Adalah Briefing Paper:
Key Concerns Regarding the Rights of Palestinians in Israel and the OPT
Submitted to the EU for the 2013 ENP Progress Report

15 October 2013

Introduction

Adalah is submitting this briefing paper to provide information to the EU in its preparation of the ENP Progress Report on Israel covering the year 2013. The paper highlights key concerns of Adalah that are relevant to the progress made on the EU-Israel Action Plan concerning the human rights of Palestinian citizens of Israel and Palestinian residents living under Israeli occupation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory (OPT). The paper demonstrates that the human rights situation of the Palestinian minority in Israel and the Palestinians in the OPT deteriorated in several areas, both materially and structurally, in 2013. It discusses the following main issues:

1. Forced displacement on both sides of the Green Line:
   A. The Prawer-Begin Plan to destroy the unrecognized Bedouin villages in the Naqab
   B. Implementation of the Absentees’ Property Law in East Jerusalem
2. New discriminatory and anti-democratic legislation
3. Arab children’s rights in Israel
4. Discrimination in budgets and employment
5. Racist incitement against Palestinians
6. Ban on family unification

1. Forced displacement on both sides of the Green Line

Israel is continuing to pursue a policy of forced displacement against Palestinian citizens of Israel and Palestinians in the OPT, who are ‘protected persons’ under international humanitarian law. Forced displacement or eviction is the “involuntary removal of persons from their homes or land, directly or indirectly attributable to the State.”1 States can only forcibly displace people in strictly-defined and exceptional circumstances, and always with utmost respect for their fundamental rights.2 In Israel and the OPT, clear domestic and international legal frameworks theoretically protect Palestinians from forced displacement. However, in practice Israel suspends these rights to maintain its control over the maximum area of land, containing the minimum number of Palestinians. To this end, Israel has constructed legal frameworks that enable the state to pursue its policy of forced displacement against Palestinians through ‘legal’ means.

1 UN OHCHR, Fact Sheet No. 25, “Forced Evictions and Human Rights,” May 1996.
2 UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, General Comment 7: Forced Evictions.
A. The Prawer-Begin Plan to destroy the unrecognized Bedouin villages in the Naqab

Prawer Law passes first reading in the Knesset

Despite mounting local and international pressure, the Israeli Government is pressing ahead with the Prawer Plan. Adalah expects that the legislation will be high on the Knesset’s agenda this fall/winter.

On 24 June 2013, the Prawer-Begin Bill passed a first reading by a vote of 43 to 40. Significantly, many parliamentarians who opposed the legislation did so on the ground that it was too ‘generous’ to the Bedouin rather than for any concern about violations of their rights. The law is the legislative arm of the Prawer Plan, which, if fully implemented, will destroy dozens of ‘unrecognized’ Bedouin villages in the Naqab, forcibly displace up to 70,000 Bedouin citizens of Israel (the population of the ‘unrecognized’ villages), confiscate over 800,000 dunams of ancestral Bedouin land in the Naqab/Negev, and impose a resolution of outstanding land claims in the state’s favor.

Despite objections to the plan, the government has refused to seriously consider Bedouin input on the plan/bill, and a post-facto consultation or ‘listening process’ led by former minister Benny Begin abjectly failed to incorporate the Bedouin’s grievances into the final plan.

From Goldberg to Prawer to Begin: No recognition for the unrecognized villages

Contrary to the EU’s view as stated in the ENP Progress Report covering the year 2012, it is important to stress that the denial of recognition to the unrecognized villages was decided previously by the Goldberg Committee. Although the Goldberg Report recommended recognition “as much as possible”, in practice this recommendation is highly misleading, since any recognition is explicitly tied to the parameters of the planning regime. The Regional Master Plan for Be’er Sheva, approved in August 2012 despite strong objections by the Bedouin community, offers minimal scope for recognition. The Master Plan outlines in concrete terms the state’s confiscation of Bedouin land and provides for the eviction and destruction of most of the unrecognized villages.

For example, the Master Plan designates Atir and Umm el-Hieran, home to 1,000 people, as sites for the expansion of the Yatir Forest and the development of the new and exclusively Jewish town of Hiran respectively. Meanwhile, Al-Araqib, home to 350 people, has been designated in the Master Plan for two Jewish National Fund (JNF) forestation projects. Thus these and other unrecognized villages have long been under threat of destruction, whether under the auspices of the Goldberg Report or the Prawer-Begin Plan. Like the Goldberg Report, the Prawer-Begin Plan, too, is grounded in the discriminatory Regional Master Plan for Be’er Sheva. Moreover, like Prawer and Begin, Goldberg took a hardline stance, concluding that the Bedouin had no title over land in the Naqab.

UNCHR Navi Pillay “alarmed” by Prawer Bill

On 25 July 2013, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Navi Pillay issued a statement in which she called on Israel to reconsider the Prawer Law, stating that, “I am alarmed that this bill, which seeks to legitimize forcible displacement and dispossession of indigenous Bedouin communities in the Negev, is being pushed through the Knesset.” She continued, “If this bill becomes law, it will accelerate the demolition of entire Bedouin communities, forcing them to give up their homes, denying them their rights to land ownership, and decimating their traditional cultural and social life in the name of development... The Government [of Israel] must recognize and respect the specific rights of its Bedouin communities, including recognition of Bedouin land ownership claims.”
Considering the urgency of the case, on 20 June 2013, the European Parliament (EP) Subcommittee on Human Rights (DROI) hosted a parliamentary hearing on the human rights situation of the Bedouin and other minorities in Israel, where the Prawer Plan dominated the discussions.

**Bill being pushed forward despite growing criticism**

On 15 July 2013, the Knesset announced that the Internal Affairs Committee had been charged with preparing the bill for its second and third readings. Further readings of the law are expected once the Knesset reconvenes in October 2013.

For more information, see Briefing Paper: The Prawer-Begin Bill and the Forced Displacement of the Bedouin, May 2013; article by Adalah’s Dr. Thabet Abu Rass, Two Years Since Prawer... What’s Next?; Adalah’s Stop Prawer Campaign page.

- **B. Implementation of the Absentees’ Property Law in East Jerusalem**

  The Attorney General (AG), Yehuda Weinstein, has adopted the position that the Absentees’ Property Law (1950) should be applied to the East Jerusalem properties of Palestinians who are resident in the West Bank. On 10 September 2013, the Supreme Court heard civil appeals on this matter. In the run-up to the Supreme Court hearing, Adalah filed an amicus curiae opinion outlining Adalah’s legal position.

  The Absentees’ Property Law (1950) was the main legal instrument used by Israel to take possession of land and other properties belonging to internally displaced Palestinians and refugees after the 1948 War. Under the law, the state took control of any property belonging to absentees and passed to the Custodian of Absentee Property for guardianship, until a political solution for the refugees was reached. This law provides a very broad definition of who is an ‘absentee’; it encompasses the approximately 800,000 Palestinians who fled or were expelled to neighboring countries during and after the 1948 War, as well as many who remained.

  The AG’s agreement to the designation of West Bank residents as ‘absentees’ is not a result of any change in their legal status; indeed, it is nonsensical since they never left their homes. Rather, it is an outcome of a unilateral move by Israel when it decided to annex East Jerusalem to its territory in violation of international humanitarian law (IHL), and to apply Israeli domestic law to this area. The transfer of ownership of their property to the Custodian of Absentees’ Properties (post 1967) would equate to the confiscation of these properties and would allow them to be sold on, thereby severing any link between the owners and their property. This act constitutes a grave violation of Israel’s duties as an Occupying Power. Further, the clear discrimination between Palestinians and Jewish settlers resident in the West Bank (e.g., these property owners are not considered ‘absentees’) violates the principles of non-discrimination set forth in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD), which also applies to the OPT.

  AG Weinstein’s position undermines the status quo that has prevailed for decades. Successive AGs found that the Absentees’ Property Law does not apply to the East Jerusalem property of Palestinians resident in the West Bank.

  At the end of the hearing, the Supreme Court requested that the lawyers for the appellants and Adalah provide additional arguments on the question of, were the court to rule that the application of the Absentees’ Property Law in East Jerusalem was unlawful, whether such a decision should be
applied retroactively or merely prospectively. Arguments on this issue are due in the coming months, and meanwhile the case remains pending.

Lack of transparency
Crucially, there is no basic, public data about these properties. In December 2010, Adalah initiated correspondence with the Custodian of Absentees’ Property, requesting information, inter alia, about the number of properties in East Jerusalem belonging to residents of the West Bank that have been declared absentees’ properties, and how many applications had been made to release such properties. The Custodian claimed that he did not possess this information, and that such information was confidential as its publication might damage the state’s security, foreign relations, public security, and/or the safety of an individual, on the basis of Article 9(a)(1) of Israel’s Freedom of Information Act. The state may be compelled to release this information as part of the civil appeals case noted above.

2. New discriminatory and anti-democratic legislation
Since the new (19th) Knesset began its work in March 2013, MKs have proposed **at least 30 new discriminatory and anti-discriminatory bills** that target the human rights of Palestinians in Israel and the OPT. The bills that Adalah is following closely include:

1. The Prawer-Begin Bill, discussed above;
2. The ‘Contributors to the State’ Bill, which gives preferential treatment to discharged soldiers in employment, rent, purchasing land for housing, the civil service, university admission, student housing and other areas;
3. The Basic Law: Israel, Nation State of the Jewish People Bill, which seeks to change the ‘Jewish and democratic’ definition of the state by subordinating the democratic component to the Jewish component;
4. The Counter-Terrorism Bill, which would entrench many emergency regulations currently in effect into Israeli law, in a move that will significantly undermine the rights of Palestinian ‘security detainees’;
5. The ‘Jenin, Jenin’ Bill, which allows Israeli soldiers to file class action lawsuits against a film director, journalist, or any other individual for defamation regarding criticism of their conduct during military operations in the OPT;
6. A bill to raise the electoral threshold from 2% to 4%, which threatens to squeeze the Arab political parties out of the Knesset without creating safeguards for minority representation in the country’s law-making body; and
7. A new amendment to the compensation law which would further restrict Palestinians from the OPT injured or killed by the Israeli military from filing tort damages claims before Israeli courts.

See a new list of [the most discriminatory bills](#) tabled so far by the current Knesset.

Adalah’s [Discriminatory Laws Database](#) contains approximately 55 discriminatory laws and numerous pending bills in Israel.
3. Rights of Arab children in Israel

As noted by the EU in its ENP progress report on Israel covering the year 2012, children are not recognized as a distinct group with specific needs under Israeli domestic law. Adalah would add that as both members of the distinct group of children and as members of the Arab minority in Israel, Arab children citizens of Israel face multi-layered, overlapping and cumulative forms of discrimination, and consequently merit special consideration and protection.

- **Concluding Observations of the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child**

On 20 June 2013, the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC) issued its **Concluding Observations on Israel**, following its latest review on 3 June 2013. The Committee raised serious concerns about Israel’s violations of the health and education rights of Palestinian Bedouin children, as well as the substantially lower state budget and resources allocated to children belonging to the Palestinian minority in Israel. Highlights of the CRC’s Concluding Observations (CO) relating to the rights of Arab children citizens of Israel include calling upon Israel to:

**Health and Land Rights**
- Take all measures to ensure that all children enjoy the right to the highest attainable standard of health “without discrimination,” including “safe and unconditional access” for children and pregnant women from Bedouin communities in the Negev (CO 54);
- “Unconditionally commit itself to refrain from any actions that would further deprive Palestinian and Bedouin families of their land and of access to safe drinking water, sanitation and food” and “restore confiscated land to Bedouin and Palestinian families and their children” (CO 60);

**Education**
- “Take active measures to ensure the right to education of Bedouin children” (CO 62);
- Adopt a “comprehensive national policy” for early childhood education and development in order to address the “disproportionately low number” of Arab children enrolled in early childhood education (CO 68);

**Budgetary inequalities**
- Ensure that budgetary allocations including for the health sector “no longer discriminate against Arab Israeli families and their children and define strategic budgetary lines for children in disadvantaged or vulnerable situations, in particular Bedouin, Palestinian, [and] Arab Israeli children” (CO 14);

**Discrimination in law**
- “Include the prohibition of discrimination and the principle of equality in its Basic Laws and to undertake a comprehensive review of its legislation and policies to ensure that laws that discriminate against non-Jewish children be repealed without delay” (CO 22);

**Ban on family unification**
- Revoke the Citizenship and Entry into Israel Law and take “immediate measures to ensure that all separated Palestinian children are reunited without delay with both their parents and with
their siblings, and that all family members obtain proper registration to avoid any further risk of separation” (CO 50);

- **Child allowance cuts that have a disparate impact on Arab children**

In a related development, on 5 June 2013 the Supreme Court dismissed Adalah’s petition against a law that imposes cuts to child allowances paid for unvaccinated children. Amendment 113 of the National Insurance Law reduces child allowances by up to 60% for families with children whom have not received all the vaccinated mandated by the Ministry of Health.

The condition of immunization harms children from poor families in areas that lack access to health services due to state neglect, especially the unrecognized Bedouin villages in the Naqab, where health clinics are lacking as a matter of state policy, including ‘mother and child’ clinics (Tipat Halav in Hebrew), which administer vaccinations to young children. The amendment therefore merely further increases the incidence of poverty among children; children from the poorest families are the least able to reach distant clinics to receive vaccinations. In dismissing the case, the court cited “the lack of specific cases of harm done to children”, despite the fact that Adalah provided relevant testimonies from 10 Arab Bedouin women from unrecognized villages. See Adalah’s news update

In a separate development, the proposed national budget for 2013-2014 stipulates sharp reductions in monthly child allowances. For example, a family with four children currently receives NIS 1,938 per month in child allowances, a figure that will drop to 840 NIS under the new system. The proposed cuts will hit the neediest families the hardest. Based on information released by the Israeli National Insurance Institute, 860,900 children in Israel live below the poverty line, **more than half** of whom are Arab. The cuts in child allowances will widen the socio-economic gaps between the various population groups in Israel, contrary to Israel’s commitments as a member of the OECD.

4. **Discrimination in budgets and employment**

- **Budgetary preference for Jewish towns and the illegal West Bank settlements**

Despite the socio-economic gaps that separate Arab and Jewish communities in Israel, the government continued to prioritize Jewish towns and villages in its state budgets in 2013, based on political considerations. On 4 August 2013, for example, the Israeli Cabinet approved a list of new ‘National Priority Areas’ (NPAs) consisting of 20 new Jewish towns, nine of which are settlements in the Occupied West Bank. NPAs are municipal regions designated by the government to receive significant tax cuts, special benefits and funds for housing, education and culture, as well as tax exemptions, special mortgage rates and other lucrative subsidies.

The most serious aspect of this policy is that governmental ministries themselves designate the NPAs, and decide the benefits and support that they receive. Thus, these benefits are not awarded based on socio-economic need or fairness, but on political considerations.

In June 2013, Adalah sent letters to the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Culture and Sport to request a list of towns given NPA status, which had actually received funds and benefits, and for a detailed breakdown of these benefits to enable a direct comparison between what Jewish towns had received versus what Arab towns had received. Adalah has not received a clear response.
This lack of transparency in its resource allocation between Jewish and Arab communities in Israel has been consistently criticized for being discriminatory against Arab citizens. In 1998 and 2003, Adalah filed petitions to the Supreme Court on behalf of the High Follow-Up Committee for Arab Citizens of Israel challenging the government’s designation of NPAs. Adalah argued that the government’s designation of NPA status was arbitrary and discriminatory; of the 553 designated NPAs, only four small towns were Arab, although the alleged purpose of the NPAs was socio-economic need. In 2006, in a landmark decision, the Supreme Court declared the government’s policy regarding the designation of NPAs in the field of education illegal, and ruled that the Knesset should legislate in such matters as they involved the massive allocation of state resources. The government’s new designation concerning NPAs seemingly contradicts the Supreme Court’s ruling. For more information, see Adalah’s news update

- Still very few Arab women in the civil service

As the EU notes in its ENP progress report covering the year 2012, the state has not met its targets set for the employment of Arab citizens in the civil service. It is particularly dire in the case of Palestinian women citizens of Israel, of whom just 20.5% participate in the labour market as a whole, according to a study by the Bank of Israel from March 2012. While Jewish women have made substantial gains in the civil sector, Palestinian women still hold a negligible number of government positions. However, the percentage of Palestinian women among civil service employees is as low as 1.8%, even though they comprise 10% of the state’s population. This figure contrasts sharply with the 56.6% of civil service employees who are Jewish women, according to a report published by the Civil Service Commission in 2011. The following table, also published by the Israel Civil Service Commission, details the representation of women in various government ministries.

*Arab Women in the Civil Service in the Years 2006-2011 (Israel Civil Service Commission)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government ministry</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Arab women relative to all employees</td>
<td>% of Jewish women relative to all employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry, Trade and Labor</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy and Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Housing</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The very modest gains made in Palestinian women’s employment in governmental ministries over the five-year period between 2006 and 2011 demonstrate the government’s lack of commitment to its own targets.

Indeed, the previously-cited ‘Contributors to the State’ Bill, which favours former soldiers in civil service appointments (see above), for example, would make it even more difficult for Palestinian citizens of Israel, including women, to find employment in the public sector.

- The use of military service to exclude Arab citizens from the labor market

The military service requirement remained a major obstacle in 2013 for Palestinian citizens seeking employment in public and private workplaces in Israel, especially in senior positions. Palestinian citizens are exempt from serving in the army for historical and political reasons. In many cases, military service is an irrelevant and its use constitutes racial discrimination against Palestinian citizens of Israel.

For example, Arab applicants for positions in high-tech companies in Israel are routinely discriminated against for not performing military service. As a result, they account for just 0.3% of all high-tech workers, based on statistics issued by the Knesset Research Center in July 2010. In addition to the military service requirement, Arab applicants face additional hurdles such as the fact that a majority of Palestinians live in the north and the south, a great distance from most high-tech companies near Tel Aviv. Following reports in April 2013 that Minister of Trade and Economy Naftali Bennett had announced during a conference of the Israel Advanced Technology Industries union that the number of ultra-Orthodox Jews working in high-tech companies would soon rise dramatically, Adalah wrote to him to request that he also work to break down all barriers to the participation of Arab citizens of Israel in the country’s high-tech sector. For more information, see Adalah’s letter to Naftali Bennett, the Minister of Economy and Labor.

In a similar case, the Israeli Airports Authority imposes the military service requirement for the employment of baggage handlers at its facilities. A recent job advertisement for baggage handlers at Ben-Gurion Airport stated military service as one of the primary qualifications, although the specification makes clear that the job consists mainly of moving bags and carts. Preventing Arab Palestinians from applying for work at the airport constitutes discrimination on the basis of national belonging, and violates Equal Employment Opportunities Law as well as the Basic Law - Freedom of Occupation. The Basic Law acknowledges the right of all people to work in any occupation, position, or field without restrictions except those, which are stipulated in the law. Therefore, the military service condition for work as a baggage handler is illegal and unconstitutional. For more information, see Adalah’s letter to Yaakov Ganout, General Director of the Airport Authority.

5. Racist incitement against Palestinian citizens of Israel

Palestinian citizens of Israel experienced a worrying amount of racist attacks and incitement from Israeli officials and the Israeli public in 2013. These acts have taken the form of racist speech and remarks, physical attacks, destruction of property, racist graffiti and other forms of defamation, frequently expressed by public figures. According to statistics gathered by the Coalition Against Racism, in the months of January-March 2013, there were 45 documented instances of racial incitement against Arab citizens of Israel by elected representatives and public leaders, and 125
documented cases of racism in government institutions, private businesses, and public and private organizations.

These incidents are symptomatic of continuing racist attitudes among sectors of the Jewish-Israeli population towards the Palestinian minority in Israel. The impunity with which racist acts are allowed to occur also demonstrates disturbing official tolerance of this racism. Below are several examples of these trends.

**Racially-motivated assaults on Palestinian citizens:** Two incidents received media coverage in August 2013: one was an attack by a group of young Jewish boys against an Arab bus driver near Tiberias; and one was the writing of a hate slogan on an Arab family’s home in Rakefet. The family in Rakefet was prominent for having taken their residency application to the Supreme Court (by Adalah) after the village admissions committee rejected their application because they were not “socially compatible” with the community.

**Racist incitement by Minister Naftali Bennett:** In July 2013, a news article cited a conversation between Israeli Minister Naftali Bennett, leader of the right-wing party HaBayet HaYehudi, and National Security Adviser Yaakov Amidror regarding a release of Palestinian prisoners, during which Bennett stated that, “If you catch a terrorist, then you just have to kill him.” Amidror reportedly replied that what Bennett was espousing was illegal, but Bennett disagreed, adding that, “I’ve killed lots of Arabs in my life – there’s no problem with that.” Adalah sent a letter to the Attorney General in which it argued that Minister Bennett’s remarks constituted “praise, words of approval, encouragement, support or identification with an act of violence or terror. No action by the AG or the government has yet been taken on this matter, and Minister Bennett has not issued any apology or retraction for his remarks.

**Racist remarks by Upper Nazareth Mayor:** In December 2012, the mayor of Upper Nazareth, Shimon Gapso, stated in a public letter that Nazareth, an Arab city in Israel, “is becoming a den of terrorists in the heart of the Galilee, waiting for the right time to stab the nation in the back.” The letter accused Nazareth’s mayor of organizing anti-state activities, and added that if the matter “were in my hands, I would send the Arab citizens to Gaza, because that is the right place for them.” Mayor Gapso continued making racist remarks against Arabs, including residents of Upper Nazareth, and vowed to continue forbidding the establishment of an Arab school in the city. In an op-ed published in Haaretz on 7 August 2013, Mayor Gapso reaffirmed his views, stating “I’m not afraid to say it out loud, to write it and add my signature, or declare it in front of the cameras: Upper Nazareth is a Jewish city and it’s important that it remains so.” Israeli state prosecutors have consistently refused to open an investigation into his racist remarks. Mayor Gapso will run for his second term in the Israeli municipal elections in October 2013, and has continued to use racist speech in his campaign.

6. **The ban on family unification**

In April 2013, the Knesset extended Israel’s ban on the family unification of Palestinian families inside Israel until 30 April 2014. The Citizenship and Entry into Israel Law, as amended in 2003, prevents spouses of Palestinian citizens of Israel, who are from the West Bank, Gaza Strip, and countries deemed ‘enemy states’ by Israel from living together in Israel. This racist law, which has no parallel in any democratic country, was passed as a temporary order for a period of one year. However, it has been extended continuously since then and exists, practically, as a permanent law. It
has now been in force for over a decade. The law affects thousands of Palestinian Arab citizens of Israel, most of whom are married to Palestinians from the OPT, and infringes on their constitutional right to equality and to family life in Israel. It also constitutes racial discrimination as it bars individuals from family unification solely on the basis of their national and ethnic belonging.

The state alleges that the purpose behind the blanket ban on family unification is to protect Israel from threats to its security. However, the numbers show that the law is totally disproportionate; instead, it is part of Israel’s efforts to maintain a Jewish demographic majority. Moreover, the fact Palestinians from the West Bank may enter Israel in order to work, and that thousands of people receive such permits and enter Israel every day, seriously undermines the state’s security arguments in defense of the law.

The Supreme Court rejected petitions brought by Adalah and other groups against the law in 2003 and against various amendments to the law in 2007. Adalah argued that the law was unconstitutional and violated Palestinians’ rights to citizenship, family life, and to freedom of choice in life partner, dignity and equality. In both cases, the Supreme Court dismissed the petitions in 6-5 decisions issued in 2006 and 2012. The law’s passage in 2003 and the Supreme Court’s failure to strike it down in 2006 and again in 2012 are two of primary causes for the wave of racist legislation that has swept Israel, and for the unprecedented deterioration in both the position of Arab Palestinian citizens of the state, and in the respect given to human rights.

In July 2013, the UN CRC joined other UN human rights treaty bodies in calling on Israel to revoke the law, expressing its “concern that thousands of Palestinian children are deprived of their right to live and grow up in a family environment with both of their parents or with their siblings and that thousands live under the fear of being separated because of the severe restrictions on family reunification under the Citizenship and Entry into Israel Law” (CRC/C/ISR/CO/2-4, para. 50).

See an English translation of the Supreme Court’s 2006 ruling; on the court’s 2012 decision, see article by Adalah’s Hassan Jabareen and Sawsan Zaher, The Israeli Supreme Court’s Decision in the Citizenship Law Case.