

OUTPOST

APRIL 1994 PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

THE CHAOS THAT THE PLO ACCORD HAS WROUGHT

Herbert Zweibon

When Ronald Reagan debated Jimmy Carter before the 1980 elections, his theme was "Are you better off now than you were four years ago?" With inflation rampant, with American hostages ridiculed and tortured in Iran while the United States stood helpless, most members of the American public had no trouble answering the question, and they did something--they cast their vote for Ronald Reagan. Six months since the signing of the Israel-PLO accord, that agreement should be judged by the same question: "Is the Middle East a safer place than it was six months ago? Are Israelis, Arabs, indeed, Americans, better off today than they were on September 12, the eve of the signing?"

It is difficult to see how the current chaos in Judea, Samaria and Gaza can possibly be considered an improvement upon the pre-September situation. Proponents of Israeli withdrawal from the territories relentlessly inveighed against the alleged evils of the status quo, and even today the accord's supporters challenge their critics by asserting that the alternative to PLO self-rule is the supposedly intolerable situation that existed before. But all changes are not improvements, and the situation existing before the agreement with the PLO was far better than it is now. Indeed, it may soon look idyllic compared to the bloody aftermath.

The accords failed from the start to achieve their aim: to end the bloodshed and create goodwill between Jews and Arabs. Instead the accords have led to bloodshed on a scale dwarfing anything that came before. Thirty-five Israelis were murdered, and many hundreds more injured, by Arab terrorists since September 13, with the victims both inside and outside the pre-1967 borders. Hamas and PLO factions alike have vowed to intensify their attacks on Israelis. Dr. Baruch Goldstein's massacre of Arabs was also a product of the agreement: his insane act was triggered by the situation the Rabin government had created.

While Dr. Goldstein's Arab victims receive massive attention, there are many more unnoticed Arab victims of the "peace" accords. PLO death squads, largely composed of Arafat's Fatah Hawks routinely

torture and murder politically incorrect fellow-Arabs. In areas of the Gaza Strip that are already under de facto PLO control, the *New York Times* recently reported, young terrorists-turned-policemen punish traffic violators by shooting the offenders in the legs. The intra-Arab slaughter is sure to accelerate as the PLO and Hamas view for supremacy.

From an economic point of view, too, it is difficult to argue that Israel is better off now than it was six months ago. Foreign Minister Shimon Peres continues to spin off cotton candy webs about Israel at the center of a Middle East "Benelux" but in the real world the Arab economic boycott continues. Indeed the well-known Arab subterranean purchase of Israeli products is likely to diminish. The burden of trying to protect Israeli security under the vastly more dangerous conditions produced by the accords with the PLO self-rule has further taxed the Israeli economy. And tourism has dropped precipitously because of the increase in terrorism.

Israelis are beginning to discover what Arab states learned long ago: Yasser Arafat's "deals" do not hold up. Instead of bargaining in good faith, the PLO continually renegotiates agreements it has already signed, while ignoring any obligations it has taken upon itself. Nonetheless, the Clinton administration continues to press Israel to make further concessions: free more terrorists from detention, evict Jews from their homes; disarm those that remain; go along with the Arab contention that East Jerusalem, although annexed by the Knesset almost thirty years ago, is "occupied territory."

The Clinton administration, like much of the

(Continued on

p.2)

IN THIS ISSUE:

<i>Towards a New Israeli Right</i>	...3
<i>Peres Through the Looking Glass</i>	...5
<i>Israel's Futile War Against Hamas</i>	...6
<i>Expelling the Jews, Again</i>	...8

AIPAC'S SILENCE ON JERUSALEM

Friends of Israel can only be outraged by the shocking refusal of the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) to urge the Clinton administration to veto the recent United Nations resolution describing Jerusalem as "occupied territory." AIPAC's position on the Jerusalem controversy is additional evidence of how far AIPAC's new leaders have drifted from the path of their predecessors--and how little concern the new AIPAC has for the views of grassroots American Jewry.

The choice of Steve Grossman as AIPAC's president in 1992 spoke volumes about the direction in which AIPAC has been moving: Grossman had previously signed an open letter publicly attacking the Israeli government. A man who had helped undermine American support for Israel was now to be in charge of the organization that is supposed to lobby for Israel in America. But Grossman's first act of lobbying was to pressure the new Clinton administration to re-hire Dennis Ross, the leading Israel-basher in James Baker's State Department.

Grossman has left his mark in other areas, as well. The editor of *Near East Report* was fired because he was not far enough to the left for Grossman's taste. Under its new editors, *Near East Report* dutifully follows the Grossman line. Radicals like Robert O. Freedman (the Baltimore Peace Now leader who once compared Yitzhak Shamir to Adolf Hitler) have been published in its pages, and all references to "Judea" or "Samaria" are banned--only the Arab term "West Bank" is used.

And now, Jerusalem. The AIPAC executive committee meeting in Washington in early March, was the scene of a vigorous debate over the forthcoming U.N. vote. Grossman and his allies argued that AIPAC should refrain from pressuring the Clinton administration to veto the resolution, because its passage might help promote "the peace process." Opponents pointed out that a "peace process" in which Jerusalem is designated as Arab territory is a process not worth promoting. But Grossman's appointees have a majority on the committee, and his position carried the day. Thus we witnessed the pathetic spectacle of the Senate (by a vote of 82-0) pressuring Clinton on Jerusalem while the so-called Israeli lobby stands idly by, afraid to speak up to prevent Jerusalem from being sacrificed to appease the PLO.

It is no secret that large segments of the grassroots AIPAC membership are furious about the way in which Grossman has steered their organization. Unfortunately, AIPAC does not have elections that would permit members to vote democratically on the group's leadership. That leaves the AIPAC grassroots with only one sensible choice: to vote with their feet, by leaving AIPAC and joining an alternative pro-Israel organization. If they

fail to do so, then they too will bear the moral responsibility when the history books one day record who spoke up, and who was silent, when the fate of Jerusalem was at stake.◇

THE CHAOS THAT THE PLO ACCORD HAS WROUGHT

(Continued from p. 1)

American media, propagates the fiction that if the settlers can only be made to disappear; peace will come. But all that removal of the settlers will accomplish is to launch phase two of the PLO's phased plan: using the territory obtained from Israel as a base against the rest of Israel. On the very day he signed the peace agreement, Arafat reaffirmed his allegiance to that plan in a broadcast over Jordanian TV.

If the Israeli government's hopes for the PLO to serve as partner-for-peace rest on no solid foundation, the same is true for its plans to achieve peace with Syria. The idea here is that American security guarantees backed up by an American military presence, can substitute for Israeli control of the Golan Heights. The history of "guarantees," American and otherwise, is such as to make the very offer a mockery.

Supporters of Israel's peace agreement with the PLO are wont to say "We must take risks for peace." But taking risks requires risk assessment. A prudent person does not stake survival on a one in a million chance, or even, for that matter, a fifty-fifty chance. The course of the so-called peace process has already made clear that prudence is not what guides Israel's leaders.◇

Herbert Zweibon is chairman of Americans For a Safe Israel.

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.

TOWARDS A NEW ISRAELI RIGHT: A MANIFESTO

Dr. Yoram Hazony

Post-Marx, Post Zion

With the collapse of Marxism, the sixty-year domination of the Jewish national movement and the State of Israel by the socialist idea have come to an end. Yet the demise of the red flag has not weakened the Israeli left; it has grown stronger. Today, the government of the left goes about reconstituting the Jewish state with a deft hand, while the political movements that should have opposed it have shattered into a thousand pieces, each striving to destroy the next, a war of all against all.

Did the Israeli Labor movement somehow survive the fall of Communism, a fall which has buried its ideological kin the world over? No one who knows it well believes it did. The tough old half-breed, the Marxism-Zionism which built the kibbutzim, the Palmach, the Labor federation and the State, the fire of the founders of Israel, is in fact fast vanishing from the world.

In its place is the left of the grandchildren: Spoiled, selfish, and self-assured, it is a left which mimics American popular fetishes, the international peace movement, the left-nihilism of Europe. A generation of me and now, it is a left which seeks easy peace abroad and easy love at home. It chatters ceaselessly of material possessions and pleasures; it is little concerned with moral truth except as it is used to discredit the State; it is openly hostile towards national duties and religious heritage; it is messianic in its belief that problems of politics and human nature can simply be made to vanish. It is a left which has happily exchanged the Bible, A. D. Gordon, and Chaim Nachman Bialik for Jacques Derrida and John Lennon, and now openly dreams of surrendering all that is Jewish for the dissolution of Israel's borders and a new identity among the citizens of the world.

In short, the left of the young is not only post-Marxist, but post-Zionist as well: Having outlived the fascination with class, it sees itself having outgrown Judaism and the Jewish people no less. For an entire creed of new Israelis, the relationship with the Jewish state is at best an accident of birth.

Those who once loved Labor Zionism know the new left is not a variant of the old passion for a Marxist-Jewish paradise in Zion; it is its most lethal opponent, working successfully within every one of its institutions, within the media and the arts, within academia and the schools, the sooner to make an end of it. The left of the young has no use for the ideology of Labor, and it comes to control the political institutions and power of its socialist fathers not as an heir, but as a usurper and a destroyer.

Not by coincidence has the red banner been

shorn from the dais at Labor assemblies, and the "Socialist Internationale" suppressed. Not by coincidence are Labor central committee meetings and primaries now torn by activists seeking to emasculate the unions. Not by coincidence have the old "Labor hawks" been driven from the Labor faction in parliament. Not by coincidence did the Oslo accords flatly reject the two essential political teachings that Labor Zionism had sought to instill in the Jewish state: non-capitulation in the face of terror, and the unique Jewish right to the Land of Israel.

One must read the writing on the wall. The new ideology is the renewed life and breath in all that still uses the name "Labor"; within a handful of years it will have disposed of Labor Zionism for good and positioned itself to dominate every aspect of the ideological and political life of the State of Israel.

For all those who fought to build Israel as a special place of refuge and spiritual center for the Jewish people; and for all those who saw in Israel the chance to pursue the great Jewish mission of becoming a light unto nations; and for all those who prayed that Israel should become a kingdom of priests and a holy nation--for all these, the astonishing rise of this new, post-Zionist left signals not merely the end of one political fashion and the advent of another; it means the end of the idea of the Jewish state, the end of the idea of Israel. And without such an idea inspiring its youth and breathing life into the bones of its diaspora, it is unclear who would wish to fight for this people and why, and how it could continue to persist.

The Condition of Organized Resistance

The moment of truth has finally arrived for the Zionist right, for those movements which have always trumpeted the need for a non-Marxist and Jewish State of Israel. After six decades, the once-powerful nemesis is faltering and only awaits the end; an abyss has opened up in the heart of the nation, and the majority of the Jewish people longs for direction. It should have been for the movements of the right now to step forward: to seize this irretrievable moment, to fill this void, providing the dreams and plans to recast the politics of Israel and the Jewish people for generations to come.

Yet one looks in vain to the right for any serious, organized effort to capture the heart of this people which has gone faint; for even an awareness of the magnitude of the moment which is being missed.

What has become of the right? Today, in the teeth of the catastrophe, only the religious ideologies of the Zionist and haredi yeshiva communities possess any vitality at all; and these have yet to make their message beyond the most narrow segments of society. The large political movements of the "secular" right and center--the General Zionists and the Revisionists, the Liberals and

(Continued on p. 4)

TOWARDS A NEW RIGHT

(Continued from p.3)

Herut, the Likud, Tzomet, and Moledet--these have bequeathed us but little that could pass as intellectual heritage or political vision. Not since the death of Vladimir Jabotinsky in 1940 does there seem to have been any serious effort to vest the factions of the right with an ideological motive beyond their partisan political interests and such simplistic slogans as they could hatch.

Even after fifteen years in power, these movements have managed to leave behind them nothing but a wasteland: No institutes, no college, no think tank; no newspaper, no broadcasting, no literature, no art; no books of original social thought, no books of liberal or conservative thought in translation--indeed, no serious political ideas at all in any form.

It transpires that it is simply not sufficient to declare oneself "hawkish" on territorial issues in order to lead a nation; no opinion as to the country's proper boundaries can be a substitute for a vision of Israeli society. To be won, a public must be presented with a larger truth, a plan of what should be done to build a good society, or even a great one.

The right has not presented Israel and the Jewish people with such a truth. In the pursuit of instant political gratification and personal self-aggrandizement, its champions have long been absent from the battlefield of ideas. And now, though the politicians of the right may drown the nation in words, it is clear that few of them have anything to say--while the new left rapidly builds momentum and pushes itself forward to become the motive spirit of the nation.

A New Right and a New Center

The need of the moment is to stem the rising influence of the post-Zionist left by elaborating and establishing a serious ideological alternative to it. By offering a worldview and a plan of action which speak for the majority of Israelis ill at ease with the direction the nation has taken, it is yet possible to challenge the left and retard its progress; by fashioning from the existing political splinters a real ideological movement of height and depth, it is yet possible to discredit the left and defeat it.

There can be no question that most of our people longs for such a movement, for a New Right, truly a new center, which will offer an embracing political philosophy, and a serious political program for the construction of what most of the Jewish people wishes to see--a State of Israel which is at once truly strong, truly free, and truly Jewish.

Strong. Despite heady predications of the "end of history" and of a new, benevolent Middle East, peace will be assured for the foreseeable future only by the nation's ability to deter aggression. The Middle East

remains a region of brutal dictatorships, and the future of the East in general remains far from certain. Israel must be able to rely on its own strength, and its diplomatic, military, and territorial position must be maintained and bolstered to reflect this situation.

Free. Israel's centralized economy shackles the abilities of its citizens and stunts its growth. For the nation to flourish, every individual must be granted the greatest possible intellectual, legal, and political freedom to initiate enterprises and guide them to success. This means cutting taxes and government controls, breaking stifling cartels in the media and academia, privatizing most sectors under government and union ownership, and permitting real competition. Only thus can Israel realize its potential as an international economic, intellectual, and spiritual force.

Jewish. The State of Israel was founded as the Jewish state, unique among the nations, and it is from this fact that Israelis have always drawn their unique strength. Israel can only survive if it builds its Jewish character, nurturing a knowledge of Jewish sources, history, traditions, and moral values in its citizens and among Jews abroad, and inspiring in them a sense of mission to build the Jewish state and through it to serve all mankind.

In recognizing the present need, the activists of the Zionist right cease to wait for salvation from one quarter or another; we take responsibility for the future of the nation ourselves. We take responsibility to organize ourselves into a serious intellectual movement such as there has not yet been in Israel and the Jewish people, a New Right; to speak, to deliberate and to write anew the dreams that will move our people towards truth and towards Zion, preparing a program to build up our country and articulating it as a serious plan of action. For if we do not, we too will end as did our predecessors: divided, frustrated, defeated.

The present is the time, for it is terrible and pressing. And we are the ones, for there are no others. Let us rise to the occasion and go forth together.◇

Dr. Yoram Hazony is director of the Shalem Institute-Center for National Policy, in Jerusalem. He will be speaking at AFSI meetings this month about the current political situation in Israel.

PERES THROUGH THE LOOKING GLASS

Rael Jean Isaac

Over three hundred years ago, Axel Oxenstierna, Sweden's greatest statesman, remarked: "Behold, my son, with how little wisdom the world is governed." Even Oxenstierna would have been astonished at Shimon Peres, whose book *The New Middle East* provides terrifying proof that Israel's foreign policy is directed by a man totally out of touch with reality.

In the last *Outpost* J.B.Sorkin described *The New Middle East* as "the political equivalent of science fiction" and "mental cotton candy." More serious, "scary" in Sorkin's word, was the book's revelation that Peres had in effect become a press agent for Arafat. It would not seem worthwhile to devote more space to the book except for two facts: incredibly, with the exception of Sorkin (and this reviewer in *Commentary*) the book has been favorably reviewed, and Peres is the architect of the so-called "peace policy" that, as becomes more obvious daily, threatens Israel's very survival.

And so we draw attention to something thus far not sufficiently emphasized: the book's tawdry rhetoric. That rhetoric (and the thought processes it reveals) is so

Shimon Peres

painful that one is tempted to coin the term Shimonisms. Some particularly egregious examples from a cornucopia of absurdities:

* *"Instead of visions of blood and tears there will rise visions of happiness and beauty, life and peace. We are at a historic crossroads. Do we choose the path of the tongues of fire, billowing smoke, and rivers of blood, or of blooming deserts, restored wasteleands, progress, growth, justice and freedom?"*

* *"The Trojan horse of war is obsolete; we each*

now have one of our own, in our own backyard."

* *"The Middle East needs democracy as much as a human needs oxygen."*

"A true leadership is chosen by the people of today, in order to represent the electorate of tomorrow-those citizens who have not yet been given the right to choose."

"We are in transition from a world of identifiable enemies to one of unidentifiable problems."

"We can do it. We have to remove the desert from the land, the salt from the water, and the violence from the people."

"The world has tipped in the direction of economics rather than military might. Armies might conquer physical entities, but they cannot conquer qualitative ones. At this stage of the game, objects that may be subject to a military takeover are no longer of value."

Having gone through the looking glass, Peres has apparently decided that if Kuwait, to take a recent example, can be taken over by military force, it is worthless. Now we know why Peres is so cavalier about Israel's defense. Let the Arabs conquer Israel militarily. By definition, what they take is not worth having.

The book also casts disturbing light on the methods by which the PLO won over Israel's Foreign Minister to become in effect their PR man. The PLO's negotiators recognized in Peres a small mind with a massive ego and massaged it to good effect. Peres cites a "heartwarming" letter from Bassam Abu Sharif, in which the Arafat lieutenant told Peres how he admired "your clear vision to the future, your ability to grasp the new in this world...When we examine deeply the positions of the Israeli ministers, you spring among them as the one who has enough of a historical figure to be able to start a better future." Peres writes that he read the letter "over and over."

Alas that Peter Sellers is gone. Only he could do justice to Israel's comic opera foreign minister. And he might play Yasser Arafat at the same time, doubly appropriate now that Peres emotionally identifies with him. But even a Sellers farce would be hard put to live up to the preposterous reality.◇

Rael Jean Isaac is author of Israel Divided and (with Erich Isaac) The Coercive Utopians, among other works. She is a member of the editorial board of Outpost.

ISRAEL'S FUTILE WAR AGAINST HAMAS

Louis Rene Beres

A mighty Greek hero, son of Jupiter and Aemena, Hercules took part in the expedition of the Argonauts and won immortality by accomplishing twelve feats, which are known to us as the Labors of Hercules. The second labor was killing the Hydra, a monster that ravaged the country of Argos and dwelt in a swamp near the well of Amymon. The Hydra had nine heads, of which the middle one was immortal. Hercules struck off its heads with his club, but in the place of the head knocked off, two new ones grew forth each time. Finally, with the aid of his faithful servant Iolaus, he burned away the heads of the Hydra, burying the ninth or immortal one under a huge rock.

Seeking to minimize security costs of the September 13 agreement with the PLO, Israeli troops have undertaken sweeping raids in Gaza, striking forcefully against leading Hamas activists. Although such raids might well have been militarily cost-effective prior to the Israel-PLO accord, when Israel still exercised indefinite control over Gaza's borders, today they are no longer cost-effective. No matter how many Hamas commanders are arrested or killed before Israeli withdrawal, they will be replaced several-fold once Jerusalem relinquishes authority. Like the Hydra of Greek mythology, for each "head knocked off, two new ones" can be expected to grow.

The essential problem, of course, is the agreement itself. Spawning a curious alignment between Israel and the PLO, this agreement places the former in the ironic position of "cleaning up" Gaza of Hamas fighters on behalf of the latter. Also ironic is the fact that, for its troubles in making Gaza safe for PLO, Israel is being blamed by the PLO for violations of the agreement. According to Bassam Abu Sharif, a top adviser to Yasser Arafat, Israel's recent operations in Gaza amount to "a flagrant violation of the Israeli-PLO peace accord." Further, said Sharif, "The aggressive operations are entirely unjustified and will only lead to reactions in self-defense."

Because of the agreement, Israel can no longer assume that the number of Hamas fighters in Gaza is fixed and determinate. However many of these fighters are immobilized between now and when Israel begins troop withdrawals, the long-term net effect upon available Hamas leadership and manpower will be altogether negligible. It follows that the only productive options currently open to

Israel are to: (1) terminate the September 13 agreement; or (2) control Hamas infiltration *at the source*, i.e., within the pertinent Arab sponsor states and Iran.

The second option is infeasible on its face. It is, in fact, entirely beyond the bounds of tactical possibility. To attempt to compensate for a misconceived "peace settlement" by undertaking a completely irrational war would surely represent a wrong choice for Israel.

The first option, however, is another matter. As the Israel-PLO agreement is already invalid under international law, that agreement and its attendant expectations concerning Gaza could be terminated very quickly. Although the political outcry following such lawful termination would be deafening in several quarters, Arab and Israeli, the net effect upon Israeli security from terrorist attack would be profoundly positive.

But why, exactly, is the September 13 agreement already invalid? The answer lies in the fact, codified expressly at Article 53 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, that (a) any agreement in conflict with certain basic rules of international law, known to the lawyers as "peremptory" or *jus cogens* norms, is automatically null and void. Because (b) these basic rules include the principle of "No crime without a punishment," or *Nullum crimen sine poena*, and (c) PLO leaders, especially Yasser Arafat, are guilty of major Nuremberg-category crimes under international law (crimes of war, crimes against peace, crimes against humanity), it necessarily follows that (d) the agreement confers no legal responsibilities and no legal obligations.

When the victorious allied powers established a special military tribunal at Nuremberg on August 8, 1945, they reaffirmed the ancient principle of "No crime without a punishment." In 1946, this reaffirmation was underscored in Principle 1 of the binding Nuremberg Principles: "Any person who commits an act which constitutes a crime under international law is responsible therefore and liable to punishment." These Nuremberg Principles were later formulated by the United Nations International Law Commission, at the request of the General Assembly, in 1950, stipulating: "Offenses against the peace and security of mankind...are crimes under international law, for which the responsible individuals shall be punished."

Terrorist crimes of the sort committed over the years by the PLO mandate universal cooperation in apprehension and punishment. In this connection, as punishers of "grave breaches" under international law, all states are expected to search out and prosecute, or extradite, individual perpetrators. This means that not only is the Israel-PLO agreement invalid, but that Yasser Arafat and other PLO leaders should have been duly prosecuted.

We see, therefore, that lawful termination of the September 13 agreement is a readily available option for Israel, and that it remains Jerusalem's only effective path

(Continued on page 9)

NOTES ON ISRAEL'S "PEACE IN OUR TIME"

H. David Kirk

The phrase "peace in our time," deriving from Chamberlain's capitulation to Hitler in 1938 at Munich, fits the current Israel-PLO "peace agreement." What led Israel's government to that potentially fateful step? How did it happen? The following notes are musings rather than final answers.

To explain Israel's peace initiative, consider first of all *ideology*. Remember that the universalism of socialist humanism declared all people essentially identical in interests and needs. Much Zionist pioneering, and not only that of the secular ranks, was imbued with faith in human brotherhood. Martin Buber and Ernst Simon, with their *Ihud* movement, sought to bring Jews and Arabs together in a binational state. Arabs who dared to form a parallel organization were dispatched in blood. But Jews, wedded to a democratic-socialist ideology, did not give up; they agitated for a "two-state" solution. That formula now lives in the Rabin-Peres initiative.

For a second key to understanding the sources of Israel's "peace in our time" initiative, consider Zionist *semantics*. The Balfour Declaration promised that Britain would foster a "Jewish National Home" in Palestine under its League of Nations Mandate. But the phrase "Jewish National Home" is not really synonymous with Herzl's *Judenstaat* (*The Jews' State*) or *Autoemanzipation* (*Auto-Emancipation*) by Pinsker. The issue had already been spelled out in 1949, in an essay by Emanuel Neumann:

Zionism has been a revolutionary movement from its birth. It was so conceived by its classical protagonists, Pinsker, Herzl and Nordau...The explosive idea with all its force and implications was capsuled in the slogan, the "Jewish State."

This essentially revolutionary character of Zionism...was not always grasped by all Zionists, including many who made notable contributions toward its progress...

In the face of seemingly insuperable obstacles,...there emerged the doctrine of evolutionary Zionism, of gradualness, of accommodation to the discouraging realities...Defeatism spoke with the voice of reason...

The trend toward compromise was often rationalized and sublimated into virtue. Thus for many years the [term] "Jewish State" became taboo--not merely on grounds of expediency. The very word

was banned from official Zionist use and driven underground. The State was not only impossible of achievement but of questionable morality. The National Home, interpreted as a spiritual and cultural center, was deemed a nobler and loftier conception--and one which offered practical advantages. A "spiritual center" required little space, no Jewish majority and no political sovereignty. It would avoid war with the Arabs and could even exist in the midst of an Arab nation. It could be built slowly, over many decades, even centuries. Above all, it had the supreme virtue of being acceptable to the British and promised to avoid a head-on clash with Imperial policy.

The attenuation of political Zionism and its revolutionary elan was manifested in other ways. The decline of "offensive spirit" and the acceptance of defensive attitudes involved loss of political initiative and the adoption of a Fabian strategy of delay and retreat before superior force, even when bolder and more aggressive tactics were called for. The accent was upon patience, caution and restraint, and the avoidance of risk. *Zionist statesmanship was made synonymous with moderation--carried at times to an immodest extreme.*

--from the introduction to *Vision and Victory: A Collection of Address by Dr. Abba Hillel Silver 1942-1948* (New York: Zionist Organization of America, 1949). [Emphasis added.]

Neumann noted that there was a time when the Zionist leadership of North America eschewed the term "state." It became taboo. "Homeland" was used instead. But the charge of "extreme moderation" did not fit the Palestinian Zionists. Many of them had not shed their revolutionary mission. In contrast, the becalmed leadership of today's Israel seems to have moved even beyond the American Zionists' moderation of half a century ago. Israel's "peace in our time" initiative has handed the revolutionary spirit of Zionism over to those who have successfully managed to challenge its legitimacy.

The third key to understanding Israel's "peace in our time" initiative is linked to a questionable political formula. That formula is incorporated in the phrase "Israel's right to exist." Early on it seems to have been invoked in the context of the birth of the State, by vote in the young United Nations. But shortly after that vote, the

(Continued on p.11)

ONE MINUTE TO MIDNIGHT

Dr. Irving Moskowitz

EXPELLING THE JEWS: SPAIN 1492, HEBRON 1994?

The year before last, Jewish communities around the world held ceremonies to commemorate the 500th anniversary of the brutal mass expulsion of Jews from Spain. The way things are going now, it will not be long before Jewish calendars are marked with another black day--this one commemorating the mass expulsion of Jews from Hebron in 1994, with Yitzhak Rabin and Yasser Arafat cast in the role of the modern-day Ferdinand and Isabella.

The Jewish residents of Hebron are not accused of committing any crime. The Arabs and their allies want the Jews out for one reason only: because they are Jews. Forcibly preventing Jews from having access to their holy sites is something that Arabs have always done when given the opportunity. When the British gave the Arabs control over Hebron's Cave of the Patriarchs, before 1948, Jews were barred from ascending beyond the seventh step of the walkway leading to the Cave.

When the Jordanians occupied Hebron during 1948-1967, they forbade Jews from visiting the city at all. During that same period the Jordanians occupied the Old City of Jerusalem, and they likewise forbade Jews from visiting the Jewish holy sites there.

Transferring Jews out of Hebron might temporarily appease Yasser Arafat--but only until the next time Arafat can find a pretext to stay away from the negotiations in order to wring even more concessions out of Israel.

Who knows which of the PLO's longstanding demands will be used to hold the negotiations hostage next time? Perhaps Arafat will announce that the negotiations cannot continue until all Arab terrorists are set free from Israeli jails. Perhaps he will demand that Israel's Law of Return be abolished. Perhaps he will demand self-determination for Israeli Arabs. (The American Jewish Congress may have given a boost to the latter demand, with its recent announcement that it is financing a study of alleged Israeli discrimination against Israeli Arabs.) One thing is for sure: for Arafat, Hebron is just the beginning. As far as Arafat is concerned, there is no difference between Hebron and Tel Aviv. It's all "occupied Palestine" to him.◊

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

LETTERS THEY REFUSED TO PRINT

March 1, 1994

Letters to the Editor
Newark Star-Ledger
Dear Editor:

The tragic massacre in Hebron has rightfully received the condemnation of every Israeli parliamentary leader, including Rehavam Ze'evi of the Moledet Party, who advocates transfer of the Arabs from the administered territories.

That the various PLO leaders seek to make capital of the event and to moralize, is both repulsive and totally unacceptable. One can only feel disgust and contempt in the face of this human tragedy for the utterings of the murderers of 20 schoolchildren at Ma'alot, Olympic terrorists, shooters of 13 mothers and babies at Kiryat Shemona, killers of the "moderate" wing who fired into the kitchens at Nahariya, airline hijackers, and destroyers of 49 peaceful lives in a single postwar spring, and a list of atrocities too lengthy to record here.

And to suggest that what we have just witnessed is unique in terms of the mass killings of worshippers at prayer is a lie of vile proportions. One has only to recall the slaying of 24 Jews by Abu Nidal's "Fatah

Revolutionary Council" in Istanbul's Neve Shalom Synagogue on the Sabbath of September 7, 1986. Not to mention the Yom Kippur War of 1973.

It is proper to both condemn the individual and the act in assessing the Hebron massacre. It is equally correct to display understanding. For in the same town of Hebron, no less than 67 yeshiva (seminary) students were butchered to death by Arabs in 1929. These were not Zionists, "occupiers," or "settlers." If anything, they were anti-Zionist.

What needs to be comprehended in reviewing this tragedy, is the extraordinary restraint exercised by the Jewish people in the face of a history of aggression. For over a century, Jews have been the victims of Arab terror in Palestine. They have also been the prey of Crusaders, pogroms, and the House of Islam throughout history.

That a single Jew on a one time basis reacted out of total frustration is surely not that surprising given the facts. One cannot justify the act, but to exclude context is to assure that peace will not be secured.

Alex Rose
West Orange, NJ

SPOTLIGHT ON THE EXTREMISTS

...**Mordechai Vanunu**, the Israeli radical convicted of nuclear espionage, was "not a spy, but a whistleblower," according to **Sam Day**, leader of the Wisconsin-based "U.S. Campaign to Free Mordechai Vanunu." The campaign has been endorsed by the radical-left Jewish Peace Fellowship as well as Senator Edward Kennedy (D-MA), Rep. Gerry Studds (D-MA) and Rep. Ronald Dellums (D-CA)...

..."The presence of the Israeli settlers" in Judea, Samaria and Gaza is itself "a provocation to violence," according to **Corinne Whitlatch**, leader of Churches for Middle East Peace, a coalition of liberal Christian groups that frequently denounces Israel. The coalition is insisting that all Jews in the territories "must be disarmed," and is urging the expulsion of all Jews from the city of Hebron...

...The recent Hebron violence was not the act of an individual, but rather "underscores the murderous anti-Arab ideology, backed by the Israeli state itself, still present within the Zionist movement...Israeli troops were complicit in the massacre and have since killed over 18 Palestinian civilians," claims longtime PLO propagandist **Edward Said** in a recent issue of the London-based Arab newspaper *al-Hayat*...

..."For 46 years," Israel has been "the aggressor in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict," according to **Donald Bustany**, president of the Los Angeles chapter of the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, in a March 4 letter to the *Los Angeles Times*. In other words, Bustany and the ADC believe that Israel was the aggressor in the 1948 war, not to mention the others...

ISRAEL'S FUTILE WAR

(Continued from page 6)

to controlling Hamas terrorism in Gaza. In the absence of such termination, Israel will find itself trying hopelessly to slay the Hydra, and to do so in order to protect the PLO. Having lost all control over Hamas infiltrations into Gaza, Jerusalem will likely swing its "club" at every terrorist "head," but for every strike "two new ones" will grow forth. While Hercules was ultimately able to identify and bury an immortal head, thereby killing the beast, Israel's only hope now lies in burying "under a huge rock"

April 1994

- 9 -

NOW AVAILABLE FROM AFSI:

Videos

After the Handshake: A Town Meeting with Martin Kalb
116 minutes - \$19.95 (non-members: \$21.95)

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 David 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)

The Hollow Peace
by Shmuel Katz - \$16.95 (non-members \$17.95)

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

its manifestly lawless agreement with the PLO.◊

Louis Rene Beres (Ph.D., Princeton) is the author of 14 books and several hundred scholarly articles dealing with international law. His newest book is Force, Order and Justice: International Law in an Age of Atrocity.

Outpost

WHAT WAS IN DR. GOLDSTEIN'S MIND?

Les Kinsolving

There is simply no excuse for shooting people at prayer. But there might have been a number of explanations, had the worshippers in Hebron's Tomb of the Patriarchs not lynched the suspect.

Baruch Goldstein, M.D., was a native American, in that he was born in the United States. If he was, as some Israeli or American Jewish spokesmen are claiming, a lunatic, then he deserved to be incarcerated in a mental hospital. But he was lynched. He was beaten to death while Israeli soldiers were unable to reach him because of the number of understandably frantic people trying to escape from what, in his apparent rage, he turned into a shooting gallery.

Why was Dr. Goldstein, a major in the Israeli Army reserves, enraged--as he surely must have been, in order to engage in such massive slaughter of people at prayer? There seem to be a number of possibilities, all of which can be included within the historic maxim "Justice delayed is justice denied." For Dr. Goldstein was a native of the largest Jewish city in the world--New York--where worshippers at a murder mosque in New Jersey had blown up the world's largest building. If their explosives had been more efficient and powerful, it is estimated that the deaths could have been 20,000--rather than six dead and 1,000 injured.

And how much outrage did we hear expressed in the Arab world over this blowing up of our largest building and killing and wounding our people? Some outrage? Yes, possibly. But not a great deal.

The bombing of the World Trade Center, by Moslem worshippers, took place exactly one year before Moslem worshippers were shot in one of the many Islamic Conventicles which have served as centers for anti-Jewish hate, and terrorism pep rallies.

At the beginning of the day of this first anniversary of the Trade Center bombing, Dr. Goldstein retaliated. He also retaliated for the September 6, 1986 Arab murder of 22 Jewish worshippers in a synagogue in Istanbul, as well as the May 15, 1974 Arab murder of 21 children in Ma'alot, among other instances of mass murder of Jews by Arabs.

Was Dr. Goldstein thinking of the assassination of Rabbi Meir Kahane at a New York hotel? Almost surely he was. For this was done by an Arab whom a jury would find guilty only on a gun violation--and who has not been given another trial for violating the civil rights of the rabbi.

The doctor was hardly unaware of a similar lack of justice in the case of Lemrick Nelson, identified by a yeshiva student as the man who stabbed him, and who

was caught with a knife covered with Yankel Rosenbaum's blood. Was Dr. Goldstein unaware that the jury which acquitted Nelson went out to lunch with him--to celebrate?

Dr. Goldstein was described by much of the U.S. media as a "settler." What exactly does that mean? Are *all* Israelis "settlers" because the land once owned by the Ottoman Turks and seized by force by the British, and invaded by force by the Arab Legion, was taken in battle by Israeli troops, in the third war they had to fight against those determined to erect an Auschwitz in Tel Aviv? Okay, they are for the purposes of identifying "settlers"--but it is there they made their homes and invested their lives.

He was an immigrant. And he made his home and established his medical practice in the West Bank town of Kiryat Arba, near Hebron, where, in 1929, the Arabs massacred 69 Jews.

Here, he was on call to treat the wounded, including his close friend Mordechai Lapid and his 19 year-old son, Yisrael--both of whom died in his arms. They were murdered for no reason other than their being Jews, on

whom the West Bank's Palestinian terrorists have maintained open season for murder--continually--since the notorious Handshake.

And he saw the incredible Rabin government planning to deliver him and thousands of other Jewish settlers into the tender hands of Yasser Arafat's Palestine Police. He told Israeli Army Radio: "This government is like a Nazi government, which gives Arabs the right to kill Jews."

The Mayor of Kiryat Arba, a community of 5,000 Jews next to 100,000 Arabs in Hebron, is Zvi Katzover. Mayor Katzover recalls: "He [Goldstein] spoke out against the government's abandonment of security for Jews against the settler leadership. He said we should be more aggressive though he didn't spell it out. I heard him express sorrow and pain about the peace process--that something serious should be done to blow up the process. He didn't talk about shooting and killing, but he said that a formula must be found to blow up the process."

Israeli radio quoted Avram Gross, who also knew

(Continued on p.11)

WHAT WAS IN DR. GOLDSTEIN'S MIND?

(Continued from p.10)

Dr. Goldstein, as saying as long as two years ago that the day would come when a Jew would rise up and kill dozens of Arabs in revenge for the assassination of Rabbi Kahane. Another resident of Kiryat Arba is Noam Arnon, who recalled: "Just yesterday, as we were praying in Hebron, Arabs were shouting, 'Massacre the Jews!'"

Within the Arab world there is an outrage which appears to have been out to lunch when Arab "heroes" machine-gunned worshippers in the Turkish synagogue, and Jewish children in Ma'alot. Their demands that Jews in the West Bank be disarmed, are echoed by such incredible peace-at-any-priceniks as the editor of *Tikkun*, Michael Lerner. The *New York Times* provided its op-ed page so that Lerner could demand disarming all the settlers.

This is not the first time such an obscenity has been proposed. It was the practice of the Bevin government of Britain to confiscate all weapons owned by Jews, in the late 1940's, while the pro-Hitler Palestinian Arabs, led by the Grand Mufti, were allowed to arm to the teeth, and Glubb Pasha's Arab Legion, with Spitfire air cover, prepared to invade the West Bank and Jerusalem.

But this lethally unfair policy was *not* proposed by any Jews. Instead, it was unsuccessfully opposed by a considerable number of America's Jews, from playwright Ben Hecht, to newspaperman Hank Greenspun, to West Pointer David (Mickey) Marcus.

Today, David Ben-Gurion's giant mantle rests on the pigmy prestige of Yitzhak Rabin who, for PR's sake, announced that because of Dr. Goldstein, "I am ashamed to be an Israeli."

He's got that just a little bit askew. All loyal Israelis should be ashamed of *him*. For as Benyamin Netanyahu noted in the Knesset: "At least Neville Chamberlain didn't sell out his own country."

In Jerusalem, devout worshippers at the Western Wall were stoned by Moslem worshippers, who emerged from the Al Aksa mosque on the Temple Mount.

Near Tel Aviv, retired New York City police officer Morris Eisenstat was stabbed to death by Palestinians. Mr. Eisenstat was 80 years old.

But Leon Klinghoffer, another of our fellow Americans, was nearly that age when he took a cruise on the *Achille Lauro*, which was seized by PLO pirates. They machine-gunned Klinghoffer and pushed him and his wheelchair overboard. He was part of the long, long record of that serial killer of Jews with whom Yitzhak Rabin shook hands last fall.◊

The author is host of Uninhibited Radio: The Les Kinsolving Show, which is broadcast on the Baltimore-area radio station WCBM, Monday through Friday, 12:00 noon to 3:00 pm. Kinsolving's commentary is also aired on the morning drive shows of WCBM and WPOC-AM, in Washington, D.C.

This article is a slightly abridged version of a recent radio broadcast by the author.

ISRAEL'S "PEACE IN OUR TIME"

(Continued from p.7)

"right" had to be fought for and was paid for in blood. Thereafter Israel's "right to exist" as a sovereign state was self-evident and should never again have been questioned. Who has ever heard such a formula used in the case of Britain or even Burundi? In the case of Israel it has again and again been used not only by her enemies, but also her friends, and even her own nationals. It suggests that Israel's place among the nations is not firmly established. Could this sense of uncertainty have contributed to an initiative that looks to critics more like surrender than peace-making?

Lastly, a "grandparent syndrome" as clue to the "peace in our time" initiative: with so many Israelis slain in war and murdered by terrorists, it is reasonable to ask

April 1994

whether aged leaders of the State, even those not swayed by ideology or semantic ambiguities, might be desperately fumbling to leave a legacy of peace to their children's children. Do they fear that Israel will one day not sustain the militancy needed for survival? Are they hoping that vicious old enemies can be bought off by ultra-generous concessions? And is Rabin's sadly emotional "enough of blood" not all too reminiscent of Chamberlain's falsely hopeful "peace in our time"?◊

H. David Kirk is a retired sociologist, currently writing, together with his wife, Beverly Tansey, a biography of Pierre van Paassen. (See "Pierre van Paassen, Righteous Journalist," Midstream, May 1991.)

BALDERDASH

"[President Clinton's] meeting with President Assad was aimed at delaying the moment when Israel will have to make the choice to pull back from the Golan and admit Syrian sovereignty...The U.S. sent two of its best Zionist-Americans to negotiate with Israel on accepting President Assad's offer to normalize relations."

-Gene Bird of the Council for the National Interest, in the February-March 1994 issue of the *CNI Newsletter*

"Settlers are armed and have acted as lords and masters in the occupied territories and have acted in a most racist and arrogant fashion toward the Palestinian Arabs...Jewish settlers have openly carried out pogroms of neighboring villages..."

-Palestinian Arab activist Jonathan Kuttab, in the *Washington Post*, March 2, 1994

"For decades, Palestinians in the Hebron area have endured mob violence on a daily basis..."

-statement issued by the Middle East Justice Network, February 25, 1994

"The [U.S.] sanctions [against Iraq] are a weapon of mass destruction attacking an entire nation at once, injuring all..."

-former attorney general Ramsey Clark, in the *Los Angeles Times*, February 20, 1994

"The Israelis want to have their cake and eat it too...What is needed now is for the current leader of the free world to act with the same decisiveness that he employed last week against Serb aggression."

-Palestinian Arab activist Daoud Kuttab, in the *Los Angeles Times*, February 27, 1994, after the U.S. shot down Serbian planes

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