
OUTPOST

NOVEMBER 1993

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

ARAFAT VIOLATES HIS 201st AGREEMENT

Herbert Zweibon

The murder of two young Israeli hikers by Arab terrorists on October 10 was typically savage. The victims were stabbed, shot, bludgeoned with large rocks, and then according to an Israeli Army spokesman, their bodies were "severely mutilated." What did Israel's new "peace" partner have to say about such brutality? Radwan Abu Ayyash, an aide to Yasser Arafat, declared: "Those who are opposing the peace treaty are trying to create confusion." Although the Israel-PLO agreement requires the PLO to condemn such terrorism and attempt to punish its perpetrators (and President Clinton specifically reiterated those obligations in a September 13 *Washington Post* interview), Arafat's spokesman offered no expression of condemnation nor any pledge of punishment.

But is that surprising? After all, the ink was not even dry on the Israel-PLO agreement before Yasser Arafat and the PLO were violating its key provisions.

Defending terrorists. While refusing to condemn Arab terrorists, Arafat and the PLO have harshly condemned Israel for arresting terrorists. PLO spokesman Sari Nusseibeh denounced Israel's arrest of a prominent fugitive terrorist, Ahmed Ikmail (who was wanted for murdering Jewish and Arab civilians), whom he praised as a "soldier."

Encouraging terrorism. When Israel raided a number of Hamas terrorist hideouts in Gaza on October 2, the PLO was furious. PLO spokesman Bassam Abu Sharif not only denounced what he called "Israel's aggressive operations," but went so far as to declare that Israel's action "will only lead to reactions in self-defense"--meaning that as far as the PLO is concerned, any future Hamas terrorist acts are legitimate "self-defense reactions."

Spreading anti-Jewish bigotry. Earlier this year, the Moscow office of the PLO was reported to be distributing a Russian-language edition of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. There is no evidence that such activity has ceased. The PLO never apologized for the publication, in its official journals *Balsam* and *El-Istiqlal*, of articles calling the Holocaust "a Zionist hoax." Arafat

himself encouraged the continued circulation of anti-Jewish stereotypes with his reply, to a journalist's question, at the National Press Club on September 13, about why most Jews don't trust him. "Well, most Jews didn't trust Jesus, did they?" Arafat remarked. Arafat's outrageous comparison of himself to Jesus should have been condemned by Christians everywhere; his perpetuation of the stereotype of the 'mistrustful Jew' should arouse worldwide Jewish outrage.

Refusing to call off 'intifada' violence. Arafat has not yet made a single speech to an Arab audience urging Arabs to halt "intifada" violence. On the contrary, he has urged the Arab mobs to continue their attacks in all areas that have not yet been given over to PLO control.

Urging continuation of the Arab boycott. Although the PLO is supposed to be at peace with Israel, it is still urging the Arab regimes to continue their economic warfare against the Jewish State. In early October, PLO officials declared that the Arab economic boycott against Israel would continue at least until a PLO state is established with Jerusalem as its capitol. The boycott deprives Israel of billions of dollars worth of commerce by scaring away foreign companies that want to do business with the Jewish State.

In his analysis of the Israel-PLO accord, the veteran Israeli journalist Uri Dan noted that Israeli intelligence experts had examined some 200 agreements that Yasser Arafat has signed over the years, and found that he had honored none of them. Make that two hundred and one.◊

Herbert Zweibon is chairman of Americans For a Safe Israel.

IN THIS ISSUE:

<i>Rabin: A Modern King Canute?</i>	...3
<i>Report on the Washington Conference</i>	...4
<i>Israel and the Arabs: What Next?</i>	...5
<i>A Lawyer's Crusade Against Israel...</i>	...7
<i>Israel 1993, Yugoslavia 1941</i>	...8

TARGET: THE SETTLERS

The Jewish residents of Judea, Samaria and Gaza have good reason to fear that their safety will be sacrificed in the Rabin government's rush to appease PLO demands. Rabin set the stage earlier this year, when he attempted to delegitimize the settlers by denouncing them as "a bunch of crybabies." Now his crusade against the settlers seems to be shifting into high gear. The settlements of Talmon and Nahliel were informed in mid-October that their electricity generators will soon be repossessed by the Housing Ministry. Recent reports in the Israeli media indicate that there is a government plan to confiscate weapons from many of the settlers. An expose that recently appeared in the *Jerusalem Post* disclosed that the government is blocking the sale of unoccupied homes in Jewish settlements--and is preventing new homes that have families from being hooked up to electricity and water facilities. Imagine the outcry if any other government in the world tried to prevent Jews from living in certain neighborhoods, cut off the electricity of those already living there, and handed over control of the region to an organization that has committed thousands of violent anti-Jewish atrocities. Today the Israeli government is doing just that--and getting away with it, by calling it "the peace process."◇

"HOLOCAUST MENTALITY": ANOTHER VICIOUS MYTH

To the long list of vicious anti-Israel myths that certain American journalists propound, add a new and particularly vicious variety, courtesy of *New York Times* correspondent Thomas Friedman: the myth that Israel's fears about its security are not the result of Arab behavior but rather are an extension of Israel's own "Holocaust mentality." Writing in the *Times* in September, Friedman (who in the past has contemptuously referred to Israel as "Yad VaShem with an air force") announced that the signing of the Israel-PLO agreement could mark the beginning of Israel's emergence from its "Holocaust mentality."

Friedman's theory is beset by two problems, one a matter of history, the other a matter of demography. The historical problem is that the past century of Arab violence against Jews is a fact, no matter how politically inconvenient that may be for some. The demographic problem is that the majority of Israelis are not Holocaust survivors, or even Europeans at all, but are immigrants from Arab countries or the children of such immigrants--meaning that their view of the Middle East is not based on memories of the Holocaust, but on actual experience living in the Arab world.◇

Outpost

WHAT DO U.S. JEWS REALLY BELIEVE?

"New Poll Finds 90% of American Jews Support Israel-PLO Agreement," the headlines blared in late September. It is not often that 90% of U.S. Jews agree on a particular Israeli policy, and when one looks closer at the Israel-PLO treaty it turns out that the claim of "90% support" is fraudulent.

The poll in question was sponsored by the American Jewish Committee, and since the AJCommittee endorsed the Israel-PLO deal, it is no surprise that the poll's main question was worded in such a way as to produce a result as close as possible to the AJC's own viewpoint. Thus the lead question asked Jews if they regard the PLO's "recognition of Israel" as "a positive development." It was to that biased question that 90% of the respondents answered in the affirmative, and newspapers whose editors feel the same way naturally trumpeted that as the headline. A look at the other questions and responses, however, offers a more accurate picture of what American Jews really believe.

For example, a majority of U.S. Jews said they support autonomy for the Palestinian Arabs in the Gaza Strip and in the city of Jericho--but when asked if that autonomy should be later extended to the remainder of Judea and Samaria, only 43% said yes. In other words, a majority of American Jews want PLO self-rule restricted to two geographically small areas--a position far more hawkish than that of the Rabin government.

When asked if Israel should surrender all or parts of the Golan Heights in exchange for peace with Syria, a majority replied that Israel should keep all, or virtually all, of the Golan. Only 2% of American Jews favored giving up all of the Golan. With regard to Jerusalem, a solid majority opposed any concessions.

When even a slanted poll like the AJCommittee's produces such 'hawkish' results, it is not hard to imagine what a poll with non-partisan questions would discover about American Jewish attitudes. ◇

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.

YITZHAK RABIN: A MODERN KING CANUTE?

Erich Isaac

An old English tale relates that King Canute sat by the sea near Southampton and ordered the rising tide to go no farther. Ironically, the tale is sometimes told as if it illustrated the king's folly, although in its original form it was a lesson by the king to his courtiers--he was showing them that though they called him king, he lacked so much as the power to "stay by his commandment so much as this small portion of water."

Yitzhak Rabin is a modern King Canute, without the old Danish king's humility. He believes he has the power to turn back the tide of Islamic fundamentalism by his actions. There seems little doubt that a primary consideration in the decision by Israel's Labor leaders to prop up the fading Yasser Arafat (of whom even his Arab financial supporters had enough after he backed Saddam Hussein in the Gulf War) is that they see him as a counterbalance to Hamas and the forces of Islamic fundamentalism.

But leaving aside for the moment the absurdity of seeing Arafat's "phased" plan for Israel's destruction as something to be aided and abetted, there is enormous hubris in a government of Israel thinking that it can control the current in the Arab world. In medieval Christianity pride took first place among the deadly sins and its deadly consequences in this instance make one appreciate the wisdom of that ordering.

Islamic fundamentalism has a profound appeal to the Arab world and Israel's actions will have no effect in stemming it.

It must be recognized that fundamentalism has much greater appeal within Islam than it does in the Christian world. In the West, fundamentalist appeals face formidable cultural opposition, both from the secular society and state, and from competing Christian traditions. Christian fundamentalists must rely on differing textual interpretations or relatively recent theologies like dispensationalism, that are not in the theological mainstream. In Islam, however, fundamentalism *is* the mainstream tradition.

In the Arab world, there is no secular opposition to Islam. Quasi-secular ideologies which have made some inroads in Middle Eastern societies have refrained from challenging Islam. In the pre-World War II period, and during the war, Italian Fascism sought to portray itself as a form of Islamic fulfillment (e.g. "Mussolini as the Sword of Islam") and more recently the Communists claimed they were the true and more perfect Islam. The same line was used by the so-called 'socialist' Ba'ath.

Within Islamic thought, there is no effective intellectual opposition to the fundamentalist claim that *jihad*

is the central religious doctrine of Islam. The best non-fundamentalist Muslim intellectuals can do is to allegorize, symbolize, or mysticize this religious doctrine. They cannot get away from the fact that historically, Islam preached conquest of the whole world. All non-Islamic areas under Muslim law are *dar al-harb* or "territory of war," and peacemaking is only an expedient in times of weakness, or a stratagem of war. From this it followed that arrangements between the *dar al-Islam* and the *dar al-harb* must be short-lived, i.e. to be abrogated by Muslims whenever they had the strength to do so. Attempts to moralize the religious commandment for *jihad* (as "a struggle against inner or social evil," for example) are ineffective against the sonorities of fundamentalist Koranic calls for sacrifice and slaughter.

A second reason why Islamic fundamentalism has such force is that sufficiently countervailing social forces are lacking, especially in the Arab world. Yes, there are commercial interests, military, dynastic and political loyalties, and a complex of bureaucratic, ethnic and clan vested interests in Arab states. Regimes on occasion have successfully used such forces against internal threats: King Hussein of Jordan, for example, was able to call on tribal and military loyalties in quashing the Palestinian Arab uprising that became known as Black September.

But the ability of such countervailing forces to cope with growing fundamentalism is dubious. In Jordan a sick king has been forced into complicated maneuvers. On the one hand, he makes conciliatory gestures, freeing fundamentalist leaders who, armed by Iran, had sought his overthrow. On the other hand, he has made speeches against fundamentalism and against Iraq (!), which of course he supported in the Gulf War. In Egypt and Algeria, leaders have taken military/police action against Islamic radicals who have unleashed mob unrest and enjoy growing popular support.

As fundamentalism spreads in Muslim countries, it increasingly weakens countervailing interests. Its influence extends far beyond a pious proletariat or peasantry which formed the mainstay of forerunners in the Muslim Brotherhood. Indeed the appeal of an uncompromising Islam, demanding total submission to the point of sacrifice, has become particularly strong among intellectuals. It is the anchor of certainty at a time when traditional self-images of Muslims have been challenged, providing the means by which doubt and moral ambiguities are overcome. Fundamentalism has taken fire in the universities and among communication elites, and permeates the military. And everywhere, its primary drive is the final cleansing of the *dar al-Islam* of its enemies, first and foremost Israel.

Arafat can try to ride this tiger or be thrown by it. The weakened, vulnerable Israel which Rabin and those around him are shaping is likely to be eaten by it.◊

Erich Isaac is professor emeritus of geography at the City University of New York.

Mobilizing Against Israeli Surrender

CONFERENCE IN D.C. WEIGHS RISKS TO ISRAEL

ARLINGTON, Va.- More than four hundred pro-Israel activists from around the country gathered near Washington, D.C. on October 10 to discuss the risks that Israel faces as a result of its agreement with the PLO.

The American Leadership Conference on Israel, as it was called, was sponsored by the Center for Near East Policy and Americans For a Safe Israel, and brought together senior activists from a variety of pro-Israel groups, including the Coalition for Israel, the Zionist Organization of America, the Religious Zionists of America, and a number of Christian Zionist organizations. Conference moderator Dr. Arnold Soloway set the day's tone when he opened the morning session by reminding the audience that their discussions would not be merely an academic exercise, but could "ultimately affect the survival of Israel and the vital long-term interests of the United States."

The speakers at the conference covered a broad range of issues that have attracted the attention of the pro-Israel community. Eugene Rostow, a former Deputy Secretary of State, emphasized Israel's legal right to Judea, Samaria, Gaza and the Golan Heights. Frank Gaffney, of the Center for Security Policy, characterized the Israel-PLO agreement as "the triumph of hope over experience." Gaffney said that "this hope appears to be the product principally of a democratic society's understandable weariness with the relentless violence and other costs of occupying territory critical to its security."

Dr. Kenneth Levin of Harvard University warned that "illiberal forces hold sway throughout the Arab world," and they, not Israel, will ultimately determine whether or not there is peace in the Middle East. (For the full text of Levin's remarks, see page 5 of this issue.) Dr. Rael Jean Isaac refuted the popular belief that the Israel-Egypt treaty is a model for Israeli-Arab peace agreements. "If Egypt is to be the model, Israel signs more peace treaties at her peril," Dr. Isaac asserted, proceeding to detail Egypt's "massive and direct violations" of numerous provisions in its treaty with Israel. Noting, for example, that the treaty requires Egypt to "abstain from hostile propaganda," Dr. Isaac pointed out that today, "only Iran can compete with Egypt as the world center for publication and distribution of anti-Semitic literature."

Dr. Irving Moskowitz cited the growing pressure for a U.S. withdrawal from Somalia as evidence that Israel should not exchange strategic territory for American security guarantees. "If there are U.S. troops on the Golan, the minute that some Islamic terrorists kill a few of

them, Congress will demand that the U.S. forces be withdrawn," Moskowitz predicted. "Israel will be left without territory and without American protection."

Moving the conference proceedings from discussion and analysis to practical action, Herbert Zweibon, chairman of Americans For a Safe Israel, urged the audience to "return to your communities and lead a nationwide, grassroots effort to prevent Israeli suicide." Zweibon said it was the obligation of pro-Israel activists to "educate American Jews and non-Jews about the dangers of a PLO state, the mistake of Israel or the U.S. relying on the promises of Arab dictators, and the folly of Israel depending on American 'security guarantees'."

Those who attended the conference were given copies of a new AFSI activist programming manual called *Organizing for Israel*. It provides step-by-step guidance for local activists on everything from how to write a letter to the editor to how to organize a picket line. (Copies are available for \$2.95 from the AFSI office in New York.) ♦

This report was compiled from articles by David Isaac, in the Hartford Jewish Ledger, Harley Goldberg, in the Cleveland Jewish Times, and a staff report by the Miami Jewish Tribune.

ONE MAN AGAINST THE PLO

One of the few Congressmen to challenge the Clinton administration's rush to finance the PLO has been Rep. Charles Schumer (D-New York). Following are excerpts from Schumer's remarks in the House of Representatives on October 12:

"I have a great deal of doubts whether the PLO is either able or willing to carry out the peace that was signed just a few weeks ago.

"Can they effectively renounce their long history of terrorism? Have we forgotten about Leon Klinghoffer and U.S. Ambassador Cleo Noel? We must remember them.

"It strikes me as extremely anomalous that at the very same time that we are lifting the restrictions in preparation of sending aid to the PLO, we do not hear a peep about ending the [Arab] economic boycott, not only of Israel but of any American firm that does business with Israel. Is it not strange?

"Here this country is going to send aid to a group that was labeled terrorist but a few months ago and, at the same time, not hold their feet to the fire and say at the very least, 'Show your good will and at least renounce the boycott and urge other Arab nations to do so.' "

ISRAEL AND THE ARABS: WHAT NEXT?

Kenneth Levin

The rush of dramatic developments in Israeli-Palestinian negotiations has been euphorically praised, and the current Israeli government hailed as motivated by an assessment of Israel's interests more pragmatic, more in tune with the era, and less overreaching than that of its predecessors. But a sober look at current Israeli policies suggests they are less the product of measured pragmatism than of a potentially devastating hubris.

The Rabin government's negotiating stance is predicated on the belief that, through recognition of the PLO, territorial and other concessions, and economic incentives, Israel will be able to engineer a moderating of Palestinian Arab opinion, assure the emergence of a liberal Palestinian polity that enjoys the support of its people, and also win surrounding Arab states, especially Syria, to an enduring peace. Indeed, a constant refrain of government ministers is that Israel's policies will now bring peace and prosperity to the entire region. But, in reality, the politics of Israel's Arab neighbors, and their attitudes toward war or peace with the Jews, are shaped by forces that are far beyond Israel's ability to control or even substantially influence.

There are vast political currents sweeping across the entire Arab world from the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf: Islamic fundamentalism; the ever-shifting machinations of Arab potentates determined to retain control over their own populations and extend their influence over their neighbors; the ever-resilient pull of pan-Arab nationalism; the often murderous suspicion of and antipathy toward non-Arab and non-Muslim minorities. In the traffic of these swirling forces, the Palestinian Arabs have always been a pliable tool and Israel a convenient whipping boy. They will continue to be so until there are dramatic changes in the Arab world and these forces are superseded by more moderate and liberal currents. Until then, the Palestinian Arabs will be wracked by all the conflict, violence, extremism, and illiberalism that mark the wider Arab world, irrespective of any concessions by Israel, and no Israeli concessions will win Arab leaders to relinquish their use of anti-Israel policies as an instrument of domestic and inter-Arab politics.

Despite the wishful delusions of the current Israeli government, it will not be the four million Jews of Israel who shape the course of Arab political life or decide the issues of war and peace. It will be, for example, sixty million Egyptians, in ultimately choosing between their current corrupt but relatively cosmopolitan and tolerant secular junta or an austere and bloodthirsty regime of fundamentalist mullahs who will cast out the peace with Israel along with everything else they deem blasphemous. The future

of the Middle East will be shaped by twenty-seven million Algerians, along with the people of Jordan and Tunisia and Yemen, who will decide on similar choices. It will be shaped by the decision of fourteen million Syrians as to what will succeed Assad's Alawite clique, whether it will be another secular strongman or the Muslim Brotherhood or some more liberal regime, and it will be shaped by the actions of nineteen million Iraqis in deciding the ultimate fate of Saddam Hussein and fashioning a successor leadership. The future will be determined by whether the world's powers, particularly the United States and Western Europe, choose to contain the well-spring of current militant fundamentalism, Iran, and allow it to collapse of its own excesses in violence and mayhem, or choose instead to cultivate the mullahs for the sake of their oil revenues and a lucrative arms and technology trade.

Four million Israelis have no more control over the dynamics of these unfolding political dramas than do the other minorities of the Middle East who are buffeted by the ascendant Arab illiberalism: the six million Kurds in Iraq and Syria, or the nine million Coptic Christians in

Egypt, or the million Christians still struggling to maintain a communal existence in Lebanon, or the seven million black Christians and animists of the southern Sudan, tenuous survivors of an Arab war of racial and religious extermination that has already taken the lives of more than a million of their brethren.

Unlike these other groups, however, Israel has been in a position to defend herself, though never able to insulate herself entirely from the surrounding storms. She has endured constant threat, suffered war after war, and, in the wake of Arab rejection of all peace overtures after the 1967 war, has been in the corrosive position of ruling over a Palestinian Arab population in political limbo. But she has been able to protect her people against all attempts to destroy them. And through these decades, whatever wishful thinking there may have been among war-weary Israelis about some move that would elicit peace from the Arabs, there has been a general if tacit acknowledgement of the limits of Israel's influence over the dynamics of Arab political life and a realization that Israel could do little more than wait for the

(Continued on page 11)

Outpost

FROM THE LEGAL FILE

...The Israel-PLO agreement is invalid from a legal standpoint, according to a new Israeli legal action group called "Tzedek Tzedek - the Jewish Civil Liberties Center." A study released by the group maintains that Yasser Arafat and the PLO Executive Committee exceeded their authority by making the deal, since the PLO's official Constitution makes both Arafat and the Executive subordinate to the PLO National Covenant, which still rejects Israel's right to exist and calls for terrorism against Israel; the Constitution prohibits any PLO official or agency from taking action that contradicts the Covenant. The only way to change the Covenant is by a two-thirds vote by the PLO's Palestine National Council, something Arafat has not sought, because he would probably lose such a vote. All of which means, according to Tzedek Tzedek, that Israel signed a deal with an unauthorized minority faction of the PLO that is not even bound by what it signed since it had no authority to sign it...

...Residents of an apartment building across the street from the home of Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, in north Tel Aviv, decided to hang banners from their windows, with the slogan "The People Are With the Golan." Not exactly a controversial declaration, particularly since Rabin, on the eve of the 1992 elections, had himself declared that "anybody who surrenders the Golan Heights is abandoning the security of Israel." But Rabin, whose plans for the Golan are evidently rather different from his campaign pledge, was incensed by the pro-Golan banner. He ordered Shimon Sheves, director of the Prime Minister's Office, to suppress the banner-hangers. Sheves called in the mayor of Tel Aviv, as well as the mayors of other cities where such banners began sprouting up. The mayors promptly dispatched teams of city inspectors who, armed with an old and never-used law against such

things, went from door to door ordering that the banners be taken down. Had such steps been taken during the Likud years against Peace Now banner-hangers, what would the response have been?...

...No arrests yet in the murder of Amitai Kapah. The 17 year-old resident of Beit El, was killed on September 26, when he lost control of the car he was driving after it was attacked by Arab rock-throwers near the Jerusalem Arab neighborhood of A-Ram. After it was stoned, Kapah's car swerved head-on into a car coming from the other direction, the four occupants of which were injured...

...Israel's High Court of Justice has reprimanded Jerusalem Mayor Teddy Kollek for failing to take action against illegal Arab construction activity on the Temple Mount. Ruling on a petition that was submitted in 1990 by the Temple Mount Faithful organization, the High Court agreed that there was sufficient evidence that local Arabs have undertaken a variety of construction projects on the Mount, "all of which require a permit, yet no permit had ever been requested, much less issued." (According to the Temple Mount Faithful, some of the construction was done for the purpose of obliterating archaeological evidence of Jewish links to the site; and some involved the building of anti-Israel monuments, one of which accuses Israel of carrying out the Sabra-Shatilla killings in Lebanon in 1982.) The High Court justices agreed that "the authorities have been negligent in enforcing the law," and rejected the reasons given by Mayor Teddy Kollek for the non-enforcement (he said that "much of the construction was done years ago," and "any legal action could have a detrimental effect on Arab-Jewish relations." But the Court declined to order Kollek to prosecute the Arabs, saying that it was satisfied with Kollek's promise "to keep a close watch on the situation from now on." A Temple Mount Faithful spokesman said that Kollek's promise is "unreliable" in view of his willingness to permit total Arab control of the Temple Mount compound...

***The Annual Conference of Americans For a Safe Israel
will be held on Sunday, December 12, 1993,
at the Sheraton Center Hotel, in New York City***

***Guest of Honor:
Norman Podhoretz
Editor of Commentary***

For more information, call (212) 628-9400

Letter from Israel
Aryeh Shomron

A LAWYER'S CRUSADE AGAINST ISRAEL

One of the most passionate fighters for the Arab cause is a portly 48 year-old Jerusalem-based attorney who has converted from Judaism to Catholicism and devoted her career to fighting what she calls "Zionist propaganda."

Linda Brayer, a previously obscure Israel-basher, has risen to prominence in recent months after receiving the annual Human Rights Award of the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee (ADC). Brayer was honored for her work as director of the little-known "Society of St. Yves," which describes itself as a "legal resource center" and is sponsored by the Latin Patriarchate of Jerusalem. The reason that the ADC is so enamored of Brayer's group is that its 'legal resources' are used to bash Israel and advance the Arab cause. Brayer regularly goes to court to restrict Israeli counter-terror actions in Judea and Samaria, to prevent the deportation of Arab terrorists, and to press for the right of Arabs from abroad to settle in Israel.

Brayer came to the Palestinian Arab cause via an unusual route. Her grandmother was born in Turkish-occupied Palestine, then emigrated to South Africa in 1922. Brayer was born in Johannesburg in 1945. While attending Hebrew University in Jerusalem during the 1960s, Brayer says, she became convinced that Israeli

laws affecting Arabs were "the kind of law they must have had in Germany in 1935."

It was in Jerusalem that she began attending church, where she was particularly attracted to "Christianity's huge concern for others, embracing all Palestinians." She eventually converted to Catholicism. Although Brayer claims to hold no grudge against Jews or Judaism, her anti-Israel diatribes are laced with remarks that border on bigotry. She describes Israeli policy in the territories, for example, as "twisted Talmudic thinking." When she first came to Israel, Brayer recalls, "I believed Zionist propaganda--my God, I'm ashamed."

Brayer's passion for Israel-bashing has taken her overseas in recent months. In April of this year, she was on hand to accompany ADC lobbyists as they met with Congressmen in Washington to attack U.S. support for Israel. Considering Brayer's devotion to the Arab cause, Americans can expect to be seeing a lot more of her in the months and years to come.

In the meantime, Israel's judicial system will continue to be clogged by Brayer and her ilk, as they try the patience of Israel's judges with their frivolous lawsuits and petty political maneuvering in the guise of law.

For some time now, Israeli courts have had to put up with political attorneys who use every subterfuge in the book, whether judicially legitimate or not, to strike a blow for the Arab cause. The Association for Civil Rights in Israel (ACRI) has been particularly adept at combining legal activism with political pressure to change governmental policy, and it will no doubt regard Linda Brayer as a welcome ally in its unholy struggle.◊

Aryeh Shomron reports for Outpost from Jerusalem.

BEHIND THE NEWSMAKERS

... A dictator who is the only candidate in his country's "election," and who jails political dissidents and journalists for criticizing him, usually is denounced by the world media--except when an Arab dictator is involved. In mid-October, Egyptian dictator Hosni Mubarak was "re-elected" with 96% of the votes in an "election" where his name was the only name on the ballot. Voters were well aware of the potential consequences of a "wrong" vote: that same week, a political dissident and two journalists were jailed on the charge of "humiliating the president" by publicly disagreeing with his policies. Yet consider the headline on a *New York Times* story about Mubarak's forthcoming term: "Mubarak Promising Democracy, and Law and Order"...

...Outlining the consequences of the Israel-PLO agreement, Jerusalem correspondent **Paul Miller**, reporting on the television program "NBC News Today" on September 12, declared: "One analyst said this agreement will put an end to Israel's Holocaust mentality, of being a garrison state that deals with its neighbors with a fist." Miller did not name the "analyst" in question. Could it have been Miller himself?...

...On that same "NBC News Today" broadcast, correspondent **Linda Vester** attempted to summarize the history of the Arab-Israeli conflict. She noted that the U.N. Partition Plan of 1947 was rejected by the Arabs, then added: "War ensued, and countless Palestinians were expelled." No mention of the Arab invasion; no mention of the fact that even leftwing Israeli historians like Benny Morris (in his book, *The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem, 1947-1949*, which Vester has evidently not read) say that the vast majority of the Arab emigrants left voluntarily...

ISRAEL 1993, YUGOSLAVIA 1941

David Isaac

Yitzhak Rabin's agreement with Yasser Arafat has been compared to Chamberlain's sellout of Czechoslovakia for an illusory "peace in our time." However, there is a less familiar but in some respects more striking parallel: Yugoslavia in 1941. Winston Churchill recounts the tale.

In 1941, the situation of Yugoslavia was desperate. Over the previous two years, her traditional friends and allies had either left her or been destroyed. On February 14, 1941, Yugoslavia's Prime Minister Cvetkovic and Foreign Minister Markovic were ordered to appear before Hitler, in Berchtesgaden. The Fuehrer demanded that they give him use of Yugoslavia's roads and railways to carry military supplies for operations against Greece. The ministers returned to Belgrade where they were subjected to the added pressure of watching German forces encircle their country.

On March 1, Bulgaria, true to the Tripartite Pact, allowed German units to enter the country. They reached the Serbian frontier by evening.

Seventeen days later, on March 19, Prince Paul, the Yugoslav regent, secretly visited Berchtesgaden. There he promised that Yugoslavia would do as Bulgaria had done. However, upon returning, Prince Paul encountered much opposition from the Royal Council and political and military leaders. Yugoslavia was not prepared to capitulate.

But Yugoslavia's leaders felt differently. On March 24, Prime Minister Cvetkovic and Foreign Minister Markovic surreptitiously slipped out of Belgrade from a suburban railway station. Their destination was Vienna and a meeting with Hitler. The next day, without public knowledge, they signed the pact with the German dictator. When Cvetkovic and Markovic revealed what they had done to the Yugoslav Cabinet, three members resigned. The public felt that a great calamity approached.

General Simovic and a small group of patriotic army officers had planned direct action in the event of capitulation. On March 27 they decided to act. The conspirators captured strategic locations in Belgrade. Cvetkovic was forced to resign and Prince Paul abdicated and was exiled to Greece. The bloodless coup unleashed a wave of popular support. Crowds chanted, "Rather war than the pact; rather death than slavery!" The young King Peter II was crowned as the crowds cheered. English and French flags were flown. In Churchill's words: "A people paralyzed in action, hitherto ill-governed and ill-led, long haunted by the sense of being ensnared, flung their reckless, heroic defiance at the tyrant and conqueror in the moment of his greatest power."

Hitler was furious. He resolved to invade Yugoslavia and summoned the German High Command. They devised "Operation Punishment." On April 6, German bombers flew over Belgrade. In their cruel attack which lasted three days, over seventeen thousand citizens of Belgrade were killed.

Shmuel Shmueli, in *Israel Shelanu*, the largest Hebrew language paper in the United States, describes how the agreement with the PLO was reached behind the back of most of the cabinet, Parliament, the public and without consultation with the army. The principal figure behind the negotiations was Deputy Foreign Minister Yossi Beilin, who was assisted by a far-left member of the Labor Party, Dr. Meir Hirschfeld, and leftwing journalist Ron Pundak. Foreign Minister Shimon Peres became active in the later stages and Prime Minister Rabin only at the end.

When the draft of the peace agreement was finally laid before the Israeli Cabinet, the ministers were not permitted to remove it from the Prime Minister's office. A vote was demanded immediately. Any detailed discussion of what was hidden within the document's disastrous depth was impossible. In the brief time before the vote, there was only a debate over its general meaning. The Chief of Staff of the Israeli Army, Ehud Barak, was granted only a hurried glance before the vote. That was more than most. The generals of the General Staff did not even see the peace proposal, nor did they have a chance to express an opinion, before the government vote. When Barak and his

(Continued on p. 10)

SPOTLIGHT ON THE EXTREMISTS

...After a visit to the Gaza Strip recently, **Rick Halperin** of Amnesty International decided that conditions in that region are comparable to those suffered by Jews during the Holocaust--and that Israel is the one in the role of the Nazis. In an op-ed essay that he faxed to newspapers around the country, Halperin declared: "It remains a sad irony that Israel, created following the Nazi Holocaust that exterminated more than 6 million Jews, has for the past decade found itself in a reversed role." Amnesty International's annual human rights survey, released in July, included harsh criticism of Israel's treatment of Arab rioters and almost no mention of the more than 1,000 Palestinian Arabs tortured, maimed and murdered by PLO death squads in Judea, Samaria, and Gaza during the *intifada*...

...Will the Israel-PLO agreement help pave the way for Israeli Jews to assimilate into the Arab Middle East? That's the hope of leftwing Israeli anthropologist **Jeff Halper** of Hebrew University. For years, Halper had been urging Israeli Jews to give up their "Jewish tribalism" and forge a new "Israeli identity." The Israel-PLO deal could facilitate the process, Halper declared in the *Jerusalem Post* on September 26. He wrote that he is looking forward to "the Arabization of Israeli culture that will undoubtedly become stronger as Israel and its neighbors open up to each other...We can expect to hear much more Arabic music, see more Arab films and travel more to Arab countries. More Israeli schoolchildren will learn Arabic and, hopefully, about Arabic culture, and all of us will become more familiar with our neighbors." Israel's distinctive Jewish identity will, Halper hopes, give way to an Arab-influenced "Hebrew nation," and the Israel-PLO deal will mark the beginning of "a true homecoming of the Hebrew nation in the Middle East." Halper's extremism on cultural matters is rivaled only by his extremism in politics. He sparked an uproar in 1983 when he accused the Israeli government of "forcing Ethiopian Jews to live in the occupied territories," a statement which Ethiopian Jewry groups strongly denounced. Halper ran for Jerusalem City Council in 1988 on a platform pledging to surrender the Old City to Arab control. He received less than 1% of the votes cast...

...**Edward Said**'s latest book, *Culture and Imperialism*, is filled with anti-American venom and apologia for Arab terrorism. Said was not bothered by Libya's role in international terrorism, but waxed indignant over the U.S. raid against Libya. Said blamed "fundamentalists" like Margaret Thatcher and the Pope for most of the ...

world's troubles...

...Americans for Peace Now has decided to shift its controversial president, **Gail Pressberg**, to a powerful but out-of-the-spotlight policymaking position. The exposure of Pressberg's background --she spent 14 years working for pro-Arab organizations, and even wrote an article justifying an Arab terrorist massacre of Jewish worshippers in Turkey-- nearly torpedoed APN's admission to the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations in March. APN has never distanced itself from any of Pressberg's extremist positions --including support for a PLO state and surrender of Jerusalem's Old City to the PLO-- and she will continue to run the organization, but now from behind the scenes...

NOW AVAILABLE FROM AFSI:

Videos

NBC In Lebanon: A study of media misrepresentation.
58 minutes. Purchase \$50. Rental \$25

Books

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

Eye On the Media: A Look At News Coverage of Israel
by Davd Bar-Illan - \$14.95 (non-members: \$15.95)

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)

If I Am Not for Myself...: The Liberal Betrayal of the Jews
by Ruth Wisse - \$21.95 (non-members: \$22.95)

Monographs

Should America "Guarantee" Israel's Safety?
by Dr. Irving Moskowitz - \$3.95 (non-members: \$4.95)

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

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)

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

THE SOMALIA LESSON

The virtual stampede of Congressmen and pundits to leap aboard the "Get out of Somalia" bandwagon has grave implications for Israel. If a handful of American casualties results in such hysteria, how can Israel expect American "security guarantees" to protect it from future Arab invasions?

Israeli Foreign Minister Shimon Peres and U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher have publicly confirmed that the two countries are discussing the idea of having American "security guarantees," including the stationing of U.S. troops on the Golan Heights, as a substitute for Israel's presence on the Golan. The Rabin government knows that most Israelis will be outraged when he announces his intention to surrender the Golan to Syria (polls show that about two-thirds of Israelis oppose such a retreat). So he hopes to soften the blow by assuring them that America will protect Israel from Syrian aggression.

Not many Israelis are likely to agree that such American involvement is wise. They are well aware of

the troubling American record of making such promises to allies, and then abandoning them--allies like South Vietnam, Taiwan, and even Israel itself.

It wasn't so long ago, after all, that the U.S. convinced Israel to give up the Sinai (in 1957) in exchange for a promise to prevent Egypt from blocking the Straits of Tiran. But when Nasser blocked the Straits in 1967, there was a new president in Washington and he reneged on his predecessor's "guarantee."

The Israeli public is also well aware of what happened the last time that the stationing of U.S. troops was used to coax Israel to give up territory. It was in 1983, when the American marines were sent to central and south Lebanon as part of the deal to bring about an Israeli withdrawal. But when Islamic terrorists attacked the U.S. Marine barracks and killed 241 of them, the Americans fled. That's what happened in Lebanon. That's what is happening today in Somalia. What would happen if American troops on the Golan were attacked by Hezbollah terrorists? It's not hard to imagine--which is why Israelis understand the Somalia lesson: America cannot be relied upon to fight other people's battles.◇

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

ISRAEL & YUGOSLAVIA

(Continued from p.8)

deputy publicly voiced worries about the security implications, they were told to keep quiet. To their shame, the Chief of Staff and his deputy immediately apologized.

Of course, the historical parallel is not perfect, nor do the differences redound to Israel's credit. When Cvetkovic and Markovic laid the pact with Hitler before the Yugoslav Cabinet, three members resigned. When Rabin and Peres placed the agreement with Arafat before the Israeli Cabinet, with the outrageous command that it must vote immediately, the Cabinet Ministers meekly obeyed. General Simovic, upon hearing of the shameful pact,

"We witness an international fraud, the greatest in human history. The fraud with which Hitler inveigled Chamberlain, and the entire world, is a feeble deception compared with what goes on today in the preparation of 'peace' between the PLO and Israel..."

"If indeed this plan is carried out, it will be an unparalleled absurd political deception of the Jewish people without precedent in human history."

--from Shmuel Shmueli, "The Great Fraud," in Israel Shelanu, September 10, 1993

revolted. General Barak, after pointing out the peace agreement's military flaws, apologized.

Then there is the reaction of the Yugoslav populace. The news of the military revolt was greeted with enthusiasm. The Serbians rose en masse in defiance. Churchill admiringly announced to the House of Commons: "Early this morning the Yugoslav nation found its soul." The world waits for the Jews to find their soul.

Finally, the Yugoslav nation faced imminent invasion. Their leaders' action was motivated by a very real fear. The same cannot be said for Rabin and Peres. There existed no impending crisis. They did not face a massive assault. The PLO was on the brink of bankruptcy. In a political magic trick that would have confounded the great Houdini, the Israeli leaders have shackled their formerly free nation with unbreakable bonds. Not once in the history of the world has a nation, at the height of its power, submitted to an incomparably weaker force --until now.

In his book, *The Grand Alliance*, Winston Churchill said of the military revolt and popular uprising: "The mistakes of years cannot be remedied in hours." In the case of Israel, the mistakes of hours will take years to remedy, if indeed they can be remedied at all.◇

David Isaac is a freelance journalist.

ISRAEL AND THE ARABS

(Continued from p.5)

emergence of a more liberal Arab world...

Today the same illiberal forces hold sway throughout the Arab world, the level of intolerance and victimization of minorities and would-be reformers, the denigration and demonization of all outsiders, including, of course, Israel, having actually increased with the rise of fundamentalist fervor; and maximalist demands against Israel remain the standard fare from Arab leaders and commentators. Indeed, even since announcement of the Israeli-PLO agreement, Arafat and his lieutenants have been assuring their constituents that this is the first step in executing the PLO's 1974 two-step program, which called for gaining what territory it could by negotiation and using that territory as a base for the annihilation of Israel. What, then, can account for the hubris of the current Israeli administration, its belief that, through concessions and other enticements, including abandonment of what has been a national consensus on minimal territorial requirements necessary for maintaining Israel's defense, it is capable of rerouting the course of Arab politics and winning a durable peace?

One can only speculate, but part of the answer surely lies in the role played in the government by the Meretz faction and other members of the ideological left, who regard the current Israeli administrative control over the lives of one and a half million Arabs as such an abomination that any risk must be taken to end it, and who have chosen to deny the risks and adopt a narcissistic faith that their own evident goodwill cannot help but be met by equal goodwill from the other side. Another part of the answer seems to lie in the sensitivity of many members of the government to the criticism and ostracism to which Israel has been subjected and to the hypocritical insistence of her critics, eager for Arab approval and Arab markets, that the fault in the conflict is indeed Israel's and Israeli concessions are the path to peace. Uncomfortable before the critics, some in the government have chosen to embrace a part of the obvious lie at the heart of the indictment and to ascribe to themselves the power their critics would attach to them, the power to change, through Israeli concessions and enticements, the course of the vast Arab polity and usher in a Middle Eastern Golden Age. Or so they assure us is their intent and their inevitable achievement.

But what will actually transpire now that the Israeli government has invited in the PLO? Perhaps there will be some brief respite from old patterns, a period of cold peace. Or perhaps the demand for more Israeli concessions and the condemnations and threats and sanctions will ensue almost at once. The details, of course, cannot be foreseen. What is more certain, however, is that the Arab world will go on its way as it did before, following a dynamic of its own and influenced, at most, by outside

forces infinitely weightier than Israel. And the Palestinian Arabs will muster as before to every lash in the storms that envelop the Arab world. The difference will be that now, for the first time in decades, with every lash Israel will hemorrhage.◇

Kenneth Levin is a historian and physician who writes often on the Middle East. This article is excerpted from his address at the American Leadership Conference on Israel, on October 10.

LETTERS THEY REFUSED TO PRINT

Letters to the Editor
New York Times

September 20, 1993

To the Editor:

It may seem churlish, or worse, to resist the current Middle Eastern peace euphoria. But as one of those irreconcilable Jews to whom Alexander Schindler's "Memo to a Hawk" (September 17) was addressed, I remain unpersuaded by his cheer-leading for the Rabin government. Mr. Schindler's notion that Jews who once backed Begin should now back Rabin is a *non sequitur*. Begin relinquished the Sinai to preserve Judea and Samaria, the heartland of biblical Israel. But the Rabin government has all but transformed the ancient Jewish homeland into a Palestinian state.

This matters little to Mr. Schindler, or to Labor Zionists in Israel, whose conception of Zionism since socialism evaporated has been framed by the shifting fashions of contemporary liberalism. Yet even David Ben-Gurion, an inveterate Labor Zionist, insisted that the source of Zionism was the Hebrew Bible. From that perspective on Jewish history, the Israeli-Palestinian peace accord is nothing less than a Zionist surrender, troubling evidence of a debilitating loss of Zionist will for Jewish national fulfillment. It is little wonder that while Arafat exulted in Washington, Rabin's demeanor at the White House was funereal.

The "muttered curses" that trouble Mr. Schindler do not come from those who "still deify land over life." They come from Jews who understand that the land deified by the Rabin government, within Israel's pre-1967 borders, is the coastal plain of the ancient Philistines -- and, as Mr. Schindler's memo suggests, their modern spiritual descendants.

Jerold S. Auerbach
Professor of History
Wellesley College

BALDERDASH

"When it comes to squelching open debate and punishing dissent, the notorious guardians of the Politically Correct have nothing on the guardians of the Semantically Correct. That is why you hear so little public criticism of Israel...The Politically Correct prevails on certain college campuses. But the Semantically Correct prevails in the news media."

--syndicated columnist Joseph Sobran, in the Greensburg (PA) *Tribune-Review*, July 6, 1993

"For the sins we have committed by not publicly criticizing the Jewish people and Israel...And for the sins of not recognizing the humanity and suffering of the Palestinian people and the injustice they face living under the unwanted Occupation..."

--from Michael Lerner's supplement to the Yom Kippur liturgy, in *Tikkun*, September/October 1993

"As a progressive Jew, I have something in common with Palestinian Christians. We are both on a certain level rendered invisible. Progressive Jews are left out of the 'Jewish community,' our perspectives and experiences uncounted, not legitimized because of our open criticism of Israel. And since in the West, Palestinians--indeed all Arabs--are perceived as Muslims and fundamentalists (read: terrorists) Palestinian Christians are neglected in a parallel way."

--Deena Hurwitz of New Jewish Agenda, in the Summer 1993 issue of *Churchwoman*

"When Benjamin Netanyahu warns about 'a full-fledged war that could be launched against Israel...open to invading armies from the east,' what on earth is he talking about?...The invading army of Syria, which is preparing to conclude an agreement? The invading army of Palestinians, perhaps, formed and fitted out with advanced weaponry in the still of night, while Israel sleeps?"

--Leon Wieseltier, in *The New Republic*, October 4, 1993

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