

The Implications of United States Military Training of Palestinian Security Forces

by David Bedein



THE CENTER FOR
NEAR EAST POLICY
RESEARCH LTD.

WWW.ISRAELBEHINDTHENEWS.COM

Cover design by Samuel Sokol, samuelsokol@gmail.com
Picture by Rina Castelnovo for the NY Times, with permission



THE CENTER FOR
NEAR EAST POLICY
RESEARCH LTD.

WWW.ISRAELBEHINDTHENEWS.COM

In March 2005, a US Security Coordinator Team was established in order to help the Palestinian Authority reorganize its security services.

The approach of the Team is being presented as markedly different from, and more effective than, prior international efforts to help the Palestinians transform the old Palestinian Liberation Organization militia into a professional force – a gendarmerie – that might serve a state. General Keith Dayton, who now holds the office of Coordinator and is striving to fulfill the mandate with which he has been charged, is on record as saying “What we have created are new men.”¹

This report takes a careful look at the development of this program and its import.

© Center for Near East Policy Research 2009

RECEPTION	4
DEVELOPMENT	5
BACKGROUND	5
CURRENT SITUATION	6
PROGRAM, PLANS, AND FACILITIES	6
THE HEART OF THE MATTER: A PALESTINIAN STATE.....	8
CRITIQUE.....	9
INHERENT CONCEPTUAL FLAWS IN THE PROGRAM	9
<i>Meddling</i>	9
<i>Loyalty</i>	10
<i>The Hamas Factor</i>	11
<i>Fatah/PA position on terrorism</i>	12
<i>Risk to Israel of Attack by PA forces</i>	13
<i>PA Capacity to Stand Against Hamas</i>	14
<i>Jordanian Unease</i>	15
THE SECURITY FORCES ON THE GROUND	15
<i>Failures</i>	15
<i>Nablus</i>	16
<i>Facing Islamic Jihad</i>	16
<i>Comparison with Hamas</i>	16
FURTHER CONCERNS ABOUT OPERATIONS	16
<i>Venue, Instruction and Cost</i>	17
<i>Muzzling Criticism</i>	17
<i>Human Rights</i>	17
STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE ISRAEL KNESSET (PARLIAMENT).....	18
APPENDICES	19
APPENDIX ONE.....	19
<i>QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO THE U.S. CONSULATE IN JERUSALEM, NOT RESPONDED TO</i>	19
APPENDICES TWO THROUGH FIVE.....	20
<i>PERTAIN TO US LEGAL RESTRICTIONS ON AID TO THE PA AND CONGRESSIONAL INTENTIONS IN THE MATTER</i>	20
APPENDIX TWO	20
APPENDIX THREE.....	20
APPENDIX FOUR.....	21
APPENDIX FIVE	21

Reception

In many quarters the plans for the US Security Coordinator Team have been greeted with enthusiasm. Maj. General Diab el-Ali, Commander, Palestinian National Security Forces,² speaks with optimism about the success of the program:

“We're building a force to defend our people, and also to help the Palestinians build a nation. We must protect the people from any danger. Currently, the focus is on protecting people from internal clashes and fighting among themselves. The main thing now is to enforce the law in Palestinian cities. By doing this, we generate security, which generates prosperity. And if the situation will improve, and if we have a state, we will need to expand our mission and improve our capabilities to be just like national security forces all over the world.”

“Part of the PNSF will be police and part will be more like a basic army, and each group will have their own requirements and specialty areas...”

Political consultant Yossi Alpher — who co-founded and does editing for the Israeli-Palestinian website www.bitterlemons.org — offered this perspective when requested to do so:³

“I believe the Dayton force is a very good thing for Israel. It has already contributed to a considerable restoration of law and order in the West Bank. It has renewed Israeli-Palestinian security links and coordination. And it appears to be better trained and less corrupt or likely to sink into a terrorist pattern than any of its predecessors among Palestinian security forces. It is part of a broad development program supervised by PM Fayyad to put the PA on track toward a statehood that Israel can live with.”

Senator John Kerry, Chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in a talk to the Saban Center of the Brookings Institution on March 4, 2009, had this to say:

“For years, everyone has talked of the need to give the Israelis a legitimate partner for peace. But the truth is we all failed to do all we could to help President Mahmoud Abbas develop governance capacity and build legitimacy... We must help the Palestinian Authority deliver for the Palestinian people, and we must do it now.”

“...Most importantly, this means strengthening General Dayton's efforts to train Palestinian security forces that can keep order and fight terror. Recent developments have been extremely encouraging...”

While veteran New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman recently wrote:

“A Palestinian peace partner for Israel may be taking shape again.”

“The key to this rebirth was the recruitment, training and deployment of four battalions of new Palestinian National Security Forces.”⁴

Development

Background

An understanding of the current situation — and the reason for present enthusiasm — requires a look backward:

Starting in 1994, after the advent of the Oslo accord, Israel had permitted the PLO to bring in thousands of soldiers of the Palestinian Liberation Army from countries such as Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Tunisia and Yemen.

These efforts were not successful, as the soldiers were well past their prime. Subsequent recruitment of young Palestinians from the West Bank and Gaza Strip brought new blood to the burgeoning security forces. However, the old PLA commanders became chiefs of their fiefdoms, using their troops for personal gain and siphoning off funds from their salaries.

The new chairman of the Palestinian Authority, Yasser Arafat, whose career credo was divide and rule, prevented the establishment of a chain of command.⁵ Instead, he insisted that all PA commanders report to him. Arafat played one commander off another as well as subordinate off his superior, thus generating chaos and demoralization. The West began seriously working with the PA security forces only after Arafat's death in 2004.

The following year, 2005, the European Union formed its European Union Coordinating Office for Palestinian Police Support, or EU COPPS, to develop PA civilian police. In 2007, the EU began train-and-equip operations for the PA police with a \$55 million budget.⁶ The key goals of EU COPPS, with an office in Ramallah, were to form a robust Western-style police force that was transparent and respected human rights.⁷

The EU has deployed at least 33 advisers in the West Bank to help train and mentor the police and establish infrastructure such as police stations. Today the PA police, commanded by Brig. Gen. Hazem Atallah, number about 7,200. Under EU COPPS, about 1,000 police officers have undergone training and at least 12 police stations have been opened in the West Bank. In mid-2008, the PA received pledges that totaled \$242 million from donor states, money meant to come under Atallah's supervision.

At the same time that EU COPPS was founded, the United States established the Office of the U.S. Security Coordinator (USSC). Its development and efforts constitute the focus of this report.

General William Ward, who founded the program, served in the office of Coordinator for eight months. He was succeeded in December 2005 by Lt. General Keith Dayton.

The goals established for the USSC were to coordinate Western funding and allocate it toward reform and restructuring of the PA security forces; to train personnel; and to render the entire apparatus transparent and accountable to the Palestinian government and people.⁸ The U.S. office, which has fewer than 50 people, coordinates efforts with EU COPPS. General Dayton and his senior aides are tasked with lobbying Congress in Washington as well as such governments as Egypt, Jordan and the six Gulf Cooperation Council states for assistance. The USSC Team is multi-national, currently with a British contingent of some eight people, a Canadian contingent of some 16 or more persons – including Arabic translators – and a handful of Turkish officers, all working with General Dayton.

A month after General Dayton took office, Hamas won Palestinian Legislative Council elections, thereby severely impacting the plans for USSC: Hamas, which held a majority of the seats in the legislature, was heavily represented in the government, notably with Ismail Haniyeh serving as prime minister.

The prospect that loomed was either a Hamas government in Palestinian areas or a Hamas-Fatah unity government. Hamas, in addition, created its own security forces, with generous funds from Iran and Syria.⁹ Plans for developing a PA security force were curtailed, and no funds of substance were forthcoming.

According to General Dayton,¹⁰ during this time period, USSC focused on coordinating international activity to help get the Gaza economy going, primarily via activities at the crossings into Gaza. Additionally there was coordination of British and Canadian training assistance to the Palestinian Guard — which reported directly to PA president Abbas and was considered to not be Hamas influenced; the Guard manned crossings from the Gaza side. The U.S. Secret Service, State Department's Bureau of Diplomatic Security and U.S. embassy in Tel Aviv provided counter-insurgency and bomb squad training to the Presidential Guard.¹¹

In June 2007, Hamas fighters routed a U.S. equipped and trained¹² PA force that was 10 times bigger and captured the Gaza Strip.

Current Situation

The Hamas coup served as a wake-up call for both the White House and Congress. What is more, an official separation — in reality not as clear or absolute as it was represented as being¹³ — between the Fatah-contingent of the PA and Hamas then ensued: PA president Mahmoud Abbas fired Hamas's Haniyeh in Gaza and appointed in his stead as prime minister Salam Fayyad, a political independent. Fayyad, greatly popular with Western governments¹⁴ and perceived as a competent moderate, made it possible for the US to now support a PA that was separate from Hamas, and ultimately would stand against Hamas.

Within weeks after the Hamas takeover, President George W. Bush announced an \$86 million security assistance program for the PA, allocated solely for the West Bank. (Additionally, in October 2007, the PA, with mostly Arab funding, opened the Palestinian Academy for Security Sciences in Jericho.) In 2008, the Bush administration and Congress added another \$75 million to PA security training. In June 2009, now with the support of the Obama administration,¹⁵ Congress approved \$109 million for training to be expended through 2011. The administration has requested another \$100 million for fiscal 2010 through the State Department's International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement program.¹⁶

(These plans and allocations were approved against the backdrop of US legal restrictions on assistance to the Palestinians. Please see Appendices Two through Five.)

Program, Plans, and Facilities

General Dayton decided to train and equip the National Security Forces and Presidential Guard, with NSF envisioned as the largest security agency and PG as an elite unit that would protect the Abbas regime. Since 2008, four NSF battalions, or about 2,100 troops, have been trained at the Jordan International Police Training Center outside Amman. (The center was used to train about 32,000 Iraqi police officers until around 2007, and the United States has sought to keep the facility active with its program for the Palestinians.) Three out of the four battalions —or 1,500 troops—came from NSF, with

the remaining unit of 600 from PG. Trainees have been a mix of troops already in service, who were among the first trained in Jordan, and new, young recruits, who comprised the groups most recently trained. Since May 2008, only new recruits, many 20 years old, were sent for training in Jordan.¹⁷ The remaining 6,000 troops within NSF that were not trained in Jordan had previously received standard PA training, with some undetermined number having been trained in Egypt.

All troops, new or already serving, are vetted for terrorist links, human rights violations, and/or criminal records by the CIA, Israel Security Services (Shabak), Jordan intelligence, and PA intelligence before they are admitted to U.S.-sponsored training courses.¹⁸

The U.S.-trained battalions have been deployed in Hebron, Jenin, Nablus and have been used in operations in Kalkilya and Tulkarm. In these areas the IDF has pulled back and allowed PA troops more latitude, but reserves the right to act as necessary and still does anti-terrorist operations at night. Cooperation between the IDF and PA security forces has increased.

The U.S. Coordinator's Office sees the PA security forces as able to take over security responsibility for most of the West Bank in 2010. General Dayton regards the training in Jordan as the key to the development of these forces; plans are already in place for the recruitment over the next year of three more battalions, with training to be done there. (The \$109 million allocated by Congress for this program through 2011 calls for 10 more battalions; General Dayton's preference is to utilize the Jordan facility for all battalions, but it has yet to be officially determined where the additional seven will be trained.) The U.S. program envisions NSF as ultimately growing from its current strength of 7,500 to up to 40,000 troops.¹⁹

The program has also overseen construction of two cutting-edge training facilities, for NSF and PG, in the West Bank city of Jericho. (At least two classes of senior PA officers have graduated an eight-week seminar on interoperability and security management.) Over the next year, there are U.S. plans to build two operational bases in the West Bank. While the Palestinian Academy for Security Sciences in Jericho is not under U.S. auspices, it is under the oversight of General Dayton, who has control over training, major operations and appointments.

Focus within the program is on four areas: training, equipment, infrastructure and the formation of an effective chain of command.²⁰

DynCorp International, headquartered in Falls Church VA, is contracted to provide the American training supervisors—who oversee Jordanian Arabic-speaking instructors—and equipment, according to specifications laid out by General Dayton and his staff. The intense 1,400-hours of instruction called for in the curriculum include human rights law, defensive tactics, first aid, urban and rural small-unit tactics, firearms, mounted- and foot-patrol techniques, and crime scene investigations.²¹ Course manuals are provided by the State Department's Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (INL).

General Dayton has attempted to separate the PA security forces from Fatah, but despite this effort, virtually every officer in the PA forces remains a member of Fatah and pays dues from his monthly salary. These officers are taught to pledge allegiance to Fatah and its militia.²²

The Heart of the Matter: A Palestinian State

In all venues, the goal is made clear: The training for PA security forces has not been developed simply to improve the capacity of the PA to maintain order. It is, rather, being done so that the Palestinian Authority will be in place to establish a state.

This is best understood within the broader context of U.S. policy: what is being promoted is a fast track for the creation of that state. In June 2009, a plan was advanced by the administration for a Palestinian state to be established within two years.²³ The seriousness with which this is being pushed is reflected in October reports regarding attempts — rebuffed by the Israelis — to have Israel start negotiations within a month, with the understanding that they would be committed before the fact to reaching an agreement for a state within two years.²⁴

The forces being trained via the U.S. program are seen as having two crucial roles vis-a-vis building that state.

One is establishment of law and order on the street. The other is confronting and taking down terrorists, primarily Hamas, in the West Bank: PA forces must have the capacity to stand against Hamas so that what happened in Gaza is not repeated. General Dayton refers to this as “Peace through Security.” He says,

*“We are now on that road, and we can make out the outlines of the destination ahead.”*²⁵

In a speech in Tulkarm in late April, addressing a battalion that had recently completed the U.S. training in Jordan, General Dayton declared:

*“As I look at you, I couldn't be more proud of the fact that you stepped up to be the founders of a Palestinian state.”*²⁶

While in his address to the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, on May 7, 2009,²⁷ General Dayton explained:

“...these young men [who have been through the training in Jordan], when they graduate, and their officers believe that their mission is to build a Palestinian state.”

In this talk, he described an interactive process that is highly politicized, and which, once again, reflects the goals of the U.S. government: His team works closely with others on reform of the Palestinian judicial system; and is “well tied in with the efforts of the Quartet special representative Tony Blair, and his team,” and “with Lt. Gen. Paul Selva...who is the roadmap monitor and reports directly to Secretary of State Clinton.”

As would be expected, the General does not project a vision of state building that is a slow and deliberate process. He told his audience at the Washington Institute that:

“With big expectations, come big risks. There is perhaps a two-year shelf life on being told that you're creating a state, when you're not.”

Critique

Inherent Conceptual Flaws in the Program

Major-General (res.) Ya'akov Amidror — former commander of the IDF's National Defense College and former head of the IDF's research and assessment division, with special responsibility for preparing the National Intelligence Assessment — suggests²⁸ that the Americans might possibly be acting with a certain naiveté in drafting these plans, operating on the basis of their dreams [for peace in the Middle East and the advantages of fostering a two-state solution], while ignoring pertinent facts.

A prominent Palestinian journalist interviewed for this report²⁹ agrees:

“To expect political fruits from this is a mistake — an illusion.”

Meddling

In many quarters the mission of the U.S. Coordinator's Team is viewed as having the ability to improve upon or “fix” what has been a problematic situation. That is implicit, for example, in the John Kerry and Thomas Friedman quotes above.

An opposing perspective, however, sees the mandate of the U.S. Coordinator's Team as a mistake that leads to inappropriate interference by the Americans — the net result being an exacerbation of problems rather than repair or improvement. Unintended consequences flow from what may have been sincerely meant actions if the dynamics are not sufficiently understood; in this situation the dynamics are extremely complex.

A prominent Palestinian journalist³⁰ concludes that the bold and public association of the Americans with the training of PA troops will actually give Hamas a boost in the next elections: There will be Palestinians who will not vote for a faction that appears to be controlled by the U.S., for the bottom line is that while Palestinians gladly take American aid, the U.S. is not seen by them as a friend.

Palestinian commentator Mohammed J. Herzallah — a former president of the Harvard Palestine Solidarity Movement and currently a graduate student at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy and a research fellow at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace — holds a similar opinion.

In July, Herzallah wrote:³¹

“The US-sponsored ‘security coordination’ program...has done more harm than good.

”... the[Coordinator's] agenda provides important clues about the scope and nature of US intervention in Palestinian affairs. Through the security coordination program, the US is penetrating the Palestinian Authority's (PA) core organs...

“More than the meddling in inter-factional Palestinian politics, US involvement extends to affairs within Fatah itself...

“[The]security coordination program has weakened the Palestinian presidency, discredited it in the eyes of its people and rendered it critically dependent on American and Israeli support for political survival. It has forced Hamas to seek support from regional powers to counter the US-sponsored scheme against it, and therefore allowed further external meddling in Palestinian

affairs. But perhaps the most important negative consequence is that by building direct ties with first- and second-tier commanders in the PA's security establishment and "young guard" elements in Fatah, the US has created new vested interests with a stake in continuing outside intervention. With the power, money and prestige that comes with US support, these new political cleavages start developing their own agendas and hence become a source of further disharmony in the Palestinian polity.

"[The] program has in effect, if not intent, deepened and solidified Palestinian disunity and discord..."

Loyalty

General Dayton has explained:

"The graduates [of the training program in Jordan] have been extensively schooled...on loyalty to the Palestinian flag and the Palestinian people."³²

This is precisely what would be expected in accordance with U.S. goals. But here, again, it must be questioned as to whether the deeper dynamics of the situation are understood.

In contrast, General Amidror has made the observation³³ that:

"You cannot train people to be loyal to what they don't believe in."

Dr. Mordecai Kedar, research associate at the Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies at Bar Ilan University,³⁴ says that, yes, the troops can be loyal to the PA now.

"However, when (not if) there will be domestic problems in the PA/Palestinian State these people will be loyal primarily to their clan [Arabic: hamula] rather than to the state, since they will never shoot their brothers or cousins... you can surely say that their loyalty will be according to the context of the event in which their participation will be required."

Explains a prominent Palestinian journalist,³⁵ the clan system is not as strong as it once was, and General Dayton has tried to work around it. However:

"This is Arab society. You can't erase a centuries-old tradition — can't tamper with culture. It will never work. You can't impose a solution on anyone."

To grasp this essential fact — and to recognize that members of a given clan may include both ruffians and terrorists who nonetheless command clan protection — is to understand that those running the U.S. training program may be over their heads when they imagine that they are training troops who will, under all circumstances, act for the good of a Palestinian state.

As to motivating troops to act on behalf of a Palestinian state, a knowledgeable Palestinian in touch with what is going on additionally observes³⁶ that often the first concern of the troops is not a state, but job security.

The Hamas Factor

The situation is often represented as being one of the West Bank versus Gaza, when in fact what we are looking at is one group (Fatah) versus another (Hamas), with considerably more connection between the two than is frequently recognized.

The PA troops being trained by the U.S. are, in theory, supposed to stand against Hamas, an Iranian proxy, so that it cannot take over in the West Bank.

Yet as this is being written, and as plans for training additional battalions are advanced, there is talk, once again, of the formation of a Hamas-Fatah unity government.

On September 14 of this year, Fatah reiterated its commitment to an Egyptian proposal for a joint government³⁷ and by October 14 had signed it. On September 28, Hamas accepted the plan as well.³⁸ Political dynamics in the beginning of October³⁹ subsequently slowed Hamas readiness to sign, although Hamas leaders say they are still in favor.⁴⁰ A Hamas representative has made it clear that endorsement of reconciliation with Fatah does not mean Hamas has made any concessions.⁴¹

That unity coalition, as it is being proposed, would see a revamping of PA security forces under exclusively Arab auspices; Hamas is particularly contemptuous of training for PA forces done under U.S. auspices. Additionally, Hamas is demanding that Fatah release all Hamas prisoners being held by the PA in the West Bank.

The Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA), a U.S. think tank, is quite clear in its position here: This institute has frequently expressed concern that the United States is training Palestinian security forces without a clear understanding of the authority to whom the force will ultimately answer.⁴²

Put simply: Why is the U.S. expending effort and funds on training a force that is expected to contain or take out Hamas, when the reality is that Hamas might command these very forces some day?

From the JINSA perspective, Hamas control might come simply as the result of legislative elections in the West Bank — even if no unity coalition were established. It is important to remember that Hamas did win the last elections, and that there is a real possibility that the PA (Fatah) is even weaker now because of American involvement. It is the assessment of General Amidror⁴³ that Hamas has the greater political strength, and with it the capacity to sabotage PA attempts at state-building.

According on one source,⁴⁴ if PA president Mahmoud Abbas releases Hamas prisoners as a gesture, even if the unity coalition never materializes, he will have made a mockery of American efforts, which are supposed to be working to ensure that the PA forces arrest Hamas operatives with terror links.

It is appropriate to ask why the U.S. is prepared to work with and invest in a PA that is willing to consider a unity coalition with Hamas and the release of Hamas prisoners. Do those establishing U.S. policy genuinely believe that training of some thousands of young recruits will make the difference if the governing powers of the PA are prepared to court Hamas?

Fatah/PA position on terrorism

Says General Amidror⁴⁵:

“There is a huge difference in the Palestinian view between law enforcement, which is seen as legitimate, and anti-terrorism, which is NOT seen as legitimate.

“The U.S. confuses the two.”

The U.S. is reassured because PA forces at present are taking on Hamas in a variety of contexts and sometimes successfully (more on this below): This is read as a turning point in the attitude of the PA — a new and genuine cooperation with the West with regard to combating terrorism.

However, the more realistic scenario, attested to by a number of sources, is this:

It suits PA purposes at present to conduct itself this way because of a convergence of interests — Hamas is seen as a mutual threat. The only time the PA forces do security operations is when Hamas is undermining the PA. When the PA perceives that it may be weakened by Hamas, it has no choice but to take it on.

What is more, the “anti-Hamas” operations that have been done please the West, and engender support — in particular from the U.S. The PA sees that it accrues benefits in terms of U.S. largesse and training as the result of its current policies.

There is, however, no action against Hamas undertaken by PA security forces out of anti-terrorist ideological conviction or solely to protect Israel.⁴⁶ This basic fact is critical to an understanding of what is happening.

The evidence that the PA is not opposed to terrorism is extensive.

Salam Fayyad, PA prime minister, reached an agreement with the forces of Al- Aqsa Brigades — a terrorist group linked to Fatah — not to arrest them as long as they maintained a low profile. Al- Aqsa people are sheltered and receive salaries from Fayyad.⁴⁷ When PA security troops were deployed in Nablus, Al-Aqsa people who had not been trained in Jordan and were not vetted received command positions, this included one individual who had engaged in extortion.⁴⁸

The point here is that Al-Aqsa presents no threat to the PA, and so the fact that it may have the capacity and motivation to kill Jews is of no interest.

On February 28, 2008, Mahmoud Abbas, president of the PA, gave an interview to the Jordanian daily, *Al Dustur*.

“At this present juncture, I am opposed to armed struggle because we cannot succeed in it, but maybe in the future things will be different...”

“I was honored to be the one to shoot the first bullet in 1965 [Fatah terror against Israel began in 1965], and to have taught resistance to many in this area and around the world, defining it and when it is beneficial and when it is not...”⁴⁹

On July 30, 2008, Salam Fayyad, PA prime minister, told reporters in Cairo:

*“We are certainly an occupied people and resistance is a legitimate right for the Palestinian people as an occupied people.”*⁵⁰

In August of this year, Fatah held its first conference in twenty years. Abbas, in his opening address, said:

“It is the right of people to say ... these negotiations [with Israel] are in vain...”

“Although peace is our choice, we reserve the right to resistance, legitimate under international law...”

“We are not terrorists, and we reject a description of our legitimate struggle as terrorism.”

Word play: “Resistance” is a code word within Palestinian society for violent action against Israel.

*“The Palestinians are very honest about their intentions. You have to listen to what they say in Arabic, not what they say in English.”*⁵¹

It is because PA action against Hamas is self-interested pragmatism and not based on anti-terrorist principle that the leadership is ready to consider a unity coalition with Hamas, which has never tried to hide its commitment to terrorism.⁵²

At this time the PA is playing both ends against the middle. This cannot be sustained indefinitely. Should the decision be made that there is more to gain from cooperating with Hamas than from taking on Hamas, there will be a significant shift in the PA position, repudiating U. S. efforts.

Risk to Israel of Attack by PA forces

The possibility that forces being trained by the U.S. now will eventually turn on the IDF, using enhanced skills and equipment, is exceedingly high. There is strong precedent for this, as PA security forces trained by the CIA have several times turned on Israel, in particular in 1996 and following, and again during the Second Intifada that began in 2000.⁵³

Several knowledgeable sources consulted for this report consider it inevitable that in the end the PA forces will once again turn on Israel. It is thought that neither the vetting being done nor the alleged training for loyalty will ultimately make a difference.

What makes this all the more likely is the linkage of the forces to the formation of a state. General Dayton’s statement regarding the time limit for creation of a Palestinian state, cited above and again here, strongly suggests that he perceives the potential for problems inherent in current U.S. plans:

*“With big expectations, come big risks. There is perhaps a two-year shelf life on being told that you're creating a state, when you're not.”*⁵⁴

The international community is receiving this state of affairs with considerable equanimity. The assumption is broadly made that there is now a two-year window for establishing a Palestinian state, but that, especially with current U.S. efforts, this can be done and there will therefore be no problems.

PA prime minister Salam Fayyad has picked up on the “two-year” theme and announced, on August 25, 2009, that it was a “must” that a “de facto” Palestinian state be established within two years,⁵⁵ during which time he would build the institutions necessary for the state (something that has not been achieved by the PA since its establishment in 1994). This reassured many with regard to moderate PA intentions and capacity for state building.

However, a closer look at what Fayyad intends is in order, for his plans reflect neither moderation nor the compromise necessary for reaching an agreement with Israel:

Fayyad’s written plan⁵⁶ calls for Israel’s return to pre-1967 armistice lines, with Jerusalem as the Palestinian capital, and resolution of the refugee problem based on Resolution 194 (which is used as the basis of arguments that the refugees have the “right” to return to Israel). This reflects not an iota of change from what the Palestinians have demanded at the negotiating table with Israel for years, and it is not a plan that has even a remote chance of being accepted by Israel now. Particularly is this so as there is no mention of recognizing Israel’s right to exist as the state of the Jewish people.

Other provisions of the plan make it eminently clear that the state envisioned by Fayyad would not be moderate at all:

- It speaks of teaching Shari’a (Islamic law) and maintaining Shari’a courts, which operate in a method that is the antithesis of what would be expected of a moderate democracy.
- It states that “all Palestinians are equal before the law,” rather than referring to all citizens or residents of the state, bringing into question whether this state would operate on a system closer to Apartheid than liberal democracy.
- It speaks about including sovereignty over Gaza and restoring unity, which refers to intentions to establish a governing coalition with Hamas. As discussed above, this insures a climate that is not moderate.

Rather than simply hoping for the best, it is time for U.S. decision-makers to ask what will happen if no Palestinian state is established within two years, or if one is declared unilaterally that is not moderate in its principles and practices and is not accepted by Israel.

If the forces trained by the U.S. are led to believe that they are building a state and see Israel as the obstacle to the founding or acceptance of that state, against whom will they apply their enhanced military expertise?

PA Capacity to Stand Against Hamas

The scenario as presented by the U.S. Coordinator’s Team has the IDF pulling out of the West Bank within two years, leaving security operations entirely to the PA.

There is, however, a strong body of opinion amongst reputable military analysts that PA security forces will never be able to do this on their own. A host of factors play into this, including: clan allegiances, ambivalence about combating terrorism, the PA force reluctance to take on the tough jobs, and demonstrated lack of moral and determination (see below “Security Forces on the Ground”).

The fierce determination of Hamas to sabotage the PA should not be underestimated. In 2009, PA General Intelligence concluded that Hamas had recruited senior PA officers to spy on the political and security leadership.⁵⁷

Already, Hamas has succeeded in building a secret paramilitary force in several West Bank cities under the noses of the PA. In an exercise in November 2008, a mock Hamas force overran a PA Preventative Security Apparatus facility and freed Hamas prisoners. PSA officers, believing the attack to be real, fled, and commanders aborted the exercise and warned participants not to speak of it.⁵⁸

General Amidror⁵⁹ — who points out that in Gaza there were Fatah forces that joined Hamas instead of fighting it — maintains that U.S.-trained forces can be effective only under the IDF umbrella, with the IDF maintaining the right to garner intelligence and act on it, and monitoring what comes into the West Bank.

The current U.S. plan may actually facilitate a Hamas take-over in the West Bank.

Jordanian Unease

The crown on the head of the Hashemite king of Jordan rests uneasy, because he belongs to a minority group in a nation that is 70% Palestinian. There is a history: It was because of a threat to the throne that King Hussein in September 1970 expelled the PLO from Jordan and, in the course of fighting, killed thousands of Palestinians.

The Jordanian government has become increasingly concerned that PA officers, trained in Jordan, would sell their services to Palestinian insurgents in the Hashemite kingdom. One scenario raised within Jordanian intelligence circles has the PA officers helping to foment a Palestinian revolt in the kingdom.⁶⁰

The Security Forces on the Ground

One achievement of the PA security forces, to date, took place in January 2009 during the Israel war against the Hamas regime in the Gaza Strip.

PA security forces coordinated with the Israel Army and blocked Hamas attempts to organize violent rallies in both the West Bank and Jerusalem.

The U.S. team played a role in coordinating the Israeli and PA commanders as well as in providing incentives for Palestinian cooperation. The result was that PA security forces kept the demonstrations under control, which enabled Israel to divert forces to the Gaza Strip.

For Israel, the PA operation marked a watershed and changed the minds of several senior commanders who had been skeptical of the U.S. program.

Failures

There have been consistent failures in missions by U.S.-trained forces in the West Bank. In several cases, heavily-armed and large numbers of PA troops failed to overcome insurgents in such West Bank cities as Jenin, Kalkilya and Nablus. PA agencies were unable to communicate, the chain of command proved inadequate and discipline was deemed extremely low. PA operations are quite limited in scope, with the IDF taking on tasks that the PA forces will not confront. If Israel secures intelligence on Hamas or Islamic Jihad, the IDF often must assume responsibility.⁶¹

Nablus

Because almost every officer in the PA security forces remains a member of Fatah, pledging allegiance to Fatah, PA units have refused to battle Fatah-allied militia fighters — primarily from the terrorist Al-Aqsa Brigades — or stop their sabotage.

In Nablus, elite PA forces trained in Jordan have been unwilling to stop Fatah militia operations, including extortion and abductions.

In April 2009, PA security forces trained in Jordan literally fled an operation to expel Fatah gunmen from Nablus's Old City quarter. More than 300 NSF and other officers raided the Old City and couldn't get past Fatah gunfire. The PA force tried six times to reach a suspected Fatah stronghold before abandoning the mission. The PA, in what was deemed a miserable failure, estimated the Fatah force at 13 fighters armed with light weapons. In the end, the Israel Army attacked the Fatah stronghold and killed a militia commander.⁶²

In July 2009, the PA, with assistance from U.S. offices, arranged a music festival meant to highlight Nablus as the economic capital of the West Bank, but Fatah militia set out to sabotage it. Despite heavy PA security, Fatah thugs entered the festival area and torched the performance stages, bringing the event to an end. Fatah had warned against staging a festival that contained rock and rap music, but Palestinian sources said the militiamen were upset that they had not been paid to maintain quiet. NSF and police units did nothing to stop the attack or make any arrests.⁶³

Facing Islamic Jihad

PA security forces have also failed in operations against the Iranian-sponsored Islamic Jihad in the West Bank. In May 2009, the PA deployed a force of 480 officers, most of them from NSF, to expel Jihad fighters in the Palestinian refugee camp of Kabatya, located south of Jenin, which is the main base of the militia. The operation was regarded as vital to stopping Jihad insurgency activities around Jenin and the northern West Bank.

An advanced unit of 200 PA officers from an elite police unit entered Kabatya and was met by heavy fire from both Jihad as well as Fatah insurgents. The PA force was surprised by the resistance and officers began to flee. Commanders were unable to maintain discipline and within 30 minutes the PA operation was called off. No arrests were made.⁶⁴

Comparison with Hamas

The Islamic regime in Gaza faces about 40,000 former Fatah and PA fighters as well as several thousand Al Qaeda-aligned insurgents and supporters. In August 2009, a force of some 2,000 Hamas soldiers and police blocked the southern Gaza Strip and raided a mosque in Rafah controlled by the Al Qaeda-aligned Jund Ansar Allah, a militia believed to be funded by Saudi Arabia. In a 12-hour battle, Hamas destroyed a force of about 100 Jund fighters and killed its commander, Abdul Latif Mussa.⁶⁵ Hamas's successes in battling much larger insurgency forces have come in spite of an Israeli siege on the Gaza Strip. Unlike in the PA, Hamas commanders are united by a strong sense of mission and discipline. There have been no reports of a Hamas retreat in any operation against Fatah or other insurgents in the Gaza Strip since the Islamic takeover in 2007.

Further Concerns about Operations

Conversations with numerous PA officials and security sources as well as with diplomats with intimate knowledge of the program and PA security agencies have yielded additional insights regarding the

manner in which the program is being operated:

Venue, Instruction and Cost

Criticism has come from senior PA commanders and even from Prime Minister Salam Fayyad and concerns the venue of training, type of instruction and cost. In the absence of transparency, it is unclear how accurate the PA criticism is. But it clearly points to a gap between U.S. and PA assessments of the requirements of Palestinian security forces.

Some PA officials assert that the program in Jordan is largely irrelevant to requirements in the West Bank. They argue that most of the four-month program could be as easily taught in new PA security facilities in Jericho. Indeed, the biggest advantage cited by the officials is that trainees have not been limited in the amount of bullets they can fire.

The PA leadership has examined the complaints of the officers, and Fayyad himself determined that they are correct. In July, Fayyad, responsible for PA security, told a meeting of security commanders that he was dissatisfied with the quality of the training in Jordan.⁶⁶

Other PA security commanders assert that the training in Jordan does not suit the conditions in the West Bank. The Palestinian director of NSF training, Yunis al-Asi, has determined that his cadets were not absorbing the advanced instruction and called for a simpler program designed for the level of raw recruits.⁶⁷

Another complaint concerns the cost. The PA has determined that the cost of training in Jordan is more than 15 times what it would be in the West Bank (Jericho). An NSF battalion would be able to complete the same course in Jericho within three rather than four months, at a cost of \$700,000. The same training at the Jordan International Police Training Center now costs \$11 million.⁶⁸

Muzzling Criticism

Because the U.S. training program has been directly linked to a priority of the current administration, the fast-track establishment of an independent Palestinian state in the entire West Bank, criticism of the program and even demands for transparency have been seen as an obstacle to the U.S. goal. Non-governmental organizations have been stone-walled on requests for information on the training program, particularly with regard to teaching officers to respect human rights.⁶⁹

Human Rights

Whatever the results of the U.S. training program, virtually all Palestinians agree that it has not improved human rights. Palestinian and other human rights organizations report brutality, torture and arbitrary arrest by those PA security forces trained by both the United States and European Union..⁷⁰

Statements by Members of the Israel Knesset (Parliament)

All 120 members of the Israeli Knesset were asked for their response to the American training program for the PA security forces. Only a small number agreed to be interviewed.

Member of the Knesset (MK) Yaakov Edri, a member of the Kadima party and former Israeli Minister of Public Security, said that lessons had to be learned from previous times when PA people were trained to use weapons and guns were then turned against Israel. Edri suggested a meticulous system to check every step of the way in the training program.

Ayub Kara, a Druze Likud MK and a Deputy Minister in charge of Galilee and Negev development, added that, in his view, “The Palestinians are not ready for independence.”

Kara, explaining that he knows how the Arabs think, said that American forces are viewed as an invading force and would soon become a target of Arab terrorism.

In addition, Kara asserted that even if it is in American interests to have armed forces on the ground, that this is not an Israeli interest. Kara said that while it may have been an American interest to expel the Jews from all of Gaza, the reality shows that this was not in Israel’s interest, adding that “ Now, instead of 7,000 Israelis in the line of fire from Gaza, we have 700,000 in the line of fire from Gaza.” Kara complained about Israel Defense Minister Barak’s “zig-zag” policy of wanting to appease American interests, and expressed the fear that any American training on the ground would be used to help the Arab war against Israel.

MK Otniel Schneller, from Kadima, offered another perspective, saying that there was a consensus decision to invite the American troops to train the Palestinian armed forces. When asked about the fact that the armed forces of the Fatah are still in a state of war with Israel, Schneller said that he acknowledged that fact and that he would prefer to be in an armed conflict with an American trained Fatah army instead of a disorganized band of terrorists.

MK Aryeh Eldad, from the National Union Party said that he was the only member of the sensitive Knesset Foreign Relations and Defense Committee to ask that the issue of American training of the PA forces be discussed, and that this discussion has yet to be held in the one forum of the Knesset where such security matters should be discussed.

MK Eldad did say that he had learned that all candidates for security training by the Americans had gone through a security check by Israeli intelligence.

He warned, however, that Israeli and even American security checks were irrelevant, since it is only a matter of time before the Fatah uses that training to make war on Israel.

APPENDICES

Appendix one

Questions submitted to the U.S. Consulate in Jerusalem, not responded to

In the third week of September 2009, a representative of the Center for Near East Policy Research submitted the questions below to appropriate persons within the U.S. Consulate in Jerusalem. No answers have been received.

1. One of the premises of the American military aid to the PA is that the PA would be using its military training to fight terrorist organizations, especially the Hamas. However, the PA is now speaking of a unity government with the terrorist group Hamas. PA president Mahmoud Abbas is in favor of this. How can the US train PA security troops, increasing their competency, when it is not clear at the end of the day who will be commanding them?
2. How can the US have confidence in, and work with, a PA leadership that plays both ends against the middle — claiming to work towards moderation and seeking a coalition with Hamas at one and the same time?
3. There is strong precedent for US-trained PA security troops utilizing their expertise against Israel. The training currently being done by the U.S. has been solidly linked to the formation of a Palestinian state. In a talk at the Washington Institute in May, General Dayton said: “With big expectations, come big risks. There is perhaps a two-year shelf life on being told that you're creating a state, when you're not.” The implication here is that violence directed at Israel may follow if there is no state within two years. Are U.S. decision-makers not concerned about the dangers to Israel inherent in what is currently being done?
4. The PA state now being promoted by PA prime minister Fayyad is not moderate. There is no compromise included on any of the key issues – Fayyad insists on Israel's return to pre-'67 armistice lines, the return of refugees, the PA control of all of Jerusalem. Is the U.S. complacent about the possibilities of establishing a Palestinian state, despite these considerable stumbling blocks?
5. There is considerable evidence — both from academics and Arabic-speaking journalists — for the influence of the *hamula* (clan) system in Palestinian society. This system, strongly entrenched within the society, demands that Palestinians give their first loyalty to the *hamula*, which means that troops in the security forces may have cousins who are linked to Hamas. In light of this, can the U.S. be confident that troops it is training will be loyal, first, to the Palestinian flag?
6. PA officials, according to published reports, said a four-month training course in Jordan costs \$11 million, while the same course in Jericho could cost as little as \$700,000. Can this be explained?
7. In July 2009, PA security, including NSF, failed to stop the sabotage by Fatah of the U.S.-supported festival in Nablus. Has the Coordinator's Team investigated this failure and, if so, what were the findings?
8. Will the PA armed forces have authority to arrest and detain Israelis?
9. What will be the legal process for Israelis if they are detained by the Palestinian armed forces?
10. Who will supervise the prison system? What human rights and civil liberties will the PA assure detainees?
11. How will the PA armed forces deal with those who continue terror operations?
12. How will PA armed forces cope with those caught planning, supplying, or engaging in terror operations?
13. Will the PA forces hand over such people to Israeli authorities?
14. How will weapons be controlled? Will illegal weapons be confiscated and destroyed?

APPENDICES TWO THROUGH FIVE

Pertain to US legal restrictions on aid to the PA and Congressional intentions in the matter

Appendix two

<http://tinyurl.com/yegfj87>

Congressional Research Service (CRS) Report for Congress
March 4, 2005

United States Aid to the Palestinians

by Clyde Mark
Specialist in Middle East Affairs Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division

"Congress wants to ensure that U.S. assistance is used for legitimate humanitarian projects and that no U.S. aid is diverted for military or terrorist use against Israel."

Appendix three

<http://tinyurl.com/ybz486w>

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 108TH CONGRESS 1st Session

MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2003,
FEBRUARY 13 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 12), 2003
p.195

PALESTINIAN STATEHOOD

SEC. 563. (a) LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE.—None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be provided to support a Palestinian state unless the Secretary of State determines and certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) a new leadership of a Palestinian governing entity has been democratically elected through credible and competitive elections;

(2) the elected governing entity of a new Palestinian state—

(A) has demonstrated a firm commitment to peaceful co-existence with the State of Israel;

(B) is taking appropriate measures to counter terrorism and terrorist financing in the West Bank and Gaza, including the dismantling of terrorist infrastructures;

(C) is establishing a new Palestinian security entity that is fully cooperative with appropriate Israeli and other appropriate security organizations; and

(3) the Palestinian Authority (or the governing body of a new Palestinian state) is working with other countries in the region to vigorously pursue efforts to establish a just, lasting, and comprehensive peace in the Middle East that will enable Israel

and an independent Palestinian state to exist within the context of full and normal relationships, which should include—

- (A) termination of all claims or states of belligerency;
- (B) respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence of every state in the area through measures including the establishment of demilitarized zones;
- (C) their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force;

Sec. 568. West Bank and Gaza Program

The conference report includes House language on this matter. It contains prior year language (also in the Senate amendment) requiring the Comptroller General of the United States to certify that procedures have been established to assure access to appropriate financial information in order to review the uses of funds provided for the West Bank and Gaza Program of the Economic Support Fund. In addition, the language requires the Secretary of State to take all appropriate steps to ensure that assistance is not provided to entities or individuals that advocate, plan, sponsor, engage in, or have engaged in, terrorist activity.

Appendix four

<http://tinyurl.com/yar36ej>

U.S. Foreign Aid to the Palestinians

Congressional Research Service RS22967

April 29, 2009

By: Jim Zanotti

Analyst in Middle Eastern Affairs

jzanotti@crs.loc.gov, 7-1441

p. 9

Assistance for PA Civil Security Forces

...aid has been given to train, reform, advise, house and provide non-lethal equipment for PA security forces loyal to President Abbas in an effort both to counter militants from organizations such as Hamas, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, and the Al-Aqsa Martyrs' Brigades, and to establish the rule of law for an expected Palestinian state.

Appendix five

<http://tinyurl.com/naheaf>

U.S. Foreign Aid to the Palestinians

Congressional Research Service R4064

June 24, 2009

By: Jim Zanotti

Analyst in Middle Eastern Affairs

jzanotti@crs.loc.gov, 7-1441

p. 7

Israeli-Palestinian agreements that authorized the creation of Palestinian security forces in the 1990s in areas of limited Palestinian self-rule contained clauses that preserve Israel's prerogative to conduct operations in those same areas for purposes of its own security.

p. 9

During the intifada, some members of Palestinian security forces engaged in activities aimed at Israeli soldiers and, in some cases, civilians. Palestinians generally characterized these actions as "resistance," but most Israelis perceived them to be acts of militancy and/or terrorism.

p. 35

... an option for Congress is for it to require audits of U.S. security assistance to the PA by the Comptroller General/Government Accountability Office (GAO), much as it periodically requires GAO to audit the USAID West Bank and Gaza program and U.S. contributions to the U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA).

Footnote 138

The Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008 (P.L. 110-252) contained the following reporting requirement as Section 1404: "Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act and 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations a report on assistance provided by the United States for the training of Palestinian security forces, including detailed descriptions of the training, curriculum, and equipment provided; an assessment of the training and the performance of forces after training has been completed; and a description of the assistance that has been pledged and provided to Palestinian security forces by other donors: *Provided* [emphasis original], That not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall report to the Committees on Appropriations, in classified form if necessary, on the security strategy of the Palestinian Authority."

The joint explanatory statement included in the conference report dated June 12, 2009 (H.Rept. 111-151) on H.R. 2346, Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 directs the Secretary of State "to submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, in classified form if necessary, on the use of assistance provided by the United States for the training of Palestinian security forces, including the training, curriculum, and equipment provided, an assessment of the effectiveness of the training and the performance of forces after training is completed, and an assessment of factors that limit the operational capabilities of forces trained."

¹ Address by Lt. Gen. Keith Dayton to the Washington Institute. May 7, 2009.

² In Interview with Defense News, October 19, 2009, p. 22.

³ Responding by e-mail on August 31, 2009.

⁴ "Green Shoots in Palestine II," *The New York Times*, August 8, 2009.

⁵ Gal Luft, "The Palestinian Security Forces: Capabilities and Effects on the Arab Military Balance."

⁶ "New Europe" weekly, December 2008.

⁷ EU COPPS fact sheet.

⁸ Address by Lt. Gen. Keith Dayton to the Washington Institute, op. cit.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Human Rights Watch report, "Internal Fight," July 29, 2008.

¹² In late May, 2003, CIA operatives in Gaza began training of a PA anti-terror force in anticipation of a confrontation with Hamas. See Khaled Abu Toameh, *The Jerusalem Post*, May 27, 2003.

Subsequently, the US transferred to Fatah forces in Gaza loyal to Mahmoud Abbas American-made small arms and ammunition as well as a wide range of military equipment and vehicles. Much of this equipment was seized by Hamas during its coup. See Nick Francona, The Washington Institute for Near East Policy, August 27, 2007.

¹³ According to Public Security Minister Avi Dichter last year, the PA transfers roughly 4 billion NIS (shekels) each year to Hamas to help pay salaries of its workers and security officers. *The Jerusalem Post*, May 25, 2008.

¹⁴ "Mr. Fayyad...has gained the confidence of the West..." *The New York Times*, August 25, 2009.

"Mr. Fayyad is the West's most trusted Palestinian partner. He has won praise from the U.S. and other Western countries..." Charles Levinson, *Wall Street Journal*, March 13, 2009.

¹⁵ Obama has extended Dayton's tour of duty for an additional two years and is on record as saying he relies upon advice from General Dayton.

¹⁶ "U.S. Security Assistance to the Palestinian Authority." Congressional Research Service. June 2009.

¹⁷ According to "U.S. Security Assistance to the Palestinian Authority," Congressional Resource Service, June 2009: From May 2008, only new recruits, many 20 years old, were sent for training in Jordan.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Middle East Newslines, November 14, 2008.

²⁰ Address by Lt. Gen. Keith Dayton to the Washington Institute, op. cit.

²¹ See description of courses by Stephen Smith, "Too Little, Too Late," *The New York Times*, May 19, 2008; Smith was part of an American monitoring group.

²² In a piece in the *Jerusalem Post* on June 24, 2007, Khaled Abu Toameh reported that PA president Abbas was going to merge Al-Aqsa Brigades, a terrorist arm of Fatah into the security forces:

“All the members of the Al-Aqsa Martyrs Brigades will become official members of the security forces,” sources said. “We want them to become a legitimate force operating within the frame of the Palestinian security forces.”

²³ Ha’aretz, June 9, 2009.

²⁴ Diplomatic correspondent Shlomo Tzesna writing on October 21, 2009 in the Hebrew journal *Yisrael Hayom*, as cited in translation by Dr. Aaron Lerner, director, Independent Media and Review and Analysis (IMRA): <http://imra.org.il/story.php3?id=46148>

²⁵ Address by Dayton to the Washington Institute, op. cit.

²⁶ Reuters, May 27, 2009.

²⁷ Op. cit.

²⁸ General Amidror was interviewed for this report on September 5, 2009.

²⁹ September 16, 2009.

³⁰ In interview, op. cit.

³¹ July 2, 2009: <http://electronicintifada.net/v2/article10639.shtml>.

³² Address by Dayton to the Washington Institute, op. cit.

³³ In interview, op. cit.

³⁴ Interviewed via telephone and e-mail exchanges over early September 2009, for purposes of this report.

³⁵ In interview, op. cit.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Reuters.

³⁸ Khaled Abu Toameh, *The Jerusalem Post*, September 29, 2009.

³⁹ When PA president Abbas, responding to American pressure, withdrew a demand that the UN Human Rights Council immediately consider the Goldstone Report, Hamas was furious. Abbas has since reversed his position.

⁴⁰ On October 17, The Palestinian news agency Ma’an cited Hamas leader Mushir al-Masri as saying, “Reconciliation is a strategic choice for Hamas...and we intend to sign the Egyptian agreement...”

⁴¹ For evidence of increased Fatah (PA) radicalization under the influence of Hamas, see Arlene Kushner, “Fatah as ‘Moderate’ – a Hard Look Post-Annapolis,” Center for Near East Policy Research, May 2008:

<http://www.israelbehindthenews.com/library/pdfs/FatahModerate.pdf>.

⁴² See, for example, JINSA Report # 900 of June 23, 2009.

⁴³ In interview, op. cit.

⁴⁴ An Israeli journalist, Arab-speaking and with PA connections, interviewed for this report.

⁴⁵ In interview, op. cit.

⁴⁶ According to Dr. Michael Widlanski, an Arabic-speaking specialist in PA media and politics, who was interviewed by phone for this report on August 27, 2009, there has not been a single case in which the PA security forces have taken arms from Hamas people when they were shooting at Israel.

⁴⁷ Israeli journalist with PA connections, op. cit.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Palestinian Media Watch, February 2008 Bulletin.

⁵⁰ Reuters.

⁵¹ Palestinian journalist, in interview, op. cit.

⁵² From the Hamas charter:

“[Peace] initiatives, the so-called peaceful solutions, and the international conferences to resolve the Palestinian problem, are all contrary to the beliefs of the Islamic Resistance Movement. . . .

“There is no solution to the Palestinian problem except by Jihad.” (article 13)

⁵³ From the *NY Sun*, August 21, 2007: A senior officer of PA president Abbas's Force 17 Presidential Guard unit, Abu Yousuf, told the *Sun* in an interview: “I do not think that the operations of the Palestinian resistance would have been so successful and would have killed more than one thousand Israelis since 2000. . . without these [American] trainings.”

Excerpt from journalist Roni Shaked, “Military Intelligence Warns About CIA Training of PA,” *Yediot Ahronot*, August 27, 1999 (translated by IMRA).

“Today there is already a difference of opinion regarding the merit of advancing Palestinian intelligence capabilities. In the GSS (Shabak) it is said that the American training helps in the struggle against terror. In Military Intelligence they think otherwise. The Palestinians, Military Intelligence maintains, also use the intelligence and knowledge against Israel.

According to a senior member of the Israeli defense establishment, the American-Palestinian connection hurts Israel – and in a big way. “Every course advances them, raises their level, helps them to become more professional. The CIA invests in them, gives them good courses. They get fantastic equipment, not just from the USA, also from European countries. The problem is that they also use the equipment against us, instead of using it to trap terrorists. So, for example, in the area of surveillance, they have a surveillance unit that monitors Israeli targets. And if you have advanced equipment, there is no problem monitoring military communications networks, intelligence networks or cellular phones.”

⁵⁴ Washington Institute Talk, op. cit.

⁵⁵ www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?pagename=JPost%2FJPArticle%2FShowFull&cid=1251145110420

⁵⁶ See <http://www.geneva-accord.org/images/Offical%20Paper%20-%20Program%20of%20the%20Thirteenth%20Government,%20August%202009.pdf>.

⁵⁷ “PA Security Forces Face Steep Climb to Reform,” *Jane’s Defense Weekly*, May 14, 2009.

⁵⁸ Source: PA security officer, December 2008.

⁵⁹ In interview, op. cit.

⁶⁰ Source: U.S. government consultant who recently met with Jordanian officials, August 2009.

⁶¹ Among the sources for this is General Amidror, *op. cit.* The General believes that Dayton-trained forces can be effective only under the umbrella of the IDF.

⁶² World Net Daily, July 31, 2009.

⁶³ *Ibid.*

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶⁵ World Tribune, August 25, 2009.

⁶⁶ "Palestinian Authority Seeks Changes in Security Training," *Jane's Defence Weekly*, August 5, 2009.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

⁶⁸ *Jane's Defence Weekly*, August 5, 2009, *op. cit.*

⁶⁹ Human Rights Watch Report, "Internal Fight," July 29, 2008.

⁷⁰ Palestinian Centre for Human Rights, August 11, 2009.