

THE DANGERS OF A PALESTINIAN STATE

Inside: Seven
Important
Articles



Zionist Organization of America

www.zoa.org
email@zoa.org

Founded 1897

ZOA
ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA

Dedicated to
Dr. Stanley Benzel Mel Dubin Sylvia Freyer
***Outstanding and relentless advocates
for the Jewish State of Israel***

**Zionist Organization of America
National Board of Directors**

Morton A. Klein, National President

Dr. Michael Goldblatt, Chairman of the Board

Dr. Alan A. Mazurek, Chairman, National Executive Committee

Henry Schwartz, Treasurer

Stanley Kessock, Acting National Executive Director

Arnold Aronoff	Eli Hertz	Stanley Rosenberg, Esq.
Janet Aronoff	Dr. Esther Hirschenbaum	Nina Rosenwald
Dr. Newton Becker	Irwin Hochberg *	Howard Schaerf, Esq.
Dr. Stanley Benzel	Larry Hochberg	David Schoen, Esq. *
Bart Blatstein *	Robert Jacobs	Henry Schwartz *
Dr. Herbert Caskey	Daniel Katz, Esq.	Dr. Zalman Shapiro
Dr. Ben Chouake	Dr. Jerome Kaufman *	Gene Shusman
Lewis Dashe	Hon. Alfred Kleiman	Edward M. Siegel, Esq.
Mel Dubin	Jay Knopf	Henry Silverman, Esq.
Congressman Jon D. Fox	Dr. Arthur Kook	Samuel (Sonny) Sklar
Sylvia Freyer *	Joshua Landes	Martin Sokol
Jack Friedler	Joseph Loshinsky *	Sandra Stein, Esq.
Harvey Friedman	Rubin Margules	Henry Taubenfeld, Esq. *
Dr. Jonathan Gold *	Dr. Alan A. Mazurek *	Henry Z. Ten
Steven Goldberg, Esq. *	Joseph Mermelstein	Jacques Torczyner *
Miriam Goldberger	Jay P. Miller	Ronn Torossian
Dr. Michael Goldblatt *	Cherna Moskowitz	Larry Wenig, Esq.
Taffy Gould	Dr. Irving Moskowitz	
Al Grossberg	Nelson Obus	
Robert Guzzardi, Esq. *	Michael Orbach *	
Prof. Malvina Halberstam	Dr. Rosalie Reich	

* ZOA National Officer

The Dangers of a Palestinian State

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 3 Israeli-Palestinian Peace: Based upon Security, Freedom, and a Change of Heart**
Former U.S. Senator Connie Mack
- 11 A New Palestinian State: Danger Ahead**
Douglas J. Feith
- 14 The Dangers of Establishing a Palestinian State**
Morton A. Klein
- 24 The Myth of Demilitarization**
Bernard Smith
- 31 Israel's Water and Environment in Danger**
Itamar Marcus
- 35 Withdrawing from History**
Michael Freund
- 38 Israeli History in Palestinian Hands**
Shimon Riklin

Israeli and Palestinian Peace: Based upon Security, Freedom, and a Change of Heart

FORMER U.S. SENATOR CONNIE MACK OF FLORIDA

(The text of a speech delivered before the U.S. Senate on March 3, 1999.)

Mr. President, I very recently traveled to Israel. It had been several years since my last visit, and I expected this year we would bring some important measures to the Senate floor. I learned a great deal during the week and I rise today to share a few simple thoughts regarding what I saw and what went through my mind as the week in Israel unfolded.

Let me begin with the question that is on my mind today: How is it possible to engage in peace negotiations with people who maintain the right to obliterate you, who are filled with hatred toward you, and who harbor the dream of one day destroying your homeland? Peace is a matter of the heart. I believe in the depths of every person's heart is a desire to live in peace. But what I saw, which was the outcome of the Palestinian Authority

rule, convinced me that their hearts and minds are set on other goals. The Palestinian leadership does not want peace. They want, first, their own state which they can control with total power. Then they want to use that state to eliminate the State of Israel.

Let's be clear. The peace process, to be meaningful, must be about more than rules and laws and lines on a map. We can reach a short-term agreement on these points, but if the Palestinian leadership fails to abandon incitement of hatred, persecution, and terrorism, then we are all dreaming, only dreaming, and our President's behavior must be labeled foolish appeasement. There will

Former U.S. Senator Connie Mack, Republican of Florida, chaired the Congressional Joint Economic Committee, and was a member of the Senate Finance Committee, the Senate Banking Committee, and the Senate Housing and Urban Affairs Committee. He was also a member of the Peace Accord Monitoring Group, which monitors violations of the Oslo accords.

not be peace until hearts and minds are changed, and we must focus our attention on these issues. Mr. President, many of my colleagues in the Senate and in the House are aware of the promotion of hatred contained in the Palestinian media, and more significantly in the Palestinian schoolbooks. Let me provide some examples.

This is a picture that was taken off of Palestinian Authority-controlled television. It is a picture of a young girl, probably six or seven years old. This is a young girl singing into a microphone. She is on a television show that would be what we would refer to as kind of a Mickey Mouse Club type of show that would be shown to children by the Palestinian Authority. I want to read to you what this little girl is singing. Again, this is a program that was produced by the people who are sitting across the table from you, supposedly negotiating peace. This is what the little girl is singing:

*When I wander into the entrance of Jerusalem,
I'll turn into a suicide
warrior in battledress.*

*In battledress. In
battledress.*

There is no way I can convey to you the emotion of actually seeing that scene on television. There is no way I can put the emotion into what she was expressing and the emotion that she was expressing as she sang those words. And after her song, she got an ovation from her classmates and from her teacher.

This focuses us on the fundamental difference in approach between the Palestinians and the Israelis. I have a grandson about that age, about the age of that little girl. How would I feel if he were being taught hatred in school? If he were being taught hatred on television, how would I feel? How would you feel if your government was teaching your children to hate? Could you conclude

that they were serious about long-term peace with their neighbors?

I also have some examples from Palestinian textbooks for a third-grade grammar lesson. Here is the task: “Complete the following blank spaces with the appropriate word.” And the sentence is, “The Zionist enemy blank civilians with its aircraft.” The “correct” answer is, “The Zionist enemy attacked civilians with its aircraft.” For seventh graders: “Answer the following question: Why do the Jews hate Muslim unity and want to cause division among them? Give an example of the evil attempts of the Jews, from events happening today.” These are from Palestinian textbooks today. One would expect, rather than focus on hatred, if they were serious about peace, they would focus on how the two peoples are working to live side by side. A history book for twelfth graders published only last summer teaches:

“The clearest examples of racist belief and racial discrimination in the world are Nazism and Zionism.”

To see this taking place today is chilling. If you can, think about it in the context of being in Israel and being briefed by a member of the government with respect to what is happening in what they refer to as the anti-incitement committee, which was set up by the Wye Agreement. To be sitting there and seeing this, I must say to you, was chilling. I found it to be extremely chilling.

While the government of Israel makes good-faith efforts to come to a peace agreement, the Palestinian Authority teaches children hatred. This causes me to ask: How can peace be obtained when the children are being taught hatred? Let me share another story. I attended Shabbat dinner at the home of Saul and Wendy Singer in Jerusalem. Saul worked on my staff for seven years

before moving with his wife to Israel. They just had their second child, a girl named Tamar.

Wendy told the story of the day she was checking out of the hospital in Jerusalem, two days after giving birth. In a very ordinary and matter-of-fact way, the hospital gave her the necessities for bringing home a newborn baby. In addition to providing for diapers and other things we would expect, she was handed a gas mask for her baby. It is actually a tent which you put your baby under in case of a chemical weapons attack.

In Israel, this preparation is routine. Everyone in Israel knows to have a gas mask ready. It just becomes a part of the craziness of everyday life. But when you bring home a newborn baby, when you bring home your baby and you get the chemical weapons tent at the hospital, then you realize how unordinary life is in Israel today. You

realize that you are really simply struggling for a normal life, hoping for peace and security, praying to God, while actually living in a war zone.

I had another profound meeting during this week. I met one evening privately—secretly—with Arabs who were being persecuted for their Christian faith. I met with about ten Palestinian Christians. I will tell you just one of their stories, but I will change some of the details to protect the person I am describing.

I remember an energetic man, in his early forties, at the end of the table. I remember him because he seemed so full of life and love. He had a great smile on his face and displayed a wonderful sense of humor. I say this was memorable because, frankly, after hearing what he had been through, I do not know if I could express the sense of peace and love he did. This is his story.

He had many children and very little money. He converted to Christianity in 1993. He clearly loved God, and he loved to tell people about his conversion. He described to me how in 1997, the Palestinian Authority asked him to come to the police station for questioning. When he arrived, he was immediately arrested and detained on charges of selling land to Jews. He denied this charge, since he was very poor and owned no land. He was beaten. He was hung from the ceiling by his hands for many hours. He showed me what I just said. He showed me how his hands were tied behind his back and then raised from the floor and hung that way for many, many hours.

After two weeks, he was transferred to a larger prison where he was held for eight months without trial. He was released in February 1998, after his family borrowed

thousands of dollars to pay off the local authorities. And even though he is free, they are keeping his father in prison. They believe it is for his son's beliefs. He feels his father is being held hostage to prevent him from talking with people about his faith. Needless to say, these Christians met with me at considerable risk. They conveyed to me a message of fear and desperation. But their mere presence in the room with me demonstrated their hope, and it also caused me to ask, how can the people of Israel find peace with the Palestinian Authority while the Palestinian Authority engages in coercion and torture based upon religious beliefs?

I also met with the parents of American children killed by Palestinian terrorists. In this meeting, I was struck by the courage displayed by these families after suffering the tremendous loss of a child brutally murdered. These families told me of the

hopes and dreams they had for their children. I couldn't help thinking about my own. My daughter, Debbie, traveled with me on this trip. She was in the room as these stories of brutality and murder were related. There was scarcely a dry eye in the room.

I am sure Debbie was thinking about her three little boys, ages 14, 11, and 5. We were moved by the comments made by the parents as they described to us what had happened.

I understand that the Palestinian Authority knows a great deal about these murderers, but they are not being punished. Some of them have gone to trial and were sentenced, but we don't know if they remain in prison. I was told that we know some have been released.

There are reports that the Palestinian Authority allows them to leave prison each day and return in the evening—

like free room and board more than like prison. I was also presented with stories of the lionization of these murderers in the press and again in the classrooms. Try to imagine how you would feel, try to imagine what would be going through your mind when you are dealing with the grief of the loss of your child. You know who is responsible. You saw them go on trial. You saw them then released. You have to ask yourself, what are we going through this peace process for?

I would like to mention one story of many that I heard. Mrs. Dassberg sat directly across the table from me. When she told us of the loss of her daughter and son-in-law, the lesson of these murders became so clear—we must fight terror and we cannot back off.

Mrs. Dassberg's family, her daughter, American son-in-law, and their nine-month-old daughter, attended a wedding in central Israel on June 9,

1996. They decided not to bring their two-year-old daughter along. Thank God. On the way home from the wedding they were stopped by Palestinian terrorists and killed in a so-called drive-by shooting. Fifty bullets were found to have been used in this murder, and yet, by some miracle, the baby survived. Even with a crime this gross, the Palestinian Authority did not arrest everyone involved or suspected in the shooting. One of those who remained free, it is believed, later took part in the bombing of the Apropos Café, killing many others.

Another suspected killer, according to the Israeli Justice Ministry, was under arrest but given permission to come and go as he pleases from prison. Mohammed Dief, another suspected Palestinian terrorist, took part in the murder of two other Americans, at two different times, according to the mothers

with whom I spoke. Mrs. Sharon Weinstock lost her 19-year-old son in a drive-by shooting masterminded by Dief. And only a year later, Mrs. Wachsmann told me of the kidnap-murder of her son, also believed to have been planned by Dief.

I am told Mohammed Dief remains a free man today. The obvious lesson—terrorists kill and those who are not jailed remain free to kill and to kill again, thanks to the Palestinian Authority.

How would I feel in their place? I couldn't keep the thought from my mind, as I listened. If I had lost a child and knew that the murderer or accomplices were on the loose, how would I feel? And if I knew the killer remained free to kill other people's children, how would I feel? It is so hard, hard to even consider, but I do know that I left there committed to doing whatever I could to help each of those families.

Once again, I began to

better understand the way the Palestinian Authority leadership was approaching peace. How can one find peace with people who do not condemn terrorism? Mr. President, how is it possible to engage in peace negotiations with people who want to teach their children to die in a holy war against you? How is it possible to engage in peace negotiations with people who persecute those of other faiths? How is it possible to engage in peace negotiations with people who keep terrorists on the loose to wreak havoc and evil against you and praise them for heroism?

Today the Israeli people are exhausted by fifty years of violence against their homes and families, of sending their sons and daughters into the army, and they dream of a promised peace now. This is our hope and our dream as well. But we must not get confused. History is replete with examples of compromises which bring terror and

destroy dreams.

In the United States, many people seem to think that if we do not confront these obstacles to peace and if we look the other way, then we will be able to come to an agreement. The reality, however, is just the opposite. If we do not acknowledge the attitudes and acts of those at the peace table, then the peace process is already over, and we just won't admit it.

In other words, the surest way to kill the peace process is to avoid confrontation, to fear upsetting a belligerent force and to avoid addressing incitement, violence, persecution, and terrorism. The only way to keep the peace process alive is to focus on truth, freedom, security, and justice.

Israeli efforts, to date, have sought to keep the peace process alive, improve security during the negotiating process, and obtain reciprocity as a vital element of

implementation.

The process remains alive, but terrorism continues and is exalted by many in the Palestinian Authority, and reciprocity does not exist. The United States' role has been to seek the middle ground. Unfortunately, this only rewards those willing to go to new extremes.

The middle ground between Prime Minister Netanyahu and Chairman Arafat is not halfway between the two. The United States must not engage in moral equivocation. We must not shy away from holding Arafat responsible for acts of violence, incitement, and persecution.

The United States must demonstrate principled leadership and end the appeasement that perpetuates the cycle of violence. The peace process can only work when leaders uphold their agreements and answer to the people, and the United States

remains a vigilant defender of the principles which bind us to Israel: freedom, democracy, and the rule of law.

What should we do? I believe there are three things. First, we should insist upon the strict adherence to Oslo and the reciprocity codified at Wye. The purpose of the Wye accord was at long last to force the Palestinians to comply with commitments before further territory would be turned over.

So at Wye, Israel agreed only to turn over territory in phases, in which it could verify Palestinian compliance at each and every step. In the first phase, Israel completed its redeployment after the Palestinian Authority completed its tasks. In phase two, the Palestinians did not meet all their obligations, and, therefore, Israel has not yet turned over the additional land. Reciprocity makes no sense unless it is based upon this formulation. Once Israel has ceded

territory, it is unlikely it ever could recover it. The Palestinians, on the other hand, can turn on and off their promises. In fact, this is exactly what they have done.

Second, we should stop paying the Palestinian Authority. Any funds provided to the Palestinian people should continue to go through private voluntary organizations. We should also monitor much more closely the rampant corruption and mismanagement of funds provided currently.

And third, we must aggressively seek the bringing to justice of Palestinian terrorists who killed American citizens. I am told that our Justice Department can do a better job here, that they have a great deal of information on the murderers of the Americans who are free in the Palestinian areas and, indeed, can make some requests for indictments. It is time to do this. Let's put the needs of the American families and other victims' families

over the needs of those engaging in or supporting terrorism.

Mr. President, these are very basic principles. I am not discussing today the intricacies of the peace process, U.S. funding, embassies, or any other number of issues we will be discussing this year in the Senate. We need to focus on a more fundamental level first. And I hope that this message will be heard at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

What I mean when I say this is that I hope the President will hear the message. I say this from a standpoint not of arrogance, not of confrontation, and I do not mean it in a political way. I just hope that the President will listen and take another look at what he and his foreign policy team are trying to force the Israeli government to do.

There cannot be peace

until there is a change of heart. I returned from this trip with a newfound concern for the future of Israel. I saw examples of incitement. I heard examples of persecution and hatred being taught throughout Palestinian society by their leaders. When the people engaged in peace talks return from the negotiating table only to disparage compromise and incite violence, there can be no progress toward peace.

Israel has come a long way since I first began following the fate of this state and the people of Israel. In so many respects, life appears and feels normal. The economy is developing, the standard of living is growing and improving. But just below the surface of this normalcy, Mr. President, Israel still faces a threat to the state's very existence. Israel's survival remains, unfortunately, a very real and central concern fifty

years after its independence.

Some people believe, however, that by ignoring this threat, that the peace process can succeed. Mr. President, it will fail. It is clear to me that many in the Palestinian leadership today see the peace process toward the goal of eliminating the State of Israel.

I suggest today that we get back to the basics. Peace is not possible while teaching children to hate and kill. Peace is not possible while persecuting those of other faiths. Peace is not possible while lionizing terrorism. We must stand up for freedom, security, and human dignity. We must stand up to ensure the security of Israel. We must stand up in the Congress, and we must insist that our President stand with us.

Today is the day to end American pressure on

Israel to force a peace agreement. Today is the day to remember it is up to the people of Israel to determine their own fate—their own security. We should pressure those who fill children with slogans of hatred and holy war; we should pressure them to change. We should pressure those who torture; we should pressure them to change. We should pressure those who encourage and support terror and murder, and those who rejoice in hatred. That is where the pressure should be.

Now is the time, Mr. President, for a return to our principled stand. The only way to truly attain peace is to support freedom, democracy, and justice, and oppose the cycle of hatred. We must face tyranny and oppression where it exists, condemn it, and stand up for peace—real peace based on security, freedom, and a change of heart.

A New Palestinian State: Danger Ahead

D O U G L A S J . F E I T H

The traditional land-for-peace approach entailed danger for Israel because the land in question could serve as a staging area for terrorism, military attacks, or both, and because the promises given to Israel, even if sincere, would come from individuals who ruled undemocratically and could not commit their political successors. But...as the expression on Rabin's face made clear during the first famous handshake on the

White House lawn, Israel can hardly take Arafat's credibility for granted. And even if it could, subsequent events have demonstrated that Arafat cannot win a reassuring margin of support for the deal from the PLO as a whole, or even from his own Fatah organization, let alone from the growing number of Palestinian Arabs who line up with Hamas, Islamic Jihad, and other non-PLO rejectionist groups....

Unilateral withdrawal cannot produce the promised liberations from moral, military, or other problems. It will instead result in Israel's exchanging one set of problems for another.

The material and moral burdens of the occupation—though not to be denied or belittled—are not a threat to Israel's existence. Neither, as 27 years of history attest, need they be fatal to Israel's democratic institutions or principles. They create strains, sometimes severe; but many democracies have suffered and survived strains from security threats, and Israel's commitment to a liberal rule of law remains robust.

Douglas J. Feith served as the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy for United States President George W. Bush. Feith is the Director of the Center for National Security Strategies and a Senior Fellow at the Hudson Institute, a public policy think-tank.

On the other hand, ter-

ritorial withdrawals that (1) reduce Israel's strategic depth; (2) deprive Israel of control over the Judean and Samarian highlands; (3) reduce Israel's time for mobilization in a crisis; (4) require greater reliance on pre-emption strategies; or (5) increase Israel's chances of being cut in half in a war will create problems of a far higher order. The often demoralizing psychological and economic burdens of the occupation will then be replaced by even more demoralizing psychological and economic burdens arising from physical insecurity and a hair-trigger national defense posture....

If the Israeli government maintains its opposition to a new, sovereign Palestinian state, either the Oslo "final-status" negotiations will deadlock beyond redemption (as they may do anyway over a number of other issues, like Jerusalem) or the PA [Palestinian Authority] will decide to accept, for the time being, whatever

form of self-rule Israel is willing to offer. Many in Israel and abroad would judge the former outcome a diplomatic disaster for which the Netanyahu government should be held responsible. But from the perspective of Netanyahu and his supporters, the latter outcome could be even worse.

The reason is this: Any "final-status" arrangement that provided for a new Palestinian state, even one with limited sovereignty, would inevitably lack finality. The state would cover less than the whole of the territories (which are anyway less than 25 percent of the "sacred Arab land" between the Jordan River and the sea). It would not include all of eastern Jerusalem (and might not include any of it). And its sovereignty would be severely limited in various ways. (All this would be true, it bears noting, even if Labor had done the negotiating, at least if Rabin's and Peres's frequent statements on the matter are to be credited.)

The premise of Oslo's "final-status" provisions is that Israel will offer at least minimum satisfaction of Palestinian national aspirations. Oslo can produce a stable peace, therefore, only if Palestinian nationalism turns out to be a small-beer phenomenon. If, on the other hand, that cause is as robust and ambitious as it appears to be, the Palestinians will not be assuaged by the kind of hemmed-in, hands-tied, semi-independent entity envisioned by the Labor Party architects of Oslo, much less the one envisioned by the current Likud-led government.

When PA leaders speak within their own community, they do not lecture their people, as they do the Israelis, on the virtues of trading land for peace. On the contrary, the PA makes a point of embellishing its stationery, public monuments, TV broadcasts, and schoolbooks with maps that designate Palestine

as covering not only the West Bank and Gaza Strip, but all of Israel. Unless Palestinian leaders drastically change their own and their community's thinking, a mini-state can be expected to serve as a base from which the "final status" will be challenged at the first opportunity.

As for limitations on sovereignty—including demilitarization, restrictions on military relationships with other states, and limits on the so-called Palestinian "right of return"—the PA may promise to respect these as the price of Israeli recognition; but once a new state comes formally into being, how long before it defies them? Like arms-control treaties, peace agreements between democratic and non-democratic parties are often deemed of great significance until they are signed and ratified,

whereupon demands that the undemocratic party adhere to their terms are commonly dismissed as legalistic and impractical.

The same means now used by the Palestinians to pressure Israel—terrorism, rioting, Arab economic sanctions, diplomatic condemnation—will also be available post—"final status." So will the means now used by Israel's neighboring states, including threats of renewed war. What will have changed—and it is an important change—is that Israeli forces will no longer be able to act directly against security threats originating from the territory of the new state without violating the internationally recognized sovereignty of an independent country.

To be sure, if one assumes that a mini-state of their own will satisfy the Palestinians' national ambitions and neutralize their anti-Zionism, then

security concerns are beside the point: Israel need not defend itself against neighbors who actually are at peace with it. But so long as Palestinian politics remains dominated by a hostile, violent, and lawless leadership, Israel cannot assume that "peace" will serve as the basis for its security. Even without the machinery of a state, Oslo has enhanced the Palestinians' capability to exploit anti-Israel violence for political ends. A state would give them a much greater capacity than they now have to facilitate terrorism against Israel, conduct anti-Israel diplomacy, assist or join enemy armed forces in the event of war, and destabilize local states (such as Jordan) that cooperate with Israel.

In short, if consummated in the form of a new Palestinian state, Oslo, over time, is more likely to result in war than in peace.

The Dangers of Establishing a Palestinian State

MORTON A. KLEIN

Introduction

Since the signing of the Oslo Accords between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) in 1993, negotiations have been occurring between Israelis and Palestinians for most of the time in one way or another. The entire Oslo process was built on such negotiations and yet its only outcome was a massive Palestinian terror war, not reconciliation and peace. So why do people persist in urging yet more negotiations? Because they believe two things:

1. That the absence of a Palestinian state is the

cause of the continuing conflict; and

2. That such negotiations can produce a Palestinian state and therefore peace.

For several reasons, both of these assumptions are mistaken. In fact, the contrary is true: creating a Palestinian state under existing conditions would most probably bring increased violence and bloodshed and could endanger Israel's existence.

Fatah is not a genuine negotiating partner which would deliver peace

The purpose of the Oslo agreements was to see

if the Palestinians were ready for a state by fighting and jailing their terrorists and ending the incitement to hatred and murder against Israel and Jews in their society. The late Yitzhak Rabin was very clear on this point – he regarded the creation of the Palestinian Authority (PA) under Arafat as a reversible experiment and said repeatedly that a Palestinian failure to transform their society into a peaceful one would result in Israel giving up on the process. The process indeed failed and Palestinian society is more extreme and violence-prone than when he said those words, because Fatah, the Palestinian movement co-founded in 1959 by Yasser Arafat and Mahmoud Abbas

Morton A. Klein is National President of the Zionist Organization of America.

never did – and still does not today – accept the permanence and legitimacy of Israel as a Jewish state.

Fatah's Constitution, which has never been revoked or amended, to this day calls for the “complete liberation of Palestine, and eradication of Zionist economic, political, military and cultural existence” (Article 12) and for terrorism as “a strategy and not a tactic ... this struggle will not cease unless the Zionist state is demolished” (Article 19). It has backed that murderous program with deeds, having since the outbreak of the Palestinian terror war in September 2000 killed nearly 500 Israelis and maimed thousands more in acts of terrorism.

The Oslo process was to have meant the end of Fatah's original program but Arafat and the Fatah leadership simply lied, claiming to accept Israel and renounce terrorism on behalf of the PLO while Fatah retained its

aims, constitution and terrorist infrastructure.

That Fatah does not accept Israel is obvious from the statements of its senior leadership, speaking in Arabic to Middle Eastern audiences. In October 2006, for example, speaking in Arabic on PA and Dubai's al Arabiya TV, Abbas said plainly, “It is not required of Hamas, or of Fatah, or of the Popular Front to recognize Israel.” During and since the 2007 Annapolis conference, Abbas and other senior PA officials explicitly repudiated accepting Israel as a Jewish state. For example, Abbas stated, “The Palestinians do not accept the formula that the state of Israel is a Jewish state.” More recently still, in April 2009, Abbas reiterated these thoughts at a Palestinian Youth Parliament conference: “I say this clearly: I do not accept the Jewish State, call it what you will.” At the end of the conference, Abbas was presented with a large framed map of ‘Palestine,’ labeled

in English, covering the entire area of Israel.

Other senior Fatah figures have been equally revealing. For example, Muhammad Dahlan, the former commander of Fatah forces in Gaza, had this to say in March 2009 on PA TV, “I want to say for the thousandth time, in my own name and in the name of all of my fellow members of the Fatah movement: We do not demand that the Hamas movement recognize Israel. On the contrary, we demand of the Hamas movement not to recognize Israel, because the Fatah movement does not recognize Israel, even today.”

Similarly, in October 2006, Abu Ahmed, a Fatah commander said, “The base of our Fatah movement keeps dreaming of Tel Aviv, Haifa, Jaffa and Acco ... There is no change in our official position. Fatah as a movement never recognized Israel.” He also said that the Al-Aqsa Mar-

tyrs Brigades, the terror arm of Fatah which has murdered hundreds of Israeli civilians since the start of the terror war in September 2000, is “one and the same” with the Fatah party.

Fatah’s August 2009 conference, held in Ramallah, show-cased its continuing fidelity to these unreconstructed positions: the conference refused to accept Israel’s existence as a Jewish state; glorified terrorists and the “armed struggle,” insisted on the so-called ‘right of return’ and rejected of an end of claims in any future peace agreement. Former PA prime minister Ahmed Qureia opened proceedings, “in the name of shahids (martyrs, i.e. dead terrorists)” – not exactly the words of a peace partner who has accepted Israel and renounced terrorism and incitement to hatred and murder. Abbas himself told the conference that “we maintain the right to launch an armed resistance, which is legitimate

as far as international law is concerned.”

Marwan Al-Barghouti, the jailed Fatah terrorist chief who is widely regarded as a future Fatah leader, said in an interview coinciding with the conference that “Resistance to the Israeli occupation is a national obligation, and it is a legitimate right.” Some weeks earlier, he said that “Fatah believes in a combination of all forms of struggle, and it will not abandon, thwart, or rule out any form of struggle ... We in Fatah think that political activity and negotiations complement resistance, and harvest its fruits.” And senior Fatah official Jibril Rajoub said, “Resistance was and is a tactical and strategic option of the struggle are part of Fatah’s policy.”

Thus, there was loud applause from assembled delegates when Qureia praised two terrorists, Khaled Abu-Isbah and Dalal Mughrabi, responsible

for the 1978 coastal road bus hijacking, in which 37 Israelis, including 12 children, were slaughtered. Qureia praised these bestial murderers as “heroes” and “shahids,” shouting “All the glory! All the glory! All the glory! All the sisters here are Dalal’s sisters.”

The Fatah platform also continues to demand the so-called ‘right of return’ to Israel for Palestinian refugees of the 1948-49 war and their millions of descendants, something that would mean Israel’s extinction. It calls for increased international pressure on Israel, opposes any normalization of relations between Israel and Arab states, and refuses to declare that Fatah has no further demands from Israel beyond a peace settlement. The platform also calls for a “strategic channel with Iran to be opened” – at a time Iran is defying the world by seeking to acquire nuclear weapons.

Tragically, Fatah’s glorification of terrorism and

the goal of removing Israel is not mere rhetoric. The PA-controlled media, mosques, schools and youth camps inculcate this ideology in the next generation. Thus, at a recent high school graduation, students chanted such slogans as, “In the name of the Shahids (Martyrs), in the name of the prisoners, in the name of the stone and the rifle” and “in the name of Palestine: Haifa, Acre, Jaffa, and our Arab Jerusalem” – giving a clear picture of the nature and content of Fatah’s indoctrination.

The record also shows that all aspects of PA life – the schools, youth movements, sports teams, newspapers, TV, even the names of streets – are made vehicles for honoring and praising terrorists and their vile deeds. This in turn breeds more terrorists and bloodshed. Only last year, Fatah, the Palestinian party co-founded by Yasser Arafat and Mahmoud Abbas, issued a new official emblem, showing a map of all of Israel,

even within the pre-1967 armistice lines, covered with a Palestinian head-dress, including pictures of arch-terrorist Yasser Arafat and a Kalashnikov rifle. In January this year, Abbas mourned the passing of veteran Palestinian terrorist George Habash, saying, ‘The death of this historic leader is a great loss for the Palestinian cause and for the Palestinian people.’ He also declared three days of mourning and ordered Palestinian flags lowered to half mast. In February last year, he called for uniting the blood of Fatah and Hamas in a common struggle against Israel. In May 2006, Abbas named Mahmoud Damra, wanted by Israel for supervising various terror attacks against Israelis, as commander of Fatah’s Force 17.

Palestinian society approves of terrorism and does not accept Israel

The detrimental effects of such indoctrination over 16 years are evident from successive Palestin-

ian polls. Two features are notable: rejection of Israel’s permanence and legitimacy as a Jewish state; and support for terrorist assaults upon Israel:

- January 2009: A Jerusalem Media & Communications Center poll that found that 55.4% percent of Palestinians support continued suicide bombings against Israel, as against 37.6% percent who oppose it. (Jerusalem Media & Communications Center, Poll No. 67, January 2009)
- March 2008: 83.5% of Palestinians approve of the March 6, 2008 terrorist attack on the Mercaz Harav seminary in Jerusalem in which 8 people, mainly teenagers, were murdered and a further 40 wounded; 63.6% support rocket attacks on Israeli towns, as against 32.6% who oppose it. (Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research poll, March 2008).

- February 2007: 75% of Palestinian Arabs do not think that Israel has a right to exist; 70% of Palestinian Arabs support a one-state solution in which Jews would be a minority, not a two-state solution with a Palestinian Arab state living peacefully alongside Israel (Near East Consulting (NEC) poll, February 12-15, 2007, ‘NEC 12-15 February Poll: 75% of Palestinians do not think that Israel has the right to exist,’ Independent Media Review Analysis, February 16, 2007).
- September 2006: 67% of Palestinian Arabs oppose Hamas recognizing Israel (Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research (PCPSR) poll, September 14-16, 2006).
- September 2006: 57% of Palestinian Arabs support terrorist attacks upon Israeli civilians; 75% support the kidnapping of Israeli soldiers in a bid to obtain the release of jailed Palestinians terrorists; 63% are inspired by the Lebanese Islamist terror group Hizballah and seek to emulate it (Harry S. Truman Research Institute for the Advancement of Peace, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and the Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research (PCPSR) poll, September 2006).
- February 2006: 83.3% of the Palestinian Arabs oppose dropping the legally and morally baseless so-called ‘right of return’ of refugees and their millions of descendants to Israel and reject substitute solutions to the refugee issue (Palestinian Center for Public Opinion (PCPO) poll, February 16-20, 2006).
- February 2006: 56.2% support terrorism against Israeli civilians (Jerusalem Media and Communications Center (JMCC) poll, February 8-12, 2006).
- December 2005: 51% of Palestinian Arabs oppose the disarming of terrorist groups; 82% support the absorption of members of Hamas, Islamic Jihad into the PA. (Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research, December 6-8, 2005).
- December 2005: 69% of Palestinians regard terrorism as legitimate; 65% support Al-Qaeda

actions in the USA and Europe (Fafo poll, December 22, 2005).

- October 2005: 60% of Palestinian Arabs oppose the PA disarming the terrorist groups Hamas, Islamic Jihad and Fatah's Al-Aqsa Martyrs Brigades (Bir Zeit University poll, October 2005).
- December 2004: 66% of Palestinian Arabs oppose the PA disarming the terrorist groups Hamas, Islamic Jihad and Fatah's Al-Aqsa Martyrs Brigades (Bir Zeit University poll, December 2004).
- April 2003: 75.6% of Palestinian Arabs support terrorism against Israeli civilians (Jerusalem Media and Communications Center (JMCC) poll, April 2003).

In short, both the Palestinian leadership, whether Fatah or Hamas, and the bulk of Palestinians in general support terrorist violence against Israel

and do not accept its existence. It follows that Palestinians are not ready to sign and abide by any peace agreement with Israel, in which case setting up of a Palestinian state will bring, not an end to war, but an intensification of it.

Concessions to Fatah useless

Israeli concessions to the Fatah-controlled PA over the years – yielding half of Judea and Samaria, all of Gaza, and handing over assets, funds and even arms to the PA and freeing hundreds of jailed Palestinian terrorists as “good will gestures” have not impelled Fatah to alter or modify its program, to rescind its Constitution, to cease committing and promoting terrorism against Israel or to moderate its demands.

Put simply, the Palestinians are obligated by the Oslo agreements and the 2003 Roadmap peace plan to arrest terrorists, confis-

cate their weaponry and end the incitement to hatred and murder against Israel in the PA-controlled media, mosques, school and youth camps that feed terrorism. At no stage have they fulfilled these basic requirements, which utterly contradict their continuing goals and terroristic conduct.

The truth is actually opposite: Israelis concessions have emboldened the Palestinians to stick with their extremist aims and conduct, to simply pocket these concessions and stick to their own demands. As senior PA and Fatah official Saeb Erekat put it in July 2009, “Many people say that the [Israeli-Palestinian] negotiations of the last 10 or 15 years were useless and yielded nothing, but [that is not true]. In 1994 [i.e. during the Oslo negotiations] the Palestinian side could have capitulated and gained an achievement within one month. [That is,] we could have agreed to undertake the management of the education and health [sys-

tems] in the West Bank. [Likewise] Yasser Arafat could have accepted what was offered him at Camp David [in 2000], instead of [letting himself] be besieged in the Muqata'a and then murdered for no reason. President Mahmoud 'Abbas could have accepted [Olmert's] December 2008 proposal, [but he preferred to wait] ... [Some ask] where the negotiations with the Israeli side have brought us. First [the Israelis] said we would [only have the right to] run our own schools and hospitals. Then they consented to give us 66% [of the occupied territories]. "At Camp David they offered 90%, and [recently] they offered 100%. So why should we hurry?"

Strategic dangers of creating a Fatah-dominated Palestinian state

Since Fatah neither accepts Israel's permanence and legitimacy as a Jewish state; does not put Israel in its maps, atlases and

school curricula; names streets, schools and sports teams after suicide bombers; and has not ended the incitement to hatred and murder within its society, creating a Palestinian state run by it would not bring tranquility, only more bloodshed. This would be the case regardless of strategic questions regarding territory and security. But in Israel's case, the stakes are extremely high.

The creation of a Palestinian state essentially involves returning Israel to the armistice lines that existed from 1949 until 1967. Yet the consensus of authentic military opinion, expressed free of the exigencies of political circumspection, is that such borders are strategically indefensible and potentially disastrous for Israel.

U.S. Lt.-Gen. Thomas Kelly, director of operations for the Joint Chiefs of Staff during the 1991 Gulf War, stated "I look out ... onto the West Bank and say to myself,

'If I'm the chief of staff of the Israel Defense Forces, I cannot defend this land without that terrain.' They [Arab forces] only have to go to the high ground running north and south in the middle of the country in order to dominate the country. So I don't know about politics, but if you want me to defend this country, and you want me to defend Jerusalem, I've got to hold that high ground."

Shortly after the 1967 war, then-U.S. Defense Secretary Robert McNamara asked the Joint Chiefs of Staff to analyze which of the administered territories Israel needed to keep for its security. Regarding Judea-Samaria, the Joint Chiefs concluded: "Control of the prominent high ground running north-south through the middle of West Jordan [the "West Bank"]... and then southeast to a junction with the Dead Sea...would provide Israel with a militarily defensible border."

The chimera of demilitarization

Aware of the substantive, strategic objections to Israel creating a Palestinian state in these territories, many have attempted to override these objections by advocating a peace agreement in which an essential element would be the long-term demilitarization of the future Palestinian state.

Unfortunately, the idea of Palestinian demilitarization is illusory. First, there is no precedent for a sovereign state that was demilitarized in the long-term. Second, there is no precedent for the PA observing an agreement it has signed. Throughout the Oslo years, the PA signed several agreements in which it committed itself and recommitted itself to fighting terrorism and ending the incitement to hatred and murder that pervaded Palestinian society, yet never did so. Third, the PA never paid any price internationally for its non-compliance with signed agreements.

To the contrary, Israel continued and continues until the present day, to be pressured to make further, unreciprocated concessions to the PA. Meanwhile the PA receives ever higher levels of U.S. and other foreign aid. Clearly, the international constellation of forces is such that the Palestinians are never likely to feel compelled to keep an agreement, nor are they likely to be penalized when they do not.

Accordingly, even if the PA agreed to demilitarization, how could Israel prevent it from subsequently violating such an agreement? Germany was demilitarized after World War I, but when Hitler began building up the Germany army during the 1930s, the Allies took no action, because they were not prepared to go to war over Hitler's infractions. A Palestinian Arab state would have its own airports and seaports, as well as borders with Egypt and Jordan, making it a relatively easy matter to import heavy weapons, missiles,

and troops. And the same kind of Iranian "volunteers" who have been sent to aid the Hezbollah terrorists in southern Lebanon would no doubt be dispatched to "Palestine."

A Palestinian state would cost Israel strategic depth and high ground while shrinking it to indefensible borders, including a 9-mile width. Creating it would mean further, massive, irreversible concessions to an unreconstructed PA that has never fulfilled its obligations under the Oslo agreements and the 2003 Roadmap peace plan.

In such circumstances, creating a Palestinian state would simply mean creating a terror state. Such a state would enjoy sovereign powers, would be free to enter into alliances against Israel with hostile states and groups and import weaponry without control or supervision of any kind. Cross-border raids

would become routine along what would become Israel's longest border. A Palestinian state would also control a third of Israel's vital water supply. To do this runs contrary to all logic and prudence.

Caroline Glick, Managing Editor of the *Jerusalem Post* and Middle East Fellow at Center for Security Policy, Washington, D.C. has elaborated on the strategic dangers of Israel setting up a Palestinian state: "Without Judea, Samaria, Jerusalem, the Jordan Valley and the Golan Heights, Israel would be so vulnerable to missile and artillery attack that it could be overwhelmed even before conventional invading Arab armies set foot on its remaining territory."

The one reason Judea and Samaria today are relatively peaceful is because, unlike Gaza, from which Israel withdrew in 2005, the Israel Defense Forces (IDF) are on the ground and able to intervene to prevent terrorist acts and

break up terror cells when and where necessary. That would no longer be the case the moment a Palestinian state is established. Just as Ashkelon and Sderot are already under constant bombardment from Palestinian shells and missiles fired from Gaza, Jerusalem, Ben Gurion Airport and most of Israel's major population centers would be in range of Palestinian terrorists in Judea and Samaria.

Yet, let us suppose, despite the absence of any ground for thinking so, that somehow Judea and Samaria would remain relatively peaceful if the IDF withdrew (only relatively – there are dozens of terror alerts coming out of Judea and Samaria every week, most of which the IDF, by its presence, is able to thwart). Any Palestinian state that is created would necessarily include Gaza, which the PA, and the world, regards as part of the territory for a Pal-

estinian state. In short, unless Hamas is granted sovereignty in Gaza (and in Judea and Samaria, if it takes them over from Fatah) no Palestinian state under Abbas and Fatah which includes Gaza can even be set up, making the plan not only dangerous and potentially disastrous for Israel but impractical as well.

A Palestinian state, should one emerge, is likely to be but another Arab dictatorship and an enhanced base for radical Muslim terrorism. This reflects the political character of the current Palestinian Authority as built up by Yasser Arafat and maintained by his successor, Mahmoud Abbas.

Most likely, such a state would prepare for long-term warfare with Israel, nurture terrorist movements behind a wall of sovereign immunity and create the sort of destabilization that would lead to full-scale war.

Quite apart from the probable character of

such a state, it is also undesirable for geographical, economic and political reasons as well. A Palestinian state founded in Judea Samaria and Gaza would enjoy few natural resources and most likely have a weak economy. It could prove destabilizing to neighboring Jordan and would certainly endanger Israel, as any such state would mean the withdrawal of Israel military forces from strategic positions in the high ground of Judea Samaria, in turn providing a more vulnerable Israel as a tempting target.

Israelis see the dangers and oppose Palestinian statehood

Unlike the situation during the 1990s when most Israelis were willing to set up a Palestinian state, tragic and bitter experience of dealing with the Palestinians has changed the Israeli public attitude. Today, clear majorities of the Israeli public oppose any concessions to the Palestinians – let

alone statehood. Three examples:

- A June 2009 War & Peace Index poll found that 53 percent of Israelis oppose evacuating all settlements, even if crucial for a peace agreement, while only 41 percent say they support evacuating settlements.
- February 2009: A Maagar Mohot Survey Institute poll showed that a majority of Israelis – 51 percent – oppose the creation of a Palestinian state, as opposed to merely 31 percent that favor its establishment.
- An October 2007 Tel Aviv University poll also demonstrates that a 59 percent of Israelis oppose, even in return for a peace agreement, Israel handing over any part of Jerusalem to the PA.
- A May 2007 Magaar Mochot poll found that 72% oppose uprooting

of Jewish communities within the framework of further Israeli unilateral withdrawals in Judea and Samaria; and 58% reject the “land-for-peace” formula whereby Israel has made territorial concessions to the PA.

Conclusion

The danger posed by establishing a Palestinian state under current conditions is clear and serious. As a recipe for peace, it would be disastrous and bring about the opposite of the desired results.

Any prospect of peace is entirely dependent upon transformation of Palestinian society and leadership over a sustained time period in which Palestinians would accept Israel's legitimacy and permanence as a Jewish state before it could be hoped that they would co-exist peacefully alongside it.

The Myth of Demilitarization

BERNARD SMITH

(Originally published in 1987)

If Israel's security is to depend largely on the demilitarization of a Palestinian state, Israelis should be worried. Historically, demilitarization has not been successful: The territory is eventually remilitarized. The Palestinian Authority (PA) leadership will not willingly accept the humiliating and inhibiting servitude implied by demilitarization. Yasir Arafat will accede only for the sake of appearances, until such time as he can subvert the final agreement—which is precisely what he did with the

restrictions place on his security forces by the Oslo accords.

The accords closed the door on full demilitarization, allowing an excessive number of weapons and police, and the introduction of 12,000 battle-trained Palestinian Liberation Army soldiers and PLNA quasi-regulars. This was insufficient for Arafat, who egregiously violated the partial demilitarization of the 1995 interim agreement by exceeding the number of "police" and weapons allowed, and obtaining antitank and anti-aircraft missiles, Katyusha rockets, and hand grenades.

Israeli newspaper columnists, government officials, and IDF officers refer to the PA police as "the Palestinian army," "soldiers," and "an armed military force" to the PA's "military intelligence chief." The prime minister's communications director has said, "... They have an army. [The PA does not] even bother calling the army a police force any more, they call it an army." A.M. Rosenthal of the *New York Times*: "The Palestinians already have an army." PA leaders flaunt their lack of concern for Israel's reaction to their violations. Nabil Sha'ath talks of a 30,000-man armed force. Soon, the only ones left believing in Palestinian "police" and demilitarized autonomous

Bernard Smith is a member of the Board of Directors of the Jerusalem Institute for Western Defense.

areas will be those Israelis who, desperately hoping for peace, cling to the fiction that security can be assured by demilitarization. Before the final settlement, the PA will field an estimated 50,000 lightly armed infantrymen. While still embryonic, the Army of Palestine is here.

Several facts suggest that demilitarization in a Palestinian state will be short-lived. Convinced that Palestine must have an army, Arafat began to build the “core of a regular army” in 1989. He is expanding it under the euphemism of “police” until a structured military body takes shape as the armed force of an independent state. An Arab country without an army is unthinkable. It would be the laughingstock of the Arab world.

And this degradation, recognized as a severe infringement of sovereignty, will be imposed by coercion, acquiescence being the only route to statehood. It will also be

unilateral; no part of Israel will be demilitarized.

In the unlikely instance that demilitarization stands any chance of success, it must be mutually acceptable and refer to a limited space rather than all of a country’s territory. In the case at hand, all four factors—infingement of sovereignty, coercion, reciprocity, and extent of area—augur that demilitarization will most certainly fail. The PA will also argue the need to defend itself against domination or invasion by irredentist neighbors. Pointing to an external threat, Palestine could, one day, abrogate the demilitarization clauses, citing the rule of international law regarding “fundamental changes of circumstances,” compounded by the internationally recognized right to self-defense.

All these reasons would be less meaningful were it not for Israeli tolerance of Arafat’s flagrant viola-

tions of the Oslo accords, including creation of an army. This grievous policy only invites further breaches after an entity is solidly in place. The outer limits to expansion of the Palestinian order of battle will depend only on how far violations can go before the threat to security provokes the certainty of an Israeli response.

Ending breaches of demilitarization requires national will. Peace generates devotion to the good life, and a lack of motivation to engage in corrective action, including war. The result is futile diplomatic protests and a tendency to rationalize violations. This is best exemplified by the French and British reaction to the German remilitarization of the Rhineland in 1936, which threatened the peace of Europe. Israelis will repeat what the British said about Germany: “They have the right to arm. After all, it’s their country.”

Faced with a long series

of “minor” infractions, Israel would need to decide after each violation whether to take action, economic or military. Complicating the process would be the state of the IDF. A reduction in its size following peace would produce extreme caution in responding forcefully to violations. In an era of peace, the national will turn inward to deal with internal problems, paying inadequate attention to “unimportant” activity across the border. External pressures will interact with internal ones to block meaningful action. Israel would have to consider the possibility of U.S. and European economic and Arab military retaliation. As Arab countries and Iran stockpile chemical and biological weapons and missiles, Israel will be more hesitant to take military steps. Israelis will justify inaction by saying the new Arab entity “wouldn’t dare challenge the IDF.”

A militarized entity

would constitute a real danger as part of an Arab coalition at war with Israel. Operating in units up to the company level armed with antitank weapons, anti-aircraft missiles, mortars, machine guns, and mines, the Palestinian army would attack military and civilian targets just prior to and during the initial assault by Arab coalition forces. In a variation of a 1940 German tactic, this lightly armed infantry could be supplemented by hundreds, even thousands, of Syrian special forces introduced into Palestine as tourists and businessmen. Tying up desperately needed troops in the initial stage might be what one Israeli analyst called “the 50 grams that could change the Arab-Israeli strategic balance in [the Arabs’] favor.”

If the nation does not comprehend, quickly, the danger of employing demilitarization as a primary security measure in

a final agreement, it will pay a terrible price for ephemeral tranquility.

.....

The sign in the car window in Jerusalem read, “Peace is my security.” This mantra, recited by Israeli peaceniks, refutes the need for strategic territory, depth, and, presumably, a large army or even nuclear weapons, because once peace is established, there simply will not be any more war. As Shimon Peres said at the United Nations last year, peace with Syria “will be the end of war in the Middle East.” What could be more naïve—and dangerous? War is so frequent that it has occurred in one or more places in 3,179 of the last 3,449 years. During that period, the world was free of war 8 percent of the time. The same percentage is valid when speaking only of the past fifty years.

Armed conflict has so permeated history that some, seeking an explanation, theorize an innate human

drive to destroy. More undeniably, countries, like individuals, have interests that are to be protected and furthered. National interests and the influences that act on them and emanate from them are not static. A primary interest can be overridden by a stronger one. For example, a nation heavily involved in economic development may find this need superseded by the drive toward nation-building and expansion. As interests or the factors that affect them change, a country elects war or peace. Both are tools to advance national interests. The essential point is that there is no reason to assume that war cannot occur because a country is at peace. History is instructive on this matter. It is worthwhile to review three of thousands of examples.

Poland and Russia

During the early 17th century, Polish and Russian expansionist designs and Russian irredentism—not to men-

tion traditional Russian enmity toward Poland—kept the two periodically at war. The conflict was interrupted when overwhelming factors forced a peaceful interval: Russia exhausted economically and militarily by internal upheaval and strife; discord between the Polish king and Diet (assembly); the Turkish menace to Poland's southern border. Finally, Czar Michael concluded an “eternal” peace with the king of Poland in 1634. The eternal peace lasted for 19 years.

Tis sometimes difficult, and even unnecessary, to separate ideological from self-serving motives for war. Such was the case with Czar Alexis’ decision to end peace with Poland. The second Romanov certainly wished to free the Orthodox from the yoke of Catholic Poland and Muslim Tartar. And, like his father, Alexis found the borders of Muscovy too confining. The spur to war was the rebellion of the Zaporogian Cossacks against Poland in 1649.

In 1653, Alexis acceded to the Cossack appeal for Moscow’s protection, knowing it meant war. The conflict ended with a truce in 1667, resulting in territorial acquisition for Russia. In 1686, the Russian gains were solidified by another “permanent” peace, the Orthodox Russian regent and the Catholic Polish king going so far as to form an alliance against the “infidel” Turks. Peace with Poland was an expedient, which allowed Russia to utilize its expansive energies to drive south against the Turks and toward the Baltic, colliding with Sweden.

Peace built on expediency offers little promise of permanence. By 1733, Russia’s pro-Austrian foreign policy would not abide the election of an anti-Austrian to the throne of Poland. Fifty thousand Russian troops terminated the reign of Stanislas Leszynski. Politically and geographically weak (her plains inviting invasion), Poland’s sovereignty was limited when Catherine

II ascended the Russian throne in 1762. While still at peace, she turned Poland into a virtual Russian protectorate in 1767. Between 1772 and 1795, Russia participated in three partitions of Poland, the last resulting in its disappearance. In 1939, reconstituted Poland, at peace with its neighbors, was invaded by the expansionist Soviet Union.

Norway and Germany

Norway learned a cruel lesson in the instability of peace a year later. For more than 100 years, Norway was at peace with Prussia and then Germany. In 1907, Germany agreed to recognize and respect Norway's integrity. During World War I, the two countries carried on a sizable and important trade. Following the war, Norway sheltered thousands of German children.

During the 1920s and 1930s, however, the forces of German history dictated new relations be-

tween Germany and the rest of Europe. "German nationalism and the exaltation of the Machtstaat, the Power State," in the words of the historian Alan Bullock, propelled Germany into aggressive relations with Europe, giving "expression to the long-smoldering rebellion of the German people against the defeat of 1918 and the humiliation of the Peace Settlement." Germany embraced a leader whose vision of the future could be realized only through war.

By the end of 1939, Germany's strategic interest was to defeat Great Britain as quickly as possible. To accomplish this, Berlin was determined to prevent a likely British occupation of Norwegian ports, ensure the supply of vital Swedish iron ore transported safely along Norwegian coastal waters, increase projection of its naval and air power into the Atlantic Ocean through use of bases on the Norwegian coast, and

secure passage of its ships from the Baltic into the North Sea and Atlantic Ocean. These required an unavoidable revision in relations with Norway based on the changed German national interests and the necessities that emanated from them.

On April 8–9, 1940, Germany made what historian T.K. Derry called a "brutally abrupt transition from peace to war." It was a terrible shock for the Norwegians. In the words of Carl Hambro, President of the Norwegian Parliament, what stupefied the Norwegians more than the act of aggression itself was the national realization that a great power, for years professing its friendship, suddenly appeared a deadly enemy. More than by the violation of treaties and every international obligation, the people of Norway were dazed to find that for years their German friends had been elaborating the most detailed plans for the invasion and subsequent enslaving of their country.

Iran and Iraq

Unlike Germany and Norway, historical Iraqi and Iranian national and religious differences brought about a treaty, delivering benefits to both countries. Relations continued to improve following the 1975 treaty. Oil production, the lifeblood of both, promised reality. Many were obsessed with the belief that rhetorical adherence to peace was the cure for war. The historical record proves that peace today is no guarantee for the future. Peace along with respect for sovereignty and borders are, as they have always been, subject to shifting currents. Power and self-interest determine adherence to treaties and relations between states. History shows that countries prepared for war are more likely to prevent one. For almost half a century, the United States avoided war with the Soviet Union. Americans, believing that “strength is my security,” assembled the most formidable military force the

world has ever known. Its strategic depth reached deep below the ocean’s surface and into the skies. This massive deterrent, not an unsubstantiated, uncertain belief in peace, provided security—and kept the peace.

Israel will ensure the security of its people and national survival in the same way. Arab acceptance is based on the realization that Israel is too strong to destroy militarily. Peace can exist only so long as this perception predominates. Therefore, instead of weakening itself by reductions in its armed strength and the ceding of geostrategic territory, Israel must maintain a powerful military, based on its air, missile, and combined land forces, the qualitative superiority of each ensured through adequate investment in research and development. However, just as quality must never be employed to diminish quantity, technological advances cannot be used as an ex-

cuse to reduce territorial depth. Israel’s minuscule width is already a strategic nightmare. Only those who believe in the fantasy of “peace is my security,” or that the economic well-being of potential enemies guarantees peace, are ready to minimize even further the country’s strategic depth by acceding to Arab demands to relinquish land.

The Gulf War of 1991 is only the most recent evidence that the outcome of war is still determined by armor, artillery, and infantry. This means that depth and geographic barriers to invasion continue to assume great strategic importance, making the Golan Heights, Judea, and Samaria crucial to Israel’s defense. Strategic depth will have to be broadened. The nation’s defense will be seriously challenged when one or more Arab countries and Iran will possess nuclear weapons. Because of its tiny area, Israel will not be able to respond following a first strike if it relies only on

land-based nuclear weapons. It should, therefore, be prepared to expand its strategic deterrence to missile-carrying submarines.

Israel's security depends on the perception that the cost to potential aggressors is not one they are willing to pay. In 1908, Neville Chamberlain opined that "treaties are not to be depended on for keeping the peace.... We have got to make ourselves too strong to be attacked." In light of the tragic results that followed the British prime minister's behavior in the 1930s, how ironic yet instructive his words are. Let us hope that leaders of the democracies will understand the lesson.

.....

Notes

1. *The figure for the 3,420 years ending in 1968 are those of Will and Ariel Durant, cited in Donald Kagan, On the Origins of War (New York: Doubleday, 1995), p. 4. Those for 1969 to 1996 are the writer's. calculations for the 50-year period ending in 1996 do not include civil wars except those in Lebanon and Bosnia, where large external components were involved.*

2. Alan Bullock, *Hitler: A Study in Tyranny* (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), p. 313.

3. See *ibid.*, pp. 575–77, 582, and Winston Churchill, *The Second World War* (London: Cassell & Co., 1950), I, 483, 508–9.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 546.

5. Kagan, p. 376.

Israel's Water and Environment in Danger

ITAMAR MARCUS

The land of Israel, from the Mediterranean to the Jordan River, is one ecological whole. Water flows through underground streams without regard to political decisions, and the environment does not have pollution-impermeable walls to protect artificially adjusted borders.

Israel's largest and cleanest water source is the Mountain Aquifer. In an average year, 600 million cubic meters of rainwater enters the ground in the hills of Judea and Samaria. The water then flows in all directions via underground streams,

settling in large aquifers spanning both sides of the Green Line.

Israel has been pumping this water since 1948. Before the Six-Day War, the Arab population of Judea and Samaria used only 5 percent, while Israel used a full 95 percent of this water. Since then, Israel has expanded drilling for the Arab population, raising their share of the water usage from 5 percent to 17 percent. For itself, Israel has built a complex water system that supports the economic and social infrastructure of the country. Today Israel is totally dependent on the

Mountain Aquifer for economic and social survival. Forty percent of Israel's total water use and a full 50 percent of the drinking water come from this underground source.

Israel's water is now in grave danger. According to the agreement with the PLO, the autonomous region will expand rapidly to include most of Judea and Samaria. Topography would then put Israel at a distinct disadvantage. Although the water Israel uses from this aquifer is pumped from wells within Israel's pre-1967 borders, 80 percent of it enters the aquifer system in the hills of Judea and Samaria. As gravity draws the water west, north, and south toward the Israeli wells,

Itamar Marcus is founder of Palestine Media Watch and a member of the Israeli delegation to the Incitement Monitoring Committee established as part of the Wye accords.

pumping along the way diminishes its volume. As Israel's comptroller reported (5-89): "There exists the physical capability to increase the pumping in Judea and Samaria to a degree that will completely eliminate the pumping in Israel." Thus, whoever controls the water in Judea and Samaria controls the water for Tel Aviv.

None of this would matter if the Arabs of Judea and Samaria would not claim this water. However, at the multinational talks, the Arabs demanded the rights to 100 percent of the water entering the ground in Judea and Samaria. Israel's arguments that the water settles primarily on Israel's side of the Green Line did not affect their position, nor were they concerned that Israel now uses this water and is totally dependent on it. Rather, they saw Israel's present use as theft of Arab water and went so far as to demand compensation for the water

pumped since 1948 or, at the very least, since 1967.

The Arabs have reason to claim all the water for themselves. If the agreement is implemented, they anticipate the immigration of a million or more Arabs from refugee camps; they have earmarked significant portions of the coming international financial aid for agricultural development to compete with Israeli farmers; the industrial infrastructure they plan for Judea and Samaria will also need water. The Arabs know that the lifestyle they foresee will never materialize without the water Israel is using today. In case there be any doubt, they have already announced that by the end of 1995 they expect to be using 80 percent of the water from the Mountain Aquifer, causing a loss of 25 percent of Israel's yearly water (three months' water usage for the entire country). In very real terms, Israel's most important water source is in very grave danger.

Can Israel survive such a loss? Clearly not. Just a few years ago, Israel faced a major water crisis following two years of low rainfall. The government limited the watering of gardens, raised water prices, cut back on agriculture, and turned water conservation into the national challenge. What life in Israel will be like with a 40 percent loss of water is beyond anyone's imagination. Much of Israel's agriculture will be destroyed, water for private gardens will be limited, and very expensive and tiny private gardens will become the status symbol of the very rich. Cities will have to carefully consider whether their parks will be grass or concrete. The green revolution that turned a dusty, dry land of Israel into a blooming garden will be erased.

This water loss will affect not just lifestyle but Israel's very psyche as a nation. Efficient water use and greening of the land have been prominent in the Israeli national

identity since the advent of modern Zionism. The evolution of Tu B'Shvat into a popular Israeli holiday is a direct result of Israelis' sincere love of the land, especially when it is green.

As negotiations progress, water "cooperation" is often discussed as the ideal solution for the entire region. Unfortunately, "cooperation" is the elegant catchword for taking water that Israel alone is using today and dividing it up for others to "cooperate" with tomorrow. Shimon Peres recently spoke of the flowering of both sides of the Arava with joint Jordan-Israel "water cooperation." What his advisors forgot to tell him was that Israel today is pumping out the maximum ecologically possible, and if Jordan is to "cooperate" and develop its own agriculture, it will mean destruction of our kibbutzim and moshavim.

The same is true of the "cooperation" talked about for the waters of

the Mountain Aquifer. If control of the land is given to the Arabs, the best Israel could hope for under "cooperation" would be a split of the water. The Arabs would use the new water to develop agricultural exports, while Israel would be short 250 million cubic meters, or nearly 20 percent of her water. Israel would be forever in a position of using the leftover water after Arab use. There would be no way, short of military action, to stop the Arabs from using all the water before it reached Israeli wells.

To make matters still worse, Israel faces a grave environmental crisis should the agreement be implemented. An ecosystem's ability to support human life is limited. Again, topography here plays an important role, putting the residents of the coastal plain ecologically at the mercy of the residents of the high lands of Judea and Samaria. Already today, sewage from Shechem and

other towns form noxious brown rivers of untreated household waste that flow west, ultimately ending up in Israel's aquifers. Tel Aviv's water is clean today only because the population in Judea and Samaria is limited and the environment is able to purify the pollutants as they enter the ecosystem. However, warns geologist Prof. Arnon Sofer of Haifa University, once the land absorbs a million Arabs without proper waste management, "they will finish off the Israeli coast with sewage, dysentery, and typhus." Moreover, if the hundreds of millions of dollars promised to the autonomy are used to develop industry and agriculture, the total waste flowing to the coast of Israel will bring ecological disaster.

In addition, the environment is threatened from still another direction. Over-pumping in Judea and Samaria will lower the water table below sea level, causing salt water to flow from the sea into Israel's coast. This would

cause immediate and permanent destruction of the aquifers and the land.

The only glimmer of hope amidst this gloomy picture is that Israel does not have to hold all of Judea and Samaria to control most of the water. There are three defined regions in Judea and Samaria where pumping affects the water flow to Israel's wells. These regions, which amount to only 20 percent of the land, are adjacent to the Green Line in northern and western Samaria and include the Jerusalem hills heading south past Gush Etzion.

To prevent a destructive loss of water, Israel must retain full authority over these areas during the autonomy period and

annex them to Israel as part of the permanent agreement. Israel would control and pump the maximum amount of water from the aquifer, dividing it between Jews and Arabs as today, without endangering the ecological balance.

Preventing an ecological crisis is more difficult, as waste anywhere in Judea and Samaria will ultimately find its way to the aquifer. Israel will have to insist during the peace negotiations that it be a participant on all decisions regarding industry, agriculture, and immigration, and that all of these projects be done under the inspection and supervision of Israeli ecological experts.

Otherwise, the unavoid-

able fact is that all of Israel will wake up one morning in the near future to find that whoever rules Judea and Samaria will determine the quantity and quality of Israeli water. Its enemies, without even firing a shot, could bring Israel to its knees if Israel is not in control of the water and the environmental protection standards of Judea and Samaria. Israeli life and environment could be destroyed by ecologically dangerous activities in Judea and Samaria.

Israel must insist on controlling all the water sources and demand control and supervision in setting all ecological standards. Otherwise, Israel faces a very dry, polluted, and bleak future.

Withdrawing from History

M I C H A E L F R E U N D

(Originally published in December 1995.)

When Israeli troops complete their pullout from Shechem (Nablus) this week, they will be leaving behind more than just a city in Samaria. They will be abandoning more than 3,000 years of Jewish history, as well as a place that has always played a prominent role in our heritage.

Shechem was where our forefathers walked, where kings ruled, and where Jewish patrimony in the Land of Israel was realized. When the patriarch

Abraham became the first new immigrant to Israel, it was to Shechem he went. According to the Bible, “Abraham passed into the land as far as Shechem, until the plain of Elon Moreh” (*Genesis 12:6*).

When Abraham’s grandson Jacob returned to Israel after an absence of nearly twenty-two years, it was in Shechem that he settled. “Jacob arrived intact at the city of Shechem.... He bought the parcel of land upon which he pitched his tent...for one hundred kesitahs”

(*Genesis 33:18–19*).

It was this purchase that led the rabbis to state that no one could question the Jewish claim to Shechem. “Rabbi Yudan son of Rabbi Simon stated, this is one of the three places about which the nations of the world cannot deceive Israel by saying, ‘You have stolen them’” (*Bereishit Rabba 79:7*). How sad that our own government has fallen victim to such deception.

So distinctive is Shechem that when the patriarch Jacob, who lay on his deathbed, wanted to bless his beloved son Joseph with a special gift, it was the city that he chose to bequeath to him. “Then Israel said to Joseph...And as for me, I

Michael Freund, a columnist for the Jerusalem Post, previously served as speechwriter for the Israeli Ambassador to the United Nations and as Assistant Director of Policy Planning for the prime minister.

have given you Shechem, one portion more than your brothers" (*Genesis 48:21–22*). And so the city was passed down from father to son, from one generation of Jews to the next.

When Joshua, who led the Israelites into the Promised Land, gathered the twelve tribes together before his death, it was Shechem that he chose as the venue. "And Joshua gathered all the tribes of Israel to Shechem.... And Joshua made a covenant with the people that day, and set them a statute and an ordinance in Shechem" (*Joshua 24:1, 25*). It was there, in Shechem, that the Jewish people renewed their commitment to live according to God's commandments, a commitment they had undertaken on Mount Sinai.

It was in Shechem that the Israelites buried Joseph, Jacob's son, whose tomb is still visited by

thousands of Jews every year. Later, when Jeroboam was crowned king, he established the first capital of the northern kingdom of Israel in the city (*I Kings 12*). Thus, Jewish ancestry and Jewish royalty are closely associated with the city.

Throughout the Middle Ages, and into the modern era, Jews resided in Shechem. After Saladin defeated the Crusaders in the 12th century, Jews began to return to the city of their roots. Though the community was small, it struggled hard to renew the Jewish presence in the city. Nachmanides (the Ramban) wrote of a Jewish community there, as did other travelers and visitors.

Rabbi Menachem Mendel of Kaminitz, who visited the city in 1883, testified that there were three Jewish prayer quorums, two Sephardic and one Ashkenazic, operating in Shechem. In the 19th century, attempts were made to settle dozens of Ashkenazic Jews in the city.

Arab animosity proved too great, however, and most of the pioneers were forced to leave.

By the early 1900s, after seven centuries of continuous Jewish settlement, the Jews left the city as a result of grinding poverty and violent hostility. After World War I, Jews again attempted to live in Shechem, but growing Arab nationalism, and the 1929 anti-Jewish riots, brought a sad end to this endeavor.

In the 1970s, repeated efforts to settle Shechem were rejected by the Israeli government, leading Jewish pioneers to instead establish the nearby settlement of Elon Moreh. In recent years, a flourishing yeshiva with 70 students has been operating in Shechem in Joseph's tomb. Despite several attempts by the students to recreate the Jewish community of old, successive Israeli governments would not allow it.

Now, with the city to come under the control

of PA troops, the tenuous Jewish presence in Shechem is once again in danger of being uprooted.

However, so strong and so insoluble is the bond between the Jewish people and Shechem that the Bible refers to

it as “the inheritance of the children of Joseph” (Joshua 24:32). It is our legitimate possession, by right of purchase and by right of inheritance. No U.N. resolutions, nor any agreements signed on the White House lawn, can cut our links to Shechem.

Though the government may be able to withdraw from the city, it cannot withdraw from our past. For more than three millennia, Shechem has been a focal point of our national existence. It will yet again serve that role.

Israeli History in Palestinian Hands

SHIMON RIKLIN

(Originally published in September 1998.)

The extent to which the authors of the Oslo accords viewed the Jewish presence in Judea, Samaria, and Gaza as temporary can be seen from the example of Tel Rumeida. On the one hand, Tel Rumeida, ancient Hebron, appears on the list of important Israeli sites that have been transferred to Palestinian control. But on the other hand, Jews actually live at the site. The meaning is clear. Since all of Tel Rumeida is an archaeological site, the Labor government effectively conceded the possibility of future development or

construction at the site. After all, it would be unthinkable for the Palestinians to accept a “rescue” excavation, certainly not for the sake of developing the Jewish community there.

The Hebron accord left the situation unchanged; civilian authority in H2, which includes Hebron’s Jewish community, remains in Palestinian hands. Thus, when excavations began at Tel Rumeida last month in order to enable the construction of an army facility to protect the Jewish residents, the Palestinians objected, claiming a violation of both the Oslo and Hebron

accords. As a consequence of these protests, the excavations were repeatedly halted and renewed. Meanwhile, during the excavations, a number of undamaged Middle and Late Bronze Age artifacts, beads, and rings were found.

4,000 Different Sites

The ruins of approximately 1,500 rural and urban centers, dating from the Neolithic to the Ottoman periods, can be found throughout Judea, Samaria, and Gaza. In addition, there are more than 4,000 additional sites, from wine presses to graveyards, in these areas. Many of these locations relate to the history of the Jewish people in its land, from the

Shimon Riklin is a staff correspondent for the Israeli weekly Makor Rishon.

time of its conquest and settlement in the 12th century BCE. It should be noted that more than 90 percent of the places mentioned in the Bible are located in Judea, Samaria, and Gaza.

When the Oslo accords were signed, Israel and the PLO symbolically left archaeology as the last topic for discussion; after all, despite the marginal influence of archaeology on daily life in the state of Israel, there is nothing that better expresses the unprecedented concession of a national homeland than surrendering the places that formed its character.

In the article of the Oslo accords that is devoted to archaeology, Israel effectively concedes its right to all the archaeological sites in Judea, Samaria, and Gaza except for a small, symbolic list of sites important to Israel, which also maintains the right to add additional sites to the list during future withdrawals. In practice, however, Israel

has no practical authority over the sites, and is totally dependent on the goodwill of the Palestinians. The list remains accurate through the last withdrawal from Areas A and B, and mainly includes ancient synagogues (such as Jericho, Gaza, Estamoa, and Maon) and the tombs of important people such as those of the prophet Nathan and Gad the Seer in Halhoul and Joshua's gravesite in Kifel Hares.

A number of crude errors were made in the list as a result of poor preparation. A case in point is the Maccabean palaces on the southern and northern banks of Wadi Kelt. How can the fact that Israel conceded the northeast section of the palaces be explained? It would have been simple to deflect Jericho's Area A border a few dozen meters to the east. The same question can be asked about the Tel a-Nazba, which is near the checkpoint in southern Ramallah, and is identified as an observation post in

the book of Samuel.

Beyond the neglect of such sites, the Tel a-Nazba instance also demonstrates a lack of security consideration. According to the IDF's working plan, Tel a-Nazba, the highest peak overlooking the southern approaches to al-Bireh and Ramallah, was supposed to have served as a military outpost. The IDF viewed this as an asset, especially in the event of a possible outbreak of violence, such as occurred after the Western Wall tunnel exit was opened in September 1996. For some reason, despite being an important security factor and an archaeological site, and in spite of the IDF plans, someone marked Tel a-Nazba as Palestinian Authority (PA) property.

At the request of the Jewish residents of Tekoa and as a result of pressure from the Civil Administration staff officer responsible for archaeology in Judea, Samaria, and Gaza, the sites of Herodi-

an, Mount Gerizim, and Nebi Samuel were kept, at the last moment, in Israeli hands.

Another mistake was Israel's volunteering to include Samaria/Sebastia, Israel's capital dating back to King Omri, in Palestinian territory even though the location actually lies outside the PA. It appears that, given the "new Middle East" atmosphere at the signing of the Oslo accords, it was not particularly important to Israel's representatives whether some site would be included within the state of Israel or not.

It can most bluntly be said that, on the various maps of Israeli interests (as prepared by both the previous and current governments), primary attention was given to the issues of security and settlement. Painfully, Jewish heritage is no longer "in"—neither in the country at large, nor among Israel's decision makers. As such, the fate

of two key areas in Jewish history now lies in the hands of the Palestinians, and visits at these sites are contingent upon their goodwill.

There are two synagogues in Jericho: "Shalom al Yisrael," named after the Hebrew text included in a mosaic at the site, and "Na'aran," near Ein Diuk. The two synagogues were built during the Byzantine period, and appear on the list of important archaeological and historical sites attached to the Oslo accords.

A yeshiva functions at the Shalom al Yisrael synagogue from Sunday to Thursday. On Friday, study groups arrive from Mercaz Harav Yeshiva in Jerusalem. Residents of Shadmot Mehola, Ofra, Beit-El, Ma'aleh Adumim, and Michmas also hold early morning prayers there. Orna Kobus of Ofra periodically organizes cultural activities.

Despite the considerable

activity at the site, the Jewish presence is always conditional. For example, Jews are not allowed to enter when there is a fear of riots. In recent weeks, due to a misunderstanding, prayers have not been permitted in the synagogue itself; in fact, such misunderstandings depend on the mood of the Palestinian guards and there has already been an incident in which a Palestinian guard aimed his loaded weapon at Jewish worshippers.

Activity at the synagogue in Na'aran is more limited and centers around organizing Sabbath retreats at the nearby Camp Noam; overnight stays at Na'aran are prohibited. The mosaic floor discovered there, which was renovated when Israel controlled the site, is beginning to disintegrate. Despite official Israeli appeals to repair the mosaic, obviously at Israel's expense, these requests have not been granted, which will undoubtedly lead to the complete destruction of the site.

The Palestinians are thus in clear violation of the Oslo accords, since they are obligated “to protect such sites and to prevent damage to them.”

In fact, it can be said that the Palestinians are not complying with most of Oslo’s archaeology-related articles. The joint committee of experts that was supposed to cooperate on the issue has met just a few times and, over the past year, it has effectively ceased to exist. Despite the fact that the Palestinians committed to respect academic freedom and to provide permits for archaeological excavations, not a single Israeli researcher has actually received a permit to dig in the Palestinian-ruled areas. Despite the commitment to prevent damage to archaeological sites as a result of construction and development, the Palestinian Authority regime of fear and favoritism, which also lacks skilled manpower, is preventing this promise from being kept. If a distant cousin of Jibril

Rajoub were interested in building a house at Tel a-Nazba in Ramallah, no official would dare prevent him from doing as much.

The Sinai Excavations Precedent

But it is the non-fulfillment of the articles prohibiting the theft of, and traffic in, archaeological artifacts that constitutes the worst damage to sites in Judea, Samaria, and Gaza. Even during the period when Israel controlled the entire area, theft and vandalism were rampant as manifestations of anti-Israel activity, but at least then there was a fear of the Civil Administration inspection unit, which occasionally registered significant success in apprehending those stealing and trafficking in antiquities.

Today, it can be clearly said that many Palestinian families make their living from stealing and trading antiquities, by digging at ancient sites, extracting archaeologi-

cal finds worth a great deal of money (including coins, undamaged earthenware, marble columns, and stones with inscriptions) and selling them to interested parties in Israel.

In this manner, not only are the sites slowly being emptied of their contents, but there is less chance of someone eventually conducting a scientific excavation, given the great destruction that the thieves leave in their wake.

Meanwhile, there is one article of agreement that the Palestinians insist be implemented. According to this stipulation, “with due consideration to the Palestinian demand that Israel shall return all archaeological artifacts found in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip since 1967, this issue shall be dealt with in the negotiations on the final status.”

The Palestinian demand

to receive all the artifacts is based on the precedent by which all the archaeological artifacts from Sinai excavations were returned to Egypt. A reading of the article would seem to indicate that the authors intended to give these archaeological artifacts to the Palestinians as part of the permanent settlement. Despite the reality in which the Palestinians are violating most relevant articles, it appears that Israel will not prevent them from getting their way.

The fact that mainly the urban centers were given to the Palestinians during the first phase of the Oslo accords has caused a smaller amount of ruins and ancient settlements to be handed over thus far, since the large sites are generally located outside present-day Palestinian urban centers. From this standpoint, the planned 13 percent second withdrawal is serious for three reasons:

1. It will include key sites.

2. It will include more sites than all the previous withdrawals, since at issue is mainly handover of open areas surrounding the urban centers.

3. The difference between sites inside urban centers and those in open areas is also expressed in the degree of antiquity theft.

While it is more difficult to steal artifacts in the view of passersby, theft is far easier in open areas, and more massive destruction is expected.

It has arisen from inquiries that, if another withdrawal is made, the sad picture of a lack of consideration for the ancient sites is liable to repeat itself. The government is investing no effort in this matter. Nobody knows how the map of the coming withdrawal will look, but there is a general picture and nevertheless, reliable sources have said that no staff work on the archaeological sites has commenced.

It is difficult to shake the

impression that this is not the product of a mistake or neglect on the part of the previous government, paramount to the abandonment of archaeological sites, but rather an intentional move consistent with that government's secular political philosophy. After all, when the Jewish people becomes detached from the landscape of its birth, its link to the land, to the religion, and to Jewish tradition will in any case be broken.

From this perspective, a direct line runs between Moshe Dayan's order to remove the Israeli flag from over the Temple Mount during the Six-Day War and the lack of concern for the archaeological sites where the Jewish nation was born and formed. This will be a hindrance to future generations and increase their general detachment from Judaism, from the land, and from the Jewish people's history.

The Civil Administration is embarrassed by these

findings, since these allegations are well-founded in light of the Labor government's excessive willingness to make concessions, as expressed in the agreements. In the

end, the Civil Administration was able to make this redeeming statement: "Archaeological excavation is also part of the IDF's security operations, and security is Israel's

responsibility." This is a precedent-making assertion that may yet be evoked at important sites in the future.

About the Zionist Organization of America

The Zionist Organization of America (ZOA) is the oldest, and one of the largest, pro-Israel organizations in the United States. Founded in 1897 to support the re-establishment of a Jewish State in the ancient Land of Israel; its presidents have included such illustrious Jewish leaders as U.S. Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis, Rabbi Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, and Rabbi Stephen Wise. The ZOA was the principal organization mobilizing the support of the U.S. government and the American public which

Israel's Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said: "When I think of the ZOA, I think of an organization that refuses to compromise on the truth regardless of prevailing fashion... The Zionist Organization of America, under the leadership of Morton Klein, has done important work in explaining Israel's case to the American public, media, and Congress. The ZOA has performed a vital service by documenting and combating anti-Israel media bias; and by helping Americans understand the shared

make one-sided concessions. ZOA works to counter the existential threats that Israel faces. The ZOA is the leader in making a serious issue about the Palestinian promotion of hatred and violence against Jews in their schools, media and speeches.

The ZOA has also played a major role in fighting anti-Semitism and Israel bashing on college campuses. ZOA's testimony on campus anti-Semitism led to landmark findings and recommendations to combat this problem

"I urge you to support the ZOA and its efforts on behalf of Israel."

—Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu

led to the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948.

With a national membership of over 30,000 and active chapters throughout the United States, the ZOA works to strengthen U.S.-Israel relations through our Divisions of Government Relations, Campus Activities, and our Center for Law and Justice. ZOA leaders frequently appear on TV and radio programs including O'Reilly Factor, CNN, CNBC, MSNBC, Fox, NPR, BBC and others. We also publish articles and letters in the New York Times, Washington Post, Wall Street Journal, Jerusalem Post and elsewhere. The ZOA produces and disseminates publications such as "The Dangers of a Palestinian State" and "In Danger: Israel's Sovereignty over Jerusalem."

values and mutual strategic interests that are the basis of U.S.-Israel friendship... The ZOA has been a bulwark in the defense of Israel and the Jewish people... I urge you to support the ZOA and its efforts on behalf of Israel."

The *Wall Street Journal* said "The ZOA is the most credible advocate for Israel on the American Jewish scene today." The *Jerusalem Post* called the ZOA "one of the most important and influential Jewish groups in the U.S. today." The *New York Times* wrote that the ZOA "ferrets out anti-Semitism wherever it is."

The ZOA's Government Relations Department continues to educate members of Congress about the truth of the Arab War against Israel and the mistaken policies pressuring Israel to

by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. We triggered an internal investigation at UC Irvine to examine the possibility that a student group was illegally soliciting funds on campus to support Hamas.

We bring in speakers, distribute literature, and set up programs at colleges across the country. We teach students how to respond to anti-Israel propaganda and each year we bring a large group of students to Israel including visits to Judea, Samaria, and the Golan Heights, the only major Jewish organization to do so.

The ZOA's Kfar Silver School, on a 400-acre campus near Ashkelon, has provided education and vocational training to more than 50,000 new Jewish immigrants and others, and has a current student body of 1,000.

