

11 October 1985

## GANGING UP ON ISRAEL

THE CURRENT campaign orchestrated by Egypt, Jordan and Arafat to achieve the opening move of an induced act of suicide by the Jewish state has called forth, as in the past, a medley of supporting voices.

Most prominent recently has been cooperation from Britain – in absolute harmony with British tradition since the Mandate days. If Prime Minister Thatcher daydreams back into that tradition she may sense in her mind's ear a chorus of approbation from the ghosts of a host of leaders of Mandatory Albion led by Ernest Bevin.

Engaged in the business of selling more arms to the Kingdom of Jordan, basking in the golden glitter of the state dinner given her by Hussein in Amman, she might have recalled the decisive part played by her imperialist predecessors in fathering and fostering the artificial creation that became Jordan. Listening there to Hussein's virulent verbal onslaught on Israel and Israel's "expansionism," she may well have pondered the miraculous circumstance that Britain's connection with Transjordan has always been related to action hostile to the interests and future of the Jewish people in Palestine.

It began with an act of legalized plunder in 1922. The Mandate for Palestine was granted to Britain because she had undertaken to facilitate what was describe in its test as the "reconstitution of the Jewish National Home" in Palestine which naturally included eastern Palestine, that is Transjordan, after the French had been persuaded to give up their claim to include it in their sphere of interests. The French were told that Transjordan was essential for the security of the projected Jewish state.

Subsequently, for reasons of purely imperial convenience. Britain excluded "the territories lying between the Jordan and the eastern boundary of Palestine" from the application of those paragraphs in the Mandate relating to the Jewish National Home.

By stages, Transjordan was developed by Britain as a *judenrein* Arab dependency until, in 1946, Ernest Bevin turned it into an independent anti-Zionist state.

IN WESTERN Palestine, meanwhile, the Mandate's aim was gradually perverted into a programme to destroy Zionism. The final act was the White Paper of 1939, which unabashedly presaged the end of Zionism. It was to facilitate its implementation that Britain, before and during the Holocaust, worked hard at preventing Jews from escaping the Nazis and from finding refuge in their homeland.

It was pre-war Britain that bullied East European and Balkan governments to prevent the transit of Jews fleeing Nazi Germany; and during the war she obstructed every possibility of saving Jews or even slowing down Hitler's "final solution."

It was Britain that, after the war, supplemented her repressive regime in Palestine with a wide-ranging campaign, including violence, to prevent survivors of the Holocaust from reaching Palestine.

When, in 1947, the UN recommended the partition of Palestine – which the Arabs rejected – Britain defied the recommendations, continued arming the Arab states towards fulfillment of their proclaimed purpose of destroying the Jewish state in embryo, and energetically urged the U.S. to refrain from sending arms to the Jews.

Central to Bevin's policy was direct British collaboration with Transjordan's King Abdullah in the invasion of western Palestine – which resulted in the occupation and

annexation of Judea and Samaria (then renamed “the West Bank”) to Transjordan (then renamed Jordan).

It was with British arms that Abdullah’s grandson in 1967 launched his aggression at the remaining minuscule part of Palestine covered by Israel, as part of the Arab states’ declared purpose of annihilating her. In repelling that invasion, Israel regained Judea and Samaria.

That is the story in brief of “Zionist expansionism.”

Its British context also explains how Mrs. Thatcher could be so enthusiastic in her invitation to Mohammed Milhem – a mere PLO propagandist, a mere agitator calling for violence, a mere preacher of *jihad* against Israel – and to describe him as a moderate man seeking peace.

KING HUSSEIN has always had great success in public relations. Soft-spoken, with a pleasant manner, cultured by an English education, he is one of the great masters of eloquent mendacity in the Arab world. Typical of his style is the recorded speech he disseminated some years ago asserting that Jordan had protected the Holy Places for “hundreds of years.” In the 19 years of Jordan’s rape of Jerusalem, she had reduced to rubble every synagogue in the Old City.

It is probably his personable, friendly manner and his readiness over the years actually to meet – albeit secretly – with Israeli Labour leaders that has beguiled them repeatedly into believing that he is a “moderate.” Since 1986, they have been proposing to him a “compromise” in the shape of the Allon Plan.

Through the cloud of verbiage Hussein has always made sure that they understand that he is not interested. Moreover his public statements are uniformly vicious and threatening. He is the high priest of pressure on the U.S. to force Israel to withdraw to the 1949 armistice lines he attacked in 1967.

They evidently never thought to ask Hussein why, when he ruled over Judea and Samaria, he did not then establish the “Palestinian entity” which is now the alleged craving of his heart; or why, instead, he tried to destroy Israel; or why anybody should now believe that if Israel were to restore the pre-1967 boundary, he would then not cooperate in a renewed attempt to destroy her.

Israel’s Labour leaders – and not only they – do not want to face the unpleasant but transparently simple truth: Hussein is faithful to, and bound by, the Arab purpose and the Moslem doctrine which cannot tolerate the existence of an infidel Jewish state. His “moderation” consists of his realization that in the circumstances – resulting from his own blunder in 1967 – Israel cannot be erased from the map in one blow. Her surrender of Judea and Samaria must, therefore, be brought about by international pressure. Thereafter, the coalition of Arab states, all arming themselves to the teeth, will decide on the next step. All Hussein’s utterances and actions harmonize with this theme.

That is why he has been demanding (together with his colleague Arafat) the convocation of an international conference. Such a conference would be nothing but an international ganging up around one table to bully Israel. All the governments nominated by Hussein – the Soviet Union, China, France, Britain and yes, the U.S., too – all have demanded that Israel go back to the 1949 armistice lines (with the U.S. generously allowing for minor modifications). The only difference among them would relate to their respective views as to which Arabs shall govern in Judea and Samaria.

SOME OF his encrusted Labour fans have pretended to find in his recent speech at the UN hints of a modified attitude. One of them, Prof. Shlomo Avineri, says it was a “masterpiece of complexity and ambiguity” but this he finds is a good thing. He calls it “constructive ambiguity.”

Complex it was; its ambiguity would not deceive an intelligent eight-year-old. Hussein was careful to state all the traditional Arab demands, going back to the original 1947 partition plan and including the Fez plan (the latest Arab blueprint for Israel’s elimination): these would then be discussed at the international conference. Under these “appropriate auspices” – with Britain, France, China, the Soviet Union, the U.S. and assorted Arab states breathing down Israel’s neck – “direct” talks might take place.

Before they were murdered aboard their yacht at Larnaca, two Israelis had their hands tied behind their backs. The UN Security Council last week embraced that barbaric pattern as a working principle. It laid down in effect that any state may provide bases and facilities on its territory for organizing the murder of Israelis and Israel’s arms must remain tied behind its back.

If earlier experience is not sufficient for Mr. Peres and his colleagues to grasp the full obscenity of the idea that Israel should accept international intervention in decisions on their future – they must surely recognize the significance of what the international community – including the U.S. – did to Israel last week.

Israel has treated the UN resolution with due contempt. It must also learn the lessons it contains.

The first lesson is simple: direct negotiations with Jordan – yes; international conferences in any composition – *non possumus*.