

**Refugee Review Tribunal
AUSTRALIA**

RRT RESEARCH RESPONSE

Research Response Number: ISR31732
Country: Israel
Date: 24 May 2007

Keywords: Israel – Military service – Reservists – Conscientious objectors – Deserters

This response was prepared by the Country Research Section of the Refugee Review Tribunal (RRT) after researching publicly accessible information currently available to the RRT within time constraints. This response is not, and does not purport to be, conclusive as to the merit of any particular claim to refugee status or asylum.

Questions

- 1. Please provide information on the military service system in Israel, the reservists' system and obligations of reservists and details about desertion.**
- 2. What provisions are made for pacifists?**

RESPONSE

- 1. Please provide information on the military service system in Israel, the reservists' system and obligations of reservists and details about desertion.**

Military service and the obligations of reservists

The sources consulted indicate that all Israeli citizens and permanent residents of both genders are liable to perform compulsory military service for periods up to three years, and to be on call for reserve duties for varying numbers of years after that. No provision is made for alternatives to military service for conscientious objectors, but there are a number of categories of persons who are exempt from service.

A February 2006 RRT Research Response looks in detail at the military service system in Israel. Question 1 of the response draws on material from the Economist Intelligence Unit, the US Department of State and the Mahal2000 website, which provides information about a program enabling young overseas Jews to volunteer for service in the IDF. Points of note include:

- Israel has always been reliant on a strong system of conscription and reserve duty, due to the perceived military threat from neighbouring countries.
- Of the Israeli Defence Force (IDF)'s estimated strength of 167,000 in 2003, 107,500 were conscripts.
- Terms of service are 48 months for officers, 36 months for servicemen, and 24 months for women.

- After military service, released soldiers continue to serve as reservists, contributing one month per year. Theoretically, this may continue into their early 50s, although in practice it usually ceases by the early 40s.
- Exemptions are typically granted to religious students, married women or women with children, and those with medical or psychological conditions, as well as other categories [please see Question 2 for further details on exemptions].
- Service is not compulsory for Israeli Arabs, although a small number do volunteer. It is compulsory for Druze and Circassian communities (RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Request ISR23829*, 2 February – Attachment 1).

One of the sources which the above Research Response draws on is a 2003 paper by Andreas Speck for War Resisters International. Of the system in general it states:

Conscription exists since the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948. The present legal basis of conscription is the 1986 National Defence Service Law. All Israeli citizens and permanent residents are liable to military service. However, the Ministry of Defence has used its discretion under Art 36 of this law to automatically exempt all non-Jewish women and all Palestinian men except for the Druze from military service ever since Israel was established. Palestinian Israelis may still volunteer to perform military service, but very few (especially among the Bedouin population of Israel) do so. Military service lasts for three years in the case of men, and for 20-21 months in the case of women. It lasts longer for officers and certain specialists, such as doctors and nurses. New immigrants are given a two-year 'absorption period', but can be called up for military service during this period. They are conscripted for similar or shorter periods, according to their age, gender, and status as 'potential immigrants' or 'immigrants'. Reserve service is required up till the age of 51 in the case of men (54 for officers) and up till 24 in the case of women. Reservist duty involves one month training annually. Traditionally the reserve service has been considered a very important aspect of Israel's defence policy, indeed an important aspect of building a national identity. Since the 1980s attitudes seem to have changed somewhat. Men of over 35 are often not called up for reserve training, as they are considered medically unfit. Usually men are finally discharged at the age of 41 or 45. Women are as a rule not called up for reserve training at all (Speck, Andreas 2003, 'Conscientious objection to military service in Israel: an unrecognised human right', War Resisters' International website, 3 February, p.3 <http://wri-irg.org/pdf/co-isr-03.pdf> – Accessed 24 January 2006 – Attachment 2).

Question 1 of a 2003 RRT Research Response looked at the particular situation of new immigrants to Israel, and whether they are liable for military service. It draws on material from Amnesty International, the Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada and War Resisters International which indicates that in general new immigrants are granted an "absorption period" of up to two years before they are obliged to serve (RRT Country Research 2003, *Research Response ISR15895*, 1 May – Attachment 3).

The full text of the 1986 Israeli Defence Service Law, which was accessed from the Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs website in October 2006, is attached ('Defence Service Law - Consolidated Version 5746-1986' (undated) Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs, http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/MFAArchive/1980_1989/Defence%20Service%20Law%20-Consolidated%20Version--%205746-1 – Accessed 31 October 2006 – Attachment 4).

Also attached is a 2000 fact sheet on the IDF from the same website ('Subjects Relating To The IDF', 2000, Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs website, 9 August, <http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/About+the+Ministry/Consular+affairs/idf.htm?DisplayMode=print> – Accessed 31 October 2006 – Attachment 5).

[Both documents are still currently available on the Ministry of Foreign Affairs website.]

Penalties for desertion/evasion of military service

The following material discusses the penalties for various forms of avoidance of military service, including refusal to perform reserve duties.

The 2003 paper by Andreas Speck for War Resisters International states of the penalties for avoiding military service:

According to the National Defence Service Law, art 35 (a) (2), failure to fulfil a duty imposed by the National Defence Service Law is punishable by up to two years' imprisonment.

Attempting to evade military service is punishable by up to five years' imprisonment. Refusal to perform reserve duties is punishable by up to 56 days' imprisonment, the sentence being renewable if the objector refuses repeatedly.

Helping someone to avoid military service is punishable by a fine or up to two years' imprisonment.

Those who disobey call-up orders are regarded as refusing to perform military service and can thus be sentenced to up to five years' imprisonment. In practice sentences do not exceed more than a year's imprisonment. In practice, conscientious objectors are sentenced on one of the following charges: refusing to obey an order, absence without leave, desertion, or refusal to be mobilised.

If an application for exemption from military service is rejected, the individual is ordered to perform military or reserve service. Continued refusal may lead to being disciplined or court-martialled. As stated above, there is no clearly discernible pattern to decision-making in cases of people refusing to serve. Military courts have sentenced objectors to up to one-and-a-half years' imprisonment. Sentences are frequently much shorter, but may be imposed repeatedly. They may be from seven to 35 days' imprisonment, and they may be renewed as much as five times. After they leave prison people may either be 'forgotten' or exempted. Usually COs get exempted after serving a total of more than 90 days in prison. However, this practice is changing, and recently conscientious objectors were sentenced again and again after having spent more than 150 days in prison.

It has been reported in the past that Druze objectors are apt to receive exceptionally severe sentences for draft evasion and desertion.

Since October 2000, more than 181 conscientious objectors spent time in prison – the majority (151) refusing reserve duty in the Occupied Territories (selective conscientious objection).

While the sentences for refusing to perform reserve duty in the Occupied Territories mainly remained constant – normally 28 days, with some cases of 14 or 21 days, and some cases of 35 days – the sentences for draft evasion increased. It can be seen that the average was below 90 days for draft resisters who were called up in 2001, those who were called up in 2002 received sentences of more than 100 days on average, with average sentences climbing to more than 140 days for those called up from August 2002 onwards (the figures for December 2002 and January 2003 are misleading, as these draft resisters haven't received their last prison sentence yet.).

The increase of sentences is the result of repeated imprisonment. Before 2002, draft resisters were usually sentenced 4 or at maximum 5 times, until they had spent at least 90 days in prison. Eventually they are sent to the "Unsuitability Committee" that usually exempts them on grounds of 'unsuitability for military service'. The decision to refer a draft resister to this committee is with the 'Classification Officer'.

In some cases a classification officer referred a draft resister to the Unsuitability Committee even before 90 days in prison were reached. For those draft resisters who were called up in 2002 the situation changed. Victor Sabranski, who was called up in May 2002, spent 126 days in prison. Those who were called up from August 2002 on spent even more days in prison, being sentenced five, six, seven, or even more times, with no end in sight³⁹. In the case of Jonathan Ben-Artzi, who is presently serving a seventh prison term, the decision was transferred to the Head of the Manpower Department of the IDF, an indication that the increase in sentencing is a change of policy.

It is especially worrying that repeated imprisonment of conscientious objectors is on the increase in Israel. This is in contradiction to UN Commission on Human Rights Resolution 2002/45, which explicitly took note of “recommendation 2 made by the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention in its report (see E/CN.4/2001/14, chap. IV, sect. B), aimed at preventing the judicial system of States from being used to force conscientious objectors to change their convictions” (Speck, Andreas 2003, ‘Conscientious objection to military service in Israel: an unrecognised human right’, War Resisters’ International website, 3 February, p.8 <http://wri-irg.org/pdf/co-isr-03.pdf> – Accessed 24 January 2006 – Attachment 2).

The same report includes a table of information on the lengths of prison sentences for those refusing service (p.9); a graph of average sentences from 2001-2003 (p.10); and list of those imprisoned at the time of writing and their sentences (pp.11-19) (Speck, Andreas 2003, ‘Conscientious objection to military service in Israel: an unrecognised human right’, War Resisters’ International website, 3 February <http://wri-irg.org/pdf/co-isr-03.pdf> – Accessed 24 January 2006 – Attachment 2).

Chapter Six of the 1986 Israeli *Defence Service Law* deals with Offences and Procedure under the law, including information on penalties and onus of proof (‘Defence Service Law - Consolidated Version 5746-1986’ (undated) Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs, http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/MFAArchive/1980_1989/Defence%20Service%20Law%20Consolidated%20Version--%205746-1 – Accessed 31 October 2006 – Attachment 4).

Question 4 of the 2006 RRT Research Response examines the penalties for refusing military call ups. Aside from the War Resisters report quoted above, it draws on Amnesty International reports from 2006 listing the names of imprisoned conscientious objectors; a 2004 report from the UN Human Rights Commission; a 2005 report from the Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada; and a 2004 War Resisters report on the trial of some conscientious objectors. The material indicates that those who refuse service on the basis of objections to Israel policy on the Occupied Territories – called *refuseniks* – are more likely to receive prison sentences than those claiming to be “pure” pacifists, who are eventually exempted from service if they persist (RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Request ISR23829*, 2 February – Attachment 1).

The War Resisters website contains several recent reports from Israel on the short but sometimes repeated prison terms for people refusing military call-ups:

- ‘Woman CO Hadas Amit sentenced to second prison term of 10 days’ 2007, War Resisters’ International website, 2 January <http://www.wri-irg.org/news/alerts/msg00077.html> – Accessed 24 May 2007 – Attachment 6.
- ‘Fifth prison term for woman CO Hadas Amit’ 2007, War Resisters’ International website, 19 February <http://www.wri-irg.org/news/alerts/msg00079.html> – Accessed

24 May 2007 – Attachment 7.

- ‘Occupation refuser sent to prison’ 2006, War Resisters’ International website, 17 October <http://www.wri-irg.org/news/alerts/msg00069.html> – Accessed 24 May 2007 – Attachment 8.
- ‘Objector Uri Natan sentenced to 14 days in military prison again’ 2006, War Resisters’ International website, 13 March <http://www.wri-irg.org/news/alerts/msg00059.html> – Accessed 24 May 2007 – Attachment 9.

Refuser Solidarity Network website www.refusersolidarity.net carries updated information on current numbers of refuseniks in prison at http://www.yeshgvul.org/jail_e.asp?past=1

Reservists who evade call up by staying overseas

It was not clear from the available material whether a reservist who was overseas would be obliged to return to Israel if there was a call up of reservists.

A letter was sent to Ms Rachel Hani, the Consul at the Israeli Embassy in Canberra, on 1 May 2007 asking whether a man who had completed his three years of compulsory military service and travelled overseas would be obliged to return to Israel if he was called up for reserve service; whether there was a call up for overseas reservists during the conflict with Lebanon in 2006; and if so, whether such a person would be liable for any penalties on return to Israel (RRT Country Research 2007, Letter to the Embassy of Israel, 1 May – Attachment 10).

Information added on 26 June 2007.

On 26 June 2007, a reply was received from the Embassy of Israel, enclosing answers from the Israel Defence Forces Strategic Division to the questions on reserve service:

Regarding your request from the Israeli embassy on the subject of Reserve Recruitment, the following is the response provided by the IDF Human Resources Branch:

1. The IDF does not command soldiers who reside overseas to return for reserve duty.
2. A soldier who receives a call up order before he has planned his departure from Israel (i.e. purchased his tickets) is required to serve his reserve duty unless he has been released from his unit.
3. Because the Population Registry is often unreliable (Passport control), a situation could occur where the soldier could receive a call-up order or interpolation to his home. If the soldier is abroad at the time he is summoned, than (sic) the call-up order is null and void.
4. Emergency call-up orders were not issued to reserve soldiers residing abroad during the Second Lebanon War.
5. Let it be pointed out that in every emergency event, there were independent requests from reserve soldiers residing abroad to be drafted to reserve duty (Embassy of Israel, Canberra 2007, Information on reserve duty from the Israel Defence Forces Strategic Division, 21 June – Attachment 14).

2. What provisions are made for pacifists?

The sources consulted indicate that there are no provisions such as alternate forms of service for conscientious objectors under Israeli law. However, persons who are deemed to be genuine conscientious objectors may be granted exemption from service: one issue involved here is whether the person is an “absolute” pacifist or whether they object to performing military service on “political” grounds, such as in the Occupied Territories. There is also some evidence that the large number of draftees who are granted medical exemptions may include people who are simply unwilling to serve.

A 2005 document entitled ‘Conscientious Objection’ from the website of the Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs provides the government’s legal position:

3. The IDF will respect the views of a conscience objector, provided that it is satisfied that these views are genuine. To this end, a special military committee, headed by the IDF’s Chief Recruitment Officer, or his deputy, hears the application of those who wish to be exempted from the army on the basis of conscience objection. Among the members of this committee are an officer with psychological training, a member of the IDF attorney’s office and a civilian expert on conscience objection.

4. The willingness to grant an exemption from the army due to conscience objection stems from the fact that the State sees the freedom of conscience as a fundamental human right and this attitude is integral to a tolerant society, regarding objection as a human phenomenon.

5. The High Court of Justice has addressed the issue of conscience objection in H.C.J. 7622/02, *David Zonsien v. Judge-Advocate General*. The Court here held that the difficulty lies in balancing between conflicting considerations: the duty to pay appropriate respect to the individual conscience of the objector, stemming from the right of individual dignity, and the consideration that it is neither proper nor just to exempt individuals from a general duty imposed on all other members of society.

6. A very fine line divides between the two main fundamental values of society: the freedom and protection of the individual and the value of equality and order in society. The duty of army service is a civil duty of every citizen that is explicitly stated in the Law. It is extremely difficult to decipher where an objection is a conscience objection, and therefore acceptable, and when to deny the exemption.

7. In a recent decision of the high Court of Justice from August, 2004, (H.C.J. 2383/04 *Liora Milo v. Minister of Defense et al.*) the Court emphasized that once it is clear that the objection stems from genuine motives, there is a need to distinguish whether the case is a conscience objection case or non-fulfillment of a civil duty. The latter has a “protest nature” to it and is perpetuated by ideological and political opinions with the intention of influencing change in State policy, usually performed in public by numerous people trying to get a message across to the authorities. The individual’s needs and consciousness are not the reasons standing behind this phenomenon.

8. The Court here affirmed that exemption from army service, in the case where conscience objection is proven, is granted to men and women alike in the context of the abovementioned Section 36, according to the balances set in H.C.J David Zonsien, mentioned above.

9. The conscience objection is compelled by personal and specific motives. The purpose behind the objection is not to change state policy, it stands on its own as a completely

individual decision with personal reasons. The individual has no interest in influencing others to join him.

10. Furthermore, the Court here distinguishes between a general objection and a selective objection. The general objection that is acceptable has no relation to the circumstances of time and place or to the army's policy, but rather stems from the lack of correlation between the individual and the nature of the army service. The selective objection is the result of ideological and political beliefs and is directly linked to the time and place where duties need to be performed by the army (objection to fulfill duties at a specific place, time or manner). Inherent in the army system is the fact that individuals do not choose what commands to fulfill or not. The selective objection alerts discrimination and dismantles the unity existent in the defense forces inherent in its nature.

11. The IDF is non-political. Soldiers are not permitted to engage in partisan politics while in uniform. Nevertheless, as citizens of a democracy, soldiers are permitted to be members of political parties and to advocate change in government policies. IDF Soldiers, just as all Israeli citizens, are encouraged to vote in national elections. By voting and exercising their individual right to party membership, soldiers are able to participate in the democratic process with the intention of achieving change.

12. Nevertheless, it is absolutely imperative to differentiate between the duty of fulfilling a command and political debate. Incorporating political values and opinions in the IDF drafting policy, will damage the basic values of the security service. Acceptance of selective objections will discriminate between individuals and in effect harm the democratic system based on equality.

13. Note that the disciplinary measures that Israel takes against objectors who are illegally refusing to fulfill their duties are lenient in nature. This, despite the imminent security threat, which places a higher value on the preparedness of each individual soldier in its comparatively small army ('Conscience Objection' 2005, Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs website, 13 July

<http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/Government/Law/Legal+Issues+and+Rulings/Conscience%20Objection%2013-Jul-2005> – Accessed 1 May 2007 – Attachment 11).

The 2003 report by Speck for War Resisters International notes that “applications by absolute pacifists are believed as a rule to be more apt to be granted than those made by partial objectors”, that is, persons who may object to serving in the Occupied Territories. Further, “an application is more likely to be granted if it has not been the focus of public attention, as the authorities are not keen on CO cases turning into political cases”. (Speck, Andreas 2003, ‘Conscientious objection to military service in Israel: an unrecognised human right’, War Resisters’ International website, 3 February, p.6 <http://wri-irg.org/pdf/co-isr-03.pdf> – Accessed 24 January 2006 – Attachment 2).

A 2005 Canadian Research Response notes that no alternative service is provided, and discusses the issue of objection on political grounds:

In a February 2004 statement to the UN Commission on Human Rights, the International Federation of Human Rights Leagues (Fédération internationale des ligues des droits de l’homme, FIDH) noted that the student courts-martial marked the first time that this procedure had been used “since the 1970’s” (UN 10 Mar. 2004). In addition, the FIDH claimed that the use of this “strategy may be the result of the sharp increase in the number of young refuseniks (those refusing to serve in the Occupied Palestinian Territories), which may become a threat to the image of the Israeli army and policy” (ibid.).

With regard to treatment of COs, the story of an imprisoned student, Jonathen (Yoni) Ben Artzi, was published in Counterpunch, “a bi-weekly muckraking newspaper,” (n.d.) in January 2003 (17 Jan. 2003). According to the article’s author, Professor Yigal Bronner of Tel Aviv University, Ben Artzi faced administrative, legal and social penalties for his refusal to perform military service (Counterpunch 17 Jan. 2003). In the first instance, Ben Artzi’s high school attempted to prevent him from graduating and receiving his diploma (ibid.). Then, a government “conscience-experts” committee ruled that Ben Artzi and his fellow students were “pretending” to be COs, and Ben Artzi, in particular, was labeled as a “troublemaker” (ibid.). Finally, Professor Bronner claimed that opposing military service is viewed as “too subversive a position in Israel” and Ben Artzi “paid a high social price for standing up for his unpopular beliefs” (ibid.). Professor Bronner further mentioned that the military would have excused Ben Artzi from military service for “mental reasons,” if he had relinquished his CO status, something Ben Artzi refused to do (ibid.).

Amnesty International reported that Ben Artzi was released in January 2004 after 196 days in prison, and “eventually exempted from army service” (AI 30 Mar. 2005). However, Artzi faced “further imprisonment for having refus[ed] a military order,” and in April 2004 he was sentenced to two months in military prison and fined about US \$500 (ibid.). According to Amnesty International, Artzi has “appealed the decision to the High Military Court of Appeals and their decision is expected in September [2005]” (ibid.).

In March 2005, AFP reported that about 250 students from various “prestigious schools in the country” signed a petition outlining their refusal to perform military service “while the Jewish state occupies Palestinian territory” (14 Mar. 2005). According to the same article, if the students continued their refusal, they would be liable to discipline, including a possible sentence in military prison (AFP 14 Mar. 2005) (Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada 2005, ‘Israel: Update on ISR36779 of 17 April 2001 on the treatment of conscientious objectors called up for reserve duty or military service (2002 – April 2005)’, UNHCR Refworld website, April <http://www.unhcr.ch/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/rsd/rsddocview.htm?tbl=RSDCOI&id=42df611020> – Accessed 23 January 2006 – Attachment 12).

A recent report by the Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada is of interest. It indicates that while there are no legal provisions for conscientious objectors, a large number of draftees are granted medical exemptions; and some commentators say that these include persons who are simply unwilling to serve:

Draftees who are given a Profile 21 medical classification based on a medical condition that makes them unsuitable for military service are exempt from service in the Israel Defense Forces (IDF) (Haaretz 5 Dec. 2006; The Jerusalem Post 1 Feb. 2006).

New Profile, a pacifist non-governmental organization (NGO) opposed to the military draft, estimates that a quarter of draftees are exempt on medical grounds and that “[i]t is common knowledge that a large proportion of these [draftees] in fact choose not to serve” (n.d.). In August 2006, the Hebrew-language newspaper Maariv reported that some 20 percent of young Israelis eligible for conscription do not enlist in the Israeli army (23 Aug. 2006). That figure is a slight drop from November 2001, when an article appearing in the Irish Times noted that of the total number of Israeli draftees, some 25 percent fail to enlist, and a further 20 percent drop out of the IDF at a later time (6 Nov. 2001). Like New Profile, the article mentions that there are resisters and that the majority of them manage to obtain exemptions under Profile 21, although “Profile 21 people don’t show up in the statistics as draft resisters” (Irish Times 6 Nov. 2001). Similarly, Maariv noted in April 2003 that approximately 20 percent of draftees had either not been conscripted into the defence forces or, once recruited, were exempt from service on medical-psychological grounds. However, in the first three

months of 2003, defence statistics showed a 25 percent drop in the number of soldiers discharged from service on psychiatric grounds, after having been assessed under a Profile 21 classification (Maariv 9 Apr. 2003). The decrease in numbers was the result of an IDF decision to reduce the number of discharges on psychological grounds by classifying some soldiers who used to be discharged under Profile 21 under Profile 41, which indicates that they experience “adjustment difficulties” (ibid.). Soldiers classified under this profile are not discharged from the military but are instead given a lighter service (ibid.).

In a report on the practice of recruiting children, New Profile cited figures from Ynet, the main Hebrew-language Web site of the daily Yediot Ahronot, indicating that some 40 percent of eligible men and 54 percent of eligible women are not conscripted (29 July 2004, 11). A 25 July 2005 article appearing in The Jerusalem Post, citing figures from the IDF, also reported that 42.3 percent of Jewish women “opt out of military service.” Of these, 10 percent drop out for medical reasons or personal “unsuitability,” and 32.1 percent base their claims for opting out on religious beliefs (The Jerusalem Post 25 July 2005). Senior military officials consider this figure suspiciously high (ibid.). Similarly, the Glasgow-based Sunday Herald estimates that only half of eligible women actually serve in the Israeli army: almost 20 percent are exempted because of religious beliefs; 20 percent because they do not meet the educational requirements; and 10 percent because they are married (17 Apr. 2005) (Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada 2007, *ISR102087.E – Israel: Proportion of draftees who are disqualified from military service for receiving a Profile 21 classification or for other reasons (2005-2006)*, 26 February – Attachment 13).

List of Sources Consulted

External

Ms Rachel Hani, Consul, Embassy of Israel Canberra

Internet Sources:

War Resisters’ International website www.wri-irg.org

Refuser Solidarity Network website www.refusersolidarity.net

Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada

Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs <http://www.mfa.gov.il/mfa>

Databases:

ISYS

CISNET

List of Attachments

1. RRT Country Research 2006, *Research Request ISR23829*, 2 February.
2. Speck, Andreas 2003, ‘Conscientious objection to military service in Israel: an unrecognised human right’, War Resisters’ International website, 3 February <http://wri-irg.org/pdf/co-isr-03.pdf> – Accessed 24 January 2006.
3. RRT Country Research 2003, *Research Response ISR15895*, 1 May.
4. ‘Defence Service Law -Consolidated Version 5746-1986’ (undated) Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs, http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/MFAArchive/1980_1989/Defence%20Service%20Law

[%20-Consolidated%20Version--%205746-1](#) – Accessed 31 October 2006.

5. 'Subjects Relating To The IDF', 2000, Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs website, 9 August, <http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/About+the+Ministry/Consular+affairs/idf.htm?DisplayMode=print> – Accessed 31 October 2006.
6. 'Woman CO Hadas Amit sentenced to second prison term of 10 days' 2007, War Resisters' International website, 2 January <http://www.wri-irg.org/news/alerts/msg00077.html> – Accessed 24 May 2007.
7. 'Fifth prison term for woman CO Hadas Amit' 2007, War Resisters' International website, 19 February <http://www.wri-irg.org/news/alerts/msg00079.html> – Accessed 24 May 2007.
8. 'Occupation refuser sent to prison' 2006, War Resisters' International website, 17 October <http://www.wri-irg.org/news/alerts/msg00069.html> – Accessed 24 May 2007.
9. 'Objector Uri Natan sentenced to 14 days in military prison again' 2006, War Resisters' International website, 13 March <http://www.wri-irg.org/news/alerts/msg00059.html> – Accessed 24 May 2007.
10. RRT Country Research 2007, Letter to the Embassy of Israel, 1 May.
11. 'Conscience Objection' 2005, Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs website, 13 July <http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/Government/Law/Legal+Issues+and+Rulings/Conscience%20Objection%2013-Jul-2005> – Accessed 1 May 2007.
12. Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada 2005, 'Israel: Update on ISR36779 of 17 April 2001 on the treatment of conscientious objectors called up for reserve duty or military service (2002 – April 2005)', UNHCR Refworld website, April <http://www.unhcr.ch/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/rsd/rsddocview.htm?tbl=RSDCOI&id=42df611020> – Accessed 23 January 2006.
13. Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada 2007, *ISR102087.E – Israel: Proportion of draftees who are disqualified from military service for receiving a Profile 21 classification or for other reasons (2005-2006)*, 26 February.
14. Embassy of Israel, Canberra 2007, Information on reserve duty from the Israel Defence Forces Strategic Division, 21 June.