

This unofficial public service transcript was prepared while the live program was in progress. "The Advocates" is not responsible for errors of omission or commission.

THE ADVOCATES

7:00 - 8:00 PM, PDT

June 21, 1970

Topic: "The Middle-East: Where Do We Go From Here?"
Part II: The Case For U.S. Support For Israel
?

Participants: Advocate Roger Fisher (against support)
George Habash, leader of Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine
President Nasser of Egypt
Abu Omar, code name for Al Fatah leader (live)
King Hussein, Jordan, President of U.A.R.
Arnaud De Borchegrave, senior editor, Newsweek
Advocate Alan Dershowitz (for support)
Abu Omar (live)
Abba Eban, Israeli Foreign Minister
Golda Meir, Prime Minister of Israel
Maj. Gen. Y. Harkabi (Ret.) former Chief of Intelligence, Israeli Defense Forces (live)
Gen. Yitzhak Rabin, Israeli Ambassador to the U.S.

Moderator: Victor Palmieri

Origination: KCET, Los Angeles

"The Advocates" is a public television network presentation of KCET, Los Angeles and WGBH, Boston made possible by grants from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the Ford Foundation.

ANNOUNCER: Tonight from Los Angeles, "The Advocates." Roger Fisher. Guest advocate, Alan Dershowitz, and the moderator, Victor Palmieri.

VICTOR PALMIERI: Good evening. Tonight again, for the second week in a row, the problem is the Middle East and the practical choice again is this: "Should the United States give less or more military support to the state of Israel?" Our guest advocate, Alan Dershowitz, professor of law of the Harvard Law School, said, yes, we should give more support to Israel.

ALAN DERSHOWITZ: The United States should supply more military support to Israel, a nation that wants to live in peace. The Arab belligerents armed to the teeth by the Russians are determined to destroy Israel as soon as they feel sufficiently strong. The interests of world peace and of the United States are served by keeping the peace-seeking country -- Israel -- strong enough to discourage miscalculation by those who want war. I just returned from a trip to Israel where I interviewed the leaders of that country. You will see the films we made with Prime Minister Golda Meir and Foreign Minister Abba Eban. With us in the studio today is Israel's leading expert on Arab ideology, General Harkabi, former chief of Israeli military intelligence and now a professor at Hebrew University. I will also recall Mr. Fisher's witness from last week, Abu Omar, a representative of the Al Fatah.

PALMIERI: Last week, our advocate Roger Fisher presented the arguments for the Arab side of the question. Mr. Fisher.

ROGER FISHER: There are two big issues in the Middle East, two disputes. One between Israel and the Palestinians; one between Israel and its neighboring Arab states, particularly Egypt and Jordan. Professor Norm Chomsky of MIT has written that, "in America there is little willingness to face the fact that Palestinian Arabs have suffered a monstrous historical injustice. That worse injustice was done the Jews in the past is no reason for us to overlook the present plight of the Palistinians."

Palestine for 25 years was a mandate territory under British colonial rule. During that period Jews were imported, brought in immigration. Thirty per cent of the population was Jewish at the time when Israel was founded in 1948. At that time 600,000 Palestinians fled in the fighting -- that set up Israel -- between the Arabs opposing the establishment of Israel, and fled Israel. They cannot now get back. During the war of 1967, more Palestinians fled. There are now 2.4 million Palestinians without a home. Their entire country is occupied by Israel military occupation and actual part of Israel, the state of Israel. Arms will not settle that problem. The United States should not provide arms with which to do it.

The second problem is that between Israel and the United Arab Republic and Egypt. The Security Council here has recommended a plan which beyond doing a justice to the Palestinian refugees will require withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied lands. The occupied lands, I might renew, are, the entire Sinai of Egypt is under occupation, the West Bank and the Golan Heights of Syria. The plan requires the withdrawal of that ... acceptance of all sides of peace. The Arab states have accepted this plan. They promised to fulfill their side of the bargain. Today Israel declines to make any commitments as to what it will do until face-to-face capitulation, unconditional talks have taken place. The United States is committed to withdrawal. We should not give arms to Israel until Israel promises to withdraw at least.

PALMIERI: Thank you, Mr. Fisher. The advocates and their teams spent almost a month in the Middle East preparing for this program and Mr. Fisher and his team left Aman, Jordan only days before the current outbreak of fighting between Jordanian troops and the Arab guerillas. I assume, Mr. Fisher, that you had nothing to do with starting that action. Let's begin, Mr. Dershowitz.

DERSHOWITZ: What kind of military support is Israel seeking from the United States? It's not seeking American soldiers. It is receiving no military aid. It is simply asking for the right to buy, for cash and at a profit to American businessmen, weapons that would enable Israel to defend itself -- weapons which Israel which unlike Egypt cannot obtain from any other countries. For the United States to refuse to sell weapons to Israel, would be for it to take sides against Israel. The cause of world peace and the interests of the United States cry out against a one-sided world-wide arms embargo against the only true democracy under military attack to date. And Israel is under military attack. It is accepted and complied with the United Nations cease-fire. Egypt has now rejected that cease-fire. And with the help of Russian planes and pilots has set out to force Israel by guns, rather than by negotiations to retreat from the agreed upon cease-fire lines. Israel is now being attacked not only by the Arab countries, but also by terrorist groups claiming to represent the Palestine refugees.

Now to understand this refugee problem, we must go back to 1947 when the United Nations partitioned Palestine into two separate states. The Jews were given a small area in which they constituted a majority of the population. The remainder was to become a Palestinian state. Therefore, under the United Nations decision, every Palestinian Arab could have lived, either as a part of an Arab majority in a Palestinian state or as a part of an Arab minority in Israel if the Arab countries had not attacked Israel and if Jordan had not annexed Arab Palestine. Moreover on the very day that the Arabs declared war against the new state, the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem appealed to the Palestinians to leave their homes. The Secretary of the Palestine Higher Arab Command himself conceded that the refugees are a direct consequence of the unanimous policy of the Arab states.

Now while the Arab leaders were telling their people to leave their homes, what were the Israeli authorities saying? They were telling them to remain. In Haifa, for example, the Jewish Workers Council issued the following plea: "Do not fear. Do not move out. In this city, yours and ours, the gates are open for work, for life and for peace." It is a tragedy that most of the Palestinians left. But it must be understood that they were not seeking refuge from oppression at the hands of Israel. They had a choice. They could have stayed. They were not refugees in the same sense that the survivors of Hitler's extermination camps were refugees. Those who fled from Nazi Germany had no choice but to die or to seek refuge. And now I would like you to see how the world responded when these Jewish refugees who, unlike the Palestinians, had no homeland when these Jewish refugees sought haven in other countries.

FILM:VOICE: The United States: Congress rejects proposal to admit 20,000 German Jewish children. Great Britain: British Government rejects appeal by the Archbishop of Canterbury to abandon quota system. Cuba: Cuban and U.S. governments turn away 900 German Jews in the refugee ship St. Louis. They return to Europe. Canada: Jewish refugees are barred by immigration restrictions. Brazil: Jewish refugees are barred by immigration restrictions. Australia: Jewish refugees are barred by immigration restrictions. Mexico: Severe restrictions on Jews are introduced. Chile: Jewish immigration limited to 300 a year. India: New Delhi virtually bars Jewish refugees. Turkey; Istanbul strictly forbids Jewish immigration.

MIDDLE EAST, PART II/3

South Africa: Policy of unrestricted immigration changed. Almost no Jews allowed.

GOLDA MEIR: We brought our people here. (END OF FILM)

DERSHOWITZ: Can the Arab states say the same about their people? No. The Arab countries put them in camps instead of taking them into the numerous Arab homelands with a common culture, language and religion. For example, Palestine had for years been regarded as southern Syria. In 1951 Syria had wanted more population. It offered to half million Egyptians to come and settle. Yet when the United Nations asked Syria to accept 80,000 Palestinian refugees, they flatly refused. This and other similar refusals led a research team in Europe to conclude that the existence of the refugees were the fault of the inhuman policy of the Arabs for the purpose of maintaining a menacing population on the frontier with Israel.

Now the existence of a refugee becomes a refugee problem only if political considerations are permitted to outweigh human considerations. When India and Pakistan were partitioned for example, the Moslems from India were received by their people in Pakistan and the Hindus from Pakistan were received by their people in India. That population exchange of almost 15 million didn't become a refugee problem. The 9 million East Germans who were resettled and accepted in West Germany didn't become a problem. In the Mid-East itself more than half a million Jews who were forced to leave Arab countries where they had been living for thousands of years, were resettled in Israel. This didn't become a problem. Indeed, the number of Arabs that left Israel was approximately the same as the number of Jews who were expelled from Arab countries.

What happened in the Mid-East, therefore, can be understood as a legitimate exchange of land and population. There is, therefore, no moral imperative on Israel to take back large numbers of refugees 20 years after they left. Moreover, it would be dangerous and to demonstrate this I would like to recall Mr. Fisher's witness Abu Omar, a representative of the Al Fatah.

PALMIERI: Abu Omar, we're glad to have you back again on "The Advocates."

DERSHOWITZ: Abu Omar, Mr. Fisher says that the solution to the refugee problem is to permit some of them to return to Israel. If you were to receive an invitation tomorrow from the Israeli government to return and live in peace as a citizen of Israel, would you accept?

ABU OMAR: First, I could not possibly receive an invitation from the Israeli government. I'll be thrown in jail because I am in the resistance movement. It works against the occupation of my country.

DERSHOWITZ: ...Well, what are some ...

ABU OMAR: Second, I do not want to live in a state that is by definition Jewish, that is committed in gathering the Jews of the world in my country. I want to live in my country, Palestine, where we would have room for those Jews who want to live there as Palestinians without discrimination, fighting for right as human beings not as Jews, Moslems, Christians or atheists.

DERSHOWITZ: Now what if other refugees felt differently from you and decided to accept an invitation extended by the Israeli government? Would you prevent them from coming back?

ABU OMAR: The wishes of the Palestinian people who were kicked out of their country is a very clear and well known. All the Palestinians on repeated occasions have expressed their wish to return to their country and live in their country and determine their destiny.

DERSHOWITZ: What if some of them wanted to come back to live as citizens of Israel? Would you stop them from coming back? Would you use force to prevent them from coming back?

ABU OMAR: Those who want to live, there are very few who want to live as citizens of Israel. We would not like it.

DERSHOWITZ: Would you try to stop them?

ABU OMAR: We would not try to stop them.

DERSHOWITZ: Have you in the past tried to stop Arabs from cooperating with the Israeli authorities?

ABU OMAR: We have considered Israeli authority not an authority but as an occupying country, occupying power, and therefore we do not consider it legitimate.

DERSHOWITZ: Legitimate and so you kill any Arab who disagrees with you.

ABU OMAR: That is absolutely not true.

DERSHOWITZ: Have you killed any Arabs, your organization?

ABU OMAR: We are involved in war. And in war there is killing on both sides.

DERSHOWITZ: Have you killed Arabs?

ABU OMAR: We ...there have been ...we have not killed Arabs.

DERSHOWITZ: Do you agree with the tactic of blowing up airplanes?

ABU OMAR: No, I do not.

DERSHOWITZ: Do you agree with the tactic of killing Israeli and non-Israeli citizens? Civilians?

ABU OMAR: The strategy of Al Fatah is very clear. Our strategy is aimed at military targets and economic installations that feed into the economic military machines.

DERSHOWITZ: It's not true that the Al Fatah placed explosives to kill the women and children in the market place of Jerusalem?

ABU OMAR: There have been exceptions where Al Fatah has used attacks against non-military targets on two occasions. First, as a retaliation when our villages and our homes are being bombed by phantoms not by ...come in by bombs...

DERSHOWITZ: Did you plant a bomb...

ABU OMAR: ...but they can come by Phantom planes and by long-range artillery. If you want a description of the various civilians that your Phantom planes, or your friends Phantom planes, I can easily tell you that in only the last few months...

DERSHOWITZ: But is it not true ...

ABU OMAR: ...that 70 were killed, 80...

DERSHOWITZ: ...is it not true that all those bombings would stop if Egyptians would accept the cease-fire...

ABU OMAR: ...it is true that all these bombings would stop if the Palestinians are given the right...

DERSHOWITZ: ...(inaudible)

ABU OMAR: ...to return to their homeland...

PALMIERI: ...Gentlemen, you're starting to talk and I'm joining the problem of talking all at the same time...just a moment...

DERSHOWITZ: ...I want to make one point very clear.

PALMIERI: ...Yes, but I want to make it quite clear that I expect both of you to give each other a minimum time to answer and will you now proceed with the next question?

DERSHOWITZ: ...It's not clear that there would be no more killing by Israel if you would accept the cease-fire would you not, but if Israel accepts the cease-fire you will continue to plant bombs in marketplaces and kill women shopping for the Sabbath.

MID EAST, PART II/6

ABU OMAR: It is very true that killing would stop if the Palestinian people accept, capitulate to an occupation, accept that they live out of their country, accept to live under occupation, accept to live in a Jewish state. I would like to comment, Mr. Dershowitz, it's really, I find it extremely surprising that a person of your intellectual position in this country and an American citizen should go through these verbal gymnastics in dealing with a problem. When a person like Dayan who is the head of the station would say ...

DERSHOWITZ: ...I just don't want to listen to a lecture from a bomb thrower who kills children...

ABU OMAR: ...it is not a lecture, Dayan himself says who are we to reproach them for hating us? ...

PALMIERI: ...Mr. Omar...

ABU OMAR: ...communists who transform the Jewish homeland ...

DERSHOWITZ: ...I don't even want to listen to a lecture from ... who throw bombs ... (everyone talking at once; inaudible)

PALMIERI: ...Let me explain something. Let me explain something. In just a moment, I'm going to ask Mr. Fisher to ask you some questions, and I'm sure he'll ask you the questions that you'll want to be asked. And right for the moment you're going to be asked questions you don't want to be asked.

ABU OMAR: No, but I think we have rarely occasion to address the American people and I think I should mention...

PALMIERI: ...let me have Mr. Dershowitz ask one more question. Mr. Fisher will then give you your opportunity. Mr. Dershowitz...

DERSHOWITZ: Is Yasir Arafat the Palestinian Liberation organization anti-Jewish?

ABU OMAR: No, he is not.

DERSHOWITZ: How then do you explain the publication in their journals of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion and other obscene anti-semitic literature?

ABU OMAR: There has never been to my knowledge any publication of the Protocols of Zionists in our journals.

DERSHOWITZ: You will see that is not true.

PALMIERI: Mr. Fisher, will you proceed?

FISHER: Mr. Abu Omar -- Abu Omar, excuse me, drop the Mister -- we have a couple of minutes. As to the leaving of the Palestinians when they fled, did any of them intend to leave permanently?

ABU OMAR: Well, in war obviously people who are not involved in fighting do seek a place for safety, but they did not leave because they wanted to leave the country, their home, their furniture. Regardless how they left, they have the right to go back to their homes, to their farms, to their villages.

FISHER: Now let's get the quotation, I think you're ... the point you were trying to make is that however much injustice have been done the Jews by the Nazis, two wrongs does not make a right. And you were saying that Moshe Dayan accepts the fact that hardship has been inflicted upon the Palestinians. Would you read that if you have it?

ABU OMAR: Well, I have, I began to say two quotations from Dayan. One, he says, "Who are we to reproach them (the Palestinians) for hating us -- colonists who transform into a Jewish homeland the territory they have lived in for generations?" Or again it says, "It is not true that the Arabs hate the Jews for personal, religious or racial reasons. They consider us unjustly from their point of view as westerners, foreigners, invaders who have seized an Arab country to turn it into a Jewish state." I was trying contrast is the contrast between an American intellectual who has to go through all these moral and intellectual gymnastics as compared with Dayan -- persons involved in the fighting -- who the moral integrity and intellectual honesty to admit the historical problem.

PALMIERI: Abu Omar, do you think that the U.S. will permit the destruction of Israel?

ABU OMAR: This is for ... you ask this of the U.S.?

PALMIERI: I ask this of you.

ABU OMAR: As far as, I don't think that ... I'm not the one that decides these policies.

PALMIERI: What I asked you was ...

FISHER: No, but the question really is, if the people of Palestine, if they feel strongly and if the Jews of Israel begin to worry about their discrimination is there possible that the Liberation Movement as you see it would succeed or are you fighting a hopeless cause?

ABU OMAR: I am absolutely certain that the Liberation Movement is going to succeed. I think the Americans sometimes confuse two things. First, the destruction of people, the killing of the Jews and nobody will stand for that neither Al Fatah nor the American government. What we are committed to is not the destruction of the Jewish people, but we are committed to the destruction of the system, that is based on excluding the native inhabitants of Palestine from Palestine and getting Jews from all over the world to come and live in their place.

PALMIERI: Abu Omar, thank you for coming to "The Advocates." Mr. Fisher, will you forgive me? I must now interrupt...

ABU OMAR: ...thank you ...

PALMIERI: ...and thank our guest for coming.

DESHOWITZ: I, too, think the Palestinians have had an injustice committed against them, but I think the injustice has been committed primarily by the Jordanians and the Arab people who have kept them hostages in concentration camps. And I quarrel primarily with means and not with ends. I quarrel with George Habash's statement that after what has happened to us we have the right to do anything, including raping the wives of American diplomatic personnel and planting bombs in the hulls of

airplanes. That's where my complaint with the Fatah lie.

Now you've heard an impassioned plea for a Jewish, I'm sorry you've heard an impassioned plea against the Jewish state and for the establishment of an Arab homeland. But Jews, too, want a homeland. And they want it in the area where as the Foreign Minister of Israel told me, you cannot dig a hole without finding traces that the Jews were there before.

FILM: ABBA EBAN: People go around saying it's all right to have a community, a sovereign community, for the Mount Eve Islands and for Malta and for Gabon and for the whole alphabet from Afganistan to Albania to Yeman and Yugoslavia, But the one thing that is not natural is that this great historic people who represents the most tenacious preservation of collective identity in all history, it should not have a control of its destiny but should everywhere be a minority, a community in other states. But that's been rejected. It's 23 years too late juridically and it's about 3,000 years too late culturally and historically to question the particularity of Israel as one of the elements in the national ... in the international community. The United Nations didn't recommend or ask us to establish Israel but they said establish a Jewish state which we called Israel. And it's going to be Israel and that will be it's name for as long as history lasts and it will be predominately Jewish, although of course we have Christian and Moslem citizens who are equal before the law. But if nobody recoils before the idea of a French state or a British state, he's not entitled to criticize the concept of a Jewish state. (END OF FILM)

DERSHOWITZ: The solution to the refugee problem is not for Israel to commit political suicide and to give up the idea of a Jewish state. What then is the answer? I asked the Foreign Minister if an independent Palestinian state on the West Bank would be consistent with Israel's security. He did not rule this out. And he intimated that the solution lay in the Palestinians asserting themselves on the West Bank and in Jordan proper. The Prime Minister spoke of reuniting families and of compensation.

FILM: GOLDA MEIR: We've never said not one single refugee will take back. As a matter of fact, we have taken back between forty and fifty thousand. So for the reunion of families we're very sensitive on this subject for ourselves and we understand it in others we've taken back. And we've never said not one more. And we've said for compensation for what the Arabs have left behind, naturally we are obligated to compensate them and we will. In many cases, there are quite nice sums. There was a UN commission; we cooperated with the commissinn. But the Arab governments wouldn't listen.

ABBA EBAN: The people who suffer deeply and whose problems cannot be solved except by peace are predominantely the Palestinian Arabs. I, therefore, suggested that they take the initiative of raising their voice on behalf of peace negotiations between Israeli and the Arab states. And I pointed out that in a peace settlement in which the permanent boundaries were drawn, they would be able to secure a definition of their civic and political status. They would emerge from this Nirvana, this question mark, this lack of clarity about who they are in terms of their citizenship and their collective community identity. But since Israel doesn't envisage having another million Arabs in Israel, the likelihood is that the state to the east of Israel would be predominantely Palestinian because there isn't a Jordanian people, there is a Palestinian people. And, therefore, that they would be able to assert themselves whether in the form of the Jordan kingdom if they want to or in the Palestine Republic if they want to modernize the structure of a under which they lived for the past 20 years. (END OF FILM)

MID EAST, PART II/9

DERSHOWITZ: Israel's policy towards the refugees is eminently fair. So, too, is its policies towards the Arab states. In the 1967 War, Israel occupied Egypt, Sinai, Syria's Golan and Jordan's West Bank. The Arabs now want this land back but they are unwilling to sit down and negotiate for peace. Indeed, a leading Egyptian newspaper recently declared that every area that Israel will evacuate will serve as a base for fedayeen action. It's entirely understandable that without peace Israel should refuse to give back land which like a battle ship can only be used to make war against it. Throughout their history, Jewish communities have been surrounded by hostile forces. And unlike 1967, they have not always survived.

In 70 AD when Jerusalem had fallen and the Jews were enslaved, a thousand zealots resisted. From the fortress of Masada, a mesa rising 1300 feet above the Judean desert -- there surrounded by the Roman tenth legion -- they withstood a seige for 3 years. The orders from Titus, "destroy the nest of Jews at all costs" -- rather than be enslaved the Jews took their own lives.

May 1967. President Nasser of Egypt, "Our aim is the destruction of Israel." Syria's Minister of Defense: "The army with its hand pressed on the trigger is united in its determination to hasten the battle." King Hussein of Jordan: "March forward along the road which leads to the wiping out of our shame in the liberation of Palestine." From the heights of Masada recruits of the Israeli defense forces swear their oath of allegiance. "We shall remain free men. Never again shall Masada fall."

FILM: GEN YITZHAK RABIN: Egypt carried out an act of war by closing the Strait of Teheran and by putting a declared and practical blockade against Israel. No one can be sure that another blockade will not be put against shipping from Israel and to Israel without controlling this area -- Charma and its surroundings.

We stopped along the Suez Canal because the Suez Canal itself presents the best defensive line that one can find between Tel Aviv and Cairo. It's almost half of the length of the boundaries that we had between Egypt and Israel prior to the Six-Day War. When Syria joined the Egyptians in the war we found that it was essential to us to get rid of their presence that had threatened all Israel's settlements and towns in this area. The Golan Heights topographically were in control over one-third a part of Israel. And they exploited their topographical advantage and opened fire whenever they wanted. The attack on the school but -- the brutal attack on children -- exemplifies what's going on along the Lebanese border. If buses of children run now along the former Syrian border, there is no danger that such an eventuality would occur.

In the morning of the 5th of June, 1967, when the Jordanians open fire and moved their forces, we warned them twice but the Jordanians decided to go into the war. They were capable because of the short distance to shell from positions in Jordan the city of Tel Aviv. 60 to 70 per cent of the Israeli population were within the range of the Arab guns. I believe it's about 10 per cent now. To give up at the present the cease-fire lines which gives us a military capability to defend ourselves effectively without the need to mobilize our forces would be almost like to commit suicide. (END OF FILM)

DERSHOWITZ: That was General Rabin. I would now like to call General Harkabi former Chief of Israeli Military Intelligence and Israeli's leading authority of foreign affairs. He currently lectures on the Mid-East at the university in Jerusalem.

PALMIERI: Welcome, General.

DERSHOWITZ: General Harkabi, is Abu Omar telling the truth when he says that under the plan of the Fatah people from Israel will be able to live in peace in a secular Palestinian state?

GEN. Y. HARKABI: No, the Arab position is a national position, it's not a diplomatic one. Now as a national position, they have the national document. The most important national document is the Covenant, the national Covenant of the Palestinians, which was formulated in their Congress. In this national Covenant they put it very clearly that only Jews who came to the country before 1917 will be allowed to live in the free Palestine. They speak about the democratic state in which Jews and Arabs will live together but I've seen this evening epitomize one fact that I was not allowed to stay in this room because I would contaminate Mr. Abu Omar and I had to be kept away. To my mind the national Covenant it is the most important document that it is. I know the problem that sometimes leaders of the Arab countries express themselves to foreigners in a different way. But people are inconsistent. Now if somebody wanted to summarize my position and I said 98 times something and two times I express myself a different way. Now if he would say that the two times in which I expressed myself reflect my true position, I think it will be perhaps distortion of truth and at worse an act of fraud. Now Nasser expressed himself many times and in most, other ways than he expressed what we have seen a week ago ...

DERSHOWITZ: Today he spoke or last week he spoke in conciliatory tones, but does that reflect how he speaks to his own people?

HARKABI: No, he repeats to his own people, that the Khartoum, no peace, no negotiation that is the factor. Now he knows that the foreign visitor comes and goes. It's a butterfly. Comes and goes. It has no effect. What the people will demand from him are declarations that he makes to his people and therefore that is what is important. As I said, the Arab position is a national, it is not a diplomatic. If it had been a diplomatic, it would be changed by diplomatic declaration. But being a national position, ingrained in the ethos, in the literature, in the way that they educate the people, I therefore give more importance to see what goes on in their society.

DERSHOWITZ: Therefore, what Abu Omar told us that the Palestine Liberation Organization is not anti-Jewish, that they did not ever publish the Protocols of the Elders of Zion, the most disgusting anti-Semitic forgery ever concocted, Is that statement the truth?

HARKABI: No, I have in my hands the monthly of the Palestine Liberation Organization from November, 1969 in which one sees the Protocols of the Elders of Zion.

PALMIERI: All right. Mr. Fisher, will you cross-exam?

FISHER: Do you think that Israel never says things differently at home than abroad?

HARKABI: I would say that no nation is immaculate, but to equate two cases is to impose a false symmetry.

FISHER: I will concede you the Arabs tend to talk bigger, I think, than Israel. I think Israel talks peace and fights harder -- the surprise attack in '56, deceitful treaty with Britain and France trying to overthrow Nasser and strike all the way to Suez -- completely, now that was non-disclosed. Now do you think the Arabs have reason to suspect Israeli leaders?

MID EAST, PART II/11

HARKABI: To suspect Israeli leaders?

FISHER: That when they talk peace they don't mean it.

HARKABI: I would say in every conflict, both sides suspect each other...

FISHER: ...And how do you...

HARKABI: ...but there is one big difference. In our case, perhaps we are not always immaculate as I say, but that is the exception. But on the Arab side that is the norm.

FISHER: Are you saying you're anti-Arab on that or are you making a general characteristic of Jews and Arabs...

HARKABI: ...No, what I say is if you put it in absolute terms then you arrive at a...

FISHER: ...let me ask you two questions.

HARKABI: Yes.

FISHER: In May, 1969 in the famous pink statement, the embassy in Washington of Israel said this resolution (referring to the UN resolution) is the operational international document that lays down the framework of principles for Mid-East peace. Israel accepted the resolution.

HARKABI: It did and recently, the Prime Minister of Israel, repeated in the Knesset declared that Israel accept the UN resolution.

FISHER: Now, Moshe Dayan referring to Israeli groups of correspondants in Israel reprinted this week in le Monde said, "I hereby declare in the name of the government that there exists no decision of this government which considers the resolution of 22 November as a basis for talks with the Arabs."

HARKABI: Mr. Fisher, I...

FISHER: ...which is the policy of Israel?

HARKABI: Mr. Fisher, I told you in the corridor that that is not the declaration of Moshe Dayan. It may be that it...

FISHER: ...it's reported by an Israeli correspondant...

HARKABI: ...it may be that it is in le Monde...

FISHER: ...let me give you a different one...

HARKABI: ...but it is not his declaration...

FISHER: ...if you doubt that quotation, I'll give you one from the Prime Minister which I heard, which Mr. Dershowitz heard when we were in Jerusalem. She said categorically "the other side must not expect us to accept anything before we sit down." Now, which is the policy of Israel?

MID EAST PART II/12

HARKABI: Before we sit down...

FISHER: ...Right. Have they accepted the resolution is what I'm asking.

HARKABI: ...they did accept the resolution...

DERSHOWITZ: ...(in background) Mrs. Meir told us four times she accepted the resolution...

FISHER: ...as basis for discussion...

DERSHOWITZ: ...completely out of context, if you ask the producer for a tape recording of the discussion we will repeat it...

FISHER: ...you will listen to it when the tape comes on (many voices -- all jumbled)

PALMIERI: Gentlemen, gentlemen, the bench regards the question as being in dispute for what it's worth. Let's proceed.

FISHER: How about the withdrawal? Shall we believe the acceptance of the resolution or shall we believe the statements which report is the consensus of the government that they will not withdraw from Jerusalem and its environs -- the Golan Heights, the Gaza Strip, Charlmelchek, together with a strip of the Sinai, together with certain ramifications of the West Bank.

HARKABI: Do you want us to withdraw as the Syrians have not yet and have not accepted the ...

FISHER: ...I know. They're asking, you made a commitment to withdraw.

HARKABI: What our position is and our predicament is that we have a coalition against us which is not cohesive so they don't fight effectively but what, they cannot make peace because in order to make peace, they have to agree together. Now I think that our withdrawal will be proportionate to how comprehensive will be the change in the Arab side. So long as the Syrians don't accept, don't want...

FISHER: ...would you accept a proposition that the United States should not provide arms until Israel makes a commitment fully...

HARKABI: ...that's what I said...

FISHER: ... to implement the resolution?

HARKABI: No, I won't.

FISHER: Do you think that we should... you have a problem of the domestic coalition in Israel, the cabinet cannot agree on withdrawal or not withdrawal but why should not both sides commit themselves to that resolution and then work out, first in indirect talks and finally in public peace-making, the peace which both sides want?

MID EAST, PART II/13

HARKABI: We have committed ourselves to the Security Council Resolution. The Arabs say and repeat, as I said, a national position, no peace. The Jews don't have national self-determination.

PALMIERI: Gentlemen, I must interrupt and thank you, General, for being with us on "The Advocates."

HARKABI: Thank you.

DERSHOWITZ: This position of the occupied territories will be decided at the negotiating table, but I did get some clues as to what we might expect with my talk with the Foreign Minister and by a personal visit to the old city of Jerusalem.

FILM: ABBA EBAN: We have no interest in territory as such. We don't have an arbitrary interest in the territory but we do need territorial change in order to maintain our security. For example, if you take the Golan Heights, we would certainly insist on retaining the Golan Heights because that has a direct bearing on our security, not because we like the landscape. In other words, security will be the criterion on which we will base our territorial proposals. We think that we have a right not to have an Arab army pushing us up against the coastal plain. So that the security border with Jordan as our late Prime Minister, Mr. Eshkol could be different from a political border. A political border could be more advantageous for the Arab side than a security border. The security border we think should be the Jordan River. An Arab army should not come over the Jordan River but that does not rule out various alternatives concerning the administration and the political sovereignty in parts of the West Bank.

DERSHOWITZ: This is Jerusalem. This is the spiritual center and the spiritual heart and the religious heart of Judaism, and the historical heart of Judaism. It's just a wall. It's called the Western Wall. It's the remnant of the temple, the only actual physical remnant of the temple that personified the Jewish state more than 2,000 years ago. It's been called the Wailing Wall. It's been a wall of tragedy. It's been a wall where people have come to bemoan their fate in other countries. It's a synagogue; it's the most important synagogue in Judaism. When one comes here during Friday night, one finds it to be a massive synagogue with hundreds and thousands of people praying. My grandfather, many, many years ago who was living in America came to Israel just to pray at the wall. And then he went home and returned. He felt that his life could not be fulfilled until he came here and prayed. And then in the 1940's the Jordanian army captured this part of Jerusalem and captured this wall and kept the Jews for over 20 years from coming to this wall and praying. It's hard to understand the significance of that unless you're a Jew. It would be as if some group captured St. Peter's in the Vatican and kept the Catholics away from using it and praying at it for 20 years. The world couldn't tolerate that, the world wouldn't tolerate that.

It's very interesting how the Jews have treated this wall ever since its recapture, a number of years ago. When I came here for the first day, I went to pray at the wall. It was a very important and meaningful experience for me. And in the middle of the most important part of the prayer, I was surprised to hear the call to Moslem prayer being echoed from that direction. And at the same time I heard church bells and I wondered to myself for a minute how it is that the Jewish prayer can be interrupted in this way. Of course it occurred to me that this is not only a Jewish city, this is a city of many faiths. This is Christianity's most important city. It's a very important city to the Moslems. But what the Jews have done since the recapture of this wall is to permit all faiths to pray here equally, to permit the Jewish to be disturbed by a Moslem call to prayer, by Christian church bells.

It wasn't really disturbing after a minute, it was really quite beautiful to understand how three faiths were using this area together and not apart. The Jews will never again let this wall be taken back and no responsible man on earth, no responsible person can ever ask a Jew to deny himself access to this place again.

The Jews will not again be denied access to their holy places in Jerusalem, but who will administer Jerusalem, what the political arrangements will be is still up for negotiations. But it must be remembered that internationalization was once before tried, and it failed. When Israel recaptured the holy city in 1967, they were embarrassed, ashamed and disgusted to find the desecration that the Jordanians had committed on their holy places. But so long as their holy places are protected and they're granted access to them, I believe that there can be an accommodation on Jerusalem. As for the rest of the territory, Israel has no interest in territory. It doesn't want territory. It simply must make sure that no Egyptian armies can again come into the Sinai, can again block Charamelchek and deny them access to their shipping port, can again shoot down from the Golan Heights and shell their children and can again put Tel Aviv within gunshot range of belligerent cannon.

What we have heard so far is the least that Israel is prepared to do in the event of negotiations. And negotiations are not mere technicalities. They, too, are required by the UN Security Council Resolution and the importance for direct negotiations is that when the Arabs see Nasser sitting down and negotiating with Israel a psychological climate for peace will be established. A psychological climate that can help to offset the 20 years of vicious hate that has been instilled particularly in the refugees but generally throughout the Arab world. Everybody in Israel is convinced that it will do more, much more, if the Arab countries are prepared to make and enforce a real peace. I discussed the importance of a peace treaty negotiations with the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister.

FILM: ABBA EBAN: The only thing that is agreed universally is that Israel will be completely off its head if it were to withdraw from any of the cease-fire lines without peace, that is approved, attested legitimate. The reason is that there is now a state of war that we maintain our positions on the cease-fire line until there is peace. But national suicide is not an international obligation.

GOLDA MEIR: We have over and over again made statements. We want negotiations and a peace settlement. And when we will come to the negotiating table, we are not coming in a spirit of conquerors to speak to the defeated. But we want to conduct negotiations as equals with full appreciation and concern for the respect and honor and dignity of the other side and as we expect for ourselves.

ABBA EBAN: This is the norm of international conduct. Never in international history have states passed from water peaks on the basis of a refusal to set eyes on each other.

GOLDA MEIR: We have said that we're prepared to go on the Rhodes formula under the chairmanship of Dr. Bunche meant the procedure was that there were joint meetings of the two delegations. Dr. Bunche met with each delegation separately. There were informal meetings of the delegations; there were formal meetings of the delegations and when I was asked as soon as I came to New York last September whether we would accept the Rhodes formula, I immediately said, yes and we're still prepared to do it.

ABBA EBAN: We've said that negotiation for us is unconditional, that we would take under review and express our reaction to anything that they propose on any subject.

GOLDA MEIR: Now, this means that we will not ask Nasser or Hussein or the Syrians to accept anything before we sit down at the negotiating table. But the other side must not expect us to accept anything before we sit down.

ABBA EBAN: We do not say that the cease-fire lines are permanent boundaries. The map of peace would be different from the map of war...

GOLDA MEIR: So that there is no misunderstanding we do not accept the 67 boundaries as secure boundaries for Israel because they have proven themselves not to be secure boundaries.

ABBA EBAN: In the light of our traumatic experience in 1967 when the impotence and the flight of the Security Council from the scene and from the conflict played such an important part in bringing about the war, we must have a very critical view of the United Nations in general and its role in the Middle East in particular. In other words, there is no country amongst the 123 countries whose security rests upon the United Nations. Least of all can Israel rely upon the United Nations because it's a packed court. In the General Assembly, there are some 46 votes automatically against Israel on any issue. Before the issue is even examined there is a commitment of 46 states to vote for the Arab governments no matter what they say or do. I said once that if the Arab governments proposed in the General Assembly that the earth is flat, they would get their 42 votes for that.

GOLDA MEIR: What Mr. Nasser can do is in the first place we would like to hear one clear, definite statement that under any conditions he sees the state -- an independent Israel state -- as part of this area with which he is prepared to live in peace. Just something as simple as all that. Under any conditions. He hasn't said that.

ABBA EBAN: If the UAR were to announce tomorrow that the UAR recognizes Israel's right to exist and you were to ask what my reply would be, I would make a courteous and reciprocal reply saying that we recognize the right of the United Arab Republic to exist. So existence must be a taken for granted. What we want is not recognition of our right to exist. We want the recognition of our right to peace, a mutual, juricial and human relationship to be a called peace. And negotiation will create a new intellectual and emotional climate. And in that climate, the Israeli effort to secure peace would engage and stretch our imaginations and our efforts. It's extraordinary that the Arab states don't understand this, don't put our capacity for peace-making to its test. (END OF FILM)

PALMIERI: Mr. Fisher, last week we had Mr. Dershowitz question you about what your interviews of King Hussein and President Nasser and now I think it would be good if you ask Mr. Dershowitz some questions about his distinguished witnesses who were on camera.

FISHER: Well, rather than cross-examine you, Alan, we've been going at this for two weeks, let's see if we can come out. We disagree about whether the provision of more jet air craft or less will help the situation. I don't think we're as far apart in identifying some of the questions. One of the first points it seems to me is that, is to whether talks should be unconditional or whether talks should be for the purpose of implementing the Security Council Resolution. We heard your Prime Minister of Israel say all she wanted was a clear statement from Nasser that he accepted the existence of Israel. We've heard that clear statement.

DERSHOWITZ: No, I don't believe that's right. We heard a statement that he accepts Israel on two conditions and he is not sure about secure territories. We have not yet heard a statement by Nasser to his people. Israel, as Israel, as a Jewish state has the right to exist in peace in the Mid-East.

FISHER: I believe I heard that although what troubles me is that what General Harkabi says is that no matter how many times he says it, he won't won't count...

DERSHOWITZ: He didn't say it once...

FISHER: ...because of prior statements, he has to weigh a statistical... the difficulty of fighting and having peace at the same time faces both sides. Israel talks war. Israel is today, as I pointed out, the first ten days of June they dropped more bombs than during the entire June, 1967 War.

MID EAST, PART II/17

DERSHOWITZ: That can be stopped by a snap of the finger by Nasser...

FISHER: ...no...

DERSHOWITZ: ...cease-fire and it'll be stopped. You know that and I know that.

FISHER: If we stop the fighting, would he get his territory back?

DERSHOWITZ: If he would sit and negotiate, Israel...

FISHER: Let's ...I'll try to be constructive, I really ...

DERSHOWITZ: ...no longer hold onto the Sinai...

FISHER: I really was looking forward to the question, do you believe that Israel is prepared for talks directed to the purpose of implementing the resolution?

DERSHOWITZ: Yes.

FISHER: Or shall we accept what the Prime Minister says, do not ask us to accept anything first or ...

DERSHOWITZ: ...no...

FISHER: ...to accept what Eban said, the talks must be unconditional. I'll tell you

DERSHOWITZ: We were told by both the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister that the talks would be within the framework of the Security Council Resolution but that Resolution doesn't say return all the territory. It says to return territories and then if you look in the next paragraph, it says, "Secure and recognized boundaries." I spoke myself personally to the United State Ambassador to the United Nations who participated in the drafting of this -- the Honorable Arthur Goldberg he told me of the days of debate that went into this phraseology and that it means unequivocally that Israel is not committed to returning all the territories but is committed and the United States is committed to permitting it to make territorial adjustments necessary for security. And that is Israel's position and this is the United States position.

FISHER: All right. The Secretary of State in describing that position in his speech of December said, "We believe that while recognized political boundaries must be established and agreed upon by the parties, any changes in the pre-existing lines should not reflect the weight of conquest and should be confined to insubstantial alterations required for mutual security."

DERSHOWITZ: ...that's precisely Israel's position...

FISHER: ..."we do not support expansionism. We believe troops must be withdrawn as the resolution provides." Now in the French text it says "de territoire" meaning the territories ...

DERSHOWITZ: ...no, but the American-English text was voted on, and this is an important point, the English text was voted on; the French translation was not for grammatic reasons and did not change the thrust of the resolution.

(VOICES, JUMBLED)

PALMIERI: Gentlemen, I'm sure that's an important point, too, but I want to broaden the question. I'd like to think that there are a lot of people out there who feel that there is right on both sides, wrong on both sides and I think you've both said that.

DERSHOWITZ: ...no, I haven't said that. I've said that there ...

PALMIERI: ...don't worry about it, don't worry about it then for a minute...

DERSHOWITZ: ...is substantial wrong on the side of a country that seeks peace.

PALMIERI: Let me ask you this. What might the U.S. do, what might the U.S. do beyond giving more war planes to Israel to move us closer to peace?

DERSHOWITZ: What the United States ought to do and what it did not do in 1948 and 1956 and in 1967 is to insist that tinkering cease-fires and disarmaments will not work. What we need is a peace. What we need is a treaty. What we need is an agreement by the Arab states to sit down and talk peace. The United States should do everything in its power to bring Egypt and the Arab...

PALMIERI: ...shouldthe United States do everything...

DERSHOWITZ: ...states to the negotiating tables...

PALMIERI: ...in its power to influence the state of Israel to accept the fact that the Arabs cannot come to the table directly but might come to it indirectly?

DERSHOWITZ: Well, Israel should not accept indirect negotiations should not do anything. I think that Mr. Fisher agrees that Israel should not withdraw on the basis of indirect negotiations. There must be direct recognition and...

PALMIERI: ...we only have just a second left at this time ...

FISHER: ...let me clarify that point. I think it is crucial. Mr. Dershowitz and I do agree that talks could start indirectly, that...

DERSHOWITZ: ...so does Mrs. Meir agree with that...

FISHER: ...could develop that you should not, that Israel should abandon insistence that the next step be direct negotiations. (jumbled voices)

PALMIERI: Let's stop on that not of agreement. We did it without a UN peace-keeping force. And gentlemen, thank you very much. Mr. Dershowitz, you have a little less than a minute for your final statement.

DERSHOWITZ: The war in the Middle East will stop any time the Arabs want it to stop. Israel has reiterated its unconditional willingness to comply with the ceasefire if the Arabs will only stop shooting. Indeed, General Dayan recently said, "the government is ready to reestablish an unconditional and unlimited cease-fire even if this will enable Egypt to reorganize and put up SAM-3 missile sites." But the Arabs persist in seeking a military solution rather than a negotiated settlement. Mr. Fisher said that the initiative for peace lies with Israel. If only this were true. All objective people know that Israel will do almost anything for peace. The initiative lies as it has since 1948 with the Arabs in general and with Nasser in particular. The United States must not black-mail Israel into jeopardizing its security. Should Israel ever lose a war we can understand what it would face by reading from the Jordanian military document captured during the 1967 War. The orders: destroy the agricultural village of Matzah and kill all its inhabitants.

PALMIERI: Let's go now to Mr. Fisher for your final statement, please.

FISHER: There's a very tough problem in the Middle East. It's not sure peace can be made. The sides as we have heard feel violently about the situation and are prepared to fight. Israel is prepared now to drop heavy bombs on Egypt, well beyond the Sinai, to reduce the possible risk that Russians might be able to get missiles there to help defend Egypt which is undercut their ability to inflict unlimited destruction on Egypt later. The Russians have put nothing there except defensive equipment, that is their position as General Barleff of Israel has said.

The problem is not should the United States rally to Israel's support in a hard pressed fight. The question is, shall we take sides with an overwhelming military superiority now on the Israeli side, shall we take sides or shall we be the peace-makers? I think it should not be hard if the United States uses its leverage to get talks started. You see how close we are on some process of indirect talks, some commitment to the resolution.

PALMIERI: Thank you both, gentlemen, for your very good arguments. We're now going to get a reaction from our studio audience. They've listened to both sides over two weeks programs. Before either argument was presented, we asked them to vote on the issue, and we'll show you the results of that in a moment. Now that they've heard both sides of the arguments we're going to take a second vote. Ladies and gentlemen, you all know the question. I'm sure you know how to vote. Are you ready? Remember to hold the lever down for a count of five. Go with me. Please vote now. Five, four, three, two, one.

All right, Now may we see the results of the first vote taken before our audience heard the arguments? And there it is. At that time 39 of our audience said, less military support of Israel; 31 said more. Now let's see what happened. How many changed their minds? And where did they go? Fourteen left; 11 went to the more side, 3 to not voting. Now of those 31 who originally favored more support, where did they go? Ten left. Almost as many. One to not voting and 9 to the left side. Now let's look at those 30 who were originally undecided. Nine left; 9 to more and 14 to less. Here's the final tally: a very even result somewhat more saying less support than more. Eleven still undecided. Gentlemen, congratulations to you both for very able arguments once again.

Well, you've heard these able arguments, all of you out there and now it's your turn. Your turn to register your vote. You know how to do it. Wherever you stand on the question of the United States giving more or less military support to the state of Israel, you as a citizen can make your position felt by writing "The Advocates" Box 1970, Boston, 02134. That's what this program is all about. We tabulate your views and we make them known to President Nixon. I've been told that he watches the program from time to time and members of the Congress and members of the cabinet. If you want to hear from other organizations than the one Mr. Fisher mentioned who are working on this problem, let us know. We'll do our best to put you in touch with them. Incidentally, we welcome your comments at any time, but if you want them to count on the tally, let us have them within two weeks. Remember the address, Box 1970, Boston, 01234. And now let's look ahead to next week.

FILM: ANNOUNCER: We'd like to know what you think of the Women's Liberation Movement.

VOICE: I think it's right on.

VOICE: I think it's a sick idea.

VOICE: No, no.

VOICE: Well, my feelings are very mixed on that subject.

VOICE: I suppose I'm in favor of it.

VOICE: Oh, please. I don't.

VOICE: They should stay home and have more babies.

VOICE: It's got some very good things about it.

VOICE: Women's Liberation? I'll tell you the truth I don't know what it means. I haven't taken that much interest in it. What's it supposed to mean?

VOICE: I like that, you know "I Love Lucy."

VOICE: I think that Women's Lib as far as employment is concerned, it's a great idea. As far as the rest, Viva La Difference!

ANNOUNCER: Women's Liberation. A question for "The Advocates," Sunday, June 28th.

PALMIERI: Thanks to both our advocates and our witnesses, I'm Victor Palmieri. Until next Sunday, thanks very much to you and good night.

ANNOUNCER: "The Advocates" as a program takes no position on the issues debated tonight. We ask each advocate to present responsible arguments not necessarily his own personal views. Our job is to help you understand both sides more clearly.

This program is made possible by grants from the Ford Foundation and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.