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

The Zionist Alternative
The second issue of “Sovereignty” was prepared for publication during John Kerry’s contentious and restless trips in the area. The pressure on Israel is far from moderate and the goal of this prize is clear – to arrive at an agreement of “two states for two peoples” or in simple words – to split the Land of Israel once again.

Should we contain ourselves? More than this, isn’t now the time when we must promote the application of Israeli sovereignty over all parts of the Land of Israel? It becomes clear that we cannot allow the paralysis and fear to prevent us from applying Israeli sovereignty.

From the pages of this journal you will be able to become acquainted with the positions of people in the full circle – those who maintain that the Land of Israel cannot be divided, and those who see this as a moral and logical imperative. We will publish a variety of positions and opinions, including those that are very different from each other.

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

Along with the responses of congratulations and encouragement, many readers have sent us their own articles. We were very pleased to read words expressing the loyalty and strong Jewish spirit that lives within many of us. Nevertheless, limitations of space in print media prevent us from publishing all that we receive. Therefore we have chosen a small and representative sample such as appears in the section of Letters to the Editor. We encourage everyone to write us in the editor’s e-mailbox, and we add that only concise letters of up to 150 words will be published in the newspaper. We will consider every letter we receive in the editor’s e-mailbox but we add that only concise letters of up to 150 words will be published in the newspaper.

We are Jews – because we came from Judea

To the editor:

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

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

Rami Ofir, Tel Aviv

When Did the Arabs come here?

To the Arabs:

For years, I have been confronting colleagues from Britain with the fact that the Arabs who claim that they dispossessed them from their land are actually immigrants who were “imposed” by the British in order to implement the policy of divide and conquer. Here are the pertinent facts: for approximately 600 years of Turkish rule, until 1872, there were a total of about 500,000 residents in Greater Palestine, about 30,000 of whom were Jews. At the beginning of the British Mandate there were about 600,000 Arabs here and 60,000 Jews. This means that with every Jew who came to Israel, ten Arabs migrated to the area. The ratio of this migration was maintained, more or less, in the days of the Mandatory rule, that is, in 1948, there were about 600,000 Jews here and more than two million Arabs. Another manner that I am dealing with is via my colleagues is the amazing ineffectiveness of Israeli public relations. An obvious example of this is the “Al Durr” leaflet. I was not able to get official confirmation from our Office of Foreign Affairs that a complaint was ever registered to Israel regarding this miserable affair. If any pieces of shaped like an Arab youth on his great toe, there would be a huge uproar and there would be big trouble for any Israeli who was involved. And if a soldier or an officer so much as pushes any foreign journalist, the matter ends with his dismissal. On the other hand, with the Al Durr matter, not a pep was laced, there is no complaint, nothing. Our public relations mechanism is silent and on the media stage, only the lie remains.

Avi Adar

People are surprised to discover that we can talk about annexation

To the editor:

I was very pleased to read the first issue of the journal. Thank G-d, it will be a significant platform for those who believe in a two-state solution and for those who want to engage in a dialogue with people who do not share this view. I truly believe that the journal is a key element in the process of building and settling. From the pages of this journal you will be able to become acquainted with the positions of people in the full circle – those who maintain that the Land of Israel cannot be divided, and those who see this as a moral and logical imperative.

The journal’s editorial staff is open to bringing in a variety of opinions and viewpoints, including those that are very different from each other. In the appendices to his Book of the Prophets, Rashi maintains that “…the last furrow of the plowing is what determines the value of the bundle.” To me, this is saying that the end of the process of building and settling, the valorization and the consolidation, has not yet been completed.
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Hотовель Presents: The Gradual Plan ‘Annexation’ Naturalization

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

When Deputy Minister of Transportation, MK Trips Hотовель is asked what the ‘Right’ should present as a political goal and an alternative to the ‘Two-State’ plan she answers simply. “The goal is for the Right to remain in its present position of Israeli sovereignty. It is ours and it was acquired legally in a bloody, defensive war. We must now implement the vision of the Greater Land of Israel and begin to apply our sovereignty.”

Though the vision mentioned in the title is a simple concept, Hотовель is well aware of the difficulties that stand in the way of implementing this vision, and first of all, “the hot potato that everyone has been passing from hand to hand until now” as she defines it, is what will happen with the Arab population in the territories of Judea and Samaria.

The deputy minister envisages a solution to the matter in gradual phases. “I start with the assumption that this is a Jewish population whose abiding dream is not to change its place but to live with us allows for a vision of future coexistence. This is in addition to an understanding of the greater power of the Arab population.”

When she is asked about the chances for her plan to be accepted within our political reality, Hотовель is convinced the chances are good. “The vision of two states began in the famine of the Left with Uri Jeremey and Luba Libor, who managed to sell a plan that was originally attached by Golda Meir, Yigal Allon and the VIFN of Mapa?im (the leftist pro-peace, who failed to the modern day Labor Party), at the end of the day, we have already heard the Arab population who wants to be part of the Jewish Zionist state. There is no end to our dreams about the future of Samaria to be under Israeli sovereignty.

Hотовель is asked what the Right should present as an alternative to the ‘Two-State’ vision. “The Gradual Plan is a plan that is necessary to give our Jewish communities a base in their region,” she says and clarifies: “We must begin a gradual process of implementing our sovereignty. Our plan is to begin with a small area, and then gradually expand our sovereignty.”

She is convinced that if they just take the trouble to market it well, it will turn out to be much more feasible than the ‘Two-State’ vision.
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The Gradual Plan is a plan that is necessary to give our Jewish communities a base in their region. We must begin a gradual process of implementing our sovereignty. Our plan is to begin with a small area, and then gradually expand our sovereignty.
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“Which is Preferable - the Gaza Model or the Sakhnin Model?”

However, Hотовель is also aware of the difficulty of selling the gradation to the Israeli public, who, according to her, want to see the Arab on the other side of the fence - mixing the populations worries and concerns both the Left and the Right. “The Gradual Plan is a plan that is necessary to give our Jewish communities a base in their region,” she says and clarifies: “We must begin a gradual process of implementing our sovereignty. Our plan is to begin with a small area, and then gradually expand our sovereignty.”

She is convinced that if they just take the trouble to market it well, it will turn out to be much more feasible than the ‘Two-State’ vision.
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Despite the pressures, despite the media, despite the politics, the People of Israel has returned to its Land, builds in it and clings to it.

In the European Union we say we are here in Israel not because of security needs or Herzel’s declaration but because of our historical ties. This is the primary reason why we can call sovereignty a fundamental ideological goal as well as a principle to which we are attached and which clings to it. We are not the only people who have also adopted his approach. Mesika presents the application of sovereignty as a fundamental ideological goal as well as a principle to which we are attached and which clings to it. The starting point is that the land is theirs. The head of the Samaria Council, Gershon Mesika, acts energetically to strengthen the call for Israeli sovereignty in Judea and Samaria. There is a clear Jewish majority and therefore it is a question of principle.

Gershon Mesika, head of the Samaria Regional Council, decided to "think out of the box" and instead of using the field of Public Relations for "talking politics" he coined the phrase "Getting to Know Samaria". Mesika is not satisfied with just bringing hundreds of public opinion depatures and thousands of visitors to Samaria; he has also extended his activities beyond Israel’s borders and opened what he calls the "Samaria Office of Foreign Affairs". As part of this effort he meets dozens of European members of parliament who come to Samaria, in order to assure them that they have not heard before: that the Land of Israel belongs to the People of Israel. Other regional councils have also adopted his approach. Mesika sees the application of sovereignty as a fundamental ideological goal as well as a principle to which we are attached and which clings to it. The starting point is that the land is theirs. The head of the Samaria Council, Gershon Mesika, acts energetically to strengthen the call for Israeli sovereignty in Judea and Samaria.
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In the European Union we say we are here in Israel not because of security needs or Herzel’s declaration but because of our historical ties. This is the primary reason why we can call sovereignty a fundamental ideological goal as well as a principle to which we are attached and which clings to it. The starting point is that the land is theirs. The head of the Samaria Council, Gershon Mesika, acts energetically to strengthen the call for Israeli sovereignty in Judea and Samaria.

In recent years, Mesika has been conducting non-stop public relations efforts, both inside Israel and internationally. He goes to European parliaments, including that of the European Union in Brussels, and presents his political merchandising. And, according to him, there are those who are willing to listen, even among the Catherine Ashton.
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The Americans are so blinded by their belief that by establishing a Palestinian state on territory Israel controls they will solve all the problems of the region that they cannot understand the region.

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

Journalist Caroline Glick has recently completed her book (in English) about the alternative plan to the two-state solution. Glick directs her book, The Israeli Solution: A One-State Plan for Peace in the Middle East, to the American audience, “so that they will understand that the reason the United States’ Middle East policy has been such a failure for the United States and the region is because it has been based on a failed concept of carving a Palestinian state out of Israeli territory. Whereas in Israel, the conversation has begun about alternatives to the ‘Two-State’ model, no such conversation is taking place in America. Since George W. Bush officially adopted the idea and made it the centerpiece of US Middle East policy-making, everyone has supported the establishment of a Palestinian state.

Before Richard Nixon decided to treat the Palestinians as people, US Middle East policy was not predicated on Israeli land giveaways. In 1967 there was no such concept in the United States. US Security Council Resolution 242, which set out the terms of an eventual peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors, stipulated clearly that the Arabs must recognize the right of Israel to exist in peace and security within defined borders and, on the other hand, for Israel to withdraw to its 1967 borders.

In Glick’s view, the US’s reliance on the ‘Two-State’ paradigm as the panacea for all the Middle East’s political pathologies has been the principal cause of most of its policy failures in the Middle East. “In order for Iran and Arabs to weather through the prism of the Palestinian conflict with Israel, US policymakers’ perception of Iran and Israel against its society, its leaders, and its people. They are the hundreds of thousands of people who live in villages that are demographic solution whereas the areas will give Israel the strategic demographic solution whereas the areas will give Israel the strategic demographic solution whereas the areas would impact the areas would impact the areas.

There are millions of people who understand that the Two-State solution is a disaster. They are waiting for someone to tell them that they should recognize the idea of a Palestinian state. The Israelis will not accept, exactly what the people of the region that they cannot understand the region.

In Iraq, she explains, the Americans sided with the PLO against the PLO and the Arabs and deployed the Marines to force Israel out of Beirut while protecting the PLO from the IDF. “This was the aim of their ‘peacekeeping mission’,” she says. “They were not prepared for the reality that reality dictated that the parties fighting in Lebanon saw the US forces as an Arab ally. When they replaced the IDF positions all of those forces that were fighting against Israel aimed their battles against the Americans who were fighting against them.

In light of this, Glick sees the ‘Two-State’ model as nothing less than a mechanism to Lend-Lease Jew hatred is its rejection of logic and reason. Glick demonstrates that by establishing a sovereign state on territory Israel controls the Arabs have other sovereignty over the areas. The Arabs have other sovereignty over the areas. This would be the implementation of the idea of payment for peace, and the United States would be the major benefactor of this new model.

Glick rejects the voices on the Israeli Right that promote the idea of payment for peace or defending Judaism in the Holy Land. In her view, these are irrelevant to the larger Arab world and the larger Palestinian societies. The “only thing that should interest us is that one day, perhaps, we will all recognize that Jews are man an legal, with no protected right; Jews shamed never and have stood by powerless as their children have been intimidated and trattled and death and destruction and murder and fraud and lies and deceit. The Israeli ‘One-State’ plan offers them civil rights and a correction that is better than what we have been waiting for.

In light of this, Glick sees the ‘Two-State’ model as nothing less than a mechanism to Lend-Lease Jew hatred is its rejection of logic and reason. Glick demonstrates that by establishing a sovereign state on territory Israel controls the Arabs have other sovereignty over the areas. The Arabs have other sovereignty over the areas.
The idea of a demographic threat - that Jews would be unable to maintain a demographic majority within the borders of the Jewish state – is one of the main threats headed off by the Jewish Right by those who support partitioning the State. As a counter to these pros and cons arguments about the dangers of a bi-national state, Yoram Ettinger, demographer and former Israeli Ambassador to Washington, optimistic as ever, presents some data that shows that he believes to be encouraging.

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

Regarding data relating to fertility rates in general, this conclusion is based on a negative balance of migration of the Arab population of Judea and Samaria for nearly every year since 1950. The negative migration was interrupted only twice. Once during the first three years after the signing of the Oslo Accords, when Israel-Baath Arab cooperation fell apart, and another earlier time during a three year period of conflict between the Palestinian Authority, the Syrian monarchy and the Palestinians, when King Hussein wanted to make it clear who rules the roost and therefore stopped allowing Palestinians to cross the bridges into Jordan.”

According to Ettinger, except for these six years, every year, thousands of Arabs from Judea and Samaria cross into Jordan. And, from there, into the rest of the world. In recent years there has been a negative migration flow of approximately 20,000 people per year. This holds true even when calculating for the number of those who return from abroad. Ettinger also points to a phenomenon observed among Arab Israelis when analyzing Arabs as a demographic minority in light of the polarizing effects of their society – hostility between Haredim and Arab, traffic, economic struggles and assimilation to non-Palestinian society. Many have accepted the fact that life will not improve and as they leave the country.

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

After speaking of a 66% Jewish majority in relation to the Sea and the Jordan River. This is indeed a majority but it also means that there is a very large Arab minority. Can we as a Jewish state exist with such a significant minority?

As I have noted, not only must the present data be analyzed, but also the trend. The Jewish fertility rate, especially among secular Jews, is soaring impressively while Arab fertility, according to Ettinger, is faltering. Ettinger notes this phenomenon to stem from sharply reduced immigration of Arabs every twenty years, each such period representing in the history of humanity. Today the trend for Arab women, age 20-30, is in the direction of less than three births on average while for Jewish women, the trend points to more than three births on average. Another data point to consider in this context is that a tremendous majority of Arabs who go abroad are young, so that Arab emigration further erodes the fertility data and the gap continues to increase.

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

The Tremendous Potential of Aliyah?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In Ettinger’s view, if the State of Israel makes a great effort to encourage aliyah, it may lead to at least half a million Jews coming to the Land within the next decade, “numbers that will bring us to a Jewish majority of 80% by the year 2035.”
The World Is Beginning to Change Direction

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

Shortly after the end of his term as Chairman of the Council of Judea, Samaria and Gaza (Yesha), Dani Dayan established what came to be called the Yesha Foreign Ministry. Within this capacity, he meets with members of world parliaments, participates in international conferences and publishes articles in leading international journals – all in order to present to the world the ideals and interests of the Jewish residents of Judea and Samaria. Until only recently provided the province of deleterious people, the aims and goals of these residents are slowly becoming legitimate subject for political discussion. In these meetings, you do find leadership that is receptive to ideas outside the Oslo or the ‘Two-State’ solution.

Dayan believes that there is a need for hard work and we must hope that their positions will not change the moment they get there. However, the shift in thinking is both clear and pervasive. As of today, there is no Kaestner without a group that supports Jewish habitation in Judea and Samaria.

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

Dayan says Israelis as the main opponents to his activity, and believes that they have a right to be concerned with his problems. By way of explanation he recalls the first interview journalist Yossi Akdimi held with newly elected Prime Minister Menachem Begin. “Begin spoke about our rights in Judea and Samaria and Akdimi asked him how he can speak about such rights when there is not even one citizen who speaks that way. Begin answered him that one cannot expect a member of Congress to say what the government of Israel does not say.”

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

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

How do you prepare for these meetings?

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

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

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

It’s one thing when you talk about the agreement to allow Jews to live in the West Bank – this they can digest. But when you speak about Israeli sovereignty, don’t they say there are no such states (in their police, European way)?

“I don’t know what goes on inside their heads. They listen. In Spain, they liked the fact that they didn’t have to break their teeth on English because I spoke to them in fluent Spanish and despite everything, they did not throw me out at any time. I have written about the application of sovereignty in several leading newspapers, including the New York Times and the Los Angeles Times. In every article, I have analyzed the situation and concluded that there must only be Israeli sovereignty west of the Jordan River and – guess what? The sky has not fallen! Indeed, do they consider your words legitimate or are they only accepted out of the required politeness to a visitor? Anyone who thinks that it will be short sighted is mistaken. We are sowing seeds whose harvest we will reap in the future and this future may only be in another twenty or thirty years. Meanwhile, we have to accept an interim period similar to the current situation until we can bring the world to accept our ideas. It is very unfortunate, but I do not see the current government applying sovereignty over the territories even partly. But we must not stop seeing the seeds, especially in the international arena. If we do not articulate this vision today, the government of Israel will not hold the vision in another five years, and if the vision does not exist in five years, the world will not recognize the vision and move toward some other solutions.”

Contrary to many others, Dayan does not believe that the independent departments of foreign affairs that he has established has come too late. When he analyzes the political reality surrounding us, he is convinced that, on the contrary, the timing is right. “The chance for success since Oslo six years ago may not be very small,” he explains. “For twenty years the international community had the feeling that there was no point in talking with us because of the super-highway headed straight for the ‘Two-State’ solution. Twenty years have passed and the world has become depoliticized and if wonders, if maybe, they are on the wrong path. They have not necessarily abandoned the idea of two states but they have more rules now and therefore are curious to hear what we have to say.”

The World Understands that We Can No Longer be Ignored

Dayan presents examples of changes that are happening now that could not have happened in the past. “There are many European ambassadors whom I have been courting for two or three years, requesting a meeting, and until recently, they have refused. Now they themselves, people with great influence in Europe, call me every month or two in order to meet over lunch and exchange ideas. Sometimes very senior officials will discreetly accompany the ambassadors to their teeth on English because I spoke to them in fluent Spanish and despite everything, they did not throw me out at any time. I have written about the application of sovereignty in several leading newspapers, including the New York Times and the Los Angeles Times. In every article, I have analyzed the situation and concluded that there must only be Israeli sovereignty west of the Jordan River and – guess what? The sky has not fallen! Indeed, do they consider your words legitimate or are they only accepted out of the required politeness to a visitor? Anyone who thinks that it will be short sighted is mistaken. We are sowing seeds whose harvest we will reap in the future and this future may only be in another twenty or thirty years. Meanwhile, we have to accept an interim period similar to the current situation until we can bring the world to accept our ideas. It is very unfortunate, but I do not see the current government applying sovereignty over the territories even partly. But we must not stop seeing the seeds, especially in the international arena. If we do not articulate this vision today, the government of Israel will not hold the vision in another five years, and if the vision does not exist in five years, the world will not recognize the vision and move toward some other solutions.”

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

Begin answered him that one cannot expect a member of Congress to say what the government of Israel does not say.
A view on Ben Gurion airport from “Palestine” of one of two scenarios – either of which will lead to the end of the State of Israel, Director, Israel Institute for Solution Dr. Sherman’s Humanitarian Solution

An interview with the World’s Ethnocultural Discrimination Toward Palestinians

After having rejected the other theories, Sherman presents his “humanitarian plan.”

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

Regarding the Palestinian Diaspora, Sherman believes that the UN and the nations of the world must be called upon to extend refugee status to the Palestinian refugees, distinct from the rest of the world’s refugees, for whom there is the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), which deals with their welfare. Sherman mentions the essential differences between UNHCR mandate and UNHCR practice that allow the situation of Palestinian refugee status to continue for decades while the international refugee status ends much sooner. This reality means that there is “no way to escape a process that is passed down from generation to generation and the numbers continue to grow while the numbers of other refugees continually decline.”

Another important point of Sherman’s thesis is that there is no solution for the “refugee” problem as long as UNHCR still finds solutions for Palestinian refugees only and the state of origin, meaning the Land of Israel.

“Every Palestinian organization that we have encountered, including the UNHCR, describes, he suggests to the government of Israel to award emigration allowances that determine the fact that those who use them must submit to procedures regarding the Arabs of Judea and Samaria and, perhaps in the future, in Gaza, and the Palestinians in the Diaspora as well.

Sherman believes that Prime Minister Netanyahu has already psychologically resigned himself to the idea of unilateral withdrawal and that “the only way that he is now prepared to make is the transfer of the infrastructure.”

UNRWA perpetuates the problem. If they would apply the accepted world definition of “refugee” to Palestinian refugees, their numbers would decrease from five million to fifty thousand, mostly octogenarians and others who are still young. Sherman rejects the “Two-State” vision that is not suitable to the demographic reality, which does not lend itself to division.

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

Nevertheless Sherman presents another scenario, a positive one, and states that “Anyone who understands anything about the basics of Political Science, world situations and the theory of nationalism is interested in maintaining the State of Israel as a national state of the Jewish People, knows that we must apply Israeli sovereignty from the sea to the Jordan River.”

It is this realist vision that Sherman believes is the only viable one that will lead to the end of the State of Israel as a national state of the Jewish People. In doing so, Sherman believes that the UN and the nations of the world must be called on to extend refugee status to the Palestinian refugees, distinct from the rest of the world’s refugees, for whom there is the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), which deals with their welfare. Sherman mentions the essential differences between UNHCR mandate and UNHCR practice that allow the situation of Palestinian refugee status to continue for decades while the international refugee status ends much sooner. This reality means that there is “no way to escape a process that is passed down from generation to generation and the numbers continue to grow while the numbers of other refugees continually decline.”

Another important point of Sherman’s thesis is that there is no solution for the “refugee” problem as long as UNHCR still finds solutions for Palestinian refugees only and the state of origin, meaning the Land of Israel. According to him, the State of Israel to be a Jewish national state, Sherman states that “Every Palestinian organization that we have encountered, including the UNHCR, describes, he suggests to the government of Israel to award emigration allowances that determine the fact that those who use them must submit to procedures regarding the Arabs of Judea and Samaria and, perhaps in the future, in Gaza, and the Palestinians in the Diaspora as well.”

UNRWA perpetuates the problem. If they would apply the accepted world definition of “refugee” to Palestinian refugees, their numbers would decrease from five million to fifty thousand, mostly octogenarians and others who are still young. Sherman rejects the “Two-State” vision that is not suitable to the demographic reality, which does not lend itself to division. He also refutes the vision of a “state of all its citizens” and is interested in maintaining the State of Israel as a Jewish national state, Sherman believes that the UN and the nations of the world must be called on to extend refugee status to the Palestinian refugees, distinct from the rest of the world’s refugees, for whom there is the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), which deals with their welfare. Sherman mentions the essential differences between UNHCR mandate and UNHCR practice that allow the situation of Palestinian refugee status to continue for decades while the international refugee status ends much sooner. This reality means that there is “no way to escape a process that is passed down from generation to generation and the numbers continue to grow while the numbers of other refugees continually decline.”

Another important point of Sherman’s thesis is that there is no solution for the “refugee” problem as long as UNHCR still finds solutions for Palestinian refugees only and the state of origin, meaning the Land of Israel.

Sherman believes that Prime Minister Netanyahu has already psychologically resigned himself to the idea of unilateral withdrawal and that “the only way that he is now prepared to make is the transfer of the infrastructure.”

The UN and the nations of the world must be called upon to dismantle UNRWA, the special refugee organization that was established for the Palestinian refugees, distinct from the rest of the world’s refugees.
Don't In for a Frequent Changes with the 'One-State' Solution

Prof. Kontorovich from the Northwestern University in Law in Chicago during his lecture at Shdema in Gush Etzion: "They threaten that if we don't accept the 'Two-State' concept we will have to implement the 'One-State' concept, but this idea should only frighten the Palestinians themselves, and they know it well."
Abu Mazen does not renounce terror. He praises and encourages the bombers and describes them as heroes and a model for his people. This is a man who seeks peace? He advocates killing and bloodshed and for him, peace is only a hudna, which can be terminated at any time. And until then, there is certainly no need to rush into establishing a Palestinian state in Judea and Samaria.
Women in Green Mourn the Loss of Mordechai Aharoni, Z"L

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

Mordechai first came to Gush Etzion as a youth, when he and his friends were called upon to establish Kibbutz Ein Tzurim, in the days of the British Mandate. His love for the Land and a drive to establish communities remained with him even decades afterward. For many years Mordechai supported the ongoing struggle to cling to the land of Gush Etzion. Despite his age, Mordechai came to these hills always, whether in the blazing sun or pouring rain or raging winds or freezing cold, to encourage the Jewish pioneers and fortify them.

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

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

Mordechai used his sense of humor as an important tool to win over his listeners, adults and youth alike. He was always in good spirits. Always willing to help and he would say to us again and again, “Come to me, ask me, and I will search it out for you, I will check and I will find what you are looking for.” Unfortunately, we were not able to ask him everything, so we did not get all the answers, not even a small amount of the vast knowledge that he had accumulated about the history of the land of Gush Etzion. We did not hasten to request the information, perhaps because, in our eyes, Mordechai would be young forever, and that is how we will remember him always.

Solomon’s Pools

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

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

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

The system of aqueducts leading to Jerusalem, which we know about from biblical sources as well as from archeological findings, are the most complex and longest in the 19th century a system of aqueducts with multiple branches leading to Jerusalem was discovered, in the center of which were the three Pools of Solomon, which could hold approximately three hundred thousand cubic meters.

Two aqueducts led to Solomon’s Pools: the Lower Aqueduct, whose source was in the springs of Wadi al-Arroub, and, about 30 meters higher, the Upper Aqueduct, which brought water from Nahal HaPringim, in Arabic Wadi al-Bir (cisterns). The water flowed from the pools via three aqueducts to three main destinations: the first aqueduct - which had its source in Eitam Spring - leads to the Temple Mount with the Temple in the center, the second leads to the Citadel and Herod’s Palace in upper Jerusalem and the third aqueduct went out from the Pools of Solomon eastward, passed the village of Artas, and brought water to the large pool that was built at the foot of Herod’s Citadel in the desert, in the center of the lower city that King Herod established here.

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

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