Israel. They also fail to understand that the Israeli Arabs deny the right of Diaspora Jews to immigrate to Israel, because they consider the Arab right of return as taking precedence over the Jewish right to return to their land. Therefore, it is easy to understand the thinking of the Israeli Arabs, who are enjoying this Jewish aid and much more difficult to penetrate the point of view of the Diaspora Jews on this issue that is ultimately intended to undermine them.

Thus, the Arabs have almost achieved their first objective, as the Jews, especially those in Europe, were afraid to openly identify with their Jewish brethren, rid themselves of Jewish symbols liable to “give them away” and were even portrayed before the general population surrounding them that it is dangerous to fraternize with them due to the damage liable to be caused by riots to anyone found in their undesirable proximity. Along with frightening Jewish communities around the world, who reacted by boycotting Israel, while courageous Christian groups continue to assemble there in order to prove their solidarity, the second stage of the Arab strategy, to achieve equality with Israel in Western eyes, has begun to take effect after years of investment in various peace processes. They have indeed succeeded in bringing about a total reversal, to show that they are not the ones that refuse to make peace but rather it is Israel that refuses to restore the Arabs’ rights and to treat them justly. For it is not that the Arabs have become disgusted with war and decided to adopt Isaiah’s

vision of peace, but after realizing the enormous damage, in image and economy, that their belligerent positions have caused them, they decided to take the path of “peace” and thereby gain Western political support and material aid. We are witness to the fact that Egyptian positions, 22 years after the peace, remain saturated with hatred and antipathy and the same is true of the Palestinians in the midst of negotiations. Even in the course of the *intifada* they talk peace, accept all of the mediation and the agreement proposals and even publicly announce a ceasefire, but at the same time they insist that justice be done and their rights be restored, which renders their war legitimate, even in the midst of declarations of peace, etc. They consider their calls for the right of return and the total Israeli evacuation of the territories as part of their lost rights, which they can, with Western support, regain as part of the peace process. Therefore, Israeli Arab support for the right of return and the evacuation of the territories as part of these “peace” agreements was, it turns out today even to the most naïve people, who were enchanted by peace, part of the comprehensive Arab strategy to smite Israel with its weapon of peace, in order to reach a position of equality with it as far as image is concerned and subsequently to overcome it, relegate it to the periphery of world public opinion and ultimately to replace it.

While the Palestinians and the Syrians today, and the Egyptians and the Lebanese before them, resolutely insist on their uncompromised rights, for example, in matters of Jerusalem, the Temple Mount, the right of return and the June 4, 1967 borders – and since the al-Aqsa *intifada* with cooperation among them and refusal to accept a partial or separate agreement – Israel adopts a strategy of “understanding” and compromises, and unlike Solomon’s judgment, justice will be ultimately with the determined, uncompromising one while the hesitant spineless one will be cast aside and his credibility will be undermined. For if the Arabs insist on the fact that Jerusalem is their capital and they are unwilling to have any discussion about the fact that the Temple Mount belongs exclusively to them, while Israel is prepared to transfer to them Arab neighborhoods in the city and are content to suffice with a corner of the mountain for the purpose of worship, why should the Arabs concede anything to them, whether they want to be there above or below ground? Even their well-intentioned demands for “peace” *vis-à-vis* the world that their refugees be allowed to return to their homes, sounds much more humane, credible and self-explanatory and is therefore able to enlist broad international support, than the counterclaim of the Israelis, who are willing to relinquish part of their land, their holy places and even their security, “for peace”. How is it possible to convince someone of any right to his house, if in the same breath he expresses willingness to cede one floor to

someone else? In negotiations, the mediators always seek to bring the parties to compromise considering their opening positions and with the determination with which they remain resolute in their demands. Therefore, anyone who opens with concessions and compromise positions, ultimately much more than he intended, was willing or was able to give will be taken from him, while the stubborn and demanding one will emerge with most of what he desired. Ehud Barak made all of his concessions and in Taba displayed flexibility for more, while the Arabs paid no attention to him, initiated violence against him and then accused him of stealing their assets and even demanded and received a continuation of the negotiations for more concessions, while their violent frenzy gained momentum. It was important to be aware of the Arab desire to win, not to argue, to get all of their demands, not to bargain over them, and we should have been conscious of the lessons of Munich of 2-3 generations ago.

The Arab demands for totality do not result exclusively from psychological positions and behavior patterns deeply ingrained in their culture as mentioned above, but also from tactical and strategic considerations and calculations. For had they compromised with reality, then the ensuing agreement would have frozen their aspirations for the future, which are supposed to again take center stage when the opportunity presents itself. Even countries like Egypt, which made peace with Israel, did not completely close the door before renewing the conflict if any Arab country finds itself in a state of war with Israel. And indeed, the hatred and the vitriolic attacks against the Jews and Israel in all Egyptian media outlets and in other opinion shaping forums remained as they were, and in the absence of education for peace among the Egyptian population, it is liable to once again be drawn into a violent conflict if the leaders think that the time is right. The same is true of the Palestinians, who after all of the concessions made to them in Oslo, Wye, Camp David and Taba, decided to take the path of violence so that, heaven forbid, a compromise agreement with Israel would not be established in international precedent until their demands have been completely satisfied. Proof is, they agreed to arrangements proposed to them as long as they were not committed to end the conflict. The implication is that the Arabs are only willing to accept an arrangement that will leave them with sufficient maneuverability and will contain within it enough promising potential for the elimination of Israel from the scene. All that is necessary is to look at the standards set by Hizbullah in Lebanon: First, it demanded unconditional Israeli withdrawal from Southern Lebanon, in order to leave in its wake chaos and to exhaust Israel by forcing it to deal daily with threats at the border; then it was the Shaba Farms, despite the UN determination that anomalously supported

Israeli positions; then they demanded the liberation of all Lebanese prisoners in Israel; and then they added the liberation of all of the Arab inmates as well. In order to underscore their determination, they also kidnapped Israelis, while the Lebanese authorities refuse to station troops in that region so as not to appear “guardians of Israel’s borders”. Thus, Arab countries continue to urge Israel to restore to the Palestinians all of the rights that they are demanding, including the right of return, and Hizbullah even dispatched emissaries and weapons to them in order to emphasize pan-Arab solidarity. Since the Israeli Arab leaders declare their support for the Palestinian struggle as well as for Hizbullah support for them, we have another decisive point of confluence between the Israeli Arabs and the rest of the Arab world.

The upshot of all this is that as long as the Arab world does not accept Israel as a *fait accompli*, on the one hand, and due to the component of Arab identity that has been strengthened in the identity of the Israeli Arabs on the other, there will be no improvement in relations between Israel and its Arab citizens in the near future. On the contrary, we have seen that the Israeli Arab relations with the rest of the Arab world do not focus on those countries that have recognized Israel or have forged relations at different levels (Egypt, Jordan, Morocco, Oman and Qatar, etc.), but rather focus precisely on those most hostile to it like Syria and the Palestinian Authority. In other words, had the Israeli Arabs sought to serve as a bridge to peace as they claim, they would have certainly focused on those countries relatively open to Jews and Israel from the first category, by cultivating normalization and battling the nationalist and Islamic forces there who strongly reject that convergence. Instead they have chosen to turn specifically to the most stubborn and rejectionist among them and fall into line behind them, which decreases not only the chance that they will integrate into Israeli society, but also renders them suspect in the eyes of the Israeli public that they are peace rejectionists and collaborators with the most heinous of their enemies. These suspicions were exacerbated when the Arab community in Israel scornfully protested and continued to express reservations regarding the State’s efforts to reward, even if only symbolically, Arabs that assisted it in its struggles on all fronts. Thus, instead of opening the gates of their homes to congratulate other Arabs who took effective action for the sake of Israel’s security, something that Israeli Arabs disgustedly avoid, they joined an ugly campaign of persecution and hatred against those unfortunate people, their brethren under normal circumstances, refused to absorb them in their villages, banned them from their company and declared them enemies. In other words, another perverse innovation: The friends of your state are your enemies and therefore disapprove

of them, persecute them and hurl at them humiliating calls of “traitors” – while the enemies of your state are your real friends. Do not be surprised, therefore, that others have noticed this phenomenon and they are quick to categorize you, not on an ideological basis but on an empirical one, with the enemies of the State from whom one must be, at the very least, very wary, or if there is no alternative to go to war against them. The same is true of the SLA (South Lebanese Army) refugees who reside in Israel and were profoundly disappointed by the cold shoulder offered them by their Israeli Arab “brethren”. How can one who failed all of these tests of loyalty to the State expect to be treated as if he was on our side and not on the side of the enemy?

The peace agreements that have been reached to date with the Arab countries remain problematic and lack the capability to stand alone, and during every crisis they teeter on the verge of collapse, because the populations of those countries, that continue to be educated on the knee of the old animosities and to internalize the incitement of the official and private media, blindly follow the ruling and opposition elites, which shun Israel, boycott it and impose harsh sanctions upon anyone who dares to associate with it. All Israeli attempts to bring those elites to accept it and the Jews as peace partners, to convince them to open up, to share with them the sites sacred to both parties and to seek compromise over the disputed lands, were fruitless. Furthermore, all Israeli proposals for concessions and compromises, merely raised the bar on Arab demands, as anything placed on the list of concessions becomes the basis for the next compromise, in other words, for the next Israeli concession, until Israel is pushed towards absolute and uncompromising capitulation. That was the case in Jerusalem, in Sinai and regarding the right of return. This indicates that the Arabs are not yet ready to recognize Israel and even less prepared to make peace with it. However, since these are not positions that are likely to be accepted around the world, the Arabs adopted a policy of positive statements regarding their desire for an agreement if their demands are met in full. If in fact those demands were met in full they would force Israel to borders and a demographic situation that would be especially lethal from its perspective. Countless agreements have been signed between Israel and the Arabs: Camp David A and B, the “peace” agreement with Lebanon that was torn to shreds by the Syrians, Oslo A and B, Cairo A and B, Sharm a-Sheikh A and B, Taba and Eilat, Wye and Washington, however it is difficult to point to stable, clear and final results, even on the long-standing Egyptian front. If there were so many agreements, perhaps none of them is a genuine “agreement”. Israel and the Arabs signed papers, especially under pressure from foreign elements, and after the expectations for both parties for a bright

future were cultivated by irresponsible leadership on both sides, which did not do its homework, which gave precedence to wishes over profound consideration, which took irreversible steps when it thought that it could reverse them if it did not succeed, and saw with its own eyes the large lacunae that were discovered in its plans and predictions, but continued to charge forward (actually backward) possessed by madness. It was especially fateful for the side of Israel, the giver, which could have slowed down the withdrawals and made them contingent on countermeasures that the peace partners were supposed to carry out and to stop the process completely if they were not carried out.

The most severe aspect was that all of the mediators whom we allowed to infiltrate the process, or even invited them to play an active role in it, waiving the direct, exclusive contact between the parties to the dispute, ultimately turned against us due to their own personal interests. We have not learned that the more American, European or Egyptian mediators that there are, the more they will ultimately seek “compromises” by pressuring us, because we are the party that gives, as long as some paper for which they will be able to take credit is signed, and its tragic implications for Israel are insignificant. Thus, they allowed Mubarak to be the final arbiter, as if he has any interest in objectivity as Egypt is forcing Israel to its “natural dimensions” and seeks to maintain its regional hegemony, which only Israel could challenge; or as if the righteous Norwegians would ever be willing to admit that they were mistaken in their original optimistic assessments; or as if the Europeans could conceal their hypocritical positions that are hostile to Israel; or that the Americans would unconditionally support Israel, disregarding its other interests in the region. For all of the above, the fact that while for them it was a matter of foreign policy, which could either succeed or fail without any negative consequences befalling them, for Israel it is an existential question regarding which any failure could, heaven forbid, conclude in an irreversible tragedy, was of no consequence. Ultimately, Mubarak piles all the blame upon Israel, which comes to him begging for his mediation and his moderation of the Palestinians, whom he supports without reservation at the Arab summit conferences, and implores them not to relinquish Jerusalem and the Temple Mount; the Europeans, especially the French and the Norwegians, whose prestige received a fatal blow because their mediation effort collapsed, of course, place the yoke of failure on Israel’s shoulders; and even the Americans in whom we placed our trust, demand much unilateral blood, restraint and victims from us so that they will agree to decide who is implementing agreements and who is violating them. The Israeli Arabs joyfully see this very difficult political situation for Israel, into which we were placed by the architects of Oslo, who

continue to walk free among us and continue to entrench themselves in their positions and continue to cause damage instead of admitting their tragic mistake and the dead end into which they forced us. Because they, as “loyal” citizens, are encouraged by the distressing situation in which their state finds itself, because they are convinced that with these governments that are malleable, unprincipled and peace-loving at all costs, they will also be able to get what they want and implement the right of return that will finish off their state.

As the Israeli Arabs are first and foremost Arabs and Palestinians, the more the shares of Israel’s negotiating partners rise, so too will their own bargaining power, not within the State and from within, as they pretend, but from outside the State and against it, while adopting the positions of the rest of the Arabs. Because this not only satisfies their identity needs, but it also constitutes an unshakeable fortified wall, standing behind them and guaranteeing their existence, which restores to them the feeling of majority in the expanse and helps them forget their minority status that was forced upon them unwillingly, transcending the vagaries of time and the moments of despair that take hold of them both within Israel and *vis-à-vis* their Palestinian brethren in the territories. For them, the Arab world is like a large ocean, in which they will always find *lebensraum* and the basic needs for existence, even if they are temporarily suffocating in the claustrophobic Israeli and Palestinian aquarium. In other words, even in times of trouble the hope of going out into the wide open spaces always remains, and there is an emotional guarantee that even if all hope is lost, they, truth be told, will never be lost. The connection and the hope that Israeli Arabs attach to the Arab world are tied to the legendary longing for Arab unity that, if it was to be realized, would overcome all of its enemies and its obstacles and restore the lost Arab glory. If not genuine unity, then at least unity in practice and action, and attempts to unify two, three or four Arab countries that the Arabs have been attempting to realize for 40 years but always end in disappointment. Like the rest of the Palestinians and the Arabs who seek succor for their ills, the Israeli Arabs regularly cleave to a unifying charismatic leader, who appears, temporarily controls their lives and then disappears until the rise of the next personality. In the 1950s and 1960s it was Gamal Abd al-Nasser who ruled the world of Arab nationalism, restored color and pride to the faces of the Arabs in general and the Palestinians and many Israeli Arabs considered him their savior. Since the Second Gulf War, the image of Saddam Hussein achieved prominence and his name is mentioned in the same breath as the legendary Saladin, who, with the wave of his hand united the Muslim Middle East around him, and marched proudly to redeem Jerusalem from the Crusaders. His personality and his might,

so popular in the Arab public, including the Israeli Arab public, seduces some of them to think of a new Saladin who will come and redeem them from their suffering at the hand of the new Jewish Crusaders, and the message is very popular on the street and hopes are skyrocketing.

There is no doubt that this Arab background is always situated not only in the consciousness of the Israeli Arabs, but also in the consciousness of the war-weary Israelis, who consider every violent outburst by their Arab neighbors within Israel, as a replica, or a dress rehearsal for the comprehensive Arab assault against them. For example, during the October 2000 riots, in which 13 Arabs were killed, the isolated Jewish settlements high in the Galilee Mountains imagined that they would be the first victim of that assault, which caused them to reprise in their mind's eye the battles of 1948 and to install a perimeter defense around their homes and the security forces to implement harsh measures to prevent that danger. Many of the Jews living in those areas also drew parallels between the events of 1948, in which the Arabs of Palestine, including long-time neighbors of Jewish settlements, participated alongside the Arab armies and gangs that invaded the Land of Israel, and their situation in 2000, when their erstwhile Arab neighbors and friends did not lift a finger to come to their aid when they were attacked on the roads of the Galilee by violent, frenzied Arab youths. There was a basis for their suspicions, because if the security forces would need to battle in order to "recapture" intersections controlled by Arab youths who set fire to public property, it appeared to be a bona-fide war in which sections of Israel were "captured" by the enemy, and therefore there was a need to stage "counterattacks" in order to restore them to the control of "our forces" and to mobilize to defend the intersection lest it "fall again" into the hands of the rioters, who added to the war images by brandishing enemy flags (PLO and Hizbullah). If we add to this the declaration made by an Arab MK during his visit in Damascus, that "Syria and Palestine are one homeland with a common destiny" and that "by the power of the sword, the Arabs will emerge victorious and restore the Arabs to their homeland", and on another occasion he announced the liberation of Jerusalem from the Zionists, "enemies of humanity", we indeed return to the images of 1948 in which a war to annihilate Israel, with the participation of the Arabs of Palestine, was being waged full force. Meanwhile, Israeli Arabs are arrested for illegal possession of weapons, apparently intended not for the purpose of entertainment or parades, but rather for the perpetration of violent acts that cannot be characterized as anything other than acts of war.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE ARAB AS MUSLIM – PROVOCATIVE ZEALOTRY

If the Israeli Arabs are torn regarding their identity as Israelis, cleave to their Palestinian nationalism and lean on their Arabic affiliation, their Muslim faith, all the more so, affords them a sense of might and security, due to the enormous magnitude of the Muslim population of the world (approximately one and a quarter billion adherents), the number of Muslim countries in the world (approximately 56), which constitute about one third of all of the countries, and the growth of radical Islam, which is active everywhere in restoring the *shari`ah* as a codex according to which the internal affairs of the modern state will be conducted, and the universal Islamic Caliphate to conduct the foreign affairs. The Islamic identity of the Israeli Arabs is the most volatile both because of its wide distribution, enabling it to overcome the traditional hurdles of tribes, castes and clans and also because of the profound and systematic imprint that it leaves in winning over hearts and primarily because it anchors in unshakeable faith, areas of life, dealings and matters that until now were the almost exclusive domain of intellectuals, politicians and other functionaries. Once a world view becomes subject to a religious anchor, it becomes completely without nuance and is no longer open to subjective considerations that by their nature are more subject to negotiation and compromise, but rather from that point forward, it adheres to the ultimate absolute, which views the world in terms of believer/heretic, good/evil, us/them, justice/injustice, freedom/oppression. The Islamic Movement in Israel, like its counterpart in Judea and Samaria and Gaza and like its sister organizations in Egypt and Jordan, gain momentum the more the conflict with Israel exacerbates and the more difficult it is to earn a living, because it provides absolute answers to temporal problems. Their leaders, in contrast to the corrupt people standing at the heads of the

establishments and states in the Islamic countries, are closer to the people, sense their pain and are responsive to their inner thoughts and therefore they garner significant popularity and admiration among them. Specifically, their tough messages, which demand sacrifices and dedication and promise blood and sweat, are the ones that get the greatest degree of attention and massive followings, as all other ideologies and trends, which promised the world, have proven empty.

Just like the general Israeli Arab issue entered into the consciousness of the complacent citizens of Israel, who prefer to repress their problems rather than deal with them, only in the wake of the violent, ominous outbursts of October 2000, when Palestinians on both sides of the Green Line joined together to undermine the legitimacy of Israel and its authorities, so too, the Islamic movement in Israel only received public attention in the wake of events that shocked the country. On December 21, 1997, several days prior to the Christmas celebrations in Nazareth and the month of Ramadan in all of the Muslim settlements, the members of the Islamic movement took control of the Church of the Annunciation plaza, which was to undergo renovation and preparation for the millennium and the anticipated papal visit to the city. The trespassers declared the site to be *waqf* property, even though it was state land, and began to construct a large tent there to serve as a mosque, assuming that the Jews would not dare take action against a "sacred" prayer site. They stated that their plan was to construct a permanent edifice at the site with a minaret rising to a height of 86 meters, which would overshadow the church. The authorities did not take the necessary action and did not evict the trespassers without delay. The event, which would continue for several months without resolution, served as a focal point for the 1998 Nazareth municipal elections in which the Islamic Movement won, for the first time, a majority in the city council and brought about a total collapse of the city government there. A year later, just prior to the High Holidays of 1999, a few days after the euphoria of the Sharm a-Sheikh Agreement that was supposed to return the peace process with the Palestinians on course, the northern cities of Haifa and Tiberias experienced severe acts of vandalism at the hands of the Islamic Movement, this time at the behest of Hamas. The whole country was shocked as if this was a revelation or a novelty, as if nothing like that had ever happened before and as if there had not been abundant "handwriting on the wall" regarding what was liable to happen if the members of the Islamic Movement were not restrained. However, despite the fact that two residents of Baqa, affiliated with the Islamic Movement, murdered two soldiers near Kibbutz Gilad several years earlier, that was soon forgotten as if it

never happened and was relegated to the margins of the news like a nightmare that was better off disregarded.

The juxtaposition of these two events is not a coincidence. It is a byproduct of the constant rise in power of the Islamic Movement, that because of the servility of the authorities, appropriate steps were not taken in order to deal with the threat that they represent, not only to Israel, but also to those Israeli Arabs, who have not yet been negatively affected by them. Furthermore, its victims are not only Jews, but also the Christians living among us and are fleeing for their lives to Jewish cities or overseas, or radicalizing in the nationalist direction, like Azmi Bishara, the “Palestinian patriot”, in order to prove that he is no less Arab than the Muslims. This development threatens to sully Israel’s relations with the Christian world, as Israel will not be forgiven for the equanimity with which it relates to the liquidation of the Christian community in the Holy Land, and especially in those unambiguously Christian sites like Jerusalem and Nazareth. Even during the late 2000 violent flare-up against Israel, in the clearly Islamic context of the “al-Aqsa *intifada*”, the Islamic Movement in Israel played a significant role. Although the Islamic element, in and of itself, need not engender a violent confrontation between a non-Muslim majority and a Muslim minority, however here there are the added components of ethnic, national, linguistic, political and cultural schisms, some of which were surveyed above, that significantly exacerbate the problem. In general, the recommendation is that Muslims only live in Muslim countries, where they can fully express their Muslim feelings and worship. However in Israel, which during most of its history was more Muslim than subservient to any other religion, only in recent generations did a Jewish majority form that transformed the Muslims into a minority that is unwilling to accept that situation and considers it a temporary decree that will ultimately pass from the world. Therefore, the Muslims cling to their villages and cities, some of which have become Muslim enclaves within Israeli territory, and find therein temporary consolation until they are able to overcome this intolerable humiliation.

There are several general, fundamental theological and cultural aspects that are applicable to the negativist Muslim approach *vis-à-vis* the Jews and the State of Israel, in addition to all of its other faults that are ingrained in Arabs and Palestinians, which were surveyed above:

- A. The Jews are not a nation, they have been condemned to eternal degradation and to dispersal among the nations by Allah as members of a revealed religion, who forged their sacred writings. Therefore, their very desire to

gather in the Land of Israel in order to establish their state is a virtual challenge to the will of Allah. Their subjugated condition under Muslim auspices (*dhimma*), which was developed in Islamic law into an entire system of rights and obligations from the juridical, social, economic and political perspective, is designed to become a permanent status as it was for the more than a thousand years of Muslim rule over Jewish communities for the most part, and for which the Jews were forced to pay a humiliating head-tax (*gizia*);

- B. According to the Muslim self-image, the Jews were beneficiaries of the generosity and protection of the Muslim rulers who were in charge of them for hundreds of years, and in more than a few of those cases, they could have, justifiably, been proud of the Jewish communities that flourished in their realm, especially relative to the systematic persecutions and pogroms that were their lot in Europe in those days. It is therefore, difficult for them to explain to themselves, and even harder to explain to others, how it is that the Jews, who enjoyed the “beneficence” of Islam, agreed to leave their realm *en masse* and settle in a land that became hostile to them. Moreover, those same contemptible *dhimmi*, who in the past could only exist at the mercy of Islam, have now turned the tables, wage war against Allah’s chosen nation and even emerge victorious time and again despite their numerical inferiority;
- C. The Land of Israel (Palestine in their current vernacular) was conquered in the Islamic campaigns (Futuh) and thereby became Islamic *waqf* (consecration), allotted by Allah to Muslims for all subsequent generations. The Jews, who conquered it at present, just like the Crusaders in the Middle Ages, thereby become a legitimate target of *jihad* (holy war) in order to redeem it from their hands. This God-given commandment, incumbent on every Muslim, obligates him to liberate the land, beyond all of the other political, national and international motives discussed by all, and the Muslim obligation supersedes them all as it recognizes no compromises, no negotiations and no concessions *vis-à-vis* any part of it;
- D. The jewel in the crown of the sacred land is Jerusalem, not only because of the praise ascribed to it in Muslim tradition, but because it is tied to the personal biography of the Prophet, who, as is well known, visited there on a mysterious night (*Asra*), parked his legendary horse (*al-Buraq*) alongside the stones of the Western Wall, and flew back to Mecca after leaving his footprint on the Foundation Stone on the Temple Mount;
- E. Since Islam does not seek to coexist with the other revealed religions that have

betrayed their mission, but is destined to replace them as Allah's emissary is the last prophet and therefore, ostensibly, the most up-to-date among them, all Jewish (and Christian) contentions of sanctity, affiliation, history and identity with sacred sites of their own, like the Temple Mount, are nonsense, to which the Muslims have no obligation to grant consideration.

We will see below how these sacred and unshakeable principles are on the agenda, not only of the Muslims in Israel in general, but even more so at the top of the Islamic Movement members' list of priorities, and they thereby transform the many areas of friction mentioned below to focal points of conflagration on a daily basis. But first, something about the manner in which the movement developed in Israel, which during the 1970s grew parallel to and in the same format as their sister organization in the territories under Israeli rule, i.e. as a network of local charity societies that took action in furthering Islamic education and welfare objectives, alongside the governmental authorities that tended to those areas. They established mosques and community centers at a pace unprecedented for Muslims in Israel, and took steps to revive Islamic consciousness among the youths. In an unfortunate replica of what took place in the territories, where the authorities failed to understand that welfare activity under Islamic auspices is destined to bear undesirable political and subsequently military fruits, so too in Israel proper, delusional wishful thinking of "everything is under control" and "everything is going to be alright" overcame the honest truth that came in turn and proved them wrong. And it turns out that the members of the Islamic Movement, who were trained by scholars and leaders that themselves were educated in Islamic seminaries in the territories, or recited to their students the anti-Israel and anti-Jewish slander in the philosophies of the greatest Muslim fundamentalists, like Said Quttab in Egypt and Ahmed Yassin in the Gaza Strip, laid the groundwork, sometimes unknowingly and sometimes intentionally, for taking the path of violence against Jews in general and the Zionist State of Israel in particular. It is important to know, based on all research literature on the subject of political violence, winning the hearts and minds is always accomplished through rhetoric, which manifests itself in detesting the enemy / rival to the point of his de-legitimization and transformation into prey vulnerable to every frustrated bloodthirsty person, will precede the use of physical violence. Thus, the acts of political and religious indoctrination, to which the members of the Islamic Movement are exposed, pave the way for their violent outbursts against Israel. For example, one of those arrested in the incident of the car bomb in the north told his interrogators that the Imam who recruited him referred to

Jews as “dogs”. It is any wonder, therefore, that his zealous student would rush to liquidate the stray “dogs” with whom he is displeased?

Already in 1979-1980, a group of Muslims, some of whom were “newly repentant”, who had been rehabilitated from crime and drug abuse, before beginning on a new criminal path under the leadership of Sheik Abdullah Darwish from Kafr Kassem, under the ominous name “the *Jihad* Family”, participated in several acts of terrorism within the State. The group was apprehended in its entirety, spent some time in jail and was only released after expressing remorse and promising that it would no longer be involved in physical violence. However, whoever released them was not careful to warn them against verbal violence, incitement in the contemporary jargon, which if it is not controlled or silenced, will ultimately lead to physical, terrorist violence. And he, who failed to pay attention to the cheers for Khomeini in Umm al-Fahm in 1980, is forced to deal with bombs and terrorist murders in the ensuing decades. Sheik Abdullah initiated and headed the transformation of the Islamic charity societies into a national movement organized into branches, which does not exactly preach love of Israel in the mosques and whose voice is heard among the Israeli Arabs. He installed himself as the spiritual leader, teacher, religious law arbiter, who does not dirty his hands in the mire of day-to-day political activity, as he promised upon his release from prison, with the exception of editing the movement’s periodical, “*al-Zirat*” (The Straight Path), which published invective, defamation and ignominy against Israel until it was closed by order of the authorities. The Islamic Movement, well-versed in the laws of democracy and the practice of freedom of speech in Israel, rushed to launch a different newspaper in its place, the same, still infamous *Zaut al-Haq wal-Huriyya* (The Voice of Truth and Freedom), with Darwish continuing with his skilled, abusive editorial style, that constantly attempted to test the most far-removed borders of freedom of expression and skillfully functioned in the gray areas at the outer limits of the law. However, since the authorities have not prosecuted the editors on charges of incitement and Holocaust denial, the editors have continued with their publications without hassle.

Outwardly, the Sheik and his disciples were united, however, already in the late 1980s, differences of opinion began to emerge between Darwish, who was concerned lest his enterprise be doomed to oblivion if the movement was to take an uncompromising ideological path, and as a result, he preached integration into the government, at least for appearance’s sake; and the younger men, who were both his most senior and most outstanding students and gave signs of being the next leadership generation. Meanwhile they have reached political

maturity, ran on their own in municipal elections and even garnered impressive accomplishments. These were the seeds of disagreement that would later lead to the major schism that shook the movement in the 1990s. For the time being, though, the united Islamic Movement flourished, under the leadership of Darwish, established institutions, consolidated an ideology, raised funds and inundated its ranks with new recruits. It comes as no surprise that it was most convenient for this activity to take place in the largest Muslim settlement in Israel – Umm al-Fahm, with a population of 30,000. It is true that Nazareth had a population twice as large, however, due to the largest concentration of Christians in Israel there, it was not chosen as the headquarters of the Islamic Movement. Incidentally, that situation is in flux as well, as the Islamic Movement gained power in Nazareth in the 1998 municipal elections and will, in the future, not only elect a Muslim representative of the movement mayor, but its Muslims number approximately 70%, more than its closest rival in absolute terms. Umm al-Fahm also owes its choice as the bustling center of the movement to the personality of Ra'id Salah, a young, talented person, charismatic and capable of captivating the masses, who was elected mayor after having concluded his studies in the Islamic College in Hebron (1989). He has since been elected mayor by an overwhelming majority, which crossed clan lines as well as political and traditional family loyalties, and was reelected time and again until he resigned in 2001 in order to totally devote himself to movement affairs.

Sheik Ra'id immediately made his militant and belligerent mark on the movement journals that were edited and printed in the city, despite the fact that Darwish remained the editor until the radical stream split from Darwish's more "moderate" stream. An Islamic College headed by Ra'id was also established in the city and pamphlets and tapes (audio and video) were produced and distributed throughout the country, as well as in the territories, in large amounts. The mayor was the object of praise not only because of his qualities and his modest way of life that became a model, but primarily because of his devotion to the Islamic matter, his courage in conflicts with the authorities and the effective way in which he managed the local Islamic Society, success that paved his way to the office of mayor. And indeed, the repentance movement that he headed and the welfare services provided by the Islamic Movement and subsequently by the municipality under his leadership, were legendary and afforded Ra'id very great prestige and authority. Unfortunate unemployed youth, exhausted wage-earners, parents who could not afford to provide their children supplementary education, sick people who tired of the health establishment and members of the general population seeking meaning to their lives in a state that does not

speak to them flocked in their masses to listen to his sermons, grew beards, again started to conduct satisfying Islamic lives and enjoyed the welfare services that their newly adopted lifestyle bestowed upon them. The message spread from there to other places, the village, the city, among the Bedouin tribes until members of the movement had gained control, in a strictly democratic manner made possible by the political system in effect in Israel, of the mayoralty of six Arab municipalities and they had more success in gaining a place of honor in many regional councils, including Nazareth in which they collected around them a majority of the city council members that support them. Thus emerges an absurdity: While in the Arab countries, even the “moderate” among them like Jordan and Egypt, Islamic parties may not be elected, in the State of Israel that has become a *fait accompli*, all part of the policy of “oppression” about which the Arabs complain.

The slogan of the Islamic Movement members, who have become respected leaders and directors in their cities and towns, is “Islam is the answer” or “Islam is the truth” or “Islam is the alternative”. This message is disseminated in the movement’s journals, in articles discussing repentance, the status of women, current events, attacks against rivals from within and without, in statements supporting other Islamic movements, ideological issues and the like. During the first *intifada*, support for it was expressed in these journals, which was, at the time, disseminated among the entire Arab sector in Israel as well as in the territories and they even reached some Arab countries, until they were prohibited by the security authorities there, which act with less generosity and openness towards their brethren, all the more so towards the subversive ideas that they bear with them, than the Israeli governments throughout the years have treated them. They learned to exploit Israeli democracy in order to abuse it, incite against it, accuse it of atrocities (like intentionally setting fire to the al-Aqsa Mosque), without hindrance. All the more so, when the second *intifada* began, the one named al-Aqsa (that began in 2000 and whose end is unforeseeable), that the Muslims in Israel were among its generators, among those who added fuel to its fire, contributed momentum to its stages and were among its participants, whether in the riots in Umm al-Fahm and other places or in planning terrorist acts or in abetting terrorists from across the border, which led to an unprecedentedly large circle of people among them subject to incarceration and interrogation. For example, already during the first *intifada*, an article was published in the Islamic journal (*al-Zirat*, November 1988) that was perhaps written by its editor, the “moderate” Sheik Darwish, and in any case with his agreement, that called upon the Palestinian people to “brandish

the flag of the *jihad* in order to die for Allah”. In that same edition an eight-year-old Palestinian child, who had been ostensibly abducted by the Israelis, was quoted, and with awe-inspiring valor for them and horror for us (another sign of the civic solidarity between us and the Arabs in this country), told his “oppressors”: “I am acting on the orders of Haled Ibn al-Walid [one of the most glorified warriors in Islam] and Saladin al-Ayoubi.”

This technique of attributing words challenging Israel to young children, against whom Israel cannot take action, has become standard operating procedure for members of the Islamic Movement in their indictments of Israel. They also very often place the attacks of invective into the mouths of others, like the knights of Islamic fundamentalism like Said Quttab, or great Islamic arbiters of law, or into the mouth of the Prophet himself. Thus, they always emerge pure and innocent as they were merely “quoting” others and they can always launch a noisy counterattack accusing Israel of abusing the Islamic religion, how dare it, and the like. However they do not hesitate to produce even the most direct and original attacks against Israel and the Jews. For example, when the mosque in the village of Ibtan was set on fire by criminals, the blame, as in the case of al-Aqsa, was placed upon Israel:

The Satan cultivated the claim of the superiority of his Nazi race over all of humanity. Now his descendants claim the superiority of a certain race over all others. The Satan found his subordinates, flesh and blood, who mirthfully implement his satanic philosophy. Anyone with any self respect must confront the Satan and his army. Only a caravan of faith alone, when united, is capable of preventing realization of his plan (*al-Zirat*, December 1988).

Of course similar sentiments were not expressed when Joseph’s Tomb in Nablus and the synagogue in Jericho were burned down by Palestinians, in the course of the second *intifada*, because, presumably, when their brethren are “defending themselves” against the Jewish Satan, they may and even must take all necessary actions, because Satan has no holy places or sacred values and his beliefs are a “gutter religion”, as one of the leaders of the Black Muslim movement in America expressed himself against Jews there, with, of course, no challenge from Israel’s Muslims. This stems from the fact that members of the fundamentalist Muslim groups in general, have no respect for any other opinions or beliefs. As far as they are concerned, Islam is not “merely” the third revealed religion, after Judaism and Christianity, but it came to replace its two predecessors that

strayed. Said Quttab, the Egyptian, for example went so far, that in his book, *Our Battle Against the Jews*, he abused and vilified them in terms that the Nazi invective pales in comparison. And his statements and writings are the word of the living God for fundamentalist Muslims the world over, and the members of the Islamic Movement in Israel read his statements voraciously, educate “by their light” and consider the man to be one of the brightest lights of modern Islam. The fact that he was executed in Egypt (1966) also adds an aura of “holy warrior” to his image.

The Muslims in Israel, like their co-religionists around the world, have become accustomed to thinking that their religion is more sublime than all the others and they have every right to think that and that is also the way adherents of various other religions think about their religions. But they also have become accustomed to thinking that one who defames other religions, that is part of “freedom of speech”, in which no one has the right to intervene; however, anyone daring to touch their religion, woe unto him. For example, many Muslims in Israel and around the world supported the death sentence issued by Khomeini against Salman Rushdie for having dared to “desecrate” Islam consecration. It is difficult to imagine members of any other religion, who would have taken so extreme a step these days against a coreligionist who strayed. Why they are the only ones who remained with this narrow-minded zealotry is a matter for social psychologist to answer: Are they so lacking in self-confidence or confidence in their religion that they race to liquidate anyone voicing criticism? Or perhaps they are building fences around their religion to prevent the infiltration of external ideas that are liable to undermine it? In any case, it is clear to Muslims, especially the fundamentalists among them, that criticism, insult, humiliation or provocation aimed at their religion is intolerable to the point that it justifies the use of violence “in its defense”. Well known is the system of attacks by the Islamic movement in Israel against the government for “excavating beneath the Temple Mount in order to topple the mosques”; the massive aid that it marshaled, in materials and manpower for the illegal Muslim construction on the Temple Mount; and the fevered assemblies that it staged in Umm al-Fahm and other places in order to support the exclusive Muslim right to that sacred enclave. These items not only contribute to and shape the exclusivist Muslim world view regarding its sites, that leave no rights for others, but also contributed more than a little to the outbreak of riots on the Temple Mount that gave the signal for the start of the al-Aqsa *intifada*.

The events of the *intifada* that were discussed above, to a large extent stemmed from a lack of respect for Jews by Muslims. the Temple Mount is sacred to them,

so how does Ariel Sharon dare to go up there and “desecrate” (precisely so!) the site? They never consider the possibility that perhaps the site is also sacred to him and to the Jews in general, and that his right to be there is in no way inferior and is actually superior to their right. Therefore, they are permitted to hurl stones at those worshipping at the Western Wall, who are probably desecrating the site that is also sacred to Islam – and those who desecrate the sacred have no right to stand and defend themselves and therefore everything is legitimate in the battle against them. And who is helping the Muslims? The Jews themselves, of course, whether by the fact that their statesmen generously recognize the Muslim hold on the Temple Mount, despite the fact that they had the power and the authority to change procedures there, just as they did in the Cave of the Patriarchs; or due to the fact that their rabbis prohibited them from setting foot there. Thus, the Muslims arrived at the understanding that, just like in the Judgment of Solomon, it is specifically they, who are unwilling to divide the sanctity of the mountain between the two religions, are the sole, legal owners of the site, while the tentative Jews, who are in disagreement with each other and are willing to be considerate of the feelings of others, have no claim to it. That was the ruling of the Palestinian Mufti of the Temple Mount and the rest of the Islamic world, including the Israeli Arabs, followed him. In other words, any time that a religious (or political for our purposes) dispute exists between Israel and any Islamic element, justice is always on the side of the Muslims and the support of the Muslims of Israel is automatically guaranteed to them, just as it is guaranteed by the Israeli Arabs to Arabs and Palestinians in other matters. By the very definition of Jewish-Muslim or Jewish-Arab relations, justice is always on the side of the second half of the equation. Once the Arabs on the Temple Mount ruled that Sharon had profaned the sacred, of course they have every right to defend themselves and any Israeli defensive reaction is aggression, and the rest is simple.

The Yom Kippur War was planned by the Arabs on the holiest day on the Jewish calendar, the first *intifada* on Hanukah (December 1987) and the second during the High Holidays of the year 2000. No one asked or confronted the Arabs about the fact that they do not respect the Jewish holidays. However, a month after the outbreak of the al-Aqsa *intifada* and a month after the Jewish holidays were desecrated and the worshippers at the Western Wall were stoned and the police removed them so as “not to cause bloodshed”, came the month of Ramadan, and that same police came to the defense of Muslim worshippers on the Temple Mount lest the sanctity of their holiday be disturbed and even instituted far-reaching concessions to the Muslims congregating on the mountain.

The results were two-fold and swift: The Muslims were convinced that only their holidays and consecrations are worthy of respect, as even the Jews are forced to protect all of the rites associated with them, while the Jewish holidays are worthy of trampling, and why should they respect them. The second result was that the Mufti of Jerusalem, to the jubilation of Israel's Muslims, announced that not only is the Temple Mount Muslim consecration to which the Jews have no claim, but the Western Wall (al-Buraq), the place where the legendary horse of the Prophet was hitched, when he brought him to Jerusalem and there he waited until he descended from his heavenly mission, is included within the area of consecration and therefore must be included within the Muslim Temple Mount. He also declared that the sanctity of the mountain to Muslims reaches seven stories beneath the ground and seven stories above it, lest the Jewish fools again raise their ridiculous contention that they want a division of sovereignty in a manner that beneath the surface will belong to the Israeli Jews and above the surface would belong to the Muslim Palestinians. The fact is that everything, to the sides, up and down, everything is Muslim and exclusively Muslim. The cynics among them added that it would be good if the Israeli claim would be implemented throughout the Land of Israel and the Palestinians would control the entire land above ground – and the Jews would be under the ground.

From an Islamic perspective, the right of return is also tied to these perceptions. As, theoretically, it is possible to contend that the right of return applies equally to Jews and Muslims, each side in that area of the land that belongs to it. However, were the Muslims to accept that principle, it would convey agreement to the existence of a Zionist entity on Muslim consecrated land and that is something to which they cannot agree. This is not something concealed in terminology that needs to be analyzed in order to understand it, but rather it is publicly proposed and declared, and all Israel needs to do is to be duped into believing that the return of Arab-Muslims to its territory will somehow bring peace. Its refusal to take the bait is one of the primary causes of the Arabs' rage and frustration and they think that Israel owes them an apology for it. The Islamists among the Palestinians, including the members of the Islamic Movement in Israel, add an additional element to these contentions: The Hamas Charter, for example, claims that whenever Islam did not control Palestine, for example during the periods of the Crusaders, the British and the Jewish state, the land knew only friction, quarrels, wars and bloodshed, while under Islam, the land ostensibly knew only love and brotherhood, peace and fraternity. This underscores the urgent need to restore Palestine in its entirety, including the territory of the present-day State of Israel, to Islamic rule. Then

the Jews can be restored to their *dhimmi* status, as in days past, and will also once again enjoy the generous and benevolent patronage of Islamic rule, the most just and humane of all governments, as long as they accept its yoke and its superiority over them and will be content to willingly and gratefully receive any crumb that the government decides to throw their way. The Muslims are convinced that that is the epitome of tolerance and they repeat the falsehood of their “tolerance” for all other religions, because they use the same word but mean something else. In Western terms, modern society is pluralistic and everyone has equal rights under the sun, in other words, one’s tolerance *vis-à-vis* others is manifest in his acceptance of them without value judgment, as they are equal. However, in Islamic society, in which the non-believers are infidels at worst or *dhimmi* at best, with restrictions and differential decrees in effect for them, the non-Muslim is tolerated not due to his equality, but rather despite his inequality with him and he is juridically, socially and politically inferior to him. Therefore, not only is there no equality latent in this perception, but it perpetuates the disparaging attitude towards the non-Muslim, as proven by experience and history.

For these reasons, the Muslim elements were the leading factor in the negation of the peace agreements between Israel and the Arabs: Hizbullah in Lebanon, the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt and Jordan, Hamas in the territories, fundamentalist Iran and even the Islamic Movement in Israel or at least segments of it, that did not derive satisfaction from the Oslo Accords even when they were at their highest point of glory and expectations. Because recognition of the rights of others, as mentioned above, means blunting the edge of the Muslim demand for exclusivity and totality, and that leads to rejection of any agreement requiring compromise, negotiations or concessions. Therefore, the peace agreements that have been signed to date remained, to a large extent, confined to Israel and the Arab leaders who signed them, while the masses, guided by the ultimatums of Islam, did not get carried away with the gospel of peace. All of Israel’s attempts to convey the principles of peace to the Arab nations as a whole and the members of the Islamic culture, were for naught as they were met by absolute refusal on their part that the Jews, once despicable and submissive, the object of Allah’s anger, as it is mentioned in the *Qur’an*, will overnight be accepted as allies or partners in idyllic neighborliness. If it is impossible to accept them as equals, certainly their “impertinent” demands for equality at the sites sacred to both religions cannot be taken seriously. Even the far-reaching concessions made by the Jews to the Muslims in order to reach peace agreements, are greeted by the Muslims with contempt, both due to the fact that in the Jews’ submissiveness, they see “proof”

of the absolute justice of their position and because of a profound conviction that if they can only remain firm in their uncompromising (and legitimate as far as they are concerned) demands, the Jews will eventually concede and surrender, just as they have always done by their very “acquiescent”, “frightened” and “cowardly” nature, which has always been their defining characteristic. Thus, the Arabs demanded the Temple Mount only after the Jews were willing to partition Jerusalem, and when they expressed openness to negotiations over the Temple Mount, the demand for the right of return was raised. And when there was Israeli willingness to negotiate on that point as well, they refused to sign regarding the finality of the conflict. The same was true in Lebanon: Israel was only faced with the demand to withdraw from the country’s south, when it did so, then the claim to free Lebanese and then Palestinian prisoners; anything so there would not be, or even appear to be, a permanent arrangement that would recognize Israel or its assets as an enduring reality.

One day in January 2001, the Israeli media published a picture of a procession in Ramallah in which a donkey, wearing a prayer shawl, his head crowned by a Star of David in the shape of a swastika, was led through the streets. However, while the Israeli public was shocked by the beastly nature of our enemies, as the procession proceeded through the streets under the watchful eye of the Palestinian police, who joined in the roars of laughter insulting the Jews, just a short time after the lynch of two Israeli soldiers in the same place, the Jews began to recover from the delusion that if we act fairly and respectfully, our enemies will repay us in kind. Because everyone understood, since the Palestinian insurgents were unable to cause Israel the damage that they would have liked, they vent their rage and frustration on the Jews’ symbols: Secular symbols, like the Israeli flag burned in the streets, Stars of David transformed into swastikas, cardboard Israeli buses set on fire and effigies of the leaders of Israel (and America) stabbed with a dagger in an outpouring of pathological rage like a beast of prey; or religious symbols like the synagogues that they burn, holy places that they destroy or Israeli religious articles like Torah scrolls, prayer shawls, yarmulkes and the like, which they mock publicly laughing uproariously. And the Jewish public could not help but remember the incident that took place in Hebron in 1997, when a foolish girl insulted the Prophet Muhammad by brandishing a picture of a pig near his portrait and she was arrested, placed on trial and sat several years in prison. However, the Arab and Muslim public, including the Israeli Arabs had a different understanding: The Jewish girl was punished, justifiably, perhaps not to the full extent of the law, because she dared to provoke the Muslims. However, of course, a similar and even more severe provocation, against the

Jewish religion, is trivial, worth no more than a contrite smile. And thus, since the objective is to irritate the Israelis and the Jews as they are unable to cause them real damage, any opportunity to deprecate their religion, to mock their customs, to cause their stomachs to turn and to deride their values, is blessed. That is the background for the burning of Israeli symbols and brandishing the Islamic flags of Hizbullah and Hamas by the youths of the Islamic Movement in Israel.

In any case, after the February 1989 municipal elections in which the Islamic Movement won the mayoralty and council seats in several local councils, the call for *jihad* in Israel became routine, under the watchful eye of Sheik Darwish, editor of their journal. The cover photograph of the November 1989 edition of *al-Zerat*, for example, displays the al-Aqsa Mosque with the caption: “Oh *jihad* warrior, arise! Acre and its beaches are calling you! Do not doze and do not sleep! Come and defend our rivers!” When they saw that nothing happened, the audacity gradually increased, and no one in Israel cried out or mobilized against it. The writers then moved from attacks against the State to invective against the Jews. In the December 1989 edition, *al-Zerat* wrote about “the Jewish control of the media outlets around the world, which eases their path to exploit world opinion in favor of the Jews”. Another article in the same edition plainly described how foreign visitors to Israel are taken to “Yad Vashem’, where crocodile tears that have nothing in common with reality are shed on them... All this is nothing more than part of the Jewish conspiracy...”, and on and on, wherever their perverse imagination leads them; statements for which anti-Semites in Sweden and France are arrested and go to jail, while in Israel – peace and tranquility. Because Israel only arrests and punishes for actions, as has been the case for the last few months, and not for intention, preparations, recruitment and incitement to commit criminal and terrorist acts against the State. Anyone who does not take the trouble to view this wild incitement as a warning signal and conducts himself with sweeping liberalism, whether for ideological reasons of extreme support of freedom of expression or for political considerations of attracting the Arab Muslims’ vote in Israel during elections, will ultimately be forced to deal with the criminal acts after they are perpetrated.

The handwriting was already on the wall in 1979, when the “*Jihad* family” group, which had been involved in terrorist activity on an ideological basis, was arrested and rendered powerless, as mentioned above. Almost a decade later, in March 1988, a group of Arab youths that had surreptitiously amassed weapons, ammunition and explosives that they had collected from IDF training areas was again arrested in Umm al-Fahm. “Loyal” Israeli citizens, as they like

to call themselves when they are indicted, would have refrained from collecting military materiel, and if the inclination to collect overcame them, they would have been forced to transfer the materiel to the authorities. Despite that it is not certain that these youths are offspring of the Islamic Movement, it is clear that the manifest support that the movement provided the first *intifada* created a situation and an atmosphere where it is permissible to prepare for the promised *jihad* in order to strike at the heart of the Zionist enemy. There is no doubt, in any case, that a large portion of the Israeli Arabs' ideological crime stems from and is tied to fundamentalist Islam and the members of the Islamic movement in Israel. The concentration of assaults on passers-by and Jewish settlements in the same region, which feel threatened in their own country, and the violent confrontations with the police there, in contrast to the Arab villages in the Upper Galilee that conduct themselves with greater civic restraint, point to a connection between the Islamic Movement and the rise in ideologically motivated crime there.

In publications by the members of the Islamic Movement in Israel, it is possible to discern that they are relying primarily on the two main sources of the Islamic *shari'ah*: The *Qur'an* and the Hadith, as the exclusive mine of information of the singular truth. In exegesis on these sources, they find the answers to all of the issues and difficulties that arise. They also maintain lists of fundamentalist scholars like themselves, not necessarily accepted by the Islamic religious establishment, and they recommend their writings for purposes of worship, meditation, imitation and adulation. There are also black lists of intellectuals, who are slaves of the establishment, innovators in the spirit of the West or who preach openness and integration into the modern world, perish the thought of mentioning them. Among the intellectuals whom they revere: Hassan al-Bana, the legendary founder of the Muslim brotherhood in 1920s Egypt and his successor, Said Quttab, who, as mentioned above, raised the hatred of Israel to record levels with which only the Nazi *Der Stürmer* could compete; Abu al-Alaa al-Mawdodi from Pakistan, whose radical writings in matters of religion and state are political manuals for Islamists in Israel; and also popular contemporary preachers like Omar Tilimsani or Sheik Abdul Hamid Kishak from Egypt or the late Ahmed Yassin from Gaza, all of whom are people with infectious political fervor, who opposed the establishments that vigorously persecuted them and incidentally opposed any agreements with Israel as well. These revered figures and others represent the roots of the Islamic Movement, however the trunk of the proverbial tree is, without a doubt, Sheik Darwish from Kafr Kassem, whose religious and spiritual authority stood fast even during periods of schisms and

differences of opinion in the movement. The paradox is that this man radiates compromise and pursuit of peace and is totally unlike the militant, fanatic figures, full of zeal and animosity, in whose footsteps he preaches to follow, and whose path and philosophy he seeks to imitate and promote. The answer is tied to the tension that gradually increased over time between the outbursts of invective that he spewed occasionally against Israel during the peak period of his leadership, in which he aligned with the most egregious statements, from our perspective, made by his teachers and masters, and the abyss that slowly opened between him and his students and followers, who became leaders with authority and standing in their cities and towns (Zarzur in Kafr Kassem, Ra`id in Umm al-Fahm, Hatib in Kafr Kana) who agitated for a much more forceful ideological policy. He, older and more cautious, and having had learned his lesson from his months in jail in the past, is concerned that if they go too far, they are liable to lead the movement to oblivion.

Another paradox that sustained the movement: While Darwish belongs to the old Arab leadership that sought a way to coexist, at least for the time being, with and alongside the governing establishment, it was specifically the youth that was born and raised in the State of Israel, studied in its institutions of higher learning and internalized its values, who directly opposed it in the harshest and most extreme manner. They had accurate familiarity with the language and the culture of the State, experienced freedom of speech and assembly and knew how to proceed along the paths of democracy and government. And it was specifically on the basis of that established knowledge and a clear, open thought process that they arrived at the social and political revolution that they resolved to haughtily bear its standard and proudly provide leadership in their cities and towns. Their impressive success, whose essence we see today in Umm al-Fahm and Nazareth, bears overwhelming testimony that their path was, by all accounts, considered and effective. The younger generation, instead of shooting like branches from the trunk constructed by Darwish, as he expected them to do, grew as shoots directly from the roots of the fathers of Islamic fundamentalism, and there are those that even formed mutations that distanced themselves from it. The differences in style and tempo that led to a final schism in 1996, if anything is final in these matters, should not be interpreted as two types of fundamentalist ideas. It is the same message with different emphases, different tempos, different priorities that distinguish between impetuosity and consideration, between the ideal and the possible, between the gradual and pleasant and the daring and the irascible, between the immediate and total and the staged and long term; in brief, between the young and restless and the mature and tentative. The long term

strategy, to achieve an Islamic entity that lives in accordance with the *shari`ah* and disengages from the Jewish-Zionist state or even comes in its place, is identical. There is a dispute regarding tactics and the path to achieve that objective. The moderates are willing to continue to produce conciliatory platitudes, despite the fact that they reserve the right to occasionally rant and rave, just like the others, and even participate in Knesset elections and pledge allegiance to the State of Israel and its laws, even if they do not run as an independent Islamic party, heaven forbid, lest they be punished by the Zionist system, but rather as part of a general Arab party. In that way they refrain from the humiliation of participating in the despicable Zionist government. The more radical among them, whose words and actions correspond, are unwilling to sully themselves through contact with the hated establishment and prefer to cultivate their Islamic enclaves, to weave ties with fundamentalist Islam wherever it may be found, in Israel, in the region and around the world, while they are preaching alienation and hatred, even if they generate outbursts of hostility and terrorism here.

When the youths took office, they were no longer dependent on the recognition and benevolence of Darwish in order to achieve their standing. Therefore, they were able, with Sheik Ra`id at their head, to openly and strongly oppose their hesitant, compromising and double-faced leader, at least in their opinion, relying directly on their voters, who had become the foundation of their power. It also aroused, beginning then, the argument between the parties regarding participation in the elections or boycotting them. Many principles were transposed into this argument: Islamists take part in the game of Western-style democracy would be tantamount to passing over the far superior Islamic democracy. Because, after all, in Islam, the most sublime democracy is manifest in the institution of the *shura* (an appointed council or one that grows spontaneously in the community) ever since the days of the Prophet and it considers Allah to be sovereign over the universe and He is, therefore, the source of authority and legislation (*shari`ah*), while the despicable Western democracy transfers the sovereignty to the people and therefore its legislation is inferior and fundamentally in error. Said Quttab, the high priest of all of the fundamentalists, went even further when he called for a "dictatorship of justice granting freedom to those who merit it – exclusively to the exceptional individuals", under the watchful eye of the Islamic law scholars. Quite an exemplary democracy. These arguments and others, which were conducted in-house for years and have, to date, prevented the participation of Islamists in the general elections, as opposed to the local elections that allowed them to manage their towns and villages as they please, began being aired in public on the eve of the 1996 general elections. When ego

and prestige were added to these arguments and when the movement's journals supported the position of Sheik Darwish regarding the issue of running for the Knesset, the young radicals, Ra`id and Hatib declared the establishment of their own Islamic Movement.

The moderates, led by Darwish, who from now on will be referred to as the "Southern faction", not only entered the political game and sent two representatives to the Knesset in the framework of the United Arab List, but they also declared their support for the Oslo process, although any setback that arose within it they quickly placed the blame on their country and always found a rationale to judge the Palestinians favorably. They also declare their desire that a Palestinian state be established alongside Israel, although their support for the right of return renders that desire inconsequential. The fulminating declarations of their representative in the Knesset, Abd al-Malek Dehamshe, who dispatched letters of condolence to the President of Syria for the IDF action in Lebanon, and vehemently, in a manner in no way inferior to the radicals' position, stands at the side of the Palestinians and the rest of the Arabs in any issue in dispute between Israel and them, also raise doubts as to the "moderation" of this "moderate" faction. Actually, the suspicion is growing even more compellingly that perhaps this whole matter of "moderation", participation in the elections and service in the Knesset are nothing more than a tactic of exploiting the democratic apparatus of the State as well as the sweeping immunity provided members of Knesset by law in order to escalate the struggle against Israel in a legal and reputable manner, in order to be granted legitimacy within Israeli society, to gain exposure commensurate with their status for their statements and their actions and in order to block all avenues of punishment or retribution against them. And all this is funded by the State, is under its auspices and its protection. Where else could they find so perfect a combination in order to serve their purposes or so naïve a state that would allow them to achieve their objectives at its expense? Therefore, it is no wonder that they declared that even if a Palestinian state is established, they will continue to function in Israel. Apparently, they realize that only in Israel can they organize and express themselves freely, with the protection of their parliamentary immunity, with no adverse results.

The radicals, or the Northern faction, also enjoy the same freedoms, however, they prefer to battle against the State and its institutions and to oppose the Oslo process that, in their opinion, which corresponds with the approach of the hard line organizations, does not provide the minimum that the Palestinians deserve. In other words, while the moderates, at least outwardly, support the PLO and its agreements with Israel, with a sentimental glance in the direction

of the fundamentalists among the Palestinians, the radicals have no hesitation placing their trust in the Islamic resistance (Hamas) to these agreements and to battle against them in action and word. Of course, after the collapse of Oslo, this ideological difference between the two factions has virtually disappeared, as both place the blame on Israel, openly align themselves with the Palestinians on every issue and support the demand to implement the right of return for all of the Palestinians. Nevertheless, there is a noticeable difference between the two factions as far as activity on the street is concerned. Darwish has, for all intents and purposes, resigned from the day to day matters of the movement, and the administration has been transferred to the movement's members of Knesset, who have conspicuous media presence, and to Ibrahim Sarsur, Mayor of Kafr Kassem and spokesman for the Southern faction. Several mayors from the Triangle, the Bedouin tribes in Rahat, the Muslim communities in the mixed cities of Lod, Ramle, Jaffa and Acre, which are interested, due to their demographic inferiority, to find inroads to the hearts of the majority Jewish communities and the head of the Islamic Coalition in Nazareth, Salman Abu Ahmed, who already enjoys a majority in the city council and will in the future, apparently, be elected the next mayor, all support this branch of Islamists. The Northern faction, led by the vigorous, forceful Sheik Ra'id, was successful in gaining the support of several satellite cities surrounding his city along with part of Kafr Kana that is subject to the authority of his partner in the faction leadership, Sheik Hatib.

There is no better testimony to the thought processes of these two factions than the course of action that each employs. As mentioned above, at least until the collapse of Oslo and the outbreak of the second *intifada*, Darwish coordinated the movement's activity through the Knesset faction and worked very intensively towards promoting closeness and understanding between Jews and Arabs. He expressed profound shock from the terrorist acts of the movement's members prior to the holidays in 1999, and even stated that they are likely to cause him to resume his activity in his faction. One may assume that he did not want to see his creation totally escaping his control and aligning with the more extreme faction and therefore he decided to revert to calming, lowering profiles and conciliation until the storm passes. However, the violent outbursts among the Israeli Arabs in October 2000, which came in the wake of the collapse of the peace process with the Palestinians, changed everything, because three processes have since ensued within the Arab public in Israel, including the members of the Islamic Movement, after those difficult events:

- A. To enter into a holding pattern until the governmental commission of inquiry headed by the Supreme Court Justice Theodore Orr that was empanelled to investigate those events, submits its conclusions. Expectations from the commission were high since its appointment, in other words, it is supposed to not only lay the entire blame on the Israeli authorities, but also to recommend methods to compensate the Arabs and sweeping governmental initiatives in their favor in order to deal with what they consider discrimination and oppression. Paradoxically, there are those who also anticipate, along with allocations and affirmative action programs in order to engender equality, steps that recognize the national uniqueness of the Arabs and consequently cultural autonomy. There are those who demand political autonomy as well, within a bi-national Jewish state. In other words, they expect the State to relinquish its Jewish identity but also to finance itself the ditch that they are digging for it.
- B. To exacerbate the struggle against the State, in total identification with its external enemies. This trend is led by the Arab members of Knesset, including members of the “moderate” faction of the Islamic Movement and even more so members of the radical faction. The frequent trips of the Israeli Arabs to Damascus, specifically at that time, the belligerent declarations of their leaders in the Knesset and in public, the boycott of the general elections for Prime Minister in February 2001, their open identification with the *intifada* and the right of return and their declaration of war against the foundations of the Jewish state are all preludes that bode ill for the future.
- C. There is a sense of closing of the ranks among the Israeli Arabs, which tends to bridge the traditional political and ideological differences between them, a phenomenon that is having its effect on the rival factions of the Islamic Movement as well. Even though the personal disagreements and rivalries among their leaders remain acute, they represent more outbursts of ego than a genuine ideological chasm. It is hard to remember when the leaders of the Israeli Arabs expressed themselves in such choir-like consensus. Apparently, once the hopes that were riding on Oslo dissipated, the sense of the common danger threatening them all prevailed and caused them to draw together against the common enemy.

Thus, while the voices of the moderates have fallen temporarily silent and there is no way to know where they are heading, it is only possible to trace the actions of Sheik Darwish until this recent rupture, which no one knows if or when it will be healed. As mentioned above, he made numerous appearances in the

Israeli media promoting conciliation and condemning terrorism and violence and was also a focal point for pilgrimages of the left-wing parties who court the votes that they influence prior to elections. He also very often mediated in local intra-Arab conflicts and earned a reputation as a peacemaker among them. He also did not shun the Palestinian population in the territories, especially in friction between the Palestinian Authority and Hamas, despite the terrorist and illegal nature of the organization in Israel. Part of the contraction of his power and authority, relative to the days when he was the omnipotent head of the entire Islamic Movement, can be attributed to the fact that as a result of the schism, he lost the thriving heart of the movement in Umm al-Fahm and together with that the movement's journals that were edited and printed there. He was forced to found a new journal, *al-Mithaq* (The Covenant, The Charter), which still needs to establish itself over time. He was also forced to leave behind many of the movement's assets, like: The Islamic Seminary, the Islamic Sports Club, the *Zakat* Committee, the movement's printing facility and the like. On the other hand, the second faction headed by Ra'id, seemed like it actually emerged strengthened from the events, and perhaps he will succeed to recruit more and more members from the rival faction and from the secular parties that have so far not excelled in producing results, the longer the situation with the Palestinians remains tense and there is no respite from hostile acts within Israel and on its borders. In any case, this militant faction, even before it gained strength in the *intifada*, can take credit for an impressive list of activities and accomplishments.

First, the members of the faction took responsibility to restore *waqf* sites that had been abandoned for years, to Muslim control and to refurbish them, especially cemeteries and mosques in hundreds of Arab villages that were destroyed in the War of Independence, in the framework of Israel's jubilee celebrations, which they mark as a jubilee of the "*naqba*", the tragedy that befell them with the establishment of the State. They thereby, are not only taking exception to their state's independence celebrations, but they are also creating a separate discourse or anti-discourse, which details their tragedy and blames it on the State. Of course that is a message of alienation that incites animosity, however, as far as they are concerned it is clear: While there are other Arabs inside and outside of Israel who collaborate with the Zionist state, by marching in its celebrations, lighting its ceremonial torches brandishing its flag or making peace with it – they gather, restore and refurbish in order to redeem their Islamic heritage from its oppressors. They carefully track every national construction plan in Israel, in order to oppose it and to arouse the consciousness of the Israeli Arabs regarding

every Israeli attempt to desecrate a holy place or to bury underground something that seems to them a sacred site. For example, they assumed responsibility for the restoration of the “*Istaklal*” (Independence) cemetery near Haifa where Iz a-Din al-Qassam, the Muslim national hero from the 1930s, who fought against both the British and the Zionists and who fell in the 1935 Biabad battle against the Mandatory forces in Samaria, is buried. The grave was neglected and was overgrown with wild grass, until the members of the Islamic Movement cleaned and salvaged it, by transforming it into a pilgrimage site. Of course, the fact that the Hamas terrorist brigades, that have done and continue to do much damage to Israel, are named after him, is of no importance to the redeemers, and is not worthy of comment. When the Nesher municipality sought to widen the road at the edge of the cemetery, the members of the movement organized shifts and physically prevented it. They also aspire to restore and renovate mosques that were destroyed and to collect all of the income from *waqf* money throughout the country.

Second, the members of this faction have become the knights of Jerusalem (East Jerusalem, of course) and physically attempt to prevent all Israeli activity there. Even though the majority of the Israeli Arabs align with the PLO position regarding East Jerusalem as the capital of the Palestinian state, no Arab organization ever intervened with such determination and with all their might for the realization of those wishes like Sheik Ra`id’s group. He repeatedly warns, in speeches and in writing, of the danger posed to the al-Aqsa Mosque by Israeli activity on the the Temple Mount and mobilizes Muslim public opinion and material contributions, in Israel and beyond its borders, in order to “save the Mosque”. He unceasingly attacks the Israeli excavations around the Temple Mount that allegedly “undermine the foundations of the Temple Mount”, in order to topple the mosque and establish the Jewish Temple in its place. In order to withstand Israeli threats, he initiated a foray to the cellar of the mosque, known to us as “Solomon’s Stables”, and collected construction materials and craftsman, including members of his movement in Israel, in order to renovate the site and transform it into a prayer site named the “*Muslallah Marwani*” (the Marwani prayer site, named after one of the Umayyad Caliphs). Thus, another prayer expanse for Muslim worshippers was added, and the stream of the masses on holidays fills the enormous mosque to overflow capacity. He also organized a Muslim Brotherhood convention and staged an “al-Aqsa Festival” in order to raise awareness of the ostensible Israeli threats to this sacred site, to excoriate Israel for the dangers that it poses to the mosque and concomitantly to score points against his rivals who remained inactive while he was battling fearlessly.

And indeed, this activity enhanced his prestige in the Islamic world, just as was the case in 1992, when he mobilized support and organized supplies for the 415 leaders of Hamas and the Islamic *Jihad*, who were expelled by the Israeli government to Southern Lebanon.

Sheik Ra`id also travels extensively throughout the Islamic world, especially to Egypt and Turkey, to raise money and political support for his struggles. Turkey stood at the head of his resources and hopes when it was led by an Islamic government headed by Necemtin Arbakan during the second half of the 1990s, and its sympathies were with Islamic governments, particularly revolutionary Iran. He aspired to receive official recognition from them for his Islamic Seminary (that was denied him in Israel) and also to undermine the moves that were underway leading to the gradual establishment of cooperation between Israel and Turkey. He also cultivated close ties with Hamas, especially with its leader, Ahmed Yassin, after he was released from Israeli prison. His support for Hamas was not merely moral, but it also manifest itself in material support for the families of those who died in action, and if their victims were his fellow Israeli countrymen, that is not a matter with which he needed to concern himself. In the wake of the Mash'al episode in Jordan, Ra`id led a delegation to Amman in order to welcome Yassin, whom the Israeli government so "wisely" agreed to release from prison. The Jordanian authorities, which expressed reservations *vis-à-vis* the young, vigorous sheik, due to his support for Islamic candidates during the parliamentary elections there, were forced to take the public pressure supporting the popular sheik into consideration, and allowed him to come and attend the event. We meet him again at the head of a delegation of members of his movement to Gaza, which traveled there in order to celebrate the release of the arch-murderer Yassin, and no less, the humiliation of his country that was forced to release him against its best interests. Darwish, in contrast, refrained from demonstrative actions of that sort and his prestige significantly diminished in the eyes of Hamas and its supporters – there and here. The result was that Sheik Ra`id was not popular in the Palestinian Authority, which was struggling to lower the profile of the Islamic opposition to its regime and distribution of his newspaper was prohibited there. His plan is absolutely clear: he is attempting to circumvent the establishment both in Israel and in the Palestinian Authority, and to, ostensibly, channel his contacts exclusively to the religious realm, fully conscious of the far-reaching political implications of his activity. Thus, he refrains from getting his hands dirty in the Oslo efforts, which he holds in wholehearted contempt, while at the same time he does not abstain from international activity from which he derives such pleasure.

Despite the differences in approach and style, there are times when the two factions act as one. In April 1998, for example, when tensions again were elevated in the Persian Gulf and the possibility of massive American intervention was raised, the both factions expressed, as one, support of the Iraqi people and condemned American aggression. Although both factions detest Saddam due to his bloodthirsty treatment of the Islamists in his country, within the Arab and Palestinian public in Israel in general, he was worshipped as a new Saladin who would come and redeem Palestine from the hands of Israel. Had the two factions publicly supported Saddam, it could have cost them the generous support that they receive from Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and several Islamic movements around the world that despised the Iraqi tyrant. Despite the vicissitudes that the Israeli Arabs have been experiencing since the *intifada*, both factions of the Islamic movement continue with their activity, although it is conceivable that with the exacerbation of the situation on the one hand and the increase in the regard for Ra'id due to his flamboyant successes on the other, more and more members of the Islamic Movement will gravitate towards his side. However, the moderate faction continues to act on the institutional plane and force its primary rival – the Communist Party, or Hadash in its new political costume, out, and will perhaps even succeed in gaining an advantage as far as the number of representatives that will win seats in the Knesset is concerned. However, Ra'id is also not resting on his laurels; he is reinforcing his popularity based on his impressive record in local government and on national Islamic politics that he is managing autocratically, in order to attract frustrated Arab youths to join his ranks. There is basis for the assumption that their numbers will gradually continue to grow the more that relations between Israel and the Palestinian Authority deteriorate. Thus, perhaps, on the political horizon of the Israeli Arabs there will be two colliding forces: The Ra'id-style Islamic Movement, at the expense of the moderate faction, which will boost its recruitment efforts among the young population, heretofore unaffiliated with any faction, and on the other side an ever growing secular movement around Azmi Bishara, at the expense of the infirm communists and the other factions not affiliated with the Islamists.

Of course, no one is a mind reader, and there is now way to know for certain the life expectancy of these factions, the future consolidation of the Islamic Movement in general, whether or not the two factions will continue to go their separate ways or whether political developments between Israel and the Palestinians and the Arab Muslims in general will force them to reunite in a broader Islamic front than in the past. In any case, if we were to judge according to the writings of the world's most prolific enemies of Israel, like Said Quttab,

who are esteemed by members of Islamic movements in Israel and throughout the world, it is difficult to envision how these movements will ever be able to accept these Jews as their rulers for an extended period especially in a situation of ongoing conflict between the State and the Islamic world. On the other hand, it is very easy to imagine why Islamic youths, who have been fed this horrifying material through constant, absolute and total fundamentalist indoctrination that demands sacrifice though promises reward in the World to Come, draw the desired conclusions and rise to action. The situation is particularly difficult when these youths look with hopeless yearning at their Palestinian brethren, with whom they share common opinions and ideas, who sacrifice themselves in “martyrs’ deaths” in the adjacent territories or in other districts and the temptation to imitate them and be rewarded like them with eternal glory is too great to bear. We have already found that verbal belligerence will ultimately lead to action, acts of violence in our streets the likes of which we have never experienced. As long as this irresponsible and subversive fulmination continues in the movement’s journals, without restraint or criticism, and is internalized and recited to the youth on a daily basis, with no governmental effort to moderate it, the rotten fruits that it will produce should come as no surprise.

Our work on this Islamic chapter will not be complete if we do not relate, at least in brief, to two other aspects of the Islamic Movement, one spiritual-conceptual and one worldly-material. The reference is to the phenomenon of fundamentalist terrorism around the world, regarding which there are reports that it has infiltrated Israel, and to the question of Islamic *waqf* properties in Israel, which are at the focal point of the struggle of the Islamic Movement as a source of power, money and influence on the one hand and as a mechanism for recruitment and strengthening the movement on the other. The first issue is involved with the fact that most of the violent activity in the contemporary world is tied, in one way or another, to fundamentalist Islam; from the Twin Towers in New York, to the Avigors of East Turkistan; from the Iranian involvement in the Balkans to the blowing up of American warships in the Gulf of Aden; from the abduction of tourists by the Abu-Sayif group in the Philippines to the shooting of foreign tourists by the Egyptian Jamaat; from blowing up American embassies in eastern Africa to the destruction of the Israeli embassy and buildings housing Jewish institutions in Argentina; from Hamas and Hizbullah activity inside Israel and on its borders to undermining Western interests in Central Asia. The Islamic movements throughout the Western world have also launched harsh attacks against local Jewish communities, in the shadow of the events of the *intifada*, using unconvincing rationales of “Zionist oppression of the Palestinian people”,

the likes of which the world has not seen since *Kristallnacht* in Nazi Germany. Hundreds of incidents were recorded in October – December 2000, in which synagogues were torched, cemeteries were desecrated, Jewish worshippers and passers-by were attacked, Jewish schools and institutions were threatened and hate-filled manifestos that the West has not witnessed since those dark days were published against them. The distribution of the events attest to the long arm of the World Islamic Movement, as they took place in Montreal, Paris, London, New York, Moscow, Johannesburg, Sydney, Sao-Paolo, Berlin, Zurich, Lyon, Manchester, Caracas, Toronto, Canberra and dozens of other places on all of the continents, in the same style, sounding the same slogans.

This is only because there is a guiding hand, whether by the Terrorist International that convenes on a regular basis in Tehran, whether by disciples of the elusive Osama Bin-Laden, who resides in Afghanistan and finances the training of terrorists, whether by the international arms of Hizbullah that is a force to be reckoned with not only in Lebanon but also in Israel, in the Palestinian territories and in other places. The ideal prototype developed there to wage the *jihad* against the West and Israel, is what is mistakenly called the “suicide bomber”, prepared to detonate himself to sanctify the name of God. The mistake is connected to the term employed, because terrorists of that kind do not come to “commit suicide”, which is the impression created by the mundane phrase, something that is, in any case, prohibited by Islamic law, they are not seeking to avoid their own personal problems as is the usual case with suicides, they do not cause their parents shame and humiliation because of their failure to raise a positive offspring capable of dealing with life, but rather the truth is the polar opposite: They come to kill the enemy, even if in the framework of that attempt they sacrifice their life, they come to contribute to national or religious objectives and make their families and communities proud of their supreme sacrifice. Therefore, this writer has recommended calling them “Islamikaze”, a combination of the words “Islam” and “kamikaze”, the Japanese pilots who detonated themselves and their planes on the American warships, in the course of the desperate Japanese attempt to halt the American advance in the later stages of the Pacific Ocean battles during World War II. There too, the Japanese did not come to commit suicide, but rather to bring about the halt of the American war machine and concomitantly to sacrifice themselves for the Emperor. Islamikaze camps of this type are located in Afghanistan, Sudan and Iran and under Hizbullah auspices in Lebanon. However, slowly, along with Bin-Laden’s and Hizbullah’s infiltration of the territories and even of the

Israeli Arabs, it is reasonable that we will see the fruits of this subversion in the foreseeable future.

The Israeli Arab brandishing of the Hizbullah and Hamas flags during their “legitimate” demonstrations has a message that we are too blind to see and deaf to hear. And we are not only talking about flags, but the Israeli Arabs, particularly the members of the Islamic Movement among them, send lists to Hizbullah in Lebanon to demand that their prisoners, in other words, those who compromised Israeli security, be released from prison as a condition for the release of Israeli hostages held there. And who heads these efforts? People like Dehamshe of the “moderate” Islamic Movement in Israel, who pledged allegiance to the State of Israel when he entered the Knesset, and now he seeks not only to violate the law of the land in his demand to release those who committed crimes against the State, who murdered its soldiers and were not executed only because of its lenient laws, but he also demands repeat criminals and murderers in exchange for innocent hostages and thereby implicitly encourages abductions of additional Israelis by Hizbullah, so they will have bargaining chips in freeing his people. What have we done? It’s even worse because Israeli Arabs and their leaders prefer the term “political prisoners” for their people, who have not only expressed remorse for their criminal actions, although they were ideologically motivated, and they not only have the audacity to demand improved prison conditions and they, for all intents and purposes, receive the very generous opportunity to study in their cells, but they also categorically demand a “prisoner exchange”, with one of the most heinous and merciless enemies of Israel, which does not even have the decency to confirm that the hostages are in his charge and to allow contact with them, like that which the incarcerated Israeli Arabs are allowed.

The *waqf* issue is a bit more complicated and more protracted and we will deal with it in detail in the next chapter, which discusses the concrete struggle of the Islamic Movement in Nazareth against the local Christian rule. However, in order to receive the complete picture, we will only emphasize the basic concepts and the political and economic significance of control of the *waqf*, which sheds light on an additional aspect of the Islamic Movement in Israel. *Waqf*, or consecrated, property is unique to Islam in the sense of their attitude towards it, at times, as a holy place, despite the fact that the concept exists in our tradition and in other traditions. The concept stems from the verb “*waqf*”, whose literal meaning is: to stop or cause to stop, however the broadening of the term applies to a property whose use is limited, in other words, others are “stopped” from using it. Historically, when the Islamic Abbasid Empire (750-1258) expropriated people’s land for the State treasury, the property owners sought to “consecrate”

their property in order to avoid governmental confiscations. In the modern world, the quantity of *waqf* properties has increased so much, that it causes disruptions in the economic systems of the Islamic countries, due to the mass evasion from paying taxes and from exposing the property to state expropriation. Therefore, in most Islamic countries there is a *Waqf* Ministry, which manages these properties. Many different types of *waqf* were anchored in Islamic tradition: *Waqf Abali*, meaning familial, whose fruits are the exclusive property of the contributing family; and there is the *Waqf Thi'eri*, whose fruits are enjoyed by communal or religious institutions. The *waqf* has an executor, who oversees the property and every dispute regarding its management or its benefits are under the jurisdiction of the Islamic *shari'ah* courts. During the Ottoman Empire, restrictions were imposed on the use of *waqf* that stemmed from the laws of land ownership. Theoretically, all lands belong to the State and its fruits go to its coffers. However, over the years, the State granted lands to its servants and that land became private property. Therefore, *waqf* could only take effect on private lands and could not take effect on state lands, even if they were actually in the possession of private individuals. However, the exigencies of life were stronger than the law and over time, the semi-*waqf* form of consecrating state land for charitable purposes was recognized.

The League of Nations instructed the British Mandatory Government after World War I to continue to manage the *waqf* in accordance with *shari'ah* laws, as in the past and it transferred all of the income from these properties to the Supreme Muslim Council, which saw to the distribution of the income according to the will of the original donors. Despite the fact that in many of the Islamic countries, the *waqf* matters have been subjugated to the modern civil legal code, without taking Islamic law into consideration and despite the strong opposition of Muslim clerics, the Mandatory Government decided not to get involved in this incendiary situation and continued to make the *waqf* matters in their jurisdiction subject to the *shari'ah* law, in other words, to leave them in the hands of the Supreme Muslim Council headed by the Mufti of Jerusalem, Amin Husseini. It must be noted that under British rule, the Jewish and Christian communities controlled their consecrated assets that were subject to the jurisdiction of their religious courts. However, to these ancient customs, additional interpretations by contemporary fundamentalist Muslim clerics were added, as they viewed all lands conquered in the framework of Islamic expansionism (*futuh*) from its inception as *waqf* lands that Muslims have no right to relinquish. This explains the difficulty of these Muslim fundamentalists of this sort, including the relatively “moderate” Sheik Darwish, who said it explicitly, to conduct negotiations regarding any

of the Islamic lands and certainly to relinquish even a minute part of it to a non-Muslim. This is sharply, clearly, decisively and absolutely manifest in the Hamas charter that was drafted by Sheik Yassin, to whose statements many of the members of the Islamic Movement in Israel pay attention and who resolutely determined that all the lands in the Land of Israel are eternal *waqf* for the benefit of the Muslims. It is clear that this sort of interpretation, which is based on Islamic law but not applicable in the modern world, induces shuddering in anyone living on land that was ever under Muslim occupation, including Israel, Spain and Portugal, southern France, Sicily, India and more. The threat latent in this absolute exegesis is, of course, the use of *jihad* in order to redeem these lands from their present residents and to restore them to the bosom of Islam. Regarding Israel, this demand has already been concretely manifest in the Hamas Charter that is followed by many members of the Islamic Movement in Israel.

There is another issue tied to the laws of holy places, to which *waqf* properties are occasionally ascribed, for religious reasons, to achieve political or some other utilitarian objectives. We have seen, for example, how Sheik Ra'id and his cronies pounce on an Islamic site, cemetery or destroyed mosque and in the name of its "sanctity" claim *waqf* ownership of it, even if there is no documented evidence. The Shihab a-Din episode in Nazareth, which we will deal with in the next chapter, is a classic example of this. There, one day in late 1997, the members of the Islamic Movement occupied a lot that did not belong to them adjacent to the old grave of Shihab a-Din, according to their contention, the nephew of the great Saladin, that was proven *waqf* and they attempted to apply the true *waqf*, to a place that they claimed was holy, on the entire Church of the Annunciation plaza, in order to prevent the development plans in anticipation of the millennium and to designate the Church plaza for the establishment of a mosque. It would have been possible to omit this frightful struggle that entangled Israel in extraneous tensions with the Christian world and provided tremendous momentum to the Islamic Movement's takeover of the Nazareth municipality, had it not been for the far-reaching ramifications not only on the chief Arab city in the country, but on the general status of Israeli Arabs, on intra-Arab politics that exacerbated its tone and on the confrontation that will take place in the future between the secular-nationalist branch and the religious-fundamentalist branch within the Israeli Arab community. In all of this commotion, the Christians will suffer in any case and perhaps a death blow will be administered to their existence here, as will be detailed below.

CHAPTER SIX

THE CHRISTIANS, THE DRUSE AND THE OTHER “COLLABORATORS”

As we know, in contrast to the overwhelming majority of Israeli Arabs, whose demands for equality and claims of “loyalty” to their state are never ending, but they give no indication that they are willing to bear the yoke of its defense, there are several sub-sectors, which decided to get off the fence and affirm that they are Israeli citizens in every sense and bear the consequences of that statement. Besides the Druse denomination that was officially recognized by the State collectively and therefore citizens’ rights and obligations are incumbent upon the entire community, only individuals from the other sub-sectors, on a personal and voluntary basis, have assumed that yoke of obligation. Among them are the Circassians, a minuscule group that was brought here by the Ottomans from the Caucasian Mountains in the 19th century, certain Bedouin tribes, in the Negev and the Galilee, which developed a long-standing tradition in service of the State, Christians from different denominations who decided to cast their lot with the Jewish state and to establish themselves within it and Arab village dwellers from all over the country, who, for various personal reasons reached the conclusion that they would normalize their lives in this country by entering into the yoke of obligations. It would appear to be a joyful phenomenon in light of the fact that they are all categorized as “Arabs”, especially because of their Arab language and culture, and most even characterize themselves as “Palestinians” as they are residents and natives of the land of Palestine, especially in the context of the alienation, even hostility, towards Israel that emerges from the throats and the actions of the rest of the Arabs and Palestinians in the country. However, the majority that does not fulfill its obligations preferring to alienate and hate, not only fails to silently tolerate the service of these individuals, but it directs hostility, ostracism and social pressures towards them, making their lives impossible.

These pressures, especially in the mixed villages, in which a segment serves

in the IDF and the majority does not serve (in contrast, of course, to the Druse villages where everyone serves), manifest themselves in threats, social isolation of those “breaking ranks”, curses and vilification of “collaborators” as if they had served in an enemy army and had not given their lives in the defense of the entire country in which non-serving Arabs also live. It is enough for a youth returning home for a vacation with a rifle on his shoulder to arouse perhaps jealousy and admiration from young children who never saw their fathers and brothers in a similar situation, or curiosity regarding the uniform-wearing anomalies, or a grudge against the “traitors” who abet the “Zionist enemy”. This can not only raise questions among those anomalies but also undermine their self-confidence, once they have been branded as deviants. Those who serve are so sensitive to this discomfort that cracks have begun to develop even among some Druse youths, who are surrounded by their supportive denomination, and are beginning to view the obligation to serve as a burden and even more so among those individuals who lack that support. Because, when an Arab youth hears a Christian member of Knesset claiming to be a Palestinian patriot, not an Israeli patriot, he certainly asks himself, why he should deviate from the Arab guidelines of his leaders and volunteer to be the black sheep in his family, his village or his community. Of course, the bulk of the effort of the Arab leadership and of the Arab public in Israel, to convince youths to refrain from serving their country is concentrated on the Druse denomination. It is accomplished by the endless emphasis on the exemption provided them due to the fact that they are Arabs, who need not fight against their brethren across the border. However, with the consolidation of the present situation in recent years, and in the absence of any real hope to change it, the Israeli Arabs focus on the Bedouins and the Christians, primarily by means of the Islamic Movement. Bedouins – by having them join the movement, Christians by transforming them into enemies of the Arabs and regarding them as being almost as bad as Jews unless they prove, like Azmi Bishara, their uncompromising nationalism.

The Christians, who constitute 10% of the Arabs in Israel, however, their percentage is gradually contracting both due to their slow demographic growth, relative to the Muslims, and because of their emigration, consider themselves, just like the Druse, as Arabs in terms of their history, their culture and their language. However, nevertheless, they are considered an alien presence by many Arabs, especially the Muslim fundamentalists among them, both because of the historical baggage of their *dhimmi* status in Islamic countries over the course of hundreds of years and because of the suspicion that has fallen upon them that they serve as the cultural agents of the hated West. This situation, which

doubly forces them to the margins (once as Arabs in Israel and once as Christian Arabs), can not help but increase their distress and push them to be either more Arab than the Muslims (see the belligerent nationalism of Tewfiq Toubi and Emil Habibi in the past and Azmi Bishara in the present), to withdraw from the community and transfer their residence to mixed cities in which they will be able to live their lives tranquilly as neighbors of the Jewish majority or to despair of everything and emigrate from the country. More and more of them adopt the latter two alternatives due to the demographic steamroller of the Muslim majority that overwhelms them and transforms them into a despised minority amongst it that collaborates with the West and Israel, even in settlements like Kafr Kana and Nazareth that were world-renowned specifically for their Christianity. However, in contrast to the Muslims, especially the fundamentalist among them, for whom the fundamentalist idea that transcends the boundaries of clans and tribes unites them, the Christians fragment into an extremely large number of groups, which constantly compete with each other and cause division that cannot withstand external Muslim pressure. Add to that the fact that in Palestinian cities like Bethlehem and Ramallah the same inexorable process is underway as well, you have a recipe for the continued diminution of the Christian population in the Holy Land, specifically under Israeli rule or in its sphere of influence. Already today, the Vatican and certainly the Christian churches headed by Arabs, place the blame on Israel, not because it does not intervene in order to prevent Muslim oppression of Christians, but because of the oppression of Arabs in general, among them Christians. The voices of Christian Arabs like Bishara, who lament, not the Muslim liquidation of their community, but the ostensible Israeli discrimination against them, is the clearest manifestation of this phenomenon.

When we observe today the verbal attacks of the Islamic Movement in Israel against the Christians, it is difficult not to be amazed at what has transpired during the 50 years of the State of Israel's existence, in the course of which there have been more than a few upheavals in the relations between those two Arab sects. To that end, it is necessary to briefly survey the history of the Christian denominations, the relations between them and with the Muslims and on the positions of national leadership that the Christians assumed over the Israeli Arabs in general, until they were unseated and Muslims replaced them and confiscated their assets. Truth be told, there is a duality in the conduct of the Christian leadership in its various denominations: On the one hand, it caused the gradual Arabization of the leadership as the local denomination members are Arabs in every sense and they, therefore, took over command from the

foreign, imported leadership that had stood at its head in previous centuries; this, of course, led to the acceptance of the Christian denominations as Arabs in every sense, once they were liberated from the foreign stigma that had stuck to them and they were mobilized into the general Arab struggle against Israel and Zionism. However, on the other hand, as Arab nationalism gradually absorbed fundamentalist foundations, which have accompanied it from its origins, and especially with the rise of the various factions of the Islamic Movement, the Christians were marginalized and were in crisis. Even the relatively moderate Sheik Darwish, has furiously attacked the Christian West on more than one occasion, like his fundamentalist brethren in other places, especially what they perceive to be its subversive, uncompromising attack against that which is sacred to Islam. The West was especially accused of introducing the subculture of permissiveness, which challenges Islamic conservatism and topples it from within, while shattering sacred Islamic values and corrupting the youth with pornography, alcohol, pop music and drugs that cloud the brain. And who spreads these philosophies of poison and destruction like the Christians (or, incidentally, the Jews)?

However, despite this hostile disposition *vis-à-vis* Christians among fundamentalist Muslims, Sheik Darwish attempted to speak about the respect required for all faiths and allayed the concerns of the Christians, who live together with Muslims in mixed villages, stemming from the fear of fundamentalist Islam growing in their proximity and demanding its pound of flesh. However the Sheik's young, reckless colleagues do not sugarcoat their feelings towards the Christians. Kamal al-Hatib, for example, one of the leaders of the Northern faction in Kafr Kana on the outskirts of Nazareth, mercilessly attacked the Christian PLO leaders, while, of course, shooting poisoned arrows in the direction of his Christian colleagues in the Arab leadership in Israel. His contention was that the Christian, George Habash, for example, cannot have any part in Palestinian nationalism based on Islam, which demands the exclusive Muslim right to Jerusalem, which the Christians also have the audacity to consecrate for themselves. He explains that while other Palestinian nationalists view the solution to the Palestinian problem in nationalist terms, in which case place would be granted to the Christian Arabs as well, as far as he is concerned, the problem is Islamic and only Islamic. And he has his reasons: Jerusalem and Palestine that warmly embraced Khaled Ibn al-Walid and Saladin (see above) can not embrace Archbishop Capucci or Habash, as they are loyal spouses exclusively devoted to their Muslim owners. And even if they are tarrying to come to Jerusalem, ultimately they will come with fervor and longings. In other articles in the Islamic

Movement's media, Hana Seniora, who was the PLO spokesman in Jerusalem, was accused of warning America about the rise of Islamic fundamentalism and that he cultivated contacts, heaven forbid, with personalities in the Zionist entity. In addition, it was written in the movement's periodicals that the "present-day Crusades" are aided by people like the Coptic Boutrous Ghali, who was the Egyptian Minister of State and then the UN Secretary-General, and Baklouvis Maksoud, representative of the Arab League to the UN and a Christian as well, "who pretends that he is the spokesman of the Muslims".

If that is the case regarding bona-fide Palestinian nationalists, whose only sin is their Christianity, it is all the more so true regarding Israeli Arab Christians, who have been a thorn in the side of many Muslims in general and of the members of the Islamic Movement in particular. And you do not have a clearer example of this hostility than the exhausting, yet persistent and determined process undertaken by the movement in Nazareth in order to cast the Christians aside and dispossess them of their property. It should also be said that the Christian denominations themselves, with their extreme fractiousness, their fruitless courtship of the Arab and Palestinian national movement and their occasional blatant stand against Israeli authorities, which ultimately harmed them, contributed more than a little to the process of their dual alienation from both the State and the Muslim majority among their people. Let us briefly detail each denomination and its failings:

1. The largest of the Christian denominations is the Greek-Orthodox, headed by the Patriarch, who resides in Jerusalem and his representative, the Metropolitan of Nazareth. Over the course of many years, the clerical leadership was in the hands of Greek priests, despite the fact that the rank and file faithful were local Arabs. Beginning during the British Mandate, the Arabs exerted pressure to put an end to the Greek hegemony over their spiritual leadership, with only partial success. Due to the fact that the spiritual guardianship of the denomination was in the hands of the Russian Orthodox Church, which purchased extensive properties in Israel during the 19th century, continuous friction developed between the Church leadership that was accused of selling many of its assets to the Zionists and the Arab rank and file, who were subordinate to the Jerusalem Mufti, Haj Amin, the head of the Arab movement in Palestine beginning in the 1930s who prohibited the transfer of land to the Jews. Despite the fact that the Soviet government did not display any fundamental interest in the religious issue, it did have an interest

- in continuing to hold on to and manage the Church properties in Israel, through the Patriarch, who persisted in his path.
2. The Greek-Catholic Church, second in its significance, was dominantly administered by Archbishop George Hakim, an Arab who resided in northern Israel beginning with the end of the British Mandatory period. From the outset, he took the Arab side in their struggle against both the British and the Zionists and also engaged in vigorous activity in the international arena, including at the Vatican, in order to mobilize support for the Palestinians. He even appeared before the Anglo-American Commission of Inquiry in 1946, presuming to represent all of the Christians in the country who, according to his statement, joined together with their Muslim brethren in order to bring independence to a united Palestine and also established a Christian society that aspired to bring all of the Christians in the country under one umbrella in support of these objectives.
 3. The Catholic denomination headed by the Latinate Patriarch in Jerusalem, whose roots date back to the distant Crusader past, administers communities primarily in the country's north as well as networks of education and welfare institutions staffed by monks from the veteran orders of the Franciscans, Carmelites, Jesuits, Benedictines, Lutherans and others. With Saladin's conquest of Jerusalem in 1189, the Patriarchate moved from Jerusalem to Acre and there too it was abrogated when the city fell and all Christian matters remained in the hands of the Franciscan Order. It was only at the end of the Ottoman rule in the 19th century, when Western involvement in the Land of Israel increased, that it worked harder in cultivating its relations with the Vatican than it did with the Arab national movement. This continued until an Arab, Michel Sabah, was appointed Patriarch as part of Vatican policy to promote members of the indigenous population of each land to the highest Church ranks. At that point there was a change to open identification with the Palestinians, even if it at times it involved more than a few contradictions.
 4. The other denominations are smaller and lack the democratic weight to decide one way or the other. The Maronites, for example, whose origins are in Lebanon, though they have several communities in the Holy Land, displayed sympathy for the Zionist Movement and the Jews due to their comparison of their independent status, actual or potential, and the struggle for survival in a hostile environment, in contrast to other Christian or Jewish denominations that were fated to remain minorities in the Muslim society in which they lived. Other minuscule denominations, like the Copts, the Armenians and the Anglicans, maintain representation and presence at the

holy places and sustain welfare and charity organizations in different places in the country.

In Nazareth, as an example, that became the thriving focal point of Arab identity in Israel, Muslims and Christians of all denominations always lived in harmony. However, as long as there was a guaranteed Christian majority, until the eve of the establishment of the State, relations between the two religions were proper. However, when the Muslims increased in numbers, both because of internal immigration from the surrounding villages into the city and also because of their accelerated natural reproduction, the Muslim two-thirds of the city's population had become much more militant, ambitious and determined to impose Islam on the city, governmentally, spiritually, materially and symbolically. Of course even earlier, there was an undercurrent of Muslim dissatisfaction when during the Christian holidays, especially on Christmas, the city was decorated and the bells were rung, pilgrims gathered and the sounds of prayer burst forth, which underscored the city's Christian and international character. The Muslims were forced to swallow their pride both because of the Arab solidarity and fraternity that existed on the surface and in order to refrain from breaking the ranks of unity against the common Israeli enemy. Furthermore, while during the Turkish period, the Muslims could scream and disturb the Christians' peace and celebrations unimpeded, under the British and then the Israeli law-abiding regimes, they dared not interfere by force or to undermine or publicly ridicule their neighbors' expressions of joy. However, when the item on the agenda was Muslim holidays, especially during Ramadan when the streets were teeming with Muslim passers-by, shoppers and strollers or when the calls of the *muezzin* to prayer overshadowed the ringing of the church bells, it was not pleasant for the Christians, while the Muslims rejoiced en masse with no sensitivity to their neighbors feelings. Of course, this behavior pattern applies to relations between Muslims and Jews in this country as well, as when the Muslims were the majority, the Jews were prohibited to sound the ram's horn at the Western Wall for example, and certainly to display any public expression of their religion and their holidays, while it was obvious that the *muezzin* in the mosques disturb their non-Muslim neighbors by loudly sounding the calls to prayer from powerful loudspeakers facing in all directions against which it was prohibited to react or to protest. Still today, despite the laws prohibiting noise that disturbs the neighbors' quiet, during the five "watches" of the day it is possible to hear the noisy disturbances of the *muezzin* in all of the mixed cities in Israel, including the capital, Jerusalem, and who would dare to raise his voice and protest?

As Nazareth is the largest Arab concentration in the country (with the exception of Jerusalem most of whose Arabs are not Israeli citizens anyway), it also became the center of most of the intellectual, literary and journalistic activity of the Arabs in general, and also the primary focal point of political activity. Also, the fact that it constituted a place of confluence and representation for all of the Christian denominations, in which the heads of some of the various churches are based, transformed it into the main theater of activity for all of the Christian streams. In other words, there was no trend, circle, idea, party, splinter faction, political trial balloon, religious tendency or conceptual and intellectual, nationalist or cosmopolitan, religious or secular, moderate or fanatical, pro- or anti-Israeli stream that was absent from the ideas exchange in the central square of Nazareth. Because Nazareth was the home of ideologues, frustrated ones and ones whose ideals were realized, the launching pad of new ideas and organizations, their testing grounds, the home for developing new political philosophies and the cemetery for ideas whose time was past and had passed from the world and for shattered dreams. Therefore, Nazareth became a system of perpetual motion between people, intrigues, coalitions, covenants, betrayals, beliefs and deals. This is the place that Arab politics is accomplished, publicized, gains momentum and becomes the property of all of the Israeli Arabs. Already at the State's inception, the Workers of the Land of Israel Party (Mapai) recruited Nazarenes and other Arabs, Muslims and Christians, Bedouins and Druse to the lists under its auspices, which helped them, more than a little, to maintain their hegemony over Israeli politics during the first 28 years of its existence. However, on a parallel plane, during the 1960s, the Arab political stream that left the Jewish-led Israeli Communist Party and established the New Communist List (Rakah), whose head remained Jewish in order to maintain legitimacy in the Jewish state, which, at the time, went unchallenged, however, although most of its leaders and activists were Christians, like the legendary Tewfiq Toubi and Emil Habibi and only a few Muslims reached leadership positions.

However, the Muslim demographic growth slowly left its mark, so that they not only made up most of the rank and file but they also climbed to fill medium and high level leadership positions. In 1972, the acclaimed Nazarene poet, Tewfiq Ziad, joined the party's Central Committee together with another Muslim and several years later he established a power base for himself when he was elected Mayor of Nazareth and subsequently to the Knesset in the framework of his party. In 1988, not even one Christian remained in the Knesset faction, although the veteran, Toubi, continued to hold the reins of the party secretariat. Ostensibly, the religious identity of its leaders should not matter in an atheistic

Communist Party, nevertheless, the mere fact that the Christian Arabs decided to adopt the positions of the Soviet Union, the friend of the Arabs at the time, and at the same time, nationalist Arab positions contained the message that the Christians are no less nationalist than their Muslim brethren and that they identify with the friends of the Arabs around the world. In addition, Nazareth, along with Shfaram and Haifa, was one of the three cities in Israel that had a substantial Christian community, at times even a majority in the local Arab population, due to the urban, heterogeneous nature of this intelligent, educated population, which pushed it forward into leadership positions in the Israeli Communist Party and subsequently in Rakah, which were perceived as the clearest expression of Arab and Palestinian nationalism in the country. And, indeed, the Christian leadership was the harshest in its critique of Israel's Arab policy, and consolidated its party ideology, with Soviet support, of course, around that policy. The paradox is, of course, that it is highly doubtful that this Christian leadership, just like the one in the Soviet Union that it sought to imitate, was imbued with genuine Marxist ideology, as it was a bona-fide bourgeois group, which led a much more bourgeois lifestyle than the adjacent Israeli kibbutzim, which existed in an absolute communist utopia. In other words, this leadership conducted a protest against Israel around the idea of Arab and Palestinian identity, diametrically opposed to the communist philosophical cosmopolitanism, however, that idea provided them with an organizational tool around which to rally the support of the party's Arabs. With the exception of dispatching central activists and their children to study in the Soviet Union, it is doubtful whether the party could have done or wanted to do anything to promote substantive ideological communist education.

At the same time, it is worth noting that the number of Christians who sought to join Zionist parties in those years was not insignificant, however the parties were not anxious to absorb Arab members into their ranks, preferring to rely more on the election machines of the separate Arab parties, which were dependent on them and which, in exchange for their support for the establishment, would receive various benefits. It was only in the 1977 elections that the Labor Party decided to include Arabs directly in its ranks; however, since there were no Christians on its Knesset list, they were forced to seek alternative channels of political expression for themselves. Only the smaller United Labor Party (Mapam), had already opened its ranks to Arabs in the 1950s and gave Christians highly regarded positions in its hierarchy. And when the Christians were unable to maintain their leadership positions due to the fact that they were forced out of the "independent lists" by the demographic strength of the Muslims, they

gravitated towards the communists, with whom, as mentioned above, they had no clear common ideological platform in the first place. Therefore, in this communist leadership, we find members of the Greek-Orthodox Church, who had always, as mentioned above, not only supported Arab nationalism, but also became the most outstanding spokesmen of the Arab public in the country as far as demands for equality and control over land in terms of preventing confiscation is concerned. These Christian leaders, who have stamped on their banner the right of Palestinians in Israel to self-determination and the right of return for their brethren in exile, also demanded to halt Jewish settlement in the Galilee and sounded a protest against the establishment of Upper Nazareth adjacent to Arab Nazareth, concerned that its establishment would spell the end of the effort to preserve the Arab character of the Galilee in any future political agreement. All of these trends became more radical after the party leaders rid themselves of Jewish patronage and brought about the establishment of Rakah. Christian intellectuals went even further and supported the al-Ard movement, which challenged the legitimacy of the State of Israel, until it was outlawed and declared illegal.

In 1974, the Christian leadership sponsored a convention of the Committee of Arab Mayors in the Galilee, which was the precursor of the future Committee of Heads of Arab Councils that would become, despite the opposition of the authorities, the corporative representative of the Israeli Arabs in general, and would also eventually expand into the Arab Monitoring Committee (1982), whose inclusion of the Arab members of Knesset and the heads of Arab popular societies made it into the consolidated leadership of the Arabs in Israel. In 1975, Rakah became Hadash (The Front for Democracy and Equality), which won the mayoralty in many Arab councils, including Nazareth. The first Land Day (March 30, 1976), which was planned in Nazareth, catapulted the Committee of Heads of Arab Councils from an anemic, disciplined organization, which dealt with local issues concerning Arab citizens, into a boisterous, demanding institution, with far-reaching political demands. However, at that point, the Christians had already been marginalized in Hadash and in the Arab leadership. Several of them, like Riyah Abu al-Sal, head of the Evangelical Church in Nazareth, continued to attempt to have their voices heard in new organizations, like the "Progressive List for Peace", however, their fate was sealed, despite the fact that they attempted to overtake Rakah on the Left and recognize a Palestinian state, without adding the standard conclusion accepted by the communists "alongside the State of Israel". However, there too they were unsuccessful and the Hadash neo-communists, headed by Ziad, with a Muslim leadership and a rank and

file filled with Muslims, continued to enjoy great success. In the 1984 general elections, half of the voters in Nazareth voted for Hadash, more than any other Arab city or village, no doubt because of the unique personal contribution of Ziad, whose popularity skyrocketed. Nazareth, under his leadership, became the center of Arab events in the country: In 1981 he announced the establishment in the city of a Museum of Palestinian Folklore, after conducting a Palestinian Heritage Week there. It should come as no surprise that Father Shofani, who administered the Anglican school, was the one who organized the events, while another Anglican priest, Na'im Atik, developed a "Palestinian Liberation theology", like the revolutionary liberation theologies in South America. In 1982, the Greek-Orthodox Patriarch presented Ziad with his Church's most distinguished medal. Thus, the city's Christians were transformed from its masters to sycophants of the Muslim mayor.

After the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the decline in the stature of communism, Hadash's prestige also diminished and only by dint of his personality, was Ziad able to continue to hold the reins of the city government. However, when Ziad was killed in a car accident in the middle of his term, his deputy, a member of the same party, the Christian Ramz Geraissi, who had assumed responsibility for the Nazareth 2000 program, which was conceived by the municipality and the government with the objective of preparing the city to absorb the masses of tourists and pilgrims anticipated in the course of the millennium celebrations. The mayor, who wanted with all his heart to promote the project and in light of his concern that the city's Muslims would attempt to undermine it in order to prevent their city, with a population with a Muslim majority, from once again becoming a center and symbol of the Christian millennium celebration, contacted the Vatican and elicited a declaration, by authority of the Pope, that Nazareth, along with Jerusalem and Bethlehem, would be the focal points of the events. That is, perhaps, the turning point, at which the city's Muslims, with the support of the local and National Islamic Movement, decided to initiate an all out struggle for the soul of the city, once they understood that the celebrations, in their planned structure and scale, would elevate Christianity in the city, the country and the world, even though only 30% of the population are Christians, while the prestige of the Muslims, who constitute 70% of the population, would, as a result, of necessity, be diminished and overshadowed. Then, the Islamic Movement in Nazareth stormed into the picture, with a series of dramatic and well-planned actions, despite the "spontaneous and popular" character that it sought to provide the event from a public perspective, went on the attack. Its members took control of the lot in

front of the Church of the Annunciation on Christmas Eve 1997 and thereby prevented the work that was underway in preparation for the celebrations, and planned many bold and imaginative programs to show everyone who is the true ruler of the city.

In early 1997, even before the dramatic events that will be described below took place, the City Council, of which Salman Abu Ahmed, head of the opposition Islamist faction as well as head of the Political Department of the Southern Islamic Movement (that was also supposed to be the moderate one), decided to build the Church plaza to host mass assemblies and ceremonies. Members of the faction did not oppose the project in principle, but they rather raised the question whether the state-owned lot was a *waqf* property, in which case the municipality would be prohibited from building upon it. Of course, had it been *waqf* property, it would have been public knowledge and there would have been a supervisor tending to its maintenance and managing its income. There was nothing of the sort; therefore it is possible to view the “ploy” of the Islamic faction as a trial balloon that came to gauge the majority position in the City Council, which took the decision to develop the plaza without opposition. According to the Islamists, it was enough to raise doubts and qualms regarding the status of the area, in order to transform it from an approved project into a bone of contention, thereby creating an opening for other subsequent far-reaching demands. At that stage, an additional character, Abu Nawaf, supervisor of the *waqf* in Nazareth, who from that point on would be the front man in all of the upcoming confrontations, entered the arena, while the Muslim faction and in fact most Muslims in Nazareth and later the Muslims throughout the country stood behind him in what became a power struggle between them and the State of Israel. Thus, in December 1997, while the development of the area of the plaza of contention gathered momentum, Abu Nawaf appeared in the municipality, demanded to see the Christian mayor, and presented before him a grandiose plan to establish a mansion on the lot, which would serve as a mosque reaching the heavens and would overshadow the Church of the Annunciation in terms of stature and splendor. This is not a program that is prepared in one day, and the financing for it cannot be raised in one hour. The conclusion is that the plan was conceived, and supporters and financiers were recruited (presumably from wealthy Muslim oil-producing countries famous for their tolerance of other religions) long before and at that point the pretext presented itself to turn the backup plan into reality. The mayor, agitated and stunned after seeing the program that he cultivated in order to bring about a revolution in the wake of the millennium was doomed to oblivion, requested a delay in order to

pass the new, monumental proposal through the various building committees. However, Abu Nawaf and his sponsors had a different, tighter timetable. They decided to overrun the lot, to transform it into the focal point of Nazarene politics and in their reliance on the pliability of the authorities that would not do a thing, they constructed an enormous tent-mosque, i.e. a "sacred" site that no one would dare to touch.

Ever since, the lot in the middle of the city, the illegal building on it and the masses congregating there day and night to protect it with their bodies as they issue threats that it is *waqf* land and that blood would be shed if they are forcibly evicted has become the "Shihab a-Din Affair", in which plot twists are still to come. Shihab a-Din, the nephew of the great Saladin, whom they claim was buried at the foot of the Church of the Annunciation after the Battle of Hittin (1187), and his grave, which is a genuine *waqf* property built on documented land, suddenly became the nucleus of interest and pilgrimage from the moment that the Islamic Movement decided, in its infinite wisdom, to transform it into an impetus to further its programs in the city of Nazareth. For this purpose, it demanded the annexation of the lot that was not *waqf* land and was many times larger than the adjacent *waqf* property. That is the Shihab a-Din brouhaha, as we will relate to it below. As the State, the owner of the lot, did not immediately evacuate the property, and the law enforcement officials did not hurry to dismantle the clearly illegal building, the matter was transferred to the slow and wearying charge of the windmills of justice, this is not the place to detail their exploits, until, later (not sooner) as usual, they arrived at a decision. In the interim, tension in the city was on the rise both because of the 1998 local authority elections and because of the local Christians' fear of a Muslim takeover of the properties close to the church as an impetus to gain control of the entire city. And indeed, the harsh election campaign, in which the Islamic Movement made the affair its focal point and were thereby able to mobilize the support of the Muslim majority in the city, also led to violent confrontations between Christians and Muslims. The police, who stood in the middle in order to separate the combatants, instead of evicting the intruders and nipping the entire affair in the bud, was "rewarded" by having both sides place the blame squarely on its shoulders. That which was, still is. After the 1998 local elections came the 1999 general elections in which the outgoing Prime Minister and the Labor Party's prime ministerial candidate, stirred the pot and promised through their emissaries to support the Muslims after the elections, in other words, to succumb to their demands to build the mosque.

Pressure began mounting from Christian circles, from both within Israel

and without, in light of what they viewed as the absolute submission of the Israeli governments, that which ran for election and that which replaced it, to the Muslim demands. As, the commission of inquiry empanelled by the government in order to recommend a way to overcome the dispute between the Christians and the Muslims, which was exacerbated after the 1988 local elections, in which Ramz Geraissi was reelected by the skin of his teeth, although a contrary City Council, with a majority of Islamists and their supporters, was elected and which led to the paralysis of the municipality, proved to be a flimsy fig leaf for the ignominy of the governments. Both the outgoing government and the one that was elected in its place in 1999, for all intents and purposes, accepted the Islamist trespass into territory that was not theirs; the problem was, how much to allot them for construction of the mosque. Ultimately, the commission's recommendations that were adopted by a majority vote supported a far-reaching concession to the trespassers and their conclusion was ratified by the new government, while the minority opinion that warned of the extraneous entanglement that would ensue with the Christian world, was cast aside. The Christians in Israel were torn between their loyalty to the rest of the Arabs, which obligated them to resolve the dispute within the family and their inability to witness the trampling of their rights by the Muslim majority as the authorities stood idly by and even favored the aggressor. However, when they became conscious of the escalating rage in international Christianity in protest of that which transpired, they came to their senses once they realized that they could no longer be seen as less passionate about their matters in the Holy Land than their benefactors and supporters abroad. In any case, the heads of churches around the world and other influential, prestigious clerics began protesting before the Israeli Government and some even canceled planned trips to Israel in protest.

In the meanwhile, chaos was rampant in the municipality due to the refusal of the Muslim majority to cooperate with the elected mayor, which led to the paralysis of the establishment. The Christian Mayor refused to appoint a Muslim vice-mayor, due to the fear that in his absence actions would be taken inconsistent with his policies, while other Islamists demanded that the municipality function in a manner reflecting and expressing the decisive Muslim majority, would lend an ear to its demands (among others the construction of the mosque) and would appoint their people to its cadre. Thus, instead of the Christian mayor, apparently the last one, turning to development of the city and its preparation for the flood of visitors predicted for the year 2000, he was forced to deal with his political survival, while evading the rage of the Muslim masses, walking around with bodyguards in the wake of threats and humiliations,

knocking on government doors seeking help. It was only after the death blow dealt him by the government in ratifying the majority recommendations of the committee and despite the rulings of the courts which also contemptuously rejected the Muslim attempts to gain control of properties that did not belong to them and their claim that the disputed land belonged to *waqf*, the mayor was forced to concede and agree to the Muslim conditions for forming the coalition, for failure to do so would have left the city paralyzed until the end of the term. In this way, the Islamists learned that the use of force pays dividends, because governments will always bend their principles of law enforcement for electoral considerations and that despite the court rulings that completely justified, after the fact, the Christian demands and the minority position in the Commission of Inquiry not to submit to the Muslim demands, they can win the day. In this way the new government set out to ratify the majority recommendations of the commission and allowed the construction of the mosque on half of the disputed lot after the Islamists rejected compromise proposals like the establishment of a public park or a kindergarten, to serve everyone, on the disputed land.

In the course of the Nazareth affair and in its aftermath, the scenario that would repeat itself countless times throughout the country, developed: large scale illegal construction appears and when the legal authorities exhibit interest and begin investigating and taking steps, the Arab members of Knesset join the law-breakers in a sit-in protest, relying on their parliamentary immunity and lead the forcible opposition to enforcement of the law. And when the police enforce the law, employing force, and are exposed to provocations and a barrage of stones from the Arabs and the members of Knesset representing them and providing them with patronage, the Israeli press unleashes an attack against the "use of excessive force", joined by the usual chorus of sensitive, delicate politicians, who prefer to see the laws of the State trampled and state lands plundered rather than seeing the law breakers, arrested, forcibly removed or have their illegal houses demolished. And the police that are charged with preserving all of our lives and the public order withdrew from carrying out of its task because, why should they take risks and then have the politicians and the media shower them with bucketsful of vitriol? And the lawbreakers, who have learned their lesson well, increase the pressure, gain more points as there is no one to challenge them and stop them, raise the bar of audacity and set out on additional conquests, again and again. Therefore it is no wonder that when we come to the events of October 2000, police were stoned, Jewish citizens were killed, whole Jewish settlements were intimidated and placed under siege, enemy flags were brandished, words of incitement against the State were sounded

and outbursts of violence ensued and hostility to the government was blatantly expressed. The result? Another commission of inquiry, in which the focus is not on the lawbreakers but rather on those who defended against them and risked their lives in order to prevent the events from spreading. That is precisely the formula for the further emasculation of the police and encouragement of the Arab sector to continue to act rowdily without impediment, to demand "equality" and act condescendingly, to demand the protection of the law and at the same time violate it, to grasp onto their rights, while at the same time undermining the rights of others to tranquility and security.

In November 1999, just a few weeks before the millennium celebrations that they succeeded to ruin, the Islamists laid the cornerstone for their mosque in the church plaza, despite the fact that several heads of Arab countries asked them to postpone the construction until the conclusion of the celebrations. The tent had been removed from the site by court order; however prayers are still conducted there in order to convey uninterrupted Muslim presence until establishment of the mosque. However, the Christians, inside and outside the city, are astounded and cannot believe their eyes: Is this the State of Israel that claims to protect the rights of minorities and freedom of worship for all religions, which shamefully submitted to Muslim threats and violence? How could the Jews, who share a common heritage with the Christian world, and thanks to the majority vote of the Christian countries, the UN resolution on partition and the establishment of the State of Israel was adopted, yield to Islam that is a constant threat to them and will just hold them in greater contempt once they accede to their demands? Is this the same Israel that always placed its trust in the Christian West that is now closing its ears before the outcry that is emerging from there? How could official Israel join together with its Muslim enemies, who have never concealed their enmity and contempt for the State of Israel, and turn their back on the sympathetic Christian world? In any case, churches throughout the country locked their doors in protest on the day that they laid the cornerstone for the mosque and some of their leaders publicly expressed words of admonition, disappointment and bitterness against the authorities. The Vatican went the furthest, when it accused Israel of not only submitting to the Muslims but also of "stoking sectarian tension" in Nazareth.

It seems that the primary victim of the Shihab a-Din crisis is the Arab community in Israel itself, due to the fact that it emerged from it bloodied and beaten, divided and conflicted and its leaders directionless and helpless to the point that they needed to amplify their verbal attacks against the State in order to justify their existence and to accentuate the differences between them.

The day has passed when the Communist Party could supply slogans to unify communists and nationalists, Muslims and Christians, or when venerated figures like Tewfiq Ziad could provide an umbrella of unity for all. Personal politics, or politics of personalities, which stems, more than a little, from the direct elections for mayor, have taken the place of the traditional leadership models and have emphasized personal benefits, power struggles and positions of power over ideological declarations. If at the start of the conflict, there were attempts to resolve it through inter-denominational conciliation committees in order to prevent outbursts, ultimately, everyone became aware of the deep, profound rupture in the ostensibly united front of the country's Arab sector. Although it is conceivable that the al-Aqsa *intifada* did something to reunite the front in the positive sense – *vis-à-vis* the Palestinian struggle and in the negative sense – in terms of alienation from Israel to the point of boycotting its elections, it is still too early to assess the extent of the staying power of that trend. Already in the mid-1990s, the first signs of the changes that we are witnessing today were visible on the horizon. Because, not only did the communists lose their pre-eminence and the Islamists began taking their place and challenging the Israeli Arab political system, but the signing of the Oslo Accords engendered far-reaching hopes that the resolution of the Palestinian problem would resolve many of the identity problems of the Israeli Arabs, and would leave on their agenda primarily matters of equality within the country.

However, even before the outbreak of the violent events of the year 2000 that set the clock back one decade and even made the situation worse due to the Oslo expectations that were frustrated, it became clear to the Israeli Arabs that the question of equality that they have extolled is more complicated than it seems as each faction or group supporting a leader understood equality differently and expected that it would bring it to a different safe harbor. Some believed that equality meant separation as a disparate national entity within the State of Israel and were convinced that equality could only be achieved in a bi-national framework in which both groups would manage their equal concerns on the basis of their demographic proportions, meaning a regime of quotas like in Lebanon, with whose destructive potential we are already familiar. For others, Islamic identity takes precedence over Arab or Palestinian identity and therefore, until an Islamic state is established on the entire territory of the Land of Israel, in accordance with the Hamas vision, they will not be satisfied. And there are groups and individuals who would be satisfied with cultural autonomy, which would place all matters of Arab education and culture in their control and thereby deepen the gap between them and the majority culture until they

create an abyss that will ultimately be unbridgeable. For all of them, equality means the creation of a privileged group within the Israeli population that will be able to vote and be elected, to receive National Insurance and other welfare benefits, to determine the policy of the State regarding immigration, security, foreign affairs, settlement while at the same time not paying real taxes, aligning with the enemies of the State, avoiding its defense needs and undermining it. A luxury of that sort, as far as they are concerned, can exist as a transitional stage until they are able to realize the right of return and become the majority in the country. Sweet dreams for them, a nightmare for the Jewish majority; that is the foundation upon which they want to base the "equality". This does not include those groups and individuals, like the Druse, Christians as well as Muslims who regularly vote for Zionist parties and view complete adoption of an Israeli identity, with all of its rights and obligations, as the ideal solution for their misery.

Conspicuous among all of these groups, which seek solutions for themselves, not for their state, in a different form (as advocates of a state of all its citizens), is the restless group of Islamists that seeks it all here and now and provides an umbrella organization and a focal point of ideological-religious identity for all of the country's Muslims. This was dramatically manifest in Nazareth, which until that point had been a stronghold of Christians and communists, when six parties and factions, led by Abu Ahmed, head of the Islamic Movement in the city, joined together, in 1998, under the Islamist banner in order to promote the head of the list for mayor. As mentioned above, they were not successful that time, although they lost by a minuscule margin to the elected Christian mayor, however, they were successful in achieving a majority in the City Council, which was a genuine reversal. The significance was that even Muslims who were not members of the Islamic Movement, who voted en masse for the Muslim candidate, and thanks to whom he received most of his seats in the City Council, were now mobilized behind the implementation of Islamic agenda in the city and thereby indicated that they were coming under the Islamic Movement umbrella. It is easy to project how that affects the movement's reputation throughout the Arab sector. The movement was also able to clearly show that it was not a primitive cult of clerics, but rather that it also consists of first rate intellectuals and men of action as three engineers, one attorney, one businessman, one government official, a social worker and a building contractor were on its City Council list. Thus, when the Islamic Movement set out on its struggle in late 1997 in support of the *Waqf* Committee that ostensibly initiated the incursion to the church plaza, they correctly read the political map, recruited the city's

Muslims to the mission, raised the banner of Shihab a-Din during the election campaign and as a result, gained control of the municipality.

The self-confidence of the members of the Islamic movement was so great even before their electoral victories and in light of the helplessness of the authorities that continued to court them, until they, again, under the cover of the Nazareth *Waqf* Committee, issued a manifesto to the public in January 1998, in which they called upon the masses to congregate at the Shihab a-Din site to mark *Id al-Fitr*, after petitions had been submitted to the court against their incursion onto property that did not belong to them and their construction of an illegal building. However, even more significantly, they announced that their demands for the designation of the disputed land as *waqf* property had been approved by the arbiters of Islamic law in the country as well as by respected Muftis in Jordan and the Palestinian Authority, whose authority is greater than that of any court, due to the superiority of the *shari`ah*, which is the basis for their ruling, and because, while rulings of the court are applicable in resolving private, concrete problems, the *shari`ah* ruling is fundamental, general and eternal. The Muslims also accused the municipality and its Christian mayor of plotting against the city's Muslims and their consecration, in collaboration with the Israeli authorities. In other words, we have here an Islamist revolt against the Israeli law in effect in their country and an accusation that the Christian residents of their city are "collaborating" with the authorities, heaven forbid, those same authorities that are supposed to safeguard Muslim rights in the country and to permit construction of a mosque under pressure of violence and riots. In any case, this belligerent and anti-Christian spirit, in the wake of the Shihab a-Din affair and its ramifications, led to unbridled attacks in Islamic Movement journals. *Zaut al-Haq* wrote the following (April 21, 1998):

The Nazareth Municipality is enraged that the Islamic Movement demands relate to the most sensitive site of Project Nazareth 2000, because construction of a public square there would have perpetuated the [Christian] identity of the city. And a municipality source admitted that frustrating the public square project would spell the end of Project Nazareth 2000, as it will turn into a body without a soul...

With the situation as it was, the secular-Christian *al-Sinara* newspaper (February 6, 1998) called upon all the parties to come to their senses and upon the Muslims to consider the fact that other findings do not corroborate their claims

regarding the *waqf* status that they tried to accord the disputed plot. He called upon the parties to the dispute to settle their disagreements peacefully among themselves, lest “the police intervene in order to carry out the directives of the Israel Land Administration”. Thus, the influential newspaper also joined the attempts to mollify the Muslims in return for the injustice that they caused in their incursion to the site and to remove the Israeli Arabs from the jurisdiction of Israeli law, whose protection they seek. Hence, there is a direct line leading from the refusal to accept the authority of the law enforcement officials, a long time before the October 2000 riots, and totally unrelated to them and at a time when there was no confrontation between the Arabs of Nazareth and the police – and the willingness to confront the law and its enforcers displayed by the participants in the October riots. This pacifying message made no impression on the Islamists, who continued in their attacks against the municipality for “relying on government documents, while Muslims have unchallengeable Muslim records proving the status of the land” (*al-Abd w'al-Mithaq*, February 6, 1998). In other words, another attack against the validity of the law, which is just fine when it serves their purposes, however can be relegated to contempt and repression anytime that it does not meet their expectations. During those scorching days of crisis, the Islamic media aggressively raised the Shihab a-Din affair on a daily basis and some of them went back in history to times long ago in order to corroborate their claims and even quoted great Islamic law masters from neighboring lands to strengthen their challenge against Israeli law.

Some Arab newspapers revealed that Mayor Geraissi went to plead his case before the Chairman of the Palestinian Authority, Yasser Arafat, in order to seek his aid, however, at the same time his rival, Abu Nawaf turned to Prime Minister Netanyahu to request his assistance. Indeed, the political struggle makes strange and unexpected bedfellows, as all seems fair in its context. Others claimed that the Vatican and various Western consuls in Gaza pressured Arafat to exert his influence on the Islamic Movement to reconsider its intentions to construct the mosque and thereby enable the millennium celebrations to go on in an appropriate manner, without interruption. There were also reports that the Vatican promised Arafat support when the permanent status negotiations regarding Jerusalem come to pass in exchange for his open support for the Christian position in the mosque episode. Thus, the Western diplomats, whose origins in countries governed by law, respect for which should have been natural in their eyes, were also willing to buy quiet in Nazareth during the celebrations, not by standing alongside the Christians, who were being trampled by the surrounding Muslim majority, and not by supporting the legal steps taken against the trespassers, but by means of

publicly condemning Israel for ostensibly stoking the sectarian tension in Nazareth and by going so far as to offer far-reaching commitments at Israel's expense. At the same time, the trespassers threatened that "much blood will be spilled" if the Israeli police forcibly evicts them and that they are willing to "sacrifice hundreds of sacrifices" in opposing the eviction. One of the sheiks of the Islamic Movement was even quoted as saying, "We will not allow any project to stand on this land other than ours and we are prepared to die for it." Abu Nawaf, who generated the commotion and was the driving force behind it, stated that now that "the Muslim rights have been proven beyond the shadow of a doubt", they would proceed with construction of the mosque within "a few weeks", without, of course, taking into consideration, the matter that was pending in the courts. Thus, the Islamic Movement was transformed from defendant to plaintiff, from trespasser to "holder of rights", from a specious claimant at the beginning to possessors of a case that was "beyond the shadow of a doubt".

The Christian mayor did not remain passive, even though he knew that it would be a double-edged sword if he was to attack the Islamic Movement, whose strength in the city that he administered was considerable and he was not interested in alienating them. In any case, in response to the accusation of the Movement's members on the eve of the 1998 local elections, he issued a flyer in which he assigned responsibility for the developments to the Israelis. He claimed, for example, that it was the Security Services that added fuel to the flames. At the same time, he asked the administrator of the Northern district to mediate between him and the Islamists. He received unexpected assistance from MK Azmi Bishara, the most caustic spokesman, besides Tewfiq Ziad, for Arab nationalism in the country and a Christian himself, who declared that:

We witness today the dubious and dangerous attempt to create a new symbol, totally ignoring historical facts. As, a site that had no historical significance became, all of a sudden, the crucible of all solidarity and the establishment of a new collective identity, unprecedented in Nazareth, where brotherly relations were always extant... Project Nazareth 2000 simply seeks to emphasize the primary tourism sites in the city, and they cannot be blamed for the fact that there were simply no Islamic sites there. A similar situation exists in Bethlehem, in which all of the sacred sites belong to the Christians, despite the fact that the majority of the population is Muslim... It sounds like the Muslims are trying to establish for

themselves holy places of their own in Nazareth (*Pazal al-Makal*, January 22, 1998).

Geraissi, in his desperate attempt to unite the city around him in his election campaign, emphasized his stance on the same side of the barrier as the rest of the city's residents, against the Israeli Government's policy of dispossession, oppression and discrimination, although he was well aware of how much money that very government allocated to the success of Project Nazareth 2000. And at the very same time that he was preoccupied with garnering government support for his city and his struggle against the Islamists and their Shihab a-Din plans – he preferred to attack the government and bite the hand that feeds him. In response, the Islamic Movement accused Geraissi of collaborating with the administrator of the Northern district, with the objective of causing his defeat in the elections. It also resolutely condemned the mayor's attempts to describe the city's population as half Muslim and half Christian, while the reality was that the Muslims' status and numbers were decisively greater, and mocked him for his naiveté and for the fact that the city is downtrodden, while he and his party have governed it for twenty years. It also vented its rage against him for devoting himself to upgrading every Christian site in the city, while neglecting the sites sacred to the Muslims, downplaying them and shunting them aside, an unforgivable indiscretion. In response, the movement organized a mass assembly in the city leading up to the elections, and convened there an all-star cast of heads of the Arab leadership as well as the leaders of the two Islamic factions. This step raised many eyebrows, as while Abu Ahmed proclaimed his adherence to the moderate Southern stream, whose political department he headed, he displayed an affinity and mode of conduct in the course of the crisis that would have more easily identified him specifically with the extreme Northern stream.

As time passed, the tones became more and more belligerent and the Islamists accused the mayor of treason, despite all of his attempts to appease them and to place all of the accusations upon Israel. They personally demeaned him and even suspected that he attributed the city's deficiencies to the Muslims. They raised the speculation that the Christian mayor sought to collaborate with Netanyahu's government to bring about a situation where Nazareth would replace Bethlehem that was transferred to the Palestinians. It is worth noting that this trend among fundamentalist Muslims to associate the Christians with the Jews and thereby tarnish them with the mark of the other became especially prominent after the Islamic Movement victory in the 1988 local elections. Then, the movement won the mayoralty of six Arab councils, as opposed to only one

mayoralty (Kafr Bara) in the 1983 elections. Already then, one of the villages that was in upheaval from the elections even though the Islamic Movement was unable to gain control of it was Kafr Kana, adjacent to Nazareth, 75% of whose population were Muslims and only one quarter Christian. Sheik Kamal Hatib, a talented young member of the Islamic Movement, ran for election and garnered the highest vote total (38%), however since a runoff election was necessary to determine the winning candidate, he was routed by a coalition of his rivals. Nevertheless, his faction won one-third of the council seats (6 of 18), to the chagrin of many of the members of the frightened Christian minority, which joined the rest of the parties in defeating the fundamentalist candidate. In Nazareth of those days, headed by Ziad, the Islamic Party headed by Omar Sherara achieved much more modest results.

However, what transpired in those two adjacent towns that were once Christian but the number of Muslims there gradually overshadowed the shrinking Christian minority, marked the beginning of the political rupture between the Muslims and the Christians within the Israeli Arabs. As, while the Muslims tended more and more in the direction of the Islamic Movement, the surviving Christians had no choice but to close ranks around the Communist Party, as long as it dominated Arab politics in Israel. With the decline of communism, new options presented themselves to the Christians, as was explained above, among them a preference to support Zionist parties and revulsion from the fundamentalists who threatened them. In the 1989 elections, the fundamentalists still attempted to win Christian support, employing anti-Communist rationales and even proposing that Christian candidates appear alongside their Muslim colleagues. However, the Christians preferred to form coalitions with other political parties, which could potentially block the Islamist candidates, at least for the time being. At the same time, alarm bells began ringing in their ears as although they still constituted the majority in eight Arab towns and villages (and a minority in eight others, including Nazareth and Kafr Kana), they urgently needed to forge a new path that would enable them to preserve their separate identity and avoid being inundated by the growing fundamentalist Islamic stream. The urgency was especially acute and demanding due to the fact that Nazareth and Kafr Kana, the Christian strongholds in which there were sites sacred to Christianity dating back to the inception of the Church, and even beforehand was the area of Jesus' activity, fell into Muslim hands in quick succession.

Thus, the Christians in Israel read the handwriting on the wall and could not help but notice their political standing being relegated to the margins due to the rise of the Muslim fundamentalists, which caused them, obviously, to

lose confidence in their future, as a minority within a minority. And despite the fact that the more moderate elements in the Islamic Movement attempted to allay their concerns, under the common Arab umbrella, they are overcome with trepidation lest the Islamic plan to establish a state governed by Islamic law (*shari`ah*) in all of Palestine, restore not only the Jews, but they themselves, to the *dhimma* status from which they suffered for centuries. In 1992, the Islamic Movement journal, *Zaut al-Haq*, launched a scathing personal attack against the respected Christian Israeli Arab, Atallah Mansour, for having the audacity to criticize, in a series of articles, the moral conduct of some of the heads of the Islamic Movement. He was accused, no less, of spreading lies about Islam, insulting Allah's religion, and with intentionally impugning the integrity of the fundamentalist Muslims and the honor of Muslim women in general. They also accused him, just as they do to Israelis with whom they have differences of opinion, that he was guilty of racism, heaven forbid, without detailing how the Christianity of an Arab transforms him into the member of a different race, while in ordinary circumstances, both Christians and Muslims take pride in the same Arab identity. To top it off, he was also crowned with the title of a warmonger, who sows divisiveness among Israeli Arabs of different religions, of course, contradicting thereby their previous contention that the religions constitute rival races. Mansour, devoted to defending Israeli law, sued his detractors and was awarded compensation from them, though many Christians in the country started demanding legislation by the Israeli democracy that would protect them from incitement. They simply were unaware or did not pay attention as long as it was not directed towards them, that curses and invective of that sort, and even more egregious ones, were employed and publicized against Jews unimpeded. The upshot was that the State of Israel, which does not take the trouble to defend its Jewish citizens against the invective of the fundamentalist Muslims, came to the aid of the Christians who dared to complain.

Attacks on Christians are also sounded in sermons in the Islamic Movement mosques, just as they are sounded against the Jews, as well as in the print media and in ad hoc pamphlets. On the eve of one of the Muslim holidays in 1996, for example, a manifesto lumping together the Jewish and Christian infidels by turning them into negative role models for Muslim youth that was captivated by them in their desire to emulate them in walking the paths of the modern, Western world, was disseminated in Umm al-Fahm. Of course once the manifesto was released, it became public property and word of it reached everywhere and aroused a scandal among the Christians. As they were the owners and editors of most of the Arabic language newspapers in Israel, their shock resonated. Although the rank and file

Christians, apparently because the *dhimmi* mentality, according to which they submissively accept the decrees of the Muslim lest they arouse his fury, remained with them, failed to fight back, like Atallah Mansour, but they responded with an apology that they are no less Arab than the Muslims and showed, clearly and acquiescently, how other Christians, like them, contributed to Arab culture throughout history, which just invited additional, harsher attacks against them. In June 1996, an Arab-Christian graduate student sought to circulate a survey in Nazareth schools, in preparation for writing his thesis in psychology at one of the universities. The questionnaire that he distributed among the students in the Baptist School in Nazareth, and that was filled out by students in other Christian schools throughout the country without evoking any questions or hesitation, now raised a major storm, whose outbreak, and even more so the momentum that it gathered, could not have been anticipated. And again, in an obsequious response that could only be conceived by a *dhimmi*, the Christians (not to mention the Muslims) unleashed harsh attacks against their co-religionist whose only fault was that he dared to seek to present data on his research. He, once again, was accused of sowing "the poison of racism" between Muslims and Christians, once again transforming religion into "race", and the school that sanctioned this "disgrace", also did not emerge from this episode unscathed.

Another case erupted in Nazareth, which clearly showed the "brotherly" interdenominational relations that the city's leaders attempted with all their might to put on display. During the years of Tewfiq Ziad's rule over the Nazareth municipality, a mosque was constructed without a permit at the site of Nebi Sa`in (a local Muslim saint), which overlooked the city from a lofty mountain ridge, adjacent to a Christian monastery. As usual in cases of massive unlicensed Arab construction, a building permit was granted after the fact, after the city's leaders understood that if not, they would enter into a confrontation with the city's Arab majority. However that did not suffice: The leaders of the city's Islamic Movement concocted a new contention – that the large, adjacent lot (213 dunams), owned by the municipality, was *waqf* land. This became a bone of contention between the city's Christians and Muslims, and the Islamic Movement's journal devoted an entire article to it (November 22, 1996). The Christians were concerned that the Islamic claims of *waqf* status on coveted lands that were not theirs would gain momentum at their expense as part of the process of the Muslims taking control of the city, especially because neither they nor the Israeli authorities, by means of the various city planning committees, dared challenge the Islamic Movement's incursions; the Christians – due to their fear of arousing the rage of the Muslim majority against them; the authorities – due to the fact that they

never were anxious to engage in any confrontation with the Muslims. There is no doubt that this precedent that passed without a Muslim setback provided a tremendous boost to the Islamic Movement when it came to take over the Shihab a-Din locale a year later. This chain of events, not only attests to the pliability of the authorities, who acquire temporary quiet by mortgaging the future to law breakers, who just demand more and more, with no limits and no hesitation with steadily increasing audacity, but also clarifies, from another perspective, the Muslims' self-confidence that they can get whatever they want if they just persist in their demands.

These episodes and others shed light (or perhaps cast a shadow) on the structure and the vitality of the liberal Israeli democracy and on its ability to administer a state governed by law in a riotous region and with a minority population that will only be capable of internalizing these values by means of a long, slow process, for whose conclusion Israel has neither the time nor the patience to wait. For example, if an innocent survey to investigate a scientific problem in the disciplines of sociology and psychology can be perceived as a "racist" act, then what hope can there be for so paranoid a society to be liberated, to move forward in the area of science, to accept criticism and to respect his fellow man and those different from him? In the Western world, it is difficult for policymakers, who are always complaining about Israel, to arrive at a profound understanding of the situation and to understand behavior patterns different from the ones to which they are devoted. It is hard for them to understand, for example, why Israel does not allow the Arabs to build as they choose, to settle as they see fit, even on lands that do not belong to them or to "return" to their old villages that were destroyed or evacuated during the 1948 war or in its wake. They do not comprehend our system of state lands, which is a legacy from the days of the Ottoman Empire and is inconsistent with the right to private ownership popular in the West, because they believe that anything that does not privately belong to the Jews, is by definition Arab property as there are no other owners of the land. At the same time, when the offense is against the values of the Christian world, as was the case in Nazareth, they criticize Israel for its failure to stand up to those who trespassed into territory that did not belong to them and demand that the Jewish state get involved in the insoluble matter of Muslim-Christian relations, from which there is no possibility of it emerging unscathed. We have witnessed that both parties – the Muslims and the Christians, accuse Israel of "sowing discord" between them, as if without it peace and tranquility would reign in the land. The Latinate Patriarch, Michel Sabah, who is also a Palestinian-Arab, can, at the same time, rain fire and brimstone

upon Israel for its "repression" of the Palestinians and the Israeli Arabs and at the same time accuse them of abandoning the disputed lot in Nazareth to the mercy of the Muslims who constitute the majority of the Palestinians, both in Israel and in the territories. Because, as a Christian, who has the backing of the Vatican, he is in charge of the Christian interest and tends to it and is willing to confront anyone unwilling to protect it, but not those who are compromising it, however, at the same time, he is also a Palestinian patriot, who does not seek Israel's best interests and will therefore condemn it at every opportunity.

However, it is important to remember that Sabah, like the rest of the Christians in the country, fears for the fate of the Christian minority in the surrounding Islamic world, and will do everything he can to avoid arousing the anger of the Muslim rulers and thereby defend his flock and his status, as he will not be Patriarch, without a congregation of faithful. This duality, which the Vatican expresses in its approach *vis-à-vis* Israel, despite the major transformation that has taken place in the Church's position *vis-à-vis* the Jewish people and Israel in recent years, leads, on the one hand, to the Pope's desire to preserve his fragile relations with the Arab countries, even with the dictators and anti-Semites among their leaders; and on the other hand to his resolute position towards Israel regarding the preservation of Christian sites in the country, even in the face of Muslim rage here and around the world. Of course, as far as he is concerned, it is preferable that Israel is the one to pull the chestnuts out of the fire and he would, thereby, get the best of all worlds: Israel will preserve the Christian sites within its borders, even if, as a result, it is vilified by the Arab world, and he will maintain "balanced relations" with the Muslim, Arab and Palestinian worlds, even if that does not meet the approval of the state of the "Jewish brethren", before whom he was so insistent on apologizing for the dark past of their treatment at the hands of the Church. Thus, the Nazareth affair became a test of this duality, and therefore the Pope was personally involved in it. During Prime Minister Sharon's first visit to President Bush in March 2001, the host took time out from his preoccupation with problems of security and stability in the Middle East, and raised before his guest the issue of Shihab a-Din in Nazareth, as a result of pressure by the Vatican, which looks upon the United States as the only element capable of twisting Israel's arm on the matter at hand. The President implored his guest to resolve the matter in a positive manner and the Prime Minister promised to check into the matter and make a decision.

The State of Israel had already made a commitment, due to a tragic strategic mistake involving electoral considerations, to allow construction of the mosque. It is true that the Netanyahu Government restricted the construction to an

area of “only” 500 square meters, while the Barak government that succeeded it expanded the permit by 50%, in both cases at the expense of the plaza of the Church of the Annunciation, a government lot regarding which, ostensibly, any government could decide to do with it as it pleased; and it is true that the cornerstone was laid before a large crowd and the Muslims have refused ever since to leave the area until the actual construction work begins; and indeed, every government is bound by the decisions of its predecessors and failure to fulfill them, especially in light of the October 2000 riots, would add another extremely incendiary factor for which, no doubt, the Christians in Israel and the Vatican would accuse Israel. Nevertheless, in the final reckoning of our relations with the Christian world in general, and of establishing a model of the rule of law, Israel has no choice but to retract its approval of plans for the mosque. Israeli relations with the Christian world, despite all of the associated hypocrisy, and especially our relations with the United States, in which the standing of our Christian supporters is stronger than ever, requires us to nip the mosque in the bud. Because, from the Muslims, both at home and abroad, Israel will, in any case, evoke nothing but contempt for its submission to the resolute and the rioters, even if the mosque is approved; no gratitude, no votes for Zionist parties in elections, no understanding of government actions and no acceptance of the Jewish state that is anathema to them, will be forthcoming from them. On the other hand, the rupture that will result with the Christian world, with which we are connected at the hip, could lead to substantial problems. Everyone would be overjoyed to condemn Israel for its surrender (to whom? To the Muslims, friends of Europe?), for its oppression of the Christians within its boundaries etc., and Christian support for Israel is liable to further erode. Therefore, even if no one will be grateful to us for turning the tables, Israel has no alternative but to abrogate the aberrant, short-sighted decision of the previous governments.

From the perspective of the rule of law as well, Israel has no alternative other than to restore the status quo ante. Failure to do so will mean rewarding the trespassers in the church plaza and accepting their contentions. That will not only encourage other trespassers to seize lands that do not belong to them, in a situation where illegal construction of buildings and even entire settlements is completely out of control, but it will also set a precedent and model that one may not touch sites designated as *waqf* properties. It is easy to calculate what will happen in this state, in which the Islamic Movement is already taking its supporters on homeland excursions to sites in the hundreds of Arab villages that were destroyed in 1948, and now the opportunity presents itself to move there permanently, to declare the sites *waqf* properties and to settle there. The

trespassers to the Shihab a-Din enclave threatened that “much blood will be spilled” in light of the authorities’ directive to evacuate them and the police flinched, the law was not observed and ultimately the government yielded to the Muslim demands. It is not difficult to imagine tens of thousands of Islamic Movement activists invading hundreds of sites like those simultaneously, settling there with their wives and their children, with the determination that they learned from the Nazareth model and from the example of the Jewish settlers in their outposts in Judea and Samaria, and good luck finding police personnel to evict them forcibly, exposing horrific scenes to the cameras of the international media; and good luck finding an Israeli public able to silently bear those visions or an Israeli government that would order evacuations of that sort.

However, the matter of rule of law has an additional, decisive aspect: The courts in Israel, at two different levels, ruled that the Muslim claims of *waqf* in Nazareth were without basis and ordered to evacuate the plaza and to destroy the illegal structures that they built. What would be the face of the rule of law if the government was to act in violation of the ruling and allow the mosque, even if it possesses the authority to do so as owners of the property? Who will take the rule of law seriously if the government that sought the evacuation order and petitioned the courts for its enforcement, would change its mind after having received the aid that it requested? The questions remain unanswered.

CHAPTER SEVEN

FEARS, THREATS, FORECASTS, CONTENTIONS AND REALITY

With the escalation of the Israeli Arab problem into a national problem, with the potential for entering into a frontal confrontation with the country's Jewish majority, fears on both sides of the barrier come to light that reflect the sense of primal threat against the existence of that majority and that minority. These fears, of necessity, give way to myths and accusations. Each side attempts to tarnish its rival and to defend its positions creating a whole industry of rumors, speculation and predictions heralding the fast approaching day of reckoning. Of course, each party is entitled to and responsible for its fears and concerns and each party attempts to propose a different list of priorities than the other: The Jews by establishing inequality as a result of the Israeli Arabs' alienation and hostility towards the Jewish state and the Arabs by asserting that their unsympathetic attitude towards Israel is the inevitable result of their unequal treatment. Thus, just as in all issues in the struggle between Israel and the Palestinians, in which the Israeli Arabs have always taken part, two systems of discourse have formed, one the mirror image of the other. They describe a different past of events and happenings and as a result, dictate their fears and predictions based on their view of the past, their observation of the present as it develops before them and the future as they imagine it. We will discuss here the main points as they were formed and conceived on both sides, for failure to do so will render understanding the nature of the dispute impossible.

The Jewish fears stem from Arab demography, from the sense of a fifth column developing inside their house, from the fear of Arabs taking control of state lands and from their attempt to liquidate the Jewish and Zionist character of the State. The nationalist organization of Arabs in non-governmental and at times anti-establishment frameworks provides, at times, fuel for these concerns.

The Arabs complain about inequity, discrimination, ending the multi-cultural and multi-national character of the State, dispossession of their lands and their being suspected as enemies instead of being treated as citizens. Of course, these mutual fears sustain each other and the more dominant one element becomes during a given period and in particular circumstances, the more it projects on the other elements. For example, the Israeli Arabs' open support for the Palestinian *intifadas* constitutes proof in the eyes of the Israelis of the Arab attempt to undermine the State and the expropriation of Arab land for security or public purposes, serve as proof in Arab eyes of the State's desire to disengage them from their lands. Of course these phenomena exacerbate the sense of alienation, fear and the fast approaching day of reckoning, of all-out war and arouses other fears that are perceived as an outgrowth of the uncertainty and hostility in which both populations live. The contentions sometimes assume the form of a civil, legal struggle, as in the activity of *Adallah*, the Arab group that serves as the gatekeeper of Arab minority rights; or a demonstrative, violent struggle as in the outbursts of the nationalist and Islamist movements among the Israeli Arabs; or the political attacks by Arab members of Knesset and other leaders among them; or systematic incitement against the State, as is the case on Land Days, in the statements that appear in the Arab and Islamic media, Islamic festivals and various Arab religious and national events.

Perhaps the most severe of these forms of struggle, specifically because it is not quantifiable and it always remains elusive and given to the value judgment of the beholder, is the moral issue. The Arabs claim that since the Jewish state was established on the ruins of the Palestinian people, it never had the right to exist in the first place and it is destined to lose its Jewish uniqueness and become a state of all its citizens after the fact, so some of the injustice will be redressed. Therefore, the Arabs are very careful to speak of the *naqba* (tragedy) that befell them with the establishment of the State of Israel, refuse to recognize its symbols, to celebrate its holidays, to rejoice in its successes and to stand by its side in times of crisis. As far as they are concerned, the State exists in order to satisfy their demands as they understand them, without them lifting a finger for it, because they do not owe anything to the State that caused them an injustice, while it owes them everything. In this value judgment there is no cause and effect, there is no significance in the eyes of the parties what they did in order to cause the disputes and bloodshed, but rather the only thing that matters is what was done to them – aggression and injustice while what each of them did was merely in self-defense. Therefore, it is impossible to impose restrictions in this pseudo-moral struggle, while, bottom line, survival considerations determine the

positions and the balance of power determines the results of the struggle. This struggle is multi-layered and multi-topical, multi-dimensional and fraught with emotion. Everything is subject to dispute and every related topic has political roots, aspects and ramifications. Ethnicity, holy places, culture, citizenship, nationalism, individual rights, equality, land, demography are all weighty political issues, even when they are presented as merely “civil”, “humanitarian”, “formal” or “technical” questions. All of them have far-reaching political aspects and none of them seems “innocent” without ulterior motives hiding behind it.

Let us take, for example, demographic considerations. As far as the Arabs are concerned, they are the lords of the land in which they constituted the majority until the Jews came along and took the State and majority status from them. Now, in cooperation with their Palestinian brethren from outside the State, they are determined to restore themselves to majority status, both by means of the battle of the womb, which is working in their favor from within, and by means of implementation of the right of return from beyond the borders of the State. The battle of the womb rests on the assumption that the reservoirs of Jewish immigration to Israel are finite and will ultimately dry up, while Arab demography is infinite. Meanwhile, they believe that it is appropriate to combat Jewish immigration by means of the “moral” claim that the Arabs of the land have a much greater right to their homeland than do the Jews, all the more so than do the non-Jews coming to Palestine from Russia or Ethiopia. Furthermore, they are convinced that the right of return claim is likely to evoke sympathy around the world; hence the Israeli Arabs and the Palestinians promote it and mention it to anyone willing to listen. The numbers and the prognostications are on their side and whatever has not been overcome in the past by their power and their “morality”, will now be overcome by their slowly ticking demography. It is already clear that in 2020, the Arabs will constitute 30% or more of Israeli citizens (2 out of 7.5 million). If they continue at their present rate of growth, which has them already constituting 20% (1.2 out of 6 million), their demands for bi-nationalism in the country and the liquidation of the Jewish-Zionist character of the State will escalate even more. It is enough to witness today the events in Kosovo and Macedonia, where the Muslim-Albanians were a minority among the Serbs and the Macedonians, but with armed force they achieved hegemony in regions of those sovereign countries, to the point that they demand to shape the country in accordance with their wishes, or to secede from it. Just as in the case of the Israeli Arabs, the fact that the Albanian-Muslims have a state of their own in Albania does not satisfy their desire and they strive to manifest their nationalism in Serbia-Kosovo and in Macedonia in

an attempt to form “Greater Albania”. So too, the Palestinians will not suffice with Palestinian Jordan or the territories under Palestinian Authority rule, but they will seek to expand their territory into the borders of Israel, in order to include its Arabs – and in the future perhaps into sections of Lebanon.

The developing lesson in Kosovo and Macedonia has not escaped the attention of the Palestinians and the Israeli Arabs, especially because the Western powers are willing to reprise Munich, circa 2002, in which small countries dependent on them, like Serbia and Macedonia today and Israel tomorrow, will be forced to relinquish some of its sovereignty and its authority over its citizens for “the sake of peace”. At the same time, it is doubtful whether France and Spain, which are exerting pressure on Serbia and Macedonia, would be willing to grant the Arab minorities in their countries the same partner status that they are seeking to impose upon Serbia and Macedonia regarding the Albanian minority within their borders. Therefore, the results of the struggle in the Balkans will have ramifications for us here as well. If Israel allows the demographic clock to prevail, without taking preemptive corrective measures, it is liable to find itself losing territories in the Galilee, the Negev and the Triangle. The population density, which will exert ever increasing pressure on the environment and the resources, will also create difficulties in maintaining the present way of life as the country will descend to Third World status and will no longer be able to serve as a focal point for attracting Jews and an absorption center for them. In other words, the State is going to collapse under the yoke of its residents, which will only exacerbate the contrasts between the shrinking Jewish majority and the expanding Arab minority that is anticipating that its time will come. Of course, the proximity of the Arab population to its Palestinian brethren in the territories, in Jordan and in the rest of the Arab countries, will only serve to further intensify these tensions and bring the end closer, because the Israeli Arabs will not sit back and wait passively and obediently, when the possibility of taking matters into their own hands and joining together with their brethren across the border materializes on the near horizon. This will be the situation if the Palestinian Authority continues to exist, as suggested by the events of October 2000, in which the Israeli Arabs played an active role, and all the more so if the multitudes of Israeli Arabs join the chaos in the territories, in the absence of a central Palestinian authority, in a united movement of defiance, which will then link 6-7 million angry Palestinians on both sides of the Green Line, against the Jewish state that will not be able to do much to halt the downfall.

The Israeli Arabs, together with their Palestinian brethren, are pressuring the enlightened Israeli public, especially the delicate leftists who are susceptible to

such pressure, by means of “moral” reasons that appeal to the right of a person to his country, to loyalty to his people, to equality, to rights, to recognition of him as a person. As they are pulling on these sensitive heartstrings, the Israeli Arabs evoke in their leftist audience a sense of guilt and of the need to apologize, sustained by shame that they were partners in the establishment of the Jewish state, that they are partners in its existence and contribute to its defense and that they continue to adhere to “racist” Zionism that has ostensibly “gone bankrupt”. Thus, the need for post-Zionism, post-State and even going so far as sycophancy *vis-à-vis* the enemies who plot against them, inviting more flagellation in addition to the self-flagellation, which is their area of expertise, abnegation before the Arab arrogance and sometimes even openly standing alongside the enemies of their people and those who seek to harm them. Thus, instead of these Israelis showing the Arabs how much they have been spoiled by the Jewish state over the years, receiving unprecedented welfare services, economic development and standard of living, without being obligated to provide any sort of basket of services to their homeland; all the while demonstrating against the State, identifying with its enemies and scheming against it – under the protection of Israeli law and its courts – these delicate souls pity them, identify with them, condemn their State for failing to collapse before these enemies and recite in the ears of these Arabs that justice is on their side, that it is best if they rebel and demand more and that their country is implementing an apartheid policy against them while it discriminates against them and abuses them. Oh the shame! The result – the Arabs are encouraged, find justification for their demands, raise new demands on a daily basis and cite the words of encouragement of their Israeli friends as proof. Therefore, the rupture was great both among the Arabs and among some of the Israeli Left, after the events of October 2000, with each “disappointed” by the other; these because their unconditional allies abandoned them and the others because their unconditional protégés bared their claws during the riots.

In contrast, the Israeli Left does not proffer a demand to the Arabs, on a similar moral basis, not only to accept Israel’s existence as a Jewish state for the long term as is, with the Arabs a minority within it, but primarily to fulfill their obligations to the State in which they categorically demand citizenship and equality. What moral right do they have to make such a demand at the same time that they clearly show that its security, strength and prosperity are not high on its list of priorities, but rather that the contrary is true? Furthermore, their demands for equality and the abolishment of the alleged discrimination against them rely on an ostensibly “moral” equation: As opposed to the rights that the Jews enjoy. However, there is another, no less moral, side to this

matter. A demand for equality and rights in the State and even more so the claims regarding discrimination must be based on some sort of comparison: Discriminated against relative to whom? How? If it is in comparison to the Jews, from a moral perspective, it is impossible to compare the two populations while one set out to defend their country, personally experienced one or two wars, from which, at times, they did not emerge whole in body and spirit, while, optimally, the other looked on as spectators, and, in the less optimal case, identified with their state's enemies. This is not equality, but rather a demand for an immoral privilege of giving preference to one segment of the population over another, with one living in a rose garden and the other constantly exposed to life threatening dangers. And another moral aspect of this matter: While everyone has the right to be supported by the State in his weakness and need, no collective has the right to take from the State any more than it contributes to it. It is well known that the Israeli Arabs pay less taxes, contribute nothing to the wealth and the security of the State and are even a burden upon it and therefore there is no basis for their expectations that they can milk it dry forever and demand ever increasing government allocations from the resources that they expend no effort to increase.

Most of the weight of the gnawing at the vulnerable Israeli conscience concentrates, of course, on the "humane" issue that Israel "violated" through its very establishment when it "dispossessed" innocent people from their homes, liquidated their villages and established its kibbutzim and cooperative settlements on their ruins. Israel is ordered to "atone" for its sins, the Arabs along with their supporters on the Left demand that Israel "acknowledge its responsibility", adopt the Arab "right of return" and pay reparations for the damages wrought two generations ago to the ancestors of today's refugees. These "moral" demands, which are completely, or partially, supported by segments of the Israeli Left, are the most severe source of the traumatic feelings on both sides. The Arabs – because failure to ameliorate the injustice, in other words, failure to achieve victory and remove Israel from the stage of history and once again take their place in its stead, will not satisfy them and the conflict will not be resolved. The Israelis – in light of the terrifying nightmare of millions of Arabs coming and uprooting them from their lands or inundating them with their multitudes and drowning them in the "New Middle East" in which they will have no individuality or existence. Thus, the population and possession of the land are the two keys to victory in the struggle over the land, and they are interdependent: The more the population of one side or the other increases, it will necessarily expand to additional tracts of land for living space; and the more that its possession of

the land broadens, the more its population will grow. The reality is astonishing in both aspects and both are worthy of discussion. We have already seen the essence of the internal demographic threat posed by the Arab birthrate among us, even without implementation of the right of return. We will also see that alongside the claim of dispossession and destruction of the Arab villages, there is also an accelerated process of Arabs taking control of State lands, with the State incapable of preventing it. There is another connection between these two fundamentals of land and population: The accelerated birthrate – which has been recently augmented by Palestinians and other Arabs who infiltrate Israel in search of employment, or get married, genuinely or fictitiously, to Israeli spouses in order to gain residency or citizenship privileges – also leads to the establishment of entire “illegal” settlements, lacking planning or permits, on State lands. All attempts by the authorities to destroy this illegal construction are confronted with violence and life threatening situations.

Of course, the root of the problem, like the other aspects of the general Israeli Arab conflict, lies in the different narrative that each side cultivated for itself regarding the events of 1948 and their implications. The reference is not specifically to the intentional distortions, even though their place is not totally absent, but rather to the perspective, the view of the events, which tells the story in a self-righteous, one-sided manner that leaves the other side no room to be right and to present its position. There is not even a consensus about the facts, not to mention their interpretations and the conclusions to be drawn from them, which construct two unbridgeable worlds of concepts. According to the conventional numbers, there were close to 1,400,000 Arabs in Mandatory Palestine, half of whom became refugees or displaced persons as a result of fear of the war. Since then, two additional generations have emerged from that “Generation of the Desert”, which brought about the doubling of the refugee population approximately every 20 years. In other words, 700,000 in 1949 to approximately 1,500,000 in the 1970s – and their further doubling to 3,000,000 in the 1990s and the addition of another million by the year 2000 – altogether 4 million. The Arab population in Israel also grew by a million in the course of 50 years, even if we do not take the Arab residents of East Jerusalem into account, which encumber this balance with an additional quarter-million Palestinians, half of whom are permanent residents and half of whom are refugees and displaced persons. The distinction between the two lies in the fact that a significant portion (perhaps 20%) of the Arabs that remained in Israel upon its establishment and became its citizens, were also displaced from their villages of origin and they crowded into other existing Arab settlements. The same was true regarding the

Arab refugees who crossed the State borders during the war and could not/were not able/were not permitted to return. However, their common origins in the same Arab villages that were destroyed, like their brethren who became refugees beyond Israel's borders, provide them with a common basis for their claim to the right of return. In other words, restoring the "internal displaced persons" to their villages that were abandoned during the war, necessarily brings with it the restoration of the "external displaced persons", because their legal status is equal, however, hence, one's dream becomes the other's nightmare, and here, their paths diverge and the dispute exacerbates.

As far as the Arabs are concerned, Israeli Arabs, Palestinian Arabs and Arabs in general, responsibility for the fate of the 700,000 refugees and their descendants, in other words, all of the Israeli Arabs, their children and their grandchildren, who lost their homes with the establishment of the State and are since scattered in their various countries of residence: Israel, the territories, the surrounding Arab countries and the distant exiles, rests completely upon the Jewish state. Thus, there is no distinction between one and the other and one's solution will necessarily serve as a precedent for the other. That is also the source of the Israeli Arab expectation of the comprehensive implementation of the right of return as well as the demand of the entire Palestinian nation to see all of its exiles ingathered in their land, even if it will engender the end of the Jewish state. As far as the Arabs are concerned, without dealing with the various forms of and motives for their flight in 1948-1949, they are all considered dispossessed, displaced and expelled people, against whom the Jewish state plotted and explicitly planned to evict them from the land. Therefore there is no recourse other than to repatriate them both in order to redress the historical injustice and to cause the Jewish dispossessors to uproot and return to the homes from which they came to Israel. The Jews explain that many distinctions must be made in the episode of the Arab flight from Israel as some were indeed expelled from the war zone in order to prevent harm befalling them, however much larger segments joined our enemies and remained in the country to fight against the Jews, while the decisive majority, which was caught in the war's crossfire, fled for their lives until the danger passed. Furthermore, the Jews claim that it was not a pleasure trip or a professional excursion that brought them to Israel, but rather the two thousand year yearning to return to their ancestral home. These two bodies of contentions cannot be confronted or contradicted as they speak of two different types of logic, which each side employs at its convenience and, therefore, everything returns, not necessarily to the historical-ethical dispute, but to a factual reality anchored in the sorry

state of affairs on the ground, on the one hand, and in the balance of power between the combatants, on the other.

In the historical-ethical dispute, the Jews had the advantage over the course of many years, especially when the subject was the Christian world, whose culture is based on the Bible and which internalized the connection between the Jewish people and the Land of Israel from infancy. Therefore, the return of the Jewish people to its land was perceived as a continuation of the emotional historical saga of this eternal nation and the manifestations of “Zionism” among many fine Christians over past centuries will attest to this. Modern-day fundamentalist Christian denominations are especially active as they have transformed the return of the Jewish people to their land into one of the fundamental tenets of their faith to the point that they seem to us to be the last Zionists. There are those who claim that it is a mistake to rely on those supporters as their “Zionism” is based on their eschatological prophecies according to which the Jews are going to ultimately follow the path of Jesus. However, that is the point: It is specifically by means of the Jews adhering to them that they publicly state that they do not believe those apocalyptic prophecies, because if they were genuine, the Jews would be the first ones to go to war against them. Of course, added to the above are the horrors of the Holocaust, which has weighed heavily on the Christian conscience for the last two generations. Those are the reasons that they want to repair the damage by restoring the Jews to their land. However, these reasons of “The Antiquities of the Jews” and of the “debt of the Holocaust”, which were supported primarily by the Christian West, have gradually weakened in recent years and the Arab counterclaims on these matters have risen to take their place:

- A. The antiquities of the Jews is shunted aside by the more ancient antiquities of the Palestinians, descendants of the Canaanites, who were expelled, destroyed and exiled from the land. Thus the present day Palestinian struggle is nothing more than a continuation of the ancient Canaanite struggle for survival against the Israeli invasion;
- B. At the same time and without explanation of the contradiction of the previous paragraph, the sovereign Jewish existence in the land, including both Temples, over the course of a thousand years, is explicitly denied. That millennium is simply erased from the Arab-Palestinian history books and more than a few Israeli Arabs protest the fact that the State feeds them that “bogus” Jewish history;
- C. There is a systematic denial of the Holocaust in Arab and Palestinian

publications, including some of the journals of the Arabs in Israel, in order to eliminate one of the rationales for Western-Christian support for Israel from the political discourse. European Holocaust deniers, like Geroudi in France, are placed on a pedestal in Arab countries and are received as heroes by heads of state, including those who have made peace with Israel.

Another ethical matter that the Arabs have been embellishing lately is the revitalization of the right of return as one of the fundamental basic rights of a person who was dispossessed from his home and the natural right to return to his homeland when he so desires. That is the reason that once Israel's moral rationales for existence were undermined in the eyes of the world, as explained above, the natural right of the original, dispossessed population to replace the entity about whose legitimacy there are so many question marks rises to the fore. Thus, the Arabs of the land, both citizens and the Palestinians beyond its borders, establish as obvious their right to return to their homes as taking precedence, from an ethical-moral perspective, over the rights of Jewish immigrants from foreign countries. Israel's refusal to adopt that contention, which would lead to its destruction, is therefore denounced as "racism", because it accords supremacy to the "Jewish race" by the very terminology of the Israeli Law of Return, instead of supremacy or at least equality to the Arab right of return. That is the source of the recurring Arab contention, including among Israeli Arabs, regarding "racist" Israel; and every time that there is any claim against them, they relevantly, or especially irrelevantly accuse Israel of racism. Try to logically convince them that Israel has granted civil rights to the Arabs, who make up 20% of its population, while Jordan and Saudi Arabia legally prohibit Jews from becoming citizens in their countries, it will have no effect and they will continue to contend that Israel is the racist one and not those Arab countries. Try to show that Jews left most of the Arab and Islamic countries, especially due to religious and ethnic persecution while the Israeli Arabs are multiplying, maintain their citizenship there and millions more Arabs are banging on its door in order to become citizens, it will be to no avail. Israel is always the racist one and they are the munificent and tolerant ones. Try an alternative explanation: The entire variety of conceivable races exists among the Jews: From African blacks to blond-haired blue-eyed Slavs, so where is the racism and to what purpose – in order to preserve the non-existent "racial purity"?

Perhaps it is merely ethnic-religious-social discrimination, due to the political tension and the ongoing dispute – in which the Arabs in the country adopt positions blatant in their hostility towards the State – and that requires it to

defend itself from the minority that seeks to oppose it? That is preposterous as the Arabs in Israel have a national identity that everyone must recognize and submit to its demands, for if not, anyone who refuses to commit suicide will be branded a racist. The Jews panic at the sound of such epithets and will do everything to prove that they are not racist, even if the price is suicide. After all, it is only the ethnic-national identity of the Arabs that is legitimate and understandable to every “enlightened and progressive” person, while the Jewish identity and nationalism, perish the thought, as they belong to the reactionaries whose time has past and is the legacy of people who have outdated opinions or outdated minds. For, who would dare to utter a profanity like “Zionism” in this post-Zionist era? Thus, Arab nationalism, that seeks to provide national expression for the Arab aspirations (times 22 different Arab countries), all the more so the Islamic nationalism that seeks to define the identity of almost 60 countries around the world, are completely legitimate and are located in the very center of political correctness. In contrast, the small, solitary, isolated Jewish state has pariah status due to its “racism”, is not part of the world consensus and there is nothing more reviled than its national liberation movement – Zionism. The proof is that it was characterized “racist” by a UN majority in 1975 and rid itself of that contemptible epithet in 1991 thanks to American pressure – much to the chagrin of the Arabs who did not accept the amendment. Ever since, the Arabs, among them those who have signed peace treaties with us, have continued to shout from all the world’s rooftops about the racism of Israel and Zionism. The sword of re-adoption of that disgraceful resolution continues to be held over Israel’s head in various international forums, while Sudan, which kills Christians and engages in the slave trade, or Saudi Arabia that does not allow Jews to enter its borders, or Japan that has abused its Koreans for generations, or Zimbabwe that persecutes the remnants of its white population, or Sri Lanka that kills the Tamils living there, or Iraq and Turkey that liquidate the Kurds in the thousands, or the Russians who are committing genocide in Chechnya will sanctimoniously and hypocritically vote with those slandering Israel as “racist” – and the Israeli Arabs rejoice and exult, as the world, by means of a decisive majority vote, provides justification to their longstanding contentions.

However, together with the attempt to gain control over the moral-ethical-historical high ground, the Arabs are also conducting a *Realpolitik* propaganda campaign, signaling to the Christian world that it is not right that they recognize Israel and its contentions as a way of eroding Israel’s legitimacy, to which the Israeli Arabs are happy to enlist. Until 1967, Israel was the small, besieged, threatened, pioneering object of admiration and sympathy in the Western world,

that every time the Arab-Israeli equation was mentioned, it seemed worthy of support. However, after 1967, the Arabs, with the generous assistance of the tormented Israeli Left, succeeded in turning the equation on its head and from then on to speak of the Israeli-Palestinian dispute. In that equation, Israel is the occupier, the oppressor and the expansionist, while the Palestinians are the stateless, miserable, occupied and oppressed people who are deserving of the world's sympathy as if all of the threats against Israel would dissipate were the Palestinian wishes to be granted. The victimization of the Palestinians – who in one fell swoop were transformed from aggressors, who devise evil against Israel and who battle against it by means of terrorism, which they declared in their charter and in their actions, against helpless victims – also played into the hands of the Israeli Arabs who hurried to join this process in which they too became victims of Israel's discrimination, oppression, malevolence and racism. Thus, their contentions against Israel around the world dovetail with the contentions of the rest of the Palestinians and accord them greater validity, as they are two parts of a nation suffering from the same affliction and bitterness. Thus, the right of return that is supposed to provide the cure for all of the Palestinian ills, was adopted by both branches of the Palestinian people and it is resolutely voiced *vis-à-vis* the entire world as the only way to liberate the Palestinians as a whole from oppression and racism. However, they do not explain why they seek to continue to hold onto their oppressive Israeli citizenship and also to expand their circle of oppression by the addition of their returning brethren under the yoke of this racist citizenship.

More than one-fifth of the Palestinian refugees are located in the Gaza Strip where they constitute approximately 80% of the more than a million residents. Most of them originated in southern Israel, from which they fled / were evicted / were convinced to leave during the 1948-1949 war. The overwhelming majority of them live in pathetically crowded and squalid conditions, which create the great social-religious pressure cooker that is threatening to blow up in Israel's face. That population alone will pass the two million mark in less than 20 years and will join together with the tremendous pressure and the destructive weapon in the hands of the Palestinians and the Israeli Arabs in order to inundate the Jewish state with repatriated refugees, who have the right of return. In contrast, only one third of the population of Judea and Samaria consists of refugees (more than a half million out of less than two million). Both populations maintain an emotional, perceptual, educational and almost mythical relationship with their villages of origin and in the days prior to the deluge even organized groups of tourists, youth and adults, who traveled to feel the core of their identity with

their feet and see it with their own eyes. Their longings were exacerbated and their yearning grew when they saw, on the ruins of their non-existent villages, Jewish settlements, which left no vestige of that which was previously there, that grew and flourished. As there were more than 400 villages of that sort that exist no longer but remain only in the memory of the generations; and in light of the present flourishing of those places in the hands of Jewish farmers or settlers – which indicates what could have been done with them had the original population remained in place – the frustration and the longing to return there and to restore past glory grow. Thus, it is clear that this Palestinian narrative sees nothing but the gloomy result of that war, in which, of course, the Jewish aggressors are accused and the myth that had they only remained in place and not been evicted, they would today be the residents of the flourishing settlements and they would not be living as refugees, as a burden on anyone.

The Israeli narrative does not interest anyone, not even the Israeli Arabs, who head the projects memorializing, recording, mapping and rehabilitating the villages that were destroyed in order to facilitate the return of the refugees one day. The Jewish contention that it was Israel that agreed to the resolution partitioning the land in 1947 that would have left the entire Arab population in place and the refugee problem would never have been created does not interest them. They also have no interest in the fact that the State of Israel was declared on a platform of peace and neighborliness with its neighbors and that after it was established, it invited the Arab citizens remaining there to accept its authority and to become equal citizens within it, however, they preferred to undermine the existence of the Jewish entity and joined their brethren from the surrounding countries who invaded it in order to obliterate it. They are conscious of the fact that had they been successful, the Jewish state would have been unable to survive. In other words, despite the fact that they sought to destroy the Jewish state and were close to succeeding in that task had it not been for the heroism of the small number of Jewish fighters, they still have the audacity to raise the “moral” contention as justification of their position as if morality stands exclusively on the side of Arab existence and is forsaken and silent when the topic of discussion is Jewish existence. The Arabs also charge that a military government was imposed for years in order to restrict their actions, during the years that the State was genuinely fighting for its life. They do not want to remember that they provided significant assistance to its enemies to harm the State and had it not been for the restrictions on their movements, who knows what tragedies we could have anticipated. In other words, everything that was perceived by Israel, under the conditions extant in the period of the *fedayeen*

attacks, the infiltrations and the murders of Israelis, as a crucial security necessity, without compromising the Arab citizens' right to vote, seems to the Arabs to be discrimination, limitation and conspiracy. The upshot is that it is no longer a confrontation of morality versus morality or compromising of rights versus the necessity to exist, but one must assess the entire majority-minority relationship in terms of an existential war, on both sides. It is only natural that the majority will prevail over the minority.

In other words, Israel has no reason to apologize for its actions over the years. On the contrary, if there is anything that evokes admiration here, it is the openness, generosity, and the extreme risk-taking of the democratic, considerate and tolerant State of Israel in the face of a security situation in which no Western country in a similar situation would allow itself to act with such restraint. One need only remember the treatment accorded by the Americans and British to their citizens of foreign descent during World War II, in order to understand the issue at hand. Therefore, all Arab attempts to burden Israel with any moral debt to them or to bring it to accept responsibility for something that it did not generate should be rejected out of hand. There is but one objective of this distorted "moralization" – to cause Israel to regret its establishment, recognizing the injustices that it ostensibly caused and to force it to rectify those "injustices" by adopting the massive right of return that will bring an end to the State. The State was not established in sin, but rather as the fruits of one of the most just, most successful and longest-standing national movements in the modern world. All of the Arab claims for justice, after they initiated the war – and that is the true sin – were only renewed after their plot to overcome Israel by force failed. One who speaks of justice, should place it on a pedestal in the first place, before opting for war and not after it tried and failed in that war. Therefore, if anyone owes compensation to anyone else, it is the Arabs who brought upon us more than six wars and 20,000 victims among our finest youth and who are ever ready to cause additional fatalities. In the distribution of culpability for this continuing bloodshed, the overwhelming share of the blame, if not more, must be apportioned to the Arabs.

Thus, opposite the Arab sense of despair over the fact that the number of their refugees is gradually increasing while the State of Israel is gradually gaining strength, its population is growing and filling the land – thereby diminishing its ability to absorb refugees even if it was to agree to do so – the determination of the Israeli population to not allow the demographic inundation to play on its conscience is gradually growing, especially after the bloody events of October 2000, in which the willingness of the Palestinians, in Israel and beyond its

borders, not to put an end to the refugee chapter even if agreement was reached in all other areas. This does not expedite, of course, the permanent solution of the refugee problem, because the Palestinian authorities along with the Israeli Arabs refuse to accept any arrangement that will resolve their problem on a permanent basis in their countries of residence. They fear that the beginning of a solution of that sort would mean tacit recognition that the dream of return has come to an end. And the Palestinian authorities along with the Palestinian activists and the Israeli Arab leadership built their political careers and cultivated their power bases on the “unassailable Palestinian right to return to their homes”. They built and cultivated the “temporary” (for three generations) refugee camps on the basis of that assumption, educated generations of children and prepared them for “return” and prevented any attempt to resolve the problem by means of immigration and rehabilitation even after absorption possibilities were made available in attractive places like Canada and Australia. Therefore, no Palestinian leader, not even an Israeli Arab, will dare to eradicate the dream of return or to urge his audience or constituency to open their eyes and see the reality that developed. While Palestinian persistence in pursuing the right of return can evoke sympathy on the human level or admiration for the persistence and resoluteness involved therein, it is impossible to avoid the gloomy conclusion that the Arab leaders deceived those unfortunate people to the point that they backed them into a corner from which there is no escape and they bear the full weight of responsibility and the moral burden for it.

Of course, a person may fight to the death for what he perceives to be his right. If the Israeli Arabs and the rest of the Palestinians believe that it is preferable for them to rot in the refugee camps forever and to die a “martyr’s death” for their faith rather than recognize the right, at least the partial right, of the other; in other words, if they adopted the hackneyed mantra of “to die or conquer the mountain”, which even those who coined it no longer advocate; or they prefer a complete, sweet, albeit unrealistic, victory over a painful though achievable compromise, more power to them. The Israeli Arabs came very close to recognizing that reality until the unfortunate Oslo Accords stimulated their appetites anew and they rushed, at least some of them, to fall in line with the comprehensive demands for the right of return, with the Palestinian use of violence and with the vain dreams to terminate the Jewish state. However, they entangled themselves in a rhetorical and behavioral trap in that they locked themselves into a contradiction from which there is no escape: On the one hand, they complain to the State about their ostensible discrimination with the demand and the expectation that it will serve as their benefactor beyond what

they deserve based on their negative contribution to its existence and welfare, while on the other hand they complain against Israel, at home and abroad, as if it was a foreign entity, whose well-being they do not crave. After all, if they despise, criticize and slander it at every opportunity, rejoice at its difficulties and mourn their achievements, how can Israel bestow its goodness upon them when they do all they can to prevent that goodness from being produced? Furthermore, if they want it to be diluted to the point of liquidation of its Jewish and Zionist character – the foundations that made the State of Israel what it is – how can they demand that it assist them in achieving their objective? After all, the money that it invested in their education was ultimately turned against it. Their leaders, the harshest spokesmen against the State, passed through its institutions of higher learning and were the recipients of grants and subsidies that helped them gain degrees and professions that have been a thorn in the State's side. Law school graduates among the Arabs, who were at times the beneficiaries of reverse discrimination in the entrance exams in order to “promote the minorities”, are today the defenders of terrorists and other enemies of Israel in the courts, or are “*Adallah*” activists, who find “justice” exclusively in Arab riots but not in their indictment or their being called to order; only incitement against the State, but no punishment for the inciters.

The Israeli public watches and is astounded, especially in the wake of the October 2000 riots, in which all constraints were shattered, all red lines were crossed and all of the most basic principles of equity and loyalty were violated. Is this what we hoped for? Is this the use that the Israeli Arabs have for the rights and equality that have been granted them? Are the rights that they demand from the State nothing more than a tool at their disposal to undermine it? Is not this a clear case of “*Akal Nakar*” – to eat and estrange, in Arabic? Insatiable demands for additional weapons in order to rebel against us? And then our people, even the innocent, fair, egalitarian and democratic among us, began to ask themselves: “Where did we go wrong?” Do we really discriminate against the Arabs, as they claim? Will not giving them freer rein remove all control over the future of the State from our hands? For the first time, a substantive and profound rupture has taken hold of relations between Jews and Arabs. Jews are afraid to congregate in Arab villages for their purchases and leisure and prefer to avoid Arab company. Who would want to get together with them again after at the height of the riots, cars were stopped on Israeli roads and their passengers were asked if they were Jews, when they confirmed that they were they were beaten, their cars were damaged and in two instances they were even killed by the belligerent Arabs. The implication is that the *intifada* moved into Israel in all its intensity under

the unceasing incitement of the Arab leaders, who exploit their immunity as members of Knesset in order to act with blatant hostility against the State that provides that immunity – and all the while they justify themselves because they are victims of “discrimination”, heaven forbid. Is it really so bad?

Discrimination, as far as they’re concerned, means that their standard of living is below the national average, the level of employment in their villages is also low, many professions are closed before them, they do not receive allocations at the same levels that the Jews do, they are dispossessed from their lands and disturbed in their demonstrations against the State; however, it is possible to assess each of these contentions individually and refute them. Furthermore, it is also possible to prove that when they were treated with reverse discrimination by the Rabin Government, those were the years of the greatest unruliness, the most audacity and the greatest alienation *vis-à-vis* their State, while their voting for the isolationist Arab parties reached its climax. And another basic matter that they must remember – when they come to demand rights, they must come without sin and prove that they have also fulfilled everything that is expected of any other citizen of the State. In the immortal words of Binyamin Netanyahu: If they give – they will receive, if they do not give – they will not receive. Furthermore, in any society, even in the most democratic among them, there are many social strata, there are educated and uneducated, rich and poor, go-getters and slackers, those with ambition and those lacking initiative. Has everyone belonging to the first half of these pairs been advanced by the State and does everyone who was unsuccessful place the blame on the State? Many Jews live better than the Arabs do, but the opposite is also true. If there is discrimination, it is more against Jews than it is against Arabs: Every Jewish young man and woman devotes three or more years of his life to serving his country, specifically during their most decisive formative years, while the Arab youth have no such obligation. Is that discrimination? Yes, but against the Jews. The Arabs do not pay real taxes to the State and on the other hand they have a crime percentage twice the national average. In other words, they consume more than they produce, not always individually but collectively and the entire difference is funded from the payments of the Jewish taxpayer, the legendary “discriminator” about whom they complain. They receive National Insurance allocations in unemployment benefits and childbirth grants, income augmentation and retirement benefits, immeasurably greater than the amount that they contribute to State coffers. And who pays the difference? Of course, the discriminatory Jew.

If the Israeli Arabs are dissatisfied with the rate of their suckling at the udder of the State, then let them find another state that will coddle them and provide

them with what no citizen in any Arab or Islamic country receives, or let them stand up and assume responsibility upon themselves and take action. Let them just think about the fact that because they were lucky to live in a modern prosperous country with welfare, health and education services and generous government allocations, they enjoy a much greater portion of the national pie than their efforts and accomplishments would allow them in a different country. In the Arab countries, the per capita income was 15 or 20 times lower than in Israel, and had they been there they would not have received any of the bounty that the State of Israel bestows upon them – and they call that discrimination. That prosperity was not amassed thanks to them, but rather despite the fact that they constitute a heavy burden, economically and in terms of security, upon the State. In other words, if they were not here, the per capita income would be higher. So who are the ones discriminated against if not the Jewish majority? The per capita income skyrocketed not because of the government but thanks to entrepreneurs, with talent and ability, who invested their money in studies and expertise and thereafter their audacity and money in sophisticated industry, bringing prosperity to themselves and the State. Has anyone prevented the Arab entrepreneurs from doing the same in their villages? In the few instances that they did so, it resulted in wealth and prominence. Just as the State does not take credit for those Arabs who became wealthy within its borders, it similarly can not take the blame for those who did not get rich. The State provides the Arabs with aid above and beyond what it provides the Jews, by allowing Arab youth more teaching hours in its institutions while their Jewish counterparts spend their best years in the army. Discrimination? Yes, against the Jews, not the Arabs.

This is also attributable to a mentality common to the Third World, of which the Arabs are members. There, not only must everything stem from the State and everyone awaits its utterances, but the individual, even if he sees a pile of rubbish, would prefer to sit on it rather than clean it up. There is no approach to the public domain, to the area beyond the family and the neighborhood and therefore there is no consciousness of civilian mobilization for the benefit of the collective. It is much easier to accuse the State of neglect than to get up and do something to fix it. There is no lack of wealthy people among the Arabs who could contribute and there is also no lack of people fit to support their families. However, to do something for the general good, to volunteer and contribute, it is unthinkable. The exception to this – to their credit – are the members of the Islamic Movement, who have ably mobilized their public for volunteer activities, to make donations and play an active role, financially and

physically, in the movement's projects. The proof is – in the six local councils administered by members of the movement, they have been successful, with no external funding, but rather by means of internal mobilization, to make their settlements flourish. The upshot is that the “sewage flows through the streets of Umm al-Fahm”, in the words of the common phrase, not because the Arab settlements have been abandoned by the government, but rather because of the self-neglect of the residents, who place the responsibility on the State and add their miserable condition to their list of discriminations. It is true that the State provides greater assistance to the Jewish settlements; however those funds originated in the pockets of the Jewish taxpayer. They were earmarked to subsidize those who did a thing or two for the State before they came to make demands of it. Their local councils also made an effort, and to a large part were successful, to collect taxes from their residents. The Arab local councils do not collect real taxes, maintain inflated bureaucracies controlled by corrupt nepotism, and their Arab residents do not pay their national taxes, which are the source of these funds, in the first place. Therefore, what are they complaining about? It is easy, politically popular and photogenic to stage a sit-in in the Prime Minister's office and to proclaim discrimination, responsibility for which they place on the government, which generally concedes in order to gain quiet until the next elections, when the cycle begins again.

One who strolls in the streets of Taibe, Tira, and Dir al-Assad is overcome with jealousy by the spacious residences and the high standard of living of many of the residents, and asks himself – where is the discrimination? We should be so fortunate to have many of those conditions of residence and prosperity. However, the complaints never stopped. During the period when the late Rabin bought their support by means of sweeping concessions to them – including the abrogation of the Seven Stars program in the heart of the Triangle that was supposed to ensure a Jewish majority or at least a Jewish presence in that border area – even then the complaints burgeoned. Walid Sadeq, who was then a deputy minister, publicly complained that while Israeli Arabs constituted 18% of the population, they received less than one per cent of the State budget, another clear sign of discrimination. It turned out that he was referring only to special allocations earmarked for the Arab sector, without a parallel allocation for the Jews, in order to enable them to construct new classrooms and invest in their rural development. The general State budget, for roads, health, agriculture and security, was intended for all residents of Israel, including the Arabs. They make extensive use of the roads and the health services and thanks to the IDF they are able to enjoy all that, however, as far as they are concerned, that is not

an allocation for Arabs – and there you have another claim of discrimination without a leg to stand on. Of course, they would prefer that instead of jets and tanks, the money would be spent on Arab villages, because Israeli security and increasing immigration and settlement activity have absolutely nothing to do with them. In the name of what citizenship, therefore, do they demand equality in allocations? Some of them went even further and demanded that the State allocate them 20% of the permanent State budget, reflecting their percentage of the population and even dispatched a delegation to the American Department of State demanding direct payment to them of their proportionate share of the foreign aid budget to Israel as if it is thanks to them that the State receives that aid and not specifically due to the security threats posed by them and their brethren to Israel. The absurdity knows no bounds.

The Israeli Arabs' second-rate standard of living, about which they complain, is also tied to the fact that instead of developing industries in their villages, they rely on the less lucrative branch of traditional agriculture. They do complain about the expropriation of their land; however they neglect to point out that the Israeli mechanization and technology has enabled them to leap centuries forward, and their yields in general are no less than what they produced previously with more workers on larger tracts of land. They cannot complain, on the one hand, about the lack of industrialization while they do nothing to promote it, and on the other hand to stick to traditional agricultural cultivation, which is at loggerheads with industrialization and urbanization. It is true that lands were expropriated from them; however territory was also expropriated from Jews or allotted from State lands when the need arose to establish border settlements for security purposes, IDF firing ranges or construction of roads, public water works and other development needs required in a modern country. They cannot bemoan their woeful situation because there is no industrial development in their villages, while at the same time sobbing every time land is expropriated in order to establish industry in their vicinity (like in Tefen), or Jewish settlements in the Galilee (the observation posts) in order to preserve the State lands and the forests that they tend to set on fire, or army camps (like the one in Sakhnin), in order to provide nearby protection for all of these enterprises. Granted, the educated Arabs, alumni of the institutions of higher education, cannot pursue careers in the security field and those are the most significant and sophisticated, and it is in those and similar areas that Israel maintains a significant advantage over many countries around the world. How, though, is it possible to employ them in such sensitive areas when they publicly declare that Israeli security does not interest them and they openly

identify with the enemies of the State? Even the State of Israel, which has suicidal tendencies, has not yet deteriorated to the point that it would give its enemies the keys to its coffin.

The extreme sectarianism in the conduct of the Arab politicians that is severely, violently and dangerously manifest in their legal and illegal demonstrations also scares the Jewish public. No one has ever caught them shouting anything in favor of the State or against its enemies during those demonstrations. No one has ever caught them demonstrating for the State or to the State but rather on a regular basis the demonstrations are against it and about it. Paradoxically, they act towards it as its enemies, employ violence against it, against its institutions and against its law enforcement personnel, but at the same time demand this right in the name of their citizenship in it – and they wonder why the Israelis are revolted by these provocations and have made up their minds to view the Israeli Arabs enemies in every sense. It has gone so far that all are convinced – and it makes sense – that if, heaven forbid, the State was in danger of obliteration, the Israeli Arabs would join the victors' bandwagon and would wreak havoc on their state and its residents. That, of course, does not increase the love felt by the Jewish majority *vis-à-vis* the Israeli Arabs. Meanwhile, many isolationist aspects that were discussed above are also added to the mix: Ministerial responsibility, when they serve in the government, only for their sectarian interests, even when they are taking part in a government coalition or supporting it from the outside, a phenomenon that manifests itself in their platforms; the gradually increasing unification around the Arab parties that is not a harbinger of integration; and the representative national institutions, which indicate trends of isolation and confrontation. Several Arab deputy-ministers served in Israeli governments, but in virtually all the cases those dignitaries dealt exclusively with Arab affairs. There is no Arab Deputy Health Minister who sees to the needs of the entire population of the country, but rather only to the amelioration of problems relating to hospitalization in the Arab sector and the same is true regarding welfare, labor, education and agriculture. How do they aspire to positions as ministers in the Israeli government when only the welfare of their constituency concerns them? Try to project what an Arab Foreign Minister, Treasury Minister or Defense Minister (and in principle, why not, if they were loyal, devoted citizens?) would do; would he channel all of the State resources to the Arab villages, sign capitulation agreements with the Palestinians or demilitarize the IDF? Is it any wonder that Arabs cannot reach those positions?

Every Arab motion to the agenda in the Knesset, every public demonstration, every action and demonstration, article and statement by Arab public figures, is

almost invariably directed towards the good of their Arab sector, never for the good of the State as the national consensus understands it. Even worse, they almost never raised their voices against the greatest injustices caused their state or the Jewish people, at the same time that they cry out regarding the ostensible injustices caused them or other Arabs and Muslims. Furthermore, they issue blatant justifications for the most egregious enemies of the State for every hostile action or statement against their country: from the conduct of the repressive and puzzling communist regime during its heyday and the height of its hostility towards Israel, to the murderous attacks of Israel's enemies against it; from the Yom Kippur War to the terrorism of Hizbullah and Hamas. We have never seen them participate in marches protesting the brutal conduct of the Soviet Union against its citizens, or against the Jews who sought to flee the Soviet paradise that was idolized by many of the Israeli Arabs, or more recently regarding the Russian policy *vis-à-vis* Chechnya. We have also never seen them protesting the bombing of Israeli cities by Iraqi missiles. On the contrary, we have seen and heard their declarations of support for the "Iraqi nation", in its war against the Americans, who are the source of the livelihoods of so many Arabs and whose aid is also sought by the Israeli Arabs. We have not heard speeches by Arabs in the Knesset praising the State for having absorbed Jewish refugees from around the world, for having freed the hijacked Air France passengers in Entebbe or for having brought to Israel destitute people from Vietnam and Bosnia or children who were hurt in Chernobyl and assisted in their rehabilitation and we never saw them racing to assist the famine-stricken in Ethiopia, Biafra, Cambodia and North Korea. We have never seen them mobilizing en masse (individuals – yes) to bring succor to the casualties of the earthquake in Turkey (a Muslim country!), Armenia and Mexico and we have certainly not seen them standing in line to donate blood for the wounded in Israel's wars or mobilizing their unemployed to replace the personnel fighting at the borders to protect them as well.

This is the conduct of a fifth column, not of citizens. While we never heard them celebrating the glorious technological and economic accomplishments of their country, from whose fruits they seek to take big bites (after all, they are citizens with equal rights), they expressed excitement over Saddam Hussein's capacity to set fire to Israel, from the Hizbullah's boldness to "overcome Israel" and from the Islamic Jihad's capacity to strike in Israel's heartland. They raced joyfully and generously – although it is unclear how miserable, oppressed and discriminated against people like they are finds the resources – to send contributions, medicine, food, clothing, condolences and subsistence allowances to widows and orphans of the Hamas and Islamic Jihad dead (the infamous

shahids), or supplies to the expelled Hamas members in Lebanon, or building materials for the construction of Solomon's Stables (the Marwani Mosque) on the Temple Mount, or money, materials and volunteers to restore destroyed Islamic sites throughout the Land of Israel. This not only proves systematic, subversive and hostile intentions against the State, appropriate for the enemies of a state, not its native sons, but also attests like a thousand witnesses that the legend of discrimination and misery is baseless while significant surpluses, above and beyond their abundant consumerism, are channeled to the enemies of their state. This also shows, in retrospect, that the State was correct in not submitting to the insane idea that was conceived in several government ministries, to institute reverse discrimination for the Arabs, as many of the fruits of those investments would have been ultimately directed against the State.

The Jewish public is also frightened by the apparent trend among the Arab public to translate these hostile positions into terms of power, that if steps are not taken against them in time, they will ultimately overcome us in "democratic ways". In other words, as long as the rules of democracy and freedom of representation and organization in their present form remain as they are, we have no case even though we know that these values are not employed by the Arabs in order to support democracy, which is foreign to them and which they have yet to internalize, but rather in order to exploit its principles and in order to undermine the foundations of the State, that established and preserves this democracy. The public understands, therefore, that the need exists to defend against this threat, constitutionally and before it is too late, as will be detailed in the summarizing chapter. In other words, it is clear and understood that as this threat draws closer, the Jewish majority will fight for its life. A power struggle, that has existed since the establishment of the State, will decide our existence externally and internally, with all due respect and honor to the bombastic phrases like the "power of the right", the "moral right", the "vision of the prophets", the "primacy of democracy", the "value of man", the "heritage of the Bible", and the "Jewish sense of justice", which we so enjoy to flaunt. In the power struggles in the wild world in which we find ourselves, every delicate "moralist", who "understands the other's position" and is good, will not survive. One who attempts to act like a gentleman in a jungle teeming with wild animals, will ultimately be torn to pieces. In the extremely dangerous surroundings in which we live, in which our neighbors are our enemies and some of our citizens, members of our own household, support them, we must see to securing our house before we set out to build a security fence around it.

Back to our traumas. The ominous amassing of Israeli Arab political power

is also manifest on the political plane, which constitutes part of the legitimate political game in Israel and in the unofficial, though extremely powerful, plane of leadership unrecognized by the State that developed from the Union of Arab Local Council Heads, as well. This union enhanced its authority, prestige and power by joining together with the Arab members of Knesset and several leaders and intellectuals in forming the omnipotent Monitoring Committee, which has pretensions to set the agenda for the Arab citizens. The committee decides regarding their demonstrations and riots, provides support for their disturbances and their Palestinian brethren's dreams of the right of return, inserts itself as their representative in negotiations with the authorities in the name of all the Arabs and functions as their national representative in every sense – a state within a state. It happens that the Israeli authorities, without explicitly recognizing it, make the mistake of negotiating with it as if it was recognized, to the point where in the not too distant future it will make demands (perhaps backed by the use of force or the threat to do so), in order to achieve its objective. Then the government will be compelled, like in present-day Macedonia, to negotiate with it, perhaps under international pressure, in order to transform Israel, *de jure* and not only *de facto*, into a bi-national state in which all Jewish elements will dissolve. Already today, the Union and the Monitoring Committee are taking steps in that direction, when they publicly take a stand in favor of the *intifada* and the right of return and demand that in their vision of a state of all its citizens, the State will be stripped of the Zionist flag, of "Hatikva", of Hebrew as the exclusive official language, demands similar to the demands proffered by the Albanian Muslims in Macedonia. Even a democratic country is allowed to inform its citizens that every individual is entitled to all rights, if he fulfills his obligations; however no group has unique collective rights in terms of language, separate education, privileges of exemption from obligations or a quota system of appointments to senior positions based on origin. The State must refuse to have any contacts with those national organizations, which will ultimately lead the Arab population to revolt and an additional *naqba*, compared to which its precursor will seem like child's play.

However, even in the realm of the legitimate political game, several red lines have been crossed. It is not only that the Arab members of Knesset, exploiting their far-reaching immunity (granted them in the framework of their oppression, of course), regularly hurl profanities against the State, slander it, incite against it, violate its laws, provide their patronage to other Arab lawbreakers and act like its enemies and not like its citizens; not only, when they establish and run ethnic-Arab parties, do they declare war on the Israeli political system

that is primarily based (with the exception of a few bad apples) on legitimate ideological disputes, from the extreme Right to the extreme Left, but in their political platforms and in the negotiations that they conduct with the left-wing parties that seek their support, they exclusively raise the problems of the Arab sector and the problems of the Palestinians in general. They demand their own "God's little acre" and insist that the Palestinians and the Arabs not be harmed. Beyond that they do not care what will be the fate of the State, if it will go up in flames or be destroyed, if it loses its character and its assets and the like. Some of these platforms and the lists of demands submitted by the Arabs to the Labor Party, as a condition for their support, are quoted in the next chapter in chilling detail, and some of them were even met, like, for example, the abrogation of the Seven Stars program conceived by Housing Minister Sharon in order to reinforce the Jewish presence in the Triangle, or the government resolution to allow construction of the mosque in the courtyard of the Church of the Annunciation in Nazareth, despite the fact that the courts established that it was an illegal, forced incursion by the Islamists to property that did not belong to them. Here we will just mention that in the old Hadash platform there is a demand to abolish compulsory service in the IDF for Druse, an appropriately patriotic act by those who seek the detriment of the State, who not only evade their own national obligation, but they seek to prevent others from doing so. How, then, do they seek to defend their beloved state to which they feel a sense of loyalty, they do not say.

At another opportunity, members of the United Arab List, in which the members of the southern Islamic Movement, headed by Abd al-Malk Dehamshe, are partners, detailed their demands for the bi-nationalization of the State as a condition for their support of the Barak government. In practice, they sought to recognize all illegal Arab construction, in other words to liquidate all planning and building laws and to transform the State into a planning anarchy of the sort to which they are accustomed in Cairo or Nazareth. They demanded that the Muslim *shari'ah* rulings be decisive in all matters pertaining to the Muslim sect, in other words that all Muslim Israeli citizens would be removed from the jurisdiction of the State judicial system, and so on and so forth. Had even a small portion of their demands been accepted, we would have seen the State slipping between our fingers. It is no coincidence that one of the members of Knesset most belligerent in his opposition to the State, who sent a letter of condolence to Assad over the destruction of the Syrian radar station in Lebanon is a member of the senior branch of the United Arab List, i.e. a member of the southern Islamic Movement that fancies itself moderate though it is no different than the

northern faction that is defiantly extreme. We have discussed above the argument that divided the Islamic Movement, on the basis of the Knesset vote. At least the members of the northern faction were honest and refused to compromise their positions. They therefore preferred to continue to boycott the elections so as to avoid granting legitimacy to the Jewish state and to avoid pledging allegiance to the Knesset. However, the members of Dehamshe's movement, like the other Arab parties that bitterly oppose Israel, recognizing political power as an impetus to engender change in the spirit of their destructive demands, decided to adopt a different tactic: they will swallow the bitter pill of pledging allegiance to the laws of the State, but will decide ad hoc what obligates them and what is worth violating (like the building codes), or to encourage others to violate (like illegal, violent demonstrations). Dehamshe and his movement even circumvented the second bitter pill, legitimacy of the Jewish state, by not running on a separate Islamic list, heaven forbid, but rather together with other Arabs, from Dehamshe's former party, in order to signal that they are nothing more than part of a general Arab party, in which they appear as Arabs and not as Muslims. In any case, Dehamshe, who served time in an Israeli prison together with his mentor, Nimer Darwish, the founder of the movement, on the criminal charge of possession of weapons and terrorist acts, spends his days visiting the Arab security inmates in Israeli prisons, not to rehabilitate them, but to encourage them. An Israeli patriot, if there was one among the Arabs, might join the Society for Prisoner Welfare, for the purpose of rehabilitating all prisoners, Jews and Arabs. But that would be expecting a convicted criminal to turn into Mother Theresa – and that is, by all accounts, unrealistic.

In light of all this, is it any wonder that the Arab cries of discrimination are non-starters, as they are given preferential treatment in many senses, or because meeting even some of their demands would provide them with a horrific weapon in their quest to lead to the abrogation of the Jewish state? The Jewish public is of sound mind. It views that which is transpiring before its eyes and no longer places its trust in scholarly statistics that attempt to convince us, for two generations now, that the Arabs seek integration, if they would only be granted equality; that their support for the Palestinian people has nothing to do with their attitude towards the State. The fact is that they want to remain here and accept the democratic rules of the game. Well, no my friend, the Arabs long ago ceased to be torn between their people and their country; they chose their people. They are not leaving the State because they hope to take it over by means of the right of return; they did not accept the democratic rules of the game that are so foreign to them, but rather they exploit them in order

to achieve their objectives. They have also learned to exploit the good-nature, the good intentions and the ignorance of naïve, peace and compromise loving Israelis in order to play on their consciences, to burden them with the “moral” results of three generations of their destructive behavior – and to eternally stand as unfortunate victims to whom everyone owes everything, while they owe nothing to anyone. The Jewish public was shaken and awakened after the events of October 2000. With the exception of its dreamy margins – who will do anything to avoid acknowledging the collapse of their “enlightened, “socialist and peace-loving world”, as that would mean admitting the failure of their whole *Weltanschauung* and their entire *raison d'être* – everyone understands that the pretending is over, everything is out in the open and on the table and the moment of truth has arrived.

Thus, it is not the myth of the discriminated Arab that should weigh on our conscience, but rather the dangers that we are wreaking upon ourselves if we fail to immediately take the necessary steps in order to reverse the negative trends or at least to stop them (it is not enough to slow them down, as all of the governments have done to date). Because the policy of “everything is going to be all right” is no longer valid, just like the assumption that “time will tell” is not necessarily working in our favor. Time in and of itself does nothing; it depends how one utilizes the time. If we persist in the stupor that has overcome us on the existential matter of the Arab minority among us, we will awaken in 20 years, to a reality over which we no longer have control. Already today, in addition to the frightening numbers regarding the demographic ratio in 20 years, there are great, uncontrollable forces at work that are liable to accelerate the arrival of the decisive moment of danger from 20 to 10 years. Massive processes of implementation of the right of return for Palestinians are already transpiring, above and beyond any agreement that we are likely to reach with them in the future and far beyond any rational calculation of what we can allow ourselves if it is existence that we desire. Actualization of these processes, which there is no way of knowing which are stychic and transpire on their own and which are directed by a guiding hand, from inside or outside, are proceeding on several courses simultaneously:

- A. Hundreds of thousands of Palestinian laborers flow to Israel from the territories, from Jordan and from the other Palestinian exiles as well as from other Arab countries, whether as foreign laborers or “innocent” visitors. They blend into the Arab population in Israel that occasionally provides them with assistance and shelter. They settle here, join our internal enemies and reinforce the Arab demography that is already teeming.

- B. Under the “humanitarian” excuse of “unification of families”, that many of the naïve among us are convinced to believe and to take action to promote it – and that too is above and beyond what will ultimately be agreed upon between us and the Palestinians – many family members come from across the border to be ostensibly “reunited with their families”, in order to flee the poverty and oppression in their countries and to seek their fortune in flourishing, free Israel. They thereby join the “oppression and the misery” from which the poor Israeli Palestinians suffer. It is quite a pity.
- C. The phenomenon of Israeli Arabs marrying spouses from the territories and Jordan is flourishing. In almost all of the cases, the foreign spouse seeks to gain citizenship in oppressive, discriminatory Israel, as long as he receives National Insurance, child allocations, education and health services at the expense of the generous Jewish state before it disbands once the Arabs constitute a majority of its residents. The Bedouins in the Negev, who have not yet foresworn polygamy despite the limitations of Israeli law, are especially prolific and they joyfully import as many young women as they can afford. They thereby significantly increase their birthrate, which in any case, is already today, one of the highest in the world.
- D. Once this course of action proved effective, fictional marriages between Arab Israelis and their imported spouses had reached epidemic proportions, as the importers received a financial boon, while those imported became a burden on the State. Someone calculated and found that the State treasury bears the monetary burden of hundreds of millions of NIS in outlays for health, education, child allocations and deportation of the infiltrators, if and when they are apprehended.

Thus, time is not working in our favor. If we do nothing, the situation will exacerbate to the point where the little State of Israel will turn into a pen for humans, who multiply faster than flocks of sheep until every good plot of land will be overrun and it will no longer be able to bear its residents, support them or serve as a magnet for Western Jews, who remain the only potential salvation for us in terms of their numbers and their quality. There are those among the Israeli Arabs who are joyfully participating in the aforementioned destructive processes, not only motivated by greed, but in order to manipulate Israel and impose upon it implementation of the right of return, whether it wants to or not and thereby accelerate its demise and the date when the State of Israel is transformed into another Palestinian state. Meanwhile, they conduct semi-autonomous lives, are subject to the authority of their institutions more than

they are to the State institutions, suck out of the public coffers more resources than they contribute to it or they deserve, but will do nothing on their own to improve their economic condition and will demand more and more from the State, which will, in its stupidity, pay more and more. It is true that the Arabs have a right to their fears, for example, the terror that overcame them one day that they will be dispossessed or evicted again after the deepening of the enmity and the mistrust between them and the Jewish majority since the October events. However, the responsibility is incumbent upon them to convince the Jewish majority, by means of civilized behavior and civil obedience, by displaying gratitude for everything that was granted them and with an outstanding effort to prove that it is the good of the State that they seek and not the good of its enemies. Then, perhaps they will succeed in restoring trust before a new round of suffering befalls them.

Instead, they invest considerable effort in information campaigns among the Israeli public, in close cooperation with the naïve Left, which fails to grasp that it is being exploited by the Arabs in order to further their own interests and not, heaven forbid, the interests of the Jews. Thus groups for “mutual understanding”, “education for peace”, “multi-culturalism” and the like are formed. They are funded by good Jews or foreign governments, who provide the indigent Arab youth with free trips in Israel and abroad, however, their objective is to disseminate, in a quiet missionary-like manner, the concept of bi-nationalism in Israel, which the Arabs have thus far been unable to impose upon us by force. Thus, they award prizes to Jewish students who excelled in the study of Arabic and Arab culture (and not, heaven forbid, to Arab students who excelled in the study of Hebrew and Jewish culture) and take mixed groups to Spain in order to study the “Golden Age” of the Jews and Arabs there. They just forget to explain to them that that Golden Age placed the Jews (and the more numerous Christians) in *dhimmi* (protected people) status, who were required to pay a humiliating *gizia* (head tax) in order to buy the patronage of the ruling Muslims. Is this what the organizers seek to restore? That the Jews return to that Golden Age? Under “enlightened” Arab rule? I doubt it. One of these programs seeks to establish a “project” (the fashionable word for every plan to waste money) for the Bedouins in the Negev in which the children of Gaza would also participate. To what purpose is not mentioned in the accompanying explanation, however, it is easy to guess that the Arab initiators, who themselves make a living from such “projects”, seek to forge ties between the Bedouins in the Negev and the Arabs in Gaza. This is for the purpose of preparing the corridor between Gaza, Judea and Samaria, of which the Palestinians have decided to gain

control at the same time that they strangle, by means of illegal construction, all of the Jewish corridors that we seek to fortify (Jerusalem-Maale Adumin, Nahal Iron, Acre-Safed, Beersheba-Arad and the like).

Recently, a new trend developed among American Jews, of remorse over the fact that they did not “promote” Israeli Arab interests, allowed too great a gap to develop between the Arab minority and the Jewish majority, and thereby, they believe, allowed the enmity to develop and erupt in the October events. It is true that until now two foundations funded by Jewish philanthropists from America – the New Israel Fund and the Abraham Fund – functioned, inspired by the good-hearted, naïve liberals, who hoped that by cultivating educational activities and joint Jewish-Arab dialogue, they would minimize tensions and improve the situation. However, after twenty years of verbal masturbation, which cost several millions that could have had a much greater impact had it been invested in Jewish education, those naïve benefactors are faced with failure. The balance is clear for all to see: After two decades and tens of millions of dollars, the Jewish-Arab enmity within Israel has not diminished, but it has grown, no Arab individual or organization within Israel has expressed gratitude to any of these foundations for the money that they disbursed, which, more than they support understanding and progress, benefit the bureaucracies that are supported by the activities. All of that massive aid, which was wasted over the course of two decades, was based on the mistaken assumption that promoting understanding between the nations, improving the level of education among the Arabs and staging meetings of intimacy and understanding between them and the Jews, would ultimately lead to brotherhood. They failed to understand, and still today fail to understand that the Arabs will take any money given to them, even by the Jewish Satan, as long as it is for their personal advancement. However, the moment that politics is placed on the agenda, the rifts are more profound than ever, as it has turned out recently, because the tensions do not stem from “lack of understanding”, but rather from an all too accurate understanding of one another and a mutual understanding of the collision course that the situation presents. The Israeli Arabs side with the Palestinians, period. No monetary bribe, initiation of dialogue or broadmindedness will convince them to act otherwise. They derisively, amusedly and pitifully smile beneath their moustaches at those pious, good, naïve and agonized Jews, who are willing to give them their money. Why not take it?

If those funds would just go to waste without bringing any benefit, fine. A lot of money is wasted on a thousand and one trivialities and nonsense. The problem is that they cause significant damage to the State, contrary to the

wishes of those providing the funding. Supporting the Israeli Arabs while they are confronting the authorities here, signals them that they are in the right, that even the most devoted supporters of the Jewish state, world Jewry, aid in cultivating their hatred. Why, then, should they desist from their disobedience? However, the matter is even more severe at present: For it is no longer “liberal” Jews from San Francisco who are running to balance their tortured Judaism with support for the enemies of their country – so all can witness their generosity, objectivity and love of humanity, including even enemies of their people – but in these troubled times the hard core of the conservative Jewish establishment, in New York and the rest of the holy communities in America, has reached the conclusion that it has “neglected the Israeli Arabs” and must therefore devote themselves to them. No more merely cultivating talk about love and brotherhood, but with bona-fide projects, as if they owe them something. It is as if wealthy Saudi Arabians, who aid Hamas and the establishment of mosques throughout the Islamic world, reached the conclusion that they have “neglected the poor Jews in the Land of Israel” and the non-Muslim minorities in the Arab lands and now they are in a rush to ameliorate the wrong. It is very difficult to understand the logic of this state of mind, which not only will fail to facilitate anything beneficial, but will blow up in the faces of those naïve do-gooders, just as Oslo blew up in the faces of the Israeli Left, which was debating between supporting its country and promoting its enemies. Why will it not be effective, even if the donors pour their money, in ever-increasing abundance, upon the Israeli Arabs who hate Israel and the Jews? There are many aspects to this astonishing and perverse issue:

- A. It is well known in our world that whenever a rich person bestows his beneficence on a strange poor person (not a kindred poor person, who always takes precedence), the poor person will hate him more. For the giving, especially when it is abundant, underscores, to the point of humiliation, the disparity between the haves and the have-nots, and he who has no hope to ever compare to he who has – simply hates him. Take America as an example: It has been sustaining the Palestinian refugees with its money for more than 50 years and disburses its funds in the Arab and the Islamic world and is hated there, as well as among the Palestinians, who never miss an opportunity to burn its flag along with the Israeli flag. Is it appropriate to thus repay these Arabs good for evil?
- B. The Arabs, in Israel and elsewhere, are, for the most part, not only haters of the State of Israel – for their own reasons, but also outstanding haters

of Jews. It is sufficient to leaf through the pages of the Islamic Movement publications, saturated with contempt and invective against the Jews, scorn and derision and Holocaust denial, in order to get a sense of who they are. Then come the Jews, who, in the stereotypes extant among the Arabs are mongers of strife, dominators of the world, haters of humanity and enemies of Allah – and volunteer to contribute money to their enemies. How will that be perceived by those enemies, if not with suspicion, at best, and with contempt and derision at worst? It is as if the Jews of America arose and decided to make a contribution to the editors of “Der Stürmer”, after they “neglected them over the years”, in order to improve their image among them or in order to improve the Nazi treatment of the Jewish communities under their control (before destroying them). It is grotesque and boundlessly absurd.

- C. The problem of the Israeli Arabs is neither monetary nor discriminatory, as was explained above. On the contrary, they are the beneficiaries of reverse discrimination in many areas, without accepting upon themselves any commitment to their State. There are poor people in every country and the same is true in Israel, some Arabs and some Jews. Just as slums and backward villages in the United States are not necessarily victims of discrimination, the same is true of the Arab villages in Israel. More initiative, industriousness, integration in society and acquisition of knowledge would help them, just as it would other poor segments of society, far more than external aid that brings with it nothing more than self-abasement.
- D. We have discussed above the victim mentality that the Israeli Arabs and the rest of the Palestinians have developed, which obligates the entire world, from their perspective, to race to their aid, to support them and to assist them, with no expression of gratitude on their part and no effort to emerge from their miserable state on their own. Additional special assistance provided them by American Jews will only add a shot of encouragement and justification for this manner of thinking and will also delay their freeing themselves from their situation, which, after all, is the intention of those providing the assistance.
- E. The Arabs, like all human beings, despise external patrons (and that will happen to the American Jews as well), who seek to purchase their goodwill with a fistful of dollars; or, even worse, who seek to alter their positions and their ideological commitments, as if they were for sale. The attitude of the Israeli Arabs towards the Jewish state is what it is. They seek to abrogate its Jewish national character and to confer upon it a bi-national character. Jews

- from the outside come and seek to adopt them. Why should they change their ways or give respect to those who fail to respect their people's values?
- F. The Israeli Arabs have already learned how to play on the Israeli public's feelings of guilt due to their alleged discrimination in years past. The governments allocate special funds for reverse discrimination, government officials and others "apologize" for the "sins" of the past and promise to improve their treatment of the Arabs in the future and some are even willing to accept upon their shoulders responsibility for injustices that they did not commit. The willingness of Israeli governments to allocate funds, to apologize for the alleged violence of the security forces, to establish commissions of inquiry, the justification for which is doubtful, and to appease the Arab public in general, have only boomeranged against us, as they "prove" that the Arab charges of discrimination were justified, for if that was not the case, why are the "guilty" racing to mend their ways? The practical result was unprecedented belligerence of the Arab leaders against the State far beyond conventional bounds. The contribution of the American Jews to "reverse discrimination" of this sort will only attach them, in Arab eyes, to the collective guilt of the Jews *vis-à-vis* the Palestinians, will increase their expectations for additional apologies and additional extortion of benefits and will continue to agitate rather than pacify them. Is that what we want?

If the situation has reached the point that violent Arab gangs stop vehicles at intersections, determine the identity of the passengers and if they are Jews they are beaten or killed; and if violent Arab racists passed through the streets of Jaffa during the October events, determined the identity of shopkeepers and burned those belonging to Jews; and if the number of Israeli Arabs collaborating with terrorists and abetting them is gradually increasing; and if there are more and more serious indications of massive stockpiling of weapons in Arab settlements, both for personal use and in order to abet their brethren on the day of reckoning; and if the Arab disdain for building codes and democratic values is gradually surfacing; all this without even one local Arab leader condemning this racist and lawless conduct, then we have arrived at phenomena that have not occurred anywhere in the Jewish world since the chaos of the World War – and this is right under our noses and our control – while we are accused of racism, oppression, robbing the Arabs of their rights and anti-democratic conduct. This topsy-turvy situation, in the face of which the Left – which always scrutinizes the innards of its own people in an exercise of incomprehensible self-flagellation – is silent instead of protesting that which is happening here, will require us all

to rethinking and adopting a new preventive and defensive policy, the earlier the better, before we all meet our demise. In the next chapter, we will cite a collection of statements by Israeli Arabs, their leaders, their authors, their elected officials and the rank and file regarding Israel, the Jews and Zionism, which will, perhaps, convince those still burying their head in the sand. Then we will summarize several proposals to change direction as quickly as possible.

CHAPTER EIGHT

SELECTED CITATIONS FROM THE WRITINGS AND STATEMENTS OF ISRAELI ARABS

This collection will illustrate, directly from the mouths of Israeli Arabs, in all of their various party and personal communities, factions and ideologies, their thoughts and aspirations as expressed in their writings, declarations and media interviews. Of course, every quotation of a statement of this sort must take into account the context and the atmosphere in which they were said, for failure to do so is liable to distort its meaning, in one direction or another, depending on the circumstance. Therefore, the quotes will be cited with an explanation of their background and context along with descriptions and comparisons; however we will allow the reader to draw his own conclusions. Of course, the citations from the statements of the leaders, heads and directors of the Israeli Arabs do not necessarily represent the mindsets of everyone; certainly not the feelings of the rank and file, who much more than they were concerned with formulating ideas and expressing them publicly were preoccupied with the mundane matters of making a living and subsistence. And there is another important aspect to this issue: The more that the years have passed since the establishment of the State, not only has the self-confidence of the speakers increased along with the belligerence of their expression, but the pool of spokesmen itself has expanded significantly, whether due to the fact that the number of Israeli Arabs has increased almost sevenfold or due to the fact that their numbers of spokesmen are no longer limited to their national leaders, but more and more local leaders, intellectuals, media personalities and authors are taking part in the disputes with Israel and have become well-known public figures due to the power of the media, both the general Israeli media and that of the Israeli Arabs. In order to assist the reader in finding his bearings, the

statements will be sorted according to the person who made them and their circumstances. Within each group, chronological order will be maintained so that the changing dynamic dimension, for better or for worse, will also be manifest. Of course in most cases there will be an overlap between the various categories, for example in cases where an author was also a leader, where a member of the Islamic Movement made a statement about the *intifada* or statements of national renaissance were uttered by Islamists, when each one of the two elements in the equation is an independent category, but that is inevitable. The quotations will be designated under the following headings:

1. Israeli Arabs before 1967
2. The National Renaissance (post-1967)
3. The Islamic Movement
4. Arab Politics
5. The First *Intifada* and Its Offshoots
6. The Second *Intifada* (al-Aqsa)
7. Arab Citizens Speak
8. Expressions in Arab Literature in Israel

1. ISRAELI ARABS BEFORE 1967

The trauma of the war was still fresh after the 1947-1949 battles, which Israel refers to as its War of Independence, while the Arabs, who remained in Israel, refer to it as their “*naqba*” (catastrophe), after they became a minority in a land where they had previously constituted the majority. The fact that they were the partition rejectionists and initiated the war in which they were defeated, in order to prevent Israel’s establishment does not remove the sense of victimhood within them that would develop, be exacerbated and would become a permanent fixture among them in the coming years. Nevertheless, as they were isolated from the rest of their brethren, who remained under Egyptian and Jordanian rule in the Gaza Strip, Judea and Samaria respectively, or refugees in Jordan, Syria and Lebanon, most of them gradually came to terms with their fate and were on their way to become integrated into the Jewish state, with the exception of several marginal, though revolutionary, nationalist groups like al-Ard, which was banned. Although the military government that was imposed upon them during most of the period prior to the 1967 war and their exemption from military service did not assist the Israeli Arabs to feel like regular citizens, it was a necessary and effective step in monitoring a population that acted hostilely towards the

Jewish state during the war and about whom there was no way to know at that point how it would act in the years to come. Nevertheless, that government was abrogated before 1967, when the sense among Israeli authorities was that after more than 15 years of military government, and due to the lack of a reasonable expectation among Israeli Arabs to ever be reunited with their brethren across the border, they no longer posed a clear and present danger.

A. SPEECH OF AN ARAB (CHRISTIAN) MK AT THE FOUNDING ASSEMBLY (1949)

It is a great and very significant day, in which the country is celebrating the opening of the Knesset that will assume responsibility for legislating the constitution and the regulations. I will take this opportunity, together with my colleague, the other Arab MK, to exchange with you blessings of loyalty on this great day. God Almighty has granted us the privilege of representing a significant portion of the Arab citizens and it is my prayer that we will be successful in taking action for the good of all the citizens, with no distinctions. It is unfortunate that the Arab representation in the Founding Assembly was not manifest in its entirety. This places a much greater responsibility upon us regarding the tasks incumbent upon us *vis-à-vis* the Arabs in the State of Israel. We would not want to assume this great responsibility unless we were certain that the members of Knesset will support us, encourage us and cooperate with us, as they themselves are known as people who are guided by honesty. The eyes of the Arab citizens of Israel look to the Founding Assembly, which seeks justice and the common good... Although there are numerous parties and national institutions and although there are differences in the outlooks and opinions of the individual and the collective, virtually all segments of society unanimously agree to the fundamental principle, the gist of which is: "The nascent State of Israel will be based on the principles of freedom, justice and peace, it will grant equal social and political rights to all of its subjects regardless of their religion, race or gender." So declared the Provisional Council of State on May 14, 1948... Justice is the fundamental principle of government. It is possible to realize it through daily acts of maintaining justice and honesty in the State. Thus it will be good if we make our way energetically

and persistently despite the stumbling blocks that we will encounter along the way. We should choose our own wise policy. We must refrain from adopting negative traditions and from following the paths of others. It is preferable that we maintain a completely neutral independence... It is with joy that we view the first signs of the end of the battle in the Holy Land, a conclusion in whose wake covenants of good neighborliness will be made between Israel and the surrounding Arab countries. We view the recognition by the countries of the world of the nascent State of Israel, in succession, as an honor and a tribute. The number of our supporters is growing daily. It is incumbent upon our State to prove in all its actions that it loves justice and honesty and aspires to freedom, tranquility, the advent of peace and to serve as a paragon of the culture of truth and a significant factor in promoting the good of humanity as a whole...

Amin Jarjura,

The Democratic List of Nazareth, February 15, 1949, from the book by Uri Stendhal, Israeli Arabs: Between the Hammer and the Anvil, Academon Publishers, 1992, pp. 403-404.

B. THE POEMS OF TEWFIQ ZIYAD IN THE 1950s

1. The years have taught us
That you seek to transform our land
Into a cemetery upon whose ruins you will dance;
But that will not be
The barbarity of war will be overcome by the fist of the workers
And the nations will build a perpetual peace
For all eternity...
2. My brethren in struggle!
This is a blessing,
We are like you... victims of tyrants,
A reactionary gang is in power
And the arms of crime are long,
They subject our flesh to wars
And they color indictments with the blood of the people;
Build "peace" on skulls

And chop off heads in Kafr Qasem...
 My brethren in battle,
 This is my path
 Everyone should gird the loins of his brother,
 And we will set out to struggle towards the sunrise,
 To victory over the regime of slavery
 Towards the dawn of happy life...
 O the evil gang that was fed
 A cup of degradation by my poetry!
 That I degraded with mud up to the neck
 But I raised my neck;
 I have stated in full view
 My hatred for the life of the slaves
 Oh monstrous, cowardly gang!
 He whose threat has not been fulfilled
 Is upset
 Do not delude yourself that steel armor
 Will exhaust the pride of lions.

*From the poems by Tewfiq Ziyad: "Taxes",
 "To the Striking Ata Workers", and "To
 Behind Bars", from 1954 and 1958, from
 the article and translation by Avraham Yinon,
 "Tewfiq Ziyad: We Are the Majority Here",
 in a book edited by Aharon Layish, The
 Arabs in Israel, Continuity and Change,
 Magnes Publishing, 1981, pp. 215-216.*

2. THE NATIONAL RENAISSANCE (POST-1967)

After the Six Day War and the collapse of the borders between Israel and the territories over which Israel gained control, the Palestinians from both sides of the Green Line came into close daily contact. And despite the conspicuous differences between them resulting from the years of lack of contact since 1948, very quickly contacts were established, support was cultivated and intimacy was woven, which in a relatively short time would contribute to the elevation of Palestinian consciousness among the Israeli Arabs, to its expansion from the purview of individual intellectuals and authors to the entire Israeli Arab population and to creation of the sense that they are one people. An additional

factor in the tightening of ties between the two segments of the people was the meteoric rise of Arafat as the recognized leader of the Palestinians. Many Arab opinions were expressed in Israel in favor of Palestinian nationalism, led by the nationalist-Arab parties, with significant roles in them played by Arab students in Israeli universities, intellectuals, authors and poets. For all of these language artists, who are so taken with their own statements, the power of the word took the place of action. They could not possibly believe the piles of invective that they spew from their mouths regarding “Nazi, fascist and racist” Israel and regarding their desire to establish a “true” democracy in Israel, but rather they fail to understand the meaning of those concepts. Either their whole intention is to merely incite their people against their country or they feel so impotent to harm Israel that flourishes and grows stronger against their wishes, that they exaggerate with baseless curses and abuse, just like their comrades who burn flags and effigies in the image of Israeli (and American) leaders as they are unable to cause them any genuine harm.

A. A LEAFLET ISSUED BY ARAB STUDENTS IN THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY (MARCH 1981)

For a glorious future for our Arab and Palestinian people!

You, our student brethren, you have chosen the same path that we chose before you. And you will most certainly continue to follow that path and that road, until the end of the journey and until we achieve our sublime national objectives.

[This] is the path that we follow, we, the student movement, as a sector recognized within the Arab-Palestinian people wherever it is located, against Zionism, its aggression and its fascism, in order to achieve legal national rights, foremost among them the right to return to its land and to determine itself on all of its national territory, and for the social liberation of the Arab Palestinian man. This obligates us, we the Arab Palestinian people, wherever we are located, to battle against our enemy on all planes – political, military and scientific, as the weapon of science is a significant and effective weapon and it has a significant and sophisticated status in our struggle against Zionism.

We, members of the Palestinian people, have been collapsing under the yoke of the Zionist occupation ever since the Palestine holocaust of 1948, because we are an indivisible part of the Palestinian people and our struggle is one of the extensions of the

Palestinian struggle, led by the Palestine Liberation Organization, the sole legal representative of the Arab Palestinian people.

In order to acquire the weapon of science, we encounter many obstacles in our path, complications and provocations that we must circumvent and overcome. We are acquiring an education in Zionist state institutions and those universities are racist by their very nature as they are part of a racist existence. And these bourgeois, racist institutions protect the interests, objectives and aspirations of the racist, colonialist regime and serve it, and as an expansion of the policy of racist discrimination and national oppression...

However, we are not attempting to say that we have realized what we sought to accomplish, on the contrary. We are still at the beginning of the path and we must develop and increase our scientific knowledge; especially us, members of the Arab Palestinian people, who reside under the Zionist occupation since the Palestine holocaust in 1948, we are an indivisible part of the Arab Palestinian people...

We have no choice other than to overcome these obstacles and challenges that await us on our path. All this will only end by means of struggles against the policy of the university administrations and against the groups of Zionist people and in uniting our national ranks in order to realize our rights. This struggle of ours is an inseparable part of our struggle against Zionism and our struggle against Zionism is one of the most significant aspects of the struggle of our people against imperialist Zionism and Arab reactionaries, led by the PLO... for a glorious future for our Arab Palestinian people... We will march together...

From a manifesto distributed by Arab students on the Hebrew University campus, to new Arab students, who arrived at the University as part of the application process. From a "Digest" compiled by the office of the Adviser for Arab affairs, April 1981, pp. 16-17.

B. A MANIFESTO BY ARAB NATIONALISTS (TELEM AND BNEI HAKFAR) JUNE 1981

The occupation will not continue! A manifesto marking June 5 [14 years since the Six Day War] to the masses of our Arab-Palestinian people in the midst of a struggle, to the exemplary disciples of survival and persistence, to all of the progressive circles and forces, to all those joined by unity, who battle imperialism and Zionism and stand shoulder to shoulder with us, we turn to you and say:

The fifth of June has come again and we are in the midst of an unprecedentedly bitter struggle, on the local, Arab and international levels.

On the local level – against fascist, racist Zionism that confronts our people in a war of destruction and extermination...

On the Arab level – against the reactionary regimes, like the *Hadib* regime in Egypt...

On the international level – against the imperialism determined to shatter our revolutionary path and to drain it of content...

And lo and behold, the attacks against us grow more fierce and the hostility towards us continues, homes are destroyed, villages are erased, the Galilee and Jerusalem are being Judaized and the arms of the Zionist octopus are stretching out to the occupied Arab land like lobster claws. Those who rely on national power seize homes, expel students from the universities, murder political prisoners, attack and murder mayors, open fire on children and kill demonstrators demonstrating against the occupation.

However, we, in our unity will confront them proudly and will courageously tell them: From now on, we will flee no more, no more defeats, and the catastrophe, as long as it lasts, will not last forever... And therefore, we turn to the members of our people and say: We will flee no more! The stronger we get and we build generations, we will flee no longer! Above every grain of dirt a child will be born who will protect us from the greed of the covetous and will remove the yoke of occupation from us. We will flee no longer if we are able to show determination in our decision against the threat and the Judaization, a decision that will oppose submission and patronage and will rise up against the occupier and stand against his weapons...

From "Digest" June 5, 1981, pp. 9-11.

**C. RESOLUTIONS OF A “LAND AND HOUSING” CONFERENCE
(ACRE, FEBRUARY 1982)**

The participants in this convention, who represent the great majority of the Arab citizens in Israel, declare that they are staging this convention to underscore the demands of the Arab population on the matters of land and housing, and liberation from the yoke of national oppression and from the policy of racial discrimination and Judaization of the land, upon which Israeli Arabs live and from which they make their living.

In light of the discriminatory policy employed against the Arabs, we repeat our demand directed at the government to recognize the Arab citizens of Israel, who are part of the Arab Palestinian people, as a national minority, and to recognize their day-to-day and national rights.

The national and racial discriminatory policy are an inseparable part of the expansionist and annexationist policy and the negation of the rights of the Arab-Palestinian people, and in light of that policy, the government treats the Arabs in Israel like subjects. And a change in policy is not feasible without Israel's rulers relinquishing the policy of expansionism, annexation and negation of the rights of the Arab-Palestinian people on the one hand, and recognizing its rights, first and foremost among them the right to establish its independent country alongside the State of Israel on the path to establishing a just peace in the region on the other.

From “Digest”, February 13, 1982, pp. 14-15.

3. THE ISLAMIC MOVEMENT

The ascent of the Islamic Movement in Israel, as explained above, introduced a new dimension, which transcended party politics and was irrational, in the statements of the Israeli Arabs. As, while the Arab parties and personalities maneuver between different interests and tend towards political adaptation to the existing reality, the members of the Islamic Movement are confined to the shackles of their traditions, their God and their Prophet and quotations from their sages in the sense of “do as I say”. Furthermore, they generally cull from these sources the opinions of the most rigorous fundamentalists among them

and turn them into a handbook for life to serve as their guiding light. Therefore, one can find in their statements the most uncompromising extremism and harshness, supported by quotes from statements by the fundamentalist sages and outstanding personalities of the generation, with whose statements only Azmi Bishara, the Christian, who positions himself as a greater nationalist than his comrades in Hizbullah, can compete. In the statements of the Islamists, not only do they at times challenge the legitimacy of the State of Israel for Islamic reasons, but they frequently express opinions regarding current events and identify with their Islamic brethren wherever they are located, especially those close to their fundamentalist world view, like Hamas, Hizbullah and the Islamic Jihad and support them in their violent confrontations against Israel. They do not suffice with moral support for their brethren outside of Israel, but also marshal monetary and material aid, even though they are aware that they are abetting Israel's most egregious enemies. They also make a habit of blaming Israel, the Jews and Zionism for all the ills of the Muslims and the Arabs and do not think twice about concocting nonsense and lies about them. The more radical faction also systematically opposed peace talks between Israel and the Palestinians and denounced the Oslo process as an act of deception. In other words, while the rest of the Arabs are willing to discuss conflicts with Israel in relative and quantitative terms, subject to negotiation, the Islamists among them have no interest in negotiation, as their demands are qualitative, absolute and delivered as ultimatums, regarding which there can be no question or compromise, due to the divine reinforcement supporting them. And it is clear that as far as their readers and listeners are concerned, this nonsense is accepted as the word of the living God, which obligates them to not only believe in them but also to act upon them.

A. THE HISTORY OF JERUSALEM IN THE EYES OF THE ISLAMIC MOVEMENT (1996)

The Jews assert that King Solomon, of blessed memory, built Jerusalem 3000 years ago; however there are prophetic testimonies that Jerusalem was constructed by Adam, of blessed memory and there are historical and archeological studies emphasizing and confirming that Jerusalem was built by Abraham our forefather, of blessed memory. The Muslim conquest of Jerusalem, therefore, is a restoration of the Islamic character to Jerusalem, after it was defiled by the Byzantines and Persians...

It is incorrect to portray Jerusalem as an Arab-Christian-Islamic

question. History shows that Jerusalem is an exclusively Islamic matter. The Crusades were part of a religious war against Islam and the Muslims: Tens of thousands of Muslims were slaughtered and the cross was placed on the al-Aqsa Mosque over the course of ninety years. The *Qur'an* (Chapter 17) attests that the question of Jerusalem and the al-Aqsa Mosque is a religious, Islamic question...

Does the world in general and the Islamic world in particular, know that in the course of the excavations, which lasted 10 years, in order to complete the excavation of what is called the "Hasmonean Tunnel", concentrated chemical acids were used? Does everyone know that the massive amounts of acid that were used to erode the rocks seeped into the foundations of the al-Aqsa Mosque? Does everyone realize that the seepage of those massive amounts of chemical acids mixed together with the reservoirs located at the foundation of the al-Aqsa Mosque, whose numbers reach 24 large reservoirs? Has each one of us asked the question: What is the condition of the pillars of the al-Aqsa Mosque and its underground foundations, after they were exposed to those massive amounts of chemical acids? Will we, at least, initiate the establishment of a professional commission that will urgently investigate this worrisome phenomenon, before it is too late?

Al-Medina, October 21 and November 4, 1996, cited in the Elad Digest of the Religious Affairs Ministry, no. 167/97 from January 1997, pp. 1-2; Saut al-Haq, by Sheik Raid, November 15, 1996.

B. REGARDING THE SITES SACRED TO ISLAM IN ISRAEL (NOVEMBER 1996)

The repeated attacks against Muslim cemeteries throughout the country, the most recent of which transpired at the Um Khaled cemetery in Netanya and the Arb al-Nafiat cemetery in Hadera and which did not arouse the conscience of the Prime Minister or any minister or other official. These attacks constitute a severe indication of the existence of a policy to eradicate all vestiges of the "*rabat*" (the Islamic presence in Palestine), and our existence in this land, while undermining the sanctity of our dead, showing

contempt for the dignity of the living among us and trampling the honor of both Arabs and Muslims...

We turn, by means of this manifesto, to the Prime Minister... and to the heads of the Jewish authorities in the country and call to end this illegal desecration... Desecration of the holy places constitutes a mark of discredit for any regime that does not respect the sites sacred to others...

By means of this manifesto we call upon the honorable Egyptian Ambassador, the Jordanian Ambassador and the legation of Muslim Turkey, to intercede with the Israeli government in order to stop the attacks against the Muslim graves and holy places... And we turn to everyone whose heart is touched by this matter, and ask him to be in touch with the "al-Aqsa Society for the Preservation of Islamic Consecrations" and contribute with advice or financial aid, etc.

The bulldozers had the audacity to dig and destroy the cemetery in the Palestinian village of Um Khaled, whose residents, which numbered approximately 1,000, were expelled during the year of the catastrophe... 1948... The attack against the cemetery and the desecration of its sanctity constitute a link in a long chain, whose objective is to offend the sensibilities of our Palestinian people, and to attempt to liquidate any material vestige that underscores the crime committed by Zionism and Israel, in an attempt to expunge the "naqba" and the expelled refugees from historical memory.

Saut al-Haq wal-Huriah, November 15-18, 1996

C. AN INTERVIEW WITH A MEMBER OF THE ISLAMIC MOVEMENT (1988)

Question: Does not fundamentalist religious zealotry indicate a primitive world view?

Answer: Zealotry and primitiveness are foreign to Islam. Islam teaches to respect and honor others.

Q: What do you preach in your sermons?

A: Peace, morality and fulfillment of the religious commandments.

Q: What is the difference between a religious Muslim and a secular Muslim?

A: Only in the degree of fulfillment of the religious commandments.

A religious Muslim prays five times daily, pays the *zkat* and fulfills the commandment of the *haj*, the pilgrimage to Mecca...

Q: Would it be fair to say that you hold the same extreme opinions regarding your right to Palestine, as do some religious Jews?

A: I know that there are some religious Jews who demand the rights to Palestine in its entirety...

Q: And what do you say, to whom does the Land of Israel/Palestine belong?

A: We must receive all the rights that we deserve, including the right of return for all refugees who left in 1948. They have the right to return to their homes. There should be two separate states, for Arabs and for Jews.

Q: What will be the borders of that state?

A: If you tell me the borders of the Jewish state about which you are thinking I will tell you the borders about which I am thinking.

Q: Does the combination "Israeli Arab" describe your identity precisely?

A: I am a Palestinian, a Muslim and an Arab. A Palestinian, who lives in Palestine.

Q: Do you believe that a state as you anticipate it, with full implementation of the right of return, has a chance to come into being?

A: I know that with a Prime Minister like Shamir it is a vain hope...

Q: Is there any point to dreaming about utopia, instead of struggling for an immediate improvement in the living conditions of the Israeli Arabs?

A: We must not stop dreaming. I leave that task of improving living conditions to the mayors, while I deal with the religious problem.

Q: What is your position regarding the Arabs in the territories?

A: They are my brethren and I totally identify with their positions.

Q: What do you feel towards the Israelis?

A: I live with them in the same State, but it was not my choice to do so. They were the ones who chose to love with me here, and they utilized force to achieve that objective...

Q: Have you never met a good Israeli?

- A:** No, never. I have never met an Israeli of that sort and I have no Israeli acquaintances.
- Q:** They say that you are strong and influential.
- A:** Yes, religiously I am a strong man. The Islamic festival (that I organized) drew 30,000 people and that is unprecedented. The return to Islam is what brought all of those masses here.
- Q:** Is there room in your world view for other, non-Muslim religions?
- A:** Islam respects other religions, however I aspire to islamicize the entire world, not by force but through persuasion... After all, thousands are converting to Islam daily...

*From an interview by Orit Galili with
Sheik Kamal Hatib, Haaretz, July 29, 1988.*

D. "PEARLS" FROM ISLAMIC MOVEMENT JOURNALS

The politicians in this country are enchanted by their hopeless ideas regarding the borders of their country from the Euphrates to the Nile, and it would not surprise us if they demand the Hijaz for themselves. The very declaration of those intentions is consistent with the objectives of the Zionist invasion, which is being conducted in accordance with the Crusader formula. Their venomous claims and their forgeries of history, not only do not serve their purposes, but cause the installation of a regime of power and aggression... Their lies and the forgeries will not convince us to accept *faits accomplis*. All of the political solutions that have been proposed from all quarters will not bring us to abandon our conceptual justice... After all, no one who functioned as a farmer, working the land for several years... can convince anyone that it is his land, as it is conceivable that his parents stole the land themselves. They forgot that it was the Balfour Declaration that granted them a national home in Palestine in 1917. That one-time political act, motivated by self-interest can not suddenly turn into an acquired national right...

You should rejoice that the world has recognized you as a nation for the time being, however, you cannot constantly continue to delude yourselves, lest you awaken to a cruel reality... as your very existence, based on arrogance and imperiousness, is nothing more than a delusion and vanity and therefore it is null and void by definition

as it does not stem from legitimate rights and established truths, but rather from empty claims, theft, murder, expulsion and forceful conquest of the land of others... and from the establishment of a society of immigrants from throughout the universe, whose inherent contradictions are obvious...

Their arrogance itself is proof that they have learned nothing from history... Ultimately, universal laws will bring upon them a resounding defeat, like the ones they absorbed from the Romans and others. They will always be parasites clinging to the cultures of other nations, due to their stubbornness and their rejection of history and its laws... Their arrogance will only lead them from downfall to downfall...

The Israelis are on their way to building not only their Temple, but also to take over the world, in accordance with their historical context that requires that the Torah of Zion will ultimately emerge victorious... They not only aspire to establish their Temple on the ruins of al-Aqsa, in order to transform the mosque and the Islamic sites into tourist attractions, museums and playing fields, but, even worse, they seek to destroy the Christian culture and install Israel as ruler of the world. There is no limit to their avarice and their expansionist tendency. There are those among them who believe that their Messiah, who resides in Jerusalem, will arrive as a thief in the darkness of night, or will appear as lightning, which expresses their yearning to dominate the world... If we understand this... we are standing on firm ground in order to understand their sense of their own greatness. One of their sages stated: "We, the Jews, it is our job to destroy and that will be our mission forever. As, everything that you, the Gentiles, do, will never satisfy us and will not fulfill our needs. Therefore we will continue to destroy forever, because we want a world of our own, a heavenly world, which you are incapable of constructing..."

They seek not only their Temple and not only to achieve Palestinian relinquishment of a tract of land, as they will never become accustomed to any nation at all and they are convinced that even the choicest of nations deserve to die, all the more so the Arab nation that was capable of standing up to them. It was an American author that warned the Western world about the Zionist extremists that brought about the American involvement in World War II, that they are also liable of bringing about World War III in order to

weaken the Arab countries and cause them to accept a secondary role under Israeli control...

Al-Aqsa is the heart that provides us with life and unity and it stands above all mundane political decisions... We read in the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* that the Third Temple must be established on the ruins of al-Aqsa. This connection is multi-faceted: First, tourists were allowed to enter the Temple Mount, and then the excavations surrounding the Temple Mount and in the tunnels beneath it began in order to lay the groundwork for it; and we must not forget the attempt to set the mosque on fire (1969)... Therefore, we must move from words and proposals to action...

I was leafing through the books when the tears of Haifa and the sighs of Ramle and the Triangle began crying out to me. The map of Palestine tells me that Haifa and Jaffa are preferable for them to Jenin and Nablus... Their sighs are the beloved tunes of the oranges of Haifa and Jaffa and the walls of Acre... The map of Palestine is crying for its children that were dispossessed 40 years ago... And their story is horrifying... We will not forget Hebron, Jaffa and the Galilee... Our path is long, but jails will not obstruct it... O Prophet of Islam! We will restore al-Aqsa and Haifa to you...

When will the splendor return to our beloved East,
 And when will the glory return to our nation?
 When the sharp swords return,
 Then the boastful enemy will be smitten and oppressed
 Then their fortress will collapse on the heads of its builders,
 Then the Fathers will return to restore the ruins
 O brethren in our Jordan, you are the heralds of the way
 Because people of honor will always fulfill their promises.
 Here is the Galilee, here is the port city and here is Jerusalem,
 The pearl of the East. The pearl of the world and in its heart is
 the prominent building
 We send you our blessing, we the prisoners
 This is the word of oath for the land of the Galilee...

I will engrave on the olive trees the story of the people in the form of animals of prey, which devour human flesh... The story of the criminals and the arch-murderers, who massacred my people and pursued me to the western extreme of the Arab world. I will write a poem of hatred and rage against the occupier and a love

poem to every centimeter of Jerusalem, Haifa, Jenin, Jericho, the Triangle... I will not rest as long as the descendants of the prophet are rotting in jail...

From al-Sirat, August 18, September 1, 8 and 22, October 6, 1989; Saut al-Haq wal-Horiya, October 13, 20 and 27, November 3, 10, 17, 24, December 1, 8, 22, 29, 1989 and January 12, 1990.

E. MONOLOGUE OF A YOUNG SHEIK (1985)

From everything that I know, and according to the *Qur'an* and the Islamic religion, I believe that Palestine was Muslim and under Islamic rule until the Jews came and expelled all of the Muslims from Jaffa, Tel Aviv and Safed. Those who came here by force will only be expelled by force. The Christians killed Muslims here, followed by the Tatars and the Jews. However, we believe that the Muslims will restore Palestine to Islam. We have religious leaders and they will decide where we will begin the war, and everything they say will obligate us. Do we desire a Muslim country instead of Israel? We do not reveal the truth and our true thoughts to journalists. We do not believe in peace, for if peace will reign, it will be between puppet regimes presently in power and not between the peoples. The peoples do not want peace. The *Qur'an* establishes that the Jews and the Christians are on the other side of the Muslim barricade. There will never be peace and if there will be peace it will not be a just peace. Only the strongest will prevail. It is true that today I do not have power and I am only a street cleaner, but if I had the power, I can not say what I would do. All of our fathers fought against the Jews, however now they vote for the Labor Party. The only path is to return to faith and that way we will be able to restore everything to ourselves. At present, we are living as we are living, out of clear self-interest, not out of ideology. After all, we get unemployment allocations from you. When I studied in the university and I was an excellent student, I received grants from you. There is an Arab adage that states: "Until you get what you want, kiss the hand that feeds you." What we want is a Muslim state, anywhere, from which we can expand in all directions. It is true

that Israel is a fact, however I can not accord it legitimacy, because Allah implores us to never give up, to stand firm everywhere, to take root in the land and not to relinquish anything. I am not going anywhere from here and even when I die I will not go from here but will remain here covered with dirt, but I will not move.

From the statements of Sheik Hashem that were made in the mid-1980s to Michal Meron from Yediot Aharonot. For the full text, see the book by Raphael Israeli, Islamic Fundamentalism in Israel (English), London 1993, p. 173.

4. ARAB POLITICS

One of the most outstanding areas of assimilation into Israeli society among Israeli Arabs is their integration into the process of politicization of all aspects of their lives to the point of extreme factionalism among their voters, just like the situation in the Jewish sector, and political activity bordering on the manipulative for party, sectarian and personal needs. The Communist Party in all of its incarnations (Maki, Rakah and Hadash), which was perhaps the most ideological among the Arab parties, at least until the decline of communism and the ascent of the Islamic Movement, was, at times, guilty of propaganda and occasionally even incitement among its voters when it came to serve its own narrow interests, or the interests of the communist superpower, whose message they represented in Israel. The belligerent statements of some Arab leaders at the time were so extreme that their statements about the right of return of their brethren were, for all intents and purposes, not taken seriously by the Israeli public, until the turmoil of the al-Aqsa *intifada* in the year 2000. The sectarianism embedded in Arab politics is also noteworthy. Because, while the Arabs are demanding equality in one matter or the other, they seek nothing for the good of the State, even from their perspective, or for the good of the population, not to mention its security, but only partisan benefits for the Arab sector. In that context, the paradoxical tendency to put their trust in the State in all matters, perpetually asking what they can get from it and not what they can do to sustain it, is conspicuous. They appear and sound like they are eluding the intrinsic contradiction in their expectation to milk the State more and more, while they are unwilling to lift a finger so that the milking cow can maintain its health and its secure existence and will be able to continue to produce the fruits of its udder. And in the course of voicing their demands some of

them, especially their leaders and representatives in the Knesset, reach a level of audacity, belligerence, rudeness and verbal violence, which, even though it is not rare in these parts in general, is right on the dangerous border of treason (if it is at all possible to be a traitor to something to which you are not loyal in the first place), incitement, racism and violence, when coming from the mouths of some Arab spokesmen. Even though, it must be said that other Arabs have reservations about those statements, which at times challenge Israeli law, Israel's right to exist in general and as a Jewish state in particular (for example, by supporting the right of return), or simply blaspheming their State and calling upon its sworn enemies to battle against it; however, since they do this in order to compete among themselves for the votes of their Arab constituency, it is only because they know that these belligerent statements have currency among the Arab public. In other words, one cannot say that these statements do not reflect the opinion of the Israeli Arabs.

A. RAKAH STATEMENT ON THE KAFR KASSEM MEMORIAL DAY

Kafr Kassem calls to us so that we will be one village, so that we will want to remember the massacre, so that we will not lose our way, for which the dead paid a price in order to follow – the path of survival on the land and adherence to it, and so that we will enhance our unity in our just struggle, regardless of the number of victims, we will suffer in order to realize the rights of our people and to put an end to the catastrophe of our exile from our homeland and that we will do everything in our ability for the well-being of our grandchildren and great-grandchildren in peace and security, so that they will be spared the human suffering.

From the Rakah statement on the anniversary of the Kafr Kassem massacre (1956), as it appeared in their journal al-Itihad, October 16, 1981.

B. RESOLUTIONS OF THE CONFERENCE OF ARAB MAYORS (FEBRUARY 1984)

1. The conference emphasizes that the Arab public in Israel is an indivisible part of the Palestinian people and it aspires to realize as quickly as possible the legal national rights that are recognized by international bodies and liquidation of the situation of occupation and expulsion... and realization of a just

peace as well, including security and rights for all countries and all peoples in the region... At the same time, the convention emphasizes that the Israeli Arab public is part of the State whose joint fate in the common homeland unites it with members of the Jewish people in Israel. It, too, suffers from the domestic and foreign policy of the Israeli Government...

2. Since the establishment of the State to this day, the Arab public is faced with an official policy based on discrimination, neglect and strangulation on the basis of nationality. This policy has recently borne its fruits in the form of open discrimination and the legislation of several racist laws, regulation and questionable decisions, like the National Insurance Law, the decisions of the "Katzav Commission" regarding university tuition, and other well-known decisions and regulations...
3. Similarly, the conference condemns all of the various forms of oppression and occupation and calls for their cessation. The conference calls for the immediate withdrawal of the Israeli Army from all of the territories occupied since 1967 and from occupied Lebanese land...
4. Including all of the Arab cities and villages in the program of restoring old neighborhoods...
5. Granting licenses [retroactively] to all existing buildings in the Arab sector...
6. Abrogation of the expropriation of lands in the Arab cities and villages, as well as the decisions regarding the theft of lands, expanding their jurisdiction to include all of their lands and the bordering Israel Lands Administration lands...
7. Government allocations in order to resolve the population explosion crisis among the Israeli Arabs, especially for young couples...
8. Freeing Muslim *waqf* properties and transferring them to Muslim councils consisting of members of the Muslim denomination...
9. The conference emphasizes its continuing demand from the authorities, from the government and from the Center of Local Government and from all of the bodies and the institutions, to officially recognize the National Committee as the representative of the Arab local councils in Israel...

10. The conference calls upon the local councils of the Arab and Druse villages to join the unity [heads of the Arab councils], because they face the same problems and situations...
11. The conference calls upon the National Committee of Council Heads to continue with its fruitful activity... in activating the Monitoring Committee that was recently established in cooperation with the Arab members of Knesset...

From "Digest" 37-8, February-March 1984, pp. 12-15.

C. RESOLUTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE OF HEADS OF LOCAL COUNCILS AGAINST "HATIKVA" (MARCH 1983)

We condemn the proposed legislation to transform *Hatikva* into the national anthem and consider that proposed legislation part of a series of racist laws, designed to ignore the existence of the Arab people in Israel and demand to compose a new national anthem, attuned to the reality of two peoples within the State of Israel.

Ibid., p. 16.

D. A LETTER OF THE DEMANDS OF THE UNITED ARAB LIST TO THE PRIME MINISTERIAL CANDIDATE EHUD BARAK (APRIL 1999)

...The Labor Party pledges, whether it wins the elections or not, to establish a professional forum... whose task will be to prepare a draft constitution based on the above guiding principles, and the principle of cultural pluralism, in order to recognize the Arabs as a national minority... It is agreed between the parties that whether or not the Labor Party wins the elections, to support submission of an proposed constitution agreed upon by both parties, for Knesset approval by May 2001, and until then, the Labor Party will guarantee... to support amendment of the following laws: [A list of 13 laws, including the Citizenship Law, the Education Law and the amendment of the Land Directive, abrogation of property tax, etc.]

Amendment of the Broadcast Authority Law in a manner that will guarantee Arab representation in the administration of the Broadcast Authority, in television, radio and Bezeq, in accordance to their percentage in the population;

Amendment of the Government Company and State Service Law in a manner that will ensure Arab representation in the administration of the Government Authorities and Government Service in accordance with their percentage in the population;

Amendment of the Qadi Law in a manner that will recognize Muslims as a religious denomination with all legal implications of said recognition and the establishment of a Council of Qadis and Muslim Religious Sages that will function in accordance with its Muslim beliefs and in accordance with legal status... as is customary with the Chief Rabbinate Council...

Amendment of the Entry to Israel Law in a manner that will relax the criteria for granting a permanent resident permit in cases of unification of families, and will thereby limit the absolute discretion of the Interior Minister...

ON THE MATTER OF SOCIAL EQUALITY

Resolution of the problem of domestic refugees and restoration of the displaced persons to their unsettled villages...

Abrogation of the Bedouin Administration and the Green Patrol in the Negev...

To halt the demolition of houses in Arab settlements and to provide building permits to existing houses...

Canceling the granting of work permits for foreign laborers and granting priority status to residents of the State and its Palestinian neighbors...

Renovation of all of the religious sites belonging to Muslims, Christians and any other community, especially in the Jewish settlements and in villages and sites of the displaced persons...

ON THE MATTER OF STRATEGIC PLANNING

Funding of the establishment of a department for strategic planning for Arab settlements, subject to the Arab Monitoring Committee...

Nazareth will be classified as a district and as an Arab metropolitan center on the employment, institutional and cultural levels. Among other things, a university that will serve the entire population –

Arabs and Jews, will be established... Two other sub-metropolitan centers will be established, one in the Triangle and one in the city of Rahat in the Negev... And the principle of a bi-national metropolis, which will be a guiding principle for the plan for the Beersheba metropolis... and the halt of the implementation of the strategy of outflanking and laying siege to the Arab settlements...

(From the letter of the United Arab List's members of Knesset to Ehud Barak, April 12, 1999, published in "Surveys about the Arabs in Israel", no. 24, in the Institute for the Study of Peace in Givat Haviva, 1999, through the courtesy of Sarah Ossetsky, Institute administrator.)

E. FROM THE HADASH PLATFORM FOR THE ELECTIONS TO THE 13TH KNESSET (JUNE 1992)

1. Recognition of the Arab Palestinian population in Israel as a national minority, on the political, social and cultural planes;
2. Abrogation of the policy of discrimination and oppression in all areas;
3. Full equal rights for all the Arab citizens; putting an end to the expropriation of land and demolition of houses; recognition of all existing Arab settlements and establishment of elected local councils in them; granting civil rights to Arab refugees in their homeland;
4. Granting the Arabic language official language status in practice like that of the Hebrew language;
5. Allocations transferred to the Arab local councils will be equalized with the budgets of the Jewish local councils in the areas of development, education, health, agriculture, industry, sports and housing. The Arab cities and villages will be granted development area status. Arab citizens will be included in elected and appointed government institutions.
6. A consistent struggle against ethnic divisiveness among the Arab population. Cancellation of mandatory conscription for Arab and Druse youths.
7. Freeing the Muslim *waqf* property and honoring the right

of the Muslim citizens to establish their elected religious frameworks.

8. Recognition of the representative institutions of the Arab population;
9. Full equality for the Arab population in the Histadrut labor union and its institutions.

F. FROM THE STATEMENTS OF ARAB MEMBERS OF KNESSET AND PERSONALITIES

1. MK Hisham Mahoul (Hadash) (In the Knesset, July 5, 2001)

The Taliban Government headed by Sharon is preparing programs to commit crimes against the Palestinian people... I warn you that Sharon is preparing an additional volitional war against the Palestinian people. The path from here to Sabra and Shatila can be very short and must be obstructed. I warn the Prime Minister that crimes against the Palestinian people will end up in the International Tribunal for War Crimes in The Hague... I call for the dispatch of hundreds of volunteers from international human rights organizations here as an "International Peace Brigade"... If people here can call Arafat Bin-Laden, why can I not speak of the Taliban Government? I would like to see the government prevent the International Peace Brigade from landing in the airport...

2. Amir Mahoul, administrator of Atijah, an Arab umbrella organization (*al-Sinara*, January 5 and *Haaretz*, January 10, 2001)

...Boycotting the elections in Israel serves a dual purpose: Both a protest against government policy, as well as providing incentive for the continued discussion of the Palestinian problem within Israeli society... Our interest as part of the Palestinian people is to intensify the crisis facing the Israeli leadership, and not to save the leadership from it... The right to vote is fundamental and it can be realized in any way that each citizen – man or woman – sees fit... We utilize that right in a negative manner and that is a legitimate step in a democratic framework...

3. MK Abd al-Malk Dehamshe (Raam), (*Haaretz*, October 3, 2000)

[In September 2000, in the context of the vandalism in the Sarfand Mosque, the MK warned] we will break the arms and legs of the policemen if they attempt to prevent restoration of the mosque... We will build it even if blood will be shed...

[In 1997, during his visit to Syria, he declared] Palestine and Syria are one homeland and they have a common destiny. By brandishing its sword, the Arab people will emerge victorious and return to our homeland... Victory will come thanks to the *jihad* of the Arab nation...

[In 1999, he was quoted as saying] we will liberate Jerusalem from the Zionists, enemies of humanity...

[And in October 2000, regarding the al-Aqsa *intifada*]... This is a war in which every Muslim participates. There is no Green Line as far as the al-Aqsa Mosque is concerned, it will continue in all areas within the State of Israel...

Even people whom we believed were sworn leftists and we thought that they were our friends, have condemned the obstruction of the roads in the North, because it disturbed the vacationers from returning home in the South... But no one had anything to say about the fact that over the course of 25 years Arabs have been the victims of police officers' clubs and demolition of homes... They are laughing right in our faces... Are we not people? Can I now leave my house in Kafr Kana without fearing that a policeman will shoot me in the head?

Ahmed Yassin, head of Hamas, was an excellent person and a great leader seeking peace... He never dispatched suicide bombers... The suicide branch of Hamas is totally separate. Yassin only established Hamas, which is a political organization and has nothing to do with violence. I represented him in court and I am proud of it. He was a sensitive vessel. I saw the torture that he underwent and how the General Security service agents burned his body. I understood him and listened to him. He said that we are not opposed to peace or opposed to the Jews. This man was subject to violence and he spoke in the name of an entire nation, an occupied nation that has suffered for 50 years...

We live in a harsh reality that has expunged the Green Line...

Apparently, we the Palestinians are also one people... The Arab sector in Israel numbers one million people at present. These people have successfully learned that they have rights and that discrimination against them and confiscation of their land are illegal... It is my right to fight for my land, my home and my life. I will not let them uproot me. The Arab public has not become extreme, but rather it has simply reached the limit of its ability to suffer... In the 1999 elections, the Israeli Arabs supported Barak, choosing the bad over the worse, while now it appears that the bad is worse as well...

Imagine if Ariel Sharon had sought to visit a mosque in Kafr Kana. I would approach the imam there, and I am very skeptical as to whether he would agree. However, that is not what happened in Jerusalem. With enormous cynicism, Sharon set out to perform an act of provocation in order to cause a conflagration in the holiest place in this country, with the objective to lead to bloodshed and incite riots. I can not stand idly by and watch that murderer defile the most sacred site in this country... He went to the site sacred to Muslims as a murderer, as a strong man, as a cynic and as a conqueror... All of the Jews visit the Western Wall, so why was it necessary for him to enter a mosque? They say that there is a Western Wall, alright, the Jews pray there. But that Sharon should pray? Is he a religious person? He went there in order to generate riots...

4. MKs Ahmed Tibi and Muhammad Baraka (*Haaretz*, June 21, 2001)

If the Ramle Municipality again attempts to demolish the house of the Wahidi family, which is in advanced stages of construction after it was demolished on Sunday, there is danger of severe clashes at the site... The citizens residing in the house have full rights to build, even illegally, as the housing shortage in mixed cities like Ramle, Lod, Jaffa and Acre is intolerable. When an Arab builds without a permit, he does so because he has no alternative... (Tibi)

The right of residents to housing supersedes arbitrary laws. (Baraka)

5. MK Azmi Bishara (*Haaretz*, July 12, 2001)

[In his speech on the anniversary of the death of Assad in Damascus, on June 10, Bishara said] after the victory of the resistance [in South

Lebanon], after Geneva [where the meeting between Assad and Clinton resulted in failure] and after the failure in Camp David, the Israeli Government began threatening that if its conditions are not met it would resort to a comprehensive war... And there is no way to continue with the third option, the path of resistance, other than by means of its expansion, so that the people will be able to continue to struggle by means of the path of resistance [*makwama* – armed resistance]... In the case of Lebanon, after the Israeli withdrawal, I noticed the heroism of the resistance in its war against the Israeli occupation. I did not hide this, and the method employed by the Lebanese resistance was armed struggle against the occupier...

In my speech, I referred to the Palestinian context. I lived on the West Bank for 10 years and taught at Bir Zeit University. The generation of Marwan Barghouti was my students... When they speak there of armed resistance they are not speaking of resistance in the sense of demonstrations, strikes and public assemblies... I am not attempting to change my opinions now in order to find favor in the eyes of anyone, I just seek to explain that in the case of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, that type of resistance is more effective against the occupier... What I actually said in my speech is that I seek to call upon the Zionist Left, which always took pride in the fact that it does not want to put us to the test: Please do not forget that Arab unity and international activity will prevent war and will thwart political *diktats*...

Put me to the test now; do not start making our participation in the political process contingent on our being Israeli patriots, because that will be the beginning of apartheid, and that will alter the whole configuration of the political struggle...

The Attorney General will do himself a great favor if he refrains from issuing an indictment against me, contrary to the police recommendation. However, if an indictment is issued, it will become a media festival that will cause Israel damage in the world arena... If there will be a trial, I will bring witnesses from the French Resistance, who will testify to the nature of resistance. I will bring people from South Africa, who will testify as to the nature of occupation. This trial will be the first in Israel that will be about opinions. It will not be a simple trial. If they were thinking pragmatically, they would do without this trial. It seems to me

that they are searching for a way to climb down from this tree; however it is a very tall tree due to the public expectations that they aroused... the Attorney General has a clear political opinion on the matter, and that motivated him as well, unfortunately. He understood from the outset that he had no legal pretext; however, he was unable to restrain himself from expressing his political opinion. I think that he is dying to take political revenge against me.

6. Lutfi Masour, editor of *al-Sinara*, (June 11, and *Haaretz*, July 12, 2001)

Bishara does not represent the Arab population in Israel and his declarations were made only in order to garner him publicity in the Arab world... People who live in glass houses would be well advised not to throw stones. This person has no house and no glass, and he is more naked than a bare tree. He is destroying himself. He appears in Syria as a representative of the Palestinian people. With all due respect, he has no mandate to represent the Arabs in Israel. He thinks that he is a great man in Syria; however the truth of the matter is that he is a tattered rag in Syria...

7. A telegram from Abd al-Malk Dehamshe to the President of Syria (*Maariv*, April 17, 2001)

In the name of the merciful and compassionate Allah

In honor of the President of Syria

Bashar al-Assad

Damascus, Syria

Peace Be with You and the Mercy of God

We received with sadness the report of the falling in a martyr's death of three members of the Syrian people in the course of a criminal attack by the fascist Israeli Government on Syrian targets in Lebanon, and the wounding of many others. The Israeli actions reveal the true face of the government in Israel, which seeks war and refuses to take the path of peace. This requires Arab unification in order to put an end to Israel's extreme actions. In my name and in the name of my brethren in the Islamic Movement, and the

members of our people the “internal Arabs” of 1948, I send to you all our expressions of sadness and grief,

Member of Knesset Abd al-Malk Dehamshe
Head of the Islamic Movement and head of
the United Arab List Nazareth, Palestine, 1948.

8. An article in the Hadash journal (*al-Itihad*) (August 22, 2001)

...we will not be surprised if the Senator (Hillary Clinton), and former First Lady, will change her name to “Zion”, “Moishele” or “Sharoni”. Because, together with the sexual immorality and corruption, political depravity is rampant among the ruling circles in the US. Ever since Clinton was elected to the Congress (the error is in the original, she was elected to the Senate), in the State of New York, she has adopted a form of political prostitution, which is even worse than the sexual immorality of her husband...

In order to win the hearts of the Zionist lobby and win the votes of the large Jewish community in New York, Hillary has adopted the positions of the most extreme right-wing Zionists, who are the most hostile to the Palestinian people and its rights; those are the forces that also support the tragic Sharon government, saturated with the blood of the massacres that it perpetrated against the children and the people of Palestine on the West Bank, in Gaza and in occupied Jerusalem...

Last Monday, she put on a show whose objective was to absolve the criminal and his thugs, and to place the guilt on the bleeding victim. She appeared together with a group of Zionists, including two of the victims of the act of martyrdom in Jerusalem (the explosion in the pizzeria) near the UN building, and she was the chief spokesperson...

What invective emerged from the mouth of Hillary Zion! With audacity and enthusiasm, she repeated the statements made by Sharon and the propaganda mechanisms that disseminate lies. She demanded that President Yasser Arafat “cease from the horrible terrorist actions against innocent mothers and children”! She called upon the members of the American Congress to exert pressure on Arafat so that he “stops the incitement, violence and terrorism”, and concluded her words of incitement and vitriol with the declaration;

“How important it is that we stand alongside our democratic friend in the Middle East”...

We are not surprised by the positions of this political whore, positions that turn the facts on their heads in order to gain the support and love of the members of the Zionist lobby in America. Hundreds of martyrs and thousands of wounded, including children, women and the elderly, among the Palestinian people are the victims of terrorism, massacres and escalation at the hands of the State, and of the bloody crimes of the Sharon-Peres-Ben-Eliezer-Mofaz Government and the gangs of settlers...

This pure blood did not succeed in arousing the “humane” feelings of Senator Hillary. Her stance on the side of the aggressive wolf and against the victim is no different than the stance of the American Government and its President Bush. Clinton’s wife’s slanderous statements only underscore what we have always said: The American Government is a partner of its strategic ally in escalating the aggressive and bloodthirsty Israeli attack against the Palestinian people, and its continued plot to undermine their legitimate rights... Your positions have been exposed to the light of day, Mrs. Clinton.

5. THE FIRST *INTIFADA* AND ITS OFFSHOOTS

The mass uprising of the Palestinians in December 1987 that did not come to an end until the announcement of the Oslo Accords (1993), was the second decisive turning point (after the first Land Day in 1976), in which the Arab population in Israel was forced to choose between Israel and the Palestinians, and chose the latter. Their heart was with them anyway; however they were not in a hurry to openly announce their choice, concerned that their accomplishments in the State of Israel might be jeopardized, if they were to publicly support their country’s enemies. However, once they were drawn to do so due to events over which they had no control, they were hesitant, continued to speak regularly about their Israeliness, despite their vocal Palestinian identity, and continued to carefully distinguish between themselves and their brethren across the Green Line, as if saying that despite their identification, they do not need to bear the requisite consequences. The pioneers of the crossing of all of the red lines were the members of the Islamic Movement, who not only openly identified with

their brethren in the territories, but also displayed active participation in material and moral support for members of Hamas, who bore an ever increasing share in the riots. It was then that the first buds of the schism in the Islamic Movement were generated, when its youth raced forward in identification with the *intifada*, faster and more energetically than the cautious founder of the movement – Sheik Darwish. It is, thus, no coincidence that the wave of anti-Israel activity, what the police refer to as ideological crime, skyrocketed beginning in the second year of the *intifada*, and specifically in the area of the Yiron Valley, the cradle of the movement's activity. And indeed, in 1989 alone, in that area alone hundreds of cases of disturbing the flow of traffic, burning fields and forests, demonstrations were recorded, not to mention verbal support for the *intifada*, especially in the journals of the Islamic Movement, which we are discussing, as we already saw in the previous paragraph (4). For example, open calls for *jihad* were sounded in the journals of the Islamic Movement, words of praise and glory were sounded about the heroes of the *intifada* who gave their lives, and the path was thereby paved for more than a few acts of terrorism perpetrated by Israeli Arabs against the State in those years.

A. *Al-Sirat*, November 1989 (with a picture of the al-Aqsa Mosque in the background on its cover), and in the following weeks:

O *jihad* warrior! Wake up! Acre and its beaches are calling you! Do not fall into a coma! Come and defend our rivers!

...The era of glory will come when our lands in Jaffa, Jerusalem, the Triangle, the Galilee and the Jezreel Valley will return to our hands...

We cannot forget the pioneering role of Hamas in Palestine against the forces of occupation, by its infusing the masses with the necessary passion to expel the occupation from the Holy Land and to brandish the flag of Allah in its place...

It is incumbent upon the Arab Summit in Casablanca to do something for the heroes of the *intifada*, and to remember that the land of Palestine is Arab and Islamic land, the property of the Arab nation and the patrimony of all Muslims, until Allah bequeaths the land and all of its residents... As it is written, [according to the well-known *hadith* about Judgment Day, according to which the Jews will hide on that day behind bushes and rocks, but those will loudly call out: "Hey Muslim! There is a Jew hiding behind me, come and kill him...] trees and rocks will be granted

human qualities, including the power of speech, and they will play a decisive and constructive role in the struggle against the government of despotism, injustice, tragedies and the law of the jungle [of Israel]...

...The *intifada* warriors must transform their country into a *jihad* arena, in which the flame will burn without interruption... against the mad dogs...

...the warriors of Islam must liberate Palestine and establish there the rule of Allah... The Muslims must quickly respond to the calls for *jihad* in order to win or die...

The liberators of Jerusalem must trample the hiding places of the Tatars!

...The venom-producing teeth of the snake-like Crusaders must be extracted...

...Their barking must be silenced by spears and knives...

B. A poem by the child Ibrahim Jabarin (*al-Sirat*, September 1, 1989)

...The mountains of flames must rise up against the most despicable of men

So that they will never be able to slaughter us...

We the children of the stones, challenge

Everyone who rules over us

Whose end will be like a dead dog...

C. From an interview with the family of a Hamas fatality (*al-Sirat*, October 8, 1989)

...Those robbers come to settle on the land of our fathers. The citrus groves that belonged to Abu Hassan in Jaffa are now Menahem's property... The olive groves in the Galilee were plundered by gangs of murderers and drug dealers, who came from the dark alleys of New York...

D. From articles in *Saut al-Haq wal-Horiya* (November-December 1989)

...All of the Muslims must refrain from emigration because Palestine is the land of the *Asra* and the *Maarj* (the nocturnal voyage of the Prophet from Mecca to Jerusalem and his ascent to

heaven from there), and the land of Jerusalem, Jaffa, Nablus, the Galilee and the Negev are Allah's land...

From the poem of a child from the 10th grade in the state school in Umm al-Fahm: Raise your weapon, for the days are coming, in which Islam will win and the scoundrels will be defeated...

The Muslim Brotherhood must continue to march forward until all of the land falls into Muslim hands...

...Leave our land, you treacherous robbers...

...The Jews are impure, in other words, whenever the enemies of Allah walked on the carpets inside the mosques, they defiled the site... The most pure part of the Jews is their shoes, because they are in constant contact with our pure land...

E. From *Saut al-Haq* (December 29, 1989)

...We turn to all the Muslim nations, and therefore we want Allah's flag to fly again over all lands that were part of the Muslim property and in which the sound of the muezzin was heard on high at any point in history. We want this call to reach all residents of the universe. Every one of the requisite stages has significance and ramifications, but for the time being, we will refrain from going into detail and revealing any more...

6. THE SECOND *INTIFADA* (AL-AQSA)

If the first *intifada* was the first turning point among Israeli Arabs, of alienation from Israel and identification with the Palestinians, in the wake of the first cracks that began during the Land Days of the previous decade, the second *intifada* of the year 2000, shook the entire framework of Israel-Palestinian relations to the point that it caused the rupture to broaden into a chasm, that it is very doubtful whether it will be able to be bridged in the future. Because it is not only that the Israeli Arab leaders unleashed their tongues against their country in a manner that they never dared to before, but the circles of verbal attacks expanded to broader avenues within the Arab population. Paradoxically, it is specifically the freedoms guaranteed them by Israeli law, by the power of which all of the statements and demonstrations that reach the legal limits are permitted, are the

same factors that encourage them to violate the law, to practice violence and acts of war against their state, while still claiming that they are the unfortunate victims and the law enforcement officers are the belligerent and cruel ones. The violent outburst that erupted in the territories, after Prime Minister Barak reached the limit of Israel's ability to make far-reaching concessions, instead of concentrating the support of the entire population behind their Prime Minister in difficult times, it specifically signaled the Israeli Arabs that they have nothing in common with the Jewish-Zionist government under the protection of whose laws they exist, and that it is preferable to place their trust in their brethren across the border who are quite far from providing their citizens with the same protections, all the more so to their brethren in Israel. And that let the cat out of the bag as it became clear that after the Prime Minister's concessions that went beyond their wildest dreams, they are not seeking conciliation and peace, but rather to appease Arafat and to stand by his side in his intransigence even if he is wrong. The implication is that they have no intention to pursue a logical, practical compromise, but rather Israel's total submission to Arafat's will, and failure to do so they would lead them without hesitation to take part in violence against their state, continue to demand the right of return to Israel for their brethren, while at the same time demanding as many rights, in other words, privileges, as they can.

A. From statements by Bedouins in the Negev (*Haaretz*, May 29, 2001)

...Serving in the army, you are an important person, and then everything seems proper. Then, you go home and become one of the frustrated unemployed... Today, I am trying to convince the youth to serve in the army, but I find that motivation has dropped remarkably. They tell me "what's in it for us? Why did I join the army? And what can I answer them?..." No one believes in the State or the government today. The youth are fed up with all the false promises and the neglect...

...We are gradually losing a population that was in the past quiet and loyal. If the problems continue to be neglected, the next *intifada* will come from the Bedouins...

B. The manager of an Arab radio station in the North (*Haaretz*, October 19, 2001)

The events struck us like lightning out of the blue. We had no

contingency plans, we lacked the necessary manpower and we also lacked the requisite journalistic training... For the first time in Israel, the Arabs have a radio station that does not speak to them condescendingly, but rather as equals... You must understand that the public here is educated and knows what it wants, and is capable of distinguishing between truth and propaganda. After 52 years of land expropriation, most of our listeners are no longer farmers or shepherds... There are Hebrew newspapers and internet... There are universities... Under these conditions, it is no longer possible to conceal things from us...

Over the years, the Arab population in Israel has developed mistrust *vis-à-vis* the Israeli Broadcast Authority in Hebrew and especially in Arabic. The Voice of Israel in Arabic and the telecasts in Arabic have served for years as propaganda organs, one of whose objectives was to convey messages to the Israeli Arabs from the Israeli authorities and security services. The broadcasts in Arabic have completely lost their credibility over the course of the recent events, and many of the Israeli Arabs, who received the impression that the reports were slanted in favor of the authorities, whose version was accepted uncritically, without giving the Arab side the possibility to express itself... Therefore, Radio 2000 is an interesting expression of the lack of trust of the Arab masses in the Voice of Israel...

At the start of the riots, it was not easy to get Arabic speakers on the air. There was much outrage, until people called the station and protested the fact that Hebrew was being broadcast on their Arabic station... I interviewed Natan Zakh on the air, but listeners called and demanded: "Do not let them speak! We hate them!" Although, one of the listeners called after he heard Zakh and admitted that he was wrong... In another case, several listeners called and protested the broadcast of a Hebrew song on the station, despite the fact that it was performed jointly by a Jewish singer and an Arab singer and despite the fact that it was a song of peace...

They (the Second Broadcast Authority that issued the license) accuse us of inciting people, but actually we were engaged in calming people down. Believe me, if it were not for our broadcasts, many more people would have been injured... I calmed things down as much as I could and I even censored many reports; however it is

impossible to suppress what people are saying on the air... I hope that they do not silence us. That would cause damage to the soul and spirit of the Arab public... Because the station no longer belongs to its founders but rather to the Arab masses, and they would want to defend it...

C. From the statement of Palestine Ismail, Director of the "Ialem" Media Center (*Haaretz*, October 20, 2001)

The Hebrew media outlets did not act properly, they constantly portrayed the Arabs as if they were enemies of the State, instead of speaking about their real struggle. Thirteen citizens were killed, and I still have not brought the pictures to Emanuel Halperin's program. The media totally ignored the fact that they have names and families, that they had a future and their families were destroyed... I attended three funerals in Nazareth this week and I have not yet calmed down. Yesterday, I was home all day, I looked at pictures and cried. I was gladdened that there was finally a significant Arab mobilization in support of the Palestinian people; however I was unable to carry those pictures with me all the time... I left (my job at the Civil Rights Society) at the moment that I felt that as an Arab woman in a Jewish institution, I could only advance to a certain point... Even before that, I was already sick of fighting over everything, for budgets that I had coming to me but did not receive because I was an Arab woman...

The Israeli media uses distorted language; they speak of "killed" when actually the subject is civilians, who were murdered while they were seeking to exercise their civil right of freedom of speech. They speak of "riots", a concept that accords the police legitimacy to employ force against the Arab public and they parallel rocks with weapons. Had we not been out on the street, no one would have known how many of the murder victims were shot in the back on their way home from the demonstrations... I remember from my childhood in Nazareth those attacks by the police and the army, however the difference is that now they are shooting at us, however their conduct is identical... The only ones who are in shock (among the Israelis) are those who have closed their eyes up until now, because it is convenient for them to act as if the Arab population has no problems, and to ignore the fact that they have

no building plans, the demolition of houses and from the extreme discrimination in education... As an Arab woman, I grew up in another world in which there was not even one computer in school and there were no playgrounds in school and in the meanwhile, they built Jewish neighborhoods on our lands. All these sound like strange topics to be raising these days...

Moral considerations prevented me from working for established Hebrew media outlets or for the Arab television and the like. I could not read the news on Channel Two and call al-Quds Jerusalem, or the Palestinians battling for their liberation – terrorists. Those are political and moral considerations that cannot be compromised if one wants to be true to himself. The Israeli media does not include a variety of languages, and anyone unwilling to play according to its rules, has no place there. Therefore, 20% of the population is not part of the media... The reports in (Atija) are credible. We rely on that credibility and that is the reason that our reports are accepted around the world. At first, we pursued the journalists, but now they call us, to seek candidates for interviews, to organize reactions, to find information beyond what their correspondents bring from the field. On the night after the riots in the eastern neighborhoods of Nazareth, we sent reports to the media and all of the broadcast authorities in the Arab world interrupted their broadcasts in order to quote those items. The entire world saw our reports, from Dubai to Australia, to Canada and the United States... From what I saw in the Israeli media, I am certain that there was a directive from above not to report about some of the events...

Our struggle is different than that of our brethren in the territories, but we belong to the same people. That is the reason that I consider it strange that you expect me to prove my loyalty by supporting every action taken by the army and the police, even if it is an act of terrorism on their part. The media always portrays the State as the victim and not us... I cannot sit indifferently by while Israel bombs Gaza and Ramallah... this State does not support me when my life is threatened; however it expects me to support it when it kills more and more of my people. Even my fellow journalists consider my work as a type of subversion against the State as if I was the enemy. They ask me if I have any information regarding riots that are going to take place, as if I was a member

of some violent organization, and not someone who reports and paints the picture as it is...

We are in a situation where we are fighting for our personal security. My brother, who works in Jerusalem, stopped going because he is afraid to travel. It is important to me that the Israeli public listen to my story and understand the difficult experiences that we are undergoing... This is not a media war against the State of Israel, but a media war for our right to exist as a national minority within Israel... It is easy for you to think that you also have fatalities, that you are correct, and if the pictures of the lynch in Ramallah are shocking, you have a media advantage. Instead of asking Nahman Shai how he deals with the pictures of a child killed in cold blood, start to think what you can do to prevent recurrence of actions of that sort.

D. From statements by Prof. Majad al-Haj at the "At the Gate" Convention (*Haaretz*, November 7, 2000)

...The common claim among members of the Israeli Left was that the problem of the Israeli Arabs will be resolved automatically with the resolution of the Palestinian problem in the context of two states for two separate nations, one for the Palestinians and one for the Israelis... That myth just exploded in the face of the Zionist left. The primary power of the Arab population in Israel for the struggle will begin *after* the establishment of the independent Palestinian state... For, first of all, after the establishment of the independent Palestinian state, the Israeli Arabs will no longer need to mobilize in support of establishment of such a state. They will also feel stronger and will be more determined than ever in their struggle for civil rights in their country... Second, the dissonance involved in their present existence on a double periphery, will be even more accentuated, for they will feel that while their Palestinian brethren realized their dream of an independent state, they themselves remained citizens in a state in which they are incapable of achieving equality. A day after the establishment of a Palestinian state, the Israeli Arabs will fight exclusively for equality and their rights for equality on two planes – the personal and the collective... In essence, the struggle for equality was at the top of the Israeli Arab agenda shortly after

Oslo; however, unfortunately, Israeli society, especially members of the Left, did not notice...

- E. An article by Elias Jabor in *Kul al-Arab*
(*Haaretz*, January 29, 2001)

(Under the headline – “Between the Hammer of Boycotting the Elections and the Anvil of Empty Ballots”, or “Between the Catastrophe of Sharon and the Commands of Barak”) We will die if we vote for Sharon and we will die if we vote for Barak, we will die if we decide not to vote at all and we will die if we insert an empty ballot. May Allah have mercy upon those who say: There are many arguments, but death has only one gate. In the final days before the elections, we must decide which death we choose. Arabs, Allah should help us!!

- F. The results of a survey conducted by Muhammad Darouche among the Israeli Arabs (May 22, 2001)

Those surveyed among the Israeli Arabs showed strong support for the *intifada*, 43% participated in one of the strike days in protest, more than 13% said that they were harassed by the authorities and that their houses were damaged. 50% feel that the events of the *intifada* alienated them from the State, and more than 58% believe that the Arab leadership in Israel acted responsibly in the course of the events and improved the standing of the Arabs, while 42% contended that the leadership did not act responsibly and harmed the Arabs.

Regarding the question about how they would vote if the elections were held today (January-March 2001), more than 9% responded that they would not vote at all, 10% refused to respond and 6% had not yet decided. In other words, only about 25% of those surveyed would not have voted, relative to the usual percentage of voters in general elections in the Arab sector in Israel. 78% of the voters support the utilization of the vote in order to improve the status of the Israeli Arabs, while approximately 70% believe that it is the most effective method to achieve that objective. The distribution of the voters among the parties points to a continued decline in Israeli Arab support for the Zionist parties. Therefore, Raam received 26% of the votes, Hadash 23% , Taal 7%, Meretz

8%, Labor, more than 7% and other Jewish parties approximately 5%. Thus, the percentage of voters for Arab parties rose from 70% in the last elections to 80% at present, and support for the Jewish parties declined correspondingly from 30 to 20%.

Most of the Arabs in Israel have no confidence in the government's policies. Approximately 53% believe that its policies widen the socio-economic gaps between Jews and Arabs, 36% believe that the government policy has no effect and only 11% believe that the government policies has a moderating influence on the gaps. 65% believe that the Barak government worsened their situation as opposed to only 3% who believed that during the tenure of the Rabin Government. As far as the Arabs are concerned, Rabin's assassination was a turning point in the deterioration of their situation.

While in 1999, 33% contended that the term "Israeli" accurately reflected their identity (the days of Netanyahu and Barak), during the Rabin regime 63% identified themselves as Israelis, and the number of Arabs willing to brandish the Israeli flag on Independence Day dropped correspondingly from 43% in 1995 to 27% in 2001. Similarly, the sense of closeness *vis-à-vis* the country's Jews more than *vis-à-vis* the Palestinians in the territories felt by Israeli Arabs dropped from 50% in 1995 to a bit more than 35% in 2001.

The number of Arabs rejecting Israel's right to exist rose from 7% in 1995 to more than 15% in 2001, and the number of those rejecting the Jewish-Zionist existence of the State rose from 35% in 1995 to 46% in 2001. However, only 5% expressed their desire to move to the Palestinian state upon its establishment; however 30% agreed to the annexation of the villages in the Triangle to the State of Palestine. This percentage includes 27% of the residents of the triangle themselves, including one-third of the residents of Taibe and Umm al-Fahm.

Regarding illegal demonstrations by the Arabs in Israel, whereas in the past, support for them among the Arabs was low, it rose dramatically to 21% in 1999, but dropped back to 10% in 2001, apparently due to the high price exacted from the demonstrators that time. Among the Israeli Arabs, the Bedouins are the most frustrated, alienated and radical. 42% of them negate Israel's right

to exist, as opposed to an average of 16% among the Israeli Arabs as a whole.

The data points to two factors that brought about the deterioration in relations between the Arabs and the State since Rabin's assassination – the State's abandonment of the policy of benefits, and the second – the entry of the Islamic Movement and Balad (Bishara's party) into Arab politics in Israel, which contributed an Islamic and nationalist tone to the Arab dialogue with the State, leading to the alienation and the opposition to the State. In summary, the Arabs believe that the Jews became stronger and not weaker in Israel and therefore many of them believe that the chances of their getting what they want are small (74% in 2001 as opposed to 65% in 1995).

- G. From the statements by Jafar Farah, director of "Musawa", an Arab center for civil rights and Hassan Jabarin, general manager of "Adallah" (*Haaretz*, December 3, 2000)

We told them (the European Union officials), look how they honor our rights, what do you plan on doing about it? We also met human rights activists in Europe, who promised that they would go to court in order to abrogate the agreement (between Israel and the European Union) if the Israeli government will not find a way to guarantee the rights of the Arab minority in the State... The legal center for rights of the Arab minority in Israel... Adallah, also intensified its ties with international human rights organizations... Adallah also assists in accumulating materials in order to report about the situation of the Arabs in Israel, in reports prepared by amnesty... There is nothing new in the fact that we are seeking aid from international institutions; however, in light of recent events, we sought even greater involvement of the international community...

We turn to the international channel anytime that we feel lack of responsiveness to our affairs on the part of the Israeli authorities. This time, over the course of the events, we sent letters in English to the foreign embassies, in which we updated them on the situation in the Arab cities and villages and we informed them of our demands and our positions. And since, we have held additional meetings with ambassadors in Tel Aviv and we continue to develop this channel...

7. ARAB CITIZENS SPEAK

In contrast to the politicians among the Israeli Arabs, who represent ideological trends, personal rivalries and various interests, rank and file Arab citizens, as well as dignitaries, who filled high ranking positions, expressed themselves publicly on current events, as individuals, as representatives of organizations or as ad-hoc associations for a specific purpose, in order to have their voices heard. Through these statements, in any case, the reader can discern the deterioration in relations between Israel and the members of the Arab minority, in all of its streams, over the years, as well as the various nuances in relations between different groups within that minority. For example, during the Lebanon War, Arab citizens, as a rule had their reservations about it, while the Christians, the Bedouins and the Druse supported it, raised contributions for the Fund for Israel's Security and sent gifts to the soldiers, each with his own considerations. It is even possible that these positions, as opposed to the ones adopted in extremist groups, were no different than those extant among the Jewish public, on the Right and the Left. However, even then, the Arab Israeli citizens thought that their natural allies were found on the Left, and placed their trust in them, until the rupture of the second *intifada*, which led to gloomy thoughts on both sides: Among the Left, because their naïve expectations that the response to the demands of the Palestinian public would lead to the inauguration of brotherhood and the consolidation of loyal citizenship of the Israeli Arabs were disappointed; while the Arabs, who thought that they could rely on the Left unconditionally, regardless of their exploits, came to realize that there were red lines that even the Israeli Left was unwilling to cross. The result – profound disappointment on both sides, which was an inevitable consequence of the illusions cultivated on both sides, and the extreme difficulty in going back and collecting the broken pieces in order to bring back the past. Therefore, these civilian statements, made primarily since the beginning of the second *intifada*, ranged from legitimate expressions of bitterness to calls for disobedience and raising doubts about the essential coexistence between Jews and Arabs in Israel, and at times to the point of challenging the State institutions and the very existence of the Jewish-Zionist state.

A. MANIFESTO OF THE ARAB CITIZENS OF ISRAEL (JULY 1982)

We, members of the Arab Palestinian people, citizens of the State of Israel, can not stand with our hands tied in the face of the war taking place in Lebanon between our two peoples, and which is causing

victims from both peoples as well as from the dear Lebanese people. We consider it our obligation to raise our voices in public and call upon the members of the Palestinian people and its leadership and the members of the Jewish people and its leadership, to halt the war and initiate negotiations based on mutual respect and recognition of the national rights of both peoples, the right of the Jewish people to live in security and peace in the State of Israel and the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and the establishment of its independent state alongside the State of Israel and to live there in security and peace... The results of all of the wars have proven that the solution is exclusively political and not military. We must fight a political battle alongside the proponents of peace in Israel and around the world... We call upon the entire community of Palestinian people, who are citizens of the State of Israel, to participate in the demonstration of the "Peace Now" movement, under the slogan "Stop the War and Initiate Negotiations"...

From the manifesto, signed by 18 Arab public figures, published in al-Anba (July 2, 1982)

B. MANIFESTO OF THE ISRAELI (ARAB) PUBLIC COMMITTEE (JUNE 1982)

We bow our heads over the graves of the IDF warriors, who were killed during the Peace of Galilee campaign. Honor for their memories and glory for their sacrifice. Their sacrifice fortified the security of the residents of the North. It also creates, for the first time, a genuine opportunity for the rehabilitation of a free, sovereign Lebanon that carries with it the hope of an enduring peace between Israel and Lebanon...

From the manifesto, signed by leaders of the Israeli Arabs, among them Ibrahim Nimer Darwish, mayor of Shefaram and eventually head of the Committee of Arab Mayors, who three weeks later changed his mind and signed the manifesto cited in paragraph A, above (Haaretz, June 18, 1982)

C. PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH THE "LAND FUND" (APRIL 1983)

March 30 has become a day fraught with everlasting significance for the Arab public and a symbol of the Arab public expressing its

opinion regarding its reservations, disgust and protest against the expropriation of its land. The Arab *falabim* (farmers), who inherited the land from their grandfathers and fathers and continue to work it and view it as their source of income, and who are tied to it and it is connected to them in an indissoluble tie, are the primary victims of the expropriation...

The different governments planned and continue to plan to cause the continuing starvation of the Arab farmer and to impoverish him to the point where he will lose his land and his source of income, and to transform him into a salaried worker far away from his land in the Israeli cities as well as preventing him from receiving government assistance... with innovative technological methods the way the government helps the Jewish farmer in that respect. The result is a significant decline in production and produce... Instead, monopolistic companies exploited the farmer and bought his produce from him at negligible prices... that prevented him from developing his land and his finances...

We recommend establishing on this day a "Land Fund", in which every Arab citizen can pay an annual sum, in addition to the participation of the Arab local councils and the national movements and bodies in Israel and beyond its borders, by means of which it will be possible to preserve the land...

We demand from the authorities that Land Day become an official memorial day that will be celebrated by the Arab citizens, by means of implementation of plans that will strengthen and connect our people to the land..

From an article by the "Nazareth Progressive Movement", in the periodical al-Rabita (April 1984)

D. MAHMOUD DARWISH ABOUT ISRAELI CULTURE (FEBRUARY 1984)

The problem is not the danger posed by the enemy's culture as the Israelis do not possess any cultural weapons that have the potential to "invade". They are aware of the fact that they are unable to consolidate an Israeli culture as they constitute a group of cultures. Thus, the challenge to Israel is exclusively military. Any talk about

a cultural “invasion” on their part is hyperbole, as they do not constitute a culture at all...

From an interview with the newspaper, Sabah al-Hir (February 16, 1984).

E. A MANIFESTO DISSEMINATED AMONG ISRAELI ARABS WITH A CALL TO BOYCOTT THE ELECTIONS (JANUARY 2001)

...Anyone who votes in the Zionist elections for Prime Minister is an infidel, who will be sentenced to death by hanging... The elections are being held to exchange a murderer for a terrorist. One Israel and the Likud are identical, as both joyfully dance on Palestinian blood. Therefore, we command you not to vote for any Zionist and we will hang anyone who dares to vote...

From an article by Uri Nir, Haaretz (January 10, 2001)

F. SECURITY PRISONERS AMONG THE ISRAELI ARABS (JUNE 2001)

...The Israeli Government is unwilling to resolve the issue of our release in the framework of the Oslo Accords, and the Prisons Service is unwilling to treat us as Israeli citizens... The prisoners now demand that their conditions be equalized, not to those of the Jewish prisoners, but to those of the prisoners from Hizbullah, if and when an agreement is reached for an exchange of prisoners with them, and we demand this not from the Israeli Government but from Sheik Nasrallah...

Previously, I never felt Israeli. I was born in Israel, but when I became an adult, I felt that I was a Palestinian and I joined the Palestinian struggle... When talks began regarding the way in which we would be released, whether by means of Israel or in accordance with the Oslo Accords, I began emphasizing my Israeli identity... And we wrote to the government ministers and the members of Knesset and even to the State President, as citizens, but nothing resulted from it... Today there is no difference between us and the prisoners from Gaza and Tulkarm. Ultimately, it turned out that they reinforced my Palestinian, not my Israeli, identity...

Our situation in the prison was a reflection of our lives on the outside: The approach of the establishment to Arabs in Israel, both as prisoners and as members of the Arab sector on the outside is

discriminatory and degrading... We study (academic studies) under difficult conditions. You sit folded up in your bed, with a book between your legs and attempt to write. We have neither a study room, a library nor a communal room, like the Jewish prisoners do... Every day that passes, the jail takes something from you... Every day you lose something of your connection with the world... If you do not develop, you reach a point at which you lose contact with the world, you remain primitive, lacking the tools to deal with life... Success in studies is part of your daily victory over the prison administration and over your very incarceration...

We have no apologies and no regrets... It is just that we were mistaken when we thought that our actions will lead to a comprehensive confrontation between the Israeli Arabs and the State. There is no point in expressing regret, as the authorities do not award prizes for those with regrets... However, an improvement in the treatment of political prisoners can only come as a result of a new political reality... Things have happened in the region, the peace process is already ten years old, however instead of an improvement in our general treatment, the opposite took place. We see no light at the end of the tunnel, there is no hope...

From an interview with Walid Dacca, Chris Younis and Mohalis Bourgil, security prisoners who murdered Israeli soldiers, with Uri Nir, Haaretz (June 11, 2001)

G. THE ISRAELI ARABS AFTER THE EVENTS OF OCTOBER 2001

1. Nizar Hassan, Film Director from Nazareth

The Palestinians, who live in Israel, are a people whose land was taken from them and therefore they are forced to live in the State of Israel. In Palestine, there are two ethnic entities that are inseparable: Israelis and Palestinians must live within Palestine in a cultural federation that constitutes one political unit. In this federation, the Israelis would be part of the Arab world and the disappearance of Israel as a Jewish state is inevitable, even if it does not happen the near future. The uprising of the Arab population in Israel was not the result of incitement, but the inevitable, natural result of the reality in which they live...

I know that in 1948 I lost a lot, I lost my homeland. That upsets me. It upsets me to acknowledge my weakness. However, ultimately, from a broader perspective, you (the Israelis) are nothing more than a passing moment in history. You think that you are so smart, but you are not as smart as you think you are... At present, the Palestinians are at their lowest possible point. However, look at what happened this month: From that nadir, the Palestinian caused a threat to the entire region. Both the Israelis and the Arab leaders in the region felt threatened. That says that the Palestinians have enormous power that can bring about the change about which I am speaking: The unification of the two ethnic entities in Palestine under one political entity...

Israeli society functions under the assumption that it can impose its will on the Palestinians, because it is the more powerful side. However, the disturbance caused by the Palestinian uprising points to a change in the balance of power. This did not happen because of my opinions. You can claim that I am a Hamas activist and that I incite riots, but I, Nizar Hassan, never went out to hurl a stone or burn a tire. I am a coward. Who reads what I write? Who listens to what I have to say? What outlets do I have to express myself? The people that engaged in incitement also did not know that a rebellion would develop from it. No one knew what would happen. It was the shockwaves of reality that caused the demonstrations. The inherent contradictions in reality caused the outburst.

Perhaps some Israelis will draw the conclusion (that it is preferable for the State to employ an iron fist against the calls for separation by the Israeli Arabs rather than deal with them); however every power has its limits and Israeli power has been receding since 1967. Israel must alter its way of thinking. You must understand that you are in the Middle East, in which there is a reality to which you must adjust yourselves. I do not think that any other solution is possible, whether you like it or not... (Coexistence) is a dirty, disgusting concept, whose entire purpose is to perpetuate the status quo. It would be very convenient for the Israeli Left to see us cleaning the streets and it invented the term in order to clear its conscience. The experience of all coexistence meetings is very cruel, and the Palestinian population in Palestine will no longer participate in them.

What kind of peace does the Ashkenazi establishment that you call the “Israeli Left” want? I heard Barak say during the crisis that Arafat is not ripe for peace. With Barak, no one will ever be ripe enough, because anyone that does not accept his conditions is not ripe, as far as he is concerned. Barak understands nothing but the language of force. What is the source of the credit that he received from the Israeli public? It is only from the fact that he is the Jewish samurai, who was so good at killing Palestinians, and besides that he does not know how to do anything... As far as I am concerned, Shlomo Ben-Ami is the person responsible for the killing of the Arab citizens. If he is not responsible for the murder, let him agree to the establishment of a commission of inquiry that will prove that he did not kill. I believe that the Sephardim (Oriental Jews) of the Labor party are the most dangerous, and Ben-Ami is proof of that. At least the Right does not lie to us, while the Left lies, it is hypocritical and stupid, and does not know what it wants. There are “peace tents” and calls of “let the sun rise”, but the sun will rise with no help from anyone, just wake up in the morning and look. I swear that it rises without the help of the Meretz youth.

The Left always feels that it is the victim of all of the events. Look at Yossi Sarid sitting and speaking about enlightenment, as if he has a monopoly on it, all with provincial arrogance. I never felt that that person feels my pain or identifies with me. I am certain that what I am saying hurts him, but I never felt it. Yossi Sarid is the idol of provincialism; he is not firm in his principles. When a certain population goes out to demonstrate, and it does not matter about what, I would have thought that he, first and foremost, would defend their right to demonstrate. Instead, he supports our oppression; however I expected nothing else and the last thing that I can say is that I am disappointed.

From an interview with Oriah Shavit. Haaretz (October 20, 2000)

2. Malek Youssef – An Electrical Engineer from Dabouriyeh

...I also consider myself a Palestinian. Palestinian identity is a part of me. It is very important to correct the impression that I made in the previous interview (in which I emphasized my Israeli identity)... I

said then that I am proud to be part of the State, which is developed in certain respects, like advanced technology. Today, Israel seems like a state that harms the weak, not like a sophisticated state. The fact is that the UN Security Council just adopted a resolution, which states exactly the same thing. My feelings have completely changed. Six months ago, I thought that this government would promote equality between Arabs and Jews, but now I see no difference between Labor and the Likud. They all have the same policy *vis-à-vis* the Arabs. The police are for the Jews, not the Arabs. There were riots by both Jews and Arabs, but the fact is that the approach and treatment in the two were different. When youths set out to demonstrate at the entrance to Dabouriyeh, I raced, accompanied by dignitaries to the site and we asked that the police not enter and that we would ensure that the youths would not block the road. However, the police opened fire with no hesitation. They began firing immediately, and not in the air but straight at the people. Now I feel that I am not part of the State. We must act like good children, but if we scream in pain, we immediately become the enemy. It is not right and unjust...

I still believe that there is no alternative to coexistence, but today I am frustrated, very frustrated. I lived it, I saw the pain during the funerals, and I ask myself: Who am I? A second class citizen who can be fired at any time that he displays his rage? Why should the police act that way? The police always shoot, claiming that there people's lives were in danger. Do you mean to tell me that the police are in danger only at Arab demonstrations? Were they never in danger at Jewish demonstrations? The pain will remain, and will not pass any time soon. The reckoning will be primarily political. There is now tremendous anger at Barak and Ben-Ami. We knew that Barak was inflexible, but we thought that he was surrounded by men of peace. We thought that Ben-Ami is a man of peace, but now, in the clearest possible sense, he no longer seems to be a man of peace. If he is the minister in charge of the police, then the responsibility is his. I hear people claiming that they will not participate in the prime ministerial elections. That is liable to put Netanyahu back in power, but, then again, what is the difference between Barak and Netanyahu? There is no difference. Netanyahu

did not act against the Arabs the way that Barak did. So let it be Netanyahu!

Meretz just sent me a party membership application, but I will not sign it, I do not want to be part of Meretz, because their positions regarding Israeli Arabs are unfair. In the end, Yossi Sarid woke up and said that Alik Ron should be fired. However, previously, they did not come here to visit the wounded and hear their testimony. They decided that they rioted without checking the facts. The entire Left disappeared at the moment of truth. Other than the counselors at the university, no one called me during the crisis. I suddenly discovered that I am living in another country and that is very difficult... The Palestinians living in Israel do not want war and are not preparing for war. Our job is to help bring the peace. However, now you must understand that you cannot disconnect us from the Arabs in the territories, it is a matter of feelings, of belonging. We live it, it is ingrained within us and it cannot be changed. Why must it worry you when we express our solidarity with the Palestinians in the territories? Just like the Arabs in the Arab countries are allowed to demonstrate for the Palestinians, so too should we be allowed to do so... The government must now work hard for the Arab population, and it is not merely a matter of allocations... The budgets are important, but they are not enough. I must feel that I belong to this State. When I hear the national anthem now, what does it have to do with me? When I see the flag, what is it to me?

From an interview, ibid.

3. Abd al-Hakim Mufid, Secretary of the Editorial Board of *Saut al-Haq wal-Horiya*, Umm al-Fahm

I do not believe Israeli journalists any more. The Israeli media turned us into outlaws. As far as they were concerned, the main thing was the headlines, blood and emotional turmoil. The entire media mobilized against us. They publicized, without mentioning names, the statements of the inciters, who represented, perhaps, one half of one percent of the population. When the media influences public opinion and determines what people think, that is a very serious situation. We got the impression that the media is not at

all concerned with what is happening with us. They did not take the trouble to interrogate the police. As far as I am concerned, it is a great disappointment... Why are the Israelis incapable of seeing anything beyond security? The Arabs have attempted to exist here for 52 years, and you reduce everything to the question whether we will support you in a time of war. Why are all the questions slanted in that direction? There are divisions into many groups in Israel. Has anyone ever asked if the Sephardi Jews will battle against the Ashkenazi Jews? Or that the new Russian immigrants will battle against the veteran Israelis? People pass by Umm al-Fahm and say: "Look at the villas that they have. What do they want?" However, the problem is complicated. People have feelings, identity, values. Not all of the problems can be reduced to standard of living. The Palestinians here will remain Palestinians. The Israeli journalists must understand this once and for all...

From an interview, ibid.

4. An Arab Journalist (Anonymous)

The situation is frustrating. Jewish friends have never before spoken in terms of you and us. Now, all of them are beginning to speak to me in those terms. The Left is no longer tolerant. Take Hizbullah, for example. It is okay when you abduct people in Lebanon, but it is not okay when Hizbullah abducts people on Mount Dov, which is occupied Lebanese territory. The Israeli Left does not understand why we need not sign a declaration of allegiance to Israel every time an external crisis erupts... The Left does not understand the origins of our hatred or our sense of satisfaction when Hizbullah is successful, and we really do feel a sort of satisfaction.

From an interview, ibid.

H. A DIGEST FROM THE PUBLICATION OF "ADALLAH" – THE LEGAL CENTER FOR THE RIGHTS OF THE ARAB MINORITY IN ISRAEL

...The activity of Adallah is conspicuous and its accomplishments are many. Thus, for example, the addition of Arab writing on the intercity signs, are a result of an Adallah petition, as well as

additional allocations earmarked for Arab students in the framework of the *Shahar* program, for kindergartens, welfare services etc., also thanks to its petitions... Adallah functions based on a perception that considers the personal autonomy of each individual as an end in and of itself; however, believes that this personal autonomy obligates recognition of the collective rights of the group to which the individual belongs. Fulfillment and realization of these rights will provide the individual with the opportunity to actualize his personal project and the possibility to function without oppression... The Arab minority in Israel constitutes a national-indigenous minority characterized by its own language, culture, history and collective memory. As such, the perception of collective rights of the Arab-Palestinian minority is broader than that of cultural, sectarian and religious minorities, or that of immigrant groups...

In its four years of activity, Adallah submitted 23 petitions to the Supreme Court, 13 of them dealing with equality in allocations and services, three with the status of the Arabic language and three on the matter of planning and building... Almost one-third (seven) of the petitions dealt with the status of the unrecognized settlements and the rights of their residents. Approximately 10% of the Arab residents of the State reside today in 120 settlements of that sort... We have learned that defending the rights of the Arab minority involves primarily the defense of the basic human and political rights... We dealt with many cases of the right to demonstrate and freedom of expression, the right to unionize, the right of unification of families, residency and citizenship of spouses, restriction orders, rights of detainees and prisoners, police violence, manifestations of incitement and racism and even administrative detentions... Ever since the events of October 2000, Adallah activity has peaked. Repression of the political protest of the Palestinian minority in Israel, employing exaggerated police violence and the killing of 13 citizens, redefined the attitude of the State to its Arab citizens...

More than 400 Arab lawyers participated in an emergency convention organized by Adallah and signed a manifesto published in the press, which criticized the discriminatory policy employed by law enforcement authorities... In 1997, Adallah submitted an appeal to the Haifa District Court in the wake of the conviction of an Arab student by the disciplinary committee for his participation

in an illegal demonstration on campus... In August 1998, The National Committee for Protection of the Rights of the Displaced Persons in Israel submitted a request to the police to demonstrate in the Ben-Ami cooperative settlement in the Galilee, in protest of the demolition of a mosque and a cemetery... (The police refused to permit the demonstration) despite the fact that there was no evidence that the demonstration would endanger public order or public security... In January 1999, in the wake of the petition, the police agreed to allow the demonstration in which a maximum of 300 people, who would gather adjacent to the mosque ruins, would participate... This arrangement did not restrict the right of the displaced persons or anyone else to return to that site in the future and demonstrate...

From the Adallah activities report for the years 1997-2000.

I. WAKIM WAKIM, ESQ., SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE RIGHTS OF THE DISPLACED PERSONS IN ISRAEL (JULY 5, 2001)

...There is no such thing as “present absentees”, because according to international law they are refugees. There are approximately 250,000 Palestinian refugees in Israel. Historically, the refugees in Israel, who sought to return to their homes, did so as part of the demand to find a comprehensive resolution to the entire refugee problem. However, after the signing of the Oslo Accords, activity began within the Green Line and our society was established... We unequivocally demand to return to our villages. In March 2001, we held a convention in Nazareth in which we emphasized that we summarily reject any alternative other than return to our villages. 280 representatives of the refugees in Israel attended and they declared unambiguously: We will not agree to any other solution. We insist on our right to implement the right of return. We will not agree to accept reparations. Any agreement signed between Israel and the Palestinian Authority that negates our right to return to our villages, will not obligate us and it is null and void. We have not and will not forget our homes. There is a general consensus on this matter among the Arab public. The Arab public understands today that resolution of the problem of the refugees residing in Israel will

also resolve our land shortage. This is not a question of history or nostalgia, but rather a day-to-day question of existence...

In the al-Safra neighborhood in Nazareth, where refugees from Sapporia (Zippori) reside, the residents maintain their identity and their ties with the village from which they were expelled. They have no land upon which to build. However, two kilometers from here there is a Jewish settlement that has 1,000 dunams of land, despite the fact that there are only a few hundred residents. You must understand this problem... We intend to conduct a census in the near future, in order to ascertain the precise number of refugees living in Israel. We will go from place to place, we will survey the economic and political status of the refugees and we will check how many of them want to implement the right of return. We will not accept the status quo. We are not even thinking of the displacing or evicting Jewish settlements within the Green Line, but we are insisting on our right to return to land that has no Jewish houses... Legally, Israel is obligated to implement UN Resolution 194. Furthermore, the Israeli legal system considers us citizens and therefore we have the right to live anywhere in Israel and to move anywhere. We are not standard refugees, but rather refugees that have the advantage of being citizens as well...

I do not know if a thing called the Israeli Left exists; I do not see it anywhere. As a Palestinian living in Israel, who is also conscious of his national affiliation, I determine that it is impossible to realize a lasting peace as long as the root of the conflict is unresolved. If the Israelis fail to understand that the root of the conflict lies in the fact that 72% of the Palestinian people are refugees and displaced persons, then there will be no peace agreement. From our point of view, it is self evident, and it is passed down from generation to generation... The fact that Israeli public opinion fails to understand this stems from the fact that Israeli governments have always concealed all of the crimes and massacres against the Palestinians. Many Israelis do not know that there are 4.5 million refugees beyond Israel's borders. Do you know that a massacre was perpetrated in virtually every Palestinian settlement?

8. EXPRESSIONS IN ARAB LITERATURE IN ISRAEL

Arab authors and poets in Israel, most famous among them Mahmoud Darwish, who crossed the lines and began to serve the PLO and became its propaganda trumpet, became the creators of the Arab-Palestinian narrative in the bloody struggle with Israel. Despite the fact that they developed in Israel and should have recognized and given consideration to the Israeli narrative as well, they, to a large extent, expressed and also created, supported, fed and incited, most of the time, the Arab feelings and narrative exclusively, expressing the bitterness and the sense of victim that accompany their people. They have nothing in common with the historical truth: It is not for them to tell that the Israeli Arabs have brought the tragedies upon themselves through their refusal to accept Israel as a *fait accompli*, on their initiation of war against it when an opportunity was given to them to be its equal and to exist alongside it. And it is not for them to preach integration into Israel and to accept the rules of the game of a minority within a state with a Jewish majority. The Arab intoxication with the sweet talk that excited the passions and the imagination, which places in the hands of their poets and authors a tremendous tool for the cultivation of understanding and peace, had they chosen to take that path, became instead an instrument in their hands for stoking the fire. Because, not only have they sought to recall their catastrophe, something that could have been treated with understanding and sympathy, but at times, they actually called for revenge, for “liberation” and for blood. Below are some examples:

A. POEMS ABOUT THE RESULTS OF THE WAR

1. And we cried when others broke out in song,
 And we looked towards the heavens;
 We cry and utter a prayer
 As they are rejoicing seven-fold...
 The years of wandering in Sinai were forty
 And the others returned,

And then we set out on our path
 When the others returned.
 I am the land, you will not spare me rain
 I am all that remains of it,
 Therefore, I have planted trees on my forehead
 For vineyards, wheat and roses I have made my poetry,
 So that you will identify me
 Bring me rain!

*From the poems of Tewfiq Muammar, see the
 book by Uri Stendhal, *ibid.*, pp. 394-395.*

2. Write this down

I am an Arab!
 And my identity card number is fifty thousand.
 I have eight children,
 And the ninth will come next summer.
 What is vexing in all that?
 Write this down
 I am an Arab!
 You stole the vineyards of my ancestors
 And the land that I was accustomed to work...
 I do not hate people
 And I do not vandalize the property of others;
 However, if I feel hunger,
 I will eat the flesh of the one who exploits me
 Beware, beware of my hunger
 And from the rage that is within me

*From the poem by Mahmoud Darwish, "Olive Leaves",
 1961, see the book by Uri Stendhal, *ibid.*, pp. 393-396.*

B. THE NATIONALIST POEMS OF TEWFIQ ZIYAD

1. O nation at whose head they put frauds!
 Who sold you and around the seats of government they
 assembled,
 To compete for crumbs and to crawl on their bellies,

To the heirs of Hitler they extended their hands to shake hands,
 And they scattered my flesh on my land for next to nothing.
 How many are those who sit on the seat of leadership,
 Who are worthy of prison!
 The crossing was sacred, under the scorching afternoon sun,
 As the soldiers girded with bombs moved, death fled
 North from the south and south from the north.
 And a great cry brings with it at the canal the lust for freedom
 The red, the plague passes from the sands that
 Became an inferno, under the feet of the ambitious invaders...
 The crossing was sacred under the scorching afternoon sun
 And the darkened faces feeding their flesh to the land
 And the looks: Determination and Katyusha, love and the arms
 and the rifles,
 And the cannons, and the heavy chains and the metal bridges
 Chew up the concrete of the Bar-Lev Line, and the flags are
 waving
 At their old places, at their p-l-a-c-e-s.
 And cries with the joy of all eyes...
 The crossing was sacred under the scorching afternoon sun,
 And Syria returned to the Golan, marching on the body of death
 In the name of the living. And all the flowers of the land, the grass
 of the land
 The rocks of the land, battle like weapons and the shells pound
 Steel to steel, and the sons of Damascus with sacred rage...
 March and march...
 The crossing was sacred, and it will remain sacred
 And the homeland was sacred
 And will remain sacred
 And the price was sacred
 And so it will remain...

*From the poems of Ziyad, who later became the mayor of Nazareth and a member of Knesset, "Eichmann", 1960, and "The Great Crossing", December 1973, even before the Yom Kippur War had ended, see Yinon, *ibid.*, pp. 218, 234-259.*

CHAPTER NINE

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

This harsh diagnosis is only the first step. The second and decisive step relates to what can be done to halt these destructive trends, while preserving the humanity and the basic rights of others, but only to the boundary of self-preservation and not beyond that boundary. There are not many known cases in which a people knowingly committed suicide, or sacrificed its freedom and sovereignty, just in order to find favor in the eyes of others, or just out of respect, consideration and guilty feelings *vis-à-vis* other peoples. Many countries around the world struggle with problems of minorities; however as long as the issue is multi-culturalism under one nationality, the problem can be resolved through dialogue and agreement. Even when the disagreement is national-ethnic, as is the case in Belgium and Canada, arrangements of linguistic, cultural, religious and even administrative autonomy and the like are possible, and we will discuss some solutions of that sort below. However, when the dispute is national-antagonistic, with strong foundations of total negation of the other on the basis of religious-cultural rationales, and which demands exclusivity for one nationality over the other, or which provides national and cultural expressions for one side and nothing to the other, then we find ourselves on a collision course, in a life and death struggle in which each side is trying to shunt the other aside, until one of them emerges victorious. And we are not speaking here of absolute rights or absolute justice for one side or the other, otherwise things would be too easy. There is an approach, which states that ultimately, if the existence of the two collectives, one within the other, becomes impossible (we have adopted the formula of “one beside the other” in our disputes with Jordan and with the Palestinians and it has not been successful there either), then one of them must clear the way, just as the German minorities in Czechoslovakia and Poland did after the World War, when they were “exiled” to their motherland, some willingly, some by force, or the Armenian and Greek minorities from Turkey,

who were returned to their homeland, among other examples. Here the moral and human reckoning is cruel in its simplicity: If the minority is unwilling to live in accordance with the values of the majority nationality, and their existence together causes eternal suffering to both, then it is preferable to cause a tremendous, though temporary injustice, to the members of the recalcitrant minority and to transfer it to live with the members of its people, as long as such a refuge exists, than to leave them both to clash, to quarrel and to shed blood from here to eternity, with no hope for a solution for either of them.

Let us first examine the existing resolution possibilities and then we will depart to suggest the reshuffle necessary to halt the deterioration in time. Because the patchwork attempts that have been tried to date have never even had the potential to provide actual, core resolutions, and the moment of truth that we are now facing does not allow us to avoid taking action any longer. Our fundamental assumption is that we are faced with a phenomenon in which members of a proud, recalcitrant national minority, which not only aspires to equality that it cannot attain due to its recalcitrance, but identifies with its brethren, who are in a state of war with its country, and both are locked into this conflict for the foreseeable future. Of course, it is the inalienable right of any member of a minority to identify as he pleases; however every choice has its price and you can not have it both ways. It is fair to allow each individual to choose according to the inclination of his heart; however, once he chooses, he must conduct himself in accordance with the consequences of his choice: If he wants to accept the rules of the Jewish-Zionist state, to pledge allegiance to it, to be educated in its systems and its language, to obey its laws and serve it faithfully, then he is welcome among us, like the members of the Druse denomination in this country, without distinctions or discrimination, or like Arabs, Jews or blacks naturalized in the United States or France. The faith, the customs and the way of life of every person, as an individual or as a member of a community, as long as it is not subversive or hostile to the State, are the personal matter of each person, and the State has no right, desire, need or ability to interfere with them. If he does not so desire, then he must be aware that he will not be allowed to impose his will and desires upon the entire state, and to make its residents miserable simply because the minority opinion was not adopted. He should know that his attempts to start a hostile anti-state of his own, with leaders and institutions lying in wait to liquidate the state of the majority and to establish in its place a different state, have been unsuccessful. Then, he must choose between voluntary emigration to wherever he desires, like to the Palestinian state with which he identifies or to the Arab lands of the free that so excite him, or he will run the

risk of persisting in committing crimes in the country that will smash their lives into smithereens. The luxury of enjoying the fat of the land in Israel, while at the same time working towards its dismantling, and of exploiting the democracy and freedom in order to destroy it, will no longer pass with no reaction by the Jewish majority in this Jewish, Zionist state.

The wisdom of foresight: If the Israeli Arabs are so insistent that they are Palestinians and that their land is Palestine, the meaning of those terms must be defined and it must be determined whether their elementary desire to be a free people in their land can be honored. If so, then we will be the beneficiaries, as then we will also enjoy tranquility. Because the problem of the Israeli Arabs, which has become a national problem and therefore our problem, will only be resolved in a national way, and in any case, will always incorporate two paradoxes: The more we recognize the rights of others, the more it will ease our efforts to demand our rights from a moral, public and information standpoint; and the more that our demands are greater in principle, the more we will have to relinquish in practice. And another principle that must serve us as a guiding light: We are forced to offer the Arabs of the Land of Israel/Palestine exactly what we want to apply to ourselves, precisely parallel in substance and in pace, so as not to leave any room for any claims against us. In other words, in our awareness of the intensity of the rupture of Oslo and of the other partial resolutions that have been proposed and attempted over the years, but which broadened the crisis and mistrust between the parties rather than narrowing it, we must aspire to great, comprehensive resolutions that deal with the Palestinian problem in "all its aspects", as was said at the first Camp David summit, and that includes the aspect of the Israeli Arabs, and no longer rely on partial, temporary, fragile resolutions that too easily collapse beneath the burden of their inherent deficiencies. For example, our wise men went ahead and concocted a unfounded "arrangement" of a Palestinian state in the territories of Judea, Samaria and Gaza, without paying attention to the fact that the Palestinian population there constitutes only a bit more than a third of all the Palestinians, and even if everything went as planned and Arafat joined the Zionist Federation, two-thirds of the Palestinians would remain an open, unresolved wound. Thus, it is no wonder that when Arafat sensed the "danger" of the arrangement proposed to him by Ehud Barak, he immediately raised the issue of the right of return, stating that he too is unwilling to accept anything less than the complete resolution. Thus, it is necessary to shuffle the cards and start the game from the beginning.

What is Palestine, who are the Palestinians, and what is the relevancy of referring to the Israeli Arabs as Palestinians? Palestine, the "Land of Israel" in our

parlance, is the ancient name given to the territory on both sides of the Jordan River, in which once Jews settled, and afterwards, Arabs. From the beginning of the 20th century, these Jews were called "Land of Israel Jews", (before the establishment of the State of Israel, when the Ottoman Empire, which had been the political umbrella framework over the hodgepodge of nations and cultures in this territory for the previous more than 400 years, met its demise). The British Mandate over the Land of Israel, which originally included both sides of the Jordan River and was where the Jewish national home was to be established, contracted the scope of the territory when it severed approximately three-quarters of it, calling it by their popular geographical appellation "Transjordan" and placed it under the rule of Emir Abdullah, whose origins are in Hijaz, Saudi Arabia. The Mandate maintained the name "Palestine" only over the Western territory (despite the protest of the Zionist Federation, which considered itself dislocated from the eastern part of the Land of Israel. However, that did not cause the residents of eastern Land of Israel/Palestine to forfeit their Palestinian identity, to the degree that it exists nor their connection to that part of the homeland just as the British rending of territory from the Land of Israel, did not diminish the right of the Jews to continue to demand two banks of the Jordan, this is ours and this (theirs) is too. Fujimori, who up until recently was President of Peru, is of Japanese origin and Menem, who was the President of Argentina at the same time, is of Syrian extraction, and in neither of those instances did the residents of those places cease to be called Peruvians or Argentineans and the name of their countries were not changed because their rulers came from elsewhere. Therefore, why should eastern Land of Israel/Palestine change its identity or its name simply because a ruler, who no one invited, no one accepted and no one subjected themselves to his authority, came from elsewhere? Furthermore, even when a country changes its name, like Congo to Zaire and back, Ceylon to Sri Lanka, names of the segments were determined by the negotiators: The eastern segment totaling 3 million was determined to be Jordanian and therefore the Hashemite Kingdom would see to them; the western segment also totaling 3 million, which is embroiled in a struggle for its independence and within which the negotiators imagined that they could bring the entire matter to a conclusion – and that is not the case; the Israeli segment, totaling more than a million, which reminds us daily that it is Palestinian but we insist upon considering it Israeli; and the segment in exile, numbering more than a million, in the refugee camps in Syria and Lebanon or in the other exiles in the Arab countries and the West.

Therefore, from whatever perspective we consider the matter, we will find

that the Arab problem in Israel will only come to a satisfactory conclusion in the context of a comprehensive resolution of the entire issue of the Palestinian people, in the framework of greater Land of Israel/Palestine in which there is extensive space to both realize the right of return, while at the same time preserving the vital security interests for Israel. To a certain extent, this option was frustrated by Israel's second tragic mistake which fell into the trap of King Hussein's cunning, who desired, more than anything, to receive Israeli legitimacy for his rule over the eastern Land of Israel and half of the Palestinian people, without that being called a resolution of the Palestinian problem. Because that "glorious" king, who was an absolute ruler, who was concerned exclusively about his throne, and made all possible mistakes ever since he decided to enter the war of destruction against Israel in 1967, in his stupidity and political near-sightedness, was, until 1967, the landlord of Judea and Samaria, whose residents were Palestinian, who together with those on the east bank of the Jordan constituted more than 80% of his country's residents. In those years, it was he himself who coined the phrase "Jordan is Palestine and Palestine is Jordan," indicating that he too considered the residents of Amman and its environs Palestinians in every sense, a position totally supported by the facts. Residents of Judea and Samaria, who pledged allegiance to his grandfather and him, if it is possible to place any trust in such pledges, supplies half the members of the "Parliament" – a toy whose seat was in Amman and played according to the directives of the King, who reserved supreme power for himself – as well as the national Palestinian leadership. In 1967, the residents east of the Jordan did not cease to be Palestinians, and the regime, which had pretenses to return to the Judea and Samaria, continued to treat the residents as full-fledged Jordanians. It was only with the outbreak of the *intifada* in late 1987 and Hussein feared the spread of the riots to the east bank of the Jordan and the undermining of his throne, he announced that he was "relinquishing" Judea and Samaria, which was never his anyway and to which he had no chance of returning, pulled back to defense of the east bank of the Jordan and made certain to maintain quiet along his long border with Israel, having learned the lesson of the War of Attrition in the Jordan Valley from 1968-1970, which almost led to his demise and would have, had the Palestinians been successful in their rebellion against him during Black September.

And then too there was a tragic mistake on the part of Israel, when it decided to support the King against the PLO and Syria. Had it not done so, the Palestinian state would have been established east of the Jordan, as the energetic, revolutionary Palestinian leadership would have imposed its rule over a majority of the Palestinian people. Its conflict with Israel was then about

borders, from more advantageous positions on the banks of the Jordan and not about the terrible existential questions posed today by the Palestinian leadership along with the Israeli Arabs. That was the great opportunity that we missed, due to blindness and lack of vision. Had we seized the opportunity, we would not today stand reprimanded by the entire world for preventing the unfortunate Palestinian people from exercising their right to self-determination. In that case, there is no doubt that many of the Palestinians in the territories and in Israel would have wanted to join their independent state in the east and the demographic pressure upon us would have eased significantly. Even though that did not happen, it is not too late to return to the original drawing board. When the Oslo process, which caught Hussein, and the rest of the world, by total surprise, began, he saw an opportunity to have Israel fall in the trap again, and hurried, as fast as he could, to reach peace with Israel before any agreement was reached with the Palestinians. He understood that the Israelis, in their stupidity, instead of continuing to insist on including the Palestinians as part of the Jordanian delegation, as befits members of one nation and as was the case in the Madrid Conference (in 1991) and subsequently in the fruitless Washington talks, hurried to Oslo through the back door, adopting an approach that there is no choice other than to speak directly to the PLO. They thereby opened the door to the perpetration of the greatest scam to which Israel has ever fallen victim. For in Oslo, it turns out today, according to the testimony of the Palestinians themselves, they introduced a Trojan Horse to the very heart of Israeli control over the territories, with an army, weapons, autonomous and subsequently independent territories, from which they would launch, in proximity to and with assistance from the Israeli Arabs, the decisive offensive against the naïve and dim-witted Zionist state.

Hussein understood what the Israelis did not understand, and instead of watching a Palestinian uprising sweeping his land, he passed the Palestinian ball to the Israeli court, received irresponsible and unintelligent legitimacy on the part of Israel for his rule over half of the Palestinian people and three-quarters of the territory of historic Land of Israel, under the guise of Hashemite Jordan, which has no connection with the Palestinians, and left the Israelis to scorch their own fingers in the Palestinian fire. All this was accomplished after he extorted some territory, water that we do not have and status in Jerusalem. What benefit we derived from this, is unclear. For if in 1970 we did not want a PLO neighbor across the Jordan, we now have them on the west side of the river, on this side of our security lines in the Jordan Valley and in tragic proximity to our homes in the Gilboa, the Sharon, in Jerusalem and along the Gaza Strip. A brilliant deal!

Hussein was overjoyed that we helped him rid himself of his Arafat problem, when we rescued him from his exile in Tunisia and from the rubbish bin of history and joyfully welcomed his army to the border of our homes, in contrast to Hussein's hopes that we not grant the Palestinian Authority a common border with him, lest it spread to his country. The border with Jordan was quiet anyway even beforehand, with one difference: Israelis were not killed with such frequency on that border and even within the boundaries of Jordan itself, which is the situation at present in the wake of the peace treaty. And what is important for our purposes, the immediate proximity of the Palestinian Authority enhanced the self-confidence and the audacity of the demands of the Israeli Arabs, to the extent that they adopted all of Arafat's plans lock, stock and barrel with no challenge and no criticism, his demands were their demands and they even adopted his armed violence. The PLO continuum that we established from the Mediterranean Sea to the Jordan River was turned against us, while the natural habitat of the Palestinians to the east remained beyond the area in which the agreement took effect. Once that valve was closed at our initiative, it is no wonder that the pressure cooker is bubbling and is blowing up in our face.

In other words, the Oslo process, which was supposed to regulate our relations with the Palestinians on a permanent basis, to bring peace to our eastern border and to calm the Israeli Arabs now that their brethren fulfilled their national aspiration, has proven to be an impediment in all three senses, because none of the aforementioned problems were resolved: On the contrary, it became a thousand times worse to the extent that Prime Minister Sharon employed the term a "continuing War of Independence" to characterize the distress that Oslo and its ramifications brought along with it. Had Israel been able to convince the world, at least the United States, of the need to include in one package the resolution of the Palestinian problem in its entirety, or at least most of it, then we could have consolidated an agreed resolution based, not on the one-sided principles of Oslo, which were adopted absentmindedly without properly anticipating their consequences, but rather on four other principles, in which equality, reciprocity and comprehensiveness were intertwined and are likely to guarantee long-lasting arrangements:

- A. Mutual recognition of the rights of both nations, the Palestinian-Arab and the Israeli-Jewish, for self-determination in the territory of the land of Israel/Palestine. The terrible mistake made in Oslo, despite the warnings that were forwarded to the negotiators during and after the negotiations and were dismissed with phrases like "insignificant semantics", or "old-fashioned

thinking” in the face of the “great revolution in Palestinian thinking”, was that in exchange for our recognition of that right of the Palestinians, we did not demand the obvious, that the right of the Jewish people to self-determination be recognized by the Palestinians. And why is that important? Because paragraph 20 of the infamous Palestinian Charter, which was neither revised nor abrogated despite the maneuvers and the deceptions of which we were victims and the faith of the foolish, on the Right and on the Left, that it had indeed been revised, speaks of the fact that the Jews are not a nation and therefore have no right to a state, as opposed to the Palestinians, of course. As we did not demand the abrogation of that paragraph, it remained in effect along with the rest of the charter’s paragraphs. In other words, the right of the Jews to a state was marginalized and it is once again in question, both in terms of the moralistic lectures that we hear from the Palestinians and tormented Jews that the Jewish state was conceived in sin etc., and in terms of the implementation of the right of return, which will, of necessity lead to the demise of the Jewish state.

Our wise men volunteered, at the expense of us all, to recognize the right of the Palestinians to a state and consequently relinquished, one would hope in their stupidity rather than their malice, the Jewish demand for precisely the same recognition, no more and no less. Instead, our representatives to Oslo thought that they were outsmarting their rivals, when they elicited from them their recognition of the State of Israel, and they rejoiced and celebrated that “historic accomplishment”. So, what is the problem? Our wise men did not demand, and therefore did not receive, that the State of Israel be recognized as a Jewish state, which would not only have abrogated that accursed paragraph 20, but would have preemptively torpedoed any demand for the right of return that would bring to its end the State’s Jewish character. That being the case, the Palestinians did not volunteer to grant us proper recognition, they issued interpretations of their recognition of the State of Israel, in other words, like the interpretation of the Israeli Arabs themselves, as a state of “all of its citizens”, the implication being a bi-national and not a Jewish state. The upshot is that with the natural proliferation of the Israeli Arabs and the implementation of the right of return, which even its “loyal” Arab citizens support, the end of the State of Israel will come on its own. And thus, in the latter stages of negotiations with the Palestinians, they produced the right of return, with the enthusiastic support of the “internal” Palestinians (the Triangle, the Negev and the Galilee), because, in any case, in the early stages of

the negotiations, the Jews expressed no interest in the characterization of their state as Jewish.

Had the negotiations in Oslo been conducted with a proper thought process, seriously and professionally, we would not have allowed the Palestinians to deceive us and we would have demanded that the determination that in any future demographic situation, the right of the Jewish people to a Jewish state will remain intact would be anchored in the agreement. A demand of that type, would not only serve as an early test of intentions for the Palestinians, as without agreement upon it we would refuse to move forward, but it is so natural, fair and logical, because it is based on equality and reciprocity, that there would not be a country in the world that fails to support us. However, the negotiators were in a hurry, something as basic as the designation of the Jewish state did not seem important to them, and thus, they left the door open for the Palestinians to entangle us with their maneuvers. What is even worse as far as we are concerned is that the State of Israel's relinquishment of its characterization as Jewish in that historic treaty was a sign to the Israeli Arabs that the time had come to raise the issue of the state of all its citizens, to demand to change the State's Jewish symbols and to start to express themselves belligerently and audaciously towards the State. The conclusion drawn by the Palestinians, and the Israeli Arabs with them is that while the Arab nationality has 22 political manifestations, and while the Palestinians deserve one or two states, or perhaps even three (Jordan, the territories and subsequently Israel) – the Jews do not even have the right to one state. Encouraged by the feeble Israeli positions, they insolently claim that in today's world, nationalism is of no significance (Jewish, of course, not Arab or Palestinian), that Israel as a Jewish state is racist (of course the Arab states are not like that, even if there are no Jews there), that Israel is an anachronistic "religious" state, as the Jews are not a nation, and we, by implication, accepted that determination in Oslo, or that Israel was conceived in sin anyway and therefore there is no need to feel bad over its disappearance.

- B. In Oslo, Israel also recognized the PLO as the national liberation movement of the Palestinian people, as in the first place, it conducted negotiations with its leadership, despite the fact that it was not forced to do so, as the Americans rigorously boycotted Arafat, until we surprised them behind their back in Oslo, and then they could not be more anti-PLO than Israel. However, even according to the approach of the architects of Oslo, whose building has collapsed in the interim, why was it so difficult for them to demand equality and reciprocity? After all, the Jewish people also have a national

liberation movement called Zionism, and it was only a few years before that we vehemently battled the entire world to get the UN resolution equating Zionism and racism abrogated, and it was indeed abrogated, against the will of all of the Arabs. And the simple, basic question is why did we grant recognition to the PLO and not demand recognition of Zionism in return? Was it again just stupidity or also malice and lack of self-esteem? What is the logic and justification to recognize the validity of a national movement and negotiate with it, while it declares from all the rooftops in the world that our national movement is racist? And here too, had we insisted upon reciprocity, the entire world would have supported us, due to the natural, predictable give and take, and we would have again tested the Palestinians' intentions before moving forward.

Here too, the main problem is not symbolic, but rather practical and political. For if we had demanded reciprocity as a condition for our recognition of the PLO, and then the PLO Charter would have ceased to exist on its own. After all, in that epithet-laden charter, 15 of its 33 paragraphs clearly and uncompromisingly demand the obliteration of all of the political, military, economic and cultural elements of Zionism. And, after all, the charter was and remains the PLO identity card. It is difficult to understand how our people agreed to that line of thinking, accepted their enemies, recognized them and lavished upon them praises and goodness, while they repeatedly declared their hatred for Israel and spouted their vitriol in copious amounts. That is precisely the mindset of the *dhimmi*, who, when struck by his Muslim ruler, continues to wallow in his dust and thank him for his benevolent treatment. The East-European Jew, who never experienced the *dhimma*, is familiar with this phenomenon as the ghetto-character.

Then the trouble began, and the confused vision of the ostensible amendment of the Palestinian Charter took place, while Israel could have easily avoided the lengthy self-abasement. At first, our government announced that it would not sign Oslo if the charter paragraphs "that speak of the destruction of Israel" were not amended; however since there are no paragraphs that fit that description (except for one incidental mention), as the charter speaks of the destruction of Zionism and not the destruction of Israel, the Palestinians did not hurry to fall into line with our wishes, because they could not relinquish their founding ideological and constitutional document. They also adhered from then on, to the Oslo Accords that did not require them to do so and therefore, they saw no need to volunteer to relinquish anything

that was not originally designated during the negotiations as a *sine qua non* for recognition of the PLO.

Thus began Israel's humiliating farce, which, on the one hand, continued to implement Oslo, including the withdrawals and the establishment of the Palestinian Authority, and, on the other hand continued to demand amendment of the charter without defining exactly how, without extreme forcefulness and as what turned out to be mere payment of lip service without halting the entire process. Under those conditions, the Palestinians learned that they have no need to carry out that commitment or other articles of the agreement, as the Israelis are so anxious that the failed Oslo process move forward to the point that they would put up with all sorts of irregularities without batting an eyelash. Those were the days that the terrorist acts continued (Bet Lid was the first), the number of casualties rose relative to pre-Oslo, Arafat's calls to *jihad* were sounded publicly and a new concept, "victims of peace", was coined in our area. Joyful and enthusiastic, Arafat praised his partner in the "peace of the brave", who was prepared, in his generosity to continue to bite his tongue; however the amendment of the charter did not follow. Those were the days of the attempts to buy the Israeli Arabs with money, as unprecedented sums of money were showered upon them; however, they too understood that like Arafat, they could endlessly extort the Israeli Government, and it was specifically then that there was an exacerbation in the tones of the "*naqba*" celebrations, of the identification with the Palestinians and of the demand for a "state of all its citizens", which would undergo a process of de-Zionization, as the State itself did not insist upon its Zionist identity during its Oslo contacts and thereafter.

- C. The third principle is the division of the Greater Land of Israel, in other words, Israel, the territories and Jordan, between its two owners: The Israelis and the Palestinians. The territory is broad enough to satisfy the aspirations of the Palestinians for a large, expansive state in which they will be able to both manifest their nationalism as well as find a solution to their troubling refugee problem, without whose resolution this bloody conflict will not come to an end; and at the same time meet Israel's national and security needs. Instead of establishing a series of nays that cannot constitute a worthy opening for negotiations, we will propose that everything is open to negotiation in principle, including Jerusalem and including Tel Aviv, but also including Amman and Irbid, fully conscious of the status quo – that most of the eastern Land of Israel is Palestinian in terms of its population anyway, while most of the western Land of Israel is Jewish (for the time

being and so it is important to hurry), therefore no one will consider totally overturning this basic existing situation, but rather it should be amended and adjusted locally in accordance with an agreement that will be reached and the demographic reality on the ground. This comprehensive perception of the Land of Israel as a single entity and the Palestinian people as a single totality is the one that can pressure the Palestinian leadership to accept the proposal. Because, in contrast to the present, when the residents of refugee camps in Lebanon, Syria and Jordan harshly attacked any agreement with Israel and accused Arafat of abandoning them in their pathetic situation, after he and his people found themselves an "arrangement" in Gaza and Ramallah, in the circumstances of the Greater Land of Israel there will be more than enough room to rehabilitate them.

This matter of the consensus regarding the settling of the refugees is vital, because otherwise there is no way that Arafat can avoid dealing with the right of return, as there is no other alternative in the narrow resolution that was discussed in the framework of Oslo until its collapse. Any attempt to avoid dealing with that issue will result in the refugees and displaced persons problem continuing to haunt anyone who attempts to resolve the comprehensive Palestinian problem. However, a respectable and massive settlement of the refugees and displaced persons, within the borders of the eastern Land of Israel, will be considered much less traumatic and much more reasonable than the degrading residence in a foreign land for three generations, with no hope for improvement but rather for deterioration, in light of the galloping natural proliferation. (In 50 years the number of refugees has multiplied by a factor of 5; calculate what kind of explosion will take place in the next 50 years if the comprehensive solution is not adopted!) And in that framework, perhaps some of the displaced persons in the State of Israel (approximately 200,000, who constitute an indivisible part of the Palestinian people, by their own testimony), will find a permanent arrangement east of the Jordan and then their resettlement in Israel, all the more so granting the right of return to others from without, will cease to be an issue. The Palestinian leadership, which arose after Arafat, will also reach the conclusion that due to the exacerbation of the problem each year, perhaps it is preferable to find a radical solution now, instead of continuing to delude those unfortunate souls, who are still in possession of the keys to their houses in Jaffa or Acre, that they are going to return to their cities in the future. The original generation of refugees is gradually dissipating with the passage of time, and although the heritage and the memory remain

powerful among the generations of the children and the grandchildren, one can assume that the new generation will be happy to find a permanent residence and will agree to the proposal, just like many Palestinian youths, who despaired from their long-term refugee status, traveled overseas and rehabilitated themselves.

The first obvious question is what will happen to the Hashemite Kingdom. Well, nothing will happen, if we remember that all that needs be done is to recognize the territory of Jordan as part of Palestine, geographically and demographically and to change the name of the Hashemite Jordanian Kingdom to the "Hashemite Palestinian Kingdom", because that is precisely what it is. We have already said that if the world needs to choose between the autocratic rule of a king who has no roots in the area and the Palestinian majority in the land assuming power, any reasonable person would choose the majority rule and the consequent stabilization of the Middle East. We have already found that changing the names of countries or changing their regimes does not change their substance or the identity of their people. Virtually every Jordanian has always been a Palestinian as well, and most of the Palestinians are Jordanian citizens to this day. The question of monarchy, Hashemite or otherwise, is a question of regime, that a majority of the residents must answer. Nothing will happen to Jordan, if that is the desire of the residents, if the monarchy is genuinely constitutional and not autocratic, in which the king is the supreme focal point of the decisions, while the parliaments and the governments are his playthings. As long as the government in practice falls into the hands of the Palestinian majority, with which Israel will negotiate over the final, permanent border between them. Its location in the heart of the eastern Land of Israel will enable the Palestinian leadership to gather under its rule the majority of its people and to settle the rest with Israeli and international assistance.

The matter of territorial division as well as the demilitarization of the Palestinian territories in the western Land of Israel, can be resolved by means of long and exhausting negotiations in which each side will want maximum land and minimum rival population and it is possible that the element of population exchange will be accepted by both parties: For example, evacuation of Jews from certain settlements whose territory will ultimately be designated for Palestinian rule at the end of the process, and in exchange, the transfer of residents of problematic Arab villages in Israel, who are proud of their Palestinian identity, to the territory of the evacuated settlements and Palestinian rule, for their benefit and pleasure. However, the primary solution

must be predicated on finding attractive alternatives that will convince the Palestinians to relinquish certain sections in exchange for better ones or in exchange for benefits that we will offer them. For example, if we offer them an east-west division of the land, with the center of the Palestinian state in eastern Land of Israel/Palestine to which segments of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza Strip will be annexed, then certain adjustments will be necessary in order to reach an agreement. And if we offer a north-south division, in which the State of Israel would begin from Arad-Dimona-Beersheba and would include most of Judea and Samaria, with part of the Gilead, while the Palestinian state would include Ammon, Moab, Edom and most of the Negev (with special status for Eilat), which will create a territorial continuum, between it and the Gaza Strip, it is possible that that would be appealing enough for them. The principle is that everything is open to negotiations, as each side places its interests on the table in the hope of gaining most of them and in the knowledge that they will never gain them all. It is possible that that will also resolve the problem of the Bedouins of the Negev, who would be joined to the Palestinian state for which they yearn, and the Israeli territorial and strategic loss in the Negev, which will create a continuum between Palestine, Egypt, Saudi Arabia and beyond, will be more than offset by the deployment of Israeli forces on the broad Gilead Plateau, that is fit for cultivation and provides a direct threat against Damascus from the south and not only from the west.

D. And the fourth principle, which perhaps relates to our matter more directly than the others, is also the most revolutionary, because it will enable us to put the Israeli Arabs who will choose to continue to live among us to a perpetual test, while at the same time neutralizing the demographic danger threatening us from within. How? After we agree with the Palestinians after long, exhausting negotiations that could last many years, but they contain a chance to reach a positive conclusion, regarding the permanent borders between us, then each of the parties will be its own master and will be free to implement any immigration policy that it desires. Thus, the Israelis will no longer be able to argue against the right of return as the returnees will all be directed to uninhabited areas east of the Jordan, while the Palestinians will no longer have any complaints against our Law of Return, because the incoming Jews are ostensibly no longer obstructing the return of the Arab refugees to their settlements of origin. The principle here is a distinction between sovereignty over territory that will become clear with the agreement of division of territory between us, and the personal status of the residents. In

other words, it is possible that there may be some Jews/Israelis that will fall (literally) under Palestinian sovereignty, and clearly very many Palestinians, including the Israeli Arabs will remain to reside under Israeli sovereignty. However neither one nor the other should dictate their civilian, political or national loyalty. The population on both sides that will remain in rival territory after the division will be given a choice, on a reciprocal and equal basis, to choose between 3 alternatives in total freedom:

1. To sell their belongings and movable property and move to the mother country. It is presumed that a certain percentage of the population on both sides will do so; or
2. To remain in place, to pledge allegiance to the state that adopts them, to serve in its army, learn its language and live in peace and equality within it; or
3. To remain in place as foreign permanent residents, whom no one can move from their place, however possessors of citizenship, loyalty and political commitment to their mother country in which they will also fulfill their right to vote and of political representation, like a Canadian in the United States or a Belgian in France. Obviously, an arrangement of that sort is possible only if the Palestinians residing in Israel and the territories have the sovereignty, citizenship and passport of their country, which will provide them enough of a security umbrella so that they can reside in their villages in freedom and equality in the knowledge that their country across the border is defending their rights and is aware of their problems.

Of course, a resolution of that sort for the Israeli Arabs, which is only possible in the framework of the Palestinian problem in its entirety, is fraught with obstacles and dangers, however, even if it is a bad solution – the others that have been proposed and attempted to date are even worse. Great statesmanship is not merely opting for the good choice over the bad, because that can be accomplished even by small statesmen, but in hanging on to a bad reality before it becomes worse. However, directions of this sort to resolve the conflict, which do not repeat hackneyed clichés that have accomplished nothing so far, provide hope for a new direction in the present disheartening situation. The strength of the innovation is in the fact that instead of leaving the fate of the Palestinians and the region in the hands of irresponsible leaderships, the proposal is to allow each individual to decide his own fate by deciding where he or she wants to live,

to whom he is committed conceptually and politically, with creation of as little chaos as possible, for a transition period as brief as possible for as extended a period as possible. An arrangement of this sort will afford the Palestinians a large enough territory to settle most of their people and to rule over them by means of the ultimate liquidation of the refugees' suffering, a peace of good-neighborliness, cooperation and building of two countries, freedom of political expression for minorities on both sides, ties to their mother countries, even if they continue to live in the country neighboring theirs and neutralizing the demographic problem that threatens Israel from within. Because under these conditions, the number of Arabs living under Israeli sovereignty is of no consequence as long as they are just residents and not citizens with the right to vote, on the condition that that right will be reserved for them in their motherland. Failure to do so would lead to the development of apartheid between the two populations on the same tract of land, which Israeli democracy would be unable to bear. Regarding the matters relating to demilitarization as well, the Palestinians will agree to completely demilitarize all tracts of land that come into their possession west of the Jordan, as their army will be deployed unrestricted east of the river, just as Egypt was able to demilitarize Sinai, just because its substantial armies are comfortably deployed west of the Suez Canal.

Therefore, it is vital for Israel to resolve the Palestinian problem in its entirety as a condition to rid themselves of the distressing yoke of the Israeli Arabs, who identify themselves as part of it. Only a broad, comprehensive solution of that sort can ensure the ability to circumvent other solutions that have been proposed by ambitious Arabs or concerned Israelis over the years, based on the assumption that the Arab civilian population in Israel is a factor that cannot be altered, a dictate of fate that cannot be avoided. But that is not the case, because all of those proposals contain an unresolved nucleus that will ultimately lead to a renewal of the conflict between the two populations – when the Arab percentage of the population passes a certain level of critical mass that will require a redivision of the Land of Israel within the Green Line – in order to preserve the Jewish state, if we are not interested in its total disappearance. Of course, in the opinion of the Israeli Arabs, as in the opinion of the Palestinians in general, the optimal solution for them is implementation of the right of return, which means the transformation of the State of Israel into a third Palestinian state (alongside Jordan and the territories), and ultimately to a large Palestinian state that will return the Jews to minority status, will terminate the Jewish state and will take us back to the reality that was extant before the 1947 Partition Resolution. However, even among them, due to the realization that Israel will not so much

allow themselves to fall into that trap, various “staged” programs are raised that intend to have us swallow the pill gradually, with “moral” rationales saturated with “tolerance” and “understanding” between the peoples. However, the ultimate bitter intentions emerge through the “reasonable” packaging, and anyone with eyes in his head can see them. It is enough to look at the far-reaching demands of the Arab parties that are cited in their platforms and in their contacts with the major ruling parties (see Chapter 8), in order to understand where they are heading.

For a decade, the “Givat Haviva Education Foundation for the Study of Peace”, administered jointly by the Arabs and Jews concerned with their welfare, has been working on various “options” for “autonomy” for the Israeli Arabs, that the element of alienation and the desire to divest Israel of its values and his soul, cry out from every page. Of course, under the respectability of academic “research” – as if it were possible to “research” that which has not yet happened – it is possible to say anything one wants. However, it is incumbent upon the reader to be aware in order to avoid the many traps scattered there, in the knowledge that they are nothing more than speculation and expression of desires and aspirations and they have no trace of precise “research” whose findings are unchallengeable. Meanwhile, it is worthwhile to examine the development of these ideas over the course of the 1990s in order to examine how they exacerbated in the course of “research” of the isolationist trends.

Know this: While during the years preceding the first *intifada* (1987) most of the Israeli Arabs spoke in terms of civilian equality within Israel (without fulfilling their obligations, of course) and about an independent Palestinian state alongside Israel that will meet the Palestinians’ national needs, at home and abroad – after that traumatic event that rattled the entire Israeli society and upset its serenity, including the Arab minority, new alternatives began to present themselves in the direction of isolation. At first it was in the form of various forms of autonomy and subsequently adopting the right of return and the establishment of a bi-national state within Israel, on the way to liquidating the State of Israel. Because if we are speaking of autonomy, the implication is that the Israeli Arabs would receive several areas of activity of their own, as they will be delineated by the central government; however, they would remain under the authority of the State indefinitely. While the other solutions speak of temporary joint management of the State in accordance with values and principles agreed upon between the two nationalities until, after implementation of the right of return, or by virtue of their natural proliferation, the Arabs would become the majority at which point administration would be transferred entirely into Arab

hands. In other words, the principle of a “state of all its citizens”, which is now being proposed and which is the foundation of a bi-national state, will only be valid as long as the majority is Jewish, and it will cease to exist once the State becomes Arab, heaven forbid.

As the Israeli Arabs are aware of the fact that territorial autonomy is impossible at present, because they are scattered throughout the country, and primarily in three non-contiguous concentrations: The Negev, the Triangle and the western Galilee – the forms of autonomy that they initially raised were functional and would have afforded them the opportunity to manage their cultural, economic and political affairs independently. Of course, the territorial dimension would have been manifest in de facto independence, within the jurisdictions of the Arab local councils and with the continuation of illegal construction that would have created contiguous Arab territories and served in the future as a basis for territorial autonomy as well. Several suggestions also raised the possibility of collecting special taxes, in addition to the State taxes, and even conducting foreign relations – which the Islamic movements already did in the 1980s, and the “human rights” organizations, which appear like mushrooms among the Arab public in Israel, have been doing in recent years. Of course, the Israeli Arabs do not form ties with its country’s friends, but rather collaborate with its enemies, abuse it and take action to undermine it in the international arena. The cultural emphases are apparently intended to create a separate educational system, including universities, to cultivate the Arabic language and its literature and the like. It is difficult to understand what they hope to gain from this, as it is clear to them as well that instead of being alumni of the best universities in the country, which opens doors for them throughout the world, and which educates them to be absorbed in an open, democratic society, they will cultivate a dark, backward generation, at a Third World level, which will be insular and even further alienated from the surrounding majority society, to the point of total separation.

These ideas began to sprout among the Israeli Arabs in the wake of the first *intifada*, which underscored their sense of difference and their unhappiness stemming from their lack of affiliation with either side in the uprising. There is another aspect to this matter. In contrast to most Israeli citizens, who were jubilant due to the mass immigration from the former Soviet Union in those years, the Israeli Arabs were terrified lest they lose their jobs as a result, a fear that they raised publicly in opposing the immigration. However, secretly, they also felt that the demographic change transpiring in the land to their dismay, would delay realization of their hope of achieving an Arab majority and would also be

liable to strengthen the State that they hate with all their soul and increase its life expectancy. There were also those who were in a hurry, who spoke of territorial autonomy from the outset, which would have led to separation from Israel. From that perspective, despite the fact that that type of autonomy is considered “extreme” because of the isolationist element inherent therein, and which, from an Israeli perspective, would lead to a loss of part of its sovereign territory, it is conceivable that ultimately the “soft” group autonomy, which does not entail loss of territory, is the more dangerous. Because the functional-cultural autonomy that is not concentrated in one region but rather is diffused throughout the country, is the one that will ultimately become a Trojan horse seeking, by means of an accelerated birthrate and the right of return, to expropriate the entire state for itself. It is no wonder, therefore, that our good friend, Azmi Bishara, was among the first to demand that kind of cultural autonomy as a prelude to his unbridled, open statement a decade later, while it is specifically the supporters of territorial autonomy that were then considered “extreme”, who thought of a canton arrangement like in Switzerland, in which there would be two Arab cantons in the Galilee and the Triangle that would preserve their language and culture and would open their own education and economy institutions, without leaving the federal framework of Israel.

In any case, when the idea was still in its infant stages, it had few supporters, including among the Israeli Arabs, who feared that the autonomy concept in any form was liable to instill fear into the hearts of the Jewish majority precisely when it began to become more open to the Palestinian right to self-determination and a state, and they feared to lose that asset, which was likely to pave the way for them in the future as well. Thus, the alternative of cultural autonomy was raised before the entire Arab group, who Bishara considered to be a “stranger” in Israel, and since it had no hope that a state of all its citizens would be established, in other words, a bi-national state in which the Arabs have an equal right to determine its character – he preferred disengagement, in which all matters of culture, identity and nationality would be administered by an elected autonomous council that would protect the personal autonomy of all of the Israeli Arabs. However, the State leadership feared that autonomy would constitute an infrastructural basis for Arab territorial disengagement and therefore, they refused to recognize the Committee of Arab Council Heads that was established in 1974, all the more so the Monitoring Committee that was established in 1982 and which dealt with practical steps to build the infrastructure for autonomy without acknowledging it publicly. The problem was decisive, because if a cultural/ethnic/linguistic/religious minority anywhere was to demand to preserve the rights connected

to its heritage, like the Lapps in Sweden – no problem, no one will die from that, even if ultimately that minority was to seek autonomy with the intention of separating in the future. However, with Israel's geo-strategic conditions, the establishment of a separate hostile group, which identifies with the State's enemies even according to their approach, and on so tiny a territory relative to the expanse of Sweden, and while the State is still surrounded by enemies, immediate and potential, on all sides, this would be an act of suicide. This would be not only allowing disengagement in the future, but literally paving the way for the annexation of the autonomy to the enemy forces. It must be said that the Arab leadership in Israel understood these Israeli fears and declared that it has no interest in autonomy, despite the fact that in practice, it continued to lay the groundwork for it.

However, the public discourse has begun. Once the genie is out of the bottle, it is impossible to turn the clock back, and it was clear to everyone that the discussion was not about resolving a humanitarian problem or one of human rights, but rather one of consolidation of a lobby to pressure the State during periods of peace, and perhaps a move to active support for the Palestinians on the day of reckoning, as was proven by Arab riots, at the initiative of their national institutions during the first *intifada*, and even more so during the second *intifada*. From the moment that demands for Israeli Arab rights were elevated from the level of language, culture, economy and religion to the national plane, the majority and the minority have been on a collision course. For if not a bi-national state in Israel, to which the Jewish majority is absolutely opposed, then autonomy and disengagement. There is no recourse other than a bi-national solution on this small tract of land. The advocates of the separate path approach in those days, even if very few dared then to mention the concept "autonomy", were the "Progressive Movement", a radical Jewish-Arab group, which has since ceased to exist, and the Islamic Movement, that, in any case, established their Islamic enclaves in the villages and towns under its control, and refused to participate in the Knesset elections, so that they would not need, heaven forbid, pledge allegiance to its State. Both movements supported primarily cultural autonomy, the implication of which is granting them the right to administer their education system, broadcasting and culture at the State's expense, but with the State not interfering with the content – a move that would have made Arab education even more alienated from the State, as it was primarily Arab-nationalist and Muslim-cultural, and the day would not be far off when indictments of Israel and the Jews, of the sort that we found in the writings of the Islamic Movement, would

become the daily regimen of all of the Arab children, moreover with public funding.

However, in the closing years of the last millennium, the idea gained a renewed momentum with the minimalists, who are gradually diminishing, demanding insistently at least cultural autonomy, including an Arab university, election of autonomous institutions and constitutional changes in the framework of the Jewish state. While the more maximalist among them, whose voice is gradually growing stronger the more the confrontation with the Palestinians does not abate, go even farther. Because it turns out that the longer the conflict with the Palestinians, whom the Israeli Arabs consider partners, continues, the less the desire of the Jewish public, whose expectations were once dashed, to have anything to do with the Palestinians. While on the Arab side of the barrier, especially among the intellectuals, who always despised the idea of the Jewish state, there is no longer any contentment with this sort of cultural autonomy, especially after the rupture of October 2000 and the ascent of the Israeli Arabs onto the path of conflict. Before the rupture, there was a theory among the Israeli Arabs that if the State would make life difficult for them, limit their options, force them to pledge it allegiance or join the army as a condition for the continuation of the existing rights situation, then they would have no recourse other than employing violence against the authorities and cooperating with the Palestinians in the territories to that end. Now, it seems that the order of things has reversed to the point that in the wake of the October violence in the Arab sector and the increasing public boisterousness of its leaders in and out of the Knesset, and the intrepid streaming of the Arabs in Israel to the Palestinian *intifada*, the demands among the Jewish public have been gradually increasing to put an end to that intolerable situation as the time has come for the Jewish democracy and State to defend themselves. If that is the way that it is, then there is no doubt that the Arab demands for autonomy of the territorial or cultural variety, or alternatively the de-Zionization and de-Judaization of the State with all of its implications, will become part of our public agenda, with a call for international institutions to intervene.

The October rupture also aroused, for the first time, demands in Jewish circles to change the electoral system, in order to prevent the Arabs from taking control of the State by the democratic means that the State invests in their hands at present. There are those who seek, through legislation, to prevent election of members of Knesset who identify with terrorist organizations, as a method of protecting democracy. They base themselves on the Basic Law: The Knesset, which establishes that, a list of candidates that negates the existence

of the state of the Jewish people or its democratic character, or which incites to racism, must be disqualified. This proposal was raised after MK Ahmad Tibi called the Chief of the General Staff a “murderer”, because in the framework of the IDF fulfilling its role in the war on terrorism some Palestinian citizens, who were not directly involved in the incidents were hurt; another Arab MK called upon Hizbullah and the Arab world to continue their war with Israel and a third MK sent condolences to the Syrian President for his losses during a clash with Israel (see Chapter 8). However, it is possible that proposals of that sort miss the point, because the wild comments of the Arab members of Knesset are not part of their political platforms, but rather comments covered by the immunity to which they are entitled. These comments are problematic because they are always critical of Israel exclusively, while the Palestinians and the rest of the Arabs are forever immune to criticism by the Arab members of Knesset. Their diatribes against the IDF are also infuriating, as it is thanks to the IDF that we exist in this State. Not only do they not serve in the IDF, they do everything in their power to disparage it. However, legislation in this area will change nothing, because breaking the thermometer will not reduce the fever. Therefore, perhaps, proposals for electoral reform of a different sort will achieve the objective.

One of these methods was proposed by Zvi Bar, Mayor of Ramat Gan and former celebrated security figure. In his opinion, since the State is fundamentally Jewish and democratic, anyone negating those fundamentals robs the State of its legitimacy and therefore cannot demand equal rights within it. Furthermore, he establishes that the Arabs violate the laws of the State in which they are citizens by seizing control of its lands and they have already constructed 26,000 one-story houses without a building permit, while everyone is concerned with the land shortage problem; they do not pay municipal taxes because the Arab municipalities do not collect real taxes and their debts to the treasury already total two billion NIS; they stockpile illegal weapons in their villages; they have been involved in setting fire to forests for years; under the supervision and direction of the Monitoring Committee the Israeli Arabs are incited to establish autonomy and meanwhile annually conduct the *naqba* events and Land Days that not only harm the State but actually undermine it. Therefore, he recommends dividing the country into 120 electoral precincts, including Arab electoral precincts, in order to limit their Knesset representation, just as De-Gaulle did in France in seeking to limit the communists’ power. He proposes 5-6 Arab electoral precincts, which will guarantee a respectable, consistent Knesset representation, and even permanent participation of an Arab minister in the government, but will leave

their numbers in the Knesset at a non-threatening level. He also proposes that the Arabs living in the Triangle should be given voting rights in the Palestinian state, in order to manifest the Palestinian identity of which they are so proud, even if they continue to be residents of the State of Israel.

A variant of this solution, which was once suggested by the late Raanan Weitz regarding the Palestinians in the territories, is also likely to serve as an appropriate response to the present developing situation. The reference is to a canton system, like the one in Switzerland, or a federal system, like in Canada, in which cultural-ethnic-linguistic minorities have their needs met under one general political umbrella. According to that proposal, the country would be divided into a set number of cantons (let's say 10), of which three would be Arab (northern Negev, western Galilee and the Triangle), and thereby a dominant two-thirds majority would be guaranteed in the State institutions although in each canton each group would administer its affairs on its own. However, we see before our own eyes the demands by Quebec for separation, even though Canada is not threatened by any external enemy, and the traditional neutrality of Switzerland, which neutralized the antagonism between the German, Italian and French groups within it, even when the flames of war burned in Europe between the cultures of those origins. In addition, in Switzerland (and in Canada, in this sense) there is no irredentist group seeking to annex itself to any motherland, despite the geographical proximity of Switzerland to Germany, France and Italy. In Israel, the Israeli Arab connection to the Palestinians, enemies of Israel, will not afford them the opportunity to rest calmly while their nation battles their State. In Switzerland and in Canada, no youth refuses to serve in his country's army, despite the fact that potentially he is liable to be deployed to defend his country against members of his cultural group across the border. In Israel, the conditions are not similar, however it is conceivable, as a lesser of evils, that it is preferable to set out along this path and thereby limit the damage under present conditions, than to anticipate the threats increasing to a point that even a reform of this sort will no longer be possible.

Thus, there is no shortage of proposals, but rather of consolidation of a long-term policy before the situation exacerbates further, both in terms of demography and in terms of security, due to the continued conflict with the Palestinians. And there is no time as appropriate as a period of national unity, in which any decision will be passed by a broad national consensus, to conceive and consolidate this new policy, which will require a genuine system overhaul, in order to frustrate any future possibility of severing parts of the State from it, or Arabs gaining control over all or part of it, or its transformation into a stychic democracy, invisible

to the human eye, to a bi-national state and subsequently to an additional Arab country. Whatever the policy that is ultimately adopted, whether one that includes the Israeli Arab problem in resolution of the comprehensive Palestinian problem as recommended above, or a separate and partial solution for the time being, it must take into account that even when we hear sweet talk from the Israeli Arabs, from time to time, in order to assuage the concerns of the Jewish public, their fundamental hostile trends *vis-à-vis* the Jewish-Zionist state will not diminish, but rather would exacerbate over the coming years and therefore it is incumbent upon Israel to take several immediate intermediate steps in order to stem the tide. And the intention is to distinguish between that segment of the Palestinians in Israel, who prefer to tie their destiny to the Jewish-Zionist state, to pledge it allegiance, to integrate into it and its culture, to serve it and become a citizen with equal rights and obligations, before whom nothing is closed and everything is dependent upon his talent and commitment; and those who have reached the decision to put their trust in their people and turn their back on their country, and it is upon them, ostensibly, that we must “impose upon them restrictions equal to the danger anticipated from them.” (That is the formulation of the American Supreme Court, when it supported placing the Japanese into internment camps during the World War, even when there was no bona-fide threat.) However, we need not act with such cruelty and it will be enough if we restrict the benefits that the State gives as a “reward” to the rebellious populations, and then, perhaps, they will learn that it is improper for them to constitute a genuine threat to their state.

For those of them who want to play by the rules determined by the majority, in order to receive all of the benefits and bear all of the difficulties of the society and integrate into it, the option should be granted them. It is no longer possible to tell them that they are citizens with equal rights while at the same time closing the door before them. Israel’s slogan regarding them should be summed up in the statement “for the individual choosing to integrate – everything; for the collective seeking separation – nothing”. Most will scream and rally the world, shake things up and cry “racism” and “anti-democracy”, which they already do today in any case. However, if a fair chance is given to each individual to decide about his own life, no longer through advisers, representatives, dignitaries and administrators, who constantly serve as interlocutors as to “what the Arabs want”, then we will have a picture, in a short while, who is with us and who is against us. And everything begins with education. The State must establish large regional schools in which Jewish and Arab children, children from development towns and villages, cities and kibbutzim and religious and secular children will

study on equal footing, the same curriculum, in Hebrew, which emphasizes Zionist values and the State of Israel, opens the school day with Hatikva and brandishing the national flag, just like they do in American schools, who open their day by pledging allegiance to the country's flag and proudly waving it. Jews among us will cry "fascism" and "narrow-mindedness", however, since their ostensibly liberal approach brought about the present rupture, it can be relied upon no longer. For a state that seeks to survive is not supposed to fund anti-Jewish and anti-Zionist education in its schools, and then to wonder why they burn its flag on Independence Day or refuse to stand in memory of the casualties, who sacrificed their lives for it. Children, who are supposed to be equal citizens in the same state, must be educated, if they so choose, based on the same world of values. We have the same homeland to love, and therefore we will study together; we have the same symbols, institutions and society to defend, and we will do that together.

Of course, a non-Jew, who seeks to preserve his religion, his heritage and his language, would be free to do so, during the two days a week that he is off from school. It is a personal matter, as is accepted regarding minority education, or even for members of the majority with faiths and opinions of their own in France and the United States, and no one can, may or seeks to dissuade them from doing so. However, whether he is a Jew or an Arab, who seeks to educate his children in his own way, beyond the State curriculum, can do so during his free time and at his own expense. This method of education has tremendous value in raising the academic level of the student and he will no longer have a pretext to claim "discrimination" or other excuses to explain their education gap. Any of the Arabs who start along this path, will be prepared for the highest levels of education in high school and university; once he receives the training throughout, together with his Jewish comrades, and after he, too, was refined in the IDF crucible, fulfilling his obligation and training himself to be a loyal, active citizen in his State, then, no one can obstruct his path to any objective: If he chooses to be a pilot in the Air Force, and shows that he is capable of doing so, he is welcome to defend the State's skies like the other pilots. Druse officers and soldiers serve in the armies of Syria and Israel, and they have no problem, and that is the way it should be, to identify with their state with all of their might. A loyal Arab citizen can and should also follow that path if he so chooses. In the World Wars, Americans of German descent fought in their country's armed forces against the armies of their country of origin without raising any objection. As the years pass, we will all be proud of the fact that the commander of the Air force is an Arab, just as a Georgian immigrant to

the United States, who was raised on its values, rose up through the ranks and became commander of the country's ground troops, and could have no problem fighting the Soviet Union, which then ruled Georgia, if called upon to do so.

An Arab youth, who chooses this path, will not only lessen the burden of regular and reserve duty upon the Jewish comrades his age, but his service in the army will also help him relate to the issues that trouble people his (or her) age and there is no more convincing ticket of admission or more effective key to entering society. You cannot curl up in your corner, do nothing positive and just scream that they are discriminating against you. The young Arab man (or woman), who finishes his service, will go on to higher education, like his comrades. When they graduate from the Department of Aeronautics at The Technion – no one will prevent them from gaining employment as engineers in the Israel Aircraft Industry, and thereby raise their personal level and will have the training to join the upper strata of the profession and of life in accordance with his ability. When they finish their service, they then will be able to gain Israeli citizenship, which will grant them unlimited rights. The same will be true regarding the Jews, because the State cannot discriminate between people just according to his origins or his religion. Therefore, the Law of Return and Citizenship must undergo some revision: The State continues to be the state of the Jewish people and every Jew is entitled to come there, in distress or prosperity, however citizenship therein is not acquired automatically. Every potential citizen, Jew or Arab, whether he was born here or he came here as an immigrant, once he studied in its educational system, reached maturity and fulfilled a service basket to the State, proved knowledge of its language and pledged allegiance to it, just as they do in the United States for citizenship candidates, he then becomes an Israeli citizen with equal rights. Of course, the exceptions will be established by law, in accordance with their age, their health, the length of time that they were in the country and the like, who will be entitled to citizenship even without fulfilling all of the aforementioned conditions. For example, since retroactive legislation is prohibited, no one's citizenship will be revoked; however, a determining date will be determined, after which anyone born in or entering the country, will need to follow the path that was delineated.

At the same time, one must, at all costs, avoid a quota system, whose destructive effect in a country like Lebanon, and the lack of equity inherent in it regarding free competition, based on ability and training and not on connections and origin, must serve as a warning signal. If there are Druse generals in the IDF today, it is not because they were beneficiaries of reverse discrimination or of compassion. They reached that position through hard work and merit. The

same is true of Arab university students, especially in the competitive faculties, where they keep several places for them even if they do not meet the criteria, a sort of “reverse discrimination” in order to enable them to reach desirable professions. This method, has “proven” itself negatively, as Arab lawyers who studied in our universities turned to “B’Tzelem” and “Adallah”, and unceasingly harass the State and busy the overtaxed courts with their petitions, above and beyond the call of reason, and other Arab students and university graduates are the ones raising the banner of rebellion on and off the campuses. In other words, while it is impossible to prevent them from availing themselves of higher education, which they consider an impetus to battle their country, certainly they should not be beneficiaries of reverse discrimination at the expense of others, who have served their country and endangered their lives for it, while the Arabs, who are unjustifiably beneficiaries of reverse discrimination, due to their origin, gain an advantage far beyond the benefit of avoiding any sort of national service. Therefore, if anyone should be given preference in admissions, it is more equitable that it should be those who served, Jews and Arabs, while those who refused to serve should be sent to the back of the line. In any case, not only is reverse discrimination in education or employment ineffective, as mentioned above, it will ultimately harm both the State as well as the ones who were beneficiaries of reverse discrimination themselves.

Reverse discrimination, by means of a quota system, means an insulting and humiliating declaration that the beneficiary of the reverse discrimination cannot stand on his own and the State must provide him with crutches. For, what does an Arab minister in the government or an Arab Supreme Court justice mean? That is a statement that a group of people from a certain ethnic origin is incapable of producing more than one minister or judge and perhaps even that without the quota system of reverse discrimination, not even one candidate would have been found qualified for these lofty positions. Is there anyone with self-respect, who will agree to a statement of that sort? The Arabs, who participate in our civilian experience, must be aware that they can climb anywhere, reach any position if they are qualified. They must aspire that many of them will become ministers and judges, with no limitations. Especially in politics, this test is more important and easier to realize. If the Arabs who take part in the political game join existing ideological parties, or establish others on an ideological and not sectarian basis, then it is reasonable that they will reach the highest echelons of politics on the basis of their membership in governing parties and their excellence in those parties. And then, many Arabs will be members of the government, not just one, and one of them may be Prime Minister as well.

Why not? However, it is clear, that if they choose, as long as it is possible, and the present legal situation has not been changed, sectarian Arab parties with nationalist or Islamic overtones, then it is certain that they have no chance to enter into a coalition with the ruling parties, certainly not in ministerial positions and they are relegated to continue to wail in the opposition and also to complain about the “discrimination” of which they are victims because no Arab minister was appointed. It is impossible to do everything to separate oneself from the collective and then complain that you were left out.

Separate Arab parties that were established, ostensibly, in the name of “freedom of association”, is not the only example of separatism and burying the possibility of the integration of Arabs, who are interested in doing so, in Israel. The Committee of Arab Council Heads and the Monitoring Committee, who were referred to above, also deepened the rift. Therefore, the State must refuse to negotiate with every pretender or office holder in the name of, or on behalf of, those organizations. Because it's one or the other: If the Arab citizens take the citizenship track, like every other citizen, then they have no need or desire for those organizations, and it is preferable that they go back to dealing with the local matters that they were elected to manage. And if they do not take the citizenship track and are not rank and file citizens, then about what are they complaining? Can a non-citizen complain that they are treating him for what he is? Regarding the Arabs, who choose not to take the citizenship track, as long as a comprehensive solution for the Palestinian problem that would include them has not been reached, the State must adopt a much stricter approach towards them and anchor it in legislation. In education, anyone who refuses to join the uniform national education system for all citizens, will teach his children as he chooses and at his expense, with no state interference. Non-service in the IDF brings with it low priority in acceptance to higher education, with no quotas and no reverse discrimination, and especially halting the national insurance payments, abrogating the right to state housing and transfer of the budgets to local councils exclusively based on effectiveness in collecting local taxes and in accordance with the number of those who register for the State schools in each Arab settlement. Thereby, it will reward those who integrate and will create a positive incentive for others to follow in their wake. And once the Palestinian state is established, all of those who refused to integrate will become its citizens, will vote in it and for it, and not in Israel of which they want no part, even though they will be able to continue to live in their villages and work comfortably, as long as they respect Israeli law and do not engage in incitement and subversion.

It is also important to intensify law enforcement and come down hard on every rioter, tax evader, inciter, terrorist and collaborator with terrorists, building code violator, drug criminal, thief, defacer of national symbols or brandisher of enemy symbols. If the crime violates the law, then the criminals should be placed on trial publicly so that their exploits and the resulting punishments will be brought to the attention of the public and deter others. For example, if there is a building code violation and there is a demolition order, no Arab member of Knesset and no threat of violence should halt implementation of that order; and if the Arabs obstruct intersections, they should be warned not to do so without the use of force; however if they do not respond, action should be taken against them without compassion; they will not determine when and where the police will be deployed, nor the pace of the State's development or its character, and no negotiations should be conducted with them regarding "keeping the peace" in exchange for anything, because that is a perverse policy that will only exacerbate their extortion, as the events of previous years have proven. Administrative closings of newspapers that incite only lead to the opening of others in their place and the State cannot allow itself to be portrayed as one that stifles freedom of speech by shutting down newspapers. The courts will deal with those matters; however, based on forceful legislation and exacting implementation of the rulings, so as not to leave the door open for extraneous interpretive activity, which generally sides with the "victim" and marginalizes the most urgent needs of the State in ensuring its continued existence, as is the case regarding national lands. And again, we are not only speaking here about absolute justice, if such a concept exists, but rather about Israeli society defending itself before the internal subversion of the Arabs seeking to undermine it from within. They learned to exploit all of the cracks in the legal and judicial system, justify the violence of their brethren with the hackneyed claim of "discrimination", "frustration" and the like, but will search for every excuse in the world to escape the very law whose protection they seek. Israeli society too is frustrated by them and disgusted by them and all of its attention is given to preserving what is left and not to allow any more chunks to be taken from it.

Radical Arab organizations, like the Islamic Movement, will neither be allowed to conduct contacts with parallel international movements nor to receive funding from them. Today, those elements openly aid Hamas and receive funding from hostile organizations abroad, in order to take action against the interests of the State, among other purposes. For example, the entire restoration of the Temple Mount, and especially Solomon's Stables, which added an additional floor to the al-Aqsa Mosque, was accomplished by the Islamic Movement in Israel, while

the acquiescent State governments reacted since 1967 with silence, instead of standing resolutely and demanding, as they did in Hebron, equal rights for the Jews on the Mount. Had they done so, we would not have been placed in the position of beggars, who are not allowed to arrive at their holy places and for whom the visit of the head of the opposition there constitutes a pretext for upheaval and riots for Muslims on both sides of the Green Line, because he “defiled” the Mount with his presence. We are also frustrated and silently and honorably bear the fact that the Mount is desecrated on a daily basis by the Muslims. If we do not insist upon our rights, which historically precede the rights of the Muslims, and are at least their equal today, then we should not be surprised that the various al-Aqsa societies among the Muslim public in Israel will continue to flourish and place obstacles in our path. We must clarify that if they are incapable of sharing with us, like civilized people, in the properties common to the two of us, and it does not matter who is “right” in this matter, then they will be the ones pushed aside and not us. We constantly declare that the Arabs will achieve nothing by force, but we allow their violence to speak without hindrance. Similarly, it is important to frustrate all of their attempts to revive Arab villages that were destroyed and especially their staking of claims in existing Jewish settlements by “merely” restoring mosques and cemeteries destroyed in the war, that will be followed by additional demands that will pave the way for the right of return.

At the same time, there is no alternative to informing the public of the dangers anticipated by us because of all the Israeli Arabs, if we do not come to our senses and adopt a new defensive policy, an inseparable part of which must be rewarding those who walk the straight and narrow. For example, those who fulfill their obligations to the State, like the Druse and other Arabs, and will choose the option of integration in the future, must be treated with generosity and openness, both because a devoted citizen deserves all these things by right and also in order to show those who refuse that we are not a society that despises strangers in principle, but rather have reservations regarding those who seek to harm us. This will serve as a positive incentive for additional Israeli Arabs to join those integrating and to distance themselves from resolute, anti-Israeli jingoism that will ultimately harm them. Those educated in the national educational system and serve in the army must be provided with housing and employment, complete integration at all levels of government based on their skills to prevent any slander alleging that they give everything and the State disowns them. The Christians in Israel, neglected by our politicians, who competed among themselves for the more numerous Muslim votes, must return to the focus of

our concerns. They consider themselves immediate victims of the rise of Islamic fundamentalism that threatens them and their properties, like in the case in Nazareth, and expect the State to protect them. For not only are they our natural allies, due to our common enemies and because we are both minorities in the Islamic ocean, but we will also be doing ourselves a favor and will improve our standing in the Christian world as the Muslim world is never going to be on our list of friends in the world anyway. Nearby Christians like those, are the primary candidates for integrative citizenship, with full rights and obligations, and they will be a model of sensitive, humane absorption before the entire world and before the Arabs, who will remain recalcitrant among us.

To summarize this section, it should be stated that most Israeli citizens do not have clear knowledge of the depth of the rupture that took place during the October events, to the point that the rift between Israel and its Arab citizens has become unbridgeable. It is only with the perspective provided by the passage of a year that reading the reports of the Israeli journalists, shocked by what their eyes had seen or their ears had heard, can provide a sense of the severity of the crisis. And the reporters are not specifically those who eat Arabs for breakfast, but generally, experts on Arab affairs, who struck roots and established friendships among them and even tended to report sympathetically about the objects of their interest. And here, when they compare what happened to "*Kristallnacht*", as Arab racists ran amok through the streets and checked the identity of each store owner and burned all the stores belonging to Jews to the ground; or when racist gangs stood at intersections and gas stations throughout the country, stopped passing vehicles and inquired as to the identity of the passengers, and if they were Jews they were beaten, at times to death; or when they burned to the ground banks and post offices that were in their villages to serve them; what precisely is the implication of these violent attacks, which are also justified by the Arab leaders, who accuse the police of the crimes of their voters and constituency? And our feeble government, not only failed to take immediate, forceful steps to put an end to the riots, and put their policemen in danger instead of sending them reinforcements (military if necessary in order to open the intersections), but also promised to repair the damages at its expense, pulled the police out of vital areas, under the Arab threat of further violence and committed to establish a governmental commission of inquiry to examine the conduct of the security forces, and one would hope the exploits of the rioters, and even announced the allocation of billions for the Arab sector. This is the opening to the anguish of the next troubled wave, already fermenting in the inferno that is our society.

This severe rift requires adoption of a courageous, comprehensive policy,

along the lines articulated above, or any other alternative lines, as long as the frightened, frustrated Jewish public that already avoids Arab villages, will renew its trust in its government. The truth must be told to the people: If the Jewish state is a “catastrophe” (the *naqba* that they celebrate each year) for the Israeli Arabs, then they will do everything to change the situation that has developed over the last 25 years, apparently in order to undo the catastrophe that came down on their heads. In other words, the terminology of “catastrophe”, which is fraught with symbolism and is a motivational and recruiting force, means the de-legitimization of the State of Israel and the laying of the groundwork for waging war against it. Words are very important in Arab culture, because, they, at times, come in place of action in order to cover up frustration, inaction and weakness. Then they fire words at the enemy like poisonous arrows, as long as they have no alternative. However, we must be aware of the fact that these words, which we call “incitement”, are a prelude and pre-condition for actions, when passions are inflamed, like they were during that October, and will be in the future in every situation in which the Israeli Arabs think that the State’s legs are quaking in its weakness, in the face of a comprehensive war, and this is the time to rise up against it. Some of their harshest and most extreme spokesmen, and not only members of the Islamic Movement, as we saw in the previous chapter, openly announce these intentions. We, who have preferred to ignore or repress these statements over the years, had better start internalizing them and preparing for them. Enough of the distorted self-guilt with which we unnecessarily burden ourselves, that everything stems from discrimination and prejudice as it was not the discrimination that created the alienation; on the contrary, experience shows that during the tenure of the Military Government, the Arabs were much more Israeli, much more disciplined and strived much less to undermine the State. Over the last decade, in which they were disproportionately coddled, unjustifiably, in insipid attempts to give them preferential treatment, their self-confidence skyrocketed and the process of mayhem began.

The Israeli Arabs do nothing to ease these fears of the Jews, and even take steps to add to them. Not only do they prove their hostility and alienation through violent riots and audacious statements, as mentioned above, but they also prepare the means to disrupt our lives and gain control over us: By means of the ticking demographic clock (What do they care? They produce children and burden the State to support them with the various welfare allocations: Child payments, unemployment, retirement, birth grants, etc. Why should they stop?); by aiding various programs leading to autonomy or a bi-national state; and recently by means of the right of return for their Palestinian brethren,

which is intended to deal the State its death blow. And until then, they strive for functional autonomy through their enclaves in the Arab villages, which even the police dare not enter and must first negotiate with them as if it was enemy territory; through Arab national institutions, like the Committee of Council Heads and the Monitoring Committee, which remarkably evoke the national Jewish institutions that ultimately led to separation and the establishment of the Jewish state; as well as by means of cultural autonomy and the establishment of universities, a carbon copy of The Technion and the Hebrew University at the time. In other words, although they are entitled to a state, just like we are, Israel cannot allow a third Palestinian state to form, at its expense, and perhaps on its ruins, in addition to the Palestinian Authority and Jordan. After we twice allowed Palestinian justice to be realized, we also may, without apology or feelings of guilt, see to our own justice, which can only be realized on a one-time basis, here and now, and therefore, no compromise is possible regarding it.

The Jews have 2,000 years of experience living as a minority in their countries of residence, and not only did they not attempt to undermine their host countries or attempt to change the order of things there, but they were grateful and their entire aspiration was to integrate into those societies, including in the Islamic countries when they were allowed to do so. However, the Arabs have little experience as a minority, all the more so in a land where they once constituted the majority and, woe the humiliation – under the rule of the persecuted former Jewish minority, which they always viewed with contempt, and the pious Muslims considered them to be inferior monkey-like creatures, the object of Allah's rage and therefore sentenced to eternal degradation. For both groups, their minority status in Israel ranges from humiliating to intolerable, and therefore they will do anything to change it. It is also difficult for them to adopt the Western values of democracy and tolerance, and due to their extreme frustration, stemming from their lack of success, like other Arabs and Muslims around the world, who have not been successful almost anywhere, they ostensibly become champions of those values that they do not understand, and seek to strike us with our own weapons, but to no avail. They accuse us of a lack of democracy and lack of tolerance, and bring as examples of enlightened regimes Assad in Syria and historic Islam as examples and models of tolerance *vis-à-vis* minorities. However, had Israel, heaven forbid, adopted styles of democracy and tolerance like those, the Arabs would be the first to suffer, however, their self-respect does not allow them to admit that under Israeli rule they are enjoying the best of all worlds, and they cannot allow themselves to be seen as grateful to Israel, so they act the way any child that gets everything he wants from his father, however in order to justify

his rebellion against his forbearer, he will always claim that he was oppressed, discriminated against, deprived, etc. The Arabs call this "*akal nakar*", meaning an ingrate, who eats from the outstretched hand, but estranges, denies, kicks and bites. In this perception gap, the Jews in Israel will always think that they have given everything and the Arabs will deny everything, and then both will be frustrated.

The Arab minority is fortunate that it is not located in some remote country in which the world has no interest, but rather at the center of international events as Israel is fixed under the microscope of all the nations. Egypt has a Copt minority more numerous than the Palestinians in Israel; and there are also Kurds in Turkey, Iran and Iraq, but who cares about them? They are not interesting not because they are not oppressed (the Copts and Kurds would be happy were they treated the way that the State of Israel treats its minorities) but because no one expects their oppressors to act differently. The Jews are bound to more elevated moral criteria, especially in the West, in which their suffering throughout the generations serves as a guarantee of unparalleled moral behavior. However, the Israeli Arabs, and the Palestinians in general, accept the world interest as it is, not because of Israel, with whom they are engaged in a conflict, and see it as a sign of "discrimination" against them. Thus it is easy to understand, not only the moral and material support that they receive from the West, but also the complaints that they voice there against their state and the sympathetic ear that they receive. What the external world fails to understand, sometimes innocently and sometimes motivated by malice and a narrow consideration of their interests, is that the Israeli Arabs are not demanding rights in order to become integrated in their state and contribute their part to resolving its problems, like the rest of its citizens, but rather view it as a milking cow to whose udder they are linked, in order to grow stronger, increase and accumulate power at its expense in order to ultimately rise up against it and challenge it. And since they know that they can turn any matter, large or small, into a media circus, locally and internationally, due to the international interest in Israel, not in them, they attack Israel vociferously for not being democratic or tolerant enough for them.

Democracy and liberalism, as far as they are concerned, exist not as autonomous concepts or values, but rather as a means to achieve their objectives. The proof is – the fact that they want the right of return for their brethren, whose realization would create an Arab entity like all the others and would bring with it the end of the democracy and liberalism, serves as overwhelming evidence that it is not democracy and liberalism that they seek, but rather the creation of an Arab majority here, while use of those values is only an attempt

to battle Israel using its own jargon, and to complain about it to the West using its jargon. For example, they should ostensibly understand that the harshest critics of any Israeli government, especially if it is a right-wing government, are its (and their) free press. And nevertheless, in astonishing uniformity that shows that they have neither learned nor internalized any of its values, most of their spokesmen after the October events, complained that the Israeli media supposedly “received orders” from the government to adopt its propaganda line. Why was that? Because the media did not unequivocally, as a whole, condemn the “murder” of the 13 Arabs, and did not stand with its usual combativeness against the authorities. Of course, more than that approach indicates their lack of understanding of the democratic principles of the State, especially due to their separatism and reliance on their monolithic Arab press, which knows only how to cry about their bitter fate and did not even attempt an in-depth analysis of the feelings of shock and threat experienced then by the Jews in Israel; it indicates how they would “give orders” to the press if control, heaven forbid, was in their hands. If they understood what it meant and if democracy and liberalism were internalized values for them, they would not demand rights without the desire to fulfill obligations; they would not act like enemies and demand to be viewed like citizens; they would dig further beneath the surface to see a more balanced picture of the events and not only that they are “victims” and the police and the Prime Minister are the “murderers”; and they would discern that it is not always automatic that they and the rest of the Palestinians are in the right and Israel is always “guilty”.

We have arrived at this dire situation because of Arab separatism, which lacks cultivation of democratic and liberal values. Most of their voters grew up either in the Communist Party, which up until the fall of the Soviet Union worshipped the dictatorship of the proletariat and for which, in the 1970s, more than half the Arabs voted and which always excelled in centralism, discipline and the uniform voice of the leadership and unleashed a reign of terror against any sign of “deviation”; or from the tradition of clans and dignitaries, in which the patriarchal authority always overcame personal reflection; and over the past two decades, the rise of the Islamic Movement symbolizes the domination of religious totalitarianism. There are, of course, democratic games in all of these movements; however, like in Iran of the Ayatollah, the framework of expression and the boundaries of freedom and reflection are predetermined. Then, from where will a democratic, liberal tradition develop among them, other than the one that they brandish in order to attack Israel or to lodge complaints against it overseas, while they have no idea about what they are complaining! Had they

learned from the Jewish public unlimited variety of opinions, open criticism even when it pours salt on all of the wounds, penetrating debate, internal and not only directed outward, then, perhaps they would begin to understand what is democracy and what is good citizenship. There is no such thing as conditional citizenship or loyalty, that when they involve benefits, they stand at the head of the line crying discrimination, while when the State is in dire straits, they are silent and disappear into thin air, in the best case, and in the worst case, join its enemies. There is no democracy like that in the world, and there is no worse example of citizenship than this. There is a huge mentality gap between the convenient interpretations that they attach to these concepts, and the way that they are understood in Israel and the West, where there are those who naively accept the use of those words by the Arabs, as if they accepted, understood and internalized what they were about. It is as if all of the various peoples' "democracies" were actually referring to democracy, as the magic word appeared in their names, and it is no wonder as during the Soviet era many Arab intellectuals, from Israel and the other Arab countries, were "educated" in those glorious "democracies", brought their interpretations home with them, and have had difficulty abandoning them even today.

This distorted attitude towards democratic values, in whose name they swear, also creates among Israeli Arabs a forgiving, and even arrogant attitude *vis-à-vis* their crimes against the State, in the sense of taking advantage of the landlord for everything that he is willing and able to give, but to rise up against him when he does not give enough or does not give it fast enough to satisfy them. The hundreds of cases of throwing rocks at passing cars in the Yiron Valley, even before the October uprising, and recently their very real cooperation with terrorists and other enemies would not have come into being had it not been for the Arab disavowal of their civil obligations, which in other places they would have been forced to fulfill in their entirety. Not only do they cover up for criminals of this sort against the State, conceal them and support them, but they also become popular heroes in their eyes, boast about them, enjoy rubbing elbows with them and spending time in their presence. Even the two leaders of the southern Islamic Movement, Nimer Darwish and MK Abd al-Malk Dehamshe, served time in jail for crimes against state security, accused of possession of illegal weapons, membership in a hostile organization and even terrorist acts in the seventies. These people, who were convicted in court, became popular leaders among their voters and their people because they "outsmarted" the landlord and outmaneuvered him and even proudly paid the price of their glory. The result is that they constitute a source of pride and a role model.

Therefore, the leaders of the Israeli Arabs compete with each other, who can be more outrageous, who can use fouler language in denouncing the State and who will be more audacious against it. Because the further they go in their verbal lack of restraint, their popularity level rises. It is difficult to call that good citizenship, responsible leadership or an appropriate example for others to emulate, It is therefore, no wonder that the contempt for the law of the land (security, building code violations, smuggling, forgery of documents, theft and the like) becomes not only an accepted daily action, but there is even an incentive to commit those acts with greater frequency, in order to put the criminal on a pedestal in his community.

Good citizenship would have also required concern for the problems of the State and mobilization to resolve them. How many Arabs have we seen volunteering for Civil Guard missions during difficult security situations, or comforting Israeli terrorism victims, or enlisting for national civil endeavors like ecology, nature preservation, cultivating cleanliness, maintaining public order, activity on behalf of inmates, signing up for harvest during peak season when there is a manpower shortage, blood donations or enlistment for the benefit of the sick and the elderly? If they do anything, it is only for themselves, as if they belong to another state and heaven forbid, they should never be caught or suspected of or appear to be doing anything for the Jewish state. Oh, yes! They do something: Dehamshe, who studied and specialized in state institutions and now receives his salary from its coffers, spends his days denouncing it or supporting its enemies. He regularly visits the security prisoners in jail, exploiting his immunity as a member of Knesset, encourages them and instills them with hope. He is certain that when they are released, they will go back to their criminal ways, and all the better, as far as he is concerned. They neglect the public domain and do not lift a finger to nurture it, even in the proximity of their homes. If they do not set fire to fields and forests and deface the appearance of the country that they love (to hate) so much, then they will certainly do nothing to plant new thickets in it and take pride in its beauty. They console the families of "victims", but those of terrorists that were killed, not those of the country's soldiers, who fell in the line of duty. They enjoy the highest life expectancy in the Arab world, but will contribute nothing to extend the lives of other citizens suffering from the ravages of illness and age. Good citizenship requires that they do not rejoice when their state is condemned in the Security Council, or attacked by terrorists and are not saddened by its military, technological, cultural, economic or sporting accomplishments. It does not serve their interests, because the more that the State's stature is diminished, the more they suffer as well. They are here only to

remind us of what they do not have, however they do not discuss, even among themselves, the anti-state crime endemic among them, their tax evasion, the corruption, incitement, lack of mobilization and action for the public among whom they struck roots.

Therefore, we can no longer contend that allocations, economic improvement, equality, treatment of the unemployment problem and other negligible items like those will bring about change. The rot has already corroded the roots, and there is nothing left to fix and the entire approach must be revolutionized. Because it is only if we acknowledge the illness that we will be able to find new ways to cure it, as the bandages padded with allocations and the placebos of soothing statements will no longer be effective. Like in all other aspects of our lives, we need a leadership that will consolidate a national emergency program, deal with reality as it is, waken from delusions and resolutely lead us towards some sort of solution, without constantly turning back to see who was left behind. "Understandings", words, promises and bromides have been ineffective in the past; the chances that they will lead to a solution are even smaller in the future of our conflict with the Palestinians. There is no recourse other than grabbing the bull by the horns, in full knowledge that we are not dealing here with a humane, economic, ethnic or linguistic issue that can be resolved with a modicum of goodwill. We are, rather, dealing with a problem of a national-cultural-religious confrontation that can not be bridged and with an uncompromising challenge to the Jews, the Zionists and the State of Israel. Therefore, fighting for our lives is the only path remaining, after 25 years of delusions that were fostered within us have completely shattered before our eyes.

CHAPTER TEN

SUMMARY – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS, DIFFICULTIES AND SOLUTIONS

In light of the powerful attack against Israel by its Arabs and their allies, and the defensive posture adopted by Israel, as if it, and not those rioting against it, should be placed on trial, it is important to be familiar with the primary Arab claims against Israel, whose level of sophistication is gradually increasing, and to prepare to respond to them. After all, we are not in a court of law in order to prove who is innocent and who is guilty, but rather in a war of survival for our lives. Therefore, even if the Arabs are convinced of the justice of their claims, that does not mean that we have no response, and every time they make claims of unfairness and injustice, we must show how they brought the injustices upon themselves, or forced Israel to take emergency actions against them due to their uncitizen-like, and at times hostile, conduct. It is also necessary to reveal the broad political significance of these contentions, even if they are stated superficially “innocently”, “humanely” and cunningly, certainly without virtuousness, in order to strike the State of Israel both at home, by cultivating the guilt feelings that have unjustifiably developed within Israel, or by amassing political power that will make the business of government impossible without them; and also abroad, by disseminating horrific propaganda against it, by their unbridled support for the Palestinian demands to dismantle the Jewish state and their full-fledged stance in support of its most intractable and cruel enemies. Our counterclaims must show that we have our own narrative, that the Arabs can not abduct the “truth” to their side, and portray us, in contrast to the truth, as cruel occupiers, without values, negators of rights and suppressors of other human beings. There are many areas in which these claims are raised, and we will categorize them according to topic.

THE MATTER OF REFUGEES AND DISPLACED PERSONS

Of course the question of refugees and displaced persons among the Israeli Arabs is an inseparable part of the more general problem of the Palestinian refugees. Until recently, Israeli Arabs voiced their claims separately and attempted to arrange the matter by means of direct contacts with the Israeli authorities, as citizens of the State. In attempting to achieve that end, they participated in lengthy negotiations with the various governments and also turned to various courts in order to achieve their objectives, with considerable assistance from segments of the Israeli Left and their human rights organizations. The Israeli Arabs also hoped that in the context of the negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians, which was supposed to bring succor to the refugees' suffering, room would be found to include them in the arrangements, especially concerning the displaced persons, the internal refugees, who, although they remained in Israel after 1949, were forced to leave their villages, or left in fear and were not permitted to return after the war. The most famous among them are the refugees from Ikrit and Biram, Christian villages on the Lebanese border, which, despite the legal and political storms that were raised on their behalf, their return was not facilitated. However, in the course of the negotiations, in the framework of the Oslo process, and especially after it collapsed, the Israeli Arabs returned to fight their battles separately, although at times they tied it to the right of return in general, which complicated it even further and returned it to its starting point. It is worth noting that while among the displaced persons themselves, the desire is to take care of their own and not broaden their focus, the Arab leaders in Israel took advantage of the opportunity and turned it back into a general problem in the framework of their war against Israel.

1. **UN Resolutions and the Historical Narrative** – The Arabs often quote the December 1948 UN General Assembly Resolution 194, which determined that “refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbors should be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date, and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return and for loss of or damage to property...” As far as the Palestinians in general are concerned, that means that they will be able to return at any time to Israeli territory, even against Israel's will. However, Israel persistently rejected these rationales, claiming that, first of all, General Assembly resolutions are not binding, and that Israel was not the one that created the refugee problem, but rather it was the Arabs, who launched an attack against Israel on the day that it was established. It also claimed that the Arabs will not

be able to return to the territory within its borders, as they are incapable of living in peace. And therefore, a certain paradox resulted when the Oslo process began, because, had a peace agreement been signed between Israel and the Palestinians, then their claim that from that point on they could live in peace within its borders would have been valid and therefore Israel's resistance would cease; while the failure of Oslo specifically over the issue of the right of return "proves" as far as they are concerned that Israel does not want peace so that they will not be required to take the refugees back.

Israel also agreed at the end of the war in 1949 to take back 100,000 of the refugees as part of a comprehensive agreement with the Palestinians, however, since there was no Arab agreement, they absorbed just 30,000 refugees in the framework of family unification, and they were absorbed among the Israeli Arabs, however, the general problem remained as it was. However now, if the right of return was granted, even if not all of them will want to return, no one knows how many of them will want to actualize that right. Therefore, it is more dangerous from Israel's perspective to even hint at any willingness or flexibility in this matter, because then the return, motivated by ideological and political motives would gain momentum, with direction from above, just in order to overcome Israel demographically, and in short order. Therefore, the Israeli Arab declarations that they want the right of return prove conclusively that they are not seeking a humanitarian solution that would leave Israel intact, and that they want to live in peace within and alongside Israel, but rather that they seek a fatal demographic inundation, which even the aforementioned UN resolution neither anticipated, nor wanted.

Now, the Arab refugees within Israel, those referred to as "displaced persons", raise a new contention. They state that not only is Israel required to implement UN Resolution 194, but as Israeli citizens, they have the right to live wherever they want. In other words, they are not refugees without a homeland, but they are buttressed by their Israeli citizenship. They also insist that since, by their calculations, approximately 70% of the Palestinian people are refugees, there will not be a resolution for the Palestinian-Israeli problem until satisfactory relief for their suffering can be accomplished. And the problem just gets worse and worse, because the aspiration to return is passed from generation to generation, and the number of generations is growing and the number of refugees has passed the 4 million mark. They still claim that the refugee problem was not created by the Arab defeat at the hands of the Zionists, but as a result of systematic "ethnic cleansing", in the context of which the Israeli Army forcefully expelled more than 700,000 people, who

became refugees, and more than 400 of their villages were destroyed. They refuse to recognize the complexity of the matter, as only a portion of the refugees were expelled, while most of them fled or were influenced to leave, and all this movement took place during a war that Israel did not initiate, in which it was forced to take control of strategic territories in the course of combat, and at times to evacuate hostile residents, who threatened their rear. The fact is that while many Arab villages were destroyed and evacuated, because they participated in the combat, like in the siege of Jerusalem, other villages and settlements in the Galilee and the Triangle remained intact. If this had been ethnic cleansing, how did so many Arabs remain in Israel?

2. **The Question of Responsibility** – The Palestinians, including the Israeli Arabs, demand that Israel accept responsibility for the refugee problem, and apologize to them for it, however Israel, of course, refuses, for failure to refuse would have placed on its shoulders the task of returning all 4 million descendants of the refugees and thereby fulfilling their wish for the right of return and the liquidation of Israel as a Jewish-Zionist state. Furthermore, Israel's contention that it was not the one who initiated the war and therefore it is absolved of any responsibility or obligation to express regret, not only would not have been valid any more had they accepted responsibility, but Israel would also then be required to take responsibility for solution of a problem that it did not create. Israel would also be required, if it accepted responsibility, to pay reparations to the Arabs for the property that they left behind, in addition to the funds for rehabilitation that it would help raise from international sources. Israel always made any payment of reparations for property contingent on a parallel and much larger payment for Jewish property left behind in the Arab countries when they immigrated to Israel. Bottom line, the same number of Jewish refugees (700,000) as the number of original Arab refugees who left Israel, indeed immigrated to Israel and their property is estimated at approximately 10 billion dollars, as opposed to 2 billion, the value of Arab property left behind in Israel, in dollar terms of those days.
3. **The Culture of Return among Israeli Arabs** – As related above, Israeli Arabs cultivate their ties with all hundreds of destroyed Arab villages since the war. They claim that that activity is for the purpose of preserving the memory of their "holocaust" (*nagba*), just as the Jews preserve the memory of their Holocaust. However, without equating the two tragedies, as opposed to the

Jews, who preserve the memory of their dead in various houses of grief, with no desire to return to the site of their catastrophe, the Arabs cultivate the sites themselves, and even attempt to restore the holy places there, one suspects, in order to revive them or prepare them for the day of return. This weakens the Israeli Arabs' contention that their aspiration is completely human and emotional, with no political agenda behind it. The Arab Cultural Society of Nazareth regularly organizes "pilgrimages" of this sort, which have a powerful element not only of a return to roots, but also of a territorial demand to which Israel cannot possibly agree. In these guided tours for youth, the elders who witnessed the war tell about village life as they experienced it as well as about their "expulsion" from those villages. Of course, in those very descriptions, which are only partially accurate, because many residents fled on their own, in fear of the war, there is a powerful message of placing the blame on Israel that ostensibly "expelled" them, and of return to the place from which they were "driven out". Thus the burgeoning anticipation among them that not only do they have the right to return, but they will actually return.

This is the most severe problem that Israel is facing. Because, on the one hand, approximately 200,000 of the Israeli Arabs claim that they are refugees in every sense, as they have been prevented from returning to their villages, some of which were destroyed and Jewish villages were constructed in their place, and some have indeed been destroyed but their lands remain available for Arab settlement, as in the cases of Ikrit and Biram; however, on the other hand, the authorities are concerned that if a precedent of displaced persons returning to their villages is established, then it will be impossible to halt the general inundation of hundreds of thousands of others. Because with the return of displaced persons to their villages, there is the implicit admission of responsibility for their removal, and then that "responsibility" will also constitute the basis for the demands of the Palestinians in general to restore their lands to them. After the failure of Camp David and the collapse of the Oslo process, an Arab society for the "Restitution of the Rights of the Displaced Persons in Israel", which ostensibly seeks to distinguish between resolution of its problem and the Palestinian refugees in general, was established; however, included in its list of demands, it turns out that the right of return comes in through the back window. They explicitly state that they demand to return to their villages, and they reject any possible alternative of reparations, a carbon copy of the Palestinian position in Camp David, which led to the failure of the talks. Furthermore, while in the past they hoped that their problem would be resolved in the framework as part

of the comprehensive Palestinian problem, today they insistently demand that attention be directed towards them without taking what is happening with the rest of the Palestinians into consideration, and even announced that they would not accept any Israeli-Palestinian agreement that failed to satisfy them regarding their own distress.

Thus, the right of internal return, which now stands at the top of the Israeli Arab list of considerations, comes as a substitute for and continuation of the failed pan-Palestinian demand. The Israeli Arabs, with the help of tens of thousands illegal “returnees” from the neighboring Arab countries and the Palestinian territories, whether for purposes of marriage, searching for employment or organizing terrorist cells, prepare the return operation on a daily basis, against Israel’s will. They also explicitly state that it is no longer a matter of nostalgia or history, but rather a means to regain control of their lands and thereby resolve their own land shortage. At the same time, they note, that they demand only those lands that remained free of Jewish settlements, something that in and of itself is insignificant, as the settlements always utilize only a minuscule portion of the land.

THE ISSUES OF “RACISM”, “DISCRIMINATION”, “APARTHEID” AND HUMAN RIGHTS

In recent years, a whole series of Arab societies have been established in the permissive Israeli democracy, at times with the assistance of naïve, do-gooder Jews, who seek to take, by means of taking the law as far as it will go, whatever the judicial system allows, through petitions to the courts, monitoring the implementation of rulings, inciting the Arab citizens to complain, opposition to the law enforcement institutions, constant harassment of government offices and members of Knesset, activating Arab MKs and the like. This is despite the fact that these societies have innocent names of institutions that promote law and justice, like “Adallah” (justice), “B’tzelem”, the “Society for Repatriation of the Displaced Persons” or the “Preparatory Committee for the Palestinian Non-Governmental Organizations in Israel”, a committee that was established before the infamous Durban Conference (Summer 2001), in order to join the cacophony of the Israel-haters there. Every organization of this sort has its own platform, which unlike similar organizations that aspire to serve the public at large, or have pretensions to have a universal humanitarian mission, from

the outset limits itself, like all other Arab institutions in the country, to the service of the Arab sector that sustains it and which it is supposed to serve and organize. The assumption of these societies is that the Arabs are always right, while the State, by whose grace they function, and within which they run wild, is always the oppressor. For example, if the State expropriates lands for the needs of the public, like a road, a training area for the IDF that belongs to everyone, establishment of a new settlement, the uprising will be organized against the intentions of the authorities, and the Arab citizens, who under normal circumstances would receive compensation, like any other citizen, will be organized with the inspiration of these organizations in order to oppose the “assault on their rights”. Thus, these organizations are, by definition, on a mission against the State, because every question of land, property, disturbance of the peace and illegal construction and the like, immediately becomes a cry of “discrimination”, “racism” and “violation of human rights”, mobilizing all Israeli Arabs to support it against the State. In other words, by means of these conditions, not only do the Israeli Arabs slander the only country in the region in which they can conduct themselves as they please, but they also indicate that they are interested in superior rights for the Palestinians, the more the better, and if that comes at the expense of its prestige, welfare, security and the feelings of most of its Jewish residents, all the better.

After the Third World, under the leadership of the Arabs and the Muslim world, managed to turn things topsy-turvy, and any matter with which it is dissatisfied, it calls “racism”, and in light of the feeble stance of the West, which hurries to apologize for every accusation of this sort, instead of turning it back on the heads of the accusers, the Arabs learned to hurl phrases of this sort at their state, without a clue what they are talking about. This process reached its peak (or its nadir it should be said) in 1975, when Zionism, one of the most vital and successful national movements in the last century, was determined to be a “type of racism” in the UN General Assembly, by a decisive majority of the dark regimes and dictatorships that never had any experience with a free, democratic national movement, and against the votes of the democratic countries, including Israel, who announced that they would neither accept nor honor that travesty. However, despite the fact that the UN resolution, which said more about those who adopted it than about its object, was abrogated in 1991, which tells you something about its seriousness, the Arabs have remained supremely committed to it and transformed it into a cornerstone of their policies and declarations, including those countries who signed peace treaties with us. We clearly witnessed that at the Durban Conference, the Palestinians and the other Arabs led the

chilling hate assault against the Jews and Israel, it was once again the coalition of the free, democratic countries that stood firm and prevented a repeat of 1975. However, the non-governmental organizations (NGOs) adopted these hate resolutions, whose vitriol surpassed everything said in the modern world since the Nazis, and were cruel, bitter manifestations of crude racism against a state and a people that was placed in the dock as “racists” and “champions of apartheid” through no fault of their own. This is the model emulated by the Israeli Arabs, who also contributed more than a little to its creation.

The accusation of Zionism and Israel as racist is, of course, nothing other than the de-legitimization of the State of Israel and therefore it is surprising that Arabs ostensibly seek equal rights in a state whose basis for existence they negate. For if Israel is “colonialist”, “racist” and supports “apartheid”, then of course one must battle against it and invalidate the basis of its existence and no longer demand that Arabs come through its gates to suffer from the racism etched on its forehead. Another question is whether those employing such far-reaching terminology, including the Israeli Arabs, have any idea what they are talking about. In apartheid, for example, those who are discriminated against do not have the right to vote, mixed marriages are prohibited and even public transportation and other social services are separate. Is there any Israeli Arab, who can claim that he was treated that way? On the contrary, during the October 2000 riots, it was the Arab rioters who asked the identity of the Jewish travelers and property owners in order to hurt them. Does Israel have another motherland where they can go in order to “liberate” this “colony” from its rule? Is their discrimination in law and justice against the Israeli Arabs, beyond that which is necessary due to the reality of the ongoing conflict? None of this interests the Israeli Arabs: The main thing is to vilify and abuse their state, to accuse it of all of the abominations that have become reviled in the new world, like racism and apartheid, and to demand the fulfillment of their racist demands intended to topple the Jewish state. Residents of the Third World seek to immigrate to the West without restriction, and when they are prevented from doing so, then the West is “racist”. Similarly, the Arabs seek an unlimited right of return to Israel, and when Israel defends itself against that plot, then it is racist. Approximately 20% of the population is Arab, and its immigrants come from all races and cultures, from black to yellow, and nevertheless it is “racist” in their eyes, while the Arab and Islamic countries that engage in the slave trade, oppress minorities, prevent the entry of Jews into their countries by law and have no idea regarding the meaning of human rights, are the ones who became the greatest vilifiers of Israel, sit on UN committees and judge others whose equal they will never be in

terms of defending human rights, with the Israeli Arabs in their wake. Muslims are allowed to establish mosques throughout the world, including in Israel, and the Israeli Arabs know this, however anyone attempting to establish a church or a synagogue in many of those countries condemning discrimination and racism, has signed his own death warrant. It is quite simply a topsy-turvy world.

1. **Judaization, Settlement, Distribution of Population, “Ethnic Cleansing” and Racism** – Everyone understands the importance of a policy of population distribution, in light of the very real danger of entire areas of the country turning into areas with an Arab majority, like the Galilee, the Triangle and the northern Negev. However, this policy encounters, among other things, the opposition of the Arabs seeking to cultivate their Arab enclaves in order to sever them from the State when the time comes. Of course, the very Judaization program is perceived by the Arabs as “racist”, despite the irony that the settlers in the lookout settlements in the Galilee or in the Seven Stars in the Triangle, seek to live alongside the Arabs and not in their place, while the Arabs are the ones who are rejecting the settlers. However, the Arab racism in and of itself is not the main problem, but rather it is the political ramifications involved in that racism. Because, if the Arab parties include in their platforms, planks invalidating Jewish construction in “their areas”, and even more so when the Jewish government submits to the demand when it needs the Arab votes for the Knesset, then the upshot is submission not only to the Arab settlement map, but also to the anti-Jewish ethnic cleansing, while the Arabs are complaining about the opposite. The same is true regarding national transportation lines, some of which pass through Arab areas (like the Yiron Valley and the train line to the Negev), and it is impossible to guarantee the free flow of traffic and its security without Jewish settlements along the way.
2. **The Right of Self-Determination in the Homeland** – The Israeli Arabs consider one of their basic rights the right of self-determination, as their homeland was conquered by Zionist “colonialism” and they were driven out of it. Of course, employing that language garners the automatic support of most of the nations of the world that experienced enslavement, with no one taking a moment to consider the absurdity of the matter, even if the external support is guaranteed as was proven in Durban 2001. They contend further that displacement of the “native” Palestinians gave way to the racism involved in the sense of superiority felt by the evicting occupier.

This claim, included in the document of the Israeli Arab Committee in preparation for the Durban Conference, means that not only is there no legitimacy for Israel, the “colonialist power”, the toppling of whose regime is a pre-condition for attaining the right of self-determination, it is necessary to strive for its destruction, as the Palestinian people has a plethora of rights to self-determination while the Jewish people have none. Thus, Jordan, as part of historic Palestine, was established and became the independent home of the Palestinians. Another home will be established for them in the autonomous territories and now the demand for greater Palestine is being raised, which will include the two existing homes and the independent Palestinian identity that will be established when “colonialist” Israel ceases to exist, or at least becomes bi-national. Just like the Muslim Albanians in the Balkans, who have their own independent state, and subsequently severed the Kosovo region from Serbia after achieving a majority there and expelled all the Serbs and now they are attempting to transform Macedonia into a “state of all its citizens”. In other words, the Arabs here and the Albanians there have a double and triple right to self-determination, while the Jews and the Macedonians have none.

This is, of course, the price that we are paying for the lunacy of Oslo, in which we accustomed the Arabs in general that there is neither any significance to the Jewish people’s right of self-determination, nor to their national liberation movement – Zionism, as we did not demand recognition of either as a condition for parallel recognition of the Palestinians. Therefore, today, they and their brethren who are Israeli citizens turn those two values into a rag on which to wipe their feet, insistently demand their rights in the absolute terms of the Third World that supports them, and still request that they be provided with the tools to implement their scheme. The Israeli Arabs also claim that their right to the land is dictated by the fact that they were the majority in the land, were expelled from their homes during the war, and were not allowed to return, in violation of UN Resolution 194, which was already discussed above, and the universal declaration of human rights. They complain that Israel destroyed hundreds of villages, suppressed their culture, despite the existence of various international charters prohibiting that. They just forget to mention that it was the UN Partition Resolution which provided the legitimacy for Israel and that they were the ones who rejected it and worked energetically to quash it. It is also convenient for them to ignore the fact that had they remained in place and not launched the war, they would have had a state for over 50 years, no village would have been destroyed and no refugee would have been driven out of his village.

They cry today, that since Israel did not allow their political, economic and social leadership to return after the war, they remained orphaned, while the Israeli Law of Return encouraged Jews, wherever they may be, to come to Israel freely, and they cry injustice for the terrible “wrong” that was done to them as a result. But again, once the sovereign State of Israel was established, with international legitimacy, only it is allowed to determine its immigration policy and who is allowed to enter its borders, just as Germany prefers to absorb in its territory Germans returning from hundreds of years of residence in Russia and other places, and just like the Palestinians would have done with their refugees had they come to their senses and established the state that was handed to them in the Partition Resolution. Furthermore, the UN adopted the resolution that refugees willing to live in peace in the Jewish state, to which it gave its seal of approval, will be able to return. However, since the resolution, there has been no indication that any of them accept the authority of the Jewish state, and in any case, any return of refugees, even if it was allowed, could not be stretched to the point of negating the Jewish character of the State, otherwise, the mass return would have made a mockery of the principle of the Jewish state itself, which the UN ratified in the 1947 Partition Resolution. There is also no basis for the Arab contentions that imply that the UN Partition resolution, which determined that a Palestinian state would also be established and that its national rights would be preserved there, was supposedly not implemented because of Israel. They know that that is a baseless claim, which will be of no use to them, as they were the ones who rejected partition.

3. **Rights to the Land** – One of the lies disseminated by the Israeli Arabs throughout the world is regarding the issue of ownership of the land. They state, correctly, that the Jews owned only 7% of the lands when the State was established. The impression that one draws from that statement is that the Arabs owned all the rest, and that is not the case. Already during the reign of the Ottoman government, the overwhelming majority of the land was owned by the State and a minority was owned privately, more or less in the same proportion of the population, in other words, most of the private property was in the possession of the Arab majority and a minority in the possession of the Jewish minority, which paid hard cash for it to the Arab sellers. The British Mandate inherited the state lands from the Turks, and with its establishment, the State of Israel inherited rights to the land from the abandoning British, just as in Judea and Samaria, which remained under Jordanian rule, the

Hashemite crown inherited those rights. Therefore, today, most of the State lands are in the possession of the Israel Lands Administration, which, it should be pointed out, took possession of the lands of the absentees, who became refugees. Since the establishment of the State, the Israeli Arabs have turned the land issue into the focal point of their struggle against Israel, which reached its climax in the organization of Land Day protests every March 30, since 1976.

The right to protest in order to protect the land is connected, in their opinion, to the rights to the land. For example, Land Days seem to them to be legitimate protests, even if they act violently, in the manner that they conducted themselves during the October events. They have yet to internalize that in a democratic state the right of protest is reserved for every citizen, on the condition that they refrain from violence. They have yet to understand that violence, demanding that the police evacuate villages and intersections so that they can go wild there, disturbing the public order, abusing the State, desecrating their symbols and assaulting passers-by are a declaration of war on law and order and they will, therefore, be treated accordingly. But not as far as they are concerned: As usual, their wars and the violence are legitimate, however, the suppression of said violence will always be termed aggression, racism and discrimination in their eyes. Possessors of out of control attitudes of that sort can not constitute part of a proper democratic society. Thus, in their narrative, the first Land Day that took place in 1976 and led to the killing of six Israeli Arabs was, of course, through no fault of their own; while what they did in order to bring this harm upon themselves, was, of course, insignificant.

4. **The Rights to Organize as a National Minority** – In their internal discussions in Israel, in their claims against the government and Israeli society, and in the grievances that they submit to international bodies, the Israeli Arabs complain that they are not recognized as a national minority, but rather as “Israeli Arabs”, “non-Jews” or “minorities”, and that many Israeli governments have attempted to suppress their Palestinian identity. They found the root of the “evil” in the Israeli Declaration of Independence that determined that it was a Jewish state committed to ingathering the exiles of Israel. These determinations led, in their opinion, to the fact that the State has one history, one nation and one collective memory and therefore this displays discrimination and racism against them. According to their contentions, this causes their low standard of living, their distance from

the hubs of the national resources, which provide access to housing, water, electricity and appropriate health and education services. They also complain that despite the status of Arabic as an official language, in practice, they do not confer upon it status equal to Hebrew. These are significant contentions, which cause us severe damage in the international arena and have even led to the adoption of several resolutions by various UN committees, based on the automatic majority that the Arabs can mobilize there. However it is doubtful whether any other country would be able to submit to dictates of that sort that threaten its very existence, which raises the suspicion that what the Israeli Arabs aspire to is not “equality” but rather the liquidation of the Jewish state.

First, regarding the identity of the State in which they do not find their place. Certainly, all of the countries of the world, including the most enlightened among them, have one history, one memory and one national ethos. Does the fact that France has Arabs and England, Pakistanis, invalidate the identity, the collective memory and the history of the latter? Did they, as a result, recognize both Arabic and Urdu as official languages, or did they stop teaching the history of the Gauls and the Magna Carta? On the contrary, the minorities there are the ones who aspire to learn the local culture and its language in order to be absorbed into this surrounding society. And just as those countries do not do away with their French or English character because of their minorities, why should Israel do away with its Judaism? The problem is in the Arab perception of the Jews as an ethnic-religious group (as it is manifest in the famous Palestinian Charter) and not a national community, and therefore, as far as they are concerned, any reference to the state’s Jewish character (which is essentially like a reference to the French or British character of those countries), is fundamentally racist, a very strange and baseless contention that is not raised about any other nation. This recalcitrance and not discrimination against them, leads to their volitional separation from society and their inability to share in its resources like the rest of the citizens do.

These contentions are not exactly true from a factual perspective either. How was their culture suppressed? By prohibiting them (like the Turks *vis-à-vis* the Kurds) from using and being educated in their language? Or they were not allowed to use signs in Arabic (like Quebec regarding English signs) in their streets, and even in all of the streets in the Jewish cities? Or by not allowing them a separate Arabic educational system, which, incidentally, is the source of the relative deficit in their educational level? They cannot separate

from the general educational system, to cloister themselves in educational ghettos, even aspire to establish an Arab university, and then complain about their inferior educational level. The Hebrew University is Hebrew (What can you do?), and the other universities and the Technion also teach in Hebrew, and what can we do that there is no Weizmann Institute in Arabic? Separate education in Arabic will only exacerbate their general backwardness, and if they establish a closed system for their education, from kindergarten through university, they will look like they are kindergartens and colleges of Gaza and they will again complain about the “discrimination” against them. Has anyone prevented them from writing “Palestinian” literature or poetry, compose “Palestinian” music and cast a “Palestinian” dance troupe as they please? Even the Israel Prize was awarded to an Arab writer! Where is the suppression of their culture? They repress themselves by themselves, by distancing themselves from the central stream, which has only benefited them; however they cast the blame for the consequences of their remoteness on the State. They should remember that the scientists, academics, professionals and judges that have developed among them, including those who excel in filing grievances against the State, at home and abroad, developed thanks to this repressive system. Where would they be had they been allowed, as they wished, to continue to wallow in the backwardness in which they found themselves when the State was established and before this “repressive” approach was institutionalized?

And more on the factual side: What Arab village lacks access to electricity, water and health services? If there is one, because it was established illegally, how far is it from the extremely proximate service centers? It is impossible to violate the law on the one hand, and on the other hand complain that their lot has not improved in the wake of violating the law. Many Arab villages have proved that their development or lack thereof, and the level of services there are not dependent on state allocations but rather on the industriousness of the residents, their positive attitude to the public domain and the environment, the effectiveness of the local government and the organization of the existing resources. For example, the villages controlled by members of the Islamic Movement were able to mobilize their population and to create positive motivation to volunteer for the good of the collective and to contribute to the development and appearance of the village. And of course, these matters are also dependent upon the attitude of the villages towards their general Jewish surroundings. In conventional times, a large part of their prosperity was dependent upon the Jewish visits to restaurants,

stores, sales counters and the purchase of services. If the Jews avoid going there, because they very plainly fear for their lives, and their fear is not unfounded, the residents of those villages have only themselves to blame. No one can blame the Jews, who avoid going to Umm al-Fahm, which expresses Islamic-fundamentalist hostility *vis-à-vis* the Jews and the State, and at whose entrance more than a few Jews have been attacked, or from Dir Hana and Abu Snan, whose children engaged in terrorist activities against the State, or from Baka, from which the murderers of the soldiers in Gilead, years prior to the *intifada* and unrelated to the “oppression” of the Palestinian people, emerged.

5. **The Question of National Institutions** – The Arabs claim as discrimination against them the existence of the Jewish national institutions like the Jewish Agency, the Zionist Federation, the Jewish National Fund and the like that were established and intended exclusively for Jews. And here too, the intention behind the Arab struggle against the State and its Jews is totally transparent. Because, who prevented Arabs from being a member of the Zionist Federation? Zionism is not Judaism, there are Christian and Druse Zionists, who support Zionism, serve in the IDF, participate in the Zionist enterprise, consider it a privilege and do not complain about discrimination. These organizations have a place in the identity and the history of this nation, and it is impossible to claim on the one hand that the State “stifles” the national and cultural memory of the Arabs and on the other hand demand to expunge the memory of the majority. These institutions are the foundation for the establishment of the State and without them, there would not have been a Jewish state; then, unless they are challenging the Jewish state, and it stands to reason, they have no pretext to criticize them, certainly not as “racists”. And who prevented the Arabs from establishing similar institutions? These are fundamentally voluntary institutions. The Jews could also claim that the “Arab Committee for Redemption of Lands” (that is precisely the goal of the Jewish National Fund) is racist because it is intended exclusively for Arabs and Arab land. The Committee of Arab Council Heads is also “racist” because it does not include Jewish settlements and there is not even one Jew in its administration. But this is only because the Israeli Arabs are angry that the Jewish settlement was much better organized than they were and attained its objectives and therefore they want to achieve low level equality by lowering the Jewish organizational advantage, instead of aspiring to imitate it and reach its echelon. These institutions were established with Jewish, not Arab,

money; let them also raise Arab money and improve themselves, instead of approaching the Jews to seek handouts and whine.

6. **The Question of Discriminatory Legislation** –The Israeli Arabs enumerate 20 laws among the laws of the land that “discriminate” against them, which relate to problems of citizenship, political participation, religious and cultural life and benefiting from the economy and employment. As a general assumption we can state, of course, that if the Israeli Arabs consider themselves citizens only for the purposes of their own well-being, and are not committed to the State’s existential and security needs and also do more than a little to undermine it, they cannot demand the right to an opinion when they have ulterior motives. A second assumption is that not all of the Arabs’ suffering “results from their being Arabs in Israel” as they contend. Let them look at other Arabs around them, in Syria and Jordan, in Judea and Samaria and the Gaza Strip, in Iraq and Morocco, where there is no Zionism discriminating against them and oppressing them, and their situation is incalculably inferior, in every sense, to that of the Arab citizens of Israel. Therefore, perhaps, there is something inherently amiss in their attitude towards the State, to the public domain, civil rights and obligations, laws and jurisprudence, the binds of tradition, non-acceptance of authority and lack of tolerance for non-Arabs and non-Muslims! However, as usual, it is easier to blame the Jews and the Zionists, whom they would like to emulate but are unable to do so, than to accept responsibility and take action to improve themselves. It is impossible to contend that there is discrimination against the Arabs in law enforcement and ignore the fundamental fact that crime in the Arab sector is twice the national average, or that a significant portion of that crime is ideological (nationalist or Islamic), a phenomenon virtually non-existent among the Jewish majority. If anything, law enforcement is much more lenient *vis-à-vis* the Arabs, due to the fact that regarding certain crimes (construction, forgery of documents, driving illegally, drugs and a plethora of thefts), the police dare not enter the villages and investigate.

For example, they complain that they cannot submit laws negating the State’s Zionist identity. Let them try to advise the Arabs in France to propose legislation to negate the country’s French nature, and if they succeed there, then we will also look into it. How absurd can they get? They also say that although they have the right to vote, their participation in the parliamentary activity in the Knesset is limited because of “discrimination” stemming from

parliamentary regulations. What, for example? That they are not given the opportunity to chair the Armed Services Subcommittee or the Intelligence Services Subcommittee of the State that they condemn, and with whose enemies they identify? They shed tears over the fact that only the Jewish holidays are national holidays in Israel and that only the sites sacred to Judaism are recognized. Let them check whether in America or France the Jewish or Muslim holidays are officially recognized, and if they find that to be the case, then there will be a basis for their contention. And precisely like they are considerate of minorities there and no one will force a Jew to work on Yom Kippur, here, too, the Muslim students miss school on the Festival of the Sacrifice, and no one forces all of the Muslim workers to report to their daily jobs on the holiday. The claim of discrimination is not because the Jewish holidays are national holidays but rather because the Muslim holidays are not. If they were, it would be another forerunner of the bi-national state that they seek to establish, on the path to the disintegration of the Jewish state that they are unable to accept.

On the other hand, there are attempts by the Israeli Arabs to submit legislation that would anchor the stripping of the Jewish state of its fundamental values in law. In 1999, members of the Hadash Knesset faction submitted proposed legislation to establish the “principle of equality of the Arab citizens in the State” as is the case for citizens in every “democratic, multi-cultural state”, in other words, a state of all its citizens, a bi-national or a multi-national state and not only a Jewish state. However, in the wake of the defeat of the proposal in the Knesset due to its legal flaws and the intentions of political malice behind it, “Adallah” attempted to protest, contending that the proposed principles are, in any case, shared by all of the Arab parties, and if despite that, they are allowed to function in the Knesset, there is no reason to categorically disqualify the proposed legislation. Regarding this it should be stated that:

- A. It is conceivable that it is not a bad idea to disqualify all Arab lists that negate the values of the State as Jewish from the outset, and then the question whether or not legislation of this sort can be proposed in the Knesset will be a non-starter;
- B. If those raising the proposal were really interested in the principle of equality, how did they not raise the principle of equal obligations as well? No one will relate seriously to subversive proposed legislation of this sort, backed by transparent intentions, if the principle of equality is one-sided

and inequitable, as it anchors in law the Arabs' preferred status with rights and without obligations.

7. **The Question of Freedom of Expression** – The Arabs in Israel, who have freedom of expression above and beyond the freedom enjoyed by any Arab anywhere the world, complain a lot that they are not allowed to realize their “right” to express themselves as they please. The State of Israel allows the Arabs freedom of expression that exceeds that allowed the Jews in Israel or the Arabs in Western democracies. For example, if an Arab denies the Holocaust in Sweden or France, publicly burns the national flag, announces that he is joining the ranks of the enemies of the host country, strives for the liquidation of the national character of those regimes, verbally abuses the regime that gives it shelter or incites to hate its national groups or other ethnic minorities, he will ultimately be punished. In Israel, all of these phenomena take place daily before our very eyes and nothing happens to the Arabs. The problem is one of mentality and is tied to the sense of being the victim that the Israeli Arabs cultivate among themselves. In other words, freedom of expression allows them to violate all of the laws of civility, to treat the Jewish public rudely, to deny the Holocaust, to lie and cheat in order to join the Arab propaganda effort, to attack the rule of law, to brandish enemy flags, to incite, inflame and rebel against the government, to treat the Jewish majority with racism, to violently oppose law enforcement, to take action against the State, both by means of terrorism and by means of collaboration with the enemy and all this is permitted under the rubric of freedom of expression. They do not understand the limits of freedom of expression, that goes only so far as it does not conflict with the rights of others, and anyone, who stands in their rampant way, is immediately labeled “racist”, one who “discriminates” against them, or eats Arabs for breakfast.

This is a state of mind that develops among citizens, who are not citizens, who have neither a sense of citizenship nor civic responsibility, who see the State only as a milking cow to provide their needs, forcibly attach themselves to its udder in order to suck out everything that is there, because “they have a right to do so”, however anyone, who tries to spur them to responsibility or obligations or to a sense of proportion, will suffer, because he is a “racist” without a conscience. For example, the chairman of the Central Elections Commission, a respected justice in Israel, has the authority to disqualify a campaign commercial submitted by a party that, in his opinion, has crossed the boundary of good taste. In one of the incidents, the commission chairman

removed a segment, which said that the Bedouins in the Negev “live in daily terror from the black unit”. The intention of the Arab inciters was the “Green Unit”, which took action to protect the environment and confiscated flocks that grazed on state lands, destroyed fields that were illegally sowed and dismantled tents in order to “uproot the Bedouins from their land”. The judge determined that statements of this sort are illegal and that they include incitement to racism and a call to disobey the law of the land. He also disqualified the reference in the commercial to the security forces, which is prohibited by law. However, “Adallah”, which exists to protect Arab rights and which is supposed to understand civil rights and obligations, challenged these disqualifications, claiming that they “compromise freedom of expression and democracy”. Thus, those who have yet to understand the rules of democracy and freedom of expression, seek audaciously to teach a judge in Israel the meaning of those rules. Because, as far as they are concerned, freedom of expression is designed to let them do and say anything they please, even if a judge determines that doing so involves racism and incitement, while it is their pleasure in doing so that is “racist” and “incites”.

8. **Freedom of Movement and Demonstration** – One of “Adallah’s” primary activities is to stand guard over the Arabs’ right to demonstrate and move from place to place, even when their intentions are violent and even when they do not have a police permit for demonstrations that are liable to disrupt the public order. If the right to demonstrate is absolute and unrestricted, why does the law establish the need for a police permit? Furthermore: It has been decades that the police do not allow the Temple Mount Faithful to visit the Temple Mount, precisely because of concern for “violating the public order”, despite the fact that it is a group of good citizens that never acted violently. In fact, the police intervention in their case is nothing more than submission to threats of violence by the Arabs on the Temple Mount. Therefore, Jewish groups also suffer due to the same rationale of maintaining public order. In 1997, “Adallah” appealed the disciplinary conviction of the chairman of the Society of Arab Students in Haifa, for his participation in an illegal demonstration on campus grounds. Thus, this legal organization does not insist on observance of the law, but rather on the right of Arabs to violate it. Because it claimed that it was the decision of the disciplinary committee that was illegal and that the university regulations that prohibit riots should be disqualified as illegal. And again, as far as they are concerned, the law is intended exclusively to protect the Arabs when they riot and all

of the laws and regulations that do not permit riots are illegal because they “limit the freedom of demonstration and movement”.

And thus, instead of advising Arab students to internalize the rules and respect them, just like the rest of the students, who are shackled to them, it encourages them to revolt and promises them its support if they are placed on trial. If so, “Adallah”, which is supposed to prevent legal complications from hotheaded students, on the contrary, spurs them to crime by infusing them with a rebellious spirit. It intervened to cancel the suspensions from studies in serious cases, punishments that Jewish students bear without complaint, and only Arabs must be absolved of them. Of course, this is not only an attempt to absolve the Arab citizen from the yoke of the law, but there is also an accompanying message that the laws and regulations that obligate all other citizens do not apply to the Arabs, as they are above the law. And then, paradoxically, a legal organization that ostensibly comes to defend the citizen’s right to equality, calls for intolerable privileges for the same citizen. Because the Arab is always justified, without taking what the law says into consideration, while the Jewish authorities will always be in error and will be accused of acts of injustice, without taking into consideration that they are attempting to enforce the law on an equal basis. This is another proof that the Arab lawyers that developed in Israel were unable to adopt the criteria of non-personal law, and they will always prefer to justify the Arab rather than justify the law. This is a world of thought that is different from the norm in a democratic society governed by law, whose principles they ostensibly seek to protect.

9. **Cultural Rights** – The cultural war being waged by “Adallah” in Israel, especially as far as use of the Arabic language is concerned, also indicates Arab intentions to take over when the time comes. No one is preventing them from placing signs in Arabic on their streets, shops and institutions, and no one is forcing them to place signs in Hebrew, unless they are official state institutions (like courts, government offices, police) or institutions supported by the State (like schools). So why do they want to impose upon us transformation of Arabic into a language used on Jewish streets, even in places where there are no Arabs at all? After all, if they want to be integrated into the State, then there is one language for official matters and public needs. The fact is that while in the past, speeches by Arab members of Knesset that were delivered in Arabic were translated into Hebrew, today all of the Arab members of Knesset speak Hebrew, and none of them insist upon his

“right” to speak in Arabic. They understood that it is impossible to manage matters of state in a polyglot of languages, and that in places that it is the custom (Switzerland, Canada and Belgium), it succeeds because the languages are regional (French in Quebec and English in the rest of Canada; different languages in the different cantons in Switzerland; and the virtually exclusive use of Flemish and French in the relevant areas in Belgium). In Israel – the Arabs are scattered in the north, center and south, the distances are short and therefore there is no justification for the multiplicity of languages, especially because cultivating the use of Arabic in the public domain will only encourage the separatist Arab trends on the one hand, and will arouse the opposition of Jews on the other.

After all, it is clear to all that “Adallah’s” demand for “equal” use of the Arabic language in the public domain is not constructive, as no one claims that the Israeli Arabs are incapable of reading the signs in Hebrew, and if they are not capable, then our and their education systems have failed. It is true that the Supreme Court supports its use since state law ostensibly determined Arabic “official”, despite the fact that virtually none of the judges enforcing that law can provide a personal example in their knowledge of this second official language. However, once the Arabs have turned Arabic, like other elements of their culture, into a tool for criticism, alienation and separation from the State, and an exclusive symbol for themselves, what benefit will we accrue by allowing it? Laws can be changed, but no country in the world need turn the language of its enemies into its official language, even though as a foreign language, that possesses a rich literature and as a means of getting to know our neighbors, we will, of course continue to teach it in our schools. Because the Arabs in Israel have decided to express the symbolism of their language not only on street signs, but also in the official entrances and exits from the country, publications of the government and the registrar of parties, in government press releases, translation of court documents, matriculation and college entry exams, Bar Association exams, banks, etc. How does an Arab youth, who studies in university, intend to meet the study requirements in Hebrew if he is tested in Arabic, and how can an Arab lawyer be accredited to work in his profession throughout the entire country if he does not have proficiency in Hebrew? Excellent questions.

Were legal relief provided for all of these infinite demands, tomorrow the Arabs would demand to translate “Hatikva” into Arabic so that they could understand what they despise, to have all presidential addresses on Independence Day and at diplomatic receptions delivered in Arabic, have all

army draft and reserve notices printed in Arabic in order to assist the Arabs to understand what they are dodging, and also have reserve mobilization passwords be broadcast in Arabic, because otherwise, how will the Arab masses assembling to serve their country in times of danger understand the call to service? A Jewish state needs not hesitate in imposing its national language upon all its citizens, because otherwise, how will they understand its laws, its aspirations, its rules of conduct and the like? Did anyone even consider the possibility that Arabic or Urdu would become the official languages in France and England just because those countries have Arab and Pakistani minorities? Israel even acted with greater generosity than those veteran liberal democracies, when it instituted, at its expense, a separate educational system for the Arabs, in their own language. This was a tragic mistake, because not only did it exacerbate the rift between the majority and the minority in the country, but it also caused the Arabs feelings of backwardness and frustration over their inability to meet the standards of the majority. Because, in order to compete on equal footing with members of the host culture, the members of the minority culture must aspire to profoundly make their way into the dominant environment, and that cannot be accomplished by isolation and distance from it. American Jews succeeded there, not because they insisted on speaking Yiddish or Russian, which they brought with them one hundred years ago, but because they became part of society and at times were its most accomplished articulators in (English) literature, music, science, culture, economics and politics.

10. **The Right to Citizenship** – One of the most astounding issues to which “Adallah” has adhered is the demand to include within the circle of Israeli citizenship, which, in its opinion, is “racist”, “discriminatory” and “repressive”, ever greater circles of Arabs, for whom it demands the right to be oppressed, discriminated against and victims of racism. That is, of course, an unconventional demand for an organization that has etched on its banner war against all those. “Adallah” even battles for the right of the children of Israeli Arabs, who were born abroad and had the opportunity to gain salvation from Israeli enslavement, to return and entrap themselves in the oppressive regime extant here. It is interesting why the children of emigrants from the Soviet Union or Arab countries in Israel do not seek to return and reclaim citizenship in those countries. In other words, if “Adallah” is correct, the Israeli Interior Ministry “discriminates” in granting elements of citizenship to returning Arabs; it is doing them a favor, and should be awarded a prize,

not condemned. However “Adallah” is fighting tooth and nail to prove that according to Israeli citizenship laws, children of Israeli citizens born abroad are Israelis by birth and that their non-Israeli spouses have the right to receive that despicable citizenship. So its one or the other: Either “Adallah” implicitly recognizes that its claims are false, as it strives to gain benefits for its constituency, after paying lip service to “Israeli oppression”; or it has secret intentions to increase the population of naturalized citizens as much as possible and even bear the temporary suffering of Israeli citizenship, as long as when the time comes the identity of the country will be decided in favor of the Arabs on the demographic front.

11. Social and Economic Rights – One of the contentions that “Adallah” repeats is that the Arabs are discriminated against in acceptance to places of employment for security reasons, or in receiving funds for renovating neighborhoods or even in the allocated Passover funds for indigent Jewish families. At the same time, they celebrate the fact that all Arab participants in a special “Adallah” gathering to discuss some form of national service for the Arab minority in Israel categorically rejected the idea and even negated the connection between equal rights and equal obligations. If the Israeli Arabs do not understand the connection between the two, and there is no one among them responsible and courageous enough to get up and explain to them what they fail to understand, then they are condemning themselves to banishment from Israeli society, and eternal alienation from it. Of course at first glance, anyone who sees straight must understand that the treatment of one who gave years of his life in service of the State, fought in a war or two on its behalf and at times was wounded or worse in those wars is not the same as one who deserts, alienates and schemes, and is only interested in his personal and sectarian benefit. Therefore, all the wars over rights that they raise as their standard stand on shaky ground from the outset, if not in a formal, legal sense, then at least in a moral, public sense. It is understood that there is not, nor will there be, sympathy among the Israeli public for these hypocritical concepts of an ostensible struggle for equality and democracy, while at the same time they do everything to destroy the frameworks of laws, rules and modes of conduct of democracy.

The “discrimination” about which the Israeli Arabs complain is also understandable on its merit. Of course there will be concern about accepting them for employment in the Electric Company, the Airport Authority and other sensitive workplaces while their loyalty to the State is not only in

question, but has proven to be non-existent. They refuse, as mentioned above, to serve the State and they stand alongside its enemies, until recently primarily rhetorically, which itself is sufficiently grave, and now there appears to be momentum in the move from words to actions among segments of their community. They have not managed to understand that they transform the rhetorical freedom, which they seek as part of their freedom of expression, into incitement that they themselves have generated and they will eat the rotten fruits of that effort in the future. It is conceivable that they believe that their “national rights” allows them to incite against their country, however the State of Israel also has its own national rights that it defends. They want to act like their Palestinian brethren, who declare war and consecrate terrorism, however, when the State of Israel defends itself, with endless restraint and patience while absorbing numerous casualties, it is accused of “aggression”. The same is true of the Israeli Arabs: They transmit all of the messages and signals of enemy conduct, the State patiently accepts it and attempts to treat them as human beings; however when they go too far, the State takes steps to defend itself against them, at which point it is accused of “racism” and “discrimination”.

This frame of mind of a “victim”, upon whom there is no responsibility and his job is just to extort, threaten, whine and demand, has, tragically for them, stuck with them and will cause their downfall and their next “*naqba*”. Because even a democratic, open and tolerant society has red lines that when crossed, it rises up enraged in order to defend itself. They have learned nothing from the negative example of their Palestinian brethren, who twice have missed their chance for a state because they thought that they deserve everything and others nothing, and because they did not understand the limits of the patience of a democratic, enlightened society. Now they see the rage of the American nation, which was pent-up over the years so as not to undermine the principles of democracy and freedom for all, however, once the terrorists went too far, and when it turned out that some of the Arabs who received shelter and a free life in America joined the terrorism and the calamitous acts against their benevolent land, then there will be no end to the price that the criminals will pay. This is a warning sign for people with that frame of mind among the Israeli Arabs, before they cause their own demise. Under normal circumstances, the weak aspires to protect himself by adopting the accepted rules of the game and seeking compromise for an equitable existence, while the strong is the one who demands everything, is unwilling to compromise and is confident in his strength. However, with

the State of Israel and its Arabs, the situation is totally reversed: The State is the one seeking a fair compromise with the Palestinians in and out of its borders, while they reject any agreement and seek to bring the democracy that treats them so well to its knees. They should not be surprised if it responds by fighting against those who threaten it.

12. On the Issue of Collective Economic Discrimination – This ostensibly in effect against the Israeli Arabs, accusations are hurled at this generous state that “they do not receive what they deserve”, their licenses are allocated sparingly, the Arabs in general are “discriminated against” because they are Arabs and the like. Those who complain about discrimination, the burden of proof is on them, however the obligation to clarify the concept and point to their mistaken perceptions will always be incumbent upon us. Because, whenever there is an accusation of discrimination, the question is relative to what or to whom! There is no individual that does not feel “discrimination” at some point in his life when, in his opinion, an injustice was done to him, in applying for a job, receiving a grade, a ruling that restricted his freedom or in the treatment by the surrounding society. The claim of discrimination, which on the surface, or in demagoguery or manipulation of statistics, can create the impression of being ostensibly justified, must be based on three tests: The moral test, that a person is not being discriminated against any more than his counterpart, as long as the complainant and his counterpart acted in accordance with the same legal and behavioral criteria. The second test is the comparison of Arabs in general to Jews in general, as in many of their grievances the Arabs complain, “They are not being treated like the Jews.” And the third criterion is the balance between their contributions to the State as opposed to what they take or seek to take from it, and were their demands met.

We have already found that an Arab, or anyone else, who does not contribute anything to his country and even schemes against it and is hostile to it, lacks the moral right of standing possessed by his counterpart who acts properly, fought for his country and gave his life for it, made contributions based on his knowledge and his education, promoted its progress and welfare, stood at its side during its times of trouble and the like. And the reference is not to one who is mentally or physically disabled, who tried but was unsuccessful, who wants to but was unable to translate that desire into action, but rather about individuals and a collective that declaratively do not want, or want only the well-being of its sector and not the well-being

of its country, take exception from its values and even battle against it, and seek to rise up against the society and the state that they want to provide for them. For example, if a man is convicted of a crime that involves moral turpitude, for some personal mistake in a matter that benefited him, even if it did not cause direct damage to the State but it did violate its principles or laws; does he have a leg to stand on when coming to complain that he will not be allowed to be elected or serve in any senior position, based on his abilities, plentiful though they may be? All the more so, when it is not an incidental slip but an intentional policy, of an entire community, to harm their country, or at least to negate its fundamental principles, to alienate it and scheme against it. Only one who has taken leave of his senses could claim that the State can look on indifferently, from a moral perspective, at a community of that sort and treat it as if it sought its well-being and treated it kindly.

The comparison to Jews would also be valid only if the Arabs would also be their equal in terms of obligations, as mentioned above, and the reference is not only to military service, where the gap cries out to the heavens in the extreme, but let us take for example the matters of taxation and finance: The Arabs contend in this area that the State allocates more for its Jewish citizens than it does for its Arab citizens, which is certainly true. However, the Jews also disburse more for their country than the Arabs are willing to or actually do. They pay less tax than do the Jews, not only because of their relative poverty, but primarily because of their tax evasion, and as a result, their municipalities will always be poorer, as a rule, than those in the Jewish sector. And another aspect: The Bnei Beraq Municipality is poorer than the Nazareth Municipality, and in Yeruham, unemployment is higher than in many of the Arab towns. In other words, groups who are suffering from poverty and unemployment are not necessarily suffering because they are Arabs and therefore victims of “discrimination”, but rather because they lack proper management (as a result of their vote), do not collect real taxes, there are no investments by private investors etc., just as is the case in Jewish places suffering from the same syndrome. Thus, the phenomenon is uniform and equal in the two sectors, but it is relatively more severe among the Arabs due to the fact that the irregularities mentioned above are, on average, more severe among them than it is among the Jews. In Gaza and Nablus, Cairo and Damascus there is no “discriminatory” Jewish government, and nevertheless the level of allocations and services does not equal the level extant in Herzliya or even in Netanya. There are poor, uneducated, idle and

corrupt people everywhere; however, that is not discrimination, but rather the ineptitude of the individual or the collective to improve his situation. For if that were not the case, every group of immigrants, every denomination or group of residents of a neighborhood whose lot has not equaled that of others, could claim that they have been “discriminated against”. And, after all, members of those groups have done something for the State and nevertheless remain afflicted by their backwardness, which could be mistaken for “discrimination”.

And regarding the relative contribution of giving and receiving to the definition of discrimination, if the Arabs were to claim that their collective contribution (material, we will leave the moral contribution aside for now) to the State is greater than what they receive from it, there would certainly be room for them to claim discrimination, exploitation, enslavement and scandal. However they know quite well that the wealth and progress in this country were created by the Jews, not only relative to the size of the population, but also qualitatively and absolutely. Therefore, considering the burden that they constitute on the State and the damages that they cause it, security-wise and crime-wise, all of the welfare payments that they receive: Pension, child allocations, disability, unemployment, income subsidies, funding education, health and social services, are, to a large degree, handouts, coming from the pockets of the Jewish taxpayers, who generously and patiently bear the disbursement of their money to those who seek their harm, who bite the hand that feeds them. They have grown accustomed to producing children to fight the Jews demographically, while at the same time expecting that the senseless Jews will fund that destructive process that seeks to harm them. And instead of blessing and offering thanks for the status quo, they claim “discrimination”. The extremists among them have grown accustomed to burning fields and forests, killing Jewish soldiers, slandering the State at home and abroad, destroying public property, challenging the legal authorities and still claim discrimination, but none of them have the courage or the decency to willingly relinquish the payments that he receives from the State that he despises and seeks to undermine. Another question is, who would it blame for discrimination if its desire for liquidation of the Jewish state that treats it so kindly and bestows its plenty upon it, would be realized, heaven forbid?

THE ISSUE OF REVISIONIST HISTORY AND ADOPTION OF THE FALSE ARAB PROPAGANDA

One of the most serious matters, in which the Israeli Arabs repeat the Arab horror propaganda, is regarding the narrative of the events that led to the establishment of the Jewish state, according to their contention, “on the ruins of Palestine”. We have already discussed the historic responsibility and the one-sided story about the ostensible Israeli “aggression”, which came down upon the Arabs with no provocation on their part. Of course, their persistence in telling that fictional story, in the wake of the Arab propaganda, is intended to rewrite history, to eradicate the Arab part in the development of the conflict and to place the blame and responsibility entirely upon Israel, the implication of which is a demand that Israel “do the right thing” – to relinquish all of its assets and be liquidated without a word. If Arab organizations, which consist of intellectuals who grew in Israel and seemingly internalized Israeli education, act in that way, what good is Israeli education? Why does the persistent fiction that abuses the State prevail, without research or criticism, while balanced, documented history does not have any validity among them? This is a depressing thought that reinforces the conclusions of the previous chapter regarding the urgent need to include the Arabs in the general governmental education system and prevent state participation in cultivating all of the slander against it and at its expense. Because if the Israeli Arabs, like the rest of their brethren, want to concoct historical falsehoods, to claim that they are Canaanites and therefore patriarchs of the land, or to fabricate non-existent quotes from the Talmud, let them enjoy themselves. If that is the way that they want to educate a generation of intellectuals, researchers and scholars, without intellectual integrity or a critical reading of sources, that is precisely how they will ultimately look. However, the State must wash its hands of them.

1. **The Question of Responsibility for the Six Day War** – Just as they created a distorted narrative regarding the War of Independence, in which the Israelis are the awful aggressors and the Arabs are the eternal unfortunate victim, the same is true regarding the other stages of the conflict. Because, a society of Arab intellectuals in Israel can begin its narrative about the Six Day War with the statement that “in 1967 Israel conquered the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, the Golan Heights etc.”, and every reasonable reader gets the impression that the Jewish state awakened one day and due to lack of anything better to do and boredom they decided to invade those territories and conquer

them. Not one word was written about Nasser's declaration of war, the siege on Israel, their government's pleas to King Hussein that Israel has nothing against him and the like; and not one word of condemnation of the King, who complicated their brethren in the war, was unable to protect them, lost and was forced to withdraw because of his aggression. And like in the War of Independence, if they initiate a war, it is a just war; however if they lose, then the enemy, in this case it is their state, is the aggressor and the guilty party. And the same is true regarding every outbreak of violence that they have staged against Israel since. They are allowed to declare war as they please, bear no responsibility, and every time that Israel emerges victorious it will be condemned for its "aggression". They do not understand the meaning of a defensive war, of the obligation of a state to defend itself and also to refuse to return any territory until satisfactory arrangements are in place. As far as they are concerned, Israel must unconditionally withdraw from all territory that it "conquered", as was proven by the post-Oslo events and the Palestinian autonomy that emerged from it.

2. **The National Awakening of the Israeli Arabs** – In the Israeli Arabs' narrative, their national awakening began in the 1980s, therefore it is natural that they will identify with the rest of the Palestinians, will build their national institutions and parties within Israel, and will even violently demonstrate against their country and in favor of their people. However, they do not give a moment's thought to the fact that the people with whom they want to identify is their country's enemy, and the "national" parties that they seek to establish there are nothing more than branches of that external enemy in order to attack the Jewish people from within. They do not grasp the contradiction between their desire to live both within and without at the same time, and that sometimes one must decide in these difficult issues. Because, if they choose their state, they identify with it and serve it against its enemies and then, certainly, no one would challenge the decision to grant them full rights. However, if they choose the enemies of their country, and that is their right, then that is a declaration of war in exchange for which they can receive nothing but war. And then, of course, they will be given no advantage in the form of granting them rights. Thus, the distortion of concepts and the fabrication of a revised history, and a system of values and concepts stood on its head, will lead to their downfall, because they continue to drift in a world of delusions in which they seek to rampage as they please as well as being granted legal and compassionate tools to do so.

3. **The Intifada and Its Offshoots** - This is the way in which the Israeli Arabs can build themselves a cushy, comfortable narrative, in which they are the victims of the second *intifada* just as they were the victims of the first *intifada*, through no fault of their own. In their imaginary, Kafkaesque world, there is no connection between cause and effect, between lighting the fuse and the explosion, between unbridled violence and the damage resulting from that violence. They did not burn, did not desecrate, did not hurt, did not murder, did not throw rocks at policemen and did not hear the orders to disperse. But, just like that, with no provocation, they opened fire against them and “murdered” them. Compassion is really stirred by their plight. They are allowed to express, even violently, identity with the enemies of their state, who also initiated a bloody war against it, but was not permitted to defend itself against one the way that they are allowed to do against the other. Their status as citizens of the State does not absolve them of responsibility to observe its laws and they cannot claim that they have the right to different treatment than the Palestinians in the territories with whom they identify. Citizenship in this country is not a shelter from it, but rather a requirement to act in accordance with its rules. Jews also rioted at the same time and the police did not come down hard on them; however, that is because they reacted to the Arab aggression and riots in their surroundings in self-defense, not in an initiative to treat their neighbors cruelly, as their generally proper relations attest. They also did not brandish signs in support of Hizbullah and Hamas, the mortal enemies of the State, did not scream that they will redeem the Galilee (from whom, precisely!), did not set fire to banks and gas stations, did not block roads and did not throw rocks at police. Is one like the other? If the Israeli Arabs do not understand the reasons for the justified differential police treatment of them and the Jews, then there is no hope for them, not only in Israel, but in any democratic regime.
4. **The Attitude Towards the Jewish State** – The Israeli Arabs also adopted the general Arab propaganda line in its war against the Jewish state. In the manifestos of Arab students, the statements of their members of Knesset and in other belligerent statements, both among themselves and *vis-à-vis* the Jewish public, and also before international organizations, they voice invective that no democratic country could possibly accept. Zionism is “fascist”, the Jewish state has no right to exist, the right of return is reserved for all Palestinians, Israel is the aggressor and the discriminator, the establishment of the State was a catastrophe that must be corrected (by dissolution of the State), and

so on and so forth. Of course, the State of Israel has no right to exist, but meanwhile it is a must to exploit its resources, study in its universities and demand its allocations, to gain strength and multiply, to strike Israel with its democratic tools. The State is “colonialist”, and therefore one must seek to be liberated from it, and in order to do so, to join the Arab “forces of progress”, wherever they may be, like, for example, the Palestinian, the Syrian and the Iraqi people, for whom democracy, freedom and comfort is abundant. Therefore, they encourage and adopt a “resolute stance”, no more fleeing, but rather settling the land and demographic growth and construction everywhere, whether possible or impossible, undermining the law of the land, while simultaneously utilizing its resources, perpetual playing on the Jewish conscience to acknowledge its “sins” and its “responsibility” *vis-à-vis* the Arabs, mobilization and exploitation of the Jewish Left to fight alongside them, until the Jewish-Zionist state will be overcome.

5. **The Growth of the Arab Settlement in Israel** – When one reads and hears the grievances of the Israeli Arabs about the ostensible “suffocation”, “repression” and “maltreatment”, one wonders how they grew sevenfold since the establishment of the State, their economic, educational and political situation has improved tremendously, and their voice is heard so arrogantly to the point of total identity with the enemies of their country. The facts that attest to their great progress and vitality within the Zionist state are no longer important as far as they are concerned, but rather the invective consciously harnessed to the Arab propaganda against the State. In an official publication of “Adallah”, for example, it was written that since the establishment of the State not one new Arab settlement was established, and it is well known that at least Bedouin towns, none of which existed beforehand, were built at the government’s initiative. And why is there a need to establish new Arab villages, in addition to the dozens of illegal villages that mar the landscape and make a mockery of all of the building and planning laws of a modern, organized state? Have the residents of the existing villages displayed the desire to move elsewhere? Is there massive Arab immigration to Israel, which would require the construction of new cities? Another “Adallah” contention is that, “The destruction of Palestinian cities in 1948 halted the process of migration from the village to the city and even initiated a reverse process.” It is true that statements of that sort serve Arab propaganda well, but they are untrue. The cities Jaffa, Ashqelon, Haifa, Lod, Ramle and Acre, which were Palestinian, were not destroyed but rather developed at an unprecedented pace. Arabs

fled from those cities in fear of the war, and those who remained enjoy unprecedented welfare services. True, there are also certain slums; however poverty is characteristic of the social stratification in all cities, even Tel Aviv and west Jerusalem, which are not and never have been Palestinian cities.

What "urbanization process" was halted? Nazareth doubled in size immediately after the establishment of the State with the addition of the refugees from the Galilee villages and thereby became the main Arab city in Israel. Shefaram, Taibe and Umm al-Fahm were transformed from miserable villages into cities specifically under Israeli rule. Where is the reverse process? Is not this a process of urbanization of tent dwellers? In addition, the Arabs in Israel come with the opposite grievance that they have been ostensibly ousted from their lands, which forces them to crowd into the cities, which has been the case in Nazareth and Shefaram. Then, let these propagandists make up their minds: Is urbanization, which involves the loss of land and the abandonment of agricultural land a good thing, or is it specifically the return to the villages and settling the land preferable? The Arabs cannot have their cake and eat it too: Both to accuse Israel that it is perpetuating Arab backwardness by preventing the industrialization of the Arab villages, while at the same time complaining that Israel is uprooting the farmers from their land, thereby severing their connection with their land and making them dependent on its goodwill. This matter also has a decisive developmental aspect: In the pre-state Palestinian society, only 20% of the population lived in cities or towns and the majority lived in villages, which points to a low level of economic and social development. It was specifically Israel that reversed the proportions, because the minority of the Arab population in the villages engaged in agriculture is sufficient at present to feed the majority engaged in other jobs in the cities. And this impressive rise in production is not a result of Arab innovation, but rather from the sophisticated agricultural technology that the State provided them.

INDEX

- Abu Hassan 257
Abu Nawaf 174, 175, 182, 183
Abu Snan 335
Acre 26, 94, 147, 152, 168, 221, 234, 241, 251, 256, 294, 351
Adallah 193, 207, 266, 276, 277, 278, 309, 326, 337, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 351
Afghanistan 159
Africa 20, 54, 123, 158, 252
Al-Aqsa 11, 15, 241, 258
Al-Medina 236
Albanians 61, 194, 330
Algeria 70
Aloni, Shulamit 41, 70, 71
Amman 95, 114, 156, 287, 293
Ammon 296
Anglicans 168
Anglo-American Commission of Inquiry 168
Apartheid 8, 326
Arad 221, 296
Arafat 13, 28, 70, 78, 80, 82, 83, 84, 85, 91, 97, 102, 104, 110, 114, 121, 182, 231, 249, 254, 259, 273, 285, 289, 291, 293, 294
Arbakan 156
Archbishop 22, 26, 166, 168
Argentina 158, 286
Armenia 213
Ashqelon 351
Asia 158
Asra 136, 257
Assad, Hatez al- 114, 251, 252, 315
Assad, Bashar al- 216, 253
Atik 173
Australia 124, 206, 262
Avigors 158
Baal 95
Babylonia 58
Balfour 239
Balkans 158, 195, 330
Baq 134
Bar-Lev 282
Bar, Zvi 304
Barak, Ehud 71, 72, 74, 75, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84, 91, 103, 120, 127, 190, 216, 246, 248, 251, 259, 264, 265, 273, 274, 275, 285
Baraka 251
Barghouti 252
Bedouins 24, 74, 80, 101, 164, 170, 219, 220, 259, 265, 267, 296, 339
Beersheba 13, 32, 45, 74, 221, 248, 296

- Beirut 86
 Belgium 72, 283, 341
 Ben-Aharon, Yitzhak 17
 Ben-Ami, Shlomo 80, 85, 273, 274, 278
 Ben-Eliezer 255
 Ben-Gurion 22
 Benedictines 168
 Berlin 124, 159
 Bethlehem 24, 165, 173, 183, 184
 Bet Lid 293
 Biafra 213
 Bible 59, 200, 214
 Bin-Laden 108, 159, 249
 Biram 21, 33, 322, 325
 Bir Zeit 252
 Bishara 79, 113, 114, 117, 135, 157, 164,
 165, 183, 235, 251, 253, 266, 301
 Black September 287
 Bnei Beraq 346
 Bosnia 61, 72, 213
 Boston 46
 Brazil 124
 British 22, 23, 26, 41, 44, 53, 82, 83, 94,
 144, 155, 161, 167, 168, 169, 205, 286,
 331, 333
 Bush, George W. 124, 189, 255
 Byzantines 235

 Cairo 129, 216, 346
 California 46
 Cambodia 213
 Camp David 31, 84, 85, 86, 127, 129, 252,
 285, 325
 Canaanites 20, 94, 96, 200, 348
 Canada 61, 72, 123, 124, 206, 262, 283,
 305, 341
 Canberra 159

 Capucci 26, 166
 Caracas 159
 Carmelites 168
 Casablanca 256
 Castel 51
 Chernobyl 213
 Christians 7, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 53, 63, 64,
 101, 108, 121, 135, 139, 162, 163, 164,
 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172,
 173, 175, 176, 178, 179, 180, 182, 183,
 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 200,
 202, 220, 242, 247, 267, 312, 313
 Church 26, 46, 61, 74, 134, 162, 167,
 168, 172, 173, 174, 175, 185, 189,
 190, 216
 Circassians 163
 Citizenship 246, 308, 342, 350
 Clinton 252, 254, 255
 Congo 286
 Copts 26, 64, 168, 316
 Croatians 61
 Crusaders 108, 131, 132, 136, 144, 257
 Czechoslovakia 283

 Dabouriyeh 273, 274
 Damascus 39, 70, 79, 94, 95, 106, 113, 132,
 153, 251, 253, 282, 296, 346
 Darouche 264
 Darwish 82, 138, 139, 140, 147, 148, 149,
 150, 151, 152, 153, 156, 161, 166, 217,
 256, 268, 269, 280, 281, 318
 De-Gaulle 304
 Dehamshe 151, 160, 216, 217, 250, 253,
 254, 318, 319
 Dekel 22
 Democracy 43, 172, 316
Der Stürmer 148, 223

- Detroit 46
 Diaspora 37, 38, 39, 63, 125
 Dimona 296
 Dir al-Assad 210
 Dir Ayub 51
 Discrimination 8, 208, 209, 326, 345
 Drugs 100
 Druse 7, 24, 25, 26, 35, 48, 75, 101, 163,
 164, 170, 180, 216, 246, 248, 267, 284,
 307, 308, 312, 335
 Dubai 262
 Durban 326, 327, 329, 330
- Edom 296
 Education 41, 58, 95, 246, 299
 Egypt 20, 26, 39, 42, 58, 64, 94, 109, 110,
 112, 114, 120, 121, 127, 128, 130, 133,
 137, 140, 142, 145, 148, 156, 233, 296,
 298, 316
 Eilat 129, 296
 Elections 248, 264, 270, 338
 Emorites 95
 Entebbe 213
 Equality 75, 79, 93, 172, 247
 Ethiopia 194, 213
 Ethnic Cleansing 329
 Europe 53, 64, 124, 125, 136, 190, 266,
 305
- Florentine 45
 France 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 63, 64, 124, 147,
 162, 195, 201, 213, 284, 297, 304, 305,
 307, 333, 336, 337, 338, 342
 Franciscans 168
 Freedom 118, 138, 338, 339
 Fujimori 286
 Futuh 54, 136
- Galilee 22, 32, 33, 69, 77, 89, 91, 92, 94,
 103, 132, 148, 163, 172, 195, 211, 233,
 241, 256, 257, 258, 268, 278, 290, 300,
 301, 305, 324, 329, 350, 352
 Gaza 12, 21, 29, 51, 61, 78, 81, 114, 133,
 137, 148, 156, 182, 203, 220, 227, 252,
 254, 262, 270, 285, 288, 294, 296, 334,
 336, 346, 348
 Geneva 252
 Georgia 50, 308
 Geraissi 173, 176, 182, 184
 Germans 331
 Geroudi 201
 Ghali 167
 Ghosh 51-52
 Gilboa 288
 Gilead 296, 335
 Girgashites 95
 Givat Haviva 79, 248, 299
 Goebbels 106
 Golan 75, 120, 282, 348
 Golden Age 54, 220
 Goldstein 115
 Greek 26, 167, 168, 172, 173, 283
 Green Line 87, 89, 94, 110, 134, 195, 230,
 250, 255, 278, 279, 298, 312
- Habash 166
 Habibi 165, 170
 Hadash 75, 79, 157, 172, 173, 216, 243,
 248, 249, 254, 264, 337
 Hadassah 38
 Hadera 236
 Hadith 148
 Haifa 24, 81, 94, 134, 155, 171, 241, 242,
 277, 339, 351
 Haj 94, 167, 263

- Hakim 26, 168, 275
Halperin 261
 Hamas 12, 16, 31, 33, 38, 51, 54, 77, 83, 88, 101, 103, 106, 108, 110, 112, 134, 144, 145, 147, 152, 154, 155, 156, 158, 160, 162, 179, 213, 214, 222, 235, 250, 256, 257, 272, 311, 350
Hamurabi 95
Hashem 243
Hassan 148, 257, 266, 271, 272,
Hatib 149, 151, 152, 166, 185, 239
Hebron 12, 38, 139, 146, 241, 312
Herzliya 45, 346
Hitler 82, 112, 123, 282
Hittin 175
Hizbullah 33, 51, 77, 79, 88, 106, 108, 110, 120, 127, 128, 132, 145, 147, 158, 159, 160, 213, 235, 270, 276, 304, 350
Holocaust 109, 113, 138, 200, 201, 223, 324, 338
Hussein 95, 108, 131, 213, 287, 288, 289, 349
Husseini 31, 94, 161
- Ibrahim Nimer 268
Ibtan 141
Id al-Fitr 181
Identity 7, 77
IDF 12, 13, 22, 25, 35, 48, 67, 72, 77, 100, 147, 151, 164, 210, 211, 212, 216, 268, 304, 307, 308, 310, 327, 335
Imam 137
Independence Day 28, 80, 265, 307, 341
India 162
Intifada 7, 8, 227, 255, 258, 350
Iran 15, 64, 98, 145, 156, 159, 316, 317
- Iraq 15, 42, 64, 98, 110, 114, 202, 316, 336
Ireland 61
Isaiah 125
Islam 33, 54, 95, 133, 136, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 148, 150, 158, 159, 160, 162, 166, 169, 178, 186, 236, 237, 239, 241, 242, 257, 258, 315
Ismail 261
Italy 305
Itihad 244, 254
- Jabarin 257, 266
Jabor 264
Jaffa 24, 81, 152, 224, 241, 242, 251, 256, 257, 258, 294, 351
Japan 83, 202
Jebusites 95
Jenin 97, 241, 242
Jericho 141, 242
Jerusalem 5, 12, 19, 23, 26, 51, 75, 81, 82, 91, 94, 102, 110, 120, 126, 129, 130, 131, 132, 135, 136, 144, 146, 155, 161, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 173, 182, 198, 221, 233, 235, 236, 240, 241, 242, 250, 251, 254, 256, 257, 258, 262, 263, 288, 293, 324, 352
Jesuits 168
Jesus 94, 117, 121, 185, 200
Jewish Agency 50, 76, 335
Jewish National Fund 50, 76, 335
Jezreel 256
Jihad 138, 147, 156, 213, 235
Johannesburg 159
Jordan 21, 25, 26, 42, 61, 70, 95, 110, 121, 128, 133, 140, 145, 156, 181, 195, 201, 218, 219, 227, 241, 283, 286, 287, 288,

- 289, 291, 293, 294, 295, 296, 298, 315,
330, 336
- Judaism 38, 63, 141, 222, 333, 335, 337
- Judea and Samaria 12, 97, 133, 191, 203,
220, 227, 287, 296, 331, 336
- Kafr Bara 185
- Kafr Kana 75, 149, 152, 165, 166, 185,
250, 251
- Khomeini 138, 142
- King Solomon 235
- Kishak 148
- Knesset 5, 19, 42, 46, 50, 65, 70, 71, 75,
79, 83, 84, 91, 92, 95, 101, 106, 107,
111, 117, 120, 150, 151, 152, 153, 157,
160, 164, 170, 171, 172, 177, 193, 208,
212, 213, 215, 216, 217, 228, 244, 246,
248, 249, 254, 270, 282, 302, 303, 304,
305, 311, 319, 326, 329, 336, 337, 340,
350
- Korea 213
- Kosovo 61, 194, 195, 330
- Kristallnacht 124, 159, 313
- Kurds 64, 98, 202, 316, 333
- Kuwait 157
- Labor 41, 42, 74, 79, 171, 175, 216, 242,
246, 265, 273, 274
- Lapps 302
- Law of Return 37, 76, 201, 296, 308, 331
- League of Nations 161
- Lebanon 21, 26, 50, 61, 120, 127, 129, 145,
146, 151, 156, 159, 160, 168, 179, 195,
214, 216, 227, 252, 253, 267, 268, 276,
286, 294, 308
- Likud 270, 274
- Lod 152, 251, 351
- London 117, 159, 243
- Loyalty 36
- Lyon 124, 159
- Maarj 257
- Macedonia 194, 195, 215, 330
- Madrid 288
- Mahmoud 82, 269, 280, 281
- Maksoud 167
- Malk 216, 250, 253, 254, 318
- Manchester 124, 159
- Mansour 186, 187
- Maronites 26, 168
- McCarthy 44
- Megiddo 22, 95
- Memorial Day 244
- Menem 286
- Meretz 71, 79, 264, 273, 275
- Metropolitan 167
- Mexico 213
- Middle East 9, 54, 131, 189, 197, 255, 272,
295
- Military Government 314
- Mishmar 22
- Mithaq 154, 182
- Moab 296
- Monitoring Committee 64, 90, 172, 215,
246, 247, 301, 304, 310, 315
- Montreal 124, 159
- Morocco 58, 128, 336
- Moscow 124, 159
- Mosque 108, 140, 147, 155, 214, 236, 250,
256, 311
- Muammar 281
- Mubarak 130
- Mufid 275
- Mufti 94, 143, 144, 161, 167
- Muhammad 12, 146, 251, 264
- Munich 127, 195

- Musawa 266
- Nablus 13, 141, 241, 258, 346
- Nahman 263, 359
- Naqba 28
- Nasrallah 108, 270
- Nasser 107, 131, 349
- Nationalism 105
- National Minority 332
- Nazareth 12, 22, 24, 32, 45, 46, 69, 74, 75, 91, 93, 94, 114, 121, 134, 135, 139, 140, 149, 152, 160, 162, 165, 166, 167, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 177, 178, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 187, 188, 189, 191, 216, 229, 247, 254, 261, 262, 269, 271, 278, 279, 282, 313, 325, 346, 352
- Nazism 109, 111, 112
- Negev 25, 74, 80, 163, 195, 219, 220, 247, 248, 258, 259, 290, 296, 300, 305, 329, 339
- Nesher 155
- Netanya 236, 346
- Netanyahu 71-72, 80, 182, 184, 189, 208, 265, 274, 275
- Neturei Karta 36
- New Israel Fund 93, 221
- New York 46, 158, 159, 222, 254, 257
- New Zealand 86, 124
- Nizar 271-272
- Norwegians 130
- October 2000 99, 101, 102, 132, 134, 152, 177, 182, 190, 195, 196, 205, 207, 218, 250, 277, 303, 328
- Oman 128
- Omar 148, 185
- One Israel 270
- Orr, Commission 69
- Orr, Theodore 18, 153
- Oslo 9, 16, 30, 31, 64, 66, 68, 69, 98, 99, 100, 101, 111, 127, 129, 130, 145, 151, 152, 153, 156, 179, 206, 222, 235, 255, 264, 270, 278, 285, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 322, 323, 325, 330, 349
- Ottomans 163
- Pakistan 148
- Palestine 21, 31, 58, 62, 67, 77, 92, 94, 99, 132, 136, 144, 157, 163, 166, 167, 168, 186, 194, 198, 231, 232, 236, 238, 239, 241, 242, 250, 254, 256, 257, 261, 265, 271, 272, 285, 286, 287, 289, 295, 296, 330, 348
- Paris 124, 159
- Partition 21, 298, 330, 331
- Patriarch 26, 167-168, 173, 188-189
- Peace 75, 79, 172, 237, 248, 249, 253, 268, 299
- Peres 69, 71, 255
- Persia 58
- Peru 286
- Pharaohs 95
- Philippines 158
- Poland 50, 283
- Police 11, 32, 89
- Pope 173, 189
- Popper 115
- Portugal 162
- Progressive List for Peace 172
- Protestants 26
- Protocols of the Elders of Zion* 109, 241

- Qadis 247
 Qatar 128
 Quebec 305, 333, 341
- Rabita 269
 Racism 326, 329
 Rahat 45, 74, 152, 248
 Rakah 170-172, 243-244
 Ramadan 134, 143, 169
 Ramallah 12, 146, 165, 262-263, 294
 Ramat Aviv 45
 Ramat Gan 32, 304
 Ramle 152, 241, 251, 351
 Refugees 322
 Riyah 172
 Romans 95, 240
 Ron 275
 Rushdie 142
 Russia 28, 194, 331
- Sabah 26, 168, 188-189, 270
 Sadat 95, 107, 119-120
 Saddam 95, 108, 131, 157, 213
 Safed 221, 242
 Sakhnin 102, 211
 Salah 42, 88, 139
 Salman 142, 152, 174
 San Francisco 222
 Sao Paolo 124
 Saudi Arabia 15, 157, 201-202, 286, 296
 Sderot 45, 69
 Sebastia 95
 Self-Determination 329
 Serbia 61, 194, 195, 330
 Shai 263
 Shamir 71, 238
 Sharon 288
- Sharon, Ariel 50, 71, 74, 79, 84, 85, 87,
 88, 103, 143, 189, 216, 249, 251, 254,
 255, 264, 289
 Shas 64
 Shefaram 268, 352
 Shihab 162, 175, 178, 181, 182, 184, 188,
 189, 191
 Sicily 162
 Sinai 25, 107, 120, 129, 280, 298
 Sinara 181, 249, 253
 Sirat 242, 256, 257
 Slavs 201
 Soviet Union 16, 171, 173, 213, 300, 308,
 317, 342
 Spain 162, 195, 220
 Sri Lanka 202, 286
 Students 231, 339
 Sudan 159, 202
 Suez 106, 298
 Sweden 147, 302, 338
 Switzerland 301, 305, 341
 Sydney 124, 159
 Syria 15, 21, 22, 26, 42, 64, 94, 109, 113,
 114, 117, 120, 128, 132, 151, 227,
 250, 253, 282, 286, 287, 294, 307,
 315, 336
- Taal 264
 Taba 31, 91, 120, 127, 129
 Taibe 210, 265, 352
 Taliban 249
 Talmud 59, 348
 Tamils 202
 Tanzim 11, 89
 Tarif 42
 Tatars 242, 257
 Tefen 211
 Tel Aviv 45, 242, 266, 293, 352
 Telem 233

- Temple Mount 15, 81, 84, 86, 87, 88, 89,
 110, 120, 126, 130, 136, 137, 142, 143,
 144, 146, 155, 214, 241, 311, 339
 The Hague 249
 Tira 210
 Toronto 159
 Triangle 74, 80, 89, 152, 195, 210, 216,
 241, 242, 248, 256, 265, 290, 300, 301,
 305, 324, 329
 Tunisia 289
 Turkey 156, 202, 213, 237, 283, 316
- Umm al-Fahm 52, 67, 69, 74, 80, 88, 100,
 138, 139, 140, 142, 147, 149, 154, 186,
 210, 258, 265, 275, 276, 335
 UN 20, 21, 37, 96, 97, 111, 125, 127, 167,
 178, 202, 254, 274, 279, 292, 322, 323,
 327, 328, 330, 331, 333
 United Arab List 72, 79, 151, 216, 246,
 248, 254
- Vatican 26, 165, 168, 173, 178, 182, 189,
 190
 Vietnam 213
 Vilnai 80
- Walid 141, 166, 210, 271
 Waqf 160-161, 180-181
- War 16, 22, 33, 35, 38, 44, 82-83, 107,
 113-114, 116-117, 123, 131, 143, 154,
 159, 161, 205, 213, 224, 227, 230, 233,
 240, 249, 267-268, 280, 282-283, 287,
 289, 306, 348-349
 Washington 129, 288
 Weitz 305
 Weizmann 334
 Welfare 217
 Wye 127, 129
- Yassin 137, 148, 156, 162, 250
 Yemen 58
 Yeruham 346
 Yiddish 342
 Yihya 115
 Yiron Valley 256
- Zakh 260
 Ziad 170-173, 179, 183, 185, 187
 Zimbabwe 202
 Zionism 10, 15, 28, 30-31, 36, 38, 47, 78,
 82, 103-104, 109, 111, 166, 196, 200,
 202, 225, 231-233, 235, 237, 292, 327-
 328, 330, 335-336, 350
 Zippori 279
 Zurich 159