of American Euromissiles and her own Pershing IAs, she is now being urged by her British, French, and American allies to station on her territory nuclear weapons of less than 500 km range, which she considers a threat above all to German soil, be it East or West German.”

The report goes on to explain that Europe cannot be defended without the United States. What must be done, therefore, is to build up the European pillar of the alliance. Around what existing “structures” could that be done? The authors stress the importance of the European Defense Charter published on Oct. 27, 1987 by the Western European Union, but they correctly point out that before worrying about structures, the three key European countries militarily—France, Great Britain, and West Germany—must start consulting and collaborating.

“Whatever difficulties may arise in nuclear cooperation, the INF double zero, today more than ever, requires a nuclear military dialogue between France and Great Britain. Even if cooperation in nuclear techniques seems sensitive, there are clearly many paths to the needed rapprochement, as long as both countries want to: technical problems that are not specifically nuclear, intelligence, submarine patrol zones, coordination in selecting objectives, transmissions, etc.

“France and Great Britain together seem called upon to reinforce, if not to recreate the intermediary nuclear echelon of deterrence in Europe. That requires close cooperation in the field of launchers: The British must be invited to participate in existing French programs, such as the ASMP (medium-range air-to-surface missiles) and the S4 [a mobile land-based ICBM], and vice versa, should the need arise. The French and the British must cooperatively study the cruise missile that Europeans lack.”

Modernizing French forces

Although it avoids the question of developing weapons based on new physical principles, the Renouveau-Défense group points out certain ways of modernizing French nuclear forces. “First of all, the future land-based missile S4 must be equipped with a counterforce capability, which is more credible for European defense than an anti-city capacity, in order to have at our disposal a ballistic missile with a high penetration capacity and a relatively long range, able to hit the rear of a possible Soviet offensive on the territory of the aggressor himself; then, France must very openly deploy enhanced radiation ammunition—better known as neutron bombs. . . . The conditions of use of such a weapon should be defined after consultation with our allies, especially the Germans. The neutron weapon would be a complement to already existing ‘classical’ tactical nuclear weapons, land-based missiles, artillery, airborne weapons of the alliance, which must of course be maintained.”

The authors then stress the importance of strengthening Franco-German military cooperation, and call upon France to reconsider her position vis-à-vis full membership in NATO.

Fundamentalists take over Israel riots

by Thierry Lalevée

Over the Feb. 20 weekend, a qualitative change began occurring in the riots which have been raging for two months in the Israeli occupied territories. In the short span of three days, two Palestinians were shot dead by Israeli civilian settlers, including a 13-year-old who was sitting on her doorstep, far from any demonstrations. At the same time, some Israeli soldiers began to be confronted not by stone-throwing children or adolescents, but by men trying to stab them; the first two bombs exploded in Gaza; and on Feb. 24, the first remote-controlled mine exploded near an Israeli Army patrol.

For many, the next stage is all too obvious. Al Hadaif, the weekly magazine of George Habash’s PFLP in Damascus, calls for creating armed bands in villages and the countryside, turning the demonstrations into general shoot-outs and ultimately into guerrilla warfare. As Israeli Defense Minister Yitzhak Rabin recognized, when he spoke on Feb. 21 of a “civil war” in the territories, this scenario may not take long to concrete.

The reason is that the political leadership on the Israeli and Palestinian sides has failed. Neither side has come up with any proposal acceptable to the other side which could solve the crisis. Instead, both have been trying to manipulate events for their own pragmatic aims. Israel’s Labor Party and the Likud have Israel’s upcoming general election in mind, while the PLO thinks in terms of reasserting its own organizational position within the Palestinian and Arab movement.

Islamic fundamentalists

Despite public claims, primarily in Western media, that his Palestine Liberation Organization is the natural and actual leader of the movement, Yasser Arafat probably knows better. The PLO played a minimal role in creating the “Command of the Unified Leadership of the Territories” which has been made known through eight mass leaflets. That “Command” called for, and organized, several general strikes in the territories and Jerusalem. If there are any Palestinian nationalists in this organization—which Israel’s Shin Beth
internal security service admits it has not been able to infiltrate—they are more likely to be followers of radicals George Habash or Ahmed Jibril than of the more moderate Arafat. But the real leadership, with its grassroots movement, shares little in common with Arab nationalism; it is Islamic.

Investigations show that there are at least six Islamic organizations which have led the movement from the start.

One prominent outfit is the Hezb Islamiyya al Tahril (Islamic Liberation Party), originally created in the 1950s in Jordan by a former associate of Hajj al Husseini, the Mufti of Jerusalem. The Islamic Liberation Party, active throughout the Muslim world, sponsored the creation of the first fundamentalist movement, the “Sons of the Villages,” in the early 1980s, on the West Bank. It now operates primarily from Lebanon, with close ties to the Iranian-tied Hezbollah. Penetration of Arafat’s Fatah faction of the PLO by the party was revealed after the Feb. 14 car-bomb explosion in Cyprus. The three Fatah commanders killed in their cars, close associates of Abu Jihad, the military commander of Fatah, were all members of the party.

Then there are the Islamic Revolutionary Movement, an Iranian-associated organization; the Gamaat Islamiyya (Islamic Organizations) in Gaza and Jerusalem; the Islamic Jihad from Gaza, created out of the local Al Azhar College; and the Legions of the Islamic Jihad, a paramilitary Iranian-linked organization responsible for several bombings in Jerusalem itself, as well as the killing of one Shin Beth officer in Gaza. There are also members of a dissident branch of the old Muslim Brotherhood, who are now led by Sheikh Abd elaziz Odeh and operate both in the West Bank and Gaza.

Jewish fundamentalism

A carbon copy of these kinds of forces is now operating inside the Israeli camp, with the self-avowed aim of fighting both against the Palestinians and the Israeli Army if their goals are not met. Speaking in the Knesset (Israel’s parliament) on Feb. 24, Geula Cohen, who has been associated with the organization of the Jewish settlers movement on the West Bank, Gush Emunin, and the Takhya Party of nuclear scientist Yuval Neeman, warned that “Judea and Samaria are not the Sinai; there will be war” if the government starts negotiations over the territories. And while members of Neeman’s party are lobbying Knesset members against any political concessions, the more radical organization of Rabbi Meir Kahane, the Kach, operates directly in the territories. In the first week of February, Kach members went on an armed rampage in the city of Hebron.

Kach and Takhya are only the political form of a more clandestine movement which the Jerusalem Post of Feb. 19 described as the “national-religious messianic movement” of Israel. For most, the precepts to be followed are those outlined by Chief Rabbi Avraham Yitzhak Kook, the spiritual leader of Gush Emunin, now led by his son, Rabbi Zvi Yehuda Hacohen Kook. According to the senior Kook, the Jews have three mitzvot, or duties, to perform in the Holy Land: Malchut, meaning the building of statehood, Kodesh, meaning matters of religion and concretely speaking the rebuilding of Solomon’s Third Temple where the Aqsa and Omar Mosque now stand, and the destruction of Amalek, meaning the Arabs. According to the Jerusalem Post, a debate is now ongoing inside these religious circles on whether the Third Temple should be rebuilt first, or whether the Arabs have to be destroyed beforehand. This debate goes through dozens of organizations such as the Temple Mount Guardians of the Temple Mount Faithful which tried to penetrate the two mosques last October. Meanwhile some, according to the Jerusalem Post, are “already sewing the garments to adorn the Third Temple’s priests.”

Ultimately, the backers of Islamic and Jewish fundamentalists are the same. A case in point, documented by EIR in several Special Reports, is the role in the arms-for-Iran negotiations of State Department adviser Michael Ledeen, who also figures prominently in the Jewish fundamentalist scripts for destroying the Temple Mount. The local confrontation between the Islamicists and Israel’s messianic movement which such evil meddlers are fueling, is an explosive one. As the fuse shorts, Israeli and Palestinian politicians will come to bitterly regret not having made the right concessions at the right time.