

**What You Need To Know  
About The Misinformation**

# **In Jimmy Carter's New Book**

**A Variety of Responses to  
*Palestine: Peace not Apartheid***

## **INSIDE**

“The World According to Jimmy Carter,” by Alan Dershowitz

“Jimmy Carter’s Calumny: A review of ‘Palestine Peace Not Apartheid’”  
Review by Mitchell Bard

Letter of Resignation of Dr. Kenneth Stein from the Carter Center

“Jimmy Carter’s Disingenuous Diplomacy,” by Rick Richman

**Compiled and Distributed by StandWithUs**

# The World According to Jimmy Carter

## Alan Dershowitz

*November 22, 2006*



I like Jimmy Carter. I have known him since he began his run for president in early 1976. I worked hard for his election, and I have admired the work of the Carter Center throughout the world. That's why it troubles me so much that this decent man has written such an indecent book about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

His bias against Israel shows by his selection of the book's title: "Palestine: Peace not Apartheid." The suggestion that without peace Israel is an apartheid state analogous to South Africa is simply wrong. The basic evil of South African apartheid, against which I and so many other Jews fought, was the absolute control over a majority of blacks by a small minority of whites. It was the opposite of democracy. In Israel majority rules; it is a vibrant secular democracy, which just today recognized gay marriages performed abroad. Arabs serve in the Knesset, on the Supreme Court and get to vote for their representatives, many of whom

strongly oppose Israeli policies. Israel has repeatedly offered to end its occupation of areas it captured in a defensive war in exchange for peace and full recognition. The reality is that other Arab and Muslim nations do in fact practice apartheid. In Jordan, no Jew can be a citizen or own land. The same is true in Saudi Arabia, which has separate roads for Muslims and non-Muslims. Even in the Palestinian authority, the increasing influence of Hamas threatens to create Islamic hegemony over non-Muslims. Arab Christians are leaving in droves.

Why then would Jimmy Carter invoke the concept of apartheid in his attack on Israel? Even he acknowledges--though he buries this toward the end of his book--that what is going on in Israel today "is unlike that in South Africa--not racism, but the acquisition of land." But Israel's motive for holding on to this land is the prevention of terrorism. It has repeatedly offered to exchange land for peace and did so in Gaza and southern Lebanon only to have the returned land used for terrorism, kidnappings and rocket launchings.

I don't know why Jimmy Carter, who is generally a careful man, allowed so many errors and omissions to blemish his book. Here are simply a few of the most egregious.

- Carter emphasizes that "Christian and Muslim Arabs had continued to live in this same land since Roman times," but he ignores the fact that Jews have lived in Hebron, Tzfat, Jerusalem, and other cities for even longer. Nor does he discuss the expulsion of hundreds of thousands of Jews from Arab countries since 1948.
- Carter repeatedly claims that the Palestinians have long supported a two-state solution and the Israelis have always opposed it. Yet he makes no mention of the fact that in 1938 the Peel Commission proposed a two-state solution with Israel receiving a mere sliver of its ancient homeland and the Palestinians receiving the bulk of the land. The Jews accepted and the Palestinians rejected this proposal, because Arab leaders cared more about there being no Jewish state on Muslim holy land than about having a Palestinian state of their own.
- He barely mentions Israel's acceptance, and the Palestinian rejection, of the U.N.'s division of the mandate in 1948.

- He claims that in 1967 Israel launched a preemptive attack against Jordan. The fact is that Jordan attacked Israel first, Israel tried desperately to persuade Jordan to remain out of the war, and Israel counterattacked after the Jordanian army surrounded Jerusalem, firing missiles into the center of the city. Only then did Israel capture the West Bank, which it was willing to return in exchange for peace and recognition from Jordan.
- Carter repeatedly mentions Security Council Resolution 242, which called for return of captured territories in exchange for peace, recognition and secure boundaries, but he ignores the fact that Israel accepted and all the Arab nations and the Palestinians rejected this resolution. The Arabs met in Khartoum and issued their three famous “no’s”: “No peace, no recognition, no negotiation” but you wouldn’t know that from reading the history according to Carter.
- Carter faults Israel for its “air strike that destroyed an Iraqi nuclear reactor” without mentioning that Iraq had threatened to attack Israel with nuclear weapons if they succeeded in building a bomb.
- Carter faults Israel for its administration of Christian and Muslim religious sites, when in fact Israel is scrupulous about ensuring every religion the right to worship as they please--consistent, of course, with security needs. He fails to mention that between 1948 and 1967, when Jordan occupied the West Bank and East Jerusalem, the Hashemites destroyed and desecrated Jewish religious sites and prevented Jews from praying at the Western Wall. He also never mentions Egypt’s brutal occupation of Gaza between 1949 and 1967.
- Carter blames Israel, and exonerates Arafat, for the Palestinian refusal to accept statehood on 95% of the West Bank and all of Gaza pursuant to the Clinton-Barak offers of Camp David and Taba in 2000-2001. He accepts the Palestinian revisionist history, rejects the eye-witness accounts of President Clinton and Dennis Ross and ignores Saudi Prince Bandar’s accusation that Arafat’s rejection of the proposal was “a crime” and that Arafat’s account “was not truthful”--except, apparently, to Carter. The fact that Carter chooses to believe Yasir Arafat over Bill Clinton speaks volumes.
- Carter’s description of the recent Lebanon war is misleading. He begins by asserting that Hezbollah captured two Israeli soldiers. “Captured” suggest a military apprehension subject to the usual prisoner of war status. The soldiers were kidnapped, and have not been heard from--not even a sign of life. The rocket attacks that preceded Israel’s invasion are largely ignored, as is the fact that Hezbollah fired its rockets from civilian population centers.
- Carter gives virtually no credit to Israel’s superb legal system, falsely asserting (without any citation) that “confessions extracted through torture are admissible in Israeli courts,” that prisoners are “executed” and that the “accusers” act “as judges.” Even Israel’s most severe critics acknowledge the fairness of the Israeli Supreme Court, but not Carter.
- Carter even blames Israel for the “exodus of Christians from the Holy Land,” totally ignoring the Islamization of the area by Hamas and the comparable exodus of Christian Arabs from Lebanon as a result of the increasing influence of Hezbollah and the repeated assassination of Christian leaders by Syria.
- Carter also blames every American administration but his own for the Mideast stalemate with particular emphasis on “a submissive White House and U.S. Congress in recent years.” He employs hyperbole and overstatement when he says that “dialogue on controversial issues is a privilege to be extended only as a reward for subservient behavior and withheld from those who reject U.S. demands.” He confuses terrorist states, such as Iran and Syria to which we do not extend dialogue, with states with whom we strongly disagree, such as France and China, with whom we have constant dialogue.

I hope President Carter will seriously consider addressing these omissions and mistakes. He begins his book tour soon and he will have an opportunity to correct the record.

# APARTHEID SOUTH AFRICA



# DEMOCRATIC ISRAEL

## Blacks in South Africa

## Arab citizens of Israel

White minority population controlled government and oppressed black majority. Lawmakers segregated Blacks and deprived them of equal rights and opportunities.

A Jewish majority state that respects pluralism. All minorities, including the 20% who are Israeli Arabs, have full and equal rights, representation and protections.

Blacks excluded from central government and denied right to vote in national elections.

Israeli Arabs are citizens with full voting rights and political parties and are elected members of Israel's parliament, the Knesset.

Restricted movement—blacks could enter white areas only with special permits.

Absolute freedom of movement all over Israel for all citizens.

Strictly segregated residential communities. Blacks forced into impoverished regions.

Israelis of all ethnicities and religions can legally live in any public city within Israel.

Separate and inferior public facilities for non-whites, including buses, trains, parks, beaches, libraries, hospitals and schools. Quality universities restricted to whites only.

Public facilities are fully integrated. Arab Israelis attend Israel's top universities and are among the most educated people in the Middle East.

Racist legal system with harsher penalties for Blacks. Blacks could be executed for raping whites but whites could only be fined for raping Blacks.

All people treated equally under the law. No double standard based on race or religion.

Blacks had only token local governments with little power and no international recognition.

## Palestinian Arabs in the West Bank and Gaza

Arabs living in the West Bank and Gaza are not Israeli citizens. They elect their own government, the Palestinian Authority, which makes laws and has international recognition.

Black activists sought to end discrimination and become equal citizens.

Palestinian militants and the PLO Charter have sought to eliminate Israel, the world's only Jewish state, through war and terrorism.

**To label Israel an “apartheid state” manipulates the truth and insults millions of Black South Africans who suffered under a true Apartheid regime.**

# Jimmy Carter's Calumny

A review of

“Palestine Peace Not Apartheid” by Jimmy Carter

## Review by Mitchell Bard

By titling his book as he has, Jimmy Carter is not merely being provocative to sell books, he appears to be giving aid and comfort to the new anti-Semites whose goal since the 2001 UN World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance in Durban, South Africa, has been to link Israel to apartheid South Africa.

Curiously enough, if you read through almost the entire book, which persistently accuses Israel of apartheid acts, you arrive at page 189, where he specifically contradicts the entire thesis by stating, “The driving purpose for the forced separation of the two peoples is unlike that in South Africa.” In fact, the only tangential support for the title of the book is an anonymous quotation from an Israeli lamenting the treatment of Palestinians.

It is clear from the beginning, however, that facts are of little concern to Carter who sees Israel as “the tiny vortex around which swirl the winds of hatred, intolerance, and bloodshed.” It is certainly true that Israel is subject to these winds, the question is why he blames the victim. Why doesn't he see the Islamist rejection of a Jewish presence in the region as the problem, or the unwillingness of the Palestinians to accept a two-state solution?

### Get the Facts First, Then Distort Them

The book appears to have been hastily written with casual observations and remembrances slapped together. Given Carter's resources, it is surprising that it appears to contain little or no research, which only partially explains the astounding level of inaccuracy and misrepresentation of historical facts. Carter is entitled to his opinions, but he cannot be allowed to get away with falsifying history, which he does to such an extent that the book often reads like a work of fiction. Rather than correct and refute his statements paragraph by paragraph, I will limit my critique to the most egregious problems, and even this requires many more pages than a typical review.

Some statements are outright falsehoods, such as his unsubstantiated claim that Israel stole money sent to the Palestinians for humanitarian purposes when, in fact, Israel itself provides such funds, as does the United States and many other countries. While he presents no evidence for his assertion, he ignores reports by organizations such as the World Bank, which found that Yasser Arafat stole \$900 million of the international aid.

Carter says the Palestinians were forcibly evicted from their homes in 1967. This is also untrue. The Palestinians were caught in the crossfire of a war started by Jordan and moved eastward on their own.

On his first trip to Israel, Carter says he thought Israelis “ejecting” Palestinians from their homes was like the Indians in Georgia being forced from their homes to make room for “our white ancestors.” The Jews, unlike Carter's ancestors in Georgia, were living in their homeland. The Palestinians were not ejected, most chose to leave during the violence of 1947-1949 provoked by the Arab rejection of the UN partition resolution. Prior to that, the Palestinian population had been growing, as Carter acknowledges elsewhere, when he states that the Arab population increased dramatically from 1931 to 1945. He notes that the newcomers were attracted by economic opportunity, but neglects to mention those opportunities were created by the Jews.

Like the most radical Palestinians, Carter implies the creation of Israel itself was a sin. He says the “taking of land had been ordained by the international community” in the UN partition resolution. This is a gross misinterpretation of history, which ignores the fact that the Zionists purchased land from the Arabs and that the UN also called for the establishment of an Arab state. Had the Arabs not rejected compromise and tried to destroy Israel, the Palestinian state Carter favors would now be celebrating its 60th anniversary. Elsewhere in the book, Carter takes UN decisions as the final word on international law (which they are not), but suggests the resolution creating Israel was the one unjust and invalid decision.

The description of the postwar history is equally distorted. He says that Israel took 77% of the disputed land and the Palestinians were left with Gaza and the West Bank. Historic Palestine included not only Israel and the West Bank, but also all of modern Jordan. It is Israel, including the disputed territories, that is only 22% of Palestine. If Israel withdrew completely from the West Bank, it would possess only about 18%. And from Israel's perspective, it is the Zionists who have made the real sacrifice by giving up 82% of the Land of Israel. In fact, by accepting the UN's partition resolution, they were prepared to accept only about 12% of historic Israel before the Arab states attacked and tried to destroy the nascent state of Israel.

Furthermore, at the end of the 1948 War, neither Jordan, which occupied the West Bank, nor Egypt, which controlled Gaza, had any interest in granting the Palestinians independence. One of the few accurate statements in the entire historical review is Carter's observation that "No serious consideration was given by Arab leaders or the international community to establishing a separate Palestinian state." He misleadingly says in the same sentence, however, that this was the Palestinian people's "ancient" homeland, when it would be more accurate to say it was the Jewish people's ancient homeland as the Palestinians arrived, at best one thousand years later.

Carter's description of the period following the 1967 War is equally problematic. He says, for example, that UN Resolution 242 "mandates Israel's withdrawal." In fact, the resolution was carefully worded to exclude the word "all" so it is clear Israel is not required to evacuate all the territories. Furthermore, like the Arabs, he chooses to ignore the rest of the resolution, which says that Israel has the right to secure and defensible borders and calls for a "peaceful and accepted settlement." Carter's interpretation of 242 reflects the book's theme that only Israel has obligations and the Arabs need do nothing to foster peace. Incidentally, nowhere in resolution 242 are the Palestinians mentioned or is there any suggestion that the disputed territory belongs to them.

Another example of getting basic facts wrong is his claim that Arab leaders didn't decide to create the PLO in 1964 until Israel tried to divert water from the Sea of Galilee and Jordan to irrigate the west and Negev. The creation of the PLO had nothing to do with water issues; the organization was established as a weapon the Arab League wished to use in its ongoing effort to destroy Israel.

Carter claims that as a result of 1967 War, 320,000 Arabs were forced to leave lands occupied by Israel, but they left in the course of the war that Jordan started by attacking Israel. Similarly, he claims that Syria and Egypt attacked lands occupied by Israel in 1973, ignoring the fact that Israel came to hold the territories because of a war those two countries provoked in 1967, and still held them because those countries rejected proposals to trade land for peace.

He also says the U.S. has vetoed more than 40 UN Security Council resolutions critical of Israel. Actually, the 40th veto was cast after his book was written. Meanwhile, more than 100 critical resolutions were adopted.

### Singling Out Christians

One of the most nefarious elements in the book is Carter's effort to paint Israel as hostile to Christians. He repeatedly refers to "Christians and Muslims" rather than simply the Palestinians in a transparent effort to suggest that Israeli actions were harming Christians and not just Muslims or Arabs. He claims, for example, that "many priests and pastors" were disturbed by the control of Israeli religious parties over "all forms of worship." On a visit to Jerusalem in 1990, he said he met with a variety of Christian leaders who he said complained of various abuses. He doesn't offer a single specific example, but tars Israel with bigotry. He then says that Prime Minister Shamir told him that religious parties had authority over all religious matters because of the needs of the coalition government. Carter says that this conversation made him understand why "there was such a surprising exodus of Christians from the Holy Land."

These charges are so vile they require a more substantial response. First, while Christians are unwelcome in Islamic states such as Saudi Arabia, and most have been driven out of their longtime homes in Lebanon, Christians continue to be welcome in Israel. Christians have always been a minority in Israel, but it is the only Middle East nation where the Christian population has grown in the last half century (from 34,000 in 1948 to 145,000 today), in large measure because of the freedom to practice their religion.



By their own volition, the Christian communities have remained the most autonomous of the various religious communities in Israel, though they have increasingly chosen to integrate their social welfare, medical and educational institutions into state structures. The ecclesiastical courts of the Christian communities maintain jurisdiction in matters of personal status, such as marriage and divorce. The Ministry of Religious Affairs deliberately refrains from interfering in their religious life, but maintains a Department for Christian Communities to address problems and requests that may arise.

In Jerusalem, the rights of the various Christian churches to custody of the Christian holy places were established during the Ottoman Empire. Known as the “status quo arrangement for the Christian holy places in Jerusalem,” these rights remain in force today in Israel.

It was during Jordan’s control of the Old City from 1948 until 1967 that Christian rights were infringed and Israeli Christians were barred from their holy places. The Christian population declined by nearly half, from 25,000 to 12,646. Since then, the population has slowly been growing.

Jonathan Adelman and Agota Kuperman noted that Yasser Arafat “tried to erase the historic Jesus by depicting him as the first radical Palestinian armed fedayeen (guerrilla). Meanwhile, the Palestinian Authority has adopted Islam as its official religion, used shari’a Islamic codes, and allowed even officially appointed clerics to brand Christians (and Jews) as infidels in their mosques.” The authors add that the “militantly Islamic rhetoric and terrorist acts of Hamas, Islamic Jihad, and Hizballah...offer little comfort to Christians.”

When Yasser Arafat died, Vatican Radio correspondent Graziano Motta said, “The death of the president of the Palestinian National Authority has come at a time when the political, administrative and police structures often discriminate against [Christians].” Motta added that Christians “have been continually exposed to pressures by Muslim activists, and have been forced to profess fidelity to the intifada” (Christians in Palestine Concerned About their future,” Zenit News Agency, November 14, 2004).

While Carter charges Israel with a variety of unspecified anti-Christian acts, Motta reported, “Frequently, there are cases in which the Muslims expropriate houses and lands belonging to Catholics, and often the intervention of the authorities has been lacking in addressing acts of violence against young women, or offenses against the Christian faith.”

It certainly wouldn’t be difficult for Carter to find evidence of mistreatment of Christians in the PA if he were interested, but unlike Christians who enjoy freedom of speech as well as religion in Israel, beleaguered Palestinian Christians are afraid to speak out. One Christian who has gone public is Samir Qumsiyeh, a journalist from Beit Sahur who told the Italian newspaper *Corriere della Sera* that Christians were being subjected to rape, kidnaping, extortion and expropriation of land and property. Qumsiyeh compiled a list of 93 cases of anti-Christian violence between 2000 and 2004. He added that “almost all 140 cases of expropriation of land in the last three years were committed by militant Islamic groups and members of the Palestinian police” and that the Christian population of Bethlehem has dropped from 75% in 1950 to 12% today. “If the situation continues,” Qumsiyeh warned, “we won’t be here anymore in 20 years.” Thus, it is Palestinian Muslims who are seizing Arab lands and would be the more appropriate target of Carter’s wrath ( *Jerusalem Post*, October 28, 2005; Harry de Quetteville, “‘Islamic mafia’ accused of persecuting Holy Land Christians,” *Telegraph*, September 9, 2005).

**For the complete article, go to  
[http://www.standwithus.com/pdfs/flyers/bard\\_CarterBookReview.pdf](http://www.standwithus.com/pdfs/flyers/bard_CarterBookReview.pdf)**

## THE RESIGNATION OF DR. KENNETH STEIN From the Carter Center

This note is to inform you that yesterday, I sent letters to President Jimmy Carter, Emory University President Jim Wagner, and Dr. John Hardman, Executive Director of the Carter Center resigning my position, effectively immediately, as Middle East Fellow of the Carter Center of Emory University. This ends my 23 year association with an institution that in some small way I helped shape and develop.

My joint academic position in Emory College in the History and Political Science Departments, and, as Director of the Emory Institute for the Study of Modern Israel remains unchanged.

Many still believe that I have an active association with the Center and, act as an adviser to President Carter, neither is the case. President Carter has intermittently continued to come to the Arab-Israeli Conflict class I teach in Emory College. He gives undergraduate students a fine first hand recollection of the Begin-Sadat negotiations of the late 1970s. Since I left the Center physically thirteen years ago, the Middle East program of the Center has waned as has my status as a Carter Center Fellow. For the record, I had nothing to do with the research, preparation, writing, or review of President Carter's recent publication. Any material which he used from the book we did together in 1984, *The Blood of Abraham*, he used unilaterally. President Carter's book on the Middle East, a title too inflammatory to even print, is not based on unvarnished analyses; it is replete with factual errors, copied materials not cited, superficialities, glaring omissions, and simply invented segments. Aside from the one-sided nature of the book, meant to provoke, there are recollections cited from meetings where I was the third person in the room, and my notes of those meetings show little similarity to points claimed in the book. Being a former President does not give one a unique privilege to invent information or to unpack it with cuts, deftly slanted to provide a particular outlook. Having little access to Arabic and Hebrew sources, I believe, clearly handicapped his understanding and analyses of how history has unfolded over the last decade. Falsehoods, if repeated often enough become meta-truths, and they then can become the erroneous baseline for shaping and reinforcing attitudes and for policy-making. The history and interpretation of the Arab-Israeli conflict is already drowning in half-truths, suppositions, and self-serving myths; more are not necessary. In due course, I shall detail these points and reflect on their origins.

The decade I spent at the Carter Center (1983-1993) as the first permanent Executive Director and as the first Fellow were intellectually enriching for Emory as an institution, the general public, the interns who learned with us, and for me professionally. Setting standards for rigorous interchange and careful analyses spilled out to the other programs that shaped the Center's early years. There was mutual respect for all views; we carefully avoided polemics or special pleading. This book does not hold to those standards. My continued association with the Center leaves the impression that I am sanctioning a series of egregious errors and polemical conclusions which appeared in President Carter's book. I can not allow that impression to stand.

Through Emory College, I have continued my professional commitment to inform students and the general public about the history and politics of Israel, the Middle East, and American policies toward the region. I have tried to remain true to a life-time devotion to scholarly excellence based upon unvarnished analyses and intellectual integrity. I hold fast to the notion that academic settings and those in positions of influence must teach and not preach. Through Emory College, in public lectures, and in OPED writings, I have adhered to the strong belief that history must be presented in context, and understood the way it was, not the way we wish it to be.

In closing, let me thank you for your friendship, past and continuing support for ISMI, and to Emory College. Let me also wish you and your loved ones a happy holiday season, and a healthy and productive new year.

As ever,  
Ken

-----  
Dr. Kenneth W. Stein,  
Professor of Contemporary Middle Eastern History, Political Science, and Israeli Studies,  
Director, Middle East Research Program and Emory Institute for the Study of Modern Israel  
1256 Briarcliff Road Suite A-427N  
Atlanta, Georgia 30306



Jimmy Carter's Disingenuous Diplomacy  
By Rick Richman  
JewishPress.com and Front Page Magazine  
December 4, 2006

Jimmy Carter's new book, *Palestine Peace Not Apartheid*, should, by all rights, be headed for the remainder bin. Martin Peretz, editor-in-chief of *The New Republic*, calls it a "tendentious, dishonest and stupid book." Norman Finkelstein, one of Israel's harshest critics, admits the book is "filled with errors small and large, as well as tendentious and untenable interpretations." There is not a single blurb on the book.

But while it may be tendentious, dishonest, stupid, and filled with errors and untenable interpretations, it could still have an impact. Carter says he's "going to promote [it] pretty widely," so his tendentious and erroneous assertions may ripple into the public consciousness.

Responsible people will ignore Carter's attempt to tar and feather Israel with the word "apartheid." Israel is the only country in the Middle East where Jews and Arabs live together in peace – a country where Arabs not only vote but serve in the Knesset. But Carter has done something even worse in his book: He egregiously misstates both the relevant diplomatic history and the long-standing U.S. diplomatic position, and then he blames Israel for not complying with it – demonizing Israel even more insidiously.

### **Carter, Resolution 242 and the Road Map**

At the end of his book, Carter has a chapter in which he issues his plan for peace. The chapter includes a discussion of the alleged requirements of UN Security Council Resolution 242 and the Quartet's Road Map. Carter states that (emphasis added, here and in all following quotes):

The **unwavering official policy** of the United States since Israel became a state has been that **its borders must coincide with those prevailing from 1949 until 1967** (unless modified by mutually agreeable land swaps), **specified in the unanimously adopted U.N. Resolution 242**, which mandates Israel's withdrawal from occupied territories. . . . [A]s a member of the International Quartet that includes Russia, the United Nations, and the European Union, America

supports the **Roadmap for Peace, which espouses exactly the same requirements.**

A reader would receive the impression from that paragraph that the 1967 borders are specified in Resolution 242 as Israel's final borders (perhaps with minor adjustments compensated by land swaps), that the Road Map says the same thing, and that this has been "unwavering U.S. policy." All of that, as we will demonstrate, is false.

Carter's false impression is reinforced by the final paragraphs in his book, where he asserts that peace will come only upon Israel's "Withdrawal to the 1967 border **as specified in U.N. Resolution 242** and as promised in the Camp David Accords and the Oslo Agreement **and prescribed in the Roadmap** of the International Quartet."

Carter continually refers to the 1967 borders as Israel's "legal borders." He concludes that the "bottom line" is Israel must "comply" with the Road Map and with "official American policy" by "accepting its legal [1967] borders." In exchange, he says, all "Arab neighbors" must "pledge" to honor Israel's right to live in peace.

Even Charlie Brown wouldn't kick that football. Abba Eban famously called the 1967 lines "Auschwitz borders," and he did so for a reason: they are indefensible, and it was precisely their indefensibility that provoked Arab aggression against Israel in the first place.

Nor could a "pledge" of peace be enforced by U.S. or NATO troops (much less UN ones), once Israel moved to indefensible borders – and it would be unreasonable to expect the U.S. or NATO to commit troops to defend such borders (even assuming an Israeli willingness to place its defense into the hands of others).

But there is an even more fundamental objection to Carter's plan. Contrary to his repeated assertions about Resolution 242 and the Road Map:

- The 1967 borders are not specified as Israel's "legal borders" in Resolution 242.
- Such borders are neither "espoused" nor "required" nor "prescribed" in the Road Map.
- It has never been "unwavering U.S. policy" that Israel's final borders must coincide with the 1967 borders, nor that

changes in them be “minor,” nor that any changes be compensated with “land swaps.”

- U.S. policy – both in the past and today – contemplates that Israel’s borders will be where Israel’s security requires, not the place from which the prior war commenced – and the U.S. has officially stated that any Palestinian expectation to the contrary is “unrealistic.”

The terms of Resolution 242 do not provide for “land for peace,” much less “land for [a pledge of] peace.” Instead, Resolution 242 envisions that land be exchanged for “secure” boundaries (since such boundaries are the only practical guarantee of peace). Moreover, the drafters of Resolution 242 recognized the 1967 borders were not secure.

The Road Map took this one step further. It did not envision a simultaneous exchange of land for secure borders, but rather a phased-in peace, starting with the dismantlement of terrorist infrastructure (Phase I), followed by a provisional state (Phase II), followed by final status negotiations on borders (Phase III). It did not require that Israel return to the 1967 borders, either at the beginning or the end of that process.

**For the complete article, go to  
[http://www.standwithus.com/pdfs/flyers/Carter\\_Richman.pdf](http://www.standwithus.com/pdfs/flyers/Carter_Richman.pdf)**

**For more information  
and reviews of Jimmy carter’s new book, visit  
<http://www.standwithus.com/flyers.asp>**



# Challenging Misinformation Through Education...

---

[www.standwithus.com](http://www.standwithus.com)  
[www.standwithuscampus.com](http://www.standwithuscampus.com)  
[www.united4freedom.org](http://www.united4freedom.org)  
[www.stand4facts.org](http://www.stand4facts.org)  
[www.learnisrael.org](http://www.learnisrael.org)

email: [campus@standwithus.com](mailto:campus@standwithus.com) • tel: 310.836.6140 • fax: 310.836.6145  
P.O. Box 341069 • Los Angeles, CA • 90034-1069