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"The danger of national error was engraved in the fact that we are a visionary country. The vision is aimed at changing reality, but the greatness of vision is the reality, that although the vision aims to elevate reality, its feet are always embedded in this reality. This is the difference between the vision and the imagination that shines on the wings of illusions, "wrote Hoshkapat Hercapi in his book on Metasada (1982). There are no statements such as the words of Moshe Buggy in front of the students of the Institute in Beit Shemesh, which is an embodiment of how ignorance of the history of the modern Jewish people and how to ignore the reality and its necessities in order to create illusions is the hoped-for recipe for sliding towards disaster.

"I claim that the borders are drawn by the plow, and the borders are drawn by the children's house." There is no more mythical historical legend than this claim. Of all the Jewish settlements in the Land of Israel, only the hill was the one that influenced the delineation of the borders of Mandatory Palestine. The hill was considered by the British and the French as the historical Dan, which represents the Torah version of the land of Israel "from Dan to Beersheba." It was annexed to its territory and given "the finger of Galilee" in the agreement signed in 1920.

Various proposals for dividing the country between Arabs and Jews were presented several times by various parties and considerations in the years 1922-1947, but they did not materialize. In the partition resolution of 1947, which did not apply, other considerations were included in addition to the distribution of the population, for example in the Negev, between Beersheba and the Gulf of Aqaba, there was no Jewish settlement. However, the Jewish State was allocated to use this area as a wild passage for the Red Sea for export to Africa and East Asia. On the other hand, according to this decision, there should have been at least 33 Jewish settlements in the territory of the Arab state. Because it was located far from the centers of Jewish settlement. Just like the isolated settlements in the West Bank, which there is no possibility of annexing to Israel under the permanent agreement.

Six-Day War

The borders of the State of Israel were defined in Israel's wars and mainly in the War of Independence. Geographer Gideon Baker describes extensively how the "gun war" rather than the "plow plow" is what drew the boundaries. Armistice lines were identified along the lines of troop positions at the end of the war. The areas added to Israel were first and foremost intended to create a logical and wide geographical connection between the three areas allocated to the Jewish state. And the loss of ten Jewish settlements, including the settlement of Gush Etzion, did not discourage Ben-Gurion from ending the war and signing the Armistice Agreement. Settlement in the occupied territories came after the war.

So it is for the Six-Day War. Israel occupied Sinai and the Golan Heights, and the settlers came in the wake of the Israeli army. When Israel preferred a strategic peace with the larger Arab state, it evacuated all the settlements in the Sinai. The Gaza Strip is another example. At a time when Israel realized in Sharon's mandate that it was paying a heavy price for sticking to the isolated settlements in Gaza, it had split.

"In a place where there is no home for children, there is no army." If you want to keep land there must be settlers, "Ya'alon continued. Does the Israeli army keep the Sinai peninsula, which is six times the size of the State of Israel, only for the 7,000 Israelis living there? Did not he evacuate her even though they were there? Is the Negev, which constitutes 60 percent of the territory of the State of Israel, for tens of thousands of Israelis living in southern Beersheba? Did Israel not evacuate Gaza and northern Samaria even though there were settlements and a kindergarten for children? Does not Ya'alon turn the IDF into the IDF for the settlements?

Ya'alon continues to define policies: "We do not settle on every hill. There is enough room for settlements in Judea and Samaria for one million or two million others, and there are enough places that are politically appropriate for us. We are doing this with a balanced policy. "

First, there is no such thing as the Jordan Valley, which embodies the "politically appropriate area" of the Allon plan in 1967 and even the well-known position of Ya'alon, namely, not to evacuate the Jordan Valley in any scenario. After twenty years of occupation and settlement, despite the declaration of Yigal Allon to bring two million Jews to the Jordan Valley and Sharon's declaration of the housing of a million Jews there, this area remained the same as it was at the time of its occupation. A small regional council with 5,000 people. Some of its settlements lost a number of its inhabitants in the past year (such as Hamra, Yvit and Argaman). Or that Ya'alon sees in the site «House of blessing», which was purchased by an American association stands behind the American millionaire Irving Moskowitz and his wife, a politically appropriate area? The site is 40 dunums and is located outside Gush Aseon and adjacent to the al-'Arroub refugee camp, which when he was defense minister approved his annexation to the territory under the jurisdiction of the Gush Etzion Regional Council. Second, where will one million or two million Jews come from? As the Central Bureau of Statistics forecasts that there will be no migration to Israel.

Migration from within Israel

Do you mean immigration from Israel to the West Bank? The data published by the Central Bureau of Statistics indicates a sharp decline in the annual increase of Israelis in Judea and Samaria, from 10.3 percent in 1996 to 3.4 percent in 2016, and indicates a shift in sources of increase. In 1996, 68 percent of the emigration came from the country and in 2016 the migration rate dropped to 22 percent. Even if this trend changes, in the absence of migration, it is about transferring "pocket to pocket" and not because of Jewish natural reproduction, a transfer that creates a reality that requires the creation of a state and the loss of Zionist vision.

Thirdly, where does Ya'alon intend to house them? 52 of the 100 Area C are privately owned Palestinian land recognized by Israel. Is it based on the non-democratic "settlement law"? Or that he intends to send the Israelis to IDF training areas in the Judean Desert?

Settlements in the West Bank are true dictates the eastern borders of the State of Israel. But this would only happen under a permanent agreement. An agreement on the exchange of land between Israel and the Palestinians relates to the central blocs near the Green Line with an area of four hundred and the evacuation of the isolated settlements, which greatly harm Palestinian territorial contiguity and the potential for comprehensive development.

Three things must be emphasized in this context, which reflect the heavy price of the illusions of Ya'alon. First, the exchange of land will not add any one square meter to the territory of the State of Israel because it is linked to a 1: 1 exchange rate. Secondly, the greater the number of these blocs, the more Israeli settlements in the enclave of Gaza, Bisan and Lachish will be required to concede more territory and cease to be collective agricultural settlements. Third, the boundary line will triple in length, from 313 km to about 900 km. This means that the cost of change is too large to be measured with the benefit. The settlement project is the most failed real estate project in the history of Zionism. A project that would lead Israel to harm the future of the settlements it had been involved in, which enjoyed international legitimacy in favor of new settlements, a number of which were established illegally, fraud and theft and without contributing to the security of the State.

Ya'alon's statement about reality and its necessities has no vision but is a dangerous illusion. This situation and circumstances do not resemble the unique process of establishing the State of Israel. The upcoming election campaign, and the unrealistic reality Netanyahu and his colleagues are constantly building, have enabled politicians to continue to show irresponsibility regarding the future of Israeli society and the State of Israel through a number of slogans that have no historical basis or mature future. So beware of these politicians.