

05.24.2011

Does This Make Sense?

Okay, so let me get this straight. A small, struggling people, most of whose population was wiped out in the European Holocaust, declares its independence with the permission of the United Nations. A combined, organized enemy force of four nations attempts to drive the small band of heroes into the city. The war results in a stalemate, with the nation less than one-third the size of New Jersey and under 3 million people barely hanging on to a tiny strip of Mediterranean land. After 18 years of hateful rhetoric, the same group of neighborhood bullies, with a few additional mean-spirited friends, once again attacks this nation of now almost 3 million people in order to enact the second “final solution” of this century. This time, however, the infant nation with its people steeped in antiquity, not only survives but finally establishes safe and defensible borders. That is a good thing, right?

Now comes the world, and the United States, and tells its supposed best friend that it should retreat to the armistice lines of 1949 which fueled the ambitions of both the prior wars of genocide against the State of Israel. What people, with even a few brain cells left, would agree to its own suicidal death pact?

This is exactly what some in the world community are asking Israel to do. The Arabs would not accept a Jewish nation when the United Nations drafted its partition agreement to create in another Arab nation called Palestine alongside the State of Israel. Memories are short. When Israel was attacked in 1948 its weapons had been sequestered by the British who formerly ruled the land. The United States was not yet shipping arms to Israel which barely hung on to the land it was given by virtue of a promise by the British Balfour Declaration and promises by the League of Nations in World War I. The 1948 war was fought by the Arabs, including the grand mufti of Jerusalem, thanks to modern weapons supplied by the Nazis in World War II (which had ended only three years before), and the British who turned over most of their arms to Arab forces. The Israelis defended themselves with Molotov cocktails, Piper Cub airplanes, and with some minor military assistance from the French.

The Arab world was not satisfied with Israel existing on a thin strip of coastal land. The Israelis were literally left dangling outside of a skyscraper window, hanging by their fingertips. The Arab world led by Jordan, Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia and others attempted the second final solution of the century in 1967. The first final solution was Adolf Hitler’s mass slaughter of 6 million Jews in Europe. Apparently not enough Jewish blood had been spilled in the 20th century.

Israel, by the grace of the good Lord, prevailed in 1967 and redeemed the Sinai Peninsula, the Golan Heights (which is a border area with Syria), and the West Bank of the Jordan River. These areas provided some safety and security for the Jewish people. However, Israel, in an overabundance of a sentiment which the Christians call “turning the other cheek,” gave back the rich oil and gas lands of Sinai to Egypt in return for a promise of peace. That cold peace has existed with Egypt, but now is in jeopardy as the Muslim brotherhood seeks to assume the power in that nation. The fomenters of terror in the Muslim Brotherhood have made clear that they will not respect the peace treaty with Israel, and what does Israel have as security? The answer is nothing. Israel gave back land for what may very well prove to be an empty guarantee of peace.

Israel has integrated the Golan Heights, a tiny land area along the Israel-Syrian border, to protect its valley farms below. This can never be returned in any peace deal. How could the Israelis trust the Syrians, whose leaders routinely slaughter their own people? Perhaps as many as 25,000 Syrians and Palestinians have been killed by the current and prior leader in Syria so that one particular tribe can stay in power. Syria is one of the darkest, deepest and most tyrannical dictatorships on earth. Should Israel give back the small security it

receives from the Golan Heights overlooking its pastoral farms in return for a nonexistent promise of nothingness?

What about the West Bank in East Jerusalem? There really is no such thing as East Jerusalem. Jerusalem, as a result of the 1949 armistice, was split between the traditional old city and the new city of Jerusalem built up by the Jews in that portion of the West Bank which they were barely able to hold onto in the 1948 war. The West Bank is composed of Palestinians, many of whom were placed in refugee camps by the very Arabs who attempted to destroy Israel on at least two occasions. Those pawns in the Arab effort to exterminate Jews are the responsibility of the Arab regimes which created them.

Should Israel reduce its width to between 5 and 12 miles in order to create yet another Arab regime which, in the words of a former U.S. Vice President, would be yet another knife in the back of Israel? What security could any unstable regime in the West Bank of the Jordan River ever give to Israel? We have the example of the Gaza Strip, which Israel returned to Palestinians which only became a launching pad for thousands of missiles raining down on southern Israel. The Palestinians did not make good use of the Gaza Strip, but rather did everything they could to make their poor, impoverished population into murderers and suicide bombers. The rag tag remains of the European Holocaust had the same option when they created the modern State of Israel in 1948, but the Jews did not do this. Instead, the Israeli State educated its people, provided health care, and built one of the most modern pro-western democracies in the world.

Simply stated, Israel cannot give up the West Bank in return for more empty promises. Israel would be committing blatant suicide. What Israel can and should do is incorporate within its land defensible borders, including the ancient city of Jerusalem and other areas of the West Bank not needed by the Palestinians who live there. In the areas of the Palestinian state which are thus created, there must be a non-militarized government with the control of the Jordan River border clearly in the hands of our democratic ally, Israel.

Any other resolution of the Middle Eastern conflict is not only dangerous to Israel, but would be a vital threat to the security of the United States. The last thing the United States needs is another fanatical, terrorist Muslim regime hurling missiles, bombs, and assassins at the interests of the United States around the world. Securing the safety and security of Israel is in the national interests of the United States.

The two major actions which the United States can take to satisfy its own interests are to become energy independent and to place our loyal support behind the vibrant, militarily and economically independent, third Jewish commonwealth. While the first two Jewish Commonwealths existed during the Biblical time, the third must be protected today and the fourth will be initiated by the arrival of the Messiah.

Clifford A. Rieders, Esquire  
Rieders, Travis, Humphrey, Harris,  
Waters & Waffenschmidt  
161 West Third Street  
Williamsport, PA 17701  
(570) 323-8711 (telephone)  
(570) 323-4192 (facsimile)

Cliff Rieders, who practices law in Williamsport, is Past President of the Pennsylvania Trial Lawyers Association and a member of the Pennsylvania Patient Safety Authority. None of the opinions expressed necessarily represent the views of these organizations.