

---

# OUTPOST



JULY-AUGUST 1994

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

---

## ***GIs ON THE GOLAN? THE DEBATE BEGINS***

*Herbert Zweibon*

The full-page advertisement that pro-Israel groups placed in the *New York Times* in June, opposing the stationing of American troops on the Golan Heights, has triggered a full-scale debate in Israel, in Congress, and in the American Jewish community. The debate was long overdue.

Should Israel protect itself, or should it rely upon American "protection"? Are American "security guarantees" reliable? Would U.S. troops stand fast on the Golan Heights, even in the face of terrorist attacks comparable to the assault on the U.S. Marine barracks in Lebanon in 1983? What happens if Hafez Assad dies and a new Syrian dictator tears up the agreement Assad signed with Israel? These are the vital questions that needed to be addressed. Unfortunately, those who favor putting Americans on the Golan are not addressing these important issues--instead they are serving up a mixture of insults, invective, and red herrings.

Abraham Foxman, executive director of the Anti-Defamation League, has denounced the opponents of Americans on the Golan as "irresponsible" because they supposedly "undermine the current policy of the [Rabin] government." Since when should Americans refrain from discussing the Middle East because it might displease a foreign government? Should decisions involving U.S. security interests be made according to how they might affect Yitzhak Rabin's administration?

To Foxman's left, one finds Thomas Smerling, formerly a senior activist in the radical-left New Jewish Agenda, presently director of the leftwing Project Nishma, who has said: "The whole issue of American troops on the Golan is a Trojan horse for people opposed to a deal with Syria. It's premature and it's disingenuous." Whatever one might say about the campaign against GIs on the Golan, it cannot be called a Trojan horse. The groups that signed the *New York Times* ad have asserted plainly and in full public view that they regard Rabin's policy of unilateral territorial surrender as seriously flawed. The issue of U.S. troops is not hiding another agenda; it is one aspect of the pro-Israel agenda--an agenda that the "establishment" pro-Israel groups have ignored.

Finally, there is the columnist Douglas Bloomfield, who has claimed that opponents of Americans on the Golan "give no plausible reason why Syria has kept its commitments in the Golan for the past 20 years but would not want to do so after signing a peace treaty with Israel." In fact, we have given a very plausible reason, but Bloomfield has chosen to ignore it. There has been peace between Israel and Syria for 20 years because with the Golan in Israeli hands, the Israeli Army is within easy striking distance of Damascus. If the Golan is surrendered, that deterrent will disappear.

Fortunately, the Foxmans, Smerlings and Bloomfields of this world do not have the final say in the debate over Americans on the Golan. An editorial in the July 4, 1994 issue of *The New Republic* pointed out that "there is something bizarre about the priorities of an administration that refuses to send troops to defend helpless Bosnians, or starving Haitians, but is willing to send them into a potential war zone in the Middle East to protect a country that is perfectly capable of protecting itself." The editor of *The New Republic* is Martin Peretz, who is certainly no 'hawk' on Arab-Israeli matters. Peretz's words of warning about Americans on the Golan cannot be dismissed as coming from a source that is "hawkish" or "anti-Rabin." Can Foxman, Smerling, et al come up with a coherent rebuttal to Peretz? Don't hold your breath.◊

*Herbert Zweibon is chairman of Americans For a Safe Israel.*

### IN THIS ISSUE:

<i>Negotiating With Oneself</i>	...3
<i>Future Shock, Israeli-Style</i>	...4
<i>ADL Wrongs the Religious Right</i>	...5
<i>Israel's Security After Oslo</i>	...8
<i>Foreign Service--or Disservice?</i>	...11
<i>Arab Lies About Bethlehem</i>	...11

FROM THE EDITOR

## **WHY DOES SYRIA NEED RUSSIAN WEAPONS?**

The signing of the new Syrian-Russian military cooperation pact demonstrates anew that Syria is still not interested in making peace with Israel.

According to the *Washington Times*, the Syrian-Russian military cooperation agreement was signed during the first week of June after four days of talks between Syrian and Russian officials in Damascus. Although details of the pact were not released, Russian officials were quoted as saying that the agreement "would pave the way for resumption of military supplies from Moscow...The Soviet Union had been Syria's main arms supplier before the collapse of communism."

The Syrian-Russian military agreement raises anew the most basic question about the Middle East: if Syria really wants peace with Israel, why is it buying weapons? Syria's ongoing military build-up proves that it has not yet become reconciled to the idea of a peaceful Middle East. The Syrians are continuing to purchase advanced missiles; they are still working to develop chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons; and now they are about to resume receiving arms shipments from Moscow. Syria's behavior poses a clear and direct threat to the safety of Israel.◇

## **PERES INSULTS AMERICA AND THE SIX MILLION**

Speaking at the United Nations on May 23, Israeli Foreign Minister Shimon Peres managed in one fell swoop to insult both the American public and the memory of the six million Jews murdered during the Holocaust.

Searching for a way to compare the history of the Jews to the history of the Japanese --Peres was addressing Japanese diplomats at the dedication of a "peace bell" designed in part by Japanese and Israeli artisans-- Peres declared that the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in World War II was "the Japanese Holocaust."

The foreign minister's speechwriters should read up on their history of the Holocaust and World War II before invoking such specious and insulting comparisons. There is no analogy between the slaughter of six million defenseless Jews by the Nazis and America's use of the atomic bomb in self-defense, to end a war that Japan started. Auschwitz was not Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and the Americans were not Nazis. Foreign Minister Peres should issue an immediate and unequivocal apology--to America, which did not perpetrate a Holocaust, and to the survivors of the real Holocaust. ◇

## **THE DANGERS OF DECONTROL**

"Decontrol Freaks" is the title of a fascinating essay in the June 1994 issue of *The American Spectator* by Michael Ledeen, resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, and Stephen Bryen, a former deputy undersecretary of defense. Two especially striking passages are worth quoting in full:

*During the presidential campaign of 1992, Bill Clinton and Al Gore chastised George Bush for having tilted American policy toward Saddam Hussein, thereby tacitly encouraging the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. Their most dramatic evidence for the tilt was the shocking flow of militarily useful technology from the U.S. to Iraq. "George Bush sold dangerous technology to a criminal who was intent on developing and using lethal weapons," Al Gore intoned. "George Bush does not fit the requirements of the New World Order his own speechwriters once summoned up. We require a fresh approach."*

*Clinton and Gore were entirely right, but their own policies have made a bitter mockery of their promises. Bush and his team irresponsibly and knowingly lifted controls on some sensitive technology, yet their actions pale in comparison with the near-total destruction of export controls by Messrs. Clinton, Christopher, Aspin, and Perry. Every bit of the lethal technology that Saddam Hussein obtained illegally can now be legally purchased by all but a tiny handful of pariah countries, and those bad guys can easily pick them up from third parties. The Clinton administration has enabled America's enemies to substantially reduce the time they need to develop countermeasures to the most modern U.S. weaponry. Graver still, since they can now buy even the manufacturing technology, it has become virtually impossible for the U.S. to get advance warning of enemy intentions and capabilities."*

Ledeen and Bryen have authored a powerful and revealing essay that deserves the public's urgent attention.◇

### *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.

# **NEGOTIATING WITH ONESELF: DIPLOMACY A LA SHIMON PERES**

*Rael Jean Isaac*

Shortly after Israel signed the so-called peace agreement with Yasir Arafat, this writer accused Israel's leadership of negotiating with itself. To negotiate with oneself is an obvious absurdity, for the dictionary definition of negotiation is "to deal or bargain with another or others." My point was that Yasir Arafat and the PLO were so little likely to abide by any agreements, Israel in effect was negotiating with itself.

At the time, Foreign Minister Shimon Peres, architect of the "peace process," declared he was negotiating peace with Israel's enemies, and after all with whom did one make peace, if not with enemies? Peres was echoing the radical Israeli left wing, which had long advocated negotiations with Arafat on the basis of this smug slogan.

But now, amazing to say, Shimon Peres himself has proudly announced that Israel is negotiating with itself! During his three-day visit to New York at the end of May, speaking before the Israel Policy Forum (a new group designed to support Labor Party policies here), Peres declared, "I don't think we should judge the process by the performance of Yasir Arafat. We're not negotiating with Yasir Arafat. We're negotiating with ourselves--about what sort of people we want to become."

We all know Shimon Peres is prophetic, a visionary, a certified Great Thinker. On this very trip, he was so-certified by no less an authority than the Earth Society Foundation, which bestowed upon him the honor of giving the first Margaret Mead Memorial lecture, established, according to the Foundation's president Hans Janitschek, as an "opportunity for world leaders, visionaries and great thinkers to present their vision and plan for a world in which civilization and nature can exist in harmony." (Given the fact that Mead has been accused of fabricating the idyllic conditions for "growing up" on Samoa that made her famous as an anthropologist, it was actually quite appropriate that Peres, misteaching an imaginary "New Middle East," should give the Mead lecture.)

But now the Great Thinker has outdone himself, ripening into a Visionary in Diplomacy--the first Foreign Minister who on his country's behalf negotiates with himself.

Brilliant fellow that he is, Peres has discovered there are tremendous advantages in self-negotiations. As long as he negotiated with someone else, there was no avoiding the disturbing issue of compliance. Arafat was especially irritating in this department, because he complied with absolutely nothing that he promised. As long

as you negotiated with him, you opened the way for critics to make that observation. What about changing the Covenant? What about condemning terrorism? What about the call to *jihad* in the mosque in South Africa? Every day it was what about some new egregious violation of the agreement. As he cuts through every seemingly insoluble problem, Peres sliced right through this one. Israel, he decided, had transcended negotiations with Arafat. What Arafat, the PLO, or other Arabs did was of no matter. It didn't affect the negotiations because the negotiations were not with them in any case.

Pestiferous realities no longer cloud the negotiating process. As Peres keeps saying in his book--and repeated to the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations on his May visit--"there is a stream of history that no one can stop." Peres the Prophet

fashions agreements with himself, communing with this stream of history that he alone discerns. And where does the stream take us? Why to a New Middle East in which, to quote from Peres' *The New Middle East*, we shall "remove the desert from the land, the salt from the water, and the violence from the people." The wolf lie down with the lamb? Isaiah was a piker compared to Peres when it comes to what President Bush called plaintively "the vision thing."

And then of course there's Israel's spiritual welfare to be considered. Just as the soul is much more beautiful than the body, so can the spirit of the Jewish people flower with greater purity absent the burdens of a state. Peres will preserve Israel's soul, washing away the defilements of statehood in the stream of post-Zionist history.◇

*Rael Jean Isaac is a member of the editorial board of Outpost.*

# ***FUTURE SHOCK, ISRAELI STYLE***

*Eli Kenin*

The Green Line is more than a dividing line between Israel and its territories or between Israel and the Palestinian State whose seeds have now been firmly planted. It is an imaginary line that exists in the Israeli mind, much like the line which divides the human brain into left and right portions. It separates Israelis into those who look towards the past for their inspiration and those who look towards the future and are inspired.

In his 1970 masterpiece "Future Shock," Alvin Toffler documented the social problems brought on by the increasingly rapid pace of life in the late twentieth century. The term "future shock" describes "the shattering stress and disorientation induced in individuals by subjecting them to too much change in too short a time." Israelis have endured wars, terrorism, long range missiles and hyperinflation with amazing resilience, but since the present government came to power the entire nation seems to have been infected by future shock. With the signing of the peace accord with Yasir Arafat, there is no doubt that the delicate psychological balance that has existed in Israeli society since 1967 has been upset. It now seems that the left side is firmly in control of the Israeli psyche. The left is rational--"we can't rule over another population

of two million forever." The right, which thinks in a more intuitive manner, says, "this land belongs to the Jewish people and it is ours by Divine right." The Western mind, in which most modern Israelis take pride, is rational. But is history itself rational? Is Jewish history rational?

No other nation faces the future with so many inherent paradoxes as Israel. "The roaring current of change," wrote Toffler, "overturns institutions, shifts our values and shrivels our roots." A people with deep roots and young institutions, skyrocketing into a high-tech future, we sit on the Rift Valley of the new world order. While the Russians have seen their anachronistic imperial empire, the Soviet Union, dissolved, and the South African whites have conceded control of their government, only Israel has been asked to give up the very heart

of its historical homeland.

The great psychological divide goes far beyond the future boundaries of the country, but penetrates to the central issues of Jewish history, survival and meaning. The "rational Israelis" scanning history might reason as follows: Military might has never won Israel many friends, nor has it been the major factor in the survival of the Jewish people. Modern warfare is more dependent on technology than on territory. As a small people, the bridges built to the nations of the world through "peace" will guarantee our security more than any military land bridge that we might construct in our own defense.

To those Israelis rushing headlong into the future, "land for peace" really means land for a piece of the economic pie of the post-Cold War world. It comes with acceptance by the international community, the end of economic sanctions and the Arab boycott. Territory is traded for the power of ideas. In the new world order, it is the potency of ideas, not land, that creates wealth. Certainly there is no other people in the world who survived landless so successfully by relying on their sheer wits as the Jewish people.

In this new vision, Israel is transformed into a "microchip among nations," a great intellectual power packed into a tiny area. Stripped of useless territories that antagonize the international community, we earn new friends with our advanced technologies. The light we shed among the nations takes on the pale flicker of a computer screen or the landing lights of a 747, as teams of Israeli advisers touch down on a runway somewhere in Kazakhstan.

Logical? Perhaps, but as history unfolds at mach speeds in the information age, the art of prognosis becomes the art of prophecy and rationality takes on an ever larger measure of intuition. Looking out "the window of opportunity" that opened with the fall of Communism and the defeat of Saddam Hussein by an international coalition, our leaders see a world of international cooperation based on shared economic interests. But somehow their belief in that opportunity seems to be more an act of faith than the traditional belief in the eternal connection of the Jewish people to the Land of Israel. After all, that belief is based on more than 3,000 years of history, while our present leaders' "window of opportunity" opened just three years ago.

What seems to be our new national destiny may turn out to be nothing more than a remarkable piece of "virtual reality" presented to us by Yitzhak Rabin and Shimon Peres. Certainly the facts on the "ground" as the rush towards the "new era of peace" breeds increased terrorism, make one feel that we are living an electronically-induced fantasy.

In fact, nowhere is the evidence of future shock more acute than in the behavior of our leaders. With the entire global village looking on, the ceremonial signing

*(Continued on*

*July-August 1994*

# ADL WRONGS THE RELIGIOUS RIGHT

Rael Jean Isaac

The Anti-Defamation League's new publication, *The Religious Right: The Assault on Tolerance & Pluralism in America* raises what would earlier have been an unimaginable question: "Is the ADL becoming a divisive organization which *harms* rather than promotes Jewish interests?"

ADL's national director Abraham Foxman recently wrote to AFSI, "For decades, ADL has been in the forefront of the struggle to strengthen U.S. Jewry and American support for Israel." Its current publication does the reverse--by defaming conservative Christian organizations and leaders, most of whom have been staunch supporters of Israel and have sought to purge their followers of anti-Jewish (and anti-Zionist) sentiment instilled by historical Christianity. Those who defame would-be friends--calling them "prophets of rage" who seek to legislate rejection of the modern democratic state--will lose them, and Israel (and indeed Jews in this country) can ill afford to turn the Christian right into enemies.

What is the ground of ADL's attack? The report does not accuse the religious right of hostility to Israel. On the contrary, it has to admit, if only briefly and reluctantly, that most of the groups and leaders it describes have been strongly supportive of Israel. Nor does the report even attempt to link most of those it attacks with anti-Semitism. When one peels away the rhetoric for the specifics, the ADL's onslaught is based on positions the religious right takes on social issues: on abortion, on homosexuality, on pornography, on prayer in the schools, on public financing for religious schools. (If it chose to mount a counter-assault the religious right could point out that it is surprising that the ADL, so firm in its support for publicly funded "choice" when it comes to abortion should be so opposed to school choice.) The ADL seems unaware that it holds its own position on these issues on quasi-religious faith, taking the politically correct notions of the day as self-evidently true and right.

Yet as journalist Don Feder pointed out in a stinging column attacking a similar recent attack on the religious right by the American Jewish Committee (piously described by the AJC as a "critical analysis"), Pat Robertson, James Dobson and Beverly LaHaye "defend Jewish values--the Torah's moral code--far better than the sachems of secular Jewish organizations." As Feder notes dryly, "They base their arguments on *Leviticus*--a Jewish best-seller of a few years back." Moreover, as Feder points out, given that assimilation is the greatest present threat to Jewish survival in the United States, by denouncing the school vouchers advocated by the religious right, secular Jewish organizations oppose the best single way to stem assimilation--providing more Jewish parents with the means

to send their children to a Jewish day school.

Indeed, when religious conservatives first organized politically a number of them turned to Jewish organizations in the innocent confidence that here they could count upon articulate and media-savvy supporters. For were they not calling for a return to family values and respect for commandments laid down in the Old Testament?

Tragically, many nominal Jews give greater moral authority to the pronouncements of NOW, the ACLU and various gay rights organizations than they do to their religious tradition. But this does not excuse Jewish organizations from taking stands that are controversial in the Jewish community and directly counter to Jewish religious authority and defining those who disagree with them as anti-Semitic or anti-democratic or "prophets of rage."

Nor does it become the ADL to portray activities by the religious right that are in fact the staple of democratic politics as somehow "anti-democratic." The religious right has engaged in voter registration drives to bring out its traditionally apolitical constituency, encourages members to vote for candidates sympathetic to their views and is devoting itself to the nitty gritty of local politics, fielding candidates at precinct and school board levels. (The ADL makes this sound sinister by describing those who run as "stealth" candidates.)

Much of what is wrong with the ADL report is typified by the following seemingly innocuous sentence. "Hostility to the Constitution's separation of church and state is the defining feature of religious right groups and activists." But this is arbitrarily to prejudge a legitimate area of dissent. The religious right interprets the first amendment differently from the ADL. This writer grew up in the era when prayer was a standard feature of public schools. For over a hundred and fifty years the courts had found no constitutional problem with this. Thus leaders of the religious right surely have a legitimate point when they say that the Supreme Court reinterpreted the First Amendment in the 1960s. Of course, if the ADL had said that the religious right is hostile to recent Supreme Court interpretations of the meaning of the First Amendment, it would have interfered with its self-imposed mission to delegitimize the religious right as opponents of the Constitution.

The subtitle of the ADL's report is "The Assault on Tolerance & Pluralism in America," but don't look for tolerance of pluralism in the report itself, for it evinces a total failure of sympathy and imagination for the beliefs of large numbers of fellow Americans, including, ironically, many Jews. (Feder provides a series of statements made by religious Jews that are virtually identical with those cited by the ADL as blatant examples of the religious right's alleged "assault on tolerance.")

To the ADL, anything that departs from its own

(Continued on  
Outpost

# ADL WRONGS THE RELIGIOUS RIGHT

(Continued from p.5)

definitions of "right-thinking" is self-evidently absurd. Speaking of James C. Dobson, head of Focus on the Family, a large evangelical organization headquartered in Colorado Springs, the ADL declares that his "politics begin in caricature, as when he told the 1989 Religious Broadcasters convention: 'We are engaged at this time in an enormous civil war of values' in which 'the Judeo-Christian, biblical prescriptions we trust' battle 'the humanistic, avant-garde point of view that there are no absolutes, especially if there is money to be made.'" Why is it "caricature" to point out that a civil war of values is underway? Many in the Jewish community would describe the views of ADL (and other secular Jewish organizations) that pornography, gay rights and radical feminism are core issues of Jewish concern as an indecent caricature of Jewish religious tradition.

Some of the charges in the ADL report are downright silly. For example, in an unwitting parody of the charges that used to be made by the radical right against the Council on Foreign Relations and the Trilateral Commission as supposed sinister cabals promoting world

government, the ADL writes darkly of the Council for National Policy as a "secretive, arch-conservative think tank" whose members include Pat Robertson, Phyllis Schlafley, Jerry Falwell and numerous others of the religious right." Now, that should keep you awake at night. The ADL does not mention that other members include Jack Kemp, General Daniel Graham (a speaker at AFSI conferences), Pierre DuPont (former governor of Delaware), Elizabeth Whelan (head of the American Council on Science and Health), Faith Whittlesey, U.S. ambassador to Switzerland, Peter Grace (famous for the Grace report on government waste), and writer (and AFSI supporter) Sol Sanders, among others. In conversation with this writer, Sanders laughed at ADL's description. He had dropped out of the organization because he found its meetings, generally at very expensive hotels, more in the nature of social gatherings than serious political exchanges. Says Sanders: "If that's the American fascist right, we're

all safe in our beds."

Are there then no causes for worry on the part of Jews when it comes to the religious right? Yes, there are, but with this foolish and mean-spirited report, the ADL obfuscates them and makes them immensely more difficult to deal with in a positive way. For why should leaders of the religious right seek to guard against anti-Semitism if they will be accused of it no matter what they do? The religious right is not the monolith portrayed by the ADL but a spectrum of groups with all kinds of viewpoints on a host of issues, including Jews and Israel. The ADL report insouciantly lumps together friends, neutrals and enemies without distinction: a page on Jerry Falwell (a friend of AFSI who has been such a staunch supporter of Israel that Menachem Begin awarded him the Jabotinsky Medal for service to the Jewish people) followed by one on Phyllis Schlafley followed by one on Pete Peters, who sells the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* and has apparently (the ADL offers no footnote to its citation) sharply attacked Jews. This melange of slander and misrepresentation can only deeply hurt friends like Falwell and foster indifference to warranted Jewish sensitivities on the part of other segments of the religious right. (It is worrisome, for example, that Pat Robertson purveys conspiracy theories of "Illuminati" even though he does not focus on them as a specifically Jewish "plot.")

Even before this report, there were signs that the hostility of major American Jewish organizations had hurt and alienated key figures on the religious right who had sought to reach out to Jews. The ADL quotes Pat Robertson:

*"In light of the problems facing Jews world wide and absent some divine explanation, there seems to be no rational way of explaining recent attempts by Jews in various quarters to alienate their strongest friends --the Christians of the world."*

The ADL treats this as evidence of anti-Semitism. On the contrary, this writer echoes the sentiment.

Steve Shearer, a pastor and writer on the religious right who is an ardent supporter of Israel, has warned of the blindness of secular elites which "obscures their ability to see the consequences of what they are doing by trampling, often without realizing it, the cultural values of ordinary people." As Shearer sees it, the return of large numbers of Americans to a conservative brand of Christianity may be traced not so much to a sudden desire to "find God" as to an impulse "to defend their traditional culture." By its arrogant, self-righteous identification with all the challenges to core values of the Judeo-Christian tradition, by its unwillingness to compromise, by libelling those who think differently, the ADL makes it more likely that what it fears will come to pass and those whose views are now contemptuously dismissed will one day in their

# **FUTURE SHOCK**

*(Continued from p.4)*

of an international peace treaty designed to guarantee Israel's security well into the 21st century, ends in last-minute haggling reminiscent of an ancient bazaar. Do Yitzhak Rabin and Shimon Peres feel that the future is rushing towards them so fast, that they must change it blindly, before it passes them by? Do they realize that they are dealing with an Arab world for whom the word "change" is a foreign concept?

The "accelerated thrust" of events, writes Toffler, "affects the metabolism of both the individual and the society in which he lives." The amount of change which can be absorbed is limited. "Future shock, like culture shock, is the emotional stress that comes with the clash of the unknown." When Yasir Arafat interprets the word *jihad* as meaning "peace," is he also suffering from the collision with the future? Rather, his elusive definition is the result of the age-old culture clash that has characterized Arab relations with the outside world. For while the world has been swept by change, the Arabs have remained static. Their meeting with the future breeds fundamentalism and

terrorism while their encounter with democracy has bred strife and civil war in Algeria and Yemen.

Israelis used to see themselves with their backs to the sea and nowhere to go. Now with their backs to their past, the sky seems the limit. While many see an era of unlimited economic opportunity and technological advancement, the right-minded Israeli feels he is being squeezed into a tiny country waning in both size and vision. He has seen the nation transformed, the pace of life quickening, the timeless Jewish quest for a higher moral standard replaced by the endless quest for a higher standard of living. The territories were his "wide open

spaces." Here one could feel the past while building the future.

Culture shock is relatively moderate compared to future shock. The traveler suffering from culture shock has the comforting knowledge that the homeland he left behind will be there to return to. Israelis do not. In their mind-boggling rush into an uncertain future, the present government has crossed red lines, endangering Israel's security and very existence. In their retreat to the Green Line, they abandon the moral strengths upon which the country was founded and risk leaving an indelible scar on the Israeli psyche.◇

*Eli Kenin is a resident of Jerusalem.*

---

## **THE ADL WRONGS THE RELIGIOUS RIGHT**

*(Continued from page 6)]*

turn be less likely to accommodate well-grounded Jewish concerns.

There is plenty of scope for the ADL. Israel's enemies remain legion, and the so-called peace process, by fostering perceptions of weakness, can only encourage her enemies. Anti-Semitism is rife on college campuses where political correctness requires that no offensive speech be directed at any "approved" group. On these same campuses, Jews fall under the category of free speech and Farrakhan and Co. are invited and paid well to vent their hatred. Black anti-Semitism grows, and grows more acceptable. Let the ADL, like the shoemaker, stick to its last--anti-Semites and those who disguise their anti-Semitism as anti-Zionism.

In the introduction to the ADL report, it says "Yet those who object to the religious right movement too often engage in the intolerance and stereotyping they purport to decry." This writer could not come up with a better description of the body of the report that follows. It seems appropriate to close by addressing to the ADL a quote from the New Testament: "Physician, heal thyself."◇

*Rael Jean Issac is a member of the editorial board of Outpost.*

# ISRAEL'S SECURITY AFTER OSLO

Louis Rene Beres

The Oslo agreement has made a bad situation for Israel even worse. Should it prove "successful," resultant Palestinian Arab "autonomy" will rapidly transform itself into a Palestinian state, a condition that would be intolerable for all the well-known reasons. Should it "fail," Arab bitterness--paralleled to some extent by unhappiness and frustration on the Israeli left--will accelerate the *intifada* and routine cyclical acts of violence. This, too, will undermine Israeli security, again for all the well-known reasons. Clearly, it would have been better (in Voltaire's satirical "best of all possible worlds") for the Oslo agreement never to have happened, but what is done is done, and cannot be undone. Where, therefore, should Israel go from here? This is all that we can ask today.

To answer this overriding question, Israel must first decide, by itself, how seriously it wishes to endure, as a state. This may seem an almost silly bit of advice, gratuitous and perfectly obvious--after all, every Israeli seeks preservation of the Third Commonwealth--but it is time to be reminded that states are not forever and that the Jewish State is especially fragile.

Building Israel's peace prospects upon erroneous assumptions of enemy reasonableness and rationality would be a misfortune. From the Arab and Iranian perspective generally, Israel is an enemy state because it is a Jewish state. Period! The only step Israel could take to reduce enemy belligerence would be to disappear. Right now, the government of Israel is, in fact, cooperating in such a step. Significantly, the Arab and Iranian worlds have been strikingly honest in identifying their goals. They have made it clear, again and again, that the overall war with Israel is a war with the "Jews," and that it is a war that will continue until all of "Palestine" is "returned."

A good portion of the Jewish world, however, in Israel and in the Diaspora, refuses to act upon these strikingly honest expressions of belligerent intent.

Instead, learning nothing from two thousand years of a murderous history, they create their own reality--a nicely balanced, finely-tuned reality of diplomatic bargaining, negotiation and incremental settlements--and assume that Syria, Iran, the Palestinians, et cetera, will be grateful. The result, of course, is predictable.

Israel's enemies call for more and more. Israel, the individual Jew in macrocosm, asks for less and less. Taken together, these calls portend a shrinking and enfeebled Israel in an expanding Islamic sea. It is not a pretty picture.

Right now, Israel reminds me very much of Gottlieb Biedermann. The cautious Swiss businessman in the play by Max Frisch, *The Firebugs*. Biedermann contends with a neighborhood epidemic of arson by implementing a series of self-deceptions. Ultimately, Biedermann invites the arsonists into his home, lodges them, feeds them a sumptuous dinner and even provides them with matches. Not surprisingly, the play ends, for the protagonist (read Israel, in this parable) on an incendiary note. It also ends, predictably, with a pathetic and revolting disclaimer from an academic observer, from the Ph.D., from "the professor," who has counseled capitulation all along. Removing a paper from his pocket, as the sky reddens from fire, the all-too-familiar professor dissociates himself from the calamity. He is, he exclaims, "not responsible."

In his letters, the Roman statesman Cicero set the foundations for realist thinking in world affairs. Inquired Cicero: "For what can be done against force without force?" It is time for Israel to ask itself this question. At one time, it already knew the answer. Today, I am not so sure.

International law is not a suicide pact. Israel, in the fashion of every state in world politics, has a right to endure. With respect to the territories, Israel has eroded the right by itself; the ongoing territorial surrender of the "peace process" was preceded by linguistic surrender. By accepting, incrementally, the use of the term "occupied," a term that is challenged almost nowhere in the world--it was inevitable that events would come to where they are today. In Israel, an academic journal--a distinguished law review--refused to publish an article of mine dealing with Israel's rights under international law because I did not accept that the territories were "occupied." The irony gets worse. The article was subsequently accepted by a distinguished American law review sponsored by the Jesuits.

With respect to the recent Gulf War, Israel may feel, generally, that absorbing 39 Scud attacks without direct reprisal--that is, letting the Americans do the job for them--was *smart*. It seems to me, however, even recognizing full well the military code constraints of that moment, that this deferral to Washington--a deferral reinforced by the demeaning acceptance of minimally-capable Patriot missiles--is having longer term ill effects. Israel's enemies understand Cicero. Israel does not.

What, precisely, am I suggesting? The peace process, of course, is misconceived and potentially catastrophic. Associated efforts at so-called "confidence-building measures" and "security regimes" are the foolish inventions of academics, of the professors, trapped in their hermetically-sealed world of erroneous assumptions and political correctness. In the academic world, Cicero is not in fashion. Cliches are the rage, especially when they are well-funded. Euphemisms are proper. Fortrightness is unforgivable.

There is, of course, one more arena of prospective war, an arena of particularly great importance to Israel. I

(Continued on p.10)

July-August 1994

# SPOTLIGHT ON THE EXTREMISTS

...The Israel Sociological Society, a group of leftwing Israeli professors, has demanded that radio and television programs and newspapers stop conducting phone-in referenda on public issues. Labor Knesset Member **Avraham Burg** has seconded the Society's call. Burg denounced a recent phone-in referendum by *Ma'ariv* as "unwarranted intervention by the media in politics." Burg and the Society are apparently upset because the results of the referenda have indicated widespread Israeli public support for nationalist positions...

...Leftwing activist **Yael Tamir**, who was one of the drafters of the original Peace Now petition in 1978, was prevented from signing the petition because of chauvinism among the male organizers of the document--so says **Yale Lerer**, a "Tel Aviv-based peace activist," in the latest issue of the radical-left Israeli magazine *Challenge*...

...Palestinian Arab "moderate" **Rabab Abdul Hadi**, one of the leaders of the National Board of Palestinian Women's Associations in North America, contends that Israel no longer needs weapons. In a recent interview with the far-left magazine *The Nonviolent Activist*, Hadi declared: "Rabin came to ask Clinton for more fighter jets. What for? There are gestures of peace now between Israel and the Arab countries. Why does Israel need more military equipment? Americans should care...because you are paying the bills with your tax dollars"...

...Knesset Member **Hashem Mahamid**, of the Communist Party, has written to Prime Minister Rabin demanding the release of imprisoned Arab terrorist **Ahmad Bani Nimra** on "humanitarian grounds," since Nimra is handicapped. The reason that Nimra is handicapped is because the bomb he was preparing, on behalf of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, exploded prematurely...

...**Isaac Newman**, one of the leaders of the leftwing Israeli group Rabbis for Human Rights, which claims to be moderate, has joined the editorial board of the radical-left Israeli journal *Challenge*. The magazine's editors include **Roni Ben Efrat** and **Michal Schwartz**, two Israeli Jews who have spent time in prison for being members of an Arab terrorist group...

...**Neve Gordon**, executive director of the leftwing Israeli group Physicians for Human Rights, is not bothered by the fact that some of the Arabs wounded in the *July-August 1994*

## NOW AVAILABLE FROM AFSI:

### Videos

*After the Handshake: A Town Meeting with Marvin 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

Hebron massacre died because Palestinian Arab doctors refused, as a matter of principle, to accept Israeli medical assistance. According to Gordon, "We Israelis should ask ourselves what we have done to stop the occupation, before criticizing Palestinian doctors for letting political considerations influence their decisions"...

# ISRAEL AFTER OSLO

(Continued from p.8)

refer to Iran; especially the development of Iranian unconventional weapons and the threat of Iranian nuclear attack. This threat is becoming very real indeed. Regarding this threat, Israel has essentially two options: (1) Do nothing other than rely on strategic deterrence, deliberately ambiguous or disclosed (a problem because of willingness, capability, and rationality components or a credible deterrence posture); or (2) strike preemptively against Iranian hard targets and/or associated infrastructures, a strike that would necessarily reflect the permissible use of force known as "anticipatory self defense" in international law.

Here an unfortunate synergy must be noted. Now that the "peace process" is underway, Israel's *effective* capacity to pre-empt has already been diminished. It is true that Iran is not a part of this process, but surely the global community (a community not usually known for its good feelings toward Israel or, for that matter, toward Jews in general) would see a post-Oslo defensive strike against Arab targets as evidence of continuing Israeli "aggression." But again, what is done is done. The only question that remains is: what is Israel to do *now*?

I have written widely about pre-emption and anticipatory self-defense by Israel, with special reference to Iran. The tactical requirements of such actions are beyond my domain and can be handled more adequately elsewhere. What Israel does need to keep in mind is the essential time factor. Once Iranian unconventional or even nuclear weapons are deployed, Jerusalem's pre-emption options will be severely reduced.

Of course, Israel continues to place substantial hopes in ATBM defenses, principally the Hetz or Arrow project, but the limitations of such defenses are significant and well-known. Moreover, the success of deterrence is entirely contingent upon assumptions of enemy rational

ity. Should the leadership in Iran prove willing to absorb massive Israeli counterstrikes to achieve the allegedly spiritual benefits of a first strike attack against the "Zionist cancer," Israeli nuclear deterrence would be immobilized.

Is such Iranian willingness likely? Probably not. But are you prepared to bet the Third Temple on it? And if you are not so prepared, *timely* pre-emption by Israel emerges as the only alternative to waiting patiently for annihilation.

Israel, like Biedermann in Max Frisch's ominous play, lives in a bad neighborhood. Like Biedermann, Israel can pretend that everything will be all right, that the "arsonists" will disappear of their own accord, or at least that they will be deterred from doing harm if they are indulged in their every whim and expectation. Like Biedermann, self-delusion for Israel will result in "fire," in an assortment of harms that threaten survival and that might have been averted.

Israel must act *unlike* Biedermann, choosing not the path of "reasonableness" in an unreasonable region, but of determination, self-reliance and appropriate forms of forceful self-defense.

Rejecting the "disassociating" professors for whom history might just as well have never happened, Jerusalem must now base its policies upon a sober awareness of what has already been and upon a full consideration of what is still possible.

Should Israel choose such awareness, as indeed it must, acknowledging protracted, even permanent conflict, the short-term will be markedly unpleasant (hasn't it always), but the long-term will at least remain a foreseeable possibility.◊

*Louis Rene Beres is Professor of Political Science and International Law at Purdue University. The above remarks were delivered at Tel Aviv University earlier this year.*

Americans For a Safe Israel is pleased to offer a special bonus to our members and friends. **Knowledge On the Go** is a series of cassette audio-taped narrations (unabridged) of articles by prominent writers on the Middle East and other Jewish concerns. The tapes in this year's series include contributions by Douglas Feith, Bernard Lewis, Paul Johnson, Robert Seltzer, Natan Sharansky, Edward Alexander, Kenneth Timmerman, Martin Kramer, Andrea Levin and Alan Mintz. They are culled from noteworthy publications such as *Commentary*, *National Security Quarterly*, *The Atlantic Monthly*, to name just a few. There will be six tapes (60-90 minutes each) per year.

The series is being offered as a premium for a contribution of \$100.00 to AFSI. We urge all chapter chairmen to place orders for distribution in your area. They are an invaluable source of information for educating ourselves as well as future members.

Orders may be placed by mail or by calling our office during business hours. Supplies may become limited and we urge you to order as soon as possible.

# FOREIGN SERVICE--OR FOREIGN DISSERVICE?

Ruth King

While Meir Rosenne was Israel's ambassador to France, a high-level embassy official was murdered by PLO terrorists. When a French government official came to express condolences, at a public memorial meeting, Rosenne, with characteristic candor, remarked that the government of France bore responsibility for terrorism, since the PLO was permitted to open an office in Paris. In the acrimonious exchange which ensued, Rosenne stuck to his guns, reminding his visitor that he was ambassador of a sovereign state whose citizen had been murdered on French soil. Rosenne subsequently became Israel's ambassador to the United States, where he served with distinction, always sensitive to the unique historical and spiritual bonds which unite American Jews and Israel. He maintained polite dialogue even with vocal critics of the Likud government, and always sustained Menachem Begin's conviction that terrorist attacks against all Jews were an affront to the government of Israel.

In contrast with Rosenne, Israel's present ambassador, Itamar Rabinovitch, rudely dismisses all American Zionists who disagree with Israel's current policy of appeasing the PLO. When Norman Podhoretz broke the wall of silence by writing a cogent essay critical of Israel's negotiations, Rabinovitch went into high gear to discredit him and his journal, *Commentary*. When the *Jerusalem Post's* editorials voiced dissent, the newspaper was officially expunged from all consulates and foreign government offices. When a coalition of supporters of Israel, including many Christians, publicly opposed

stationing American troops on the Golan Heights, Rabinovitch insulted them by calling them "fringes." While he fulminates against dissent, Rabinovitch is quite tolerant of Arab terrorists, always referring to the "extremists on both sides" who are all equally "opposed to peace."

Another example of foreign disservice in Israel's diplomatic corps is Colette Avital, the Consul General in New York. Ms. Avital flew into high dudgeon when a few marchers in the Israel Day Parade carried placards criticizing Prime Minister Rabin. She threatened to boycott next year's parade, blithely ignoring her obligation to all marchers who are Zionists and gather to show their solidarity with *Israel*. She, too, routinely dismisses the murders of Israelis as the work of "extremists," always careful to add that they exist on "both sides."

Since censorship of dissent is part and parcel of socialist governance, it stands to reason that Israel's diplomats reflect their own ideology. However, their indifference to Israeli or Jewish victims of Arab terrorism is something new. Every prime minister of Israel--from Ben Gurion to Shamir--reacted forcefully to terrorist attacks against Jews, wherever they occurred. The current prime minister, by appalling contrast, isn't even ruffled when Jews are killed, and this attitude is reflected in the behavior of Israel's emissaries who behave more like apparatchiks than like diplomats.

This unimaginable policy of indifference to terrorism against Jews is not the policy of the Labor Party nor, in fact, of any party. Israelis of every political stripe are horrified by PLO terrorism, wherever it occurs. Unfortunately, the present government of Israel is dominated by leftist ideologues tugging a prime minister who is pathetically clutching at the fringes of their coattails.

*Ruth King is editor of Outpost.*

---

## ONE MINUTE TO MIDNIGHT

*Dr. Irving Moskowitz*

## ARAB LIES ABOUT BETHLEHEM

Many centuries ago, Bethlehem was a Jewish city, the birthplace of King David. Later, after the Jews were exiled from the Land of Israel by the Romans, Bethlehem became a center for Christianity. The city had a Christian majority until very recently--when Israel liberated it from the Jordanians in 1967, for example, Bethlehem was approximately 80% Christian and 20% Muslim. In recent years, however, Islamic fundamentalists have been terrorizing Bethlehem's Christians and pressuring them to emigrate, and as a result the city today has a 60% Muslim majority (some of the details of this Muslim

campaign were revealed in the Christian journal *Terra Sancta* in 1992). The fate of Bethlehem is an embarrassing subject for Arab propagandists, since it could undermine international Christian support for the Arab cause.

And so the Arabists are left with only one course of action: to lie. Thus at a recent symposium sponsored by the Minneapolis Council of Churches, one Violet Al-Rahab, who identified herself as a member of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Bethlehem, blamed Christian emigration from Bethlehem on the alleged fact that Christians in Bethlehem face "a life without dignity, without identity, where human rights are neglected day by day in the name of the human rights of others." The lies of Ms. Al-Rahab and her ilk must be exposed; Christians must be told the truth about what Muslim extremists have done to the city of Bethlehem.◇

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

# BALDERDASH

*"Hebron was much worse than Sarajevo. In fact what is happening now in the occupied territories is one long massacre..."*

--Yasir Arafat, interviewed in the March/  
April 1994 issue of *Middle East Insight*

*"Virulent anti-Semitism directed against Palestinians (Arabs are Semites) has characterized not only Jewish settler activity but also Israeli governmental policy for many years...Apartheid policies are financed by a U.S. Congress in the grip of single-issue campaign financing from Jewish lobby groups, while a steady diet of Holocaust stories...helps to whitewash systematic violations of Palestinian human rights."*

--Prof. Robert Ashmore, director of the Center  
for Ethnic Studies at Marquette University, in  
the *Milwaukee Journal*, March 6, 1994

*"The firing never ceases in Israel. It could be from the machine gun of a settler, or from Israeli Army rifles. It could be from the pistol of an Israeli woman who did not like the color of the scarf on a Palestinian woman's head and so just shot her for the heck of it."*

--Khlaed Al-Maena, former chief editor of  
the Saudi Arabian government newspaper  
*Arab News*, in the March 8, 1994 edition of  
that newspaper

*"Some pro-Israel organizations are already being compared to the German-American Bund that sought to diminish U.S. support for Britain and France in the lead-up to U.S. entry into World War II, and the post-World War II 'China Lobby' that played a catalytic role in the ugly chapter in U.S. domestic politics known as McCarthyism. Most Americans, by now, see such pressure groups as too overt, not in accord with the development of a sound American political system..."*

--Eugene Bird, executive director of the  
Council for the National Interest, in the  
June 1994 issue of the *Washington Report  
on Middle East Affairs*

---

**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