



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
JOURNALS + DIGITAL PUBLISHING



Settlement Monitor

Author(s): Geoffrey Aronson

Source: *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol. 32, No. 4 (Summer 2003), pp. 150-157

Published by: [University of California Press](#) on behalf of the [Institute for Palestine Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/jps.2003.32.4.150>

Accessed: 26/02/2015 15:36

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



University of California Press and Institute for Palestine Studies are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Palestine Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

SETTLEMENT MONITOR

EDITED BY GEOFFREY ARONSON

This section covers items—reprinted articles, statistics, and maps—pertaining to Israeli settlement activities in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, and the Golan Heights. Unless otherwise stated, the items in this section have been written by Geoffrey Aronson directly for this section or drawn from material written by him for Report on Israeli Settlement in the Occupied Territories (hereinafter Settlement Report), a Washington-based bimonthly newsletter published by the Foundation for Middle East Peace. JPS is grateful to the Foundation for permission to draw on its material. Major documents relating to settlements appear in the Documents and Source Material section.

<i>Road Map Seeks to End Violence and Settlement Expansion</i>	150
Settlement Facts	
Sources of Population Growth in the West Bank and Gaza Strip	
Settlements, 1999–2001	152
Settler Population for Selected Years, 1983–2001	152
Israel's Policies on Settlements and Outposts	
Spreading a Big Lie, <i>by Ze'ev Schiff</i>	152
State Support for Developing Industries in Settlements, <i>by Nancy Hawker</i>	153
Short Takes	
Settlers Offer West Bank "Terror Tours"	154
Evangelicals "Adopt a Settler"	155
Quotes from U.S. Government Officials on Israeli Settlements	155

ROAD MAP SEEKS TO END VIOLENCE AND SETTLEMENT EXPANSION

From Settlement Report, May–June 2003.

Four months after the plan was finalized, the Quartet's "Performance-Based Road Map to a Permanent Two-State Solution to the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict" has been formally placed on the diplomatic agenda. The unwieldy title reflects more than the plan's origins as the product of an often-contentious committee of representatives from the United States, European Union, Russia, and the UN. Like the proverbial camel said to be the result of a committee's attempt to create a horse, the road map comprises a hodgepodge of ambiguous elements that invite endless haggling.

Yet while it may not be a thoroughbred, the diplomacy occasioned by the road

map's release may move the battlefield between Israelis and Palestinians from the streets and hilltops of the West Bank and Gaza Strip to the negotiating table. With or without the road map, at the very least, U.S.-led diplomacy must create the political horizon necessary to stop the bloodletting and end Israel's policy of creating facts on the ground.

Territory remains the basic currency of the continuing conflict. The road map focuses upon a Palestinian renunciation of efforts to use violence to change the status quo. But for the first time in the history of modern diplomacy, it offers the option of the "possible creation of an independent Palestinian state with provisional borders in 2003" and demands a complete cessation of settlement expansion and the evacuation of settlements.

The road map requires that the government of Israel immediately

Journal of Palestine Studies XXXII, no. 4 (Summer 2003), pages 150–157.

ISSN: 0377-919X; online ISSN: 1533-8614.

© 2003 by the Institute for Palestine Studies. All rights reserved.

Send requests for permission to reprint to: Rights and Permissions, University of California Press, Journals Division, 2000 Center St., Ste. 303, Berkeley, CA 94704-1223.

dismantle settlement outposts erected since March 2001; “consistent with the Mitchell Report,” freeze all settlement activity, “including natural growth of settlements”; take “no actions undermining trust, including . . . confiscation and/or demolition of Palestinian homes and property, as a punitive measure or to facilitate Israeli constructions [and] destruction of Palestinian institutions and infrastructure”; and implement prior agreements “to enhance maximum territorial continuity, including further action on settlements [meaning evacuation] in conjunction with establishment of a Palestinian state with provisional borders.”

The Palestinian Authority has endorsed the road map. Israel, in its response to the proposal’s provisions on settlements, rejected the call for an effective settlement freeze, referring instead to a policy permitting settlements’ “natural growth.” It opposes the removal of the at least seventy new settlement “outposts” established since March 2001, referring instead to the basic guidelines of the government that define the policy of settlement expansion (see Doc. C1 in this issue). Israel insists that such measures will be implemented only “following a continuous and comprehensive security calm.” Israel wants to postpone “‘additional action’ [evacuation] regarding the settlements” from phase 2 of the Quartet framework to the permanent status negotiations, a position consistent with Israel’s historical stance on this issue. It has not formally commented upon the road map’s apparent prohibition on land confiscation for security or settlement purposes. The separation zones now being constructed in the West Bank and around Jerusalem would appear to violate this provision.

Settlers and settlements are also at the heart of the IDF’s overall security deployment in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. The road map requires that Israel end the prohibition on Palestinian travel on most West Bank and principal Gaza roads. This draconian policy has been championed by settlers and implemented in order to end armed attacks on them.

Although the United States has been the senior partner in the Quartet and principle drafter of the road map, President George W. Bush has been a reluctant patron of this process. His administration has been maneuvered into its sponsorship by the importuning of its Quartet partners and Palestinian deference to reforms it has

demanding. It remains to be seen whether Bush will assume with enthusiasm and commitment the mantle of leadership claimed by the United States.

The Madrid era was born with Washington’s expectation that peace between Israel and the Arabs was the most effective means of isolating “rogue regimes” in Baghdad and Tehran. Today Baghdad is occupied by U.S. troops, a reflection of Washington’s new orthodoxy. Israel is a strategic ally in this post-Madrid era, and it is not at all clear if the Bush administration believes that Israeli-Palestinian reconciliation is possible or worth the major political and diplomatic investment it requires.

Israel too has refashioned policies in the wake of the failure of the Oslo process that will be difficult to challenge. Instead of empowering Palestinians, Israel has embarked upon a post-Oslo strategy based on indirect rule of separate Palestinian “cantons” controlled by Israeli security perimeters. Proponents of this strategy view it as enabling Israel to rule the occupied territories for decades while it continues to build settlements.

While a Palestinian failure to abide by the terms of the road map results in a continuation of foreign occupation, the road map specifies no parallel penalty to be suffered by Israel for its failure to evacuate or freeze settlements. Implementation of the territorial changes featured in the road map will begin the long process of an agreed upon end to Israel’s occupation and the establishment of a sovereign Palestinian state at peace with Israel. Israelis and Palestinians will continue to pay a high price in blood and money if the road map fails to achieve this objective. Prime Minister Ariel Sharon and his coalition may well choose this route unless they can be persuaded that their personal political fortunes and Israel’s security are best served by a dramatic change in Israeli policy.

SETTLEMENT FACTS

The following two tables were taken from Settlement Report, May–June 2003. The data for both were taken from the Israeli Central Bureau of Statistics, Statistical Abstract of Israel, 2000–2002; the 1999 figures in the first table were taken from the bureau’s Web site at www.cbs.gov.il. Neither set of West Bank statistics includes East Jerusalem.

SOURCES OF POPULATION GROWTH IN THE WEST BANK AND GAZA STRIP SETTLEMENTS, 1999–2001

Year	Population		Population Growth			Internal Migration			
	January	December	Actual	%	National Growth Rate	New Settlers	Immigrants	Natural Growth	Departures
1999	172,100	183,800	11,700	6.8	2.8	14,500	1,600	5,300	9,700
2000	183,800	198,200	14,400	7.8	2.6	16,500	1,300	6,000	9,400
2001	198,200	208,200	10,000	5.0	2.2	13,200	1,000	6,400	10,600

SETTLER POPULATION FOR SELECTED YEARS, 1983–2001

	1983	1990	1992	1993	1994	1995	2000	2001
West Bank	22,800	78,600	101,100	111,600	122,700	129,200	191,500	201,200
Gaza Strip	900	3,300	4,300	4,800	5,100	5,000	6,700	7,000
Total	23,700	81,900	105,400	116,400	127,800	134,200	198,200	208,200
Settlers as % of total Israeli population	0.6	1.7	2.0	2.2	2.3	2.4	3.1	3.2

ISRAEL'S POLICIES ON SETTLEMENTS AND OUTPOSTS

SPREADING A BIG LIE

The following are excerpts from an article by Ze'ev Schiff that appeared in Ha'Aretz on 9 May 2003. The full text is available online at www.haaretzdaily.com.

On 31 May 2001, after Palestinians killed an Israeli security guard at a settlement outpost near Itamar, the Israel Defense Forces presented then-defense minister Benjamin Ben-Eliezer with a breakdown of the outposts in Judea and Samaria.

The picture showed 66 outposts, 24 of which had been established since the start of the armed intifada, and 19 of which were being guarded by the IDF. The minister's aide on settlement and infrastructure issues added that 60 of the outposts were legally flawed from various points of view. Following a review of the matter by a Defense Ministry panel, Ben-Eliezer announced that 15 outposts had to be evacuated.

Some 18 months later, on 16 October 2002, a document submitted to the defense minister said that, in addition to 15 outposts evacuated in July 2001, a further 20 such sites named in the document were evacuated in July 2002. The document added that an order had been given to evacuate another 30 illegal outposts. The document again named the sites, which included six over which the settlers had petitioned the High Court of Justice.

This was the report given to the defense minister, and this is how the issue was covered in official documents. On the

ground, however, the picture was very different. On the face of it, 65 outposts should have been evacuated but toward the end of October 2002, the office of the adviser on settlement affairs announced only 21 such sites had been dismantled. This, too, was a virtual report.

The real picture bursts forth from the material released recently by the committee (an interministerial one, this time) on the issue of the outposts set up by Defense Minister Shaul Mofaz. The number of outposts in existence as of May 2003 ranges from 90 to 100. In other words, despite the repeated directives to evacuate outposts, and the alleged evacuations that took place in the field, the number of such sites has increased during the period of May 2001–May 2002 from 66 to 90–100.

All of this means that, when it comes to outposts, the issue has involved the spreading of one of the State of Israel's biggest lies—not only a lie that was told to the Americans and conveyed in semiofficial announcements, but also an ongoing lie that the Israeli public is being fed. The stories about the ministerial and interministerial committees that are reviewing, ad nauseam, the precise legal status of each and every outpost are part of the greater lie; and if the members of these committees are party to the lie, then their time is being wasted.

The establishment of an outpost with authorization on private Arab land is clearly daylight robbery. But trying to create the impression that a portion of the outposts have something of a legal foothold, and that there are only certain

anomalies in the field, the question that has to be asked is, "Legal in whose eyes?"

This is another matter in which the government has failed recently in its dealings with the Americans. In talks in Washington on the road map, Israeli representatives said Israel would act in the matter in accordance with "the understanding" reached at the time between former foreign minister Shimon Peres and U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell.

When an Israeli representative was asked to elaborate on the understanding, he said: No more settlements will be established; the recommendation that the existing settlements will not be expanded, including expansion as the result of natural population growth, will not apply to the built-up areas of the settlements; and the final fate of the settlements will be determined in the final status agreement.

The U.S. administration and Powell himself denied that such an understanding exists. Which of Israel's ministers is aware of this?

Israel's governments appear to have a policy with regard to the outposts; but ever since the outbreak of the armed uprising, it appears to be more intentional haphazardness than policy. . . . Israel, in fact, wants the settlers to deceive it; and when its policy is rudely breached, it does not enforce the law. If we have, indeed, entered a new period, the only viable conclusion is that, on this issue, Washington must apply pressure to Israel for its own sake.

STATE SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPING INDUSTRIES IN SETTLEMENTS

The following article by Nancy Hawker, who works for the Jerusalem-based Alternative Information Center (AIC) on its Settlement Project, was published in the January 2003 issue of AIC's News from Within. More information on AIC can be found online at www.alternativenews.org.

According to a recent report compiled by Peace Now's Dror Tsaban, former assistant director at the Israeli Finance Ministry, FY 2001 saw NIS 28 million [\$6.3 million] invested in developing Israeli settlement employment centers in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. This money was allocated from the budget of the Ministry of Industry and Trade and

excludes East Jerusalem and the Golan Heights.

This preferential treatment takes place within the framework of the Law for the Encouragement of Capital Investments, which outlines benefits derived from establishing a company within a certain geographical area. According to the ministry's map, which brazenly annexes the Palestinian territories to Israel, the West Bank, Gaza Strip and Golan Heights are in National Priority Area A, while East Jerusalem is in National Priority Area B. For investors, it means that any project approved by the Israeli government's Investment Center board of directors can either receive a grant of up to 24 percent of their investment into a company in the occupied territories, or get a ten-year full tax exemption. It is specified explicitly that in the areas of "Judea, Samaria, and Gaza" (the West Bank and Gaza Strip), only Israeli settlements may benefit from this support.

Moreover, the national priority status authorizes the Administration for Development Areas to build infrastructure and facilities, all sponsored by the ministry. "Modern industrial parks," states the ministry's Web site (www.moit.gov.il), "provide an attractive and competitive work environment." During the 1990s, the Ministry of Industry and Trade set up ten such industrial zones in the West Bank, each costing NIS 20 million [\$4.5 million]. In 2001, at least one more industrial zone was established. Although some Palestinians are employed in menial positions in these zones, and indeed are sought after due to their low wage requirements, security scares restrict their access to settlements.

The Applied Research Institute—Jerusalem, a Palestinian geosociological research center (www.arij.org), has repeatedly warned that settlement industries placed in the West Bank are not required to conform to Israeli laws for the protection of the environment. Many polluting industries that involve chemical processing moved from locations inside the Green Line to the occupied territories in order to avoid the costs of environment protection measures. For instance, the Barkan industrial zone in the Nablus district hosts approximately eighty companies, some of them operating in such industries as aluminum, fiberglass, and plastics. These industries produce

large quantities of hazardous liquid and solid wastes. Industrial wastewater generated from the Barkan industrial zone flows into the nearby wadi (valley) and pollutes the agricultural lands that belong to the Palestinian villages of Sarta, Kafr Dik, and Bruqin. It is estimated that this industrial zone generates approximately 810 thousand cubic meters of industrial wastewater annually. The wastewater had been previously collected in three storage tanks. Due to a design failure, these tanks are currently overloaded with mud and not in operation. Therefore, the industrial wastewater flows untreated into the nearby valley. This results in the contamination of water sources and destruction of Palestinian agricultural land. Other industries, like chemical industries now located in Mishor Adumim, used to be situated in Givat Shaul in West Jerusalem, but moved to the West Bank. Accordingly, settlement industries benefit from financial advantages offered by Israeli law, but are exempt from following those social and environmental laws that might hamper their growth.

There are then substantial incentives for the Israeli businessperson to set up shop on occupied land; however, it should not be forgotten that these incentives offered by Israeli state institutions are there precisely to compensate for the inherent instability of economic ventures in a volatile political setting. Investors need convincing, and that is what the Ministry of Industry and Trade spends NIS 28 million [\$6.3 million] of taxpayers' money trying to do.

It is obvious that this "national priority" is not set out of concern for the economic development of these regions, as might be argued for similar efforts inside Israeli state borders, such as in the Negev desert and the Galilee. The priorities here are political: to institute a de facto bureaucratic annexation of the territories to Israel, thus consolidating its grip on the whole area and preempting any negotiated land compromise.

This enterprise is not left to gangs of ideological settlers who move to historical Judea and Samaria out of nationalist-messianic conviction, but implicates Israelis who move to these areas for economic reasons, enjoying the support of a state policy that seeks to subtly (or not so subtly) entrench its territorial expansion. Eighty percent of the 400,000

or so Israeli settlers in Palestinian territory settle for economic reasons.

SHORT TAKES

SETTLERS OFFER WEST BANK "TERROR TOURS"

The following news item appeared on the British Broadcasting Company's Web site, www.bbc.co.uk, on 12 March 2003.

Jewish settlers are offering special "terror tours" of the West Bank and Gaza, in which tourists will be trained to fire weapons and participate in mock fights with Arab militants.

ITINERARY:

Weapons training
Tracking "terrorists" in desert
Aerial tour of "terrorist enclaves"
Experience of F-16 bombers and tanks
Paintball attack on "Arab village"

The four-day excursion will include aerial tours of "terrorist" enclaves and a chance to sit in the cockpit of a fighter plane capable of delivering nuclear bombs. "There's a lot of the 'wow' factor, like going up in an army helicopter and firing machine guns," organizer Jake Greenwald told BBC News Online, "but it is also aimed at training people in how to deal with a terrorist situation." Mr. Greenwald said it was also a way of attracting thrill seekers to Israel at a time when tourism is suffering because of the violence with the Palestinians.

U.S.-born Mr. Greenwald said he got the idea after seeing how people coped with the 11 September 2001 attacks on the United States. "I realized that Israel, which has great expertise in dealing with terror, will be able to teach people how to deal with fear, so there is not this mass panic when something happens," he said. He said that while people might think the tour was "a bit strange," there was a serious message in teaching "teamwork in the face of an emergency."

He said that so far more than twenty people—including a judge, doctors, and a Middle East lecturer—have signed up from the United States, at a cost of \$5,500 each.

For the participants, daily activities begin with what Mr. Greenwald called "light exercises" in hand-to-hand combat. Tourists will also be taught how to fire a range of weapons, including M16s, Uzis, pistols and Kalashnikov machine guns, and

learn how to operate a tank. There will be talks by Israelis who took part in Israel's military offensive in Jenin last April and lessons in how to track "terrorists" across the desert. Participants will be taken on a helicopter tour of Palestinian "terrorist enclaves" and be shown arms and suicide bomber belts seized by the Israeli army.

The highlight of the trip involves a paintball fight in a simulated Arab village, where participants will be able to go from room-to-room "cleaning out Arab terrorists," said Mr. Greenwald.

The tours were meant to start at the end of this month, but have been postponed because of the prospect of a war with Iraq.

EVANGELICALS "ADOPT A SETTLER"

The following news item was reported in the Jerusalem Post International, 30 May 2003.

The Jerusalem Prayer Team has announced the launch of "Adopt a Settler," a new program that pairs Evangelical Christians in the United States with Israelis living in the territories. The program hopes to pair 200,000 settlers with Christians in the United States to strengthen opposition to the road map, said prayer team chairman Michael Evans. "If [the road map] goes through, then Christians in America are going to be blamed for the pain and suffering the Jewish people will experience, and for that I say no thank you," said Evans, who founded the prayer team to enlist one million Americans to pray daily for Israel. "There are enough Christians who believe the Bible, and if they unite, it can be stopped."

QUOTES FROM U.S. GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS ON ISRAELI SETTLEMENTS

The following quotes were compiled and distributed by the Washington-based Churches for Middle East Peace and are available online at www.cmepp.org.

George W. Bush Administration

"Our position on settlements, I think, has been very consistent, very clear. The secretary expressed it not too long ago. He said settlement activity has severely undermined Palestinian trust and hope, preempts and prejudices the outcome of negotiations, and in doing so, cripples

chances for real peace and prosperity. The United States has long opposed settlement activity and, consistent with the report of the Mitchell Committee, settlement activity must stop."

—*State Department spokesman Richard Boucher, daily press briefing, 25 November 2002*

"Our opposition to the settlements is political. Washington feels that Israel would be better protected and more accepted inside borders where there are no settlements, so a decision on their future must be accepted on the basis of their feasibility. It is a fact that we have opposed the settlements for decades, and you continue to build them, and we have done nothing untoward to you [in response]. If Israel wants, it can even expand to the borders promised in the Bible. The question is whether it is able to do so from a security and political standpoint."

—*Ambassador to Israel Daniel Kurtzer, Ha'Aretz, 29 May 2002*

"Something has to be done about the problem of the settlements, the settlements continue to grow and continue to expand. . . . It's not going to go away."

—*Secretary of State Colin Powell, NBC's Meet the Press, 1 May 2002*

"Consistent with the Mitchell plan, Israeli settlement activity in occupied territories must stop, and the occupation must end through withdrawal to secure and recognized boundaries, consistent with United Nations Resolutions 242 and 338."

—*President Bush, Rose Garden address, 4 April 2002*

"During the half-century of its existence, Israel has had the strong support of the United States. In international forums, the United States has at times cast the only vote on Israel's behalf. Yet, even in such a close relationship there are some difficulties. Prominent among those differences is the U.S. government's long-standing opposition to the Government of Israel's policies and practices regarding settlements. . . . The GOI should freeze all settlement activity, including the 'natural growth' of existing settlements. The kind of security cooperation desired by the GOI cannot for long coexist with settlement activity described very recently by the European Union as causing 'great

concern' and by the United States as 'provocative.'"

—*The Mitchell Report, 30 April 2001*

Clinton Administration

"The Israeli people also must understand that . . . the settlement enterprise and building bypass roads in the heart of what they already know will one day be part of a Palestinian state is inconsistent with the Oslo commitment that both sides negotiate a compromise."

—*President Bill Clinton, farewell address to the Middle East, 7 January 2001*

"We write you because we are concerned that unilateral actions, such as expansion of settlements, would be strongly counterproductive to the goal of a negotiated solution and, if carried forward, could halt progress made by the peace process over the last two decades. Such a tragic result would threaten the security of Israel, the Palestinians, friendly Arab states, and undermine U.S. interests in the Middle East."

—*Excerpt from a letter written to Likud chairman Benjamin Netanyahu, 14 December 1996, and signed by James A. Baker III (former secretary of state), Zbigniew Brzezinski (former national security adviser), Frank C. Carlucci (former national security adviser), Lawrence S. Eagleburger (former secretary of state), Richard Fairbanks (former Middle East peace negotiator), Brent Scowcroft (former national security adviser), Robert S. Straus (former Middle East peace negotiator), and Cyrus R. Vance (former secretary of state)*

George H. W. Bush Administration

"The United States believes that no party should take unilateral actions that seek to predetermine issues that can only be reached through negotiations. In this regard the United States has opposed, and will continue to oppose, settlement activity in territories occupied in 1967 which remain an obstacle to peace."

—*U.S. letter of assurances to the Palestinians on the terms of the Madrid Peace Conference, 24 October 1991*

"Every time I have gone to Israel in connection with the peace process, on each of my trips, I have been met with the announcement of new settlement activity. This does violate United States policy. It is the first thing that Arabs—Arab

governments—the first thing that Palestinians in the territories—whose situation is really quite desperate—the first thing they raise when we talk to them. I don't think there is any greater obstacle to peace than settlement activity that continues not only unabated but at an advanced pace."

—*Secretary of State James A. Baker III, 22 May 1991*

"Secretary Baker was speaking for this administration, and I strongly support what he said . . . It would make a big contribution to peace if these settlements would stop. That's what the secretary was trying to say, . . . and I'm one hundred percent for him . . . My position is that the foreign policy of the United States says we do not believe there should be new settlements in the West Bank or in East Jerusalem. And I will conduct that policy as if it's firm, which it is, and I will be shaped in whatever decisions we make to see whether people can comply with that policy. And that's our strongly held view."

—*President Bush responding to questions regarding Baker's criticism of Israel's settlement policy, press conference, 3 March 1990*

"Since the end of the 1967 war, the United States has regarded Israel as the occupying power in the occupied territories, which includes the West Bank, Gaza, East Jerusalem, and the Golan Heights. The United States considers Israel's occupation to be governed by the Hague Regulations of 1907 and the 1949 Geneva Conventions concerning the protection of civilian populations under military occupation."

—*Ambassador to the UN Thomas Pickering, 27 November 1989*

Reagan Administration

[In Ronald Reagan's view, Israeli settlement was not illegal, but merely "ill-advised" and "unnecessarily provocative."—CMEP]

"The Reagan Plan states that 'the United States will not support the use of any additional land for the purpose of settlements during the transition period (five years after Palestinian election for a self-governing authority). Indeed, the immediate adoption of a settlements freeze by Israel, more than any other action, could create the confidence needed for wider participation in these talks. Further

settlement activity is in no way necessary for the security of Israel and only diminishes the confidence of the Arabs that a final outcome can be freely and fairly negotiated.”

—*The Reagan Plan, September 1982*

Carter Administration

“Our position on the settlements is very clear. We do not think they are legal.”

—*President Jimmy Carter, interview, April 1980*

“U.S. policy toward the establishment of Israeli settlements in the occupied territories is unequivocal and has long been a matter of public record. We consider it to be contrary to international law and an impediment to the successful conclusion of the Middle East peace process. . . . Article 49, paragraph 6, of the Fourth Geneva Convention is, in my judgment, and has been in the judgment of each of the legal advisers of the State Department for many, many years, to be . . . that [settlements] are illegal and that [the Convention] applies to the territories.”

—*Secretary of State Cyrus Vance before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, 21 March 1980*

Ford Administration

“Substantial resettlement of the Israeli civilian population in occupied territories, including East Jerusalem, is illegal under the [Geneva] convention and cannot be considered to have prejudged the outcome of future negotiations between the parties on the locations of the borders of states of the Middle East. Indeed, the presence of these settlements is seen by my government as an obstacle to the success of the negotiations for a just and final peace between Israel and its neighbors.”

—*Ambassador to the UN William Scranton, address to the UN Security Council, 23 March 1976*

Nixon Administration

“The expropriation or confiscation of land, the construction of housing on such land, the demolition or confiscation of buildings, including those having historic or religious significance, and the application of Israeli law to occupied portions of the city are detrimental to our common interests in [Jerusalem]. The United States considers that the part of Jerusalem that came under the control of

Israel in the June war, like other areas occupied by Israel, is governing the rights and obligations of an occupying power. Among the provisions of international law which bind Israel, as they would bind any occupier, are the provisions that the occupier has no right to make changes in laws or in administration other than those which are temporarily necessitated by his security interests, and that an occupier may not confiscate or destroy private property. The pattern of behavior authorized under the Geneva Convention and international law is clear: the occupier must maintain the occupied area as intact and unaltered as possible, without interfering with the customary life of the area, and any changes must be necessitated by the immediate needs of the occupation.”

—*Permanent Representative to the UN Charles Yost, address to the UN Security Council, 1 July 1969*

Jobs on Administration

“Although we have expressed our views to the Foreign Ministry and are confident there can be little doubt among GOI [Government of Israel] leaders as to our continuing opposition to any Israeli settlements in the occupied areas, we believe it would be timely and useful for the embassy to restate in strongest terms the U.S. position on this question. You should refer to Prime Minister [Levi] Eshkol’s Knesset statement and our awareness of internal Israeli pressures for settling civilians in occupied areas. The GOI is aware of our continuing concern that nothing be done in the occupied areas which might prejudice the search for a peace settlement. By setting up civilian or quasi-civilian outposts in the occupied areas, the GOI adds serious complications to the eventual task of drawing up a peace settlement. Further, the transfer of civilians to occupied areas, whether or not in settlements which are under military control, is contrary to Article 49 of the Geneva Convention, which states ‘The Occupying Power shall not deport or transfer parts of its own civilian population into the territory it occupies.’”

—*Airgram from the Department of State to the Embassy in Israel, in Louis J. Smith, ed., Foreign Relations of the United States, 1964–1968, vol. 20 (Washington: GPO, 2003)*