

## Crush or be crushed

By Edward Bernard Glick *The Jerusalem Post* August 9, 2004

Events in both Israel and Iraq prove that the winning-hearts-and-minds approach to ending wars and insurrections has the same success rate as getting rain by praying for it. If it were indeed the key to victory, armies would have exchanged their weapons for public relations kits ages ago.

The ancient Persians conquered the Babylonians, and the Greeks the Persians, and the Romans the Greeks, and the Turks the Byzantines, and the British the Turks not by capturing their hearts and minds, but by overwhelming them with so much might that they lost their will to fight and surrendered.

Swords, not sermons, swept Islam quickly from the Middle East to Africa and the Far East. Swords, not sermons, enabled King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella to rid Spain of 700 years of Moorish rule. And it was swords, not sermons, that stopped the Muslims at the gates of Vienna.

During the Revolutionary War, Great Britain's King George III did not relinquish his American colonies because General George Washington had somehow won his mind and heart. Similarly, England's Duke of Wellington didn't prevail at the Battle of Waterloo because he won the heart and mind of France's Napoleon Bonaparte.

And the South didn't surrender and end the American Civil War because Union General Ulysses S. Grant won the hearts and minds of General Robert E. Lee and his Confederate troops.

Nor did the Allied powers vanquish the Axis powers in 1945 because their brilliant propaganda and psychological warfare tactics captured the latter's hearts and minds. Germany and Italy surrendered because they knew in their brains and their bowels that they had been beaten by slow, sustained, and superior force, applied over a number of very bloody years.

And the Empire of Japan surrendered not because US navy captain (later admiral) Ellis Zacharias, a specialist in intelligence and psychological operations, was able to broadcast our surrender terms in fluent Japanese, but because Japan had already taken the measure of America's atom bomb.

IN 1970, Canada presented an excellent, if forgotten, example of force prevailing over hearts and minds.

French Canadian terrorist separatists had kidnapped James Cross, the British trade commissioner, and Pierre Laporte, Quebec's minister of labor. They later murdered Laporte. Instead of trying to win their hearts and minds, Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau, himself a French Canadian, got parliament to proclaim a War Measures Act and suspend Canadian civil liberties.

Then he ordered Canadian troops and mounties to search the streets of Quebec house by house. They arrested 500 people and crushed the terrorists.

The Cold War did not end in the 1980s because Voice of America broadcasts or State Department exchange programs eventually got to the hearts and minds of the Soviet people. It ended because the Kremlin leadership finally realized that president Ronald Reagan, with the backing of most of the American people, was ready to use all means, including economic strangulation and military prowess, to end communist domination of Eastern and Central Europe.

On the other hand, since the Korean War was at best a draw, and the United States did not win in Vietnam, many Americans no longer accept war as part of the human condition. So they seek to appease with nonmilitary approaches enemies who cannot be appeased.

Neither can these Americans fathom that when a nation does go to war, it is entirely proper, as US president Franklin Delano Roosevelt and British prime minister Winston Churchill knew so well, for it to sacrifice one in order to save 10, ten to save hundreds, hundreds to save thousands, and thousands to save millions.

Islam does not look kindly upon infidels who lose. So the issue confronting Israel and the United States is not whether one is pro-Bush or anti-Bush, pro-Sharon or anti-Sharon, for or against the invasion of Iraq, or for or against Israel's leaving the Gaza Strip unilaterally. The issue is how can the United States and Israel defeat their foes?

The Ba'athists and the jihadists will not stop fighting the Great Satan because they have been made to like, respect, or fear the United States. They will stop fighting only when they are convinced that America's Vietnam trauma is over and that America is once again willing and able to use crushing force.

And Israel, the Little Satan, will prevail over its existential enemies only when it realizes that in order

to survive it must fight by the rules of the neighborhood in which it lives.

In short, America's and Israel's struggles will end favorably only if they follow Churchill's dictum: "Victory at all costs, victory in spite of all terror, victory however long and hard the road may be; for without victory there is no survival."

**The writer is professor emeritus of political science at Temple University in Philadelphia and author of *Peaceful Conflict and Soldiers, Scholars, and Society*.**

## Israel's Scud killer: Shot heard round the world

By Bradley Burston Ha'aretz August 1, 2004

This time, the shot heard round the world was fired in California.

In an area better known for surfing than for strategic impact, last week's test-firing of an Arrow anti-missile off sleepy Point Magu barely made wave one in the States, coinciding as it did with the prime-time, straw hat and Chuck Berry hullabaloo coronation of a Democratic presidential candidate.

The demonstration, in which the U.S.-financed, Israeli developed Arrow for the first time successfully intercepted a Scud missile in flight, may well have made more noise halfway around the globe, in places like Tehran and Damascus.

To be sure, some of the claims made at home for the anti-ballistic missile system reflected a blend of wishful thinking, chamber of commerce chest thumping, and just plain fear - a vestige of the memory of the 1991 Gulf war, in which American Patriot anti-missiles may have only deepened the destruction caused by the dozens of Saddam-fired Scuds they were deployed to block.

Analysts have uniformly dismissed as unfounded such assessments as that of an unnamed Pentagon official, quoted by an Israeli television channel Friday as having said that with one shot, "Israel has changed the strategic balance in the Middle East."

Nonetheless, the test was not without significance. In a region where smoke and mirrors are boundlessly potent elements of the decision-making arsenal, deterrence, no less than politics itself, is perception.

In the eyes of Israeli defense experts, the Arrow-Scud match-up proved that the Israeli system was capable of tracking and striking a missile even smaller than the Scud, notes Haaretz defense commentator Ze'ev Schiff.

**A signal boosts Israel's deterrent capability**  
From a strictly practical standpoint, that fact alone cannot give Israelis cause for calm. Enhancements in the speed and range of Iranian and other versions of the Scud - itself a Russian re-invention of the Nazi V-2 rockets that thundered into Britain during the World War II blitz - mean that further development will be needed to effectively counter current regional threats.

At the same time, Schiff says, the test sent "a very significant signal, saying that the United States and Israel are standing together on an issue of great importance."

The signal is of paramount importance from the standpoint of deterrence, Schiff continues.

"The fact of the technology was known, in large part, by both sides. However, if the Americans invite the Israel Air Force and take the entire system, including an Israeli, not American radar system, this rare step signifies that the U.S. is working with Israel on a key issue, and this strengthens Israel's deterrent capability."

Deterrence, never far from the minds of Israeli leaders, was a central talking point of a speech by Prime Minister Ariel Sharon delivered just hours before the Arrow test.

Edging closer than ever to discussing Israel's much-rumored, never-acknowledged nuclear weapons program, Sharon said, "America recognizes Israel's right to defend itself using its own means, anywhere, and to preserve its deterrent capability against all threats."

Sharon conceded that, "The current international atmosphere is against countries having deterrent weapons" adding that "possibly someday, when we achieve peace and all countries disarm, we will also be willing to consider taking a similar step."

That day was clearly not in sight, however. "We have been given clear support from the United States, and it has been made clear that Israel's deterrent capability must not be harmed," he declared.

**'A bullet hitting another bullet'** Although the Arrow may not be ready for the challenges of state-of-the-art ballistic missiles, the test represented a formidable technical achievement, one once likened by former U.S. president and general Dwight Eisenhower as "hitting a bullet with another bullet."

"In particular, the Arrow test was a signal in particular to nations like Syria, which has many Scuds, and also to Iran, at a time when Iran is developing a weapon larger than the Scud, with greater range, different angles of flight, a different rate of speed, all of these presenting different problems for the Arrow," Schiff says.

"But when an Iranian reads of the test, he understands that Israel is not alone in this. When a Syrian reads of it, he understands that America is aiding Israel to defend itself against a missile system."

Syrians also privately worry about another element, Schiff adds. "If Israel can intercept a Scud at this range, a Syrian missile with a chemical

warhead could explode over the heads of the Syrians themselves."

In Schiff's view, the central importance of the Arrow exercise remains this: "A small state and a superpower, on a sensitive subject on which the small state is vulnerable, are sending a message to Syria and Iran, precisely when Iran is threatening and may be embarking on new [weaponry] developments."

## **Sharon: Disengagement is crucial for Israel** **By JPost.com staff The Jerusalem Post July 29, 2004**

"The unilateral disengagement from the Gaza Strip and parts of the northern West Bank is the most important plan for the country now, and it would be a dereliction of duty for me as prime minister not to carry it out," Prime Minister Ariel Sharon said at Likud convention at Metzudat Ze'ev Thursday evening.

Sharon outlined the main advantages of the plan. "What does this plan give Israel: Firstly, it maintains a central tenet of this government that no diplomatic process will be held with the Palestinians until the destruction of their terrorist infrastructure as demanded in the road map; until they have carried out their obligations according to this plan."

Secondly, an American commitment not to apply pressure on Israel to adopt any other diplomatic plan other than the road map. Furthermore, a recognition by the US that no negotiations will be held with the Palestinians until they carry out their obligations under the road map.

"These obligations include an end to terrorism, violence and incitement; dismantling the terrorist groups, a change in the Palestinian leadership, and wide-spread reforms in the Palestinian Authority.

"Thirdly, a clear recognition by the US of Israel's right to secure and defensible borders.

"Fourth, US recognition of Israel's right to self-defense in every place, including areas we withdraw from, and to retain its power of deterrence against all threats.

"We have a very clear position from the US that recognizes that nobody can interfere with Israel's deterrence. We have witnessed in recent times the international efforts to deal with the problem of weapons of mass destruction. We see this with regards to Iran, although I wouldn't say that the Iranians have stopped their activity. We have seen what happened in Libya and the general atmosphere in the world today. For us this issue is one of prime importance," Sharon said.

"It is quite possible that one day, when we achieve a real, regional peace, and everyone dismantles their weapons, then we too will be ready to consider similar steps. But for now, we have

received a clear commitment from the US that there will be no effort to damage Israel's deterrence.

"We have received a US commitment that there will be no return of Palestinian refugees to Israel," Sharon reminded his audience. "This is something we have not heard for the 56 years of Israel's existence. We have a US commitment that there will not be a return to 1967 borders for two main reasons: Israeli settlement blocs and the application of the term 'defendable borders'."

"The US has set terms for the institution of a Palestinian state, and says that this will not happen before terror groups are disbanded, so long as the Palestinian leadership is not replaced and not before sweeping reforms take place."

"We do not have many friends," Sharon continued. "We saw this in the recent UN vote, even though that vote cannot cause any damage to Israel. We have one major friend in the UN, and that is the USA, which can help us at the Security Council – the only place where actual steps can be taken against us. I would advise not understating the importance of this."

"Without implementing disengagement, we cannot continue towards peace, security, economy or education. And I, who have been elected Prime Minister, am responsible for all these." "I must not retreat from disengagement," he said. "It would be irresponsible of me as Prime Minister, even though I know the plan angers many people."

Sharon then turned to his opponents and reiterated his threats against them: "I must tell you: I need a stable government to implement all these, and I think we're in the right direction."

"There is no other movement in Israel that can undertake important steps as can the Likud we have a third of the seats in Knesset, and there is no other party that can govern the state as we can, and I'm proud to be at the head of this movement. Just as Menachem Begin had opponents in the party when he signed the peace treaty with Egypt (including myself at some points), we are today facing a proposal that is the most important at this time."

"An unstable government will harm us and force new elections. I need a stable government that

enables us to operate. And so, we're talking to everyone. But there are partners and there are

limitations. The process isn't easy. But I must make the decision."

## Who's Defying The World Court?

By James S. Tisch The New York Jewish Week July 23, 2004

**Morocco** When the UN General Assembly tells Israel, "You can't defy an International Court of Justice opinion and build a wall in occupied territory," the Israeli ambassador ought to put his arm around his Moroccan colleague's shoulder and ask the assembled diplomats, "Which one of us are you talking to?"

In 1975, the ICJ issued an advisory opinion on Morocco's claim to the former Spanish colony of Western Sahara. The court found the claim to self-determination by the indigenous Saharawi population to be superior. Morocco rejected the opinion in a dramatic fashion by sending 350,000 Moroccan civilians to Western Sahara in the "Green March." Thirty years later, negotiations continue on the status of Western Sahara. Sanctions were never enacted against Morocco for non-compliance, though the Palestinians are already talking about such measures in Israel's case.

Six years after the ICJ opinion, Morocco began to build a thousand-mile security barrier through the middle of Western Sahara to protect against Saharawi attacks. The "berm," as it is known, is a 10-foot high earthen rampart fortified with an estimated 1 million to 2 million landmines that have killed or injured dozens of people. The berm encloses nearly 80 percent of Western Sahara, while less than 12 percent of the West Bank is on the Israeli side of the non-lethal security fence.

**France, Iceland and the United States** France, Iceland and the United States -- democracies like Israel -- have defied the ICJ on grounds of national security and sovereignty without any threat of sanctions.

**France** In May 1973, New Zealand asked the ICJ to order France to end atmospheric nuclear testing in the South Pacific. France responded that it did not consider the court competent to hear the case, did not accept the court's jurisdiction and would not participate in any proceedings. In June that year the ICJ issued an order to halt its tests. The next month France responded -- with a 5-kiloton explosion. Eleven more atmospheric tests were conducted over the next year until its nuclear weapons program no longer required them.

**Iceland** In 1974, the ICJ ruled against Iceland's unilateral expansion of its exclusive fishing zone, following a complaint brought by Britain. Iceland disregarded the decision because fishing represented such a large part of Iceland's economy that it was considered a national security interest. In the

subsequent "Cod Wars," the Icelandic Coast Guard clashed with British frigates that had been dispatched to protect the British fishing fleet in the contested area. The dispute ended in 1976 with a negotiated agreement that granted Iceland almost all of its demands.

**United States** In 1999, the U.S. Supreme Court disregarded an ICJ order to stay the execution in Arizona of Walter LaGrand, a German citizen. The Supreme Court ruled: "With regard to the action against the United States [by Germany], which relies on the ex parte order of the International Court of Justice, there are imposing threshold barriers. First, it appears that the United States has not waived its sovereign immunity."

Like the U.S., Israel has declared that its Supreme Court takes precedence over the ICJ. The Israeli Supreme Court decided on June 30 that "it is the security perspective -- and not the political one -- which must examine the route on its security merits alone, without regard for the location of the Green Line," referring to the 1949 armistice line that the ICJ found decisive in its opinion.

After the U.S. lost the jurisdictional decision on a 1984 Nicaraguan complaint to the ICJ, Washington withdrew from the proceedings. Abraham Sofaer, the State Department legal adviser at the time, said: "We believe that when a nation asserts a right to use force illegally and acts on that assertion, other affected nations have the right to counter such illegal activities. The United States cannot rely on the ICJ to decide such questions properly and fairly. Indeed, no state can do so."

**Israel** Similarly, Israel's security fence is a self-defense measure against an illegal use of force: terrorism. As the American and British judges confirmed in their separate opinions, the ICJ ignored Palestinian terrorism and denied that Israel had a right to self-defense. Clearly Israel "cannot rely on the ICJ to decide such questions properly and fairly."

Israel is adjusting the route of the security fence following the decision of its own highly respected Supreme Court, which balanced Israel's need to prevent suicide bombings with the humanitarian concerns of Palestinian civilians. Regardless of the result at the United Nations, Israel should build the security fence in conformity with the law and with the obligation to protect its citizens from terror.

**The author is chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations.**

## Comparative advantages

By Mortimer B. Zuckerman US News and World Report August 2, 2004

Compare scenes. In The Hague, 15 justices of the International Court of Justice solemnly order Israel to dismantle the security fence it is building to separate Israelis from Palestinians. In the Gaza Strip, meanwhile, the Palestinians, prevented from killing Israelis by a barrier that exists now, are busy murdering one another in factional warfare of gunfire, arson, and kidnappings. And in Ramallah on the West Bank, the Palestinian Authority is in turmoil yet again over the corrupt and incompetent leadership of the terrorist Yasser Arafat, one of whose chief critics emerged from a television interview to be shot twice in the leg.

Violence is the syntax of debate among Palestinians, as it has been the syntax of negotiation with Israel. It escalated in the first place not as the result of Israeli aggression but because of Israeli willingness four years ago at Camp David to yield control of 95 percent of the occupied lands as Israel had previously yielded all of the Sinai to Egypt. Even the United Nations Mideast envoy, Terje Roed-Larsen, a longtime supporter of Arafat, publicly attacked the PA recently for its failure to end violence, combat terrorism, and institute reforms that ordinary Palestinians have been demanding for years.

The flat-Earth assumption of the justices in The Hague, reinforced by a U.N. General Assembly vote on July 20--instigated in part by France--is that all Palestinians are ready to live in peace with the State of Israel and are thwarted only by Israel's intransigence. The General Assembly vote, under European pressure, did add a couple of ambiguous paragraphs about the duty of restraint on all sides, but in The Hague's judgment there was little mention of terrorism. It was a ruling taken in a practical and moral vacuum. The court washed its hands of the sure consequence: If Israel complied, scores more Israelis would be blown up by suicide bombings. Ultimately, the court placed the victims of terrorism on trial instead of the terrorists--a move emblematic of the hypocrisy of international diplomacy, remorseless in the face of the murder of Israelis yet highly agitated over a fence aimed at saving lives--just because it ostensibly impinges a little on land in the disputed West Bank.

In truth, the decision was preordained by politics--handed down, it should be noted, by a court composed in part of justices with only a nodding acquaintance with the rule of law and democracy. The head of the court, a Chinese justice, represents a country that invaded Tibet and has a questionable human-rights record. Some of the court's members come from foreign enemies of Israel, e.g., Egypt. The one dissenting American judge on the court

nailed the key legal point: "To reach that conclusion with regard to the wall as a whole without . . . seeking to ascertain all relevant facts bearing directly on issues of Israel's legitimate right to self-defense, military necessity, and security needs, given the repeated deadly terrorist attacks in and upon Israel . . . cannot be justified as a matter of law."

Compare that blind justice with the careful ruling against the Israeli government on the routing of the fence by Israel's High Court of Justice, which the government has said it will accept. The court found the fence was not expressing a political border or any other border but was simply a barrier against the reality of Palestinian terrorism. But it still ordered the Army to alter a section to make it less oppressive to the Palestinians. This court had its eyes open--as The Hague's justices did not--both to the Palestinians most immediately affected and to the Israeli victims of the Palestinian campaign of terror, 900 dead and more than 6,000 wounded. It insisted that there must be a balancing of military necessity and humanitarian considerations: "Both international law and fundamental principles of Israeli administrative law recognize proportionality as a standard for balancing the authority of the military commander in the area with the needs of the local population."

**Expertise over magic.** In a memorable passage, the Israeli court affirms: " 'The security of the state' is not a 'magic word' which makes judicial review disappear.... The military commander is the expert on the military aspects of the fence's route. We are the experts on the humanitarian aspects of the route . . . whether the military commander's route inflicts disproportionate injury upon the local inhabitants. This is our expertise."

The court's ruling is a remarkable demonstration of the role of an honorable judiciary in a democratic state under mortal challenge. "Our task is difficult. We are members of Israeli society. Although we are sometimes in an ivory tower, that tower is in the heart of Jerusalem, which is not infrequently struck by ruthless terror. . . . As any other Israelis, we, too, recognize the need to defend the country and its citizens against the wounds inflicted by terror. . . . But we are judges. When we sit in judgment, we are subject to judgment. We act according to our best conscience and understanding."

With that perspective, the court decided to make the fence, in certain areas, more responsive to the needs of the local population while recognizing that its decision did not make it easier for military security. In effect, the court acknowledged that the delay in its completion might well come at the cost of terrorist attacks. "This is the destiny of a

democracy: She does not see all means as acceptable, and the ways of her enemies are not always open before her. A democracy must sometimes fight with one arm tied behind her back. Even so, a democracy has the upper hand. The rule of law and individual liberties constitute an important aspect of her security stance. At the end of the day, they strengthen her spirit and this strength allows her to overcome her difficulties."

Indeed, building a fence is one of the most civilized ways in which nations can defend themselves, in Shakespeare's words, "against the envy of less happy lands," when they share a border with armed attackers who lack an effective government to constrain them. The Roman Emperor Hadrian ordered a wall to be constructed across the width of England to keep barbarians out. The Chin emperor ordered several walls to be linked to the Great Wall of China to repel barbarians. Well, we don't have barbarians today, but we have their modern equivalent in terrorists--with the Palestinian Authority a known safe haven and favorite breeding ground for them, especially the suicide bomber.

The U.N. itself built a fence around its headquarters in New York for protection. Likewise, India, Saudi Arabia, Morocco, and Turkey have built barriers to contain their neighbors. India just completed a 460-mile barrier in contested Kashmir to contain terrorist infiltration from Pakistan and is building a security fence similar to that being built by Israel to protect itself from Muslim terrorists coming in from Bangladesh. Saudi Arabia built a 60-mile barrier along an undefined border zone with Yemen to stop the smuggling of weapons.

**Success.** The bottom line is that the fence has worked. Secretary of State Colin Powell emphasized this in saying the fence issue should not even have been brought to The Hague. The American people recognize this full well. In a poll this year, 68 percent say the Israelis have a right to a security fence "even if many other countries disagree." The House of Representatives voted 361 to 45 deploring the misuse of the International Court of Justice and its advisory opinion that Israel's security fence should be dismantled.

The facts are conclusive: Before the fence was erected, the average number of terrorist attacks was 26 per year. Since its partial construction, the number has dropped to three per year, while the death toll has dropped by over 70 percent from 103 to 28, and the number of injured has dropped by more than 80 percent, from an annual average of 628 to 83. Terrorist penetration into Israel from the northern West Bank, where the initial portion of the

fence was completed, has dropped from 600 a year to zero--as Israel was able to foil every suicide bombing originating from the northern West Bank and specifically from the cities of Nablus and Jenin, areas that had previously been infamous for exporting suicide bombers.

Only 5 percent of the fence is a wall to prevent fire from adjacent Palestinian communities onto Israeli areas. The height of this portion has in some places been raised, for example, as in Jerusalem--from 2 yards to 8 yards--because the terrorists jumped over the shorter wall. But in any event, it is a temporary, nonviolent way to reduce terrorism that has already saved many lives.

The fence brings benefits to the Palestinians as well: It will reduce friction between Israelis and Palestinians through the withdrawal of Israel from many settlements. The fence will also facilitate the removal of Israeli checkpoints and thus encourage greater freedom of movement within Palestinian areas. It will create an incentive for the withdrawal of Israeli settlements from the Palestinian side of the barrier, making the removal not a question of if but when. Fewer successful terrorist attacks mean fewer Israeli retaliatory defensive operations; finally, the route of the fence under this Israeli court decision will be much closer to the territorial proposals agreed to by the left-wing Israeli government in the Camp David talks and to the territorial settlements previously imposed.

Under the new court ruling, about 75 percent of Israeli settlers would be incorporated into roughly 8 percent of the West Bank on the Israeli side of the barrier. Fewer than 1 percent (13,000) of West Bank Palestinians would be stranded in these Israeli areas, while over 99 percent (1,970,000) would be left in the approximately 92 percent of the West Bank on the other side of the fence, which would be a contiguous area.

The Palestinians cannot have it both ways. They cannot avoid their security responsibilities while denying the Israelis the right to defend themselves, and they must pay a territorial price for the four years of terror they unleashed, for terrorism cannot be seen to succeed.

It has been said that if Israel is 10 percent more moral, it will be a light unto the nations; if it is 25 percent more moral, it will bring the Messiah; if it is 50 percent more moral, it will be dead. The Israeli High Court of Justice's decision brings a light unto the nations of the world. The International Court of Justice's advisory opinion would produce nothing but more dead innocents

## Reform strategy for Saudi Arabia

By Eugene Kontorovich *The Washington Times* August 1, 2004

The Bush administration has a unique opportunity to promote peace in the Middle East and further the war against terrorism. That opportunity is based not on any intelligence finding or any summit meeting of leaders, but rather in the seemingly mundane negotiations over international trade.

Saudi Arabia is seeking U.S. support for its application to join the World Trade Organization (WTO). The Bush administration can be true to its rhetoric about Middle East peace and condition support for the Saudi bid on steps to improve the Middle East and demand Saudi antiterror action.

President Bush has been clear he regards free trade in the Middle East as a way to underpin regional peace and stability. Last year, he announced an ambitious 10-year plan to create an integrated Middle East Free Trade Area (FTA), modeled on the North American Free Trade Agreement.

The main obstacle is most Arab states refuse to trade with Israel, one of but a few Middle Eastern countries with which the U.S. already has a free trade agreement (FTA).

Arab states also enforce an egregious secondary boycott according to which they will not trade with any companies — including American ones — that have any dealings with Israel. For the Arab states, a "Middle East" free trade area is really a Middle East-minus-Israel trade zone.

Although Bush administration officials have publicly suggested the Arab boycott is incompatible with their vision for a Middle East FTA, they have done little about it. Instead, the U.S. signed an FTA with Bahrain in May despite continued Bahraini participation in the anti-Israel boycott.

U.S. trade negotiators are soon expected to approve Saudi Arabia's application to join the World Trade Organization (WTO), a prerequisite to the Saudis signing an FTA with the U.S. Again, Saudi Arabia will be rewarded by the U.S. despite taking part in the boycott of Israel and insufficient domestic action against terrorism.

The Saudis will use the same tried-and-tested ways to circumvent U.S. objections to the anti-Israel boycott they use when asked for more vigorous counterterrorism: false promises. Like Bahrain, Saudi Arabia will probably indicate it intends to halt enforcement of the secondary boycott and then promptly break that promise. In the mid-1990s, when the WTO was founded, the Saudis told WTO members their anti-Israel boycott was over. In fact, as the Commerce Department showed, Saudi Arabia continued applying the secondary boycott against American firms.

Instead of being hoodwinked again, the United States should stand firm and demand elimination of

the boycott and clear counterterrorism action. After all, the U.S. is leading the antiterror war. The U.S. has made peace in the Middle East its priority and taken up the central diplomatic role in bringing this about. The boycott is a clear impediment to peace. It prevents emergence of the kind of commercial ties between Arabs and Israelis that might break down hateful stereotypes and foster interdependence instead of antagonism.

Like racial segregation, economic segregation makes it easier for people to ignore each other's humanity. And the boycott is in many ways a thinly veiled cover for anti-Semitism. The Arab boycott bans any commercial dealings whatsoever with "Zionist sympathizers," a term often banning dealing with Jews.

Riyadh covets the prestige of joining the WTO, the trade club of advanced economies. Saudi Arabia needs WTO membership to diversify its economy away from dependence upon oil.

By contrast, the U.S. can gain little economically from Saudi accession, but the Saudis cannot enter the WTO without U.S. support. U.S. trade negotiators should only support Saudi Arabian WTO membership when Riyadh publicly renounces the boycott, stops participating in Arab League boycott planning meetings and takes concrete counterterrorism measures.

Such a U.S. stance will force Saudi Arabia to decide if it really wants Middle East peace and deserves the much abused label "moderate state." In recent years, Saudi Arabia has tried to score diplomatic points by portraying itself as a possible mediator in the Israel-Palestinian conflict, with Crown Prince Abdullah proclaiming a peace plan in Beirut in 2002.

Yet the same country operates a policy that daily denies the Jewish state's right to exist. After all, the boycott began immediately after creation of the State of Israel in 1948, not after the Six-Day War in 1967 and the Israel's capture of the West Bank and Gaza. Continuing the boycott more than 50 years after the foundation of Israel shows an institutionalized opposition to existence of a Jewish state.

If the Bush administration takes this opportunity to promote Middle East free trade, the administration can show it is pursuing a negotiations-based, reward-oriented foreign policy sure to find bipartisan support in Congress.

Indeed, Sen. John Kerry in a recent interview spoke of using WTO accession as a carrot with Saudi Arabia, and a group of mostly Democratic senators and congressmen recently wrote a letter to the U.S. trade representative, urging him to block the Saudi's WTO bid until they completely abandon the

boycott of Israel. Supporters of the administration Middle East policies, as well as those who say it relies too much on force, would both be astonished if the U.S. passes up such an opportunity.

**The author is a professor at George Mason University School of Law in Arlington, Va., and an academic fellow at the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies.**

## **Informer in pay of Israel unbowed by brother's bloody fate**

**By Chris McGreal The Guardian (UK) August 4, 2004**

If Abdul Rajoub ever doubts his fate should he be discovered on one of his secret night-time visits to his children, there is the videotape of his brother's last few hours to remind him.

"They cut off his fingers one by one," Mr Rajoub said. "When they were torturing him he never admitted to being a collaborator. We were working for the Israelis and everyone in our village knew it. But he never admitted it to them."

Mousa Rajoub was tortured, shot and strung up from an electricity pylon in the centre of Hebron in 2002 with two other Palestinians who collaborated with Israeli intelligence.

Abdul now lives in hiding in the Israeli city of Ashqelon with a new wife and family, but he makes fleeting visits back to his village, Dura, to see the eight sons and daughters he left behind. The 46-year-old Palestinian has worked for Israeli intelligence for two decades. He is not ashamed to call himself a collaborator even though informers are vilified as the worst kind of traitor in Palestinian society.

"I was one of the people who vigorously resisted Israeli occupation and I was a member of Fatah," he said. "In 1986, I was arrested by the Israeli security services. This was the ideological turning point. I was looking at least 20 years in jail and I found I did not believe in the ultimate victory of the Palestinians. I was not ready to pay an ultimate price for something I did not believe in. So I declared that I joined the Israeli security apparatus and I was working in broad daylight."

The Rajoub family is renowned through the Palestinian territories and beyond. Abdul's cousin is Jibril Rajoub, national security chief to Yasser Arafat. A brother, Yunis, is head of Mr. Arafat's office in Jordan. But for many years, the real power in the village was Abdul and Mousa. Protected by Israeli patronage, they did not hide the fact that they worked with the occupiers. Both men openly carried weapons at a time when most Palestinians were not permitted guns.

Abdul Rajoub says he recruited others to work with the Israelis without too many problems, including members of his own family, after the first Intifada erupted in the late 80s.

"Each collaborator has his own motive. The intifada was a cruel phenomenon, hard, and there

were a lot of people wanted to become collaborators. Many have hatred against Fatah, and now the Palestinian Authority," he said.

Israel began recruiting collaborators from the first days of its 1967 occupation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip, using an array of pressures. Some, such as Abdul Rajoub, were drawn in as an alternative to years in jail or strong-armed while in prison. Others were subjected to blackmail over their sex lives or petty crimes. But tens of thousands of Palestinians have been coerced into low-level collaboration - giving information on who lives where, or the movements and allegiances of their neighbours - just to be able to get on with daily life. Many of those who need an Israeli permit to travel, work or study say they are pressured to cooperate or be denied. It is a dangerous business.

About 90 alleged collaborators have killed by fellow Palestinians during this intifada, 21 of them while in the custody of the Palestinian security forces. Two were killed while lying in hospital beds this week. Last month, Muhammad Rafiq Daraghmeh, 45, was shot in front of a baying crowd in the public square of Qabatiya. More than 1,000 alleged informers were murdered during the first uprising. Palestinian human rights groups say many of the dead were not collaborators but falsely accused victims of score settling or family rivalries. The latest outbreak of panic about informers followed the Israeli assassination of the Hamas leader, Abdel-Aziz al-Rantissi, in May. Many Palestinians believe that the Israelis would not be able to pick off so many militants without the help of collaborators.

Abdul Rajoub declines to discuss the detail of his collaboration but insists he has never tortured or killed anyone. He says he has stopped at least two suicide bombings, one by a member of his extended family whom he caught at a checkpoint carrying an explosives belt.

In the 1980s, when Israel still had full control over the occupied territories and Yasser Arafat remained in exile, Mr. Rajoub lived openly in Dura as a collaborator. That did not stop Palestinian activists from trying to kill him.

"Fatah tried to assassinate me three times. I still have a bullet in my head from one attack," he said.

After the 1993 Oslo accords handed control of many areas of the occupied territories to the Palestinian Authority under Mr. Arafat, Mr. Rajoub decided it was no longer safe to remain in Dura. The Israeli intelligence services moved him to Ashqelon but his brother, Mousa, refused to leave Dura and paid with his life.

Weeks after the latest intifada erupted nearly four years ago, Mousa was arrested by the Palestinian Authority, accused of collaboration and locked up in a Hebron jail. Eighteen months later, members of the Al-Aqsa Martyrs' Brigades, seeking revenge after an Israeli rocket attack killed their leader in Hebron, dragged him from prison with two other collaborators.

"They sent me a videotape. It shows his interrogation," said Abdul Mousa. "They were asking him about being a collaborator and his connection with intelligence. He was denying it. They cut off four fingers, five minutes apart, on one hand. Then they cut off the other four. Then one of the guys doing the interrogation appears before the camera reading a piece of paper. It said: 'I am Mousa Rajoub. I am a collaborator. I participated in several operations to kill Palestinians and I committed a crime against the Palestinian people. I ask for swift punishment.' They didn't cut off Mousa's thumbs, so he could stamp the paper."

Punishment was not swift. He was beaten some more and, bleeding badly, shot several hours later. His body was hanged by one leg from a pole alongside the two other collaborators.

"There were 17 people involved in those killings. Some of them we identified from the videotape, some from information. We captured 12 of them and killed five."

Mr. Rajoub makes fleeting visits to Dura every few weeks, usually in the middle of the night and for no more than a couple of hours.

"You won't find a Palestinian family without collaborators so we are just like everybody else," said his brother, Suliman, who always welcomes him. I don't want my brother to go this way but these things do not reach a blood feud, to kill each other over it."

The taint of collaboration has not stopped the extended Rajoub family from turning to Abdul for assistance when they need something from the Israelis.

"If there is a possibility for him to help us, he will help," said Suliman Rajoub. "If we need the Israelis to issue permits, he will help. If one of the family is arrested, is in jail, he is capable of finding out about him."

Mr. Rajoub says he does not regret becoming a collaborator but he would like to go home.

"I'm living here among the religious Jews and the radicals who do not like Arabs," he said. The government says we can become Israeli citizens but I don't want to. I know I can never go home, but I think about it. I know I have sentenced myself to become an Israeli. I will for ever be judged as a collaborator."

## Flip-flopping for the Jews

By Suzanne Fields *The Washington Times* August 5, 2004

Oy vay, as my Bubby would say. A lot of Jews will vote Republican this year. Bubby's spinning in the great beyond.

Most Jews vote Democratic, and they have for a long time. They have voted in huge majorities for Democratic nominees since FDR created the New Deal. Several Republican nominees since have only occasionally increased Jewish voting percentages. Dwight D. Eisenhower won 40 percent of the Jewish vote against Adlai Stevenson in 1956; Ronald Reagan won 39 percent against Jimmy Carter in 1980; and George H.W. Bush won 35 percent against Michael Dukakis in 1988. He slipped to 11 percent against Bill Clinton.

Although George W. did a little better with 19 percent against Al Gore four years ago, the president should do better in November. Ed Koch, the former mayor of New York who is as partisan as a Democrat comes, is a Bush man this year.

"I do not agree with President Bush on a single major domestic issue," he says, "but in my view

those issues pale in comparison with the threat of international terrorism. The stated goal of al-Qaeda and its supporters is to kill or convert every infidel, and that means Jews, Christians, Buddhists and everyone else who will not accept Islam's supremacy."

Critics of George W., Jewish and otherwise, complain that he plays to evangelical Christians (among the best friends Israel has), but there's good reason for people of different faiths, including moderate Muslims in America, to encourage the president's strong stand against terrorism. Mr. Koch, like a growing number of his coreligionists, don't think a President Kerry could withstand the pressures from the left-wing radicals of his party, no matter how hard they bit their tongues in Boston. These lefties are hostile to Israel and cultivate strong links to anti-American partisans in Europe, especially in France and Britain.

Mr. Kerry tells Jewish audiences what they want to hear, and when he imagines he's safely out of their

sight, flip flops. During the primaries, in a speech to the Arab-American Institute, he denounced the fence Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon was building on the West Bank. "We don't need another barrier to peace," he said. Eight months later, with the Democratic nomination safely tucked away, he sang a different tune: "The security fence is a legitimate act of self-defense erected in response to the wave of terror attacks against Israeli citizens."

He suggested that he might send Jimmy Carter, the rare evangelical Christian who is not a friend of Israel, to work on Middle East peace negotiations. When that idea bombed, he blamed the "mistake" on his speechwriters. It's not clear whether Mr. Kerry would encourage negotiations with Yasser Arafat, whom he described as a "role model" and "statesman" after the signing of the Oslo accord. How he really feels apparently depends on where he is and who's listening.

The Republicans count on Jews in America to spot the Kerry weakness as it affects Jewish and Israeli interests. They are actively courting the 500,000 Jews who live in Florida, where a small shift could make a big difference. Only one in 10 Jews in Florida are thought to have voted for George W. in 2000, but that was before September 11. A spokesman for the Bush-Cheney campaign does the

math. "Without Joe Lieberman on the ticket we get a jump," he told the St. Petersburg Times. "Then you add in the president's Israel policies and our grassroots effort ... and you can't help but get a big jump."

Many Jews agree with Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, who calls President Bush "the best friend Israel ever had." In January, 31 percent of the Jews surveyed in a major poll said they would vote for the president's re-election. The perils of Middle Eastern politics and worldwide terrorism trump everything else.

When Israel destroyed Saddam Hussein's nuclear reactor in 1981, the world universally — and naively — condemned the raid. Had it not been destroyed there would be no argument today about whether Saddam has weapons of mass destruction. One of the Scuds that landed on Tel Aviv and Kuwait in 1991 would likely have carried a nuclear tip. Saddam, in fact, had shown no mercy when he used poison gas to kill his own Kurds.

Terrorism in the Middle East was used first against the Jews, but the suicide bombers were but a warm-up act for the terrorism against the United States on September 11. Jews who take pride in their smarts know the stakes this time.

## Maryland Homeland security delegation comes to Israel to learn anti-terror strategies

By Sarah Bronson Ha'aretz July 29, 2004

A delegation of the State of Maryland's Homeland Security Department was in Israel this week to study Israel's anti-terrorism strategies.

Funded by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, the delegation followed a November meeting between Prime Minister Ariel Sharon and Maryland Governor Robert Ehrlich, at which the two agreed to exchange "best practices" in homeland security as well as develop economic ties.

The eight delegates included representatives of the state's transportation department, transit administration and police force, as well as Maryland's Homeland Security Director, a sheriff of a local county and the security director for Baltimore/Washington International Airport.

During their six-day stay, the visitors studied various means of preventing terrorist attacks, from intelligence-gathering operations at Israel Police headquarters to robots that diffuse bombs and the x-ray scanning devices at the port of Ashdod. Jim Pettit, a spokesperson for the group, said that they

were particularly interested in a presentation by the Ministry of Infrastructure showing how Israel prioritizes between high-profile and low-profile targets. "That is something we are working on in the U.S.," he said, "defining what is considered critical infrastructure."

Lt. Col. Stephen Moyer, Chief of Maryland's Homeland Security and Intelligence Bureau, said he was impressed by what he had seen, not only of Israel's security forces but also of "the willingness of the citizens to engage in the security measures at malls, on the railways, at bus stations."

"Maryland is a very open society and we don't employ measures like the ones here," he continued. "But since Sept. 11 it's a new world in the United States, and we are here forecasting what we should be doing in Maryland to make Maryland citizens safer. If you are in the homeland security or police business, if you aren't forecasting what terrorism will be in the U.S., then something will happen."

## Calendar Of Israel Events

**Shalom USA Radio Program** Sunday from 9:00am to 11:00am on a new station 105.7FM, Includes news and interviews from Israel.