

FROM LA. B'NAI B'RITH MESSENGER

The Avengers

LAST week Arab terrorists who assaulted an Israeli passenger aircraft in Athens, Greece, murdered a passenger in cold blood. Their intention was to commit mass murder, but their machine gun bullets went awry.

These Arab terrorists told police, when they were arrested, that they had come from Beirut, Lebanon, which they themselves called the headquarters of Arab gangs.

Israel reacted swiftly. But Israel reacted humanely. Their helicopters swept from the skies over Beirut. They destroyed 13 Lebanese passenger planes in a skilled and daring operation. Not one life was taken or lost in the raid—a remarkable tribute to the training and the skill of the Israelis.

The reprisal stresses the basic differences between the Jewish and Arab positions in the Middle East—the Israeli with his high regard for human life; the Arab with perpetual murderous intent.

There are many who question the weight of the Israeli reprisal against a "moderate" Arab nation. But the record clearly shows that Lebanon has deserted that role and that it has been caught up in the Arab terror orbit.

Of course, the "infallible" American State Department, whose attitudes in the Middle East have been remarkably close to the Russian position over the years, won't admit that Lebanon could be so "usurped."

There is always a strange silence from the State Department whenever Arab terrorists, for whom the Arab governments must, under international law, accept responsibility. Did you hear any hue and cry from Foggy Bottom (U.S. State Department) when 12 Israelis died in a market place blast? Was there any great diplomatic dilemma on Pennsylvania Avenue when Arab terrorists forced an Israeli plane to land in Algiers and then held both passengers and crew captive? Did the attack on an El Al plane in Athens evoke any anger—real or simulated—from Mr. Rusk and Mr. Rostow?

Israeli school busses carrying children are fair targets according to this philosophy. Bombs placed on soccer fields to maim or kill athletes are perfectly permissible under this logic. Guns shelling farmers and children at work and play are an acceptable routine thing to our State Department.

But reprisals — clean-cut reprisals in which no human lives are lost—these, according to Mr. Wiggins, the lame duck United Nations ambassador, are reprehensible.

Once again the Israelis have challenged not only the morality of the United Nations, but of our own State Department as well.

Israel may stand condemned by the United Nations—which has stamped itself as an inept, phony and hypocritical "peace keeping" organization with a double standard. Double standard? Lord! Where were those UN hypocrites when the bolsheviks marched into Czechoslovakia?

But Israel has, in effect, accomplished much. She has told the Arab world that it must be responsible for the comings-and-goings and death-dealing of its terrorists. She has by her reprisal forays deep into Egypt, Jordan, and now Beirut, warned the Arabs in no uncertain terms that in the event of an all-out war Israeli commandos can and will strike at Cairo, Damascus and Bagdad within minutes.

Israel can live with a United Nations condemnation. But it cannot live with constant harassment from illegal, murdering, marauding Arab guerrillas who, in fact, make a mockery of the United Nations own truce. The matter is simpler than U Thant, UN Secretary General, and the nations of the world make it out to be. The guerrillas are actually supported by and harbored by the Arab States. Therefore, they constitute the military arms of those nations.

The U.N. doesn't want to recognize this, however, simply because, in its weakness, it can't cope with it. Therefore, condemnation or not, Israel must act unilaterally in its own self interest.

She must and she will, in the future, give 'em hell. She has to in order to survive.

TELL TALES

"One Man Plus The Truth
Constitutes A Majority"

BY JACK TELL



(Continued from Page 1)

stitution, there were two schools of thought, according to historians, who researched the circumstances surrounding the event. While probably all the leaders who fought and won the Revolutionary War, were in favor of a government for the people, there apparently was some apprehension of a government by the people. Although it is not written anywhere, and despite the majority vote rule, some of those elected to represent a segment of the population, felt that the people needed protection against themselves. Anyone, who had commanded enough votes to top all others, the thought persisted, certainly would know what was best for those who had elected him. Mebbe so.

This may be true where a proposed law is a most question that has never been presented to the voters. The legislator must then determine in his own mind and conscience whether to vote for the law or not. We go a step further. It is our philosophy that when a moot question arises, it is not the mind and conscience of the elected official that becomes the determining factor, but his judgement on how he feels his constituents want him to vote. That is the big difference. Of course, if the elected official uses wrong judgement or guesses incorrectly, he is not re-elected.

There have been instances where the public voiced its opinion in passing a new law, as in the 18th Amendment on liquor prohibition, which was adopted by all states except Rhode Island and Connecticut. It was subsequently repealed by the 21st Amendment, which went into effect after being adopted by a bare 36 of the 48 states, then in the union. Here we have the people disavowing a law that they, they people, had supported in the first case. Here is the rub. At the time of the passing of the 18th Amendment, no one dared to suppress its enforcement, although many were against it, who were subsequently proven correct by its repeal.

The point we are making is that those elected to serve us, must of necessity on many occasions, use their own judgement in determining what laws we desire and what not. Certainly, when we determine what we want, no man, no body, no group, is empowered, by his judgement, his conscience, or even his soul to dispute the will of the majority. If the act he is directed to put into effect is so reprehensible, his recourse is to resign.

There are many times that laws are passed to protect people from themselves, i.e., the aforementioned liquor, narcotics, even gambling in many states. Recently it was decided in Congress to control the wordage on cigarette wrappings to warn against cancer. Who knows, it may be deemed necessary to abolish all smoking as a hazard to public health. If such a law were to be passed, undoubtedly it would be put into effect and enforced. Its popularity and degree of enforcement (as witness former bootleggers and present illegal bookmakers) are matters which will ultimately be determined by the voting public.

But in the case of the Firemen's raise in Las Vegas, it already has been determined by the voting public. The City Commission feels that the voting public was wrong. The Commission has commenced a suit to determine the constitutionality of the mandate of the voting public. Undoubtedly, the Commission is stalling, hoping enough time will elapse until the May elections, hoping then the voting public will renounce its prior decision and deny the Firemen their raises.

No matter what happens at the May elections, it is the contention of this writer that the Firemen are entitled to added wages, retroactive to July, 1968 as prescribed by referendum on the ballot.

For this contention we go back to the Constitution itself.

Article 1 states that no state shall pass laws impairing the obligation of contracts. We do not feel that this portion of the Constitution has been violated by the mandate of the voting public granting a raise increase to the Firemen. As a matter of fact, we feel that a law (or contract) has been entered into between the people and the firemen, which should be enforced without qualification.

With all due respect to the legal background supporting the Commission, we cannot find any other portion of the U. S. Constitution that might apply in this case. There is one blanketing portion of the Constitution, Article 10 of the Bill of Rights which states: The powers not delegated to the U. S. by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Once more, we urge the City Commission to stop pussyfooting around and grant the Firemen their pay raise. If the commissioners persist in balking, the Las Vegas Israelite demands a recall, and will be the first to sign a petition seeking to oust them from office.

LAS VEGAS ISRAELITE

PHONE 870-1255

Published Every Friday in Las Vegas, Nevada
Price per copy 15c - Per year \$6 - 2 Years \$10
P.O. BOX 14096 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89114
Editor and Publisher Jack Tell
Business Manager Bea Tell, 870-1255
Vegas News Helene Stadler, 384-3685
Reno News Diane Neiman, 1622 York, Sparks
and Barney Glazer, Nathan Ziprin, Percy Villa.

2nd Class Mail, Las Vegas, Nev.

Member American Jewish Press Association
Member of Worldwide News Service**EDITORIAL**

(Continued from Page 1)

with those kind of Jews.

It seems fairly established that Russia does not want another Arab-Israel war at this time, and for obvious reasons. The two billion in arms that Russia invested and lost in the Six Day War of June, 1967, has been replenished, but the Commies don't feel like going for that amount again so soon. Russia's main aim in encouraging the harrasing tactics of Arab terrorists, is to find a way to reopen the Suez Canal, which was closed to shipping during the Mideast War 18 months ago. Russia needs the canal to transport war supplies to North Vietnam. If it is the shortest route through the Indian Ocean, Russia is using the condemnation of Israel in the UN as a power play to force Israel to allow the canal to reopen. Israel has its own advantages in the reopening of the canal, but refuses to be benefitted at the expense of the lives of American soldiers. You see, Israel is a democracy, the only one in the Mideast, and a friend of America. Russia's ulterior motive is being thwarted. So we say to Hell with Russia.

Internally, the Arab countries are reaching a state of bewilderment and confusion. Old leaders, like Nasser in Egypt and Hussein in Jordan are being badgered by young commando officers, leading terrorist groups, who demand action. Guerrilla maraudings are becoming bolder and are receiving the sanction of the heads of state. Lebanon, formerly considered a moderate antagonist against Israel, because of its weakness at the top, has become the chief haven for the Arab mobs. The premiere has resigned and the government has been engulfed in a crisis, which could break out into civil war any minute. At this same time it endorsed a military conscription that will bring 100,000 under arms within months. Lebanon is no longer the moderate antagonist of Israel. So we say to Hell with Lebanon.

Here in America, Washington gossip columnists Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson, chose this psychological moment to break a story about Israeli intrusion into American politics. Feeding fodder to every anti-Semite in America, the story tells of an Israeli award to Hamilton Fish, ex-Congressman, who was a notorious Nazi sympathizer before and after World War 2. The award was given at a ceremony attended by two leading New York Republican Jews, Sen. Jacob Javits and Atty. Gen. Louis Lefkowitz, career politicians who probably would sacrifice their religion for their own political futures. The reason for the award was to gather votes for Ham Fish Jr., running for U. S. Representative on the Republican ticket. He won by two per cent. It is obvious that Israel was used as a dupe by Javits and Lefkowitz, who maneuvered the N. Y. Consul General into setting up the award. The Consul has since been recalled to Israel.

But Pearson and Anderson use the above story as a springboard into an editorial that castigates Israel into a low, mean and power-seeking nation. The Bierut retaliation, says Pearson and Anderson "emphasized the power of Israel to carry out the Old Testament doctrine of an eye-for-an-eye." This accusation is an outrageous, deliberate lie, because Pearson and Anderson know full well the Arabs murdered, while the Jews went to risky and deliberate pains to destroy only property.

Now comes the whopper of dirty, filthy, yellow journalism: "If the eye-for-an-eye policy were adopted by Washington," it's pointed out, "we would have bombed Jordan for the murder of Sen. Robert F. Kennedy by a Jordanese citizen in Los Angeles."

We here and now tell Pearson and Anderson there is a difference between the brutal, untimely and unwarranted murder of Sen. Kennedy and the humane, timely, and necessary retaliation by Israel against Bierut. The difference is so large that the application by these two columnist bums, shows an anti-Semitism matching the

(Continued on Page 5)