

MIDDLE EAST PEACE: “*TOUR D’HORIZON*”.

Yoash Tsiddon-Chatto

February 2006

Avant Propos

This paper attempts to provide the reader with a number of history related pieces of information, the perception of whose interaction is needed to create a knowledgeable grasp of the tragic, over a century old Jewish-Arab conflict in Palestine.

It is neither news, nor detailed history. It is, rather, the information needed to form an opinion.

The paper is dedicated to the readers who wish to come to their own conclusion, rather than to those who already have acquired a firm, politically correct, mainstream opinion and do not want to be confused with facts.

Although the views expressed are personal and subjective, I attempted to present them as logically and truthfully as possible. I would appreciate reading my opponents’ views when presented in a similar way. Maybe we shall be able to find a common denominator.

Stories and books on the Arab-Israeli conflict abound. *Middle East Quarterly Review*, Fall 2004, introduces its readers to 15 new books, some of high value, released during Autumn 2004.

Examining these publications, one realizes that many are either pure academic studies of a particular event, plain current media reporting, political defensive or offensive statements related to a detail/issue, or reports on a particular event. Most of these writings are valuable, well worth reading.

However, as an active participant in over 60 years of struggle for the establishment of a “Jewish National Home in Palestine”, I believe, to paraphrase George Orwell in reverse, that “Ignorance is By No Means Bliss”. Insufficient historical perspective, lack of careful analysis of the intense ongoing interaction between various regional events, especially US and Israeli policy/war aims in the ME coupled with insufficient attention paid to global geopolitical changes over time, do lead many erudite and diligent people to wrong conclusions. Were these conclusions to relate to historic trivia, it would not matter. But where ME political issues are

concerned, one deals with matters of life and death of the region and for about 60% of the world's oil reserves. Hence this paper, whose purpose is to cast some more light on politics and media-blurred notions, vectors closely interacting in a complicated matrix.

YTC

* * *

Highlights

A New Century Dawns in the Middle East

During the period between 9/11/2001 and the present (Feb. 2006), the major geopolitical developments in the Middle East have been a strong American military presence in the region that brought down an Islamic Fundamentalist-terrorist-regime in Afghanistan and a tyrant's "socialist" regime with imperial aspirations, in Iraq. American presence in the ME will probably last years and change balances of power in the area.

To date, the American wars in Afghanistan and Iraq did not fulfill the expectations of a quick victory, the ending of terror and massive, open, popular support.

On June, 24, 2002, President George W. Bush publicly declared, that his three major "Aims of War" in the ME were:

1. Total suppression of world terror.
2. The absolute denial of possession of nuclear or other WMD capabilities by "Rogue Regimes".
3. The democratization of the Arab/Islamic Middle East.

The over 120 year-old Pan-Arabian military/terrorist effort to prevent Jewish resettlement in Palestine, the Land Promised by the Bible as well as by International Consensus (League of Nations, 1922; United Nations, 1947), has continued unabated.

The US has not yet achieved victory in the ME war; of the three aims of war mentioned here, only the first has been partially attained because the expected popular massive cooperation and joy of liberation were stifled by terror. Islamic fervor against the "Infidel" and plain xenophobia have both

been ingrained, over long periods of time, by the ruling secular tyrants or theocrats.

The consequence of this situation is a prolongation of US or allied presence in the ME to achieve all aims of war.

Democracy has barely budded in Iraq and it may need a long time to mature. The same may be true now, after the recent elections in the Palestinian Authority. ME democracy’s future depends on US nurturing it to maturity while the UN and the rest of the world are, in fact, passive bystanders.

The unexpectedly slow pace of democratization in Iraq and Afghanistan have a strong demoralizing influence on the US public and create worldwide reactionary pressures, “a self-fulfilling prophecy”.

The timetable of the Iranian nuclear program turns out to fit the pessimistic Israeli estimates rather than the US ones.

Pending developments during the coming months may demand a drastic, even military intervention to prevent an Iranian nuclear capability from manufacturing nuclear explosive devices deliverable either by available ballistic missiles or by terrorists; or, of course, to bring about the replacement of the Ayatollahs’ regime by a democratic one.

President Bush is aware of the imminence of the existential Iranian nuclear danger to Israel.

Europe is following its traditional “Munich 1939” policy of appeasement, still deliberating on how to prevent the Iranian bomb without losing the opportunity to make money.

Russia, striving to regain its great power status, is back to its Soviet pattern of fishing in troubled waters, selling nuclear facilities to Iran, missiles to Syria (to whom it wrote off huge debts), etc.

The “Oslo” Israeli-Arab Palestinian “peace process” of 1993 and its White House, Wye, Egypt, Camp David, Aqaba, etc. wakes, actively endorsed and promoted by the peace-loving US President Clinton (of Vietnam, Sudan, Yemen, first WTC attempt, etc. fame), metamorphosed into 10 years of agony and terror that claimed 1,400 Israeli and over 4,000 Arab lives as well as tens of thousands of wounded before being *de facto* put down by Israeli military, police and other security forces in spite of heavy Western media and liberal politicians “flack”.

President Clinton, the good-willing “peace at all costs” emissary, left the White House to be relieved by an antithetical President George W. Bush whose Texan straightforwardness and direct approach made him the proper man to handle the post-9/11 emerging situation. As said, Bush declared war on “The Axis of Evil”. While doing so, he tried, at the beginning, to separate between the US (just) war of the (“innocent”) West against Islamists, and the Israeli-Palestinian “feud”, where terror was allegedly used in a liberation struggle of the Arabs living in the contested (named also “occupied” or “liberated”) Biblical counties of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza strip.

Circumstances taught both the US and Israel that, *nolens volens*, they are simultaneously fighting the same war, in the same region, against the same enemy, and any one party’s achievement bears on the other.

They both had to realize that the enemy is not only religious “Muslim Extremism” that became “Islamism”. It is much more than that. (For instance, Saddam Hussein’s Iraqi “*Ba`ath* Party”, is a secular mirror image of it.)

Attempting to placate oil rich (and important US investor) Arabia, President Bush defended the Muslim religion declaring it a peace-loving faith and stating that the bloodthirsty Muslim Extremists were “but a small minority”.

Mr. Shabtai Shavit, the former head of the Israeli “Mossad” agreed, but added, “They may be a small minority, but they write the agenda for the whole of Islam.”

Judging by the hostile anti-American reaction of the liberated Muslim masses and their support of the terrorists most everywhere, Shavit is undoubtedly right. As a matter of fact, “Islamism” writes the whole world’s agenda.

Since, whether anyone likes it or not, both Israel and the US are allies in the same war, they are requested to coordinate their particular strategy and tactics. Although constraints or aims complicate the issue creating some mutually exclusive situations, synchronization is vital. Lack of synchronization of the two parties, whether diplomatic or military, will, in the long run, be harmful to both.

Given the huge asymmetry between US and Israeli military assets, there is a tendency to discard Israel’s contribution as “marginal”. This tendency is erroneous. The intensity of force that may be applied on an enemy is directly

proportional to the volume of assets, yet inversely proportional to the square of distance (in kilometers or miles) between the frontline/region and the sources of supply, not unlike the characteristics of electrical field strength.

Fighting in its backyard, Israel has always been capable – in emergencies – to deploy forces comparative in size with US expeditionary forces in the ME. While their equipment may be less sophisticated, the Israeli intelligence and familiarity with the region is more than compensating, especially in sub-conventional/terror warfare.

The US is, and will remain dependent on Islamic oil for at least one more generation, until alternative energy sources replace it. The US dependence on oil forces it to be rather ambiguous and accommodating when relating to the Islamic world, especially to the *Wahabbi*, fiercely regressive Islamist Saudi-Arabia, which is one of the main financiers of the very terrorists against whom the US is fighting.

Israel has to put up with this as long as the US does not pay Islam in “Israeli Currency”, which it has done in the past. It has to recognize the intertwined US-Arabia financial/oil interests, although a situation is created where the US feeds, *de facto*, its enemies. This requires an enormous amount of Israeli trust which the US has to generate.

The overwhelming menace of Islam threatens Israel’s very existence at close quarters as well from thousands of miles away. The intensity of the menace varies, but it’s always there.

Israel is but a small bridgehead in the Arabian Middle East, whose clearly and openly stated aim of war is nothing less than Israel’s total annihilation – “throwing the Jews into the sea”. The immediacy, intensity, asymmetry and violence of threat, UN incompetence, the world oil bias and the over-a-century duration of the conflict, demand particular US care of the Israeli Defense/Deterrence capacity, which requires territorial/topographic adjustments to the 1949 “Green Line” that has, in fact, never been a frontier but an armistice or ceasefire line.

As stated by numerous US Presidents, the US is aware of the fact that a potential demise of democratic Israel at the hands of renegade medieval theocracies or tyrant-dictatorships is bound to be a major, intolerable strategic setback for the US itself.¹

The Bush Political Earthquake

Since WWII, the US State Dept. has pursued a policy of “maintaining stability” in the ME, which was conceived to ensure a proper, smooth supply of oil. This policy, initiated by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and supported by his brother, Allen Dulles, head of the newly formed CIA, relies on coaxing, manipulating, bribing or doing anything required to ensure the continuity of the rule of corrupt or corrupted totalitarian kings, tyrants and theocrats in oil producing countries, who are given the legendary “one-thousand-and-one nights” treatment at the White House and elsewhere. The US and the democratic West as a whole remained totally indifferent *vis-à-vis* the enslavement of the destitute, illiterate, brainwashed, plebeian masses who should be, according to democratic principles, the beneficiaries of their countries’ oil richness.

Contrary to that policy of “stability”, President George W. Bush decided to “destabilize” the Arab ME and substitute democracy for its totalitarian regimes, as a humane, as well as a Kantian approach to a stable, natural peace. This is a gigantic, perhaps underestimated, task, as experience shows in Afghanistan and Iraq. It is also a “nebulous” project difficult to sell to an electorate, as Bush has learned at home, or to a public opinion like that of “allied” Europe which has never morally recovered from its Munich-1938 spirit of “justifying” democratic cohabitation with the worst of tyrannies. But:

- It is befitting a 21st century, non-Imperialist great democracy.
- It ensures real, not power-backed or corrupt “peace”.

These are not two idealistic platitudes. When the added costs of assertion, manipulation and the explosive potential of popular dissatisfaction of Muslim masses (real roots of terror?) are added to the price of the oil barrel, democratic harmony will, most probably, prove to be more cost-efficient and stable.

Defining “Peace”

As a member of the Israeli team at the Madrid Peace Conference in November 1991, this writer was faced with the topic of defining peace, which, strangely, is problematic, and left nebulous for political expediency. Peace is either the natural outcome of harmony between parties as posited by

Immanuel Kant in his 1795 book named *Perpetual Peace* (like US-Canadian peace) or, in case of a confrontational, war-prone relationship (like the US-USSR), it is the **prevention of outbreak of hostilities by deterrence**.

The ME has never known harmony. At present, peace in the ME can only be based upon deterrence. Peace based upon deterrence is unstable, like deterrence itself. Antagonists arm themselves, whether to deter or threaten, and the level of relative deterrence varies accordingly. The higher the threat, the higher the level of deterrence required.

Recent history proved that Kant was right. There has been no war between democracies in the last century.

President George W. Bush took upon himself the task of democratizing the totalitarian Islamic states of the ME, believing that all it takes is to liberate them. The transition period was probably assumed to be short and uneventful: a wrong assumption. The transition time span is, in the writer’s opinion, a matter of at least one generation, to let democracy substitute for the present ultra-religious/xenophobic upbringing from kindergarten to post-graduate levels.

Virtual, “instant harmony”, as the Oslo/Clinton teams attempted to create between two political inimical leaderships, misfired and blew up in everybody’s face. White House photo-opportunities are not enough.

Democracy is the essence of peace. It includes the act of letting the destitute masses of Pan-Arabian/Iranian ME share in the resources of their countries, create a dynamic economy, a middle class independent of outside charities and save legendary financial richness presently spent on corruption, palaces, sky slopes in hottest climate and the continuous update and maintenance of armed forces (at levels unseen anywhere else).

Where Israel is concerned, peace between the Jewish land and Pan-Arabia/Islam is conditional upon Israel’s capability to deter. Harmony will have to wait until democracy is well established and ME nations are comfortable with it.

A Glimpse into the Future

Presently, the fate of the ME depends on the achievement of US **total victory in the ongoing war**, i.e. the complete achievement of the US war-aims as defined by President Bush on June 24, 2003.

If the war against terror and the rogue regimes' WMD is successful, and the democratization process underway, the level of Israeli deterrence may be lowered as democratization becomes accepted and manifest with time.

If the US withdraws from the ME prior to having achieved **all** its war-aims, the Pan-Arabian/Islamic threats to Israel will increase beyond the level they were at before the US intervention in the ME.

Israel has to ensure that it can protect itself by itself; to prevent endangering its security in case of a US change of policy as happened in May 1967.

If accommodation of one of the members of Pan-Arabia/ Islam is attainable, Israel is advised to proceed, provided that its achievement does not downgrade, through particular concessions, the deterrence of Pan-Arabia/Islam as a whole.

The probability of the emergence of a stable, fully independent "Palestinian" state is doubtful, to say the least, as long as the Pan-Arabian/Iranian antagonism to Israel maintains its level of viciousness.

While threatened by ME Islam, Israel can only survive if:

- the Arabs of Judea, Samaria and Gaza accept a demilitarized state whose frontiers and airspace are controlled by Israel to ascertain demilitarization;
- the Arab-Palestinian state's foreign policy remains subject to Israel's accord for any strategic/relevant agreements, for the same reasons;
- the Arab-Palestinian state's economy, water resources, sanitation, transportation and ecology are intertwined with Israel's like Siamese twins, while the cultures, values, religions and affinities are so far apart; all that within the area of, say, Greater Los Angeles.

The kind of "Palestine" that may emerge under the above-mentioned conditions will never become the proper vehicle for the emancipation of the area's Arabs. The permanent solution seems, rather, to be a future possible confederative status, with Israel and Jordan each assuming its relevant function, to ensure both the well-being and the full emancipation of the West-Palestinian Arabs.

Note: The permanent solution should, by no means, delay any temporary measure that would ameliorate the situation or clear the way for any other viable solutions that may be worked out.

Israel must prepare itself to face threats in more than the conventional war threat mode, which, it seems, slipped to a secondary role following the astounding Israeli counter-offensive of the Yom Kippur War of October 1973.

The paradigm defining Israel's defense/deterrence priorities must, beginning now, relate to three dimensions of war: terror-guerilla, conventional and WMD, at closer as well as at much longer ranges than previously anticipated. Conventional forces may be trimmed, reducing the number of weapons-carrying platforms while arming them instead with fewer but "intelligent" weapons.

Three-modal intelligence and battle coordination imposes vastly increased operational requirements.

Assets required to cover all three war-modes, will almost certainly necessitate increased defense budgets in the future. Western economies' defense budgets are between 1% and 4-5% of their GDP. Israel's is 7%. It is assumed that a further increase may cause the economy to stall and spin out of control. Substituting money for natural deterrence assets like topography or space is therefore hardly advisable, if possible at all.

If more money is needed, Israel must increase its GDP. This can be a solution taken care of by growth, were the Israeli society better organized to increase added value at a national level. But it is not. Israel has to change its political regime to do it. Its social security legislation is the prisoner of some political sectors who, at present, tip the balance.

Should the US not succeed in preventing the proliferation of WMD in rogue regimes (see Iran as example), Israel will be under its biggest threat ever.

It will have to change its strategic posture accordingly to deter or defend itself, along the lines described by "Israel's Strategic Future"² published by the ACPR on June 17, 2004. In this case, chances are that an extremely dangerous, highly "flammable" nuclear cloud will hover over the ME, darkening the skies over hundreds of million innocents and casting doubt over about 60% of the world's known oil reserves.

Conclusion

Israel, a resounding success in the resettlement of refugees and in the building and sustaining a vibrant democracy under war/emergency conditions, has known heavy geopolitical setbacks despite military successes since the Yom Kippur War of 1973.

The 1993 Oslo, Clinton-sponsored experiment in “instant harmony” turned out to be catastrophic.

The resulting Arabian/anti-Semitic/UN/European success of an anti-Israeli diplomatic offensive generated and accompanied the *intifada* terror campaigns that isolated Israel abroad.

History demands that Israel pays for its setbacks yet Israel has to keep its security, society, morale and economy in good shape.

History also demands that the Arabs, who, as Abba Eban said, “never lost an opportunity to lose an opportunity”, have a considerable debt to history, pay as well. They will not be able to dodge it.

The Arab/Islamic theocrats or secular tyrants have attempted to destroy Israel and failed. They cannot tolerate a thriving democracy in their ME. (With no natural resources, carrying a relatively huge defense budget, Israel’s GDP per capita, at US \$19,000 per year, does worry Arab leaders whose countries GDP per capita coasts around US \$1,000 or less.)

Confident of its might, the cancerous outgrowth of Islamic tyrannies took on the West, starting with the US. It will be hard to persuade Islamism to change mode and instead of destruction, seek cooperation.

Having pursued a policy of “stability at any price”, the US has become a victim of practicing it. Over decades of giving in to the whims of tyrants, the traditional Dulles type of “stability policy” created the present situation where the US finances both the Islamic terrorists and the war against them. The Bush tactic infuriates the ME totalitarian leadership and elites who feel, in fact, endangered by the new US Republican (!) democratizing effort that is bound to force them to mind their own populations and share the oil bounty with their subjects who have been taught to believe that their misery is the result of Western machinations.

Believing in “instant democratization upon delivery” has been a considerable error of the Bush Administration, with bad repercussions on the US home

front and the ever equivocating Europe. This does not change the fact that the US is moving, maybe slower than anticipated, in the right direction, i.e. world democracy, which is equivalent to universal, stable peace in the world.

Only the US is capable of providing the necessary implements to make certain that the required prerequisites prevail. The alternative may be a nuclear confrontation beyond the point of no return.

“*Tour d’Horizon*”

I. A Geopolitical Perspective

Some Facts

- * Israel is a tiny, little democratic country, between the size of Rhode Island and that of New Jersey. Its area is 1/800 of Arabia, its population is about 1/65.
- * Israel vs. Arab UN votes are 1 to 22 (add support of other Islamic countries, “Third World”, etc.).
- * Israel has no oil. Not much water either. It is a country built by a handful of idealistic Zionist Jews and by countless Jewish refugees, for the absorption of more Jewish refugees. It is a notable success story. Millions of refugees, from over 100 countries – mostly non-democratic – are free, being educated and integrated in a democratic society and earning a living.
- * Israel is located in pre-WWI Turkish Western Palestine. East and West Palestine are destined, according to the Bible, to be the land of the Jewish “ingathering of the exiles”. On the basis of Bible, History and geopolitical realities, Palestine has also been allocated to the resettlement of Jews by two “*fiats*” of the international community: In 1922, the League of Nations charged Britain with the Mandate to build a “Jewish National Home” in Palestine and then, in 1947, 13% of the original (1922) Palestine was approved by the United Nations to become a “Jewish state”.

The building of Jewish settlements outside the few walled towns began in earnest under Ottoman rule. In his 1869 book, *The Innocents Abroad*, Mark Twain’s description of Palestine was one of hunger, absence of purpose, sickness, a desolate, empty, dirty transit area between Turkey and Egypt, ruled by nomad robbers and beggars.³

The Jewish building of settlements, based on modern agriculture, brought about an economic reawakening of various Arab tribes in the very sparsely populated, desolate country.

Bread drew at least as many Arab immigrants to Palestine as Jewish, a normal occurrence anywhere in similar, new, labor-intensive, agricultural settlements.⁴

- * Pan-Arabia attempted, by guise and force, during over a century, to prevent the establishment of Jewish Palestine and when unable to prevent, it invaded the country to destroy nascent Israel on the day it declared independence in May 1948. The Arab League's policy vs. Israel continues to be one of denial and violent confrontation.

Pan-Arabian absolute monarchic or theological leaderships' antagonistic motivation remains as acute as ever.⁵ The character of the Pan-Arab antagonistic attitude is strategic, ideological, religious, political and cultural, not related to any particular disagreements.

Most of the 21 Arab countries that emerged post WWI were also carved out from the ex-Turkish Empire during the same period, by the same international institutions that decided on the Jewish National Home.⁶

Challenging tenaciously the international decision on Palestine, Pan-Arabia continues to use force in its opposition to Jewish resettlement of Palestine.

- * To form an opinion of "right and wrong" based on the present custom of "random" worldwide distributed TV spots, or on the basis of chosen flash-clips of recent clashes between Palestinian-Arabs and Israelis, is to draw a conclusion on a century-long confrontation that still rages, based on a few seconds of a narrow angle projection of a subjectively chosen incident. It can be compared to looking at a still photo of an athlete while in midair jumping over a bar, and reaching the conclusion that "man flies". There can be no understanding of the conflict without a retrospective view, hence the purpose of this paper.
- * During a century of violence, none of the Pan-Arabian wars against Israel were fought with the aim of establishing yet another, 22nd or 23rd Arab independent entity. The (West) "Palestinian" ethnicity was invented during an Arab League decision of 1964, contrary to the Jordanian view represented, at the time by King Hussein, who like his grandfather, King Abdullah I, insisted that "Jordan is Palestine", as defined by the British Mandate map of the Sikes-Picot borders,

officially endorsed by the League of Nations in 1922. (See Map 1 [1919].)

- * Like the whole world, except Britain and Pakistan, no Arabian country ever recognized Jordan’s annexation of Judea and Samaria, occupied in 1948. Egypt never annexed the Gaza Strip which it occupied at the end of that same war. As part of the League of Nations defined, now defunct, British Mandate of Palestine, Judea, Samaria and Gaza are therefore, legally, “contested”, not “occupied” territories.

II. Zionist Retrospective

Return to Zion – ~1880-1882

The Romanian and Tsarist Russian Jewish “Return to Zion” (*Shivat Zion*) movement that initiated the “*Aliyah*”⁷ and resettlement of Palestine during the last 20 years of the 19th century was an adaptation of the idea of the Jewish-European Emancipation of Western Europe, superimposed on the profound Jewish religious texture and traditions of Eastern Europe. “Return to Zion” was a small movement, a few hundred people, a negligible fraction of the approximately three million Jews who chose to emigrate to America and elsewhere during that period, to escape the savage Tsarist persecutions.

Many of the few Palestinian Jews whose families never left the country after the Roman expulsion (which took place about 1,800 years earlier) or those who returned to it after the bloody persecutions and deportations of the Spanish Inquisition (1492), as well as those belonging to the Jewish congregations who trickled to Palestine over the years,⁸ were awakened by the “Return to Zion” movement and joined the Eastern European “*olim*” (immigrants to *Eretz Israel*/ Palestine) to resettle the country.

Starting in 1882, the new Jewish settlements (“Colonies”) established under the Turkish- Ottoman rule by the “Return to Zion” immigrants and the native Jews who ventured out of Jerusalem, Jaffa, Tiberias or Safed (*Tsfat*), spread all over the country. Most of them were financed by the Montefiorie or Rothschild families. They budded in the Galilee, on the Golan Heights, the Coastal and Judean Plains and in the vicinity of Jerusalem. These villages⁹ became the cornerstones of the future State of Israel a good two decades before the classic-secular, formal, Western, ideological, “Herzlian” Zionism matured.

The Balfour Declaration

Shortly before the start of WWI, the Mossul area of today's Northern Iraq was declared vital because of the discovery of oil. The Royal Navy's new operational requirement was to convert the ships' steam boilers from coal to oil burning. Oil enhanced the strategic importance of the Middle East to the British Empire, in addition to the Suez Canal.¹⁰

Britain was in a dire need to legally and legitimately possess a territory of its own in the ME because, at the beginning of the 20th century, the Egyptians started to try and shake British "tutelage" off. A British-Zionist commonality of interests emerged.

Lloyd George, Great Britain's Prime Minister at the time, a firm Christian believer leaning on a profound Biblical education, was convinced that The Second Coming requires a Jewish resettlement of Palestine. This personal belief of his was in tune with his strategic thinking. A Jewish colony/dominion, subject to the British Crown, would provide the legitimate permanent base required, if/when the time came, to substitute for Egypt as a base for safeguarding the Empire's control of the Suez and of the oil supply of the ME. Jewish "Zionism", the aspiration to recreate a Jewish state in Palestine, was only too happy to oblige.

As against Lloyd George, the Colonial Office's view was Laurentian, pro-Arab. Bribing nomadic tribal chiefs, manipulating theocrats or dictators, they believed, was so much more convenient than negotiating with democratic Europeans.¹¹

This dichotomy within the British Government has never been settled. In fact, whether pre-planned or not, it became a major obstacle to the implementation of the Zionist enterprise, to the point of choking it.

The "Balfour Declaration" of November, 2, 1917, reflected Lloyd George's policy. Its timing, at the conclusion of the British delivery of Palestine from Turkish Ottoman rule, was surely intentional. The "Declaration" was, in fact, an informal letter written by Lord Balfour, the British Foreign Minister, to Lord Rothschild, destined for Dr. Haim Weizman, the scientist who became Theodore Herzl's successor as the Head of the Zionist Movement. It stated that "the British Government will look favorably upon the establishment of a Jewish National Home in Palestine."¹² Not much as an explicit license.

According to the Anglo-French agreement of 1916,¹³ the borders of Palestine were to include present day Israel with the contested territories of Judea, Samaria and Gaza and part of the Golan Heights as well as Trans-Jordan, today's Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. Sykes and Picot's map was similar to an old geographic description of Palestine, as remote as possible from the smoke screen of present day politics, namely that of the first edition of *Encyclopedia Britannica* (1771) which defines "Palestine" as follows (quoted verbatim except old characters):

Palestine, a part of Asiatic Turkey (sic), situated between 36 and 38 degrees of east longitude, and between 31 and 34 degrees of north latitude; it is bounded by Mount Libanus, which divides it from Syria, on the north; by Mount Hermon, which separates it from Arabia Deserta, on the east; by the mountains of Seir and the Deserts of Arabia Petraea, on the south; and by the Mediterranean sea, on the west.

It was called Palestine, from the Philistines who inhabited the sea coasts. It was also called Judea, from Judah; and the Holy Land, from our Savior's residence and sufferings in it; and it is called Canaan, and the Promised Land, in the scriptures.

It is 150 miles in length, and 80 in breadth; and in the time of Solomon, it seems to have extended from the Mediterranean Sea to the River Euphrates.

A glimpse at the noun "Jews", as recorded in the same encyclopedia, may help to better understand the ethnographic structure of "Palestine" and its native peoples during antiquity, up to the 18th century.

Jews, those who profess obedience to the laws and religion of Moses.

When a modern Jew builds a house, he must leave part of it unfinished, in remembrance that the temple and Jerusalem now lie desolate. They lay great stress upon frequent washings. They abstain from meats prohibited by Levitical law; for which reason, wherever they eat must be dressed by Jews, and after a manner peculiar to themselves. Every Jew is obligated to marry, and a man who lives to twenty unmarried, is accounted as actually living in sin.

The Jews, it is said, were formerly at the disposal of the chief lord where they lived, and likewise all their goods. A Jew may be a witness by our law, being sworn on the Old Testament, and taking the oaths to the government.

For a farther account of the Jew, see the articles Caraites, Circumcision, Levites, Passover, Pherisees, Rabbins, Saducees, Sanhedrin, Synagogue, Talmud, etc.

Remark: The total absence of any reference to the notions of “Arabs” in connection with Palestine and of “Palestinians”, anywhere, in the most important 18th century encyclopedia is more eloquent than any reference.

The “League of Nations” decision, taken in 1922, to endorse the Balfour Declaration and delegate Britain as the Mandatory Power whose task was to oversee the building of the “Jewish National Home”, provided the consensual international legitimacy given to the Zionist enterprise. Yet the wording of the decree was, probably by design, a classic example of ambiguity.

What **is** a National Home? What does “**In Palestine**” **mean**? The **whole of it**? If not, **which part of it**?

Given the blurred task definition, the British Colonial Office and the British Government’s policies applied by the now internationally endorsed Balfour Declaration, became mutually exclusive, as were the Jewish and the Arab interpretations. The “Balfour Declaration” set the stage for the over 80 years of armed conflict that followed.¹⁴

Prelude to Israel’s War of Independence

The implementation of the British Mandatory policy was, as mentioned, the charge of the Colonial Office’s Cairo Minister who was less than half-hearted about the Jewish resettlement. Having not been given a clear task definition, the Colonial Office could pursue a policy of appeasement and even of courting of the Arabs of Palestine, who, supported by peer Arab states, held a much more efficient political leverage than the Jews. London was far away and cooled off following Lloyd George’s departure from office.

The first major British move, in 1921/2, was to detach Trans-Jordan (now the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan) from the Mandate of Palestine.¹⁵

The second, almost unnoticed severance of a League of Nations endorsed Mandatory territory, much smaller but of major strategic importance, vital for the defense and water supply of whatever was to become a “National

Home", was the British transfer to the French, in 1922/3, of Palestine's Golan Heights, where Jewish settlements had been implanted shortly before the turn of the century. Attempts to develop them were, of course, abandoned.

(That move had once again, nothing to do with the "natives". It was a land-swap against some French land in Northern Iraq which was probably too near to the British oil fields.)

The resettlement of Jews on purchased land, mostly considered uninhabitable heretofore (marshes), was continuously accompanied by violent Arab unrest generated, many a time, by the same high Arab dignitaries who sold the land to the Jews. Jewish use of force, timid and sporadic to start with, became organized as an independent Jewish militia, "Haganah" (defense) whom the British collaborated with or whom they pursued, as they found expedient.

Hitler's rise to power in Germany brought about a relatively large wave of German Jewish immigrants to Palestine that, in 1936, sparked an Arab armed revolt against both the Mandatory power and the Jewish community. The British found themselves, reluctantly, fighting with the Jews rather than containing them.

The British, looking for a "compromise", appointed commissions. The first one to draw a line was the (1936/7) "Lord Peel Commission" charged to examine the possible partition of Cis-Jordan, i.e. Western Palestine, i.e. the remaining 23% of the original Mandate that remained after Britain's removal of Trans-Jordan and the Golan from the map.

Peel proposed a partition where a ridiculously minuscule area, an (inverted) "L" shaped sliver of land stretching northward, along the coast, from Tel Aviv to Haifa and then east to the (formerly) marshy Valley of Jezre'el, was to become the Jewish state.¹⁶ It was a far cry from the original Mandate.

Desperate to provide a haven for the savagely persecuted German-Jewish refugees who were not accepted *en masse* anywhere else, Ben-Gurion accepted.

The Arabs did not agree to the "Peel Plan" and, encouraged by British hesitation, went on fighting with an increased zeal.

By 1939, when the Arab revolt was practically quenched with active Jewish cooperation, Britain adopted a Munich type “appeasement” policy in the Middle East as well, parallel to the one applied *vis-à-vis* Hitler in Europe.

The British “White Paper” of 1939 undertook to stop all Jewish immigration within five years, and create an additional Arab political entity with a Jewish “autonomous minority”, a total reversal of the charges bestowed upon Britain by the League of Nations. Anxious about this “on again, off again” cooperation, a small activist group of *Haganah* members seceded in 1939 to form the independent “*Etzel*”.¹⁷

After the beginning of WWII, the part of the *Etzel* who felt badly betrayed by the British in 1939, went so far as to investigate the possibility to negotiate a solution with Britain’s Italian enemies. They seceded to form the “*Lehi*”.¹⁸

With Hitler’s rise in Europe, the Jewish political leverage dropped to an all time low.

The Jewish settlement in Palestine, totally dependent on Britain, the last possible natural refuge of the by now millions of Jewish refugees in Europe, had its gates locked like those of practically all potential havens.¹⁹

During WWII, the Jews of Palestine gradually learned that the tragedy was much larger than ever imagined. It assumed Holocaust proportions.

The locking of the centuries-old Jewish communities of Europe within the Nazi Empire resulted in the barbarous, sadist mass murder by the Nazis and their willing continental collaborators, of over 6,000,000 Jews (1,500,000 of them children), one third of the Jewish people.

And yet, Ben-Gurion, the Palestinian-Jewish leader, declared that “We shall fight the Nazis with Britain as if there were no ‘White Paper’ and fight the White Paper as if there were no Nazis.” Given the almost desperate military situation of Britain, the latter half of Ben-Gurion’s statement, i.e. the fight against the White Paper was in fact abandoned at the beginning of WWII, in September 1939, and the Palestinian Jews rallied to help Britain win. With almost 10% of the Jewish Palestinian community drafted into the British Armed Forces and the remaining able hands providing support and securing the safe allied foothold in Palestine, the *Yishuv*’s²⁰ contribution to the war effort during the 1939-1945 World War, was, percentage-wise, one of the highest in the world.

The Arab war effort went mostly against the British. When, in 1941, Rommel's Afrikakorps invaded Egypt, eventually reaching El-Alamein on the way to Alexandria and the German offensive in Soviet Russia reached the Caucasus oil fields, trying to advance to the Turkish border,²¹ the anti-British (1941) Iraqi revolt of Rashid Ali el Quilani, was actively helped by the Germans. It was to provide, if successful, the missing link in a giant pincer move meant to evict Britain from the Middle East, occupy the Suez Canal and facilitate German control over the Middle Eastern oil. The Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, Hadj Amin el Husseini, appointed to his position by the British authorities, the man who led the 1936-1939 Arab revolt in Palestine, joined Hitler and helped him mobilize Bosnians, Albanians and other European Muslims to join the Waffen-SS. His efficiency was remarkable.

In Egypt, a pro-German officers' uprising against Britain and against the supposedly pro-British King Faruk, had to be put down by the British through use of force to prevent the loss of the British bases in Egypt, vital for Britain's North-African campaign, and for control of the Suez Canal.²²

Syria and Lebanon, under Vichy-French rule, cooperated with the Nazis and provided the Germans with air force bases from which they bombed the only relatively secure British base – Palestine – until they were conquered, in 1942, by Britain, with Australian troops assisted by Jewish-Palestinian (*Haganah's Palmach*) scouts and intelligence.

During the whole term of the British Mandate, while Jewish immigration into Palestine was at best restricted and, during WWII, when it was *de facto* denied, the borders with the neighboring Arab countries were open for all practical purposes.

As mentioned, Arabs migrated into Palestine by the tens of thousands, first because the newly established Jewish colonies and other Jewish economic development provided work. Later, during WWII, when the British withdrew to El-Almein and Rommel threatened, by the end of 1941, the major port of Alexandria, the small Palestinian port of Haifa substituted for it, becoming badly overloaded. The British imported tens of thousands more Kurds and Khoranis to substitute manual labor for want of harbor installations. As a cadet at the Royal Navy-sponsored "Haifa Nautical School", the writer witnessed this process. A fair description of this labor import may be found in the detailed book, *From Time Immemorial*, by Joan Peters.²³

By the end of WWII, in early 1945, given the unveiling of the horrible tragedy of the Holocaust and the cessation of war activities, Zionist Jewry expected Britain to promptly reassume its original Mandatory charges and help the accelerated building of the Jewish National Home that was naturally supposed to safeguard the legitimate post-war British strategic interests in the Middle East.

It was not to happen.

The new British Labor Government's Foreign Office headed by Ernest Bevin, declared that, in order to safeguard the common British-Arab interests, Jewish refugees in Europe should be returned to the countries of their torments, by force if needed, and that the 1939 White Paper, written by Britain under duress, is, in fact, to be revalidated.

The British support of the Arabs became evident: the Arab League was founded by Britain on March 22, 1945, to cement and coordinate Arab-British policy in the ME at a time when no more WWII related dangers loomed for Britain, not even in the Far East.

Denied the right to save their barely surviving brethren from the Displaced Persons camps in Europe as well as the Jews fleeing communism from behind the "Iron Curtain", and with their own survival threatened, the Jews of Palestine were left no choice. They adopted an anti-British stance, confronting Britain on two "fronts": An effort to force the "gates" of Palestine open (closed to the Jews but open to Arabs), and an effort to apply guerilla pressure upon the British administration and armed forces, while avoiding full-scale encounters with either the British military or the Arab population.

The "illegal" immigration required a massive organization, control of the "illegal" embarkations at sea and an extensive covert radio-communications network, mainly in Europe, East and West and also in the British internment camps of Cyprus, in Iraq, Egypt and North Africa as well as in the US, the supply base. The network was operated from the HQ station in Palestine, with backups in Milan and, later, Paris. The covert logistics effort was enormous.

The "*Aliyah Bet*", as the "illegal" immigration organization is known, was led by the *Haganah*, the major paramilitary force of the *Yishuv*, now deeper underground than ever.

The guerilla effort was started by “*Etzel*”, the aforementioned much smaller underground formation which broke away from *Haganah*, and by “*Lehi*” (Stern Gang) which broke away from “*Etzel*”. They were not ready to accept the Jewish Agency’s (the Jewish “government in being”) policy of restraint, to apply minimum force aimed exclusively at political gain. When the *Haganah* pitched in with larger scale operations, the British had to station 100,000 paratroopers and other prime fighting units in Palestine, one soldier for every five Jews, children, women and elderly included.

Fighting the “*Aliyah Bet*” slow, rusty, crammed, old vessels (most of which did not deserve to be called ships) were the cream of the RAF and of the Royal Navy, including the cruiser, Ajax, of “Graf von Spee” fame.

The persistence (and lack of alternative) of both the Palestinian Jews and that of the Jewish European refugees who wanted to rebuild their lives, won.

Impoverished by the war and put to shame by its own actions, post-war Britain maneuvered itself into an international political, worldwide public opinion and economic *cul de sac*. Hardly anyone understands why; possibly, pure anti-Semitism. Or, maybe, doubt whether a Jewish country built by refugees for refugees could be of any lofty Imperial use.

By the summer of 1947, having faced calamity, Britain advised the UN, the legitimate heir to the by now defunct League of Nations, that it decided to return the Mandate to the International Community, and was to complete its withdrawal from Palestine by May 15, 1948.

The Jewish resistance, led by “*Aliyah Bet*” that started in earnest at the end of WWII, in 1945, won the first round on the way to independence.

Historic research based upon the by now declassified British documents of the epoch, tends to point to the British inability to stem the “illegal” immigration as being the main reason of admitting defeat.

Israel’s War of Independence

Following the British decision to leave Palestine, the UN took upon itself to find a solution acceptable to both Jews and Arabs. The Arab opposition was adamant. Jews and Arabs started to prepare for a highly probable armed confrontation.

The UN proposed a new partition of (Western) Palestine that was somewhat adapted to post-WWII realities.²⁴ It voted on it on November 29, 1947.

The hard-pressed Jews accepted it. The *Yishuv* celebrated.

The Arab world, including the Arabs of (Western) Palestine, did not. The world looked on, indifferently again, as a new holocaust, perpetrated this time by the Arabs, was about to sweep the Jewish people.

The preparations were asymmetric. The borders between Palestine and its Arab neighbors became, with British tacit consent, more permeating than ever. But during the same period, still in charge until May 1948, the Royal Navy and the Royal Air Force did their best to deny Jewish reinforcements in arms and personnel by tightening the blockade of Palestine's Mediterranean Sea access with a vengeance.

The Jews were at a clear disadvantage, relying mostly on TAAS, their local underground facility manufacturing mainly explosives, Sten submachine guns, 2 and 3 inch mortars and related ammunition as well as hand-grenades. Artillery was substituted by one or more fighters, each carrying on his back up to 50 kg. (~112 lbs.) of explosives. They approached the target undetected or covered by a foursome or so of escorts armed with Sten submachine guns whose task was to open fire on lookouts and make them take cover while the "engineers" placed the explosive charge at the wall, door, etc. With no logistics, transportation, planes, tactical communications, artillery, etc., the *Haganah* was supposed to fight the regular armed forces of a coalition of Arab states supplied, trained and, in the case of Trans-Jordan, officered by the British. Not a promising future.

Field-Marshal Montgomery of Britain and General Marshall of the US poured oil on the fire when each one produced an independent, learned study whose conclusion was that the Jews did not stand a chance. Arab self-confidence and morale were enhanced. Jews had no choice but to fight, relying mostly on motivation and on the want of an alternative, their secret weapons to which neither Montgomery nor Marshall seemed to attach much value.

On May 15, 1948, the British were officially out of the Palestine Mandate and the State of Israel was proclaimed. Pan-Arabia invaded that same day.

The Arab rulers had three valid reasons to prevent the establishment of an "infidel", Western state in their midst: (Were the Arab *fellaheen* to be aware

of the true value of Zionism which could transpose them from the Middle Ages to the 20th century, they could have had to encourage the Jews, but no “civilized” democracy has ever sought access to the plebeians of Arabia, nor did anyone, democrat or not, care about them.)

- a. Situated at the crossroads of three continents, Israel divides Arabia/Islam in two halves: “Arabia Africana” and “Arabia Asiana”. The subconscious (or maybe someone’s conscious) dream of an Islamic Caliphate or hegemony, is threatened by a Jewish state at the crossroads.
- b. A Western, high income, high added value economy, demanding education, skills and providing for higher standards of life, is bound to create a middle-class which is equivalent to a death warrant to totalitarian rulers and the fundamentalist clergy interacting with them. The Arab rulers are right: Israeli Arabs’ GDP per capita is presently about US \$12,000 per year. After five years of “*intifada*”, the Arabs of Judea, Samaria and Gaza are down to about US \$2,500. Egyptian, Jordanian and Syrian Arabs make below US \$1,000 per capita per year in “stable” political conditions. No Israeli Arab is ready to accept an Egyptian, Syrian or even Jordanian standard of life.
- c. The *Qur`an*, the Muslim version of The Book, demands that all believers fight a continuous “*jihad*” (holy war) to impose the “True Faith” upon the world, until the world is “freed”. It also declares that any territory conquered from the infidel becomes automatically part of the “*Dar el Salaam*” (house of peace) and all other territories/ land are “*Dar el Harb*” (house of war), to be conquered.

Islam forbids any transfer of “*Dar el Salaam*” land to the infidel.

Accepting an “infidel” Israel on Muslim territory is, therefore, a Sacrilege.

It is, therefore, not surprising that, having won the January 2006 “Palestinian Authority” elections, all the fundamentalist Islamic “*Hamas*” can offer is **not recognition of Israel**, but only a “prolonged truce”. It cannot, according to Islam, cede any “*Dar el Salaam*” territory.

In spite of odds and expectations, Israel won the war imposed upon it by Pan-Arabia, a war that was openly supported by Islam and tacitly by others. (Britain abstained during the UN vote and maintained its manpower and weapons blockade of Israel “in the name of the arms boycott” while it armed, trained and officered a number of Arab armies in the ME.)

A strong British-US intervention brought about an Israeli withdrawal from the Egyptian Sinai, the Eastern part of which was conquered by Israel to outflank the Egyptian Army in the Gaza Strip.

The last major planned Israeli operation of the war, the occupation of Judea and Samaria, was also cancelled two hours before “H-hour”, in deference to American coercion and offer of loans²⁵ and a British threat to intervene under its “obligation” to protect the Emirate of Trans-Jordan.

Armistice is Fake – 1949-1957

Between December 1947 and Spring 1949, all Arab fronts collapsed; there was a total Israeli victory, but not a decisive one. Minding its own interests as defined by Allen Foster and John Foster Dulles, the US Administration, supported, obviously, by the UN, prevented a clear cut outcome, as it did after all the major encounters.

Pan-Arabia accepted the UN brokered ceasefire with relief. So did Israel.

The armistice agreements that were assumed to open the door to peace were signed during the first half of 1949 at the “Roses Hotel” on the island of Rhodes, recently recovered by Greece. The major disputes were supposed to be settled. *Nolens volens*, Israel was there, independent, functioning.

Although a Pan-Arabian coalition invaded nascent Israel, a separate armistice was negotiated and signed between Israel and each of its Arab enemies except Iraq.

Note that in 1949 neither the Arabs, nor the UN, the West or anyone else were aware of the existence of a “Palestinian” nation, entity or tribe entitled to participate as such in the Israeli-Pan Arabian settlement of the Israeli-Pan Arabian conflict. They were just Arabs, refugees or not.

Trans-Jordan’s Emir Abdullah became the King of Jordan and bestowed Jordanian citizenship upon the Arabs of Judea and Samaria in 1951. In 1988, King Hussein, Abdullah’s grandson, cut his country’s ties with Judea and Samaria to avoid responsibility for the first “*intifada*” and prevent its spilling over east of the Jordan River. Legally, Judea and Samaria remain, to this day, unattached, contested territories.

Egypt never annexed occupied Gaza, which meant that Gaza remained a contested territory as well. Bordering with Egypt, the Gazans, locals and

refugees from what became Israel, were denied Egyptian citizenship and confined to their strip. They were required travel documents to cross the old Mandatory border into Egyptian Sinai.

Iraq, which had an Expeditionary Corps in Palestine during the war but had no common boundary with Israel, refused to sign the Armistice, which, according to international law, means that it is in a state of active war with Israel to this day.²⁶

Following the armistice agreements, (See Map 4 [1949-1967].) the Arab states made no effort to help solve the West-Palestinian refugee problem. In one of the rarest, most cynical and dastardly acts ever of politics substituting for brotherly empathy toward co-nationals for whose sake Pan-Arabia pretended to have attempted to annihilate infant Israel, Pan-Arabia denied help to those who became refugees as a result of the war it initiated. Having lost that war, the Arab countries turned the refugees into political pawns, a "bleeding wound", by refusing to integrate them in their societies. They were to become a tatters clad living monument, a reminder that "The Palestine Problem" stays on the world's agenda and is fed by the world taxpayers for, by now, 58 years, housed in shanty-towns all over Arabia. Their initial number of about 5-700,000 reported at the time by the British to the UN is presently assumed to be about 10 times that many. How? Since the refugees and their offspring generations are fed by the UN, many other Arabs join the soup-kitchen line and reporting on the deceased is delayed or "forgotten". The Arabs who fled the battlegrounds of Palestine, most of them at the request of the Pan-Arabian coalition "to clear the area to facilitate cleansing", were marked by Arabia to become eternal homeless.

Some 2,500,000 Jewish refugees from Europe and about 8-900,000 fleeing the Arab countries have resettled in former Palestine, renamed Israel, where they built a country for more inbound refugees. Arabia, oil-rich and covering an area 800 times that of Israel "could not" assimilate its brothers, whose customs, culture, religion and mother tongue are identical. Was this to be the only exchange of population the world has ever seen? Sixty million refugees were relocated in Europe after WWII, a tragedy, thank God, long forgotten. Does the world, the UN (i.e. its members) have to foot the bill of this aberration for eternity? It's incredible, but true; "respect" for 22 Arab and countless Islamic UN votes, and oil, probably.

No Arab signatory of the armistice honored its own signature for even one day. The general propaganda – “Hate War” – continued on the morrow of each armistice. Jordan, the most “European” of the Arab regimes, literally run by Britain for quite some time, did not permit, as undertaken, Jewish free access to the Jewish holy places across the dividing line between Jordanian and Israeli Jerusalem.²⁷

Jordanian sniping from the high ground of the walled Old City of Jerusalem became routine, as did armed incursions. A meeting of archaeologists in southern Jerusalem was targeted by Arab Legion snipers, who killed 16 scientists, etc.

Disregarding the armistice they signed, the Syrians started to push, first into the “demilitarized zones” and then into hard-to-defend enclaves, like Hammat Gader (*El Hamma*). Shelling of Israeli upper Jordan Valley settlements from the (controlling Syrian) Golan Heights, rendered regular life almost impossible. Civilian losses amassed. Agricultural machinery had to be bullet-proofed.

Cross frontier pillaging was encouraged. Protected by the Golan high-ground, the Syrians imposed, in opposition to the armistice clauses, their presence on the North-Eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee, which meant pirate fishing and pillaging of scarce water resources. That went on for years, with Israel on the defense because of the dominant Syrian artillery positions deployed on the Golan high ground.

Egypt set up the paramilitary units of “*Fedayun*” whose task was to launch a terror campaign within the borders it agreed at Rhodes to respect. Attacks on buses and other acts of sabotage were perpetrated, be it between Tel Aviv and Jerusalem or on the road to Eilat.

For years, Israeli freedom of maritime traffic sailing through the Red Sea, the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba was denied in spite of the Rhodes Armistice.

The Lebanese boundary was relatively, but not entirely quiet. At the time, there was still a Christian majority in Lebanon. Eventually, Christians became a minority in Lebanon because of the Islamic pressure that resulted in forced expatriation for many.

Arab countries not bordering with Israel ignored the armistice agreements and went on with offensive activities like propaganda and provision of

political haven, finance, arms and training for terrorists or would-be terrorist groups.

The Arab Boycott, applied in the name of the Arab League by those countries which actually signed the armistice agreements to lift it, went on, tight as ever. To this day, no multi-national oil company sells directly to Israel.

About 500,000 Jews lived in Palestine in 1945. About 600,000, in 1948, by the time the “Illegal” immigration epic ended and the gates of Israel opened. At the end of 1949 there were 1,000,000.²⁸ Most newcomers came destitute, either from the ashes of Europe, dispossessed from Arab countries or from among the poor of North Africa.²⁹ They had to be housed and fed. The armed forces build up and anti-terror defense expenditures were exorbitant. Resources were strained almost to the point of collapse. Food was rationed. When Ben-Gurion cut the defense expenditure by reducing the armed forces, the level of deterrence lowered. Automatically, Arabia downgraded the Rhodes armistice until terror and counter-terror became the daily agenda and war followed.

The first major geopolitical setback for Israel came during 1955, when the “Free Officers Revolutionary Regime” in Egypt concluded “The Czech (USSR) Arms Deal” that followed the nationalization of the Suez Canal. The quantity and quality of aircraft, armor, artillery, logistics, training, political and operational support of the Soviet Union delivered first to Egypt and then to the other revolutionary regimes like Syria, Iraq, Yemen and Libya were astounding. The Middle East started slipping away from the Western sphere of influence. The darkest, fundamentalist *Wahabbi* regimes, like that of Saudi Arabia, instinctive haters of Communist atheism and all it stood for, became the “anachronistic” symbols of association with the democratic West. The “awakening” Egypt and Syria, the hyperactive movers and shakers of the pro-Soviet “non-aligned” nations, veered east.

Embargoed Israel’s arsenal was a pittance by comparison to the modern Soviet stockpiles in Arab hands. The Israeli deterrence collapsed. The Rhodes Armistice lost the little validity it had.

Harmony between the Islam and “infidels” has never existed. At best, Islam does agree to “*hudna*”, that is, by *Qur`an* definition, a time limited truce which is supposed to last as long as Islam needs in order to acquire the force to resume its “*jihad*”, i.e. holy war.

Until democracy displaces the Muslim culture of war, which will probably require decades, peace between Israel and Pan-Arabia/Islam (against whom Israel fought its War of Independence and was to fight **all** its future existential wars), is going to be assured only by a level of deterrence that is high enough to outweigh all Pan-Arabia's/Islam's acute anti-Israeli aggressive intentions.

By 1956, the costs of absorbing a massive immigration from Europe and Arabia and of tapping the by now accessible French supply of arms³⁰ rendered the restoring of deterrence quasi-impossible in conventional ways.

This was the era of British-French indignation at Nasser's "robbery" of the Suez Canal, of the Soviet undertaking to build the Aswan dam, of the French-Arab war in North Africa; and also of the continued US arms embargo and disregard of the Jewish country in tune with the Dulles concept.

A unique opportunity arose in 1956, when Britain and France decided, without US consent, to strike at Egypt and repossess the Suez Canal. France brokered an Israeli participation in the pending Anglo-French expedition against Nasser in exchange for which Israel would receive a massive infusion of French armament before the start of hostilities.

The decision to participate in the Franco-British "imperialist" offensive against Egypt was of capital importance to Israel. It offered the possibility to halt the intensive Egyptian *feddayoun* terror offensive, rearm to a hitherto unachievable level and dramatically restore the Israeli deterrence posture by demonstrating to Arabia, the West and the Soviet Union, that Israel could fight and win a conflict even in the new, Soviet imposed geopolitical circumstances. Also, maybe, convince the US that Israel is a significant factor in the ME, worthy of superpower attention and is, of course, decidedly anti-Soviet.

The Israeli part of the bargain, the "Sinai Campaign" that started on October 28/29, 1956, a number of days before the Anglo-French landing, was an outstanding success. Israel took Sinai, three times its size, in 100 hours, with acceptable losses. When the ceasefire was forced upon it *in situ* by the Soviet threat and the US rebuke, all Israel's tactical objectives were already met. Israel's withdrawal took place only about six months later, when its conditions of checking the terror, of Sinai demilitarization and of lifting the

Red Sea maritime blockade of the Israeli port of Eilat, were met by Egypt in a formal ceasefire and guaranteed by the US and UN.

For the Anglo-French, the "Suez Affair" turned into a military and geopolitical catastrophe. They did not move fast enough to get a head start on international politics.

The choice of timing could not have been worse from the international point of view. November, 2, 1956 was Election Day for President Eisenhower's second term. The very fact that the Europeans planned and executed such a major move in the ME, while hiding it from the US, was bad enough. To do it at US election time meant a sheer challenge.

The Anglo-French operation itself was a slow-motion overkill where speed was the key. When the Soviets threatened with nuclear missiles unless the fire ceased, the Anglo-French were caught "halfway to the objective", which gave Nasser a total victory on a silver platter, thanks to the Soviets.

The US, its President hot with anger, denied any offsetting of the Soviet nuclear threat, which accelerated the Anglo-French capitulation. Acting in anger was, in the writer's opinion, a huge US mistake whose immediate result was the *de facto* acceptance by the West of Soviet interests and presence in Arabia and the ME, while precipitating the future estrangement between the Trans-Atlantic Allies, when time came and Europe could afford it. It seems that Eisenhower realized that he made a bad mistake and apologized for it, when it was already too late.

Incidentally, at the same time when the Soviets reacted with such vigor to the Anglo-French "imperialist coup", they invaded Hungary on a killing spree to put down the Hungarian anti-communist freedom fighters' revolt. No US, European or "non-aligned" voice was heard.

The US intervention in Egypt's favor in the Middle East, side by side with the Soviets, signaled the end of European influence in the area and the downgrading of Britain and France to second tier powers.

In the Arab/Islamic world, the US became identified with the regressive regimes while the Soviet Union became identified with the "progressive revolutionary/secular Arab states".

A strange situation resulted. At the end of the Suez/Sinai Campaign, the winners were Israel **and** its Soviet sponsored antagonists, while the losers were France, Britain and also the United States, the Western allies.

Israel's "Hinge of Fate" – The Six Day War, June 1967

From the beginning of 1963 to the end of 1966, this writer served as Head of Air-Branch-2 of the Israeli Air Force. Air-Branch-2 fulfilled, at the time, the tasks of Air Force Planning, Operational Requirements, Technical Intelligence, Flight Test and Evaluation as well as Operational Research. It is, therefore, suggested that the following picture of the contingency planning and execution of the Six Day War presented in this paper, whether objective or not, is based upon tangible, first hand evidence. I wish to share some of it.

The period of 1957-1967 was one of reduced tension on the Egyptian front, with *feddayoun* terror activities drastically reduced and Israel bound shipping sailing unmolested through the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aqaba. Sinai stayed demilitarized over that period.

But terror and military confrontation originating in Syria, increased considerably. Terror originating from Judea and Samaria – at that time Jordan – continued at what seems to have been a constant, maybe even increased level. The Soviets were very active.

Israeli cooperation with France intensified to the point where some leaders, military and political, believed that starting in 1963 Prime Minister Eshkol was ungrateful to our French allies when suggesting that Israel should attempt to convince the US to cancel its arms embargo. In 1963, President Kennedy fulfilled his promise to supply Israel with the purely defensive "Hawk" anti-aircraft missiles.

The French technological shortcomings in the domains of armored vehicles as well as in strike aircraft weapons systems and engines,³¹ encouraged "knocking at the door of the US". At the time, France did not manufacture tanks which matched the Soviet T-62 or even the T-55. The French SNECMA Atar jet engines, extrapolated from the WWII German jet engines of the Messerschmidt 262, had a very high specific fuel consumption, which reduced their useful payload/range performance. Sophisticated WDNS (Weapons Delivery and Navigation Systems) or airborne radars were either non-existent or non-reliable. Nor were any French airborne digital computers in existence.

Israel's insistence on upgrading its armed forces had valid reasons.

After the "Suez Affair/Sinai Campaign", the Soviet penetration in the Middle East had become an established fact. The ever increasing flow of Soviet arms, especially, but not exclusively, to Egypt, Syria and Iraq, was followed by tens of thousands of Soviet military advisers. Soviet operational doctrine was adopted by the "progressive" Arab revolutionary republics to suit Soviet arms, training and tactical as well as strategic concepts. Soviet forces structure served as model.

By 1964/5, the crushing quantitative and qualitative Arab military superiority became a fact. This fact's main consequence was, obviously, a dangerous lowering of Israeli relative deterrence, which increased the danger of war. The declarations of Pan-Arab intent of revenging the 1948 disaster and wiping the State of Israel off the map became ever louder, then strident.³²

The overwhelming Arab arms superiority, regained self-confidence, Soviet active backing and Islamic support, required a level of Israeli deterrence that Israel could not produce to prevent hostilities.

Levy Eshkol, the Israeli Prime Minister, was seen as hesitant and indecisive, which misled Arabs and Soviets to believe that he would not dare to react to pressures at the right time. This Soviet-Egyptian estimate considerably reduced the credibility of Israeli deterrence and further increased the danger of war.

Since 1963, while the Israeli deterrence level was being reduced, Egypt was engaged in the botched invasion of Yemen, its (and the Soviet's) probable main objective being Saudi Arabia. Nasser's offensive was "stuck". The Egyptian army remained stalled "halfway" even after the use of chemical weapons (mustard gas).

The conclusion, in Spring 1967, of an alliance among Egyptian, Syrian, Jordanian and Iraqi armed forces opened the Soviet encouraged option to attack Israel, which justified a withdrawal from Yemen without losing face. Note that in Arab, like in old Japanese culture, loss of face is a major catastrophe which, in current life, justifies suicide, "honor killing", etc.

In 1967, Nasser and his Soviet advisers believed that Egypt mustered a sufficient force to avenge the humiliation of 1948 and do away with the "Zionist Entity".³³

The fuse of the powder keg was ignited by the Soviets who “asked for Egyptian solidarity in view of Israel’s massing troops to march against Syria”. The fact that there was no such massing and that **all movement** in the Upper Jordan valley could be observed from the Syrian-held Golan did not “convince”. When the Soviet Ambassador to Israel was invited to come and see for himself, he refused. This outrageous situation befitted the old saying, “My mind is made up. Don’t confuse me with facts.”

On May 15, 1967, while the Independence Day Parade proceeded as planned in Israel, Nasser marched into the Sinai. Egypt decided, on purpose, to trip the tripwire.

The remilitarization of the Sinai and the deployment of its armed forces units close to the Israeli boundary, or the re-imposition of the Red Sea maritime blockade – be it in the south at the narrows of Bab-el-Mandeb or at Ras Nasrani, the Southern ingress to the Gulf of Aqaba – or, of course, both, were explicit *casus belli* as per the US brokered ceasefire of 1957.

Nasser’s openly declared Aim of War was the total destruction of Israel – no less.

Israel was supposed to cave in, either after an Israeli military attempt to check the absolutely superior Arab coalition of Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Iraq, and other expeditionary forces,³⁴ or have the government, headed by a hesitant Eshkol capitulate *a priori* when the Arab overwhelming might would be deployed on its borders. Or, “at worst”, Israel was to offer “generous” territorial concessions, as advised by renegade US, biased Britain and others.

The planned, total destruction of Israel would be brutal and immediate if the reaction of the international community would allow it, or gradual, if the world would be overly vociferous.

Israel was, and remains short-winded, not only diplomatically but physically as well. To face large concentrations of regular armed forces on its demarcation lines, tiny Israel has to mobilize reservists, the same people who earn the country’s bread and pay taxes. Therefore mobilization cannot be indefinite, over a large span of time. Mobilizing Israel’s productive population to face Nasser’s threat on the border meant total national paralysis and Nasser knew that.

The distance between the Israeli frontier and Ras Nasrani/Sharm-el-Sheikh, the southern narrows at the entrance of the Gulf of Aqaba/Eilat, or to the Suez Canal, is about 250 km. The time required by Egypt to move massive forces from across the Suez Canal to the Israeli armistice lines was assessed to be about 48 hours, the time Israel required for the mobilization of its reserves, hence the importance of demilitarizing Sinai.

In case of conventional armed conflict, victory belongs to the party whose ground forces freedom of movement is guaranteed for both operational as well as logistic purposes while the antagonist's forces are immobilized. In the ME fair weather, with its mostly arid or desert area, forces move in the open, with no cover, normally trailing behind them huge wakes of dust, making them highly visible from the air. The guarantor of freedom of movement for ground forces in the ME is air superiority. The party whose air force will achieve air superiority will win the war, even with inferior ground forces.³⁵

In May-June 1967, the Arab coalition's numeric superiority in fighter planes was about 2.65 to 1. The Arabs also possessed a fair number of bombers.

Given the size and shape of Israel, the median time of penetration of anti-aircraft defenses on the way to target would be, for an Arab fighter aircraft, approximately 1-5 minutes. For the same type of mission, an Israeli strike-fighter would have to fly for about 20-30 minutes over defended areas.

Disabling the Arab air forces by forcing upon them to fight an air-to-air battle "*à la Battle of Britain*", where Israelis were decidedly superior would depend upon the Arab response to the challenge and would certainly be, in operational terms, painfully time-consuming.

Interception and "dogfights" are, after all, a defensive battle, depending upon the enemy's initiative and timing.

The only way to disable the superior Arab air power and achieve instant air superiority was by pinning it to the ground, then proceeding to destroy the parked aircraft.

Pinning down meant penetration, anti-aircraft defense evasion, cratering the runways, adding runs for strafing/bombing/rocketing parked aircraft, while retaining enough fuel to cater to a possible defensive air-to-air engagement if challenged, and to return home safely for the next mission. That meant reduced, special payloads to hit prioritized points on the runways.

The Israeli Air Force operated at the time from only eight jet fighter runways. Egypt, Syria, Jordan and Iraq had more than 50. Priorities had to be allocated to optimize the mission and to alleviate, as much as possible, the tasks of the coming waves. However, the first sortie had to be decisive. That required the Israeli Air Force to put all eggs in one basket, a “winner takes all” move with no recourse.

A scenario that could entail a terminal Israeli catastrophe was that of an Arab opening of hostilities with an *a priori* air strike on the few Israeli runways. Under the circumstances, there was no answer to that scenario, except preventing it from happening.³⁶

The only way to prevent a decisive Pan-Arab first strike on the Israeli runways was, and remains, to preempt. Given the Arab crushing numerical superiority, preempting is not sufficient. One has to be capable to preempt by tactical surprise.

On February 22, 1967, Yigal Allon (then Deputy Prime Minister and the most experienced and successful field general of the War of Independence) made the following statement during the course of a policy presentation, (writer’s translation from memory):

In my following statement I prove that, were war to be imposed against us, Israel is entitled and even compelled – as well as capable – **to open with a preemptive strike against its enemies, so as to win and, in some circumstances, as an only means to survive.** (Translator’s emphasis)

It was the right time for Allon to make the statement. It coincided with the Soviet/Egyptian preparations.

Syria

During 1964-1965, Syria attempted to deny one third of Israel’s water supply, reneging on an agreement concluded in the 1950s, through the good services of the US envoy, Johnston. Since Israel, Southern Syria and Jordan share the same water basin, Johnston’s mediation related mainly to the sharing of water distribution. Lebanon did not need the Johnston Plan. It is blessed with water.

The Syrians planned to deny Israel the water by diverting it. The diversion began by digging a canal starting at the sources of the Jordan River located in full Israeli view, just beyond the Lebanese and Syrian Demarcation Lines. The diverted Jordan water was to flow away from its natural (Jordan)

riverbed situated within the Israeli lines, and fed by gravity into a sloping canal dug along the Syrian held slopes of the Golan Heights, bypassing the Sea of Galilee, then dumped south of the lake, into the lower Jordan River, controlled by the Kingdom of Jordan, to waste into the Dead Sea. A major Syrian national project, an expenditure of huge sums of scarce money, was meant to inflict a major, catastrophic damage to Israel. It was also meant to cause an ecological damage of first magnitude causing the abatement and staling of the Sea of Galilee, as we know it since Biblical times.

As usual, the world turned its back on the issue. It declared (mildly) that Syria's act was a breach of international agreements and went about its other business.

By 1964, after much deliberation and futile, unanswered pleas to the UN, Israel applied military force, shelling and bombing the diversion works and their machinery.

Syria had to abandon the project, but "saving face" demanded that the Israeli-Syrian Demarcation Lines be continuously harassed by the shelling of Israeli villages, by military incursions and aerial dogfights which Syria engaged in and always lost.³⁷

The last air encounter took place in May 1967, when six Syrian Mig-21 fighters were shot down by Israeli Mirages out of a 12 ship formation, some of them over the Israeli Sea of Galilee. That air encounter was the prelude to the Six Day War.

On May 22, 1967, with the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba enforced and the Egyptian armed forces moving east of the Suez into the Sinai, Nasser addressed the media from the Sinai, reactivated the Egyptian Air Force base of Bir Gafgaffa, and proudly declared, in front of TV cameras: "**Now let them come!**"

In Israel, Prime Minister Eshkol agreed to the military request for full mobilization of the Israeli armed forces reserves, yet vacillated in approving the preemptive strike. In doing so he took the heavy risk (see above) of an Egyptian first strike while waiting for the international community to bring about an Egyptian withdrawal by diplomatic means. As it turned out, the UN and the US, the 1957 original guarantors of Sinai's demilitarization and of the freedom of Israel bound navigation in the Red Sea, reneged on their obligations and no one else came forth to substitute for them.³⁸

All discussions ended with the international community asking Israel to appease, surrendering part of the Negev or do anything to placate Nasser's ego. It was a repetition of the Munich 1938 concept all over again. Apart from the strategic, economic and space loss to tiny Israel, the proposed move would seal its fate due to a complete loss of its deterrence credibility. Giving in to brutality can only bring about a repetition of brutality (worth remembering at present as well).

With the economy at an almost complete standstill and the imminent threat of a catastrophic Egyptian first strike, Eshkol convened an emergency Cabinet meeting that included opposition parties ready to share responsibility. The Cabinet agreed to the prodding of the Chief of General Staff Yitzhak Rabin and his generals, and confirmed preemption.

On June 5, 1967, 202 fighter aircraft of the Israeli Air Force (out of the total force of 206), took off on the now historic first strike of Egyptian, Syrian, Jordanian and Iraqi air bases. Only four fighters were kept to defend the Israeli homeland!!

After the end of the second strike sortie, about three hours from the first takeoff, the fate of the war was decided. To consolidate the victory and cash in, it required six days.

It was no walkover. During the first day of uninterrupted strikes, Israel's Air Force lost 19 aircraft, about 9.5% of its complement.

The second day of war, France declared an embargo on arms sales to Israel...“because of Israel's aggression”. De Gaulle was furious at this “dominant and self relying nation”. Practically all the aircraft were French. Israel had to ground aircraft for want of spares and because of irreparable war damages, yet the attacks continued in Egypt, Syria, Jordan and Iraq. The skill and diligence of the ground crews was incredible. NATO never anticipated that such a number of sorties per day per aircraft was possible – which led Nasser and Co., aided by the Soviets, to claim that US and British aircraft participated in Israel's strikes. “The Jews cannot possibly do it alone.”

(Test flying in France during De Gaulle's assumption of power in 1958, the writer was closely associated, professionally and socially, with many of the perpetrators of the change that brought him to power.) Studying in France, in 1961-1962, when De Gaulle jailed many of the very generals who put him

back on stage, among them some of the writer's friends who disagreed with his "about-face turn" on the Algerian issue, the writer wrote home a top secret letter warning about the possible change of the French policy regarding Israel, "because De Gaulle wants to become a superpower with a French head and Arab shoulders."³⁹

The Israeli Air Force won. The armor could move unhindered under the clear sky and Arab movement was impaired. At the end of six days of fighting, the **contested** territories of Judea, Samaria and Gaza, the whole of Sinai and the Golan Heights were in Israeli hands.

Israel accepted the ceasefire that the Arab coalition urgently asked for, retaining all the recovered/freed/conquered territories.

Nothing is exaggerated about this chapter's title: "It was Israel's **hinge of fate**." As in 1948, the 1967 Pan-Arab much-trumpeted aim of war against the Jewish settlement in Palestine was total destruction and expulsion (where?) of the survivors, if any. To better understand the Arab aim of war, following are some of the Arab leadership's formal, public statements⁴⁰:

- May 14, 1967, Azzam Pasha, Secretary General of the Arab League:
This will be a war of extermination and a momentous massacre which will be spoken of like the Mongolian massacres and the Crusades.
- May 18, 1967, after Nasser's eviction of the UNEF (the UN troops monitoring the demilitarization of the Sinai), "Voice of the Arabs" radio:
As of today, there no longer exists an international emergency force to protect Israel. We shall exercise patience no more. We shall not complain to the UN about Israel. The sole method we shall apply against Israel is total war, which will result in the extermination of Zionist existence.
- May 20, 1967, Hafez Assad, Syria's Minister of Defense (future President):
Our forces are now entirely ready...to initiate the act of liberation itself and explode the Zionist presence in the Arab homeland...the time has come to enter a battle of annihilation.
- Iraq joined the Egyptian, Jordanian, Syrian alliance on June 4, 1967. Abdur Rahman Aref, then the Iraqi President (later murdered by Saddam Hussein, who became his successor), made his statement:

The existence of Israel is an error which must be rectified. This is our opportunity to wipe out the ignominy which has been with us since 1948. Our goal is clear – to wipe Israel off the map.

As mentioned, on May 22, 1967, speaking to his pilots who were freshly redeployed on the Bir Gafgafa Sinai base, Nasser's statement was broadcast:

“Let them come”.

The world expected the liquidation of Israel and, as the above quoted statements indicate, no quarters were to be given. A second Holocaust in less than a generation...and no one did anything to stop it.

The best illustration of the international mood is that of Dr. Moeller of St. Ingberg, near Saarbrueken in Germany, a gentile, a proven anti-Nazi German and friend.

Moeller cooperated with the writer on an industrial project when he, the Israeli, was mobilized on May 23, 1967, as a reserve fighter pilot in view of the coming war.

Before departing for Ramat David, his fighter base, the writer was both surprised and deeply touched upon the receipt of the following telex message from Germany:

We, Germans, carry the heavy burden of the Nazi past and it is our solemn obligation to prevent further Jewish bloodshed. I understand that you're off to fight. Please, I implore you; send your family over to us, at my expense, first class. We're going to take good care of them and provide for their safe future. It is our and Germany's sacred obligation.

No further comment.

The world media dusted their 1943-1946 Holocaust reports for repeated use. Israel did its duty, alone. But this time Jews could protect Jews because they had a state – Reader, please bear this in mind!

Why is it, that amongst the leaders of the Western world, there are still those who put the blame on Israel, “the aggressor of 1967”, for preempting in order to survive – those who are absolutely not concerned with the price that Arabia should pay for attempting genocide, nor do they care about the deterrence of future Arab/Islamist attempts of doing it again in the future?

The world had over a dozen years of warning about Hitler's intention to dominate it and to dispose of the Jews, if given the opportunity. He wrote it in *Mein Kampf*. **No world leader can claim ignorance.** But the world, many Jews included, did not believe that any human being or leadership could drop to as base a level of murderous savagery. Later, when Hitler had the opportunity, between 1936 and 1945, and the Holocaust was carried out with German precision and with collaborators' enthusiasm, no church or state, private enterprise or society, except Jewish organizations, cared very much about it. A very small percentage of Gentile personal efforts were made to save Jews during WWII. The fewer they were, the shinier their efforts are today.

In 1967, the annihilation of the Jewish state and "throwing of the Jews into the sea" were, as mentioned, the Arab formal, open objective. Pan-Arabia, prodded by the Kremlin, was certain of the success of its rabid leaders' vows.

Once more, the world – civilized or not – remained indifferent, this time to Nasser and Co., and to the coming bloodbath predicted in his *Philosophy of The Revolution* (which was inspired by *Mein Kampf*). But during the second half of June 1967, as the Jewish flash victory took it by complete surprise, the world woke up. When it became clear that the Jews had won, Israel was accused of aggression because of its tactical preemption **after** the Arabs deliberately stepped over the agreed *casus belli* tripwire. The facts cried out loud and again; the world plugged its ears.

Today, preemption is accepted as legitimate and practiced, especially since the UN has repeatedly proven its impotence. But, since *Quod licet Jovis, non licet bovi*,⁴¹ the writer feels that in order to prove his point, he has to demonstrate to the reader why, in 1967, Israel **had** to preempt in order to survive. Given the fact that today's media is an active participant in conflicts rather than a neutral reporter of events and its "mantra" is "Occupied Palestinian Territories", understanding the justification of Israel's 1967 preemption is the key to the understanding of present reality. There was no "Israeli invasion of Judea, Samaria, Gaza and Jerusalem". Their liberation/occupation/conquest was the result of a "misfired" Pan-Arab renewed effort to destroy Israel and the Israeli desire to prevent such a future effort. Let's hope that the future will not request this again.

David or Goliath?

Given the asymmetry between the antagonists, the establishment of the State of Israel, on May 15, 1948, was looked upon by the world as a supernatural “David” against “Goliath” feat, which, in fact, it was. The empathy to “David” was intense and the Holocaust was still fresh in everyone’s memory.

In 1967, Egypt’s Nasser, the resuscitated Pan-Arabian “Goliath”, now strengthened and prodded by the Soviets, proud and confident, at the head of the pro-Soviet “non-aligned” countries’ block, looked upon by Arabia as the new Salah al-Din, believed himself, with absolute reason, to have reached the strength required to destroy tiny Israel. His destiny, as he saw it, was to wipe out all that shameful Jewish presence in the Middle East.

Israel was as close as ever to disaster. The US and the UN, who had reneged on their guarantees, asked for more time, regardless of the imminent danger of a Pan-Arab first strike. They demanded that Israel surrender passages in the southern Negev, to somehow placate the Arabs. Given the crushing Pan-Arab superiority, some Israelis, including that weakening “Old Lion”, Ben Gurion, were outspoken in favor of Israel’s surrender of the southern Negev to escape disaster. This would have been, at best a respite. Once the inadequacy of the Israeli deterrence would have been established, it would have been only a matter of time until the *coup de grace* came to put an end to the State of Israel, as advertised.

So, who was the “David” of the Six Day War and who was “Goliath”?

The “Yom Kippur War”, October 1973

Moshe Dayan, the amoral, witty, worldly, womanizing, snappy and intelligent amateur-archeologist-pilferer was direct, courageous and carried a Nelson-like black eye patch to cover the socket of an eye lost in Syria when spearheading the British, i.e. Australian invasion of Vichy Lebanon and Syria in 1942.

He was a successful commander of a mobile raiding battalion during the War of Independence. Being a “blue eyed boy” and political follower of Ben-Gurion did not hurt. At the end of the War of Independence, Dayan was appointed Lt. Colonel, Commander of the Jerusalem sector. Half soldier-half diplomat, he joined the teams handling the UN, etc. contacts, and maintained

particularly warm relationships with the Jordanian (on-off) enemies, particularly with his counterpart, Lt. Col. Mustafa el Tal, the Commander of the Jordanian part of Jerusalem.

Appointed Chief of General Staff before the Sinai Campaign, Dayan carried himself well as diplomat, organizer and tactician during the conflict of the complex Anglo-French-Israeli Suez Affair cum Sinai Campaign of 1956.

Dayan left the armed forces with flying colors and joined politics, continuing to display his same pirate's manipulative charm and confidence in the shadow of the mythical Ben-Gurion.

He joined Ben-Gurion and Peres when they decided to leave the ruling Labor Party, but not for long.

In May 1967, a few days before the outbreak of the Six Day War, Dayan joined Levy Eshkol's emergency government as Minister of Defense.

Prime Minister Levy Eshkol was an elderly man knowledgeable in matters of finance. He was famous for his perseverance in settlement building but totally foreign to military problems or solutions.

In 1967, when Nasser broke the 1957 ceasefire, blockaded the seaways to Eilat and started deploying his forces in the Sinai, the shooting war was only days away.

Mindful of public morale, Eshkol invited Dayan to serve as Minister of Defense. Public morale went sky high. Rabin, the Chief of the IDF General Staff, who planned the war to its last detail, who trained the troops and catered to their moral and material needs during the nerve wracking stand-by, launched his offensive, achieving the ultimate success.

The one who reaped almost all the glory of Rabin's success was, of course, Dayan. For public and media alike, the opinion was that nothing moved until Dayan came – "*veni, vidi, vici*". He became the undisputed national and international symbol of Israeli military prowess and foresight, the larger than life hero and oracle.

In 1973, the Prime Minister was Golda Meir, who took the lead when Eshkol passed away. Golda's forte was foreign relations. In the field of defense she was overshadowed by her Minister of Defense, Dayan, in whose wisdom she, like the public at large, had total confidence.

Dayan had his own “blue eyed boy” by the name of Zeira, an arrogant, overconfident general of outstanding capabilities whom he appointed to head military intelligence. Dayan created Zeira in his own image. This team was the perpetrator of catastrophe. Zeira reported formally to the Chief of the General Staff and had an open door to the Minister of Defense. His task was also to brief the government on intelligence matters.

The Head of the Mossad at the time, Gen. Zvi Zamir, had direct access to the Prime Minister but did not formally brief the Minister of Defense or the government as a whole.

Starting at the end of September 1973, large Syrian and Egyptian army formations were reported to be deployed along the Israeli demarcation lines. Relying on the precedent of a similar deployment earlier that year which proved to be merely an exercise (or a deception test), Zeira claimed that, although the Syrians and Egyptians were deployed in offensive formations, “The probabilities of hostilities breaking out are very small indeed.” In his opinion, there was no justification for even a partial mobilization of reserves. Dayan supported Zeira. After all, Zeira checked and synchronized everything with Dayan. This time they missed.

No one listened to Zvi Zamir’s opinion or King Hussein’s whisper, that war was imminent. It went “against the concept” which said that, come hell or high water, a 48 hour warning would be available. Golda accepted the Zeira-Dayan opinion.

With elections scheduled for November, Golda did not want the Americans to accuse her of increasing tensions by unnecessary mobilization of reserves.

By the evening of Friday, October 5, the eve of Yom Kippur, the holiest Jewish religious day, Zeira gave in and reported that, yes, war was certain to break out on the morrow, at 18:00 hours. No reserves, no defensive deployments, no strikes of anti-aircraft SAM batteries, no radios open on Yom Kippur, no public transportation.

Gen. Benny Peled, the Air Force Chief, supported by Gen. David Elazar, the Chief of the General Staff, asked for permission to preempt by striking the SAM missile cover of the enemy armies early on Saturday morning, October 6, so as to enable efficient Air Force support when the offensive started at 18:00 hours, as per Zeira’s updated/reversed report.

Afraid of US reaction, Golda did not authorize even this mini-preemption.⁴²

The Egyptians and Syrians attacked at 14:00 hours, not 18:00. Unprepared and shamefully surprised, although it had all the data, Israel was administered a skull-cracking harsh punishment, suffering very heavy losses in life and equipment, and losing its self-confidence.

Although it recovered in record-time, 18 days, and amply won, Israel’s reputation of invincibility had been badly dented. In the wake of the Arab worldwide oil embargo enforced as a spasm of defeat, Israel reverted to a “pariah state” status, roughened and perpetually censured at the UN. Tens of countries severed their relations with it. Come to think of it – this was a strange reaction. In 1967, when Israel preempted and won, its international public opinion position was superb, until the metamorphosis of its image from “David” into “Ugly Goliath”. Pan-Arabia and the Soviets promoted this idea, supported by others who found a Jewish victory to be unwarranted, “unnatural”, and depicted Israel as an ugly Spartan, aggressive midget, undeniably a world class danger – the Jew and his state.

In 1973, Israel was attacked by total surprise and yet succeeded, nevertheless, to achieve total victory in battle, thanks to its meager forces being deployed in the peripheries of Sinai or the “contested territories”, a move which provided some depth for withdrawal, regrouping, rearming and counter-attacking in a favorable topographical situation.

And yet, Israel’s geopolitical situation became almost desperate. Israel was held accountable for the war, not the Arabs who attacked it: a matter of media-created image, of super-power exasperation and of oil prices.⁴³

Despite suffering very heavy losses, Israel scored a brilliant military victory on the ground, maybe greater than that of the Six Day War. The Yom Kippur war was the biggest tank battle in the history of war, fought with modern, large caliber guns and anti-tank missiles. Israel, while totally surprised, badly outnumbered and denied efficient air support, turned the tide and won in a matter of 18 days.

At the end of the Israeli counterattack, the Israeli Northern Command came within cannon range of Damascus. The Southern Command, whose “Bren” division was badly mauled after a failed crossing of the Suez Canal on October 8, recovered its breath after the bitter battle fought by Ariel Sharon’s division which crossed the Canal on the 16th enabling two more divisions to cross, fan out along the Western shore of the Canal and close the loop around the Egyptian Third Army who were stuck in the Sinai pocket

along the southern segment of the Canal. The outstanding hero of the Yom Kippur war was, undoubtedly, Arik Sharon whose personal daring and calculated risk-taking were legend, as was criticism leveled at him by his more conservative peers. Dayan and Zeira were the total losers, outcasts.

It's hard to argue with success.

The US brokered (again) ceasefires, at Egyptian and Syrian panic stricken requests and vociferous Soviet threatening noises.⁴⁴ They were signed within cannon range (32 km.) of Damascus and halfway between the Suez Canal and Cairo, at the 101 km. milestone.

Lessons of the Yom Kippur War, October 1973, and of the Subsequent 1993 Oslo "Adventure"

Arabia may have concluded that it cannot win a conventional war against Israel, not even in the optimum (surprise) conditions. This conclusion is probably the reason why, in Syria, for example, priority was shifted away from conventional weaponry to WMD (Weapons of Mass Destruction), why Iran insists on a nuclear option and the ballistic missiles that go with it and why it promotes terror against Israel from Lebanon by the Iranian-Syrian proxy *Hizbullah*. It may also be the reason why the terror war mode has been increasingly intensified since. The conventional war mode seems to have lost its appeal/priorities with the Arabs for a long period in the future.

But, while brilliantly winning the battle, Israel lost the Yom Kippur War.

Public confidence in government leadership collapsed and never completely recovered.

The 1974 oil boycott and the very successful Arab/Soviet global-psychological warfare turned the geopolitical situation around. Again, tiny Israel, the "David" of the Middle East became the ugly "Goliath" with hosts of countries severing diplomatic relations, etc. The UN, the cozy, mostly democratic club of 1947 turned into the present Tower of Babel of overwhelmingly non-democratic and under-developed countries where votes are bought at the counter. This is when Zionism was "voted" as Racism!

Israeli national self-confidence, hurt more by international ostracism and concerted media campaigns against it than by the renewed Arab ("Palestinian") uprising, permitted the "Ivory Tower" left political wing to

undertake a covert experiment with “Instant Peace” at Oslo, supported by good and willing Norway and “peacenik” minded US President Clinton.⁴⁵

The outcome of the Oslo, Washington, DC, Wye, Camp David, etc. peace talks, peace agreements, peace fiestas, Nobel Peace Prizes, dinners, speeches et al., was the most vicious terror campaign Israel has ever experienced. It went on for four years until checked by Israeli security forces. After getting the upper hand on terror and after 9/11 changed the world geopolitical situation, the Israeli international standing recovered, giving the Israeli government the leeway required to resume the exploration of peace.

Definition of Peace

Peace is the stable, natural condition prevailing in a harmonious relationship between states or parties (US-Canada).

Peace is also an ongoing “state of no war” or non-belligerence between states or parties engaged in an adversarial or conflict prone relationship. The key to perpetuate this unnatural, unstable relationship is deterrence (US-USSR).

Deterrence

The absolute certainty of one party that, were it to anticipate attacking an antagonist party, it would suffer an intolerable punishment which is not in its power to bear. The anticipation of intolerable punishment will convince that particular party that an attack on the other is counter-productive, hence non-realistic, and inconceivable.

Democracy

Probably inspired by the ideals of the French Revolution of 1789, the German philosopher Immanuel Kant, wrote, in 1795, a book by the name of *Perpetual Peace*, where he posited that democracy is the ultimate guarantee to peace. The fact that no war has been fought between two modern democracies during the 20th century supports Kant’s thesis.

As mentioned, the US Middle Eastern post-WWII policy, established by the post-war State Department under Secretary John Foster Dulles and by the newly established CIA under the Secretary’s brother Allen, favored a policy of “stability” in the ME, i.e. the perpetuation of existing theocracies,

dictatorships or absolute monarchies through whatever means necessary, provided the oil flowed uninterruptedly.

Republican President George W. Bush is the first American President to “destabilize” instead of “stabilizing” the Arab ME feudal or pseudo-feudal structures, attempting to ensure a durable ME peace by building it on the solid foundation of democratic harmony rather than by expensive, explosive, hence dangerous and unstable deterrence.

Peace in the Middle East

The confrontational attitude of Pan-Arabia/Islam toward Israel does not render a harmonious peace possible.

The only peace achievable in the ME for the foreseeable future is a “Peace of No War” based upon Israeli deterrence (Israel itself does not threaten Pan-Arabia/Islam).

Israeli deterrence of all Arab/Islamist threats is the other face of the coin of peace between Israel and Arabia/Iran.

Simultaneous deterrence of the Pan-Arabian/Islamic threat, be it terror, conventional war and/or WMD war (Weapons of Mass Destruction, i.e. nuclear or biological warheads cum ballistic missiles or terror conveyed) as well as the deterrence of each member of Pan-Arabia/Islam separately are arbitrary. There will be no peace for the foreseeable future unless associated with adequate deterrence.

Oslo, Clinton’s White House, Wye, Camp David, et al.

The loss of Israeli public confidence in its governments (of whatever political color) that followed the Yom Kippur War included the lack of credit in the leadership’s competence to promote peace with the Arabs, although, or maybe because, Prime Minister Begin signed a President Carter-coerced peace agreement with Egypt, a peace that is not unlike the ebbs of the US-USSR cold war. (Surprisingly enough, it is not a peace agreement at all. Due to the Islamic religious veto on returning “*Dar el Salaam*” lands to the “Infidel”, Egypt did not recognize Israel’s territorial integrity or any borders. Egypt merely undertook to forgo war, but included the request to solve “The Palestinian Problem”. Twenty-eight years later, “peace” with Egypt is still a US-Soviet type of relationship.)

Whether the conditions for the peace allegedly negotiated in 1990 with Jordan were acceptable or not, Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir rejected Minister Peres' private, secret, unauthorized agreement draft said to have been reached with King Hussein of Jordan.

When Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin was reelected in 1992, another self-appointed private group started to negotiate (under Foreign Minister Peres' auspices again, without Rabin's knowledge and, of course, without his approval) with some Arafat PLO official appointees. The negotiation was sponsored as a "study" by the Norwegian government.

When a "Declaration of Principles" was reached, it was presented to Rabin as a *fait accompli*, which, for different reasons Rabin accepted *nolens volens*.

The results of the Oslo Agreement, that was closely followed and loudly supported by President Clinton with a big White House splash, were Nobel Peace Prizes for Rabin, Peres and Arafat, worldwide applause for Clinton and heaps of praising media, but also a total disaster for both the Israeli and the "Palestinian" peoples. A major wave of terror was Arafat's main conclusion of Israel's willingness to accommodate.

According to his words when speaking in South Africa, Arafat decided in the tradition of Prophet Muhammad's "agreement" with the Jews of Hudeida, to "complement" the agreement with terror, in order to improve on what he had already obtained.

Ten years later, with 1,400 Israeli and about 4,000 "Palestinian" lives lost, tens of thousands wounded and multi-billion US Dollar losses, we are more or less where we started, having proved that terror leads nowhere, nor does goodwill inspired drive to accommodation.

What went wrong?

The writer's conclusion is that the onus is on the naïve Israeli academics who negotiated at Oslo:

They tried to solve a longstanding, vicious conflict by reaching an "instant harmony" between them and the not-always sincere leaders of the Arabs, omitting the fact that the populations and their cultures have to be preconditioned to accept this. It was the adoption of a "best case", wishful thinking working scenario in totally unwarranted circumstances.

Harmony is the only imperative if the negotiators were to close an agreement in a harmonious environment, but when a “peace of no war” is to be concluded between antagonists, harmony among the negotiators helps, but the vital pre-requisites remain deterrence/warring assets to be used as “collaterals” to guarantee that the contracted clauses are honored.

The Israeli team and later the Israeli governments relied very heavily on the wisdom of the American President whose sincere bias to “peace-mongering” was established since Vietnam and later in 1993, 1998, etc.

Clinton was a typical “1968 peacenik”, an intellectual in synch with the Israeli-Oslo team. His weak response to the *al Qa`idah* anti-US terror attacks on the World Trade Center in 1993, on the African US embassies in 1998 and on the “Cole” USN ship in Aden, all seem to have enhanced bin Ladin’s confidence, encouraging him to attempt his 9/11 attacks.

Aware of the potential moral and material benefits that peace, be it without solid foundations, would bring to Israel, the Rabin and then Peres governments were tempted to try it and failed miserably.

When the terror war started, Israel’s PM Ehud Barak continued to negotiate and give in, “to encourage peace”, which was rightly interpreted by Arafat and Co. as gains made, which were as good a reason as any to step terror up.

History cannot be reeled back, hence Israel, as well as the (West) Palestinian Arabs, will have to bear the consequences of their mistakes and cut their losses. Israel has to preserve the required level of deterrence, take into account the positive and negative sides of US presence in the ME and of globalization and forcefully go ahead to stop the bleeding of its own people and its economy.

III. Highlights and Discussions

Many factors contributed to the complicated matrix of obstacles which slowed down, distorted, threatened and had to be overcome in order to enable the subsequent establishment of a viable Jewish National Home, too late for saving Europe’s Jewish communities from criminal extermination during WWII.

Let’s enumerate some:

- * The ambivalent British rule in Palestine that became more pro-Arab with time and drifted by the end of the 1930s toward a ME appeasement policy parallel to that practiced in Europe.
- * The "zigzagging" policy between a gradually less enthusiastic London, and an increasingly pro-Arab Cairo Colonial Office, caused a catastrophic delay in the emergence of Israel.

As a "reaction" to Arab murderous, "well organized in advance – 'spontaneous' demonstrations" against the Jews, the British Administration gave in to terror and restricted the Jewish immigration to Palestine when most needed.⁴⁶

In fact, British non-compliance with the terms of the Mandate it received from the League of Nations, started the year before Britain signed it, with the tearing away, in 1921, of over 75% of the Mandate's area in order to create the Hashemite Emirate of Trans-Jordan for Emir Abdullah, a compensation to stem the fury of the House of Hashem, the ex-rulers of Arabia which the British handed over to the House of Saud, to become Saudi Arabia.

Another purely colonial machination of Britain's was transferring to France's Syrian Mandate, the Palestine Mandate's Golan Heights ridges, seemingly in exchange for some Syrian territory transferred to Iraq (in 1923).⁴⁷ This act deprived the Upper Jordan Valley of its defense.

- * The Allied setbacks during the first two years of World War II, which focused all Jewish attention to supporting Britain, not fighting it.
- * The (war weakened) Britain's effort during 1944-1947 to hang onto its ME interests by espousing the Pan-Arab stand on Palestine. Although the Arabs had to be kept under its boot during the war, Britain was the "midwife" behind the creation of the "Arab League" on March 22, 1945 (!). By that time, WWII was tapering off, even in the Far East. The British Labor government aspired to control the Suez Canal and the ME oil wealth, even at the price of an internationally unacceptable inhuman attitude of total indifference to the fate of Europe's surviving Jewish refugees.
- * The resulting reaction of the Palestinian Jews to Britain's decisions on Palestine and to its blockade of Palestine's shores to prevent the ingress of Jewish refugees. Decisive, well led and uninhibited, the Palestinian Jewish powerful reaction broke Britain's will.

- * The Truman post-war (1945-1947) US Presidential humane attitude and diplomatic support of the Palestinian Jewish challenge to Britain which, if successful, would remove some immigration pressures from the US.
- * The British decision of early 1947, resulting from the perseverant Jewish effort and its US backing, to return the Mandate to the UN and leave Palestine by May 15, 1948.
- * The UN decision of November 29, 1947, to partition (Western) Palestine.⁴⁸
- * The Pan-Arab/Arab League decision, tacitly encouraged by Britain, to invade the Mandate area upon its vacation so as to prevent the establishment of a Jewish state in (Western) Palestine.
- * The Jewish victory in the war of 1947-1949 imposed by Pan-Arabia without consulting the (West) Palestinian Arabs.
- * The Declaration of Independence of the State of Israel on May 15, 1948.
- * The Sinai Campaign/Suez Affair of 1956. With Egypt signing a ceasefire that was Israel's condition to withdraw from Sinai, Israel won a 10 year respite from Arab superiority, reduced terror to minimum level and received US guarantees plus UN troops to maintain free maritime Red Sea passage and Sinai demilitarization.
- * The Six Day War of June 5, 1967⁴⁹ – the “Hinge of Fate” of Israel, the war that reconfirmed its permanence. That was a (probably Soviet) premeditated *casus belli*, whose stated aim was the erasing of Israel from the ME map. Preempting by surprise, Israel won the war against Pan-Arabia (Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Iraq and other small expeditionary forces) and (re)possessed Judea, Samaria, Gaza and the Golan Heights. While the world did nothing to prevent an expected second holocaust in a quarter of a century, the crushing Israeli military victory became a classic, historic watershed in regional and Great Powers geopolitical relationships.
- * The Yom Kippur War, October 5, 1973 was a very successful Egyptian-Syrian massive, existence-threatening surprise attack against Israel, rendered possible by the two fatal Israeli errors enumerated below:
- * On August 7, 1970, Egypt signed a US brokered ceasefire with Israel, undertaking **not** to deploy the SAM anti-aircraft missiles batteries

covering the Suez Canal. SAM coverage of the Suez was the key to canal crossing in October 1973. The day it signed the ceasefire, Egypt broke it, redeploying the missiles. US insistent coercion was the reason for Israel's refraining from armed prevention of the Egyptian move.⁵⁰

- * The grossly erroneous intelligence assessment error made by the Israeli Armed Forces Head of Intelligence, Gen. Eliahu Zeira, assertively supported by Minister of Defense Moshe Dayan, who held Prime Minister Golda Meir's total confidence.

Israel has never been the same after the Yom Kippur War that started on October, 6, 1973. It matured.

- * Israeli Demoralization: The post-Six Day War (June 1967) overconfidence was followed by the traumatic ebb in public confidence and leadership during and after the Yom Kippur War (October 1973).

The 1982 War in Lebanon lacked an Israeli government's clear political objective and public preparation, which gave it a political, demoralizing flavor.

The covert "cloak and dagger", (first private, only then government) dealings with Arafat and Co. in Oslo and Washington (1993) proved to be the acme of amateur incompetence. Disregarding basic defense requirements and lacking decision-making capacity, the ad hoc Israeli participants accepted the "best case scenario" of "instant harmony" as a "working assumption" (this happened in the ME!!).

They believed that a settlement with the "Palestinian leadership" would obviate all Pan-Arab/Islamist-Israeli conflicts and that "instant harmony" between two inveterate enemy leaderships, at loggerheads for over a century, are equivalent to all-encompassing national harmony and can be achieved by a fortnight's work of a committee. If this would have been the case, defense/deterrence would play no role in peace.

- * In 2006, Israel is still attempting to extricate itself from the Oslo slippery, uneven downhill slope and reach *terra firma* to start working on a realistic solution of the seemingly insoluble conflict.
- * Since the end of the 1973 Yom Kippur War, Israel's unstable, multi-party, coalitional regime prevented proper planning, real time decision-making and execution. A "zigzagging" policy, geopolitical

failures and economic slow-downs are the result. Diplomatic ostracism and downright anti-Semitism followed.

- * The change from the present “Parliamentary” Israeli system of government, too similar to that of the third and fourth French Republics of ill-repute, to a Presidential system with a stronger executive, similar to the fifth French Republic or to the US, capable of real-time decision making, is imperative.⁵¹

The appointment by the President of Israel of a committee to examine alternative systems of government (The writer is a member of the committee) and the formal undertaking of the leading Israeli political party to bring about the system’s change following the March 28, 2006 elections, may be the light at the end of the dark governance tunnel.

IV. Three Questions

- * Can peace reign between Israel and Arabia?
- * What are the prerequisites for a lasting peace?
- * How do the 9/11 terror acts in the US and the American presence in the ME affect the potential Israeli-Arab/Islamic peace?

Can Peace Reign Between Israel and Arabia?

The answer is **yes** – a carefully tailor-made peace.

Definitions of Peace

In November 1991, the writer was asked by Prime Minister Shamir to join the Israeli Madrid Peace Conference and was charged with “*Hasbarah*”, i.e. the presentation of our views in a way which would draw the listeners’ attention and, if possible, empathy. Not unlike the presentation of one’s case in a Court of Justice.

Since the objective of the conference was peace, the first query that came to mind was the definition of peace. What is peace in different circumstances? The definition of peace turned out to be difficult enough to require the use of documentation. Two apparently contradictory situations (and others in between) answered the situation:

"Peace of Harmony", the natural state deriving from a harmonious relationship between, say, two countries or ethnic entities. The harmony is the result of a common set of ethical and normative values, common economic and other interests, comparative quality of life and common goals and, of course, no relevant conflicts of interests.

A fair example of a "peace of harmony" is the US-Canadian relationship.

Neither of the two parties would deem, for instance, the necessity of deployment of troops on the frontier. A few customs and passport control officers can satisfy the privacy and discreet requirements of each party.

"Peace of Non-Belligerence" is a common decision made by two potentially antagonistic parties to avoid armed conflict between them in spite of war-prone circumstances.

The US-Soviet Union non-belligerence is a fitting example. Relations were tense because of conflicting ethical (democracy, personal freedom and pursuit of happiness, capitalism versus tyranny and state subjugation of the individual, etc.) and normative values, clashing economic systems, the violence of communist expansionist ideology, and state imposed atheism versus freedom of religion, etc.

The decision not to impose one's will upon the other by force is the effect of one major factor, a kind of inverse collateral: **deterrence**.

Deterrence is the credible capability of one party to bring the other, potentially warring party, to the conclusion that were it to open hostilities it would suffer unacceptable punishment.

At the US-USSR scale, it was MAD (Mutual Assured Destruction).

Peace and Democracy

In 1795, seeking the essence of peace, probably inspired by the French Revolution, the German philosopher Immanuel Kant wrote the book, *Perpetual Peace* where he posits that democracy is the one way to secure perpetual peace. It may be worth looking into Kant's politically unstained ideas and read some of his lines, minding the ancient terminology, where "republican" is "democrat" and a "ruler" or "monarch" is an "autocrat/dictator".⁵²

Kant wrote:

[A state governed according to] a constitution...[which] is republican...established...by principles of the freedom of the members of a society (as men); secondly, by principles of dependence of all upon a single common legislation (as subjects)...gives a favorable prospect for the desired consequence i.e. perpetual peace. The reason is this: if the consent of the citizens is required in order to decide that war should be declared (and in this constitution it cannot but be the case), nothing is more natural than that they would be very cautious in commencing such a poor game, decreeing for themselves all the calamities of war. Among the latter would be: having to fight, having to pay the costs of war from their own resources, having painfully to repair the devastation war leaves behind...⁵³

Of the opposite type of regime he warns:

But, on the other hand, in a constitution which is not republican, and under which the subjects are not citizens, a declaration of war is the easiest thing in the world to decide upon, because war does not require the ruler, who is the proprietor and not a member of state, the least sacrifice of the pleasures of his table, the chase, his country houses, his court functions and the like. He may therefore resolve on war as on a pleasure party for the most trivial reasons, and with perfect indifference leave the justification which decency requires to the diplomatic corps, who are ever ready to provide it.

President George W. Bush has been right, nay, revolutionary when he included “democratization” as an objective of the US War against Terror and WMD. As Kant demonstrated so long ago, democracy **is** the best guarantee of peace.

Until President Bush’s mention of democratization, the democratic West looked upon the ME dictatorships or theocratic regimes as a “given” that one had to deal with, be it by bribing, buying, supporting and, normally, by protecting them from their own population, indifferent of the population’s right to share in the country’s (oil) richness or to enjoy a decent quality of life.

Peace in the Middle East

The problem, as it appears in retrospective, is the underestimation of the length of the transitional period from centuries of subjugation to freedom.

To try to prove that a state of harmony between Islam and Judaism, or Christianity for that matter, (see bibliography at the end) can become fact with no period of adaptation, is an intellectual exercise in futility, much like the experimentation with “instant harmony” of Oslo. While Christianity claims to be the updated continuation of Judaism, Islam, the newcomer to monotheism, claims to be their substitute, with the God-given order to conduct a “*jihad*”, i.e. a holy war to eliminate them, their religion, their “corrupting civilization” and culture.

As in the case of the Western civilization, the Muslim mainstream culture, character, political outlook, etc., are derived from the Islamic faith and are not at all forgiving when relating to “the infidel”.

The last 124 years, since the start of the “Return to Zion” confirm that view. Relations between Pan-Arab/Islam and Judaism did worsen since 1882.

Within the foreseeable future, a stable peace between Israel and Arabia or Islam as a whole, if attainable, can only be a US-USSR type of “peace of no war”, i.e. non-belligerence based on Israeli **deterrence**.

Only “Israeli” deterrence is mentioned, neither by bias nor by conceit. There is absolutely no Israeli threat against Islam, Pan-Arabia or any of its entities, hence no real need of Arab/Islamic deterrence of Israel. The coming statement may sound “politically incorrect”, yet, before branding it as such, the reader is kindly asked to look at facts and figures.

The crushing Islamic/Arab superiority in most strategic domains, to which the vicious, aggressive, continuous hatred of Jews and “*jihad*” mindedness should be added, create an asymmetric situation: Israel has to deter Arabia/Islam, which is bent on war to achieve its destruction, yet Arabia/Islam does not need to worry about an Israeli “*Drang nach Mittel-Osten*”. No Zionist agenda has ever contemplated spreading beyond Mandatory Palestine which is less than 1% of Arabia, and no updated Zionist agenda aims at more than a viable, secure Israel living in good neighborhood in the predominantly Arab Middle East.

As mentioned, deterrence is, in our ME conditions, the other side of the coin of peace. Although deterrence pertains to war-waging capabilities, it is a “*conditio sine qua non*” for the maintenance of a “peace of no war”.

Deterrence consists of diverse factors like human resources, technology, arms, continuous economic growth, leadership, determination, political

unity, etc., and, of course, geography, including theater-characteristics such as topography, climate/vegetation, vehicle accessibility, etc.

The more intensive and imminent the threat, the higher the level of deterrence required.

Peace between Israel and its neighbors is presently attainable on the condition that Israeli deterrence neutralizes the overall Islamic/Pan-Arab threat and, in parallel, that Israel deters separately each potential threat of every state/entity which comprises Pan-Arabia.

In other words, Israel cannot reach a settlement (of non-belligerence) with any one of the entities of Pan-Arabia if that settlement reduces its deterrence of Pan-Arabia as a whole.

Deterrence Changes with Time

A continuous, credible Israeli deterrence of Pan-Arabia/Islam as a whole and each of its entities separately, constantly adapted to suit new developments until true democracy is achieved, is the “collateral” required to guarantee a stable peace in the Middle East.

Between 1882 and 1947/8, the threat to Jewish resettlement in Palestine was that of local Arab terror/robbery perpetrated by various irregular formations assisted by neighboring Arab countries/entities and tolerated to a certain extent first by the Turkish-Ottoman and then by the British Mandatory power. Under the Turks, the settlers hired not-too-reliable mercenaries. The British rule was also unreliable and politically erratic, which convinced the Jewish settlers that no foreigner would provide for their own defense/deterrence. This is why the *Haganah* Jewish armed militia was formed from small, local self-defense units. The *Haganah* (and later the seceding, much smaller “*Irgun*” and “*Stern Gang*”) defense/deterrence were structured to respond to two totally different natures of threats, namely the Arab violence and the British policy. The deterrence of Arab violence was very much affected by the attitude of the normally unsympathetic British until the forming of the State of Israel on May 15, 1948, and even later, when the British attempted to extend their Naval blockade of Israel to include not only arms, but potential arm-bearers i.e. young immigrants as well.

The Pan-Arabian armed forces invasion of day-old Israel on May 15, 1948, was, obviously, the result of the very low level (if any) of Israeli deterrence affected by reality and lowered by the British blockade and by Montgomery's and Marshall's outspoken disbelief in Israel's chances of survival. Perpetrated by a Pan-Arabian vastly superior coalition, the conventional war threat became predominant in May 1948 and continued until the end of the Yom Kippur War, in October 1973.

The defeats suffered by the Pan-Arabian conventional armed forces at the hands of Israeli forces in 1948/9, 1956, 1967 and 1973 brought about a major change in Arab attitudes. The threat paradigm shift was gradual. Egypt started to develop ballistic missiles as far back as 1963,⁵⁴ and used chemical weapons during their invasion of Yemen in the course of that same year. Yet the most evident paradigm shifts took place, in the writer's opinion, in 1973 and in 1991. In 1973, when Israel had been subjected to a nightmarish massive Pan-Arabian conventional surprise attack (Egyptian and Syrian plus Jordanian and Iraqi reinforcements) that bordered on disaster, it recovered and won within 18 days to accept the panic-stricken Arab ceasefire requests following their total defeat.

Realizing that its conventional armed forces were no match for Israel's, even in an optimum strategic/tactical situation, Pan-Arabia or the states composing it, had to choose an alternative, either by design or by instinct. It was peace (ice cold, which Egypt chose in 1978), or terror combined with WMD (Weapons of Mass Destruction) rather than conventional warfare or as a complement to it. In 1991, during the first Gulf War, in which Israel was not a participant, Saddam Hussein fired 39 conventional warheads equipped El-Hussein (SCUD-C) ballistic missiles at Israeli towns from Iraq, hundreds of kilometers/miles away. The El-Hussein missile's lack of precision was irrelevant because they were launched at civilian, urban areas.⁵⁵ The damage was far below expectation, but the disruption of life in Israel was intense. The Israeli "Arrow" anti-ballistic missile was still on the drawing board and the US "Patriot" could not intercept missiles like the increased range (hence higher reentry speed) Scud-C. The Arab conclusion is that a missile with a WMD (nuclear or biological) warhead, launched against Israeli urban areas would be a much more effective, cheaper and credible threat to Israel that would eliminate the need to win a close range encounter where Israelis dominate the battlefield. The conventional attack, the *coup de grace*, should follow the total "softening" of the Israeli rear by missiles and/or terror.

Missiles can be launched from as far away as Iran, Sudan, Saudi Arabia, or even Pakistan, etc. Terror bases, located within walking distance in Cis-Jordan (be it “Palestine”) would dispatch terrorists (suicide or not) carrying “dirty” (WMD) charges or their “traditional” lower yield.

For a nuclear warhead-equipped ballistic missile attack, two one-megaton class warhead hits on metropolitan Tel Aviv would be sufficient to obliterate about 80% of the country’s human and material resources.

In the writer’s opinion, a future quantum jump in the Israeli defense budget would be dictated by the upgrading of deterrence resulting from the threat-paradigm shift.

- * European defense budgets are about 1-2% of GDP (Gross Domestic Product).
- * The US (huge) defense budget is about 4-5% of a (huge) GDP.

The maximum defense budget that a country engaged in accelerated development and immigrant absorption like Israel can afford without spinning economically out of control is, according to Prof. Daniel Tsiddon, about 7% of the GDP. This is, approximately, Israel’s present defense budget, whose future requirements will most probably increase.

Fighting or deterring terror in a mini-country like Israel, where the interwoven populations offer infinite opportunities to harm, requires real-time specific intelligence, hi-tech or humint (human intelligence) and counter-terrorist trained units which may hardly be used in conventional or WMD warfare that, in certain situations, may be waged in parallel.

Readiness to fight a conventional war must remain at the present, superior level. It may be that the number of platforms (aircraft, tanks, etc.) can be reduced while higher accuracy/range/lethality “intelligent” weapon systems will equip them.⁵⁶

The operational gains as well as reduced manpower requirements and maintenance savings thanks to “intelligent” weapons are self evident, yet the cost reduction is not.

Three warring modes and dramatically increased ranges, (area instead of line confrontation), will undoubtedly increase the cost of deterrence.

If Israel’s budgetary ceiling remains about 7% and the defense budget requirements increase, the answer is to increase the GDP. This is definitely

possible provided we increase productivity at the national level which implies the increase of employment in the productive sector, reduction of cumbersome and expensive government overheads/bureaucracy and the elimination of other non-productive tribal or sectorial burdens, which is a difficult political step to take in the present structure of the Israeli parliamentary system. A change to the Presidential system, based on an ironclad constitution, not unlike that of the United States or , maybe like that of the French Fifth Republic, will be required to provide the sturdy, democratic, stable, nimble regime that is as much an integral part of deterrence as are the economic wealth or the war waging capabilities.

Note that this is **not a war emergency**, but, rather, **a peace requirement**. The other side of the peace coin, as mentioned.

Deterrence – War Modes

The shift or rather widening of the paradigm defining the defense/deterrence, i.e. peace (of no war) priorities, indicates that the Israeli future deterrence/defense effort will have to be materially enhanced and cover the wide span required to optimize for terror, conventional and WMD modes at double, triple or quadruple ranges.

Signs of democratization like the overturning of the pro-Syrian government in Lebanon, the relative success of the Iraqi elections or the smooth elections conducted in the Palestinian Authority are welcome, but they are only general indications of a positive trend, not yet democracy. Mistaking virtual images for reality may result in an Oslo-like *fata morgana*, both in the Israeli as well as the US effort to stabilize the region.

Nuclear Deterrence

One should, unfortunately, assume that the nuclear threat is, or will become, a nightmarish reality within the span of 2-8 years. This is **the** mortal threat to Israel, exercised as it is by rogue, irresponsible regimes, ready, in their blind passion/ideology/religious extremism, to be submitted to a devastating Israeli (assumed available) second strike in the same state of leadership mind like that of individual fundamentalist suicide bombers. Such a disposition means that the MAD (Mutual Assured Destruction) principle that served US-USSR deterrence in the past is not sufficient to deter Arab/Islamist nuclear threats. Careful statesmen ought to bear in mind Iranian Ayatullah

Hammenayi's statement that he does not care about a nuclear exchange with Israel. Given the two countries' relative sizes, a small number of charges suffice to eliminate Israel while the same kind of strike will probably only kill one or two million Iranians, a price worth paying for wiping the infidel off the map.

This being the case, deterring a rogue, war prone, irrational (in Cartesian notions of ratio) antagonist is much more complicated, if at all possible.

It is logical to assume that even a multilayered anti-ballistic-missile defense system can be saturated, or not 100% impermeable and an assured second strike capability may not suffice to deter a Mullahs' nuclear armed Iran, as mentioned above.

In that case, if international efforts will not intervene on time to strip rogue Iran or any similar rogue nuclear power of its WMD capability, it may be necessary to compensate for the default of the Israeli deterrence by what international law recognizes now as "Anticipatory Self Defense", or, simply said, **preemption**.

Israel has declared that it will not be the first one to introduce nuclear weapons in the ME theater. Whether it possesses such weapons or not, strategic and tactical considerations favor conventional preemption with high lethality, high precision ordnance, striking at a number of targets at double the Iraqi (single target) Osirak's range in 1981.

In the case of nuclear or biological (WMD) threat by any one member of Pan-Arabia/Iran, Israel's deterrence has to relate to entire Pan-Arabia/Iran as one threatening entity, assuming that, were its deterrence to be nullified by a credible nuclear threat, a Pan-Arab terror and conventional aggression would most probably follow. This means that all Pan-Arabia/Iran should become the potential target of a second strike if Israel would be subjected to a WMD attack from whichever quarter of the *de facto* Islamist alliance against Israel.⁵⁷

It is, therefore, in the interest of all Arab/Islamic non-nuclear countries to resist the nuclearization of any of their peers in order to prevent the upgrading of Israeli deterrence to include an active nuclear mode.

It is also the prerogative as well as duty and self-defense interest of all major nuclear powers to prevent the nuclear escalation in the ME, the crossroads of

three continents, the cradle of the monotheistic civilizations where about 60% of the world's known oil is to be found.

Threatened by a WMD strike, Israel cannot, according to its past experience, rely on efficient, on time foreign support, even if formalized by written agreements. Given Israel's size, WMD is a mortal threat and, as Kissinger said, governments can change their minds.

Israel also cannot rely with absolute certainty on its own anti-missile-defense and, as mentioned, its second strike capability, nor even on its preemptive strike's total success. Again, at the WMD level of threat, however low the probability of its materialization, Israel has to attempt to survive a first WMD missile strike and be ready to deliver a decisive second strike.

Survival of two-three strikes by up to 1 MT nuclear yield charges launched at the Tel Aviv metropolitan area (Hadera-Gedera), will require:

Readily available, safe, well-separated duplication of all north (Haifa/Galilee) to south (Beersheba/Ashkelon/Negev) links like roads, railways, power lines, communications, oil and water pipelines, etc. This can only be done by Israel retaining control of the Jordan Valley which may remain relatively unaffected by the nuclear discharges.

The population/logistics dispersion area (assuming reasonable warning is available) is, again, only east, due to the narrowness of the coastal strip with the sea on the western side. The writer is aware of the fact that in the present "politically correct" atmosphere, these requests sound artificial, meant to provide one more "far-fetched argument" against the territorial solution universally accepted for a "Palestinian" entity. **This is not the case. The US and its allies, who support the establishment of a "Palestinian" state, as well as the Israeli government which may accept that solution for demographic or other reasons, have to ensure first that no Arab/Iranian nuclear capability exists or will exist as long as any Arab/Iranian regime does not reach the Western level of democracy.**

This is another reason to appreciate Bush's insistence on democratization.

Israel's second strike capability, if/when operational, has to be properly hardened or hidden to survive the first strike. Given the size of its territory, Israel may have to use submarines as elusive second strike launch pads. The potential Islamic control of the Mediterranean and European "neutrality" as practiced at present would demand changing patrol areas, which means

considering the expanses of the Indian Ocean. The Suez Canal, the shortcut to the Indian Ocean, would not be available for the passage of Israeli submarines. It would almost certainly be closed by Egypt or, if not, reveal their precise position for interception or trailing. If Israeli subs have to patrol in the Indian Ocean, they would have to reach their stations by going the long way, around the Cape. To be totally independent in such remote waters, they would have to be nuclear subs.

Conventional Deterrence

Israeli conventional deterrence requirements are fairly well taken care of; however, technology may demand substantial changes.

Hi-Tech ammunitions are moving to the forefront. Their very-much-increased range, accuracy, lethality, reliability and availability are in constant rise while their weight and costs are decreasing. This means that for the same results of **Ton x Miles x Target Destruction x Survivability per Mission**, the platforms requirements (tanks or strike aircraft, etc.) will decrease. Fewer platforms and tonnage of ammunition are required when using hi-tech warheads, especially if/when a tighter theater battle coordination is achieved by improving command, control, communications, computerization and intelligence methods and equipment, enabling platforms to share on time data with one another.

Reduction of the number of platforms means a reduction in manpower, to train, operate or maintain them, and a 10-15% yearly equipment write-off for wear and tear.

The recent comparison between the two Gulf Wars is a good example:

- * In 1991, about 1,600 fight/strike/EW aircraft softened Iraq ground forces to where they collapsed in about 40 days, carrying about 1/4 “smart” bombs.⁵⁸
- * In 2003, about 600 aircraft, using over 85% “smart” bombs, enabled, within about a fortnight, the conquest of Iraq.

There is no doubt that the “deterrence-per-dollar” of the technologically upgraded conventional armed forces will be much superior, but one may safely assume that any budget surplus, if available, will not cover a substantial part of the nuclear deterrence.

Terror Deterrence

Unlike conventional warfare, where “*blitzkrieg*” tactics are forced upon Israel by tactical and manpower/economic considerations, terror requires a long breath, although of a much lower intensity.

Having won its largest terror encounter, the last five years of the second (armed) *intifada*, 2000-2005, Israel can look back with increased confidence to its capability of combining excellent real-time intelligence with technological superiority to impose a decisive, although gradual reduction in terror intensity until a tolerable situation will develop.

The increased and efficient use of the pinpoint-real-time intelligence cum anti-terror airpower teams proved to be effective. The especially designed smart ammunition for absolute minimum collateral damage is an illuminating novelty. Between 2000 and the end of 2004, the collateral damage made by air force attacks was reduced from about 50% of casualties to about 5%. Avoiding collateral damage is both a moral and tactical imperative in low-intensity war.

Deterrence – Depth

During past encounters of the Arab-Israeli conflict, when the heavy guns spoke, i.e. during conventional large scale engagements, terror was relatively silent and vice versa.

This can no longer be counted on under the present threat situations.

Deterring terror in a nuclear environment, which means preventing an armed conflagration in a low-intensity terror, or terror/guerilla mode, if/when an Islamic nuclear capability emerges, will be next to impossible unless the nuclear terror-supporting threat is eliminated by efficient nuclear deterrence or by the dismembering of “suicidal regime(s)” via political means or, *faute de mieux*, by preemption.

When the US and the Israeli governments consider the creation of a “State of Palestine”, they should take into consideration that our next door neighbor may be forced, under “peer” pressure, to reopen, against his will, terror cum guerilla attacks, prodded/“protected” by an Iranian nuclear umbrella.

The same is true when considering conventional aggression.

The territorial conclusion is that the depth of the three tiers of threat-deterrence has by now gone way beyond the conventional classic skirmish lines and immediate “rear” of battalion, to division or corps depth. If the non-belligerence is to be maintained, the nominal depth of the deterrence is now over 1,000 miles, starting 10 miles east of the Mediterranean coast.

The Israeli Air Force is becoming the dominant arm, being the one branch of service that is providing most long range, wide area intelligence and is capable of fighting or, hopefully, projecting deterrence in depth, from the Israeli coastline (anti-ballistic, anti-aircraft, early warning, etc.), to the extreme depth of potential or real threat.

Deterrence – Intelligence

The three tier deterrence requires, first and foremost a revolutionary upgrading of intelligence, to render it capable of data acquisition regarding all types of targets, from all-encompassing systems to “sand-particles”, to anticipate intentions, to cover a huge area in real-time, to enable it to instantly process the data acquired and supply it to the man behind the trigger with no delay.

For a low intensity, i.e. terror and/or guerilla threat, intelligence has to relate in real time to movements or intentions of a multitude of heterogeneous, widely dispersed individuals or small groups, and convey the processed and confirmed data to the relevant force destined to engage them.

Apart from it, intelligence must be capable of revealing grand political designs or operational plans. There is no battle line or battle zone for the terror war/deterrence; no friendly or enemy territory. In other words, in low intensity warfare, intelligence has to be able to find a needle in a haystack, all over the relevant parts of the world, and then convey the information to the “end user” in real-time. “Stepping on friendly toes” may happen, which could temporarily strain relations, especially because low intensity war intelligence may require more “humint” (human intelligence”) and trespassing than other modes.

In conventional or WMD modes, intelligence has often provided detailed information but missed the grand design, as were the cases with the US (1941; 2001), USSR (1941), or Israel (1973). Not only detailed, accurate,

on-time, tangible, credible data is required. The art of avoiding preconceived ideas when combining the puzzle is no less important (see Israel, 1973). Leaders have to be open to advice and must be able to listen carefully to those they are less inclined to hear. Human nature is optimistic – a leader does not easily accept the “worst case scenario” as the most probable one. It is very demanding, but sometimes real.

In a place like Israel, a war lost is the final demise of country and its citizens. In this condition, if a worst case scenario appears to be possible, it should be accepted as a working assumption unless there is a very good reason not to do it.

Deterrence – Territories

On October, 27, 1997, the writer was invited, as a member of the ACPR (Ariel Center for Policy Research) and as a former member of the 1991 Madrid Peace Conference, to testify before the Joint Economic Committee of the Senate and House in Washington, DC on the “territories/peace” link.

The subject was “Israel 2000 – How Will it Fare if shrunk to its Pre-Six Day War (1967) Borders”, a paper written within the framework of the ACPR book *Israel at the Crossroads*.⁵⁹

The paper, a technical rather than a political one, was most probably less detailed than the studies made by the US military⁶⁰ to establish what would be Israel’s minimum territorial prerequisites which will enable it to defend itself against an Arab/Pan-Arab/Iranian full scale conventional aggression, without requiring outside (US) operational assistance.

To reach a conclusion, the writer analyzed the 1967 (Six Day War) circumstances, when the war was won starting from the 1967 demarcation lines (the “Green Line”) and then proceeded to examine the changes that occurred during the 30 years between 1967 and 1997. Following are some points:

- * As predicted by Deputy Prime Minister Yigal Allon on February 22, 1967, Israel was able to win a war imposed upon it by a Pan-Arabian Coalition while confined within the “Green Line” demarcation of 1967, only by preemption. **It had to preempt to do so. There was no chance to survive by defensive action.**

Preempting by tactical surprise enabled Israel to win a brilliant military victory of first magnitude of strategic and geopolitical importance but, unfortunately, it entailed a severe international censure which weakened its political standing. A typical outcome of that political weakness incurred was Prime Minister Golda Meir's refusal, in 1973, to permit an air force anti-SAM missiles preemptive strike on the Suez Canal at the start of the Yom Kippur war. Such a strike might have transferred the conflict to the UN Security Council where Israel would have been censured, but it would have prevented a near collapse and saved an untold number of lives. Golda feared a strong American reaction.⁶¹

The first question investigated was whether there would have been a possibility to survive a classic defensive war in 1997, from behind the "Green Line" without having to preempt, thus avoiding international censure in an increasingly "globalized" world. In view of the successful 1973 defensive war fought away from the "Green Line" in the Golan Heights and the Sinai, it was a valid question. The answer is **no**, surely not from behind the "Green Line".

- * The collapse of the Soviet Union raised the question whether this fact may have a positive or negative geopolitical influence on its rogue clients, Israel's enemies. While the Soviet Union was strong, it managed to prevent its client states from "skidding" into an acute crisis which would drag it into a great-power diplomatic or military confrontation. During or after the Soviets left these states on their own, there were the eight-year Iraqi-Iranian war, the *al-Qa'idah* Arab bombing of the WTC in New York in 1993, the *al-Qa'idah* attacks on US embassies and naval ships in Africa, the Mogadiscio US aborted operation, the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait, the Gulf Wars (including the Iraqi launching of ballistic missiles at Israel), the Iranian nuclear ambitions, the *al-Qaidah* global "*jihād*", etc. Margaret Thatcher suggested that the world may be presently missing the "sobering" Soviet influence on Arab/Iranian ME.
- * While battles in conventional armed conflicts like 1948, 1956, 1967 or 1973, were confined to the "skirmish-line", the terror and the deployment of ballistic missiles in Iraq, Saudi Arabia, (Libya), Iran and Syria create a real threat to the Israeli civilian "rear" (whatever size it has) and expand the military operational areas for hundreds of kilometers beyond the ceasefire lines.

- * But by far the most important gap between 1967 and 1997 was the weapons' technological revolution. Digital computers mounted on much improved platforms or on guided missiles, extra-sensitive sensors, electronic warfare, satellite or UAV borne high-resolution intelligence, night (passive infrared) vision, lasers, rocket technology, stand off ammunitions, unmanned strike aircraft (UCAV) and perfected command, control, computers, communications and intelligence (C4I) coordinating the efforts at all levels to count only part of the panoply, totally changed the visage of war as well as the notions of "front line", "depth", "deployment", "theater of operations", "speed of movement", etc.
- * Within the "Green Line", Israel is at a walking distance for terrorists, too small an isolated bridgehead to defend unless it preempts in conventional warfare, and also too small an area for defense in WMD warfare. Were a WMD strategic warning available, metropolitan Tel Aviv could be evacuated only eastwards, to Samaria and Judea. Were the Galilee (north) and the Negev (south) to survive a nuclear discharge on metropolitan Tel Aviv, Israel's continued resistance/existence depends on solid, existent and protected roads, communications, power, water and oil pipelines, etc., i.e. the possession of the Jordan Valley. The Pentagon study accepted that, in modern circumstances, the Green Line was not a suitable border and suggested changes to be made. (See Map 6, "The Pentagon Map".)
- * The space redeemed/occupied by Israel during the Six Day War is small, but it provides topographic compensation which acts like a "space multiplier", vital whether in case of terror, conventional warfare, or under threat of a WMD war.

The 1967 Demarcation Lines cannot fulfill the 2006 deterrence requirements, especially now that the global political and media involvement render preemption exceedingly costly for anyone but the one superpower.

The new demarcation lines or frontiers between Israel and its neighbors have to include strategic areas or topographic assets in Judea, Samaria and the Golan Heights and the land links to them. Sinai and the Gaza Strip have to be positively, totally demilitarized.

Deterrence – Governance

Prime Minister Eshkol's poor image (justified or not) as a hesitating, slow decision-maker, lowered the Israeli deterrence posture.

The Pan-Arab 1967 decision to go to war and annihilate Israel was an outcome of the destabilizing effect of the Arab military, Soviet-supported (or premeditated) buildup on one hand and the projection of a weak Israeli deterrence on the other.

A government that cannot reach a decision on time is a security risk for Israel.

By the same token, a government that cannot provide the financial means to carry the future substantially increasing deterrence/war waging costs of Israel that are already apparent, becomes a security risk, not less.

Having been exposed to the mechanism of governance, the writer is of the opinion that the present, democratic *ad absurdum*, representative Israeli system of government is a heavy millstone on Israel's capability to deter the threats leveled at it, a millstone that will probably become increasingly heavier to carry with time. The threat, including the media semi-muted mortal threat of nuclear/biological missile-weapons launched from hundreds of miles away becomes more and more realistic. The lead time to build a boosted-up viable deterrence is counted in years if not decades. This means that a more efficient governance is urgently requested.

The Israeli Parliamentary democracy is supposed to be a carbon copy of the British system (judicial precedents substituting for constitution) with a sprinkle of Ottoman law, a dose of Jewish Biblical law and selected Diaspora-Orthodox rabbinical religious decrees (*Shulkhan Aruch, Halakha*).

The result is a mess of *ad hoc* legislation, subjected to *ad hoc* manipulations by ephemeral coalitions, with little or no executive resolution or legislative continuity nor stability; a situation not unlike that of Italy or of the French Third or Fourth Republics. But Israel is not in Western Europe. This is "democracy *ad absurdum*", without the proper checks and balances, with no proper long-range strategic planning and no nimble decision-making capacity.

Unlike the Britons who are disciplined, used for centuries to democracy, living comfortably without a constitution in a structured, layered society, Israel's population is an aggregate of more than 100 different political

cultures, most of them non-democratic, living, as mentioned above, under the stresses of the creation of a society, and of an immigrant absorption economy as well as under a threat to its security.

Israel needs a Presidential system similar to that of the US or France, adapted to its particular circumstances.

For instance, separating religion and state might add about 25% to Israel's workforce!! The ultra-religious Jews of Brooklyn work to make a living in the US where religion and state are separate. There is no reason why, for the sake of over half-a-century old, obsolete, by now twisted political accommodations, the ultra-Orthodox Jews in Israel should be exempt from both work and military service, yet receive social security and increased child allocations etc., while the Zionist, moderate religious, Orthodox or secular citizens carry the country's financial, social and defense burdens.

As mentioned, while Western European defense budgets are about 1-2% of the GDP and the US' is 4-5%, Israel's budget is 7-8%. Overloading the budget may induce an economic stall and spin. The answer is simple: let's all roll our sleeves up, go to work and increase the GDP. It is perfectly attainable in the hi-tech age, where Israel excels, but impossible in the present political circumstances.

Strange, but defense constraints demand that Israelis improve their life-standards.

V. How Do 9/11 Islamist Mass Murders in the US Affect Potential Israeli-Pan-Arab/Islamic Peace?

We learned about an enemy who is sophisticated, patient, disciplined, and lethal. The enemy rallies broad support in the Arab and Muslim world by demanding redress of political grievances, but its hostility toward us and our values is limitless. Its purpose is to rid the world of religious and political pluralism, the plebiscite, and equal rights for women. It makes no distinction between military and civilian targets. *Collateral damage* is not in its lexicon.⁶²

What the world finds so hard to acknowledge is that the source of this terrible conflict is not Israel's behavior. It is not the settlements, the roadblocks, the prisoners. It is not, despite the near-universal assumption, the absence of a Palestinian state. The source is the Arab world-backed Palestinian terror war against Israel's existence. The onus is on Abbas to end that war by

dismantling the entire infrastructure of Palestinian terror and to give his own community an identity other than the impulse to destroy another people...⁶³

There is an evidently solid, common denominator between the two quotes above, obscured by “politically correct” attitudes, oil power or the old, colonial guilt complex.

For a number of days after the atrocious 9/11 mass murders in the US, America tried to deceive itself and claim that the “*al-Qa`idah* criminal terrorist mass murder of innocents” and the “Palestinian freedom fighters’ killing of innocents” were the description of two different conflicts.

The Arab-Israeli conflict’s true picture is distorted by the (average) media bias, by Arab 1974 oil embargo hangover and by the UN as well as the European anti-Israeli political (“pragmatic”) antagonism.⁶⁴

Regardless of whatever was said in the West or in the UN Headquarters, all Islamists link the “Little Devil” (Israel) with the “Great Devil” (the United States), whose bridgehead the little one is rightly supposed to be.

As mentioned, since WWII, the US Middle-Eastern policy, as defined by John Foster Dulles and by Allen Dulles has been one of “stability at all costs”. The US protected its oil supply and ME holdings by supporting the most regressive oil rich theocracies like *Wahabbist* Saudi Arabia, or kingdoms like *Shiite* Iran or *Sunni* Gulf princes. No ruling Western democrat was supposed to care about or even mention the plight of the absolute majority of the Islam’s oppressed *fellaheen*, as long as the royally-treated tyrants, be they theocrats or feudal rulers, could be bought with gold or pomp and circumstance so as to maintain stability and secure the oil supply. In the wake of the 1956 “Suez Affair” fiasco, after Britain and France were politically expelled by the US from the ME, the Soviets penetrated the region via the “Arab Socialist revolutionaries” of Egypt, Syria, Iraq and Libya. Pro-Arab USSR became a legitimate, “protector of the impoverished Muslim masses oppressed by the US in the Islamic world” while its clients’ dictators jailed communists. By default, the US became the protector of the reactionary, oppressive feudalists of Saudi Arabia, the Gulf States, Iran, et al. The theocrats’ and tyrants’ task to funnel the populations’ frustration and bitterness was made easy: “Death to Israel!!”

“Israel, the ‘Little Satan’ and the US ‘Big Satan’ are the enemies of Allah and of Arabia.” The enslaved, illiterate, sick, hungry, superstitious, religious absolute majority of the Arabian-Muslim populations, bit it all, bait, hook

and sinker. The real enslavers, the rulers, became virtual “poor victims”, all persecuted by the infidel.

Islam, like the “Non-Aligned”, became pro-Soviet in general.

So much for the policy of “stability”.

In these conditions, it was only natural that the State Department “field-wise bureaucracy” would try to recover lost ground, courting Arabia/Islam by doing their best to censure Zionism, and cooling the “Zionist enthusiasm” of the “home politics orientated pro-Zionist Congress and/or White House” at home.

Observers of the US attitude *vis-à-vis* democratic, refugee absorbing Israel, were puzzled to note the two distinct approaches: Presidential (most times) and Congressional political and financial support on one hand, versus the State Department’s pro-Arab warm, friendly cooperation with the scum of this world’s rulers, on the other. That included political coercion of Israel, accompanied by a carrot-and-stick outstretched hand which made sure that crushing Israeli military victories could **not** be translated into a solid political gain that might prevent the next round.

After 9/11, it did not take long for President George W. Bush’s Texan straightforwardness to overcome deeply rooted contrivances and recognize that, the two, (worldwide) US and (regional) Israeli wars, were different sectors of one and the same front. A major change in US-Middle Eastern policy resulted.

George W. Bush came to a revolutionary conclusion: the “old stability”, the breeding ground of Muslim extremism, or its *Ba`athist* secular mirror image in Iraq and Syria, and the resulting anti-Western terror and potential nuclear war, had to be replaced with “global, democratic, pacifist realism”. This is an ambitious, historic, courageous undertaking of the leading superpower; a high personal political risk, a conservative act of democratic integrity.

Dictatorships, Theocracies, Terror, Warmongering and WMD – Out / Transition to Democracy and Kant’s View of “Eternal Peace” – In

The George W. Bush revolutionary redefinition of the US ME policy, if carried out to completely fulfill the aims stated on June 24, 2003, is as vital

to the democratic emancipation and well-being of the Arab populations of the ME as it is to the peace and well-being of democratic Israel.

The task assumed by the President of the United States may be much more difficult than it appears. To avoid unwarranted political damage, the President was careful enough to state and underline a number of times that Muslim Extremism (by now “Islamism”), is a very small minority, an aberration and abomination of Islam. Let’s all hope he is right. If he is, reality does not confirm it.

How much business, tourism, well-being, joy of life, leadership attention, human resources, defense spending, etc. have been wasted to date on terror? How many billions of enervating man-hours that could have otherwise been productive, have, are and will be spent on airport security by passengers, staff and guards, to prevent Islamist terror?

(It would be an eye opener to spread in airport terminals, all over the world, big banners with the inscription: “Most of the time you’re wasting here is spent to prevent ‘Islamism’ having its way with your life. Thank them for it.”)

Some media, political and academic circles, mainly in Europe, accuse the Arab-Israeli conflict of being the source of Islamic bitterness, hatred and terror against the West.

This is sheer nonsense. How do the train mass-murders in Spain, the underground and bus murders in London, etc. relate to the Arab fight against Israel when Spain, Britain, etc. are members of the pro-Arab, anti-Israeli and anti-US biased European Union? Europe’s Muslim population is presently estimated to be 30-34 million.

Defending his pro-Bush policy, Prime Minister Blair declared on July, 19, 2005, that, were there no Israel, Iraq and Afghanistan Islamist terror would have found another pretext. So much for the opposite statement re “Palestinians” that he made a number of days earlier.

Claiming that anti-Western terror is an outcome of the “Arabia’s War of Liberation of Palestine” is an expression of primitive hatred, or of the frustration from an unending repetitive story broadcast for too long at primetime.

If it takes too long to disclaim, let’s have it from the horse’s mouth: let’s hear bin Ladin. His is the voice of Islamic fundamentalism. He claims that

the Israeli-Islam (not “Palestinians”) conflict is just one of the many reasons for Islam’s anti-Western (“anti-Crusaders”) “*jihad*”.

The following abbreviated quotation from the 9/11 report may provide a better, authoritative perspective:

Bin Ladin shares Qutb’s philosophy. Qutb was an Egyptian writer whom his government sent to study in the United States during the late 1940s. Returning, he claimed that the world was beset with barbarism, licentiousness and unbelief. He argued that humans can only choose between Islam and *jahiliyya*, the religious term for the period preceding Muhammad’s revelations. He was executed in 1966, on charges of attempting to overthrow the Egyptian government.

Qutb’s teachings permit bin Ladin and his followers to rationalize even unprovoked mass murder as righteous defense of an embattled faith. Many Americans have wondered, “Why do ‘they’ hate us?” Some also asked “What can we do to stop these attacks?”

Bin Ladin and *al Qa`idah* have given answers to both these questions. To the first, they say that America attacked Islam; America is responsible for all conflicts involving Muslims. Thus Americans are blamed when Israelis fight with the Palestinians, when Russians fight with Chechens, when Indians fight with Kashmiri Muslims, and when the Philippine government fights ethnic Muslims in its southern islands. America is also held responsible for the governments of Muslim countries, derided by *al Qa`idah* as “your agents”. Bin Ladin has stated flatly, “our fight against these governments is not separate from our fight against you.”⁶⁵

Why do reporters, academicians, politicians and rabble-rousers accuse the Jews, relating only to the Israeli-Arab conflict from among so many? This is for them to answer. The writer believes that he knows why.

Future Israel-US Interaction

At the beginning of 2002, the US started gearing itself for war against the perpetrators of the 9/11 massacres. The enemy, its location, the scale and the way to conduct this war, etc., were not yet public knowledge. Nor were the Aims of War; they were made public by President George W. Bush, as mentioned, only on June 24, 2002. Common sense left no doubt that the war will be waged in the Middle East.

Any war in the ME concerns Israel because of its sensitivity to the slightest geopolitical earthquakes around it.

No one doubted that the US would achieve a “blitz” victory in the coming ME war. This confidence turned out to be wrong. During Spring 2002, this writer wrote a paper concerning the threat evolution in the case of an American withdrawal from the ME before a clear-cut decision would be reached in the pending US-Iraqi war.⁶⁶ The conclusion was that were an American premature withdrawal to be effected, Islamist terror may declare itself victorious, similarly to Vietnam, a victory which, whether real or imaginary, would sweep rogue regimes with exultation, and encourage one or a number of them to proceed unhindered with the development of nuclear weapons.

In such circumstances the US might join Europe in futile diplomatic demarches *à la* 1938/9. Israel could be faced with an Iranian or other nuclear threat that would be enhanced by terror and Pan-Arabian conventional threats. Unless it would respond, Israel would lose its deterrent posture and thus be open to any attack mode by a massive grand Pan-Arab/Iranian coalition. **Any peace concluded would then crumble because deterrence would collapse.**

As mentioned, a MAD (Mutually Assured Destruction) situation might not suffice.

A proper anti-missile missile defense may not suffice. If it misses one or two warheads, Israel would be mortally hit, and missiles are not the only means of conveying nuclear warheads.

The one option Israel had in the Six Day War in 1967 remains, namely “anticipatory self-defense” which means preemption, preferably by surprise, as in the case of Iraq’s nuclear facility Osirak, in 1981. Of course, with conventional armament; Israel would not and could not initiate a nuclear exchange under any circumstances.

But ranges from Israel to Iran are double Osirak’s range and targets are numerous. The Israel Air Force would have to penetrate hundreds of miles of enemy-defended territory. The world would be up screaming and might apply sanctions. The economy of a country the size of Israel could not survive a prolonged boycott. But if it is a matter of life and death, Israel will still have to do it.

The US is **the** one superpower and its war aims in the ME include the prevention of nuclear proliferation in rogue regimes. Given the oft proven verity of *Quod licet Jovis non licet bovi*, the US would not be exposed to the same “friendly” and other international pressures if it would do what it said it would, in which case it is Israel’s duty to assist it as required.

The writer’s conclusion is that, for Israel, the threat of yet another very painful, costly and distracting war of terror, being waged within pre-1967 armistice lines and in the contested territories, is less acute than an existential nuclear threat, distant and publicly imperceptible, coming from Iran. Therefore Israel has to relate to the nuclear threat as a first priority which includes possible tactical or strategic accommodations with US-ME interests, conditional upon the US taking care of rogue nukes or other WMD.

The writer’s above mentioned paper⁶⁷ triggered the teamwork of a mixed Israeli-American team which produced a paper on “Israel’s Strategic Future”, handed over to Prime Minister Sharon on January 16, 2003. The paper deals with the very heavy implications of an Israeli deterrence to maintain peace in a rogue WMD (nuclear or biological) Middle East.⁶⁸

There are only months left for Iran to “go nuclear”, armed with a medium range missile arsenal capable of delivering nuclear warheads to Israel (and Europe). If no US/International measures are promptly taken to deny Iran the possession of WMD and in view of its leaders formal declaration that “Israel is to be destroyed”, the West’s equivocation on the Iranian military denuclearization will force another Israeli “Osirak”, only infinitely more complicated geopolitically and operationally because of countries involved, ranges and number of targets.

The alternative is, as portrayed in “Israel’s Strategic Future”, the adoption of an Israeli deterrence policy which would cast a heavy nuclear shadow over the whole ME or even the world – unless, of course, there is a regime change in Iran.

The US in the Middle East

When President George W. Bush defined his Aims of War on June 24, 2003 and pointed to the “Axis of Evil”, he probably assumed that Iraqis, Iranians, or North Koreans, when freed from their respective oppressors, would be happy and forever indebted to their liberators, not unlike some European

nations when freed from their absolute monarchs by the French Revolution of 1793 or by the Allies in 1945. This is, unfortunately, not the case in the ME.

Different civilizations react differently.

In Afghanistan there exists no nation in the Western sense, and therefore the results are still mixed. Some tribal warlords think that the US presence is beneficial to their own interests and some do not. The multitude, the plebeian population, has never truly lived in freedom, or known the responsibility that goes with it; they are presently mostly aware of freedom's liabilities. Not used to decision-making, they prefer someone to decide in their stead. The real blessings of democratic freedom may be generations away, so why welcome a foreign "infidel" and conqueror, whose arrival causes death and upheaval?

Though more so than others, the Iraqi society cannot be considered advanced. Iraq is a name invented by the British for the post-WWI mandatory entity created by them around Mesopotamian oil. Multi-national and religiously split Iraq has always "cracked at the seams". Trust, goodwill, integrity, community awareness, common good, decent government, etc., are not part of the culture, neither that of the *Shiite* majority, nor that of the formerly ruling *Sunni* minority or that of the ethnically non-Arab Kurdish culture, except in intra-tribal relationships.

As a result, democracy in Iraq would be hesitant in coming and very slowly digested. As it would be in Syria or Saudi Arabia, it might be more welcome in Iran because of their previous exposure to the West.

But democracy, true democracy, not the Eastern European, Egyptian or Zimbabwean varieties, is the ultimate foundation and guardian of true peace, as Immanuel Kant's *Perpetual Peace* teaches, and as George W. Bush attempts to implement.

The CIA-induced error of the conflict duration assessment committed by the Administration which believed in the population's instant welcome of the deliverers does not change this reality.

Deterrence is the Malady’s Pain-Killer – Democracy is the Cure

The democratization of the Middle East will take longer, maybe much longer than anticipated, especially with Europe’s fishing in troubled waters and Russia’s renewed aspirations of *grandeur*.

The United States has started to rebuild the Middle East by “clearing the mud-huts” of poverty and removing the regimes of the Middle Ages. Unless it finishes the job, it will leave the ME in a much worse situation than before, because neither the old, nor the new, modern leadership will be there and oil money will continue to be made available to the bin Ladins of all varieties.

Israel would be glad to cooperate with the US but it cannot, obviously, replace it.

The United Nations, Created by Democracies, Dominated by Totalitarians

A prime factor that imposed the (re)creation of the United Nations at the end of WWII was the allied effort to avoid the repetition of a Nazi-like criminal regime’s enslavement of individuals, nations and states. The Germans’ regression into a bloodthirsty, rabid murderers’ nation dragged the whole of Europe with it, in a killing frenzy of tens of millions, with the Jews as their prime target.

Attempting to alleviate the suffering of the Holocaust survivors and echoing the (deceased) League of Nations decree of 1921/2, the UN decided with an over two-thirds majority, that a Jewish state be established in the British Mandate of Palestine.

It was the second time in a quarter of a century, at the end of two world wars, that a consensus of the leading countries of the world decided to allocate the formerly **Turkish** territory of Palestine, or part thereof, to establish a Jewish National Home or country.

Britain, the Mandatory Power was charged between the two world wars with the establishment of the Jewish entity and, together with France, with the parallel grooming to independence of all the 21 Arab countries emerging after WWI, mostly ex-Turkish territories like Palestine.

Come WWII, Britain reneged on its task and opposed the formation of a Jewish state in the Jewish homeland of Palestine.

The UN picked up where Britain left off. It was one of its (very few) finest hours.

Pan-Arabia opposed the UN decision by force. Israel fought its War of Independence and won.

Like Britain, the UN reneged on its task to support its own decision and oversee the emergence of an Israeli democracy that was to be established by Jewish refugees, for Jewish survivors and refugees. In 1974, after two more unsuccessful Pan-Arabian attempts to force the armed annihilation of Israel, the UN, with by now a majority of totalitarian members, voted to brand Zionism, the Jewish force behind the creation of Israel, as racism, which meant ostracism.

A formal UN statement equivalent to “Zionism is Racism” was repeated at the UN Durban Conference Against Racism on September 8, 2001.

Like the explosion of a delayed-action fuse, the UN aberrations had an echo: Even though countries like Chechnya, Abkhazia, Metropolitan Russia, Azerbaijan, Tajikistan, Kashmir, the US, Spain, Nigeria, Sudan, Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran, Indonesia, Balkans, Algeria, Saudi Arabia, as well as the ME, or Ivory Coast, etc. were and are presently ablaze with Islamic terror, polls in Britain, France, Holland and similar countries point to Israel as the prime danger to world peace, with the US coming second!

Anti-Semitism Flourishes Again

Even Oxford professors profess nowadays to be anti-Semitic. This may be because the anti-Semites are not emotionally mature enough as humans. “Well-mannered” professors or simple bigots, they revolt against the Jews probably because of the limitations imposed upon their primitive-predatory nature by the “Jewish” Ten Commandments which Christianity inherited.

Sounds Like an Orwellian Redefinition of Humanity

In 2005, after 60 years of delays and equivocation, the UN did, finally, protest against the rising tide of anti-Semitism in “civilized” countries, an anti-Semitism that it encouraged over many decades.

It dedicated a whole day, January 24, to mark the anniversary of the Allied (Soviet) liberation of Auschwitz, the ultimate Nazi concentration camp, the mass murder factory, which, as the most prominent abomination became the symbol of the Nazi beast. Strange, is it not?

As strange as the "Oil for Food", UN-Saddam Hussein racket, or as Koffi Annan's half-hearted murmur that was his reaction to the Iranian President's repeated, loud and clear declarations that, again, Israel must be wiped off the map? The UN, the "Hall of Humanism" built by the victors of 1945, turned into a predator's jungle.

President G.W. Bush was right in assuming that without reverting to its original mission, the UN would continue to be counter-productive to peace in the Middle East.

No one but the US can presently do anything about it. G.W. Bush wants to.

Among ME frustrations, European and other liberals' opposition to remove the tyrants of the ME and natural disasters, President G.W. Bush did point to the right road to global peace.

Let the world get up and go.

Quo Vadis Global Village? *Quo Vadis* Western Civilization?

What's in Store?

Given the increasing rate of globalization and the radical worldwide geopolitical changes brought about by the substitution of President George W. Bush's global activism for the previous US and continued European *laissez faire*, the writer believes that international policy synchronization will improve Israel's chances of peace and well-being. Its leadership is required to confront realities at home as well as beyond its demarcation lines, streamline decision-making and plan for as far in the future as the implementation of planning requires.

The 20th century belonged to those who controlled raw materials and energy. In the 21st century, raw materials and energy are second to brainpower. The Jews, who for centuries have developed their brainpower as the most convenient asset "to carry" when chased from one place to another, have their chance. (It's not racism! It's just statistics!) Judging by their past

(remote and recent) deeds under duress in a resource-less country, there is every reason for optimism.

Appendix I

The fundamental principle of natural justice was first coined in the Roman constitution: *Ex injuria jus non oritur* (an advantage may not be attained through an act of injustice), and it has served as the foundation for all constitutions since. The Nuremberg trials were predicated on the basis of the principle of the necessity to punish the aggressor. The Allies punished the Germans with a series of actions: The execution of nine members of the Nazi leadership; occupation, division and establishment of a military government; a process of de-nazification that lasted 10 years and intended to cleanse all of the government institutions and authorities of all those with a Nazi past and of everyone who took part, in any way, in an act of aggression against one of the Allies.

The primary punishment meted out was the removal of extensive territories (almost 300,000 square kilometers) from German sovereignty and their transfer to those nations that had been attacked by Germany. This was the case regarding the Sudetenland to Czechoslovakia; Silesia, Pomerania and Danzig to Poland; Alsace-Lorraine to France and eastern Prussia to the Soviet Union. Thirteen million residents of those territories had been deported to Germany without compensation. (200,000 were killed in acts of revenge.) It is unthinkable that the Germans could come today with a demand to return those territories to Germany. Were a demand of that raised, it would be considered a *casus belli*.

Three years after the Holocaust of European Jewry, seven Arab countries attacked the nascent State of Israel.⁶⁹ The war was intended to perpetrate an act of “policide”, a concept unprecedented in the history of nations. This was done publicly and declaratively. The Arabs were routed and Israel gained control of extensive territories beyond the partition borders as they were drawn by the United Nations. Immediately after those territories were conquered, they were annexed as sovereign Israeli land and some of the Arab residents were expelled. It was not only Israel’s right to take over those territories and to expel the hostile population, it was **its** obligation on the basis of international law that relies on the principle of natural law and the precedent of the Nuremberg trials. Furthermore, it is important to remember that the Germans never declared their intention to destroy the countries that they conquered, at least not openly, with the exception of the case of the Jews. Thus, the Arab intention to destroy was an attempt to complete Hitler’s effort. Therefore, in addition to the other reasons for Israel’s right to

take over the territories liberated in the War of Independence there is the law of “bringing Nazis and their collaborators to justice” – a law that Israel never applied to those seeking its demise.

During the Six Day War, the picture from the War of Independence was replicated in perfect symmetry. Once again, the Arabs openly declared that they are setting out to perpetrate an act of “policide”. Israel won again and it was obligated to act as it has 18 years before. **In fact**, this time, the Jewish state violated international law requiring the punishment of the aggressor, when it relinquished the Sinai Desert (one of the most significant strategic assets in this part of the world), partially withdrew from the Golan Heights and ceded most of Judea and Samaria to an enemy that continues to openly declare that the purpose of its existence is to destroy the Jewish state.⁷⁰

It is important to emphasize again that there is no room for comparison between the extent of the threat, indeed the existential threat, posed by Germany to the Allies in World War II and the existential threat posed to Israel by its enemies. It is similarly important to remember that the 1,700 victims since the Oslo Accords is the equivalent of 34 Twin Towers, however, the United States began waging a comprehensive war the next day. Israel characterizes the situation as the “peace process”.

Appendix II

Exchange of Letters Between PM Sharon and President Bush

During their meeting in Washington, Prime Minister Ariel Sharon and US President George Bush exchanged letters aimed at achieving a settlement between Israel and the Palestinians in the context of the Roadmap and the Prime Minister’s Disengagement Plan.

Letter from Prime Minister Ariel Sharon to US President George W. Bush

April 14, 2004

The Honorable George W. Bush
President of the United States of America
The White House
Washington, DC

Dear Mr. President,

The vision that you articulated in your June 24, 2002 address constitutes one of the most significant contributions toward ensuring a bright future for the Middle East. Accordingly, the State of Israel has accepted the Roadmap, as adopted by our government. For the first time, a practical and just formula was presented for the achievement of peace, opening a genuine window of opportunity for progress toward a settlement between Israel and the Palestinians, involving two states living side-by-side in peace and security.

This formula sets forth the correct sequence and principles for the attainment of peace. Its full implementation represents the sole means to make genuine progress. As you have stated, a Palestinian state will never be created by terror, and Palestinians must engage in a sustained fight against the terrorists and dismantle their infrastructure. Moreover, there must be serious efforts to institute true reform and real democracy and liberty, including new leaders not compromised by terror. We are committed to this formula as the only avenue through which an agreement can be reached. We believe that this formula is the only viable one.

The Palestinian Authority under its current leadership has taken no action to meet its responsibilities under the Roadmap. Terror has not ceased, reform of

the Palestinian security services has not been undertaken, and real institutional reforms have not taken place. The State of Israel continues to pay the heavy cost of constant terror. Israel must preserve its capability to protect itself and deter its enemies, and we thus retain our right to defend ourselves against terrorism and to take actions against terrorist organizations.

Having reached the conclusion that, for the time being, there exists no Palestinian partner with whom to advance peacefully toward a settlement and since the current impasse is unhelpful to the achievement of our shared goals, I have decided to initiate a process of gradual disengagement with the hope of reducing friction between Israelis and Palestinians. The Disengagement Plan is designed to improve security for Israel and stabilize our political and economic situation. It will enable us to deploy our forces more effectively until such time that conditions in the Palestinian Authority allow for the full implementation of the Roadmap to resume.

I attach, for your review, the main principles of the Disengagement Plan. This initiative, which we are not undertaking under the Roadmap, represents an independent Israeli plan, yet is not inconsistent with the Roadmap. According to this plan, the State of Israel intends to relocate military installations and all Israeli villages and towns in the Gaza Strip, as well as other military installations and a small number of villages in Samaria.

In this context, we also plan to accelerate construction of the Security Fence, whose completion is essential in order to ensure the security of the citizens of Israel. The fence is a security rather than political barrier, temporary rather than permanent, and therefore will not prejudice any final status issues including final borders. The route of the Fence, as approved by our Government's decisions, will take into account, consistent with security needs, its impact on Palestinians not engaged in terrorist activities.

Upon my return from Washington, I expect to submit this Plan for the approval of the Cabinet and the Knesset, and I firmly believe that it will win such approval.

The Disengagement Plan will create a new and better reality for the State of Israel, enhance its security and economy, and strengthen the fortitude of its people. In this context, I believe it is important to bring new opportunities to the Negev and the Galilee. Additionally, the Plan will entail a series of measures with the inherent potential to improve the lot of the Palestinian Authority, providing that it demonstrates the wisdom to take advantage of

this opportunity. The execution of the Disengagement Plan holds the prospect of stimulating positive changes within the Palestinian Authority that might create the necessary conditions for the resumption of direct negotiations.

We view the achievement of a settlement between Israel and the Palestinians as our central focus and are committed to realizing this objective. Progress toward this goal must be anchored exclusively in the Roadmap and we will oppose any other plan.

In this regard, we are fully aware of the responsibilities facing the State of Israel. These include limitations on the growth of settlements; removal of unauthorized outposts; and steps to increase, to the extent permitted by security needs, freedom of movement for Palestinians not engaged in terrorism. Under separate cover we are sending to you a full description of the steps the State of Israel is taking to meet all its responsibilities.

The government of Israel supports the United States efforts to reform the Palestinian security services to meet their roadmap obligations to fight terror. Israel also supports the American's efforts, working with the International Community, to promote the reform process, build institutions and improve the economy of the Palestinian Authority and to enhance the welfare of its people, in the hope that a new Palestinian leadership will prove able to fulfill its obligations under the roadmap.

I want to again express my appreciation for your courageous leadership in the war against global terror, your important initiative to revitalize the Middle East as a more fitting home for its people and, primarily, your personal friendship and profound support for the State of Israel.

Sincerely,
Ariel Sharon

Letter from US President George W. Bush to Prime Minister Ariel Sharon

His Excellency Ariel Sharon
Prime Minister of Israel

Dear Mr. Prime Minister,

Thank you for your letter setting out your disengagement plan.

The United States remains hopeful and determined to find a way forward toward a resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian dispute. I remain committed to my June 24, 2002 vision of two states living side by side in peace and security as the key to peace, and to the Roadmap as the route to get there.

We welcome the disengagement plan you have prepared, under which Israel would withdraw certain military installations and all settlements from Gaza, and withdraw certain military installations and settlements in the West Bank. These steps described in the plan will mark real progress toward realizing my June 24, 2002 vision, and make a real contribution towards peace. We also understand that, in this context, Israel believes it is important to bring new opportunities to the Negev and the Galilee. We are hopeful that steps pursuant to this plan, consistent with my vision, will remind all states and parties of their own obligations under the Roadmap.

The United States appreciates the risks such an undertaking represents. I therefore want to reassure you on several points.

First, the United States remains committed to my vision and to its implementation as described in the Roadmap. The United States will do its utmost to prevent any attempt by anyone to impose any other plan. Under the Roadmap, Palestinians must undertake an immediate cessation of armed activity and all acts of violence against Israelis anywhere, and all official Palestinian institutions must end incitement against Israel. The Palestinian leadership must act decisively against terror, including sustained, targeted, and effective operations to stop terrorism and dismantle terrorist capabilities and infrastructure. Palestinians must undertake a comprehensive and fundamental political reform that includes a strong parliamentary democracy and an empowered prime minister.

Second, there will be no security for Israelis or Palestinians until they and all states, in the region and beyond, join together to fight terrorism and dismantle terrorist organizations. The United States reiterates its steadfast

commitment to Israel's security, including secure, defensible borders, and to preserve and strengthen Israel's capability to deter and defend itself, by itself, against any threat or possible combination of threats.

Third, Israel will retain its right to defend itself against terrorism, including to take actions against terrorist organizations. The United States will lead efforts, working together with Jordan, Egypt, and others in the international community, to build the capacity and will of Palestinian institutions to fight terrorism, dismantle terrorist organizations, and prevent the areas from which Israel has withdrawn from posing a threat that would have to be addressed by any other means. The United States understands that after Israel withdraws from Gaza and/or parts of the West Bank, and pending agreements on other arrangements, existing arrangements regarding control of airspace, territorial waters, and land passages of the West Bank and Gaza will continue.

The United States is strongly committed to Israel's security and well-being as a Jewish state. It seems clear that an agreed, just, fair and realistic framework for a solution to the Palestinian refugee issue as part of any final status agreement will need to be found through the establishment of a Palestinian state, and the settling of Palestinian refugees there, rather than in Israel.

As part of a final peace settlement, Israel must have secure and recognized borders, which should emerge from negotiations between the parties in accordance with UNSC Resolutions 242 and 338. In light of new realities on the ground, including already existing major Israeli populations centers, it is unrealistic to expect that the outcome of final status negotiations will be a full and complete return to the armistice lines of 1949, and all previous efforts to negotiate a two-state solution have reached the same conclusion. It is realistic to expect that any final status agreement will only be achieved on the basis of mutually agreed changes that reflect these realities.

I know that, as you state in your letter, you are aware that certain responsibilities face the State of Israel. Among these, your government has stated that the barrier being erected by Israel should be a security rather than political barrier, should be temporary rather than permanent, and therefore not prejudice any final status issues including final borders, and its route should take into account, consistent with security needs, its impact on Palestinians not engaged in terrorist activities.

As you know, the United States supports the establishment of a Palestinian state that is viable, contiguous, sovereign, and independent, so that the Palestinian people can build their own future in accordance with my vision set forth in June 2002 and with the path set forth in the Roadmap. The United States will join with others in the international community to foster the development of democratic political institutions and new leadership committed to those institutions, the reconstruction of civic institutions, the growth of a free and prosperous economy, and the building of capable security institutions dedicated to maintaining law and order and dismantling terrorist organizations.

A peace settlement negotiated between Israelis and Palestinians would be a great boon not only to those peoples but to the peoples of the entire region. Accordingly, the United States believes that all states in the region have special responsibilities: to support the building of the institutions of a Palestinian state; to fight terrorism, and cut off all forms of assistance to individuals and groups engaged in terrorism; and to begin now to move toward more normal relations with the State of Israel. These actions would be true contributions to building peace in the region.

Mr. Prime Minister, you have described a bold and historic initiative that can make an important contribution to peace. I commend your efforts and your courageous decision which I support. As a close friend and ally, the United States intends to work closely with you to help make it a success.

Sincerely,

George W. Bush

Endnotes

- ¹ See Henry Kissinger, *Crisis*, 2004, Hebrew translation by Shalem Center, p. 122, relating to Oct. 9, 1973.
- ² Louis Rene Beres (Chair), Naaman Belkind, Isaac Ben-Israel, Rand H. Fishbein, Adir Pridor and Yoash Tsiddon-Chatto, "Israel's Strategic Future: Project Daniel", ACPR Policy Paper No. 155, 2004; also published in Nativ Online, vol. 3, April 2004, <<http://www.acpr.org.il/ENGLISH-NATIV/03-ISSUE/daniel-3.htm>>.
- ³ Mark Twain, *The Innocents Abroad*, 1869.
- ⁴ See case study in Joan Peters, *From Time Immemorial*, Harper & Row, 1984.
- ⁵ See Bat Yeor, *The Dhimmi-Jews and Christians under Islam*, Cranbury, 1985; David Pryce Jones, *The Closed Circle: An Interpretation of the Arabs*, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1989; Daniel Pipes, *The Hidden Hand – ME Fears of Conspiracy*, St. Martin's Press, 1996; David Fromkin, *A Peace to End All Peace: The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Creation of the Modern Middle East*, Henry Holt & Co., 1989.
- ⁶ See map of Arab/Islamic countries around Israel, taken from Yoash Tsiddon-Chatto, "The Right Against Wrong", 1991. (See Map 1 [1919].)
- ⁷ "Climb", i.e. immigration to Palestine.
- ⁸ The first Turkish census of Jerusalem, 1854, indicates that Jews were, at that time, the largest community among the town's inhabitants.
- ⁹ Yehudiya, Metullah, Rosh Pina, Shfeya, Zichron Yaakov, Petach Tikva, Hartuv, Kfar Urryia, Rishon Lezion, Ness Ziona, Rehovot and Gedera.
- ¹⁰ Southern Iraqi, Iranian, Arabian Peninsula, North African, African, North Sea, Russian, Angolan, Nigerian, etc. oil deposits were not yet developed. The US was a major oil exporter.
- ¹¹ As mentioned, this belief guided the US State Dept. until not long ago and still guides some European and other "exemplary" democracies. The first one to favor democracy, "loud and clear", is the Republican US President G.W. Bush.
- ¹² See Map 1 [1919].
- ¹³ Sikes-Picot, later modified.
- ¹⁴ Kissinger's notions of "constructive ambiguity" during his Vietnam "peace agreements" with Thieu yielded a similar result. So did the active US/UN mediations that prevented a clear-cut result in various Israeli-Arab encounters, ceasefires, peace treaties and, of course, the Oslo chain of "agreements". History prefers clear-cut decisions.

- ¹⁵ The British had to settle a debt with the Hashemites, the direct descendants of Prophet Mohammad who ruled Arabia before WWI, whom the British ousted. They appointed Feysal, the senior Hashemite Prince, as King of Syria, in Damascus, but Syria was under French Mandate and the French-Syrians chased Feysal out. Then the British appointed him King of a new entity which they, the British, named Iraq. During the anti-Feysal unrest and subsequent drive out of Damascus, Abdullah, rode North with his Desert Bedouins, to assist his senior brother. The British stopped him in Trans-Jordan and won him over by appointing him as “Emir of Trans-Jordan”, detaching the area, with no League of Nations authority, from the Palestinian Mandate while retaining British rule. No consultations or negotiations whatsoever with the Jewish or Arab communities in Palestine were considered necessary.
- ¹⁶ See Map 2 [1937].
- ¹⁷ *Irgun Tzeva`i Leumi*, known abroad as “*Irgun*”.
- ¹⁸ *Lohamei Herut Israel* – The “Stern Gang”.
- ¹⁹ Note the story of the St. Louis ship.
- ²⁰ “The Settlement”, as the Jewish community in Palestine was known.
- ²¹ At the time, Turkey was weighing entering the war on the German side.
- ²² Future President Sadat participated in it.
- ²³ Joan Peters, *From Time Immemorial*, Harper & Row, 1984.
- ²⁴ See Map 3 [1947].
- ²⁵ By the end of the war, with mass immigration in full swing, Israel was practically bankrupt.
- ²⁶ Which raises the question why were the UN and each one of its members, including the US, so “mad” at Israel’s preemption of an Iraqi nuclear buildup by bombing, in 1981, the French supplied nuclear facility of Osirak.
- ²⁷ As it turned out, when these sites were wrestled from the Jordanians in 1967, there was a good reason for it: the Jordanians used the Jewish cemetery tombstones on the Mount of Olives to build Army latrines and other “logistics” and erased the millenary Jewish quarter within the walls of the Old City.
- ²⁸ There are almost 6,000,000 Jews in present Israel, more than there are Irish in Ireland, Fins in Finland or Danes in Denmark.
- ²⁹ After adding Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco to their Empire, the French bestowed French citizenship upon the Jews of the Maghreb, a status they denied the Muslims. When these North African countries gained independence (during the 1950s), the Jews fled Arab persecutions. As a rule, the rich and powerful moved to metropolitan France’s thriving centers while the lower socio-economic strata

and those more attached to their Jewish heritage, went to Israel. Their contribution to Israeli society was, in all fields of endeavor, very rich indeed.

- ³⁰ Made possible by the “extracurricular”, rather “Don Quixote”-like efforts of the then Director General of the Ministry of Defense, Shimon Peres.
- ³¹ Not airframes; the French excelled at airframe design.
- ³² All Israeli Air Force Planning and Operational Requirements efforts were marked “until 1968” or “after 1968”. Analyzing the Soviet upgrading of the Arabs, 1968 was the latest estimated year of an outbreak of hostilities; see Yoash Tsiddon-Chatto, *By Day, by Night, Through Haze and Fog*, Maariv Publishers (Hebrew), 1995.
- ³³ The Soviet Union was interested in an Egyptian victory so as to be credited by Arabia with the elimination of what was considered to be a US bridgehead. According to “Un-Finished Business”, the draft of a research paper based upon a recent review of ex-Soviet archives, Dr. Isabella Ginor and Gideon Remez of the “Truman Institute” at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem posit that it was the USSR which **premeditated** the Pan-Arab attack on Israel in 1967, in order to evict the US from the ME.
- ³⁴ Jordan’s King Hussein wanted to share in the spoils of the certain victory. A Nasser-Hussein phone conversation, where Nasser gave Hussein a totally misleading military situation report, was taped by Israeli intelligence and broadcast over all national radio-stations. It was too late for Hussein.
- ³⁵ See the North African campaigns of 1940-1945 and, especially, the two US Gulf Wars in 1991 and 2003.
- ³⁶ Anticipating the possibility of an Arab surprise attack – remember that we were behind the confinement of the “Green Line” – this writer attended a number of test flights of SATS (Short Airfield for Tactical Support). The idea was to catapult fighters for takeoff and cable-arrest them at landing so as to be able to operate from fragmented runways. The tests performed in 1964 at the Marine Corps bases of Cherry Point in North Carolina, Parris Island, South Carolina and with the German Navy at Marinenvlieggeschwader Numer I in Schleswig, Germany, proved that SATS, then the only such means, were definitely inadequate for our requirement, neither for our aircraft nor for our mission. Preempting remained the only way to protect our eight runways.
- ³⁷ All segments of the “Green Line” were merely “ceasefire” or “armistice” demarcation lines, not recognized as borders by the International Community. Commercial and military air navigation maps of the period, like the one used by the writer for ferrying fighter aircraft from France to Israel (via Algeria or Tunisia), print the “Green Line” in dotted or hyphenated contours while boundaries are continuous lines. A footnote mentions that the dotted/hyphenated

lines represent armistice/Ceasefire lines which **were not recognized as borders**. See map “England-Pakistan NS-140”, 3rd edition, revised 1953, published by the USAF Aeronautical Chart and Information Center, St. Louis, MO. When “the 1967 or 1949 borders” are mentioned as the “rightful borders”, one may ask, who declared them “rightful”?

- ³⁸ Henry Kissinger once said that the privilege of an independent government is to change its mind. True, but then let the world forget about the permanent validity of the UN, US or any other international guarantees. Guarantees prove to be an efficient “painkiller” in international relations, but by no means a “medicine” to heal the problem.
- ³⁹ See Yoash Tsiddon-Chatto, *By Day, By Night, Through Haze and Fog*, Maariv Publishers, 1995.
- ⁴⁰ Quoted from Louis Rene Beres, “Facing An Explosive Future. Israel, Iran and Anticipatory Self-Defense”, Purdue University, January 28, 2005.
- ⁴¹ What is permitted to Jupiter is not permitted to the ox.
- ⁴² See Golda Meir, *My Life*, Maariv Publishers (Hebrew), 1979; see also Hanoch Bar Tov, *Dado: 48 Years and 20 Days*, Maariv Publishers (Hebrew), vol. 2, 1978.
- ⁴³ The Egyptian-Syrian offensive was very cleverly timed. Yom Kippur in Israel is the one day a year with practically no traffic and absolutely no radio/TV. It was a month before elections and Israel’s sensors were away from the real enemies. In the US, it was the time of the resignation of Vice-President Spiro Agnew with legal proceedings to follow and the dawn of President Nixon’s Watergate disaster. And Russia was very actively supporting the Arabs. See Henry Kissinger, *Crisis*.
- ⁴⁴ See again, Henry Kissinger, *Crisis*, 2004.
- ⁴⁵ An old Jewish proverb says that a “half truth” is worse than a complete lie.
- ⁴⁶ Hitler became Germany’s democratically elected Chancellor in 1933.
- ⁴⁷ See Martin Gilbert, *Jewish History Atlas*, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1969, 1976.
- ⁴⁸ See Map 3 [1947].
- ⁴⁹ See Map 5 [1967].
- ⁵⁰ The Prophet Muhammad’s teachings are explicit about the right/duty of Muslims worldwide to lie if lying benefits Islam, see Arafat’s oft quoted, *Muhammad’s Pact of Hudaibiya*, 629 AD.
- ⁵¹ See Yoash Tsiddon-Chatto, “Legislator”, *By Day, By Night, Through Haze and Fog* (Hebrew), chapter 24, p. 443.

- ⁵² Quote from Kant in Martin Sherman, *Despots, Democrats and the Determinants of International Conflict*, St. Martin's Press Inc., 1998.
- ⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 61-62.
- ⁵⁴ Employing Nazi fugitive scientists who were taken care of by the Israeli Mossad, thereafter dropping the project.
- ⁵⁵ Lack of precision equals very large C.E.P. (circular error probability), i.e. the circle that envelops 50% of the hits by the shells fired or the bombs dropped, whose center is the target.
- ⁵⁶ See, for instance, the vastly lower number of aircraft and tanks used in Gulf War II, which achieved better results than those of the first Gulf War in 1991 through use of "intelligent" weapons.
- ⁵⁷ For details, see Louis Rene Beres (Chair), Naaman Belkind, Isaac Ben-Israel, Rand H. Fishbein, Adir Pridor and Yoash Tsiddon-Chatto, "Israel's Strategic Future: Project Daniel", ACPR Policy Paper No. 155, 2004; also published in *Nativ Online*, vol. 3, April 2004, <<http://www.acpr.org.il/ENGLISH-NATIV/03-ISSUE/daniel-3.htm>>.
- ⁵⁸ See Thomas A. Keaney and Eliot A. Cohen, "Revolution in Warfare? Air Power in the Persian Gulf", Naval Institute, Annapolis, MD, USA, 1995.
- ⁵⁹ Arie Stav (ed.), *Israel at the Crossroads*, ACPR Publishers, 1997.
- ⁶⁰ See Map 6, "The Pentagon Map", drawn between 1968 and 1974, before the conclusion of the Israeli-Egyptian peace agreement "promoted" by US President Carter in 1978.
- ⁶¹ Golda Meir, *My Life*, Maariv Publishers (Hebrew), 1975, p. 309.
- ⁶² Quoted from the preface of *The 9/11 Commission Report*, authorized first edition, W.W. Norton & Co., Inc., 2004.
- ⁶³ Beginning of Melanie Phillips' article, "The Middle East Dance of Death", as quoted in "Daily Alert", February, 10, 2005, <<http://www.dailyalert.org/>>.
- ⁶⁴ Remember the UN's "Zionism is Racism" and Durban Conference?
- ⁶⁵ Quoted from "The Foundations of the New Terrorism", *The 9/11 Commission Report*, p. 51.
- ⁶⁶ Yoash Tsiddon-Chatto, "Non-Classified Realities Affecting Israel's Air Force in 2005-2010", ACPR Policy Paper No. 136, April 2002.
- ⁶⁷ *Ibid.*
- ⁶⁸ Louis Rene Beres (Chair), Naaman Belkind, Isaac Ben-Israel, Rand H. Fishbein, Adir Pridor and Yoash Tsiddon-Chatto, "Israel's Strategic Future: Project Daniel", ACPR Policy Paper No. 155, 2004; also published in *Nativ Online*, vol.

3, April 2004, <<http://www.acpr.org.il/ENGLISH-NATIV/03-ISSUE/daniel-3.htm>>.

⁶⁹ Whose creation was endorsed by international consensus: The League of Nations, 1922, the UN, 1947.


⁷⁰ See the *Fatah* constitution with Abu Mazen's signature, and all the more so in the case of *Hamas*.

Maps


Map 1: The Jewish National Home (British Mandate), 1919



Map 2: The Second Partition of Palestine, (Peel Committee), 1937



Map 3: The UN Partition Plan (Resolution 181), 1947



Map 4: Rhodes Armistice Demarcation Lines, 1949-1967



Map 5: Post Six Day War Cease-Fire Lines, 1967



Map 6: The Pentagon Map, 1974



Map 7: Areas Controlled by Israel Following the Peace Agreements Signed with Egypt and Jordan

