LAS VEGAS ISRAELITE

The Only English-Jewish Newspaper in Nevada P.O. Box 14096 Las Vegas, Nevada 89114 Published Bi-Weekly in Las Vegas, Nevada Per year \$24 — 2 years \$40 PHONE 702/876-1255

Bill Willard, Joe Behar, Trude Feldman,
David Horowitz & Rabbi Samuel Silver
Member of World-Union Press
Member of American Jewish Press Association
Member of Jewish Telegraphic Agency
Now in the 25th Year of Continuous Publication
Serving the Jewish Community of Nevada

ADL Statement The Terrorist Bind: Doing Nothing Is Appeasement

By Burton S. Levinson and Abraham H. Foxman

Mr. Levinson is national chairman of the Anti-Defamation League; Mr. Foxman is national director.

What to do about terrorism? The question came up again recently with a ferocity following the murder of Lt. Col. William Higgins by his radical Shi'ite captors.

There is much lip service paid to the notion that we shouldn't capitulate to the terrorists, that to appease them is to whet their appetite, that to reward their behavior is to cause them to repeat their behavior. Is doing nothing, however, not a form of appeasement? It may not be as blatant as paying money to the terrorists for hostages, but doesn't it amount to much the same thing? Terrorism can go on without sanction, that is the message of passivity.

Israel is the one country that does not merely pay lip service to the anti-terrorist struggle. It takes the splendid ideas formulated by former Secretary of State George Shultz and converts them to a living policy. Shultz said that we must take the offensive against terrorism. He said that we must use our intelligence networks. He said we must identify the terrorists, develop a consensus concerning the terrorist threat, and then take action.

Israel acted recently. Little violence was involved. A major initiator of Lebanese terrorism was seized. Not for revenge, but as a means to obtain the release of Israeli soldiers and Western hostages.

Now Lt. Col. Higgins is dead and some are doing exactly what the terrorists had in mind: directing their anger not at the source of this evil but at our Israeli ally.

How self-destructive can we be? Are we upset with Israel because she has the nerve to take actions that we are reluctant to take?

There is no easy way out of the terrorist bind. If we are not to capitulate, then there are limited ways to act. We can bomb, as we did in Libya. Many criticized us then. We can conduct a commando raid, but how many Entebbes are possible? Or we can look to beat the terrorists at their game, without succumbing to the abandonment of values endemic to terrorism.

Israel took the latter road, surely knowing that there were risks — to Israelis held in Lebanon as well as Americans. They sought, however, the most effective way to impress upon the terrorists that there is a price to be paid for their actions — the loss of their leader — without automatically causing the deaths of those held in capitivity (as would have resulted, for example, from Israeli bombing).

Those who criticize Israel apparently want to do nothing or even want to appease the terrorists more directly. They are not interested in national interest. They are not interested in how their appeasement will lead to others being taken hostage. They are simply interested in the here and now — avoidance at all costs of the horrible feeling that

came upon all of us with the news of William Higgins' death.

It is a reminder of what appeasement was about in the 1930s. People and governments were ready to do anything to avoid the horrible feeling that could come if there were conflict between Hitler and the democracies. They were ready to condemn Churchill, the leader of the anti-appeasement camp, sooner than Hitler himself. For Hitler the democratic refusal to face hard truths, to take risks, played right into his hands. And then it was too late.

It is legitimate to assess the wisdom of Israel's decision to seize Sheikh Obeid. Such an assessment, however, should not blur the fact that it is Israel above all other countries which is trying to deal in a responsible and serious manner with this scourge of terrorism. America and Americans should make clear that despite the grief surrounding the death of Lt. Col. Higgins, we won't compound the tragedy by handing the terrorists a victory which is their real aim — a rift between the two great democracies who are the main foes of terrorism and the main catalysts for democracy and peace in the Middle East.

Behind The Scenes

At The United Nations

By David Horowitz

A World-Union Press Feature

Senate Challenges Bush-Baker On The PLO

UNITED NATIONS (WUP) — While a lack of realism continues here at the UN regarding the terrorist PLO gang, it is gratifying to note that the vast majority of the U.S. Congress views the growing State Department involvement with Arafat and his henchmen with a deep sense of shame.

This was evidenced last week by the strong moves taken by the Senate to restrain President Bush and Secretary Baker from going overboard in their dialogue with the PLO.

The Senators, both Republicans and Democrats, were especially enraged over the recent U.S.-PLO talks which included, on the PLO side, Abu Iyad, Arafat's principle deputy, the founder of the Black September terrorist organization responsible for the murder of the 11 Israeli athletes at the Munich Olympics in 1972 and for the 1973 killing of America's Ambassador to the Sudan, Cleo Z. Noel, Jr. and his aide George C. Moore, in Khartoum.

Mr. Bush and his unscrupulous and venal Secretary Baker, in their pride and arrogance, just could not stomach what to them was a Congressional affront. They immediately convened and summoned some of the lawmakers appealing to them not to adopt the "anti-White House" resolution barring the U.S. from dealing with any PLO member who had been responsible for the death of an American citizen

Although Abu lyad, of course, was such a killer

King of One Liners



HENNY YOUNGMAN ... Man of Many Talents.

All of my X-wives were great house keepers. They each kept the house.

on the basis of the facts known to the world, it goes without saying that all Arafat's gangsters, including Arafat himself, are as guilty of murder as Abu lyad.

With President Bush's prestige at stake, he kept on pressing for a milder resolution. He was quoted as having stated that the limitations set in the amendment "would not be helpful" in the current dialogue on a settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian dispute.

"If you pass this amendment and shut down any negotiations with anybody that's ever breathed on the PLO," Bush declared, "then that's a big step backward, not a step forward."

What hutzpah! What arrogance!

How could Bush, prodded by his 'maker Baker, defend, as he has now, murderers of men, women and children, killers of not only Jews, but also of innocent Americans and others.

Unbelievable!

What struck Mr. Bush the hardest was the fact that Republican Jesse Helms stood out as one of the staunchest sponsors of the amendment which would bar the U.S. from negotiations with any PLO representative unless the President certifies to Congress that the Palestinian did not take part in terrorist activity that resulted in "the death, injury or kidnapping of an American citizen."

Coincidentally, the very day the N.Y. Times, in a front page story, reported on the Senators' action calling upon the White House to limit its talks with the PLO murderers, the same newspaper carried A.M. Rosenthal's column entitled "The Rewards of Terrorism." Here we have realism. Some of the highlights of his criticism of Bush and Baker are worth noting:

"The issue goes beyond that conflict between Israeli and Palestinian. It mocks the credibility of the United States as a fighter against terrorism anywhere. It strengthens the confidence and power of terrorist forces around the world."

This is plain language, Rosenthal concludes:

"The premature recognition of the PLO meant negotiation with terrorist and led swiftly and inevitably to negotiation with the killers of American civil servants. Mr. Helms and all who supported him deserve the credit due to those who make the country face an important truth, however nasty."

TELL TALES

"One Man Plus The Truth Constitutes A Majority"

(Continued from page 1)

its own interest and, especially, when Israelis are also being held hostage? This would deny Israel the right to act in its own defense. And as the New York Times suggests, it would result in an open invitation for all international terrorists to take whatever action they wish knowing that there will be no retribution.

The position of the United States should be courageous and determined. This is the time to stand with Israel against terrorism. Let not the mutual enemies of Israel and the United States cause dissension between two nations who place high a value on human lives and the civilized behavior of all people.

We applaud the members of Congress and the people of the United States who, at this difficult moment, were able to differentiate between rash condemnation of Israel and honest concern for American interests, and who understand that these interests include a renewed resolve to reinforce the American-Israel relationship.

Unfortunately, the recent elevation of terrorist Yasir Arafat, has given him international respectability, which is a disadvantage to all who believe that terrorists should be isolated from the civilized world community. The recognition of Arafat, gives de facto encouragement to terrorists to believe that the world is now willing to ignore all the past heinous acts which they have committed against Americans, Israelis and other innocent civilians.