
OUTPOST



FEBRUARY 1993

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

CARTER, CLINTON AND THE ISLAMIC THREAT

Herbert Zweibon

In early 1979, as the domestic crises threatening the Shah of Iran multiplied and the Shah's downfall seemed imminent, the Carter administration dispatched a special emissary to Teheran. General Robert Huyser was sent to warn the Iranian military to refrain from staging a coup. Carter had made concern for human rights the hallmark of his foreign policy, and he was instinctively hostile to the idea of a military takeover in Iran. But his aversion to an authoritarian government that was pro-Western resulted, ironically, in the establishment of an authoritarian government that was fanatically anti-Western. It was one of the most egregious errors of judgement in Carter's error-ridden management of foreign affairs. By failing to realize that the only alternative to the Iranian military was the Iranian fundamentalist clergy, Carter paved the way for those clerics to seize power and bring the Ayatollah Khomeini back from his Paris exile. Suddenly the world found itself face-to-face with the first Islamic fundamentalist state, and it wasn't a pretty sight.

Soon the "human rights" president and his State Department advisers --Warren Christopher included--discovered that the Ayatollah whose triumph they helped facilitate was far worse a trampler of human rights than the Shah had ever been. Iranian minority groups like the Bahai and the Kurds were the first to taste Islamic oppression, followed by any Iranian Moslem who dared to dissent from the fundamentalist line in any manner. Then Islamic zeal was exported. Moslem terror gangs like Hezbollah, trained and armed by Teheran, wreaked havoc on Israel's northern border. Iranian-assisted Moslem fanatics seized power in Sudan, and today threaten Egypt and Algeria as well.

In view of the colossal errors made by Carter's advisers, the last thing one would have expected was that they would be promoted to new, even more influential positions in the Clinton administration. Yet Warren Christopher is now Secretary of State, Anthony Lake is National Security Adviser, and Americans have reason to fear that the U.S. will not be ready to deal with the

growing threat that militant Islam poses to the Free World.

The new administration must recognize, first and foremost, that its predecessors, Democrats and Republicans alike, erred in basing their Mideast policies on Moslem dictatorships. Previous presidents wrongly believed that U.S. reliance on Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia and Kuwait was the key to regional stability. In fact, as the Gulf War demonstrated, the Gulf states are unreliable, vulnerable allies who can neither defend themselves nor defend American interests in that part of the world--no matter how many billions of dollars worth of weapons are bestowed upon them, and no matter how many times Israel is pressured to make dangerous concessions to the Arabs.

The Clinton team must also realize that Moslem terrorists, such as the Hamas inciters deported by Israel, are a serious danger. If Israel doesn't stop them today, America and its other allies will be threatened by them tomorrow. Israel should not be pressured into making territorial concessions that will leave it at the mercy of the PLO and Hamas, nor should it be forced to sign unenforceable treaties with tyrants like Hafez Assad.

America, Israel, and the rest of the Free World must stand together in an uncompromising battle against militant Islam. Until the veteran Carterites accept this fact, one must fear that they have yet to learn from the mistakes they made just fourteen years ago. ♦

Herbert Zweibon is chairman of Americans For a Safe Israel.

IN THIS ISSUE:

The Arab Missile Threat ...3

Defending Terrorists' Rights ...4

Librarians on the Warpath ...7

With Friends Like These... ...11

CLINTON'S CHOICE

Even though Bill Clinton campaigned for the presidency on a strongly pro-Israel platform, and even though Al Gore was one of the most outspoken supporters of Israel during his Senate days, Israel's enemies are still hopeful that the new administration can be persuaded to adopt a more pro-Arab posture. The focus of their optimism is the left wing of the Democratic Party, which in recent years has become home to some strident critics of the Jewish State. "The Democratic Party of Scoop Jackson, Alan Cranston and Al Gore is also the party of Jimmy Carter, George Ball and Jesse Jackson," declared Prof. Edward Said of Columbia University, formerly a member of the PLO's National Council, at the recent annual convention of the Association of Arab-American University Graduates.

During the election campaign, the Clinton team skillfully brought the two Democratic factions together, preserving party unity for the sake of electoral interests. But the charting of a foreign policy for the Clinton administration is another matter entirely. Before the elections, differences could be temporarily set aside. After the elections, the new president will have to choose between the two approaches.

The early indications would seem to suggest that Clinton is leaning in the direction of Carterism. In choosing Warren Christopher, Anthony Lake, and Samuel Berger for top foreign policy posts, he has selected three men who are clearly identified with the failed foreign policy of the Carter era. With regard to the Middle East, Carter's team embraced Arab dictators, flirted with the PLO, and repeatedly pressured Israel to make one-sided concessions. Will Clinton's team do likewise? If so, Israel's friends will have their work cut out for them in the years to come.◇

U.S. INTERVENTION MEANS U.S. PRESSURE--ON ISRAEL

A handful of vocal doves in the Israeli government coalition may long for American "intervention" (read: pressure on Israel) in the Mideast talks, but Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin has made it clear that he does not share that sentiment. On December 16, the *Jerusalem Post* quoted Rabin as saying that he "does not want to see the U.S. take a position on substantive issues or put forward its own proposals."

Presumably Rabin is thinking about what happened on previous occasions when the U.S. took a position on substantive issues. On each such occasion, the U.S. adopted the Arab view and pressured Israel to make one-sided concessions to the Arabs. After the 1948

war, Truman pressured Israel to give up the northern Sinai and Gaza Strip to Egypt. After the 1956 war, Eisenhower pressured Israel to surrender the entire Sinai to Egypt. After the 1967 war, Nixon's team concocted the infamous Rogers Plan, which called for Israeli surrender of virtually all the territories won in fending off the Arab invasion. After the 1973 war, Kissinger forced Israel to surrender chunks of the Golan and Sinai, and in 1975, he pressured Israel to give up even more of the Sinai. In 1978, at Camp David, Carter pressured Israel to withdraw from the rest of the Sinai. In 1982, the Reagan administration pressured Israel to permit the escape of PLO forces from Lebanon.

Prime Minister Rabin therefore has every reason in the world to fear that new U.S. involvement in the Arab-Israeli negotiations will produce a similar outcome.◇

THE 6th FLEET: NEEDED IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

Writing in a recent issue of *Navy Times*, Retired Brigadier General James Hittle, formerly Assistant Secretary of the Navy, argued persuasively that regardless of proposed NATO cutbacks, the U.S. will need to keep the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean for many years to come. Whether to enforce the sea blockade against Serbia or to strike at Libyan nuclear weapons factories, the 6th Fleet is sure to play a vital role in the preservation of future U.S. interests in the strategically crucial Mediterranean. Clinton administration policymakers should keep this in mind before making drastic cutbacks in U.S. military spending. They should also keep in mind that only Israel, with its vital Haifa port, can offer the kind of reliable support role that the 6th Fleet will need.◇

Outpost

is published by
Americans For a Safe Israel
147 East 76 St.
New York, NY 10021
(212) 628-9400

Editor: Ruth King
Editorial Board: Erich Isaac, Rael Jean Isaac,
Herbert Zweibon. *Outpost* is distributed free of
charge to members of Americans For a Safe Israel.
Annual membership: \$50.

THE ARAB MISSILE THREAT IS GROWING

John Hutt Cunningham

When first conceived in 1983, the focus of the Strategic Defense Initiative was on defending the United States from a massive nuclear attack from the Soviet Union. But as the threat from the Soviet Union changed, so did the defenses envisioned by planners in the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization.

By the end of the 1980s, plans for orbiting laser defense systems had been dropped; the technology was too immature to be effective. Other directed energy systems were also put on the back burner in favor of long-range ground-based missile systems which would destroy incoming warheads by ramming into them.

Space-based missile interceptor ideas were refined into the Brilliant Pebbles concept: a small orbiting satellite which could maneuver into the path of an incoming missile and destroy it.

President Bush's announcement in 1991 of the

GPALS plan, or Global Protection Against Limited Strikes, further modified the original SDI concept. GPALS is designed to shoot down 200 warheads or missiles, fired from anywhere on the Earth, aimed at any target, American or otherwise. With the Soviet Union a decreasing threat, SDI was scaled back to deal with accidental, rogue and Third World missile attacks.

Instability and the loss of control throughout the former Soviet republics has made accidental or unauthorized launches more likely.

The U.S. intelligence community has estimated that by the end of the decade, as many as 24 Third World nations will have acquired ballistic missiles. Half of those may develop or acquire nuclear weapons. In addition, even more may gain either chemical or biological weapons capability, or both.

While CIA director Gates has said that there will be no direct missile threat to the United States "for at least a decade," other analysts dispute this. They note that several nations are engaged in space flight programs that could be converted to use as ICBM weapons. The Persian Gulf War vividly demonstrated the definite threat

from missile proliferation to U.S. forces, interests, and allies abroad.

Which countries possess, and are likely to gain, ballistic missiles is of extreme interest to the United States. The following is a listing of [some of the] countries engaged in acquiring ballistic missiles, mass destruction technologies, and space flight technologies...(Note: Chemical weapons are fairly easy to make, using readily available industrial chemicals sometimes used in the manufacturing of pesticides. Only confirmed chemical weapons programs will be mentioned in the listings.)

Only non-battlefield range ballistic missiles, i.e., over 100 kilometers range, are mentioned.

* **Algeria:** China is helping Algeria build a nuclear power reactor, claimed to be for energy production. Western analysts believe it to be part of an Algerian effort to acquire a nuclear weapons capability. Algeria has also approached China on buying M-11 short-range ballistic missiles.

* **Egypt** possesses and produces its own version of the Scud-B ballistic missile with a 300 kilometer range. Egypt has also been engaged in a program with Argentina to develop a medium-range ballistic missile. Called the Badr-2000, also known as the Vector, this 1,200 kilometer range missile is a spin-off of the Argentine Condor-II program. This effort may have ended with the demise of the Condor-II program. Egypt is currently negotiating with China for the purchase of one or more 300-megawatt nuclear power plants. It is believed that Egypt does not have a nuclear weapons program.

* **Iran** possesses and can produce the Scud-B ballistic missile with a 300 kilometer range. Iran used Scud-Bs against Iraq during the Iran-Iraq War in the 1980s. Iran has been working with Syria to extend the range of the Scud-B. A reported 1992 test of a Scud-B derivative flew 500 kilometers. Iran also has developed and deployed the 150 kilometer range Iran-130 missile.

In a joint project with Syria, Iran has purchased Scud-C missiles from North Korea, and received the first 150 missiles in May 1992. The Scud-C has a 600 kilometer range. Iran has also been negotiating for the purchase of North Korean built Nodong-1 missiles with a 1,300 kilometer range. Iran has been aggressively pursuing nuclear weapons, and has received Chinese assistance in constructing and operating a small nuclear research reactor.

Iran is negotiating the purchase of several 400 megawatt nuclear reactors from China. It has also been reported that Iran has purchased three tactical nuclear weapons from the former Soviet Republic of Khazakstan. In addition, Iran has a chemical weapons capability.

* **Libya** possesses Scud-B missiles with a 300 kilometer range. Libya is reportedly working with North Korea on testing of the Nodong-1, a 1,300 kilometer range ballistic missile, and has built a flight test range for the

(Continued on page 10)

LETTER FROM ISRAEL

Aryeh Shomron

ISRAELIS WHO DEFEND ARAB TERRORISTS' RIGHTS

These are tough times for the Association for Civil Rights in Israel. Once a widely-respected lobby for citizens rights --an admirable task in a country known for bureaucratic indifference to ordinary individuals-- the ACRI has become the target of public scorn in recent years because of its dramatic shift from citizens rights issues to the rights of Arab terrorist suspects. Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin's recent denunciation of the ACRI as "the Association for the Civil Rights of Hamas Terrorists" has damaged the organization's credibility even further.

Rabin's remark was ignited by the extraordinary efforts by the ACRI to block the deportation of the 415 Hamas inciters. The ACRI's director, Joshua Schoffman, tipped off that the buses carrying the Hamas gangsters were heading towards the Lebanese border, rushed in the middle of the night --and in a fierce downpour-- to wake up Supreme Court Justice Meir Shamgar in order to block the expulsions. The delay that Schoffman engineered gave the Lebanese Army the time it needed to deploy troops to prevent the Hamas men from entering Lebanon, thus triggering the subsequent p.r. crisis for Israel.

But it was not the first time that Rabin was at odds with the ACRI. Back in 1989, he told Israel Radio that

the ACRI's court actions "led to an increase in Arab terrorist firebombings," because they had undermined the ability of the Army to take deterrent steps such as dismantling the homes of captured terrorists.

Criticism from Israeli leaders is bad enough, but even more damaging has been the criticism leveled at the ACRI by its professional colleagues. Professor Alan Dershowitz of Harvard University, the internationally respected civil rights expert, has charged that "the majority of [the ACRI's] people come from the left...The Association has not been sufficiently sensitive to Israel's security problem in the territories. They inject their political philosophy into their civil rights activity."

That such criticism stings is evident from the nearly hysterical reaction of the ACRI's leaders to the slightest public criticism of their organization. Prof. Ruth Gavison, a longtime leader of the ACRI, responded to Prime Minister Rabin's most recent remark as "an attempt to literally incite violence against the ACRI." Even some ACRI activists winced at Gavison's emotion-laden blast.

But those civil libertarians within the ACRI who find Schoffman and Gavison too extreme are an isolated minority, and they have seen their legal interests subsumed to an agenda which in recent years has included --in addition to helping Arab terror suspects-- assisting convicted nuclear spy Mordechai Vanunu, defending the rights of Christian missionaries, and lobbying for the legalization of Arab-Jewish intermarriage.◇

Aryeh Shomron, a former New Yorker, reports for Outpost from Jerusalem.

One Minute to Midnight

Dr. Irving Moskowitz

THE NEW HAVEN FIASCO

A few years back, the University of New Haven (Connecticut) began exploring the idea of establishing a branch in Israel. It was a wonderful idea. The Jewish State suffers from a surplus of talented students and a shortage of universities--as a result, many promising pupils are turned away. The crisis has become even more acute with the arrival of large numbers of university-age immigrants from Russia and Ethiopia.

The problem that the University of New Haven ran into was that Israel's existing universities don't like competition--and they're used to having socialist bureaucrats prevent any competitors from arising. Thus the possibility of establishing a New Haven branch ran into a brick wall. The alternative was to establish its branch beyond the pre-1967 borders, where the Defense Ministry makes the final decisions--and the Ministry quickly gave its approval. The new campus was to be located in the

Jewish town of Elkana, in Samaria, and scheduled to open in early 1993. Then the news leaked out, and the Jewish left, with its Arab allies, swung into action.

Minister of Education Shulamit Aloni, whose leftwing ideology evidently takes precedence over Israel's educational needs, warned the New Haven authorities against setting up their campus in "occupied territory." Peace Now leaders wrote letters of protest. So did the leaders of Arab-American organizations and American Jewish leftist groups, including New Jewish Agenda.

There was still time for a counter-offensive. American Jewish organizations could have urged the New Haven officials to continue with their plans. Jewish contributors to the University of New Haven could have made their opinions felt. But they didn't, and last month the University announced that it was cancelling the Elkana project. Once again, the combination of Jewish silence and Arab and Jewish leftist noise has undermined Israel's needs.◇

Dr. Irving Moskowitz is a member of the Board of Governors of Americans For a Safe Israel.

THE LAND OF ISRAEL MOVEMENT: NOW MORE THAN EVER

More than two decades have passed since Shmuel Katz, the distinguished Israeli journalist, author, and leader of the Land of Israel Movement, helped inspire the establishment of Americans For a Safe Israel (which was created in 1971 by Drs. Rael and Erich Isaac, with Erich serving as its first chairman), but despite the passage of time, the dangers that Israel faces and the need for its American friends to take action, are as pressing today as they were then. That was the theme of Katz's keynote address to the lively and well-attended AFSI National Conference, in December.

"As I was saying 21 years ago," Katz began, "there was a need then, and there is a need now, to organize pressure on the American government not to use pressure on the Israeli government." Many audience members nodded in agreement.

During those early years, Katz recalled, "there was a Labor government, under Golda Meir, and it was she who was denounced as 'intransigent' by the American media because she didn't want to withdraw from the Suez Canal area." Today's situation is even more complicated, he said, because of the combination of international pressure and an Israeli government that is all too ready to succumb to such pressure.

"The Labor government, under Yitzhak Rabin, has entered into negotiations with a declared willingness to agree to 'territorial compromise'," Katz remarked. "In ordinary language, 'compromise' means that both sides give up something. But in the language of the current Arab-Israeli negotiations, 'compromise' means that Israel gives and the Arabs receive." Katz chided the Rabin government for appearing at the negotiating table "like the defeated party, having terms dictated to it, always ready to surrender to whatever demand is made by the Arabs or by the State Department." Katz expressed particular concern about the Rabin government's "sudden silence" on the Golan Heights issue. He accused Rabin of agreeing to an "unpublicized provision of the loan guarantees agreement with the U.S. --the freezing of Jewish settlements on the Golan, even though the Labor Party always regarded the Golan settlements as 'security settlements' that would never be surrendered."

Casting a wary eye on the new Clinton administration, Katz warned of the "very serious danger" that the State Department, still filled with career Arabists, would direct Middle East policy. He urged the audience "to consider the current situation an emergency situation, and to intensify your activities to resist U.S. pressure on Israel." This could be "a moment of crisis," he concluded, "and in a moment of crisis each of us must risk time, effort,

and money on Israel's behalf."

Other featured speakers covered a wide range of subjects. Rabbi Yehiel Leiter, executive director of the Council of Jewish Towns in Judea, Samaria and Gaza, offered a frightening portrayal of what life will be like for Jews in the territories under an Arab autonomy regime. AFSI Chairman Herbert Zweibon called for the reinvigoration of the Land of Israel alliance, between the nationalist camp in Israel and its Jewish and Christian supporters abroad, to strengthen Israel's hand during the current crisis. F. David Radler, chairman of the board of the *Jerusalem Post*, was the conference's official guest of honor and was given an award for his successful effort to

rid the *Post* of the political bias under which it had labored during its previous ownership.

Many of those in attendance were especially impressed by a panel on "The Islamic Fundamentalist Threat," featuring Michael Ledeen of the American Enterprise Institute and the historian J. S. Sorkin. Ledeen described the feverish efforts by the Islamic countries to develop nuclear weapons and to spread their influence throughout the Arab world. Sorkin explained in fascinating detail the efforts of Moslem propagandists to expropriate Jewish sacred writings, as well as aspects of Jewish and Zionist history, and use them on behalf of the cause of anti-Zionism.

It was a compelling and informative day--and a vital catalyst for pro-Israel action in the months to come.◇

LETTERS THEY REFUSED TO PUBLISH

November 9, 1992

Letters to the Editor
New York Times
To the Editor:

May 15, 1992

Letters to the Editor
Long Island Jewish World
To the Editor:

It is one thing to criticize this or that Israeli government policy; it is quite another to circulate outright falsehoods about Israeli treatment of Arabs. The statements attributed to the feminist author Letty Cottin Pogrebin, in your edition of April 10-16, cross the line that divides legitimate dissent from irresponsible slander.

Pogrebin is quoted as saying that she seeks to "foster Palestinian-Jewish dialogue" because "we knew what it is to be slaves, so we should help liberate people who are still enslaved." The Palestinian Arabs living under Israeli rule are not "enslaved." Far from it; they enjoy political rights and economic progress that far surpass anything available to Palestinian Arabs living elsewhere in the Middle East. The only people who are "enslaved" in the Mideast are the black children from the Dinka tribe, in Sudan, who have been kidnapped and enslaved by Sudanese government-backed Arab militias, and the black indentured servants who are kept as de-facto slaves by Arabs in North African countries. Unfortunately, precious little about Arab enslavement of blacks is heard from Ms. Pogrebin and her colleagues on the Jewish left.

Pogrebin is likewise off base in her allegation that Israel "deports Palestinians without due process." Every Palestinian Arab terrorist who is ordered deported from Israel is permitted to appeal the deportation order to Israel's High Court. Indeed, many of the attorneys who file those appeals are supplied by the Association for Civil Rights in Israel, which receives much of its budget (\$1.4-million in the last three years) from the New Israel Fund, on whose advisory council Ms. Pogrebin herself sits. (Her ignorance may be understandable, however, because the New Israel Fund's literature is so vaguely worded as to obscure the fact that the Association for Civil Rights provides lawyers to Arab terrorist suspects.) If most of the deportation orders are upheld by the courts, it is because the evidence against the terrorists is overwhelming; in several cases, however, deportation orders have been overturned. How could that have happened without "due process," Ms. Pogrebin?

Sincerely,

Herbert Zweibon
Chairman
Americans For a Safe Israel

Flora Lewis argues (Op-ed, November 9) that "World Jewry has a special responsibility" to save lives in Bosnia largely because Jews have been "victims of persecution." The corollary implicit in this argument is that if Jews have a duty to behave particularly well because their ancestors suffered so much persecution, then it follows that the descendants of people who have not been persecuted do not have a special duty to behave particularly well, and the descendants of the persecutors of the Jews can be excused altogether for behavior which would be hard to excuse in other people. This new moral philosophy should have wide popularity not only in Europe, but also among the Arab nations whose ancestors choked off Jewish immigration to Palestine during World War II. Following out the immaculate logic of her argument, Lewis instructs the Jews to offer Bosnian Muslims refuge in Israel in order to show "that the Jewish state does indeed want to get on in peace with its Muslim neighbors." No doubt this conciliatory gesture will have a mighty impact on these neighbors, Arab nations which have always treated *Arab* refugees like human refuse.

Sincerely,

Edward Alexander
Professor of English
University of Washington

July 31, 1992

Letters to the Editor
New Republic
To the Editor:

Robert W. Tucker ("The Protectorate," August 19) proposes that the key to Middle East peace is to persuade Israel to surrender territories in exchange for what he calls "an American security guarantee to Israel."

Israelis need only review the historical record to determine whether or not it would be wise to rely on such a guarantee. South Vietnam and Taiwan were given American security guarantees, only to have those guarantees discarded when they proved politically inconvenient (for presidents Nixon and Carter, respectively). Who can guarantee an American guarantee?

Sincerely,

Herbert Zweibon
Chairman
Americans For a Safe Israel

"HUMAN RIGHTS"
--OR ISRAEL-BASHING?
LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
TAKES AIM AT ISRAEL

(Editor's note: In July 1992, the annual convention of the American Library Association adopted two anti-Israel resolutions: one deplored what it claimed was Israeli "censorship" of Arab militants, while the second denounced the Israeli deportation of suspected terrorist Omar al-Safi, formerly a librarian at the pro-PLO Bir Zeit University, in Samaria. Jack Greenberg, a prominent attorney who chairs the Seattle chapter of Americans For a Safe Israel, wrote to the Association to protest the resolutions. Below are excerpts from his letter.)

December 9, 1992

Lois Ann Gregory-Wood
American Library Association
50 E. Huron St.
Chicago, IL 60611

Dear Miss Wood:

...Concerning the chronology you sent me in reply to my question as to when did the ALA ever condemn any other country in this turbulent world as it has treated Israel, my review indicates that in fact you have singled out only Israel except perhaps for the resolution against Chile's bookburning by its military (Israel, a democracy, does not, however, burn books and so cannot accept any pleasure from being cast in the same boat as the dictatorship of Chile).

In the case of Iran, it appears from what you have sent me that the objection there is only to the death threat against Salman Rushdie and not to any other Iranian civil and political rights violations.

Nowhere does there appear any criticism of human rights violations in any of the 22 Moslem countries that are in a declared state of war against Israel, not even in those bastions of democracy, Syria, Iraq, Saudi Arabia or Libya.

There was, however, in July 1991 a motherhood-and-apple pie approach to objecting to censorship generally "in the Middle East," but without mentioning any states specifically. Of noteworthy interest here was your stated hope that there should be found "a...proper balance between the protection of human rights and the need to ensure security for all inhabitants." It would appear from your July 1992 resolution, however, that this need for the security of its citizens is not to be allowed for the State of Israel.

I am quite appalled that the ALA felt compelled to send a copy of your resolution to the Palestine Liberation

Organization. Your organization is surely aware that this group of killers constitutes the world's leading terrorist organization whose hands are covered with the blood of thousands of innocent civilian men, women and children, and whose National Covenant called for the destruction of the sovereign State of Israel even when Judea and Samaria had already been in the hands of the Arabs for 16 years. What was the message supposed to be in your sending that resolution to the PLO?

Your resolution claims Israel violates the Geneva Convention of 1949 as a foreign occupier. Has anybody actually read that article? The Fourth Geneva Convention has no relevancy whatsoever. How can Israel be accused of being a foreign occupier?

Under the founding articles of the United Nations there is continuum from the League of Nations. After World War I, England was given mandatory power over the land of Palestine, as a homeland for the Jews, as very concisely set out in the preamble to the League's Mandate authorization. England was not given ownership over the land, only that the land was to be held in trust for the Jews.

In 1948, upon Israel being admitted to the UN, the Arab world refused to accept its establishment or its borders and invaded that fledgling state to wipe it out. Jordan, whose borders were clearly defined and internationally recognized prior to 1948, and which had no territorial dispute crossed its Jordan River border and conquered Judea and Samaria.

In the whole world, only England and Pakistan recognized that conquest and the UN most certainly condemned it. When the Arabs already held Judea-Samaria for 20 years (during that terrible period when every single vestige of anything Jewish, including Jewish schools, libraries and synagogues, was systematically destroyed and obliterated, did the ALA ever issue a condemnation?) and again attacked Israel in 1967, Israel was fortunate enough in its defensive action to be able to push Jordan back to her original proper border, back across the Jordan River.

Does the ALA oppose the UN and now joins England and Pakistan in suggesting that Judea-Samaria rightfully belongs to Jordan? Just whose land is Israel "occupying"? When in the history of the world was Judea-Samaria ever a separate sovereign land except when it was the possession of the Jews. I am sure you realize from any reading of the Judeo-Christian heritage that that land is where our Kings ruled, where our Patriarchs are buried, where our Prophets prophesied, where our Isaiah spoke to God, and where our Temple stood, directly on top of which --shades of the confrontation between Hindus and Moslems in India!-- the Arabs built their Dome of the Rock mosque after their invasion and conquest of the Jews in the 6th century. The Christian Bible doesn't once refer to Palestinian Arabs, the Koran doesn't once mention Jerusalem, and even UN Resolution 242 doesn't

(Continued on page 10)

BEHIND THE NEWSMAKERS

...San Francisco television station KQED, the local affiliate of the Public Broadcasting System, has suspended plans to air the documentary, "Israel: A Nation is Born," narrated by **Abba Eban**. KQED won't air Eban's series unless it can find a "Palestinian film" to "balance" it, according to station manager **Kevin Harris**. But KQED does plan to air a pro-PLO program called "Journey to the Occupied Lands" in the near future, without any pro-Israel film to "balance" it, says **Louise Stoll**, a leading pro-Israel activist in the Bay Area. Ironically, Eban's five-part documentary features numerous Arab speakers, giving their perspective on events in Israeli history...

...Female Arab terrorists who are imprisoned in Israel "are often raped and fondled by Israeli guards," according to pro-PLO journalist **Robert I. Friedman**, writing in the November 10 issue of New York's *Village Voice*. Unable to provide documentation for the charge, Friedman tried to imply that B'Tselem, the leftwing Israeli "human rights" group (Arab rights are actually its only concern), was the source of the allegation. That prompted an angry letter from B'Tselem spokesman Yuval Ginbar, who pointed out that "there has not, to our knowledge, been a single case of rape of a Palestinian woman prisoner for the past five years, i.e., the period which we have documented." Ginbar also noted that he had "consulted other human rights organizations, both Palestinian and Israeli," and "none of them have any knowledge of Palestinian women being raped in Israeli prisons." Friedman lamely replied by claiming that he had not suggested B'Tselem had made the rape charge, but had only written that "the torture of Arab security prisoners, which is often of a sexual nature, is commonplace, according to B'Tselem." Friedman's "defense" was too disingenuous for the *Voice* editors, who added a note after Friedman's reply, conceding that Friedman had indeed included his statement about rapes in the same paragraph as the reference to B'Tselem, "separated by one sentence," as if B'Tselem had made the charge...

...In a recent "news analysis" for the Los Angeles *Jewish Journal*, Israeli correspondent **Larry Derfner** declared that former Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir "used to crow" about how he had prevented the PLO from participating in the Arab-Israeli negotiations. "Such derisive language has no place in a news article," protested Morton Klein, president of the Philadelphia branch of the American Zionist Federation, in a letter published in the November 13-19 issue of the *Journal*. "The fact

that Derfner used a term like "crows" when referring to Shamir, but never used it in his references to Labor Party leaders, indicate that he has difficulty preventing partisanship from seeping into his reporting. Klein concluded: "One need not be a supporter of Shamir or his party to be disturbed by such language." In his reply, the *Journal's* editor, **Gene Lichtenstein**, ignored the substance of Klein's criticism, and seized upon the fact that Klein had referred to Derfner's report as a "news article." Wrote Lichtenstein: "Derfner's reports from Israel are not 'news articles'..."

...Meanwhile, the same *Journal* also recently published an essay by one **Leora Frucht**, depicting Israeli children who live on the Golan Heights as paranoid, irrational Syria-haters. Any explanation as to why the children might mistrust Syria? Not much. Frucht's 38-paragraph story had just one passing mention of Syrian bombardments of the Golan before 1974, and no reference whatsoever to Syrian-sponsored terrorist attacks against the Golan Jewish communities, such as the decapitation of a Golan yeshiva student by Syrian terrorists in 1975...

...For its Sunday feature Op-Ed piece on December 27, the *Miami Herald* chose an essay by Prof. **Kenneth Stein** of Emory University, urging the U.S. to become actively involved in the Arab-Israeli negotiations and put more pressure on Israel. He proposed three immediate steps by the Clinton administration: sending Secretary of State Warren Christopher to the Mideast, establishing a special "office for Arab-Israeli negotiations" at the State Department, and "a patient Middle East envoy with previous experience could be appointed." Stein is known to be close to former president **Jimmy Carter**, who has been loudly circulating rumors that he is being considered for just such an appointment...

...**Meir Pail**, former Israeli Knesset Member, argued in a recent op-ed article in the *Cleveland Jewish News* that "the majority of the Israeli people voted 'yes' to making peace" in the recent Israeli elections. He did not explain how it is that the Likud and its rightwing and religious allies won a majority of the votes. (Likud and its allies won 59 seats, Labor and the left won 56, the Arabs won 5.) That Pail fantasizes about winning a majority of Israeli votes is no surprise--having served in the Knesset as a representative of Maki, Israel's Communist Party, Pail knows first hand how lonely it feels to be an extremist whose views are rejected by 99% of the Israeli electorate...

SPOTLIGHT ON THE EXTREMISTS

...The attorney responsible for delaying Israel's deportation of the 415 Hamas terrorists --a delay that gave the Lebanese army the time needed to block the terrorists, thereby causing an international crisis-- was American-born **Joshua Schoffman**, director of the Association for Civil Rights in Israel. As a student at Brandeis University during the 1970s, Schoffman fought against attempts to raise food fees for kosher-observant students. Today, he fights on behalf of Arab terrorists...

...The Israel-bashing Council for the National Interest has a new president: former congressman and independent presidential candidate **John Anderson**. He replaces another Israel-hating former congressman, Paul Findley. When Anderson ran for president in 1980, he claimed to be pro-Israel and won more than 20% of the Jewish vote nationwide. After the election, he joined the board of directors of the Council for the National Interest...

...At a Peace Now meeting in New York last November, Prof. **Yaron Ezrahi** praised the Rabin government's proposal for elections to an Arab self-governing regime in Judea, Samaria, and Gaza. Said Ezrahi: "In the 3,000 years of recorded history, which I have studied, no government has ever proposed the election of another governing body, which it knows will lobby against the perceived interests of the first government." Could it be that all those other governments had the right idea?...

...The U.S. should become more active in the Arab-Israeli negotiations, even if that means putting some Kissinger-style pressure on Israel--so writes leftwing polemicist **Jesse Zel Lurie** in a recent issue of the *Florida Jewish Journal*. "A strong American intervention is badly needed in the Israeli-Palestinian talks and Israeli-Syrian talks," according to Lurie. "The history of Arab-Israeli negotiations proves that the parties cannot reach agreement without a broker...let's not forget Secretary of State Henry Kissinger in his almost endless shuttle among Mideast capitals"...

...**Daniel Kurtzer**, the most infamous of James Baker's Jewish advisers, took advantage of the transition period between presidents to put some more pressure on Israel. According to the *Washington Jewish Week*, Kurtzer "lectured top Israeli negotiators" in early

December "that since they are strong and already have a state of their own, they should make additional concessions to the unresponsive Palestinians." Kurtzer and the other Jewish State Department officials --**Dennis Ross**, **Richard Haas**, and **Aaron Miller**-- are reported to have "told the Israelis they were speaking to them as 'family' and in their best interest. The Israelis were outraged and the session got very heated..."

NOW AVAILABLE FROM AFSI:

Videos

NBC In Lebanon: A study of media misrepresentation.
58 minutes. Purchase \$100. Rental \$50

Books

With Friends Like These...: The Jewish Critics of Israel
by Edward Alexander (ed.) - \$10.95

The Jewish Idea and Its Enemies,
by Edward Alexander - \$19.95 (non-members \$20.95)

Politics, Lies, and Videotape,
by Yitschak Ben Gad - \$15.95 (non-members: \$18.95)

Minorities in the Middle East,
by Mordechai Nisan - \$29.95 (non-members: \$32.50)

The Hollow Peace,
by Shmuel Katz - \$14.95 (non-members: \$16.95)

If I Am Not For Myself: The Liberal Betrayal of the Jews
by Ruth Wisse - \$20.95 (non-members: \$22.95)

Monographs

The New Jewish Agenda,
by Rael Jean Isaac - \$2.00 (non-members: \$3.95)

Seymour Hersh's Obsessions,
by Rael Jean Isaac - \$1.00 (non-members: \$2.00)

The Hidden Alliances of Noam Chomsky,
by Werner Cohn - \$1.00 (non-members: \$2.95)

The New Israel Fund: A New Fund for Israel's Enemies,
by Joseph Puder - \$2.00 (non-members: \$3.95)

The Worldwide Struggle for Jewish Survival
by Irving Kett - \$1.00 (non-members: \$2.00)

Order from: **Americans For a Safe Israel,**
147 East 76 St., New York, NY 10021

LIBRARY ASSOCIATION TAKES AIM AT ISRAEL

(Continued from page 7)

once refer to Palestinian Arabs or the establishment of a second Palestinian Arab state. In view of the above, doesn't Israel have at least as good a claim to this land as anyone else? "Foreign occupier," indeed!

Your resolution completely overlooks that it was *after* Judea-Samaria was returned to the Jews that Bir Zeit University and the other institutions of higher learning were established under Israeli leadership. When that territory was under the control of Jordan, not one single college for the Palestinian Arabs was permitted.

Your resolution refers to U.S. aid given to Israel. Shame on the ALA. Most of that aid comes back here in interest payments and purchases. For the services Israel has rendered us, it's the cheapest investment ever. But has the ALA ever complained about the approximately same amount given to Egypt, plus America's forgiving of \$7-billion of Egyptian debt owed us? And that so-called "aid" to Israel isn't even a drop in the bucket compared to the money we spend "defending" the wealthiest nations in the world in Europe and Asia. And no American troops are in Israel!

Has the ALA ever put out a resolution deploring America's role as the world's foremost arms supplier to the Middle East? If Israel could get along with its economy and not have to divert so much of its meager resources in trying to keep up qualitatively with the huge arms sales sold by us to the petrodollar feudal dictatorships in the Middle East, she would have a chance to survive without the help you complain about.

And finally, where in the 22 Moslem nations at war with Israel is there a single Jewish librarian, a single Jewish journalist, a single Jewish newspaper or magazine permitted, a single Jewish synagogue, school or library operating, a single Jewish student attending an Arab university? In Israel, including in Judea-Samaria and Jerusalem itself, there is a plethora of Moslem newspapers, circulars, periodicals and Arabs attending Israeli universities. And they have their own radio programs, and complete freedom of religion. In which other Middle Eastern country do Arabs have more freedom to express and advance themselves? Even in the U.S. freedom cannot be misused to advocate or plan or participate in the violent overthrow of the government.

As librarians, you know that language is a powerful weapon and can be manipulated to a point of view. I object to your use of the term "Occupied West Bank." I have covered the point about occupation above--one does not "occupy" your own land. At least use a less biased and inflammatory term, such as "administered territories"...Clearly you mean to convey the impression

that Judea-Samaria is Arab land and that the Jews are conquering occupiers.

Your document is a propaganda victory for Israel-bashers. It is based on misplaced emotion, and terribly erroneous information. It encourages the Arabs not to make peace and not to negotiate in good faith when they see that a prestigious organization such as yours can be so easily misled into condemning the Jews. Your unbalanced resolution impugns the integrity of libraries and librarians everywhere. This resolution, like the United Nations' Zionism-equals-racism resolution, must be rescinded. If corrective action is not taken, there are enough organizations in this country that I feel will become involved to give your action the public contempt it deserves. In the spirit of fairness and impartiality, I hope this matter can be resolved.

Sincerely,
J. L. Greenberg

ARAB MISSILE THREAT

(Continued from page 3)

program. It has also been reported that Libya has been testing motors for its own missiles, the Al-Fatah, with a 950 kilometer range.

Libya...has built a massive chemical weapons factory that is the largest manufacturer of chemical weapons in the world. Libya fired Scud-Bs at the Italian island of Lampedusa in 1986 in retaliation for the U.S. Tripoli Raid. It is possible that Libya also used Scud-Bs during its 1991 campaign against neighboring Chad.

* **Syria** has been investing in a diverse array of ballistic missile systems. Syria possesses the 300 kilometer range Scud-B ballistic missile. Syria also possesses a number of shorter range SS-21 missiles with a 120 kilometer range. Syria has recently expanded its missile capabilities with the purchase of North Korean-built Scud-C missiles with a 600 kilometer range. Along with that sale, Syria also gained manufacturing equipment and is expected to be able to produce its own Scud-Cs. From China, Syria has purchased M-9 ballistic missiles with a 600 kilometer range. Syria has also purchased solid rocket motor technology from China that will help it produce its own missiles.

Syria is interested in acquiring nuclear weapons. Some reports indicate that Syria may be getting nuclear advice from both China and Pakistan. Syria is reported to have a large chemical weapons stockpile.◊

This article is excerpted from the January 1993 issue of High Frontier.

BOOK REVIEWS

Edward Alexander, ed., *With Friends Like These...: The Jewish Critics of Israel* (SPI paperback, 1992, \$10.95). Order by calling 212-628-9400.

It was widely assumed that the rise to power of the Israeli Labor Party and its leftwing allies would put an end to the phenomenon of American Jewish liberals attacking Israel. Since the Likud was supposedly responsible for angering nervous Jewish liberals abroad, the election of a dovish government should have appeased Israel's Diaspora critics--or so everybody thought.

The truth, however, was that the Jewish left was holding its fire only momentarily, ready to unleash new verbal barrages the moment that the Labor government did anything that displeased the Arabs or the State Department. Sure enough, the deportation of 415 Hamas members has brought Israel's Jewish critics back to the fore, and Prof. Edward Alexander's new book, *With Friends Like These...: The Jewish Critics of Israel* is therefore unusually timely. It brings together a variety of essays which skewer the Jews who are attacking Rabin as well as

those who previously attacked Shamir and Begin.

Thus Anthony Lewis, who used his column in the *New York Times* to blast Israel for supposedly harming Mideast peace by expelling the terrorists, is carefully analyzed --and demolished-- in an essay by Yitzhak Ben-Zvi. "During any extended crisis in the Arab-Israeli conflict, a reader of Lewis' column often has the feeling that he is being trained to recite a catechism or a conjugation, doled out in regular weekly installments: Israel will lose its soul; Israel is losing its soul; Israel has lost its soul," Ben-Zvi notes wryly.

The Association for Civil Rights in Israel (ACRI), which led the legal effort to block the Hamas expulsions --an effort that has been hailed in Jewish newspapers

from coast to coast by one of their U.S. cheerleaders, Ted Mann-- is exposed in fascinating detail by Joseph Puder. His essays focus on the New Israel Fund, financier of Israel's radical left, of which ACRI is the ideological anchor (and by far the largest recipient of New Israel Fund grants).

Thomas L. Friedman of the *New York Times*, whose "news reports" are a thinly-veiled effort to increase U.S. pressure on the Rabin government, is the subject of a fine essay by Prof. Jerold Auerbach. Friedman's best-selling book, *From Beirut to Jerusalem*, has played an important role in shaping American public perceptions about the Middle East. It is an Israel-bashing book, of course, but what made it so popular, Auerbach shows, was its theme of the "disillusioned" Jewish journalist whose support for Israel has been shaken by Israel's "cruel" behavior in Lebanon in 1982. In fact, Auerbach reveals, the "disillusionment" story is a "myth," invented to cover up the much less interesting real story of a young Jewish leftist who was hostile to Israel long before he went off to Lebanon as a journalist. As a campus activist at Brandeis University, Friedman was demanding that Israel give the PLO a state back in 1974--when Yitzhak Rabin was prime minister, long before Begin or settlements or Israeli troops in Lebanon. Auerbach's revelations about Friedman are devastating, and if this was a just world, it would be sufficient evidence to rescind the Pulitzer Prize that Friedman won for his reporting from Lebanon.

The political diversity of the authors who contributed to *With Friends Like These...* may surprise some readers. Typically, only those who are part of what is loosely known as the nationalist camp are willing to take up the cudgels against the Jewish far-left. Yet in these pages, one finds Peace Now under attack by the late Marie Syrkin, Noam Chomsky dissected by Werner Cohn, and Jews who met with the PLO strongly criticized by Jacob Neusner--three authors who could not by any stretch of the imagination be described as rightwing. They appear in this volume alongside the likes of Norman Podhoretz, Rael and Erich Isaac, and David Bar-Illan--which helps illustrate one of the most important themes of this book: those Jews who devote themselves to Israel-bashing are not merely "critics of Israeli policy"; that phrase would have applied to Marie Syrkin as well.

The individuals and organizations scrutinized in these pages have literally devoted themselves to damaging Israel's reputation. They are obsessed with weakening the Jewish State, forcing it to surrender to Arab demands, stripping it of its Jewish identity. That they seek to mask their hostile aims by wrapping themselves in sayings of the prophets is repulsive, but now, thankfully, we have *With Friends Like These..* to rip away that mask and reveal the true, unpleasant face of the Jewish radical left.◊

BALDERDASH

"Our country is largely occupied by the Israelis."

--Simon Karam, Lebanon's ambassador to the United States, on the McNeil-Lehrer News Hour, December 22, 1992

"We Palestinians are a democratic and tolerant people. It is in the interest of Israel to recognize that her security depends on a democratic Palestinian state by her side."

--Dr. Manuel S. Hassassian, leader of Christian Churches of Palestine, and dean of the Faculty of Arts at Bethlehem University, quoted in the December 1992/ January 1993 issue of the *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*

"The U.S. may also be unwilling to sustain foreign aid to Israel at these levels if Israel is unwilling to accept the U.N. land-for-peace formula, particularly when there are so many other worthy recipients of this aid in the Middle East..."

--former Senator George McGovern, addressing the Oxford University Middle East Society Conference, May 28, 1992

"The main security threat in the Middle East is posed not to but by Israel. It has secretly accumulated an arsenal of several hundred nuclear devices, repeatedly threatened to use them, and reacted with rage bordering on hysteria to any suggestion that it sign the UN convention prohibiting the proliferation of nuclear weapons. By contrast, the Arab military posture has been basically defensive."

--Prof. Norman Finkelstein, of Brooklyn College, in the December 1992 issue of the anti-Israel journal, *The Link*

Americans For a Safe Israel
147 East 76 St.
New York, NY 10021

NON-PROFIT
ORGANIZATION
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
NEW YORK, N.Y.
PERMIT NO. 9418