

JACK TELL'S NEWSPAPER

LAS VEGAS ISRAELITE

OF NEVADA

"The News We Dreamed We Had"

THE ONLY ENGLISH-JEWISH NEWSPAPER IN NEVADA

P.O. BOX 14096
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89114

Published every Friday in Las Vegas, Nevada
Price per copy 15c - Per year \$7 - 2 years \$12

PHONE 876-1255

Publisher Bea Tell, 876-1255
Editor Jack Tell, 876-1255
Business Manager Bea Tell, 876-1255
Vegas News Helene Stadler, 384-3685

MARK TAN, DICK McINNES, TRUDE FELDMAN,
DAVID HOROWITZ, RABBI SAMUEL SILVER,
BONNIE TELL

2nd Class Postage Paid at Las Vegas, Nevada
Member of World-Union Press
Member American Jewish Press Association
Member of Worldwide News Service
Now in 12th Year of Continuous Weekly Publication
Serving the Jewish Community of the State of Nevada

Illusion of Policy

Israel received a rude awakening when William Scranton, the new American Ambassador to the United Nations, said that Jewish settlements in Israeli-occupied territories were illegal and an obstacle to peace negotiations.

During the six months that Daniel P. Moynihan was the U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., Israel lulled itself into thinking that the statements by the flamboyant professor was the true policy of the United States. Moynihan's statements, which were sometimes more pro-Israel than the Israelis made thunder, apparently received the backing of President Ford and Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger. But this thunder was more with respect to the domestic political realities.

But Scranton speaks with the real voice of American policy which is to support Israel's right to exist while at the same time seeking to win the Arab States. Scranton's negative statements on settlements and the status of Jerusalem were nothing new. He had voiced them as "even handedness" when he toured the Middle East for Mr. Nixon several years back.

But the Israelis were shocked to hear it in the Security Council where the Israeli occupation was under attack by the Arabs and their supporters as an "oppressive" rule. Israelis had expected to count on their one friend, the United States, to defend it.

The shock was even greater because it came after the close support Israel had received from Moynihan. Obviously Israel's foreign policy with respect to the U.S. must be based on reality, not on illusions or wishful thinking.

Behind The Scenes

At The United Nations

By DAVID HOROWITZ

A World-Union Press Feature

Scranton's New Style A Boost to Arabs

UNITED NATIONS (WUP) -- The U.S. veto of the much watered-down anti-Israeli resolution in the face of fourteen positive votes came as a great surprise to everyone here at the UN, especially in light of the fact that the sponsors of the draft had taken such great pains in amending it so as to make it coincide in essence with Ambassador Scranton's strong criticism of Israel's occupation as contained in his opening speech. The Arabs had looked forward to a positive American vote or at least to an abstention, which would have carried the resolution.

When William W. Scranton first appeared at the UN and met with the press after having presented his credentials to the Secretary-General, he gave correspondents the firm impression that he would not deviate from the path laid out by his dynamic predecessor Moynihan. The only difference, he stated, would be that he would approach issues with a "change of style."

As much as his veto was welcomed by Israel and world Jewry, the fact remains that his first major address in the one-sided Security Council made it clear what he had meant by a "change of style." Israel's enemies were delighted,



FORMER SOVIET COLONEL NAUM ALSHANSKY, (RIGHT) WHILE TOURING THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SOVIET JEWRY, MET WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF VETERAN'S GROUPS TO GAIN SUPPORT FOR COLONEL LEV OVISISHCHER AND COLONEL EFIM DAVIDOVICH, WHO HAVE REPEATEDLY BEEN DENIED THEIR RIGHT TO EMIGRATE TO ISRAEL. ALSHANSKY RECEIVED PERMISSION TO EMIGRATE LAST FEBRUARY, WITH HIS WIFE AND TWO CHILDREN. AT LEFT IS COLONEL IRWIN R. ZIFF, (RET.) NATIONAL EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, JEWISH WAR VETERANS, WITH JOE RAMSEY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL SERVICE FOUNDATION (AMVETS). (PHOTO COURTESY OF NCSJ).

They heard a new U.S. song.

Let's take a good look.

True, Scranton pointed to resolutions 242 and 338 as having "established a basic bargain that would constitute a settlement...for a just and durable peace in the Middle East."

Having said this, he then spoke of the need of regaining a new "momentum" for a settlement and it was here that he revealed what his "change of style" actually meant. In effect, it meant the turning of the clock back not only to 1967 but to 1947-48 and to all the outmoded UN resolutions which in the course of the years and in the reality of subsequent events had lost all validity. It was here, it seemed that he had joined the camp of Israel's enemies.

In an attempt to justify this his "new style," he leaned heavily on a 1969 statement made by former Ambassador Yost -- no friend of Israel -- whom he quoted as having declared that "the part of Jerusalem that came under the control of Israel in the June war, like other areas occupied by Israel, is occupied territory and hence subject to the provisions of international law governing the rights and obligations of an occupying power. He also invoked a near-similar statement by former Ambassador Goldberg.

What Scranton completely forgot were historic facts. He forgot that Israel had retaken those territories from an actual illegal occupier, namely Jordan, which, in a war of aggression, had occupied the West Bank in 1948. He forgot that all of Palestine, including what is now Jordan, was originally adjudicated as the National Jewish Home by the League of Nations. But, more important, he forgot that the Arabs, to whom he was now seemingly catering, had sought to destroy the Jewish State on four occasions. Finally, he overlooked biblical history and Jewry's eternal link to Jerusalem and their current prophetic return to the City of David.

And yet he had the hutzpah to say that the "substantially resettlement of the Israeli civilian population in occupied territories, including East Jerusalem, is illegal...and cannot be considered to have prejudged the outcome of future negotiations between the parties on the location of borders between the states in the Middle East."

He cited the Fourth Geneva Convention on the issue of population transfers in Article 49: "The occupying power shall not deport or transfer parts of its own civilian population into the territory it occupies." "My Government," he stated, "believes that international law sets the appropriate standards. An occupier must maintain the occupied areas as intact and unaltered as possible...and any changes must be consistent with international law."

TELL TALES

"One Man Plus The Truth
Constitutes A Majority"

BY JACK TELL



(Continued from Page 1)

a city in itself with world-famous shops, a movie house and pari-mutual Jai Alai. It can handle with comfort tens of thousands and is reported to have a "nut" of \$1,000,000 a day.

Not far behind is the Las Vegas Hilton, truly a metropolis, and the other edifices of every beguiling, bewitching design and hue, that turned a barren desert into an area of enchantment. Starting at one end there's the Sahara, Thunderbird, Riviera, Circus Circus, Stardust, Silver Slipper, Landmark, Desert Inn, Frontier, Castaways, Sands, Flamingo, Caesar's Palace, Dunes, Alladdin, Marina, Tropicana and Hacienda.

For big name attractions on hand you have a choice of Wayne Newton, Buddy Hackett, Dean Martin, Shirley MacLaine, Rowan and Martin, John Davidson and the country-music swinger Hank Thompson. For those who prefer extravagant presentations there are four outstanding girlie revues and an ice show.

They are all here. They are all open and waiting for you, and you, and especially you. See you around.

And we ask Scranton: since when have nations abided by international law? Certainly not after World War I nor after World War II. Moreover, in all wars, the aggressor is always penalized by the loss of territories and the transfer of populations. All we have to do is to look at the map of Europe as it is today and as it was before the two World Wars.

In the case of Israel on the question of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, there is no issue involving the acquisition of territory of another state. Both areas are within historic Israel. Neither Jordan nor Egypt has any legal rights there. As for the Sinai and the Golan -- these territories, in the view of Jerusalem, can be discussed and settled only through direct negotiations -- something Damascus and Cairo refuse to enter into.

So what does Scranton want? Apparently, on the basis of his charge that Israel's occupation is illegal, he wants the Jewish State to do what no other nation in the world has ever done before, namely, relinquish territory, in Israel's case, territory that never actually belonged to any other country. He thus invoked the double standard by demanding that Israel be an exception to the rule just in order to appease the "tyranny of the majority" here.

And as regards the incident on the Temple Mount -- over which the Security Council, at the behest of Libya and Pakistan, found it so greatly important to summon a special session -- Scranton admitted (mazel tov!) that "Israel's punctillious administration of the holy places in Jerusalem has, in our judgment, greatly minimized tension" (his main argument for casting the veto and not on the issue of what he had termed Israel's "illegal occupation of Jerusalem," etc.)

Although he expressed gratification at the ruling of Israel's Supreme Court, he was completely wrong in stating that the "ruling of a lower court" on the validity of Jewish prayers in the courtyard of the Temple Mount "would have the effect of altering the status of Haram" (and here he found it expedient to use the Arab name of the Mount). Surely, he must have known that here was no violation at all; that the prayers of a small group of religious Jews -- not in the Mosque, as some of the Arabs charged -- in the open courtyard violated no existing law.

The new U.S. Ambassador certainly also knew that the complaint put forward by Libya and Pakistan to the effect that the Israeli lower court had approved the "right of Jews to pray in the Al Aqsa Mosque" was, as Ambassador Herzog told the Council, "a damnable lie" and a "mischievous and sinister attempt to incite religious feeling for political purposes."

Yet Mr. Scranton seemingly did not take Herzog's charges seriously even when he said with regard to the prayer incident that "this would be comic, as would the entire proceedings."

(Continued on Page 5)