

February 25, 1994

SORRY, NO SOLUTIONS UP THEIR SLEEVES

ISRAELI defeatist academics persist in underestimating the intelligence of our public and belittling the acquired experience of our generation. Take the case of Yehoshafat Harkabi. Three decades ago, Harkabi compiled the most comprehensive and penetrating work on the anatomy of the conflict between Arabs and Jews.

Meticulously studying many hundreds of expressions of intent, he found that he had to declare unequivocally that the aim of the Arabs was the destruction of the State of Israel. As he himself described it in a recent article in Ha'aretz (February 4): "I laid the foundation in Israel for research on the Arab-Israel conflict, which at that time was not studied in our universities. "For some time I had almost a monopoly.

I pointed out that the Arab attitude which demands the liquidation of Israel is not a vague, superficial attitude but an ideological tractate, compact in structure and accepted by the [Arab] public. "I reported on this to our public, including publication for the first time of the Palestinian Covenant settlement," that is, give up the territory (the "minefield") without a peace treaty. And then, of course, a "cruel decision" will have to be taken - that is, a mass expulsion - no, not of Arabs - but Jews from the heart of the "Jewish national home." Thus the objective of the Palestinian Covenant will be partly fulfilled. In the remaining territory, the Gazit plan will provide for the Jews to be protected by "valid security arrangements."

JOINING THE eager throng of academic tranquilizers of the people of Israel is Mark Heller, a senior research associate at the Jaffee Center. Heller is in hot pursuit of a formula that will persuade Israel to give Syria the Golan Heights. Having discovered that various proposed "security measures," including demilitarization, will not provide an adequate deterrent of attack from a Golan that has been handed to Syria, Heller calls in the magic formula of American guarantees in the shape of a "Mutual Defense Treaty" (in a two-part opinion piece appearing on these pages, February 11 and February 13).

The idea is a joke, not worthy of a serious scholar, and Professor Michla Pomerantz of the Hebrew University, who has dealt with it effectively in earlier publications, blew it to pieces again in "A doubtful deterrent" (The Jerusalem Post, February 18). But a no less serious aspect arises. Has Heller learned nothing from Israel's own physical experience of "deals" with Washington and the fate of US undertakings in return for Israel's surrender of security or territory? Washington "brokered" the cease-fire to end the War of Attrition in 1970.

Israel's condition, underwritten by the US, was the maintenance of a freeze on arms, specifically that the Egyptian surface-to-air missiles would not be moved down to the Suez Canal. They were moved that night, and Washington refrained even from protesting. It was courting the Egyptians, and didn't want to upset them.

Scores of our pilots lost their lives in the subsequent Egyptian Yom Kippur aggression. In 1975, Premier Rabin succumbed to US pressure and gave up the strategically important Mitla and Gidi passes and the Abu Rhodeis oilfields. In return Israel was, inter alia, to receive exclusively the then-planned F-15 plane.

Three years later, the Carter administration reneged on that undertaking. Then in

1981, the next - Reagan - administration reneged on a further "security" undertaking. This time, Washington courteously explained that "circumstances had changed." Doesn't Heller know that circumstances are always changing? Is there any need to cite further? Surely it is reasonable to call on these academics - whose business, after all, is study and thinking - to stop trying to persuade the nation that they have solutions for life-and-death problems up their sleeves, when they haven't.

At this time of great national distress, they should surely tell themselves to "think again."