

---

# OUTPOST



OCTOBER 1994

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

---

## **THE DANGER OF U.S. "NEUTRALITY"**

*Herbert Zweibon*

Since American troops on the Golan Heights would have to adopt a position of strict neutrality between Israel and Syria, could that lead to the U.S. declaring itself "neutral" --rather than Israel's ally-- on a broader range of Mideast issues?

That is one of the questions raised by the Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies, in a recent study of putting American troops on the Golan, authored by Israeli military analyst Dore Gold. This is especially significant since the Jaffee Center is known as a dovish institution.

"Neutrality of peacekeeping forces is not just a matter of formality," Gold points out. "A force that is no longer neutral loses its credibility in the eyes of one of the parties to a conflict, thus possibly rendering its presence completely unwanted." The Americans will have to be neutral, which could in turn "serve as an efficient political instrument in the hands of Syria, to try to convert the U.S. from a closer partner of Israel to an external superpower obligated to follow an evenhanded policy in order to protect its soldiers."

For example, Gold contends, this could result in "harsh American reactions to Israeli Army actions in Lebanon...And over time American neutrality could also influence more central aspects of strategic cooperation between the U.S. and Israel, such as the supply of advanced weaponry."

It is not hard to imagine Syria arguing that U.S. weapons sales to Israel are a violation of America's peacekeeping role, since they tip the regional strategic balance in Israel's favor. The Syrians could demand "parity." The State Department, which for some time now has been searching high and low for a way to take Syria off the sponsors-of-terrorism list, would no doubt be only too happy to oblige a Syrian request for weaponry. Once an Israeli-Syrian treaty is signed, Syria will be declared "moderate" in Washington, opening the doors for an infusion of American financial and military assistance.

That, indeed, is how matters proceeded in the case of Egypt. As soon as the Israel-Egypt treaty was signed, the Egyptians began receiving huge quantities of sophisticated U.S. weaponry. Today Egypt is the second-largest recipient of U.S. aid, right behind Israel. (In fact, the Bush administration's decision to forgive Egypt's \$7-billion military debt actually moved Egypt ahead of Israel on the aid list for a time.)

The Egyptian army, which had been deteriorating because of its inability to acquire replacements and spare parts for its Soviet-made arsenal, is now completely equipped with the latest in American weapons. The next time Egypt attacks Israel, it will be with American bombers, tanks and missiles. Since Egyptian president Hosni Mubarak could be overthrown by Islamic militants at any time, the threat of Egyptian aggression against Israel in the near future must be taken seriously. In other words, Egypt before the treaty was less dangerous than Egypt after the treaty.

Israel's eagerness to involve America in a Golan retreat will produce the same result. Syria will be transformed from a despised nation and the target of sanctions to one fortified by U.S. arms and Western alliances, poised on the cliffs overlooking the Galilee and prepared for renewed and bloody conflict.◊

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

### IN THIS ISSUE:

<i>Shimon Peres Strikes Again</i>	...3
<i>New Report About GIs on the Golan</i>	...5
<i>Terrorism and Expediency</i>	...6
<i>The Blindness of the Jews</i>	...7
<i>What the Arabs Are Saying</i>	...11

## From the Editor

### **CIVIL RIGHTS, RABIN-STYLE**

Friends of Israel have good reason to be concerned about recent reports that imprisoned Jewish settlers have been physically abused by agents of the Israeli security services. The State Comptroller has already found that Israeli police officers used unprovoked and unjustified force against civilian demonstrators last year. Such behavior is reprehensible, and raises questions about how far the Rabin government is prepared to go in dealing with its opponents.

The problems of police violence and the government's scare tactics are explored in a powerful new English-language video documentary that is being distributed by Tzedek Tzedek: the Jewish Civil Liberties Center, a Jerusalem-based civil rights group. While careful not to take sides in Israel's ongoing political debate, the film offers a frank and penetrating look at the effect of the Mideast peace process on issues of democracy and dissent in Israel. It's available for \$14.95 from American Friends of Tzedek Tzedek, 372 Great Neck Road (Suite 366), Great Neck, NY 11021.◇

### **IS THE U.S. ARMY READY FOR THE GOLAN?**

Amid the growing debate over the wisdom of stationing U.S. troops on the Golan Heights, an important question has been overlooked: is the U.S. military prepared for such a deployment?

In the September 1994 issue of the military journal *The Officer*, Representative James M. Talent (R-MO) expressed concern about what he called "the hollowing out of America's armed services." Because of the efforts to downsize the U.S. military --on the assumption that the military is less needed since the Soviet Union has collapsed-- fewer and fewer soldiers are being saddled with a larger and larger burden. Rep. Talent recalls the fate of the 24th Marine Expeditionary Unit, which was at sea in a support role in Somalia and Bosnia for a period of six months earlier this year. Upon their return to the U.S. , they should have been given the standard ten-day vacation with their families, followed by an extended period of time working at homeport. What happened, Talent reveals, is that "half-way through the first ten days home, they were redeployed and reassigned to ships and sent out to Haiti...because we do not have enough people to cover contingencies abroad."

Can such an overworked force really "protect" Israel from Syrian aggression?◇

## **VISITING SYRIA**

Syria's effort to improve its image in the West has received a tremendous boost in recent months from liberal American Jews who have been traveling to Damascus and returning with glowing reports about the Assad regime. Such activity has a disturbing parallel in recent American history: during the 1920s, a steady stream of liberal American intellectuals traveled to the Soviet Union to see first-hand the social and economic experiment underway there, and returned with glowing reports about life in the USSR. How is it that intelligent, perceptive men and women had such praise for a brutal totalitarian regime? "It is a well-attested psychological truth that what people need shapes what they see," according to the historian Lewis Feuer. "The travelers' needs, in large part, conditioned their perception of Soviet reality. They selected some segments of Soviet existence for their emphasis, while they blurred others beneath the threshold of their perception."

The recent travelers to Syria have included the leaders of Americans for Peace Now, who visited Syria on the eve of the January 1994 Clinton-Assad press conference; ten officials from the leftwing "Nishma" group, led by Nishma's executive director, Thomas Smerling, a former leader of New Jewish Agenda and a delegation led by former American Jewish Congress chiefs Robert Lifton and Henry Siegman. All three groups returned with the standard lines about Syria's moderation and desire for peace—and said nothing about the massive buildup of the Syrian Army and the anti-Semitic tirades that still appear in the Syrian government press. Like the American intellectuals who traveled to the USSR in the 1920s, these American Jewish liberals are likely to continue seeing in Syria only that which they want to see—that which suits their political agenda.◇

### ***Outpost***

is published by  
Americans For a Safe Israel  
147 East 76 St.  
New York, NY 10021  
tel (212) 628-9400 / fax (212) 988-4065

**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.

# SHIMON PERES STRIKES AGAIN

Rael Jean Isaac

On May 4, 1995, the anniversary of Israel's independence, Foreign Minister Peres addressed the graduating class at the Israeli Army's National Security College. Delivering the kind of groundbreaking speech the foreign media had become accustomed to, he boldly announced that Israel accepted the partition lines of 1947 as its legitimate boundaries.

There had been skepticism about Peres's ability to equal his major speech of July 1994. Then, addressing the leaders of the kibbutz movement, he declared that "Israel has recognized Syrian sovereignty over the Golan Heights time after time." Those with feebler memories seemed to recall that Israel had annexed the Golan in 1981. (In any event, in December 1994 Israel had signed an agreement by which it dismantled settlements and left the Heights, with U.S. "monitors" acting as a buffer.)

Even hardened newsmen were impressed by Peres's newest leap into the future (or was it past?). Who said there was no visionary leadership in the world today? In his speech at the National Security College, Peres pointed out that Ben-Gurion had not merely accepted the U.N. partition but had lobbied vigorously for its passage and treated the U.N. vote as an enormous victory. No Israeli borders, Peres stressed, had ever had the weight and depth of international approval and hence of moral force enjoyed by those of 1947.

While world leaders were effusive in their praise for Peres's courage (even Peter Jennings offered a few seconds of favorable comment), and the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations hailed this bold new gamble for peace, for several weeks following the speech, Israelis were divided and anxious.

Opponents objected that the 1947 borders meant that Israel would consist of three tiny enclaves separated by Arab territory; that most of Galilee would be gone; that Ashdod, Ashkelon and Beersheba would go to the Arabs; that Israel would lose sovereignty over all of Jerusalem; that indeed Israel would consist essentially of the cities of Haifa, Tel Aviv, Tiberias and Safed with their suburbs and a strip of the Negev. Such a mini-state, complained the objectors, could not absorb the millions of Jewish refugees from the areas that would become Arab nor could it be defended militarily.

But proponents of Peres's new plan were equally if not more active and articulate. Headed by Shlomo Gazit, one-time head of Israeli Army Intelligence, 20 former generals, calling themselves Generals for a Secure Peace, issued a statement asserting that the 1947 borders would not only improve Israeli security but were the only viable option.

The generals pointed out that demography came first and foremost and that with their high birth-rate, the Arabs of Israel would before long overwhelm the Jewish population even in the 1949 borders. By disposing of Galilee, Israel would so vastly improve the demographic situation that it was worth forfeiting much of the southern and eastern part of the country.

Second, the generals observed, Israel could not fight Arabs and Muslims forever. The only alternative to a political solution was total war. The Arabs were now ready to accept Israel in the 1947 borders, but not an inch beyond them.

Within a matter of weeks, the opposition died down. To be sure, there continued to be demonstrations by those tiresome religious types who protested absolutely everything that had the word peace on it. But those people whom Prime Minister Rabin called "real Israelis" turned their attention to more pressing matters: making a living, following the lottery, planning their next vacation abroad, even snapping up a condo in Johannesburg, just in case.

Meanwhile, teams of negotiators met in Cairo, Amman, Damascus and at PLO headquarters at Orient House in Jerusalem to flesh out the details of the withdrawal and the timetable for Jewish resettlement.

And Shimon Peres? Far from basking in the success of his policies, he was tossing sleeplessly. For

---

***Even hardened newsmen were impressed by Peres's newest leap into the future...***

---

he was due to give another speech, this one to the World Zionist Organization. But how was he to astound the world again? Fortunately, his faithful deputy Yossi Beilin came to the rescue. Beilin reminded his chief of Chaim Weizmann's words at the 17th Zionist Congress in 1931: "I have no understanding of, and no sympathy for the demand for a Jewish majority in Palestine."

What could be more legitimate, more morally authoritative, than for Israel's foreign minister to translate into policy the vision of the Zionist movement's revered long-time leader? Peres had his speech. He would propose the return of the Arab refugees to their homes in Israel. The world would gasp in amazement.

And soon negotiating committees would be meeting . . . ♦

*Rael Jean Isaac is a member of the executive board of Americans For a Safe Israel and is the author of two books and numerous articles on Israeli politics.*

# IS CLINTON DUMPING ISRAEL?

David Isaac

"While Israel may have disposed of Gaza, the United States is disposing of Israel," said Randy Fishbein, former special assistant for national security affairs to Senator Daniel K. Inouye.

Speaking at an American Political Science Association meeting in September, Fishbein warned that Israel may be less secure at the end of the peace process than it was before it began. The Clinton Administration, Fishbein pointed out, has been distancing itself from Israel in the wake of the September 1993 handshake: it has tried to take away programs traditionally earmarked for Israel, recharged Israel \$170-million in loan guarantees, rejected Israel's request to lift restrictions on several export licenses of U.S. technology, and attempted to repeal provisions dating back 20 years that impose sanctions on the PLO. Most serious of all, according to Fishbein, Congress is being shut out of the decision-making on the Middle East, a "violation of its constitutional prerogative to be an equal player."

Within three months of the signing of the Declaration of Principles, the Clinton Administration had

moved against Israel on a series of issues. The administration cancelled \$437-million in loan guarantees intended for settling refugees. It publicly protested Israel's plan for incorporating Ma'ale Adumim, a suburb of Jerusalem, into the city. The U.S. offered Saudi Arabia \$6-million credit through an Export-Import Bank in America for aircraft without making a similar offer to Israel, and sold a spy satellite to Saudi Arabia, requesting that Israel not object.

Even more worrisome, says Fishbein, the director general of Israel's Ministry of Defense came to the U.S. expecting a number of restrictions on export licenses of U.S. technology to be lifted. All his requests were turned down. There was also a change in

military sales, directing all purchases of military equipment must go through the Pentagon. This denies Israel the ability to buy commercially, raising costs and creating delays.

But from Fishbein's perspective, the worst development of all has been the administration's devious behavior toward Congress, in its disturbingly successful campaign to obtain a totally free hand in relations with the PLO, shutting out Congress and simply waiving Congressional legislation regarding the PLO.

Fishbein reports that only two weeks after the signing of the Declaration of Principles, Dennis Ross, the Clinton administration's special coordinator for the Middle East, came to Capitol Hill and asked that an amendment be attached to the foreign aid bill repealing 15 years of statutes pertaining to the PLO, in effect making the PLO equivalent to any other state in the world. Says Fishbein: "This was quite odd, because never in my life on the Hill, or in recent memory that I am aware of, has such a wholesale repeal ever been attempted. When Dennis Ross was questioned on precisely what it was he was waiving, he really wasn't sure." A compromise was reached whereby Congress agreed to waive two of the statutes for a period of three months. After this, if the administration wanted an extension of the waiver, it would return in January, 1994.

What the administration sought--and won--was a waiver of the provision which prohibited the United States from transferring money to the PLO. Congress agreed without a discussion of monitoring or accountability of that money. Fishbein, who had served seven years as an appropriations committee staffer found this particularly egregious. He said that whatever one's opinion of the "peace process" or the PLO, Congress has a responsibility to the taxpayer to ensure funds intended for a specific purpose go to that purpose. Congress was willing to trust the PLO, an organization with no history of modern financial management, whose funds are usually controlled by one person and placed in banks around the world so that they cannot be audited.

But even then, the administration was not satisfied. It did not come back for an extension of the waiver, as it had promised. Instead, the administration returned to its original insistence that Congress totally repeal its legislation on the PLO. Moreover, it deliberately excluded from deliberations on the repeal Senators and House members that are considered pro-Israel, such as Representative Howard Berman and Senator Arlen Specter. The administration's tactic was to attach an amendment to the State Department Authorization bill. It almost worked--but at the last moment, pro-Israel members of Congress discovered what the administration was up to. After more maneuvering, the administration was eventually given authorization

*(Continued on p. 10)*

# **U.S. FORCES ON THE GOLAN HEIGHTS?**

*Ruth King*

The Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies, at Tel Aviv University, recently published a study by one of its senior strategic analysts, Dr. Dore Gold, entitled "U.S. Forces on the Golan Heights and Israeli-Syrian Security Arrangements." The study's conclusions are particularly striking in view of the fact that the Jaffee Center has consistently taken left-of-center positions and has until now done its best to advance the policies of the Rabin government. The dangers of a U.S. military deployment on the Golan Heights, however, are so obvious that even the Jaffee Center cannot deny them.

Refuting the claim (made frequently by Rabin supporters) that having GIs on the Golan would be comparable to the U.S. force that has been stationed in the Sinai since 1982, Dr. Gold points out that "the relative role of any peacekeeping presence in the sum total of Golan security arrangements can be expected to be greater than in the Sinai case." As a result, he notes, "the U.S. and/or Israel might, in the course of negotiations, consider giving American forces a more enhanced role [than that of the U.S. forces currently stationed in the Sinai], beyond the monitoring of agreements that are reached, in three specific areas: early warning, deterrence, and defense..."

If a U.S. force on the Golan engaged in merely monitoring, like the Sinai force, would that be of any use? According to Gold, "The value of a monitoring force to Israeli security is highly dependent upon the quality of the security arrangements that the force is intended to verify--and not beyond. In the case of the MFO in Sinai, neither the Multinational Force nor its American battalion constitutes a direct source of security for Israel. They are not equipped to absorb or block an attack and are not intended for this purpose..."

How about if GIs on the Golan serve as an early warning system? Gold: "Early warning, and particularly strategic early warning, is intended to allow the political echelon to make real time decisions (such as mobilization of reserves) regarding existential threats to the state. The introduction of the U.S. into this sensitive field would in all likelihood generate friction between the two countries on the basis of conflicting interests: Israel's primary interests would be to respond in real time to deployment changes on the other side of the border, while the U.S. is likely to emphasize the maintenance of the post-settlement status quo (particularly the prevention of an Israeli preemptive strike)..."

Could Americans on the Golan act as a deterrent to Syrian attack? "American forces proved their deterrent value in the framework of NATO and in South

Korea during the course of the Cold War," Gold writes. "The Israeli case would be completely different from those earlier instances...First, America's deterrence missions in earlier theaters were a direct outgrowth of U.S. global interests, and did not emanate from considerations of regional stability alone. Thus in the event of a threat, the U.S. response enjoyed a great deal of credibility. Secondly, the American deterrent response in the Cold War was based on the threat to use nuclear weapons, while in the Israel-Syria case the American threat, in the event of a massive treaty violation would be restricted to the conventional level...Finally, U.S. deterrent forces in Europe and the Far East were part of an explicitly military alliance; peacekeeping forces cannot be aligned, rather they must observe a strict policy of neutrality between the parties. There is a danger that the neutrality required for the peacekeeping forces would spill over to the overall strategic partnership between the U.S. and Israel, damaging the special relations between the two countries."

It is not realistic to expect that American troops on the Golan could play any actual defense role. "Anticipated cutbacks in the U.S. armed forces in the next five years will make it difficult for the U.S. to tie down large forces in one theater on a permanent basis. Given this reality, it is not likely that the U.S. would be able to deploy the forces necessary for a defensive role on the Golan Heights. Furthermore, assigning a defensive role to U.S. forces on the Golan Heights would substantively alter the relations between the U.S. and Israel, and would deepen Israeli dependence beyond the financial realm..."

"When all the negative implications are taken into account," Gold asserts, "the presence of a large American force on the Golan Heights would, in the final analysis, be disadvantageous for Israel's security. Beyond the risks associated explicitly with the deployment of a substantial American presence on the Golan, there are a number of domestic American political factors that in any case reduce the chances that such a presence would be acceptable to the U.S. While the Clinton administration began with an ambitious post-Cold War agenda for worldwide peacekeeping, events in Somalia in 1993 caused the administration to develop a number of reservations about peacekeeping operations: There is growing awareness of the limitations that could constrain the U.S. Army, in an era of deep defense cuts, when active service forces will be reduced to ten or fewer divisions in upcoming years...The U.S. would prefer peacekeeping missions that have clear deadlines instead of open commitments...The U.S. is highly sensitive to the issue of the vulnerability of peacekeeping forces..." Therefore Gold concludes, "such a development would not be in Israel's long-term interests."◇

# TERRORISM AND EXPEDIENCY

Edward Alexander

On July 13, Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin protested that Yasser Arafat had committed "a very grave violation of the [Israel-PLO] agreement" by smuggling into the Gaza District four PLO officials who had been involved in the Ma'alot massacre, in which 21 schoolchildren and one soldier were killed by Arab terrorists in 1974. One of these four (whom Arafat had attached to his personal entourage) had also been involved in the terror attack on Beit She'an, and another had helped to plan the massacre of the Israeli Olympic athletes in 1972.

In reply to Rabin's protest, Dr. Ahmed Tibi, Arafat's adviser, said (quite correctly) that "The person responsible on behalf of the Palestinian people for everything that was done in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is Yasser Arafat, and this man shook hands with Yitzhak Rabin.... The people who carried out these acts now support the peace process." (Tibi might have added that the chief of the PLO security service in Gaza is Amin Hindi, "mastermind" of the Munich massacre.)

The incident points up the moral confusion (and historical amnesia) not only of the current Israel government, but of the great majority of the "explainers" of the recent anti-Jewish bombings in Argentina (more than 100 killed) and in London (20 injured).

The standard explanation is that the culprits are trying to destroy the "peace process" or, in Shimon Peres' favorite banality, "to kill peace." (Just where this peace prevails one would like to know. Israel's internal security, since the Oslo announcement, is at its worst since 1967, with 57 terrorist killings between September 9, 1993, and July 8 of this year.)

By a revealing coincidence, those who disseminate this explanation tend to be the very same experts--the herd of independent thinkers who people the political science departments at the universities, the rented academics of the think tanks, liberal journalists of the Anthony Lewis school--who for decades insisted that anti-Jewish terrorism was attributable to the *absence* of a "peace process," which they defined as Israeli negotiations with the PLO that would lead to a Palestinian state, precisely the negotiations now under way.

These experts cannot have it both ways, telling us first (and this ever since 1967) that anti-Jewish terrorism was caused by the failure of Israel to concede PLO claims, and telling us now that anti-Jewish terrorism is caused by the very negotiations that are leading inexorably to a PLO state. One is tempted to add that if all these attacks on Jews--by Hezbollah, by Hamas, and (let us not forget) by Arafat's own Fatah organization, which has mounted 36 terrorist operations in the period between the Oslo accord and

the Cairo agreement--are now deemed to be the result of the peace process, it might be advisable to halt this process and give the Jews a little peace.

Neither should it be blithely assumed that the Islamic terrorists of Hamas and the assorted "parties of God" (one of which claimed responsibility for the Buenos Aires carnage) are really acting in order to "derail the peace process."

They know very well that Rabin's threats to halt that process if Arafat--to give but a few examples--fails to condemn terror or control it in his own ranks, or fails to change the PLO covenant calling for Israel's destruction, or calls for *jihād* to "liberate" Jerusalem, or uses Orient House in Jerusalem as the seat of PLO government--have turned out to be idle wind.

One cannot, as Rabin and President Clinton have been doing every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, embrace Yasser Arafat, head of the world's leading Jew-killing organization during the decades when it perfected the art of terror, as an esteemed head of state, and then, on Tuesdays and Thursdays, express outrage at the killings in Argentina and London, vow "to wage a war against terrorism," and expect to be taken seriously.

The perpetrators of terror in Israel or the disputed territories or New York City or Buenos Aires may be completely wicked, but they are not completely stupid. They have seen how, in the case of Arafat and his PLO, terrorism pays off, and very handsomely indeed.

Those PLO members who blew up airplanes and synagogues, murdered 26 Christian pilgrims at Lod Airport (1972), smashed infants' heads on rocks in Nahariya (1979), shot 13 mothers and babies in their nurseries in Kiryat Shemona in 1974, executed American diplomats in Khartoum in 1973 (a crime which, personally directed by Arafat by radio from Lebanon, should, according to American law, have led him to prison rather than the White House lawn when he entered the U.S.), performed their murderous acts because they believed they could get desirable political results by doing so.

If the Israeli and American governments really want to fight terror, they will have to abandon balances of expediency for balances of justice.

Israel will have to cease acting as a publicity agent for "good" PLO terrorists while excoriating bad "Islamic" ones; and the U.S. will have to give up its policy of absolving Syria of all responsibility for terrorist groups operating under its aegis from Lebanon. All *realpolitik* attempts to determine expediency are futile. No politician knows, or can know, what will be the ultimate result to himself, or to others, of any given line of conduct; but every human being may know, and most of us do know, the difference between a just and an unjust act, between pursuing murderers and war criminals, and turning a blind eye to their deeds.◊

*Edward Alexander is professor of English at the University of Washington. His most recent book is The Holocaust and the War of Ideas (Transaction Books.)*

# **THE BLINDNESS OF THE JEWS: THEN AND NOW**

*Erich Isaac*

The May 1994 issue of *Nativ* carried a brilliant and profoundly disturbing essay entitled "Then and Now" by Eliav Shochetman, professor of law at Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Its theme is that Jewish leaders have learned nothing from the experience of the Holocaust and are reenacting the fatal errors in judgment they made then.

Shochetman writes that the agreement between Israel and Arafat not only challenges the right of Jews to the Land of Israel by recognizing the legitimacy of the claims of the "Palestinian nation," but endangers the very existence of Israel and its Jewish inhabitants.

Prior to the Holocaust, Jewish leadership wholly failed to grasp in time the Nazi genocidal plans. Had they done so, many Jewish lives could have been saved, and their total annihilation in eastern and central Europe might have been prevented. Today, says Shochetman, the government of Israel, blind to the lessons of the European Holocaust, leads the Jews of Israel toward a new Holocaust.

While the Nazi program to exterminate the Jews was unique in its *extent* and its aim to destroy *all* of European Jewry, Shochetman argues that it cannot be treated as the first occurrence of its kind, at least not as the first manifestation of the idea of the destruction of the Jews. Shochetman traces Christian anti-Semitism and argues that European Jews "should have been at least aware of the *potential* outbreak of murderous hatred, liable to destroy them." Nineteenth century anti-Semites, long before the Nazis, had clamored for murderous solutions of the "Jewish Question."

Yet in spite of the unprecedented extreme Nazi language about Jews, Shochetman writes, the latter refused to believe that Nazis would carry out their plans. Even the most alert among the Jews, including the Zionists, did not believe that the Nazis would go beyond segregation to eliminate the admittedly significant Jewish influence in German life. Incredibly, even during the Holocaust, Jews refused to believe in the Nazi plan to totally destroy all of European Jewry. Neither ghetto leaders nor the Jewish masses believed in the reality of the extermination camps, even when informed by impeccable sources. And in places where they knew about these camps, they deluded themselves that their communities would be spared the fate of the others.

Not only was local leadership struck with blindness but, Shochetman points out, so was the Zionist leadership outside Europe, first and foremost in Palestine. He quotes from S.H.Beit-Zvi's *Post-Uganda Zionism in the Holocaust*: "...The phenomenal ignorance did not derive from absence or paucity of information,

but derived from their unwillingness to know, unwillingness to investigate, unwillingness to believe, when much information about what was happening arrived..."

Shochetman writes that the only Zionist leader who explicitly warned about the impending disaster was Ze'ev Jabotinsky. He read *Mein Kampf* and grasped its full meaning. It was clear to him that the new German regime intended to annihilate the Jewish people. Jabotinsky warned against the widespread belief that people become more moderate once they are in power, or that the Nazi speeches were merely propaganda. He pointed to the Nazis' "25 paragraphs which cannot be changed," and argued that even if the entire Nazi program could not be implemented, the threat to destroy the Jew could be carried out. Jabotinsky insisted that any attempt to minimize the threat was not merely stupid but a crime, and that evacuation of Europe's Jews was the only way out of the pending catastrophe.

Interestingly, Shochetman reminds his readers that Theodor Herzl, the founder of the Zionist Organization, after a pogrom in Bohemia in 1897, had predicted what Jabotinsky would foresee a generation later. Herzl wrote: "Suddenly they were pronounced to be parasites that suck the race's marrow...You poor, stupid German Jews...accept finally the reality and escape from a situation which gets daily worse." Herzl compared the intervals between persecutions to "no hunting seasons," after which one is again allowed to bag Jews. "Then will ring out again the shots in the forests." And, in 1903, Herzl wrote, after the Kishinev pogrom: "This catastrophe...is still not the worst happening...I cannot really visualize how it will happen when they expel us or murder us... I do not speculate in disaster but it will come and in a brutal fashion, and the later it comes, the more terrible, the more gruesome it will be. There is no escape...for many are waiting for the day when it is permitted to tear Jews apart."

But when Jabotinsky warned of the danger and called for rapid transfer of European Jews to Palestine, Shochetman writes, he was sharply attacked by functionaries of the various Jewish organizations, who objected that he was validating the anti-Semitic contention that Jews were strangers in Europe. These leaders insistently reiterated that the real solution lay in human rights legislation. Shochetman quotes Joseph Nedava: "There developed around Jabotinsky a dance of demons and a campaign of slander without parallel and precedent in Zionist history. Parties and organizations, Zionist and anti-Zionist, rose like one man to battle this 'enemy of the people' who had come to destroy the very basis of Jewish diaspora existence."

Jabotinsky was not intimidated by the attacks. He declared: "Jews of Poland, if you do not put an end, and immediately, to the tyranny of the do-nothings that roar in your name, they will bring you to the final economic, political, and even bodily destruction." Again he

*(Continued on p. 8)*

## BLINDNESS

(Continued from p. 7)

warned: "And I say to you...that you are not going on to your agenda but to annihilation. *Annihilation!* Learn this word by heart, and might it only be that I be proven wrong...I consider a traitor anyone who blurs the most pressing question that faces the Jews of eastern Europe...the wolf indeed is asleep...but his sleep will be very short, and end any moment. Momentarily that beast will show up in our fields and his hunger will be that much greater. Already now, those who have ears should discern the growling of the sleeping wolf."

On another occasion Jabotinsky wrote: "Even despair, even a strong consuming desperation, is a reaction. Worse than this is what I see among the Jewish masses of eastern Europe: equanimity, apathy, fatalism...People act as if their fate has already been decided. I have never seen anything like this in history. Even in novels I have never come across such yielding to fate. It is as if one had put them in a carriage, put 12 million intelligent and experienced people in a carriage and pushed it off towards an abyss. How

---

***For Islam, peace is an unavoidable temporary evil, and the Muslim state is free to break ceasefires at any time . . .***

---

do these people behave? One cries, one smokes a cigar, others read the papers, one sings--and in vain will you find one to grasp the reins to turn the carriage around. This is the prevailing mentality. It is as if a mighty enemy had chloroformed them. I now come to them to try something. It will be my last attempt. I call upon you: Put an end to this! Try to stop the carriage, try and jump off, try and put some obstacle in its way. Don't go like sheep to the wolf!"

Shochetman asks: What is the difference between Arab and Nazi plans for annihilation of Jews? He points out that now, after the Holocaust, no one can dismiss this question out of hand with the excuse that the idea of the total destruction of the Jews is inconceivable.

Plans for Jewish annihilation that are in the works are now credible and must be taken seriously. The Muslim world, of which the PLO is the spearhead, does not disguise its plan to destroy Israel. One need only look at the Palestinian Covenant, which is the *constitution* of the organization with whose chairman the peace agreement was signed. Shochetman goes on to comment on the Covenant's articles, which assert that the current reality of Israel's existence is an evil which has to be eliminated; claim that it is impossible for Falastin to be the homeland for another people;

assert that there can be no compromise, no diplomatic solutions, only a war to the end; and that anything short of Israel's complete destruction is utter capitulation. The Covenant calls for the forcible expulsion of all Jews who came after 1917. The small number this would leave in Falastin would then be subject to Arab rule. The Covenant declares the liquidation of Israel legal since its existence is illegal. Attacking it is not aggression but a foiling of the Zionist aggression. Moreover, according to the Covenant, the conflict is in the realm of values, and hence beyond the negotiable. Attachment to the Good and rejection of Evil demand a war to the finish.

One should remember, says Shochetman, that the destruction of Israel and its Jews is part of Arab anti-Semitic ideology which predates the PLO. It regards Jews as a "human mistake" and consoles itself with the thought that their concentration in Palestine is a blessing "so that it will be easier to destroy them when the time is ripe."

The present Israeli government, ignoring the principles that had guided all its predecessors, signed the "Agreement on Principles." Knowing the public would reject an agreement with a body bound to destroy it, the government found a way around this difficulty in the form of a letter from Arafat to Rabin, stating that he would cancel the paragraphs about the destruction of Israel. However, no date is given for this cancellation. Thus Israel will have withdrawn from vital areas, while the Covenant remains in full force!

Shochetman explains that the PLO is an Islamic Arab body and that war against non-believers is a *religious* obligation. For Islam, peace is an unavoidable temporary evil, and the Muslim state is free to break ceasefires at any time--even those which have an agreed time limit. Any agreement which binds a Muslim state to abjure the future use of force and not undertake a *Jihad* is *a priori* illegal.

The Israeli government's response to such reminders is to argue that the PLO is a *secular* organization, not bound by religious obligations like *Jihad*. But this is wrong. The distinction between secular and religious is absent in Muslim reality and thought. Incidentally, Arabic has no word for the concept "secular." Shochetman points out that the Israeli government's contention, that the preamble to the "Agreement" which speaks of "mutual recognition of legitimate rights, etc." proves that the PLO has abandoned its former commitments, is fallacious. It is a sleight of hand by the PLO, since along with the entire Arab world, it has simply changed its *strategy* on how to deal with the "Palestinian Problem." Since the Yom Kippur War, the PLO has adopted a "strategy of phases," meaning the use of political means to reach the *intermediate* target, i.e. an Arab state in *all* of Eretz Yisrael.

Shochetman points out that as the Arabs see it, Israeli recognition of the legitimate and political rights of the Palestinian people includes the right of

(Continued on p. 9)

# SPOTLIGHT ON THE EXTREMISTS

...Instead of finding an objective critic to review *Jewish Renewal*, the new book by *Tikkun* editor **Michael Lerner**, the *Washington Post* chose radical **Paul Breines**, author of *Tough Jews*. Here's what Breines had to say about Lerner's book: "*Jewish Renewal* is visionary, yeasty and humane. Regardless of its impact and flaws, a work that places terms like compassion, empathy, kindness and healing to the political discussion makes the present less disgusting"...

...Israeli Foreign Minister **Shimon Peres** recently heaped praise on Syrian Foreign Minister **Farouk Sharaa** for Sharaa's statement in response to the Arab terrorist attacks on Jews in Argentina and England. "I appreciate very much the declaration by the Syrian foreign minister condemning the attacks," Peres asserted. But Sharaa's actual statement, as quoted by the *Jerusalem Post* (July 29) fell far short of a condemnation. He said: "We never rejoice at killing and destruction as the Israeli settlers and some Israeli parties have rejoiced at the Hebron mosque massacre"...

...A lengthy analysis of the writings of leftwing journalist **Robert I. Friedman**, in the October 1994 issue of *Moment*, concludes that "Friedman's work is replete with mistakes and fool's gold mixed in with an occasional ounce of the real stuff...lacing facts with insinuation...'reporting' conspiracies based on little more than wild speculation..." Friedman himself refused to be interviewed for the story on the grounds that *Moment* editor Herschel Shanks must have a "bias" against him since "I have been critical of Mr. Shanks in my past writing." Friedman was referring to a story of his in the *Village Voice* in 1991, in which he attempted to falsely link Shanks to the Temple Mount Faithful...

## BLINDNESS OF THE JEWS

(Continued from p.8)

self-definition of all inhabitants of pre-1947 Falastin and their descendants (as laid out in paragraph 5 of the Covenant). Thus should Israel not honor this commitment, at the very latest in the final "peace" discussions, they are released from their undertaking for "peaceful coexistence."

Shochetman foresees the flooding of Judea and Samaria --and also pre-1967 Israel-- with hundreds of thousands, even millions of "refugees," accompanied by extensive continuation of terrorism within the Old Green Line (Israel's pre-1967 frontiers). This will lead to large scale Jewish emigration. To interpret the

## 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 in Media Misrepresentation*  
58 minutes - Purchase \$50; rental \$25

### Books

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

*Oleg in Peaceland: Cartoons by Oleg Schwartzburg*  
\$9.95 (non-members: \$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 Yitzschak Ben Gad - \$15.95 (non-members: \$18.95)

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

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

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

PLO recognition of Israel without taking into account the doctrine of "phased liquidation," says Shochetman, is to repeat today the mistaken interpretation given by Jewish leaders, and most of the public, to the threats and proclamations of the Nazis.

Against supporters of the agreement who argue that today's circumstances are different, that now Israel has a strong army that allegedly can foil any military attempts on its survival, Shochetman argues that this shows a flawed understanding of historical dynamics. Israeli recognition of the PLO is now irreversible in international law. Israel has laid the foundation of a Palestinian State which will be recognized by the entire world and the entire world will side with it on the

(Continued on p.10)

# DUMPING ISRAEL

(Continued from p.4)

to waive much of Congressional legislation regarding the PLO through July 1995. Congress has been effectively cut out, and authority over managing the "peace process" has been handed to the administration.

Similarly, on the question of U.S. troops on the Golan, Congress has permitted itself to be sidetracked. When Senator Thad Cochran (R-Miss.) prepared to offer an amendment to the Defense Authorization bill which would have required the administration to study the consequences of deployment, he was deluged by supporters of the "peace process," and those who felt it would tie the hands of the administration. After 48 hours, Senator Cochran withdrew the amendment.

Finally, Senator Malcolm Wallop (R-Utah) agreed to introduce the amendment. After much pressure from the administration, Wallop's amendment was defeated 67-3.

Fishbein observes that prior to the agreement with Arafat, discussions of Israel centered on issues of

security and defense. Now the feeling is that the conflict is over. Members of Congress are not willing to challenge the administration on the direction of the "peace process" because they are unwilling to appear more hawkish than the Israelis.

A small but poignant indication of the change in U.S. policy towards Israel is a comment made on July 6 by the Commander-in-Chief of U.S. Central Command (Middle East) at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy. Questioned if he planned to visit Israel, the general said, "I have felt that what advantage could accrue to me by my traveling to Israel could conceivably damage my relationship with moderate Arab leaders by their view that somehow I was in Israel sharing information, sharing ideas about what was going on, on the other side of the border."

Fishbein fears that the United States is cutting loose from Israel. The truth is even sadder. America's policies are a direct and inevitable response to Israel's policy of appeasement. Indeed, the U.S. cannot be blamed for deserting a weak and shrunken Israel, whose leaders retreat before every demand of the enemy.◇

*David Isaac is a freelance journalist.*

---

## BLINDNESS OF THE JEWS

(Continued from p.9)

question of the right of (Arab) return and self-definition. Can Israel war against that state and its international, near global, backing?

In the 1930s, the policy of appeasement, making treaties with blood-thirsty tyrants in the belief that such treaties would prevent war, was stupid and shameful. At Munich, England satisfied the supposedly just demands of Hitler. Three weeks after occupying the Sudeten, Hitler broke his agreement. In Czechoslovakia, the West lost an ally with 2,000 planes and a fine army of 35 divisions (3.5 million men). There was no rational basis to the belief that Hitler would keep his agreements. The entire history of the 1930s was one of Nazi betrayals and breaches of commitments, not to speak of the trampling of human and democratic rights.

Hitler made no secret of his plans but laid them out for all to see in *Mein Kampf*. Chamberlain's striving for peace was so strong that he did not see reality and he attributed to Hitler his own basic values. In evaluating Arab intentions, Shochetman warns, the Israeli government repeats Chamberlain's mistake of basing politics on an imaginary reality.

Israel's borders today, Shochetman argues, are not arbitrary but embody the religious, national and historical connection of the people of Israel to their land and are strategically vital for her defense. To trade these for temporary agreements is a deed of stupidity which has no precedent in human history, for no nation has

willingly given up its homeland and its strategic possessions for the sake of one or another group of promises. But even beyond the stupidity, in concluding treaties with those whom historical experiences teaches cannot be trusted, the government is taking risks with the very existence of the state and the lives of its Jewish citizens. It ignores the handwriting on the wall, playing loose with the lessons of the Holocaust and the lessons of Jewish history.

What is being done by the Jewish leadership is a crime for which there is no atonement.◇

*Erich Isaac is a member of the editorial board of Outpost.*

*Recent evidence that Prof. Shochetman is correct in his assessment of the PLO:*

*On August 6, in a broadcast from Algiers, Farouk Kaddoumi, the PLO's second in command, said: "It is impossible for us to give up a grain of sand of Palestinian territory...The Palestinian people know that there is a state which was established through historical force and which must come to an end."*

*On August 22, the Voice of Palestine, broadcasting from Jericho, said: "...the Fatah movement decided not to convene the Palestine National Council in order to cancel the articles pertaining to Israel..."*

# WHAT THE ARABS ARE SAYING

*Syrian Government Radio, August 29, 1994, concerning the murder of two young Israeli construction workers by Arab terrorists in Ramle:*

Brother strugglers: Israeli terrorism plants its crimes and massacres throughout the Palestinian territory. However, just retaliation is inflicted on it throughout the Palestinian territory. It even receives retaliation behind the truce line of 1949; that is, outside the West Bank and Gaza Strip, as happened the day before yesterday in Ramle and as had happened before that in Afula and Hadera. Despite this, Israeli terrorism and colonialism are still humiliating the Oslo accord group. They threaten the self-rule authority in accordance with the provisions of the Oslo accord, instead of admitting the bitter fact--namely, their huge military arsenal cannot face the resistance in the occupied territory.

This arsenal cannot even prevent the resistance from embarking on its deterrence against Israeli colonialism, terrorism, and settlement activities. Yes, Israeli colonialism does not want to admit that its huge military arsenal will have limited effectiveness in confronting the revolution and the revolutionaries.

If Israeli terrorism does not know where Ramle is located, we will now inform it that Ramle, together with its sister Lod, are located behind the truce line of 1949--that is, inside the Zionist entity. If Israeli terrorism wants to know more about Ramle, we will present more new facts that have taken place recently in Ramle. In Ramle, or in its neighborly sister Lod, the Palestinian Arab resistance men inflicted just punishment on an Israeli officer affiliated with one of the Israeli terrorist organs.

Let the Israeli terrorism ask itself: Has the Palestinian resistance stopped following this crime of expulsion [of the 400 Hamas members in 1992], or has its valiant operations abated? We ask this question, taking into consideration that no one needs the answer. Everyone knows the answer that came the day before yesterday, particularly in the city of Ramle itself. However, we pose this question because some Israeli officials are talking about what they call calming the situation because in addition to the Jews, there are many Arabs in Ramle. Here, we go back to the story of the Judaization of Lod and Ramle in 1948 to remind these Israeli officials how the Arabs, who used to constitute the entire population of Lod and Ramle, have become some Arabs or merely many Arabs, as these Israeli officials put it. They are many Arabs, but they constitute a minority as a result of the Israeli injustice. We remind of this in order to examine this calming of the situation according to the Israeli officials' remarks. Calming the situation means securing tranquility.

However, this expression now means the

opposite as a result of the crimes of the colonialist repression during some of the decades of the twentieth century. It has come to mean repressing and oppressing the resistance, and thus, tranquility will be achieved as the colonialists have always imagined. Perhaps, or certainly, this is what Israel means by calming the situation, especially since Israel practiced this criminal way of calming the situation in Hebron only a few minutes after the well-known massacre on February 25 which claimed the lives of many Arab martyrs.

The information the Israeli officials have added to this expression of calming the situation is in harmony with their intentions, especially since they said that they will calm the situation in Ramle because there are Arabs in the city in addition to the Israelis. They mean an Arab minority which used to be the majority, or even the entire population until 1948. It has become a minority amid a Jewish majority which did not exist at all in 1948. Of course, we know, and Israel admits that the Israeli Army should not interfere if it sees Jews firing at Arabs. This was clear even in the Israeli Shamgar

Commission which fabricated an investigation into the holy Ibrahim Mosque massacre.

However, Israel, particularly those racists who began to once again shout death threats against the Arabs in Ramle the day before yesterday, must remember some issues which they are fully aware of. First, no Israeli crime or act of terrorism will go without appropriate Arab punishment. The Israelis must know that the two Israelis who were killed in Ramle the day before yesterday were punished in revenge for the Hebron massacre, which was perpetrated approximately six months ago, and that this punishment is part of the series of Arab deterrence of the butchers of the holy Ibrahim Mosque. There is no need to refer here to Afula and Hadera, considering that what happened in these places a few months ago is also part of this series.

This is extremely important to deter the Zionist fascists and prevent them from carrying out hideous acts of terrorism against the Arabs in the occupied Arab territories.◇

One Minute to Midnight  
Dr. Irving Moskowitz

## **WILL AIPAC FIGHT FOR JERUSALEM?**

"The battle for Jerusalem has begun and goes on every day," AIPAC President Steve Grossman declared at the annual meeting of Boston's Combined Jewish Philanthropies in September. The battle has indeed begun--but is AIPAC taking part?

In his speech in Boston, Grossman made it sound as if AIPAC is on the front lines, fighting for Israeli control of undivided Jerusalem. AIPAC's latest literature --and fundraising letters-- stress the same theme. It's a good pitch for attracting donors. But is it honest?

Earlier this year, the Clinton administration was faced with the dilemma of whether or not to veto a United Nations Security Council resolution that referred to Jerusalem as "occupied territory." The PLO and Arabs were pressing President Clinton to let the resolution pass. But in his campaign promises, Clinton had pledged to recognize Israel's right to all of Jerusalem. And the president knew that American Jews would want him to veto the resolution.

Enter Steve Grossman. At a special meeting of the AIPAC board, Grossman urged that AIPAC not

ask Clinton to veto the resolution. Evidently he thought that helping Clinton appease the Arabs was more important than the future of Jerusalem. Many AIPAC board members were horrified by Grossman's position, and a vigorous debate ensued. Grossman's side won by a narrow vote.

On other occasions, too, Grossman's position regarding Jerusalem has come into question. Last year, when Americans for Peace Now applied for membership in the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, one of the main issues in the debate was the fact Peace Now favors Israeli concessions on Jerusalem. Nevertheless, AIPAC, under Grossman's leadership, refused to oppose admitting Peace Now into the Conference (AIPAC abstained).

Last December, the State Department criticized the Israeli government for permitting the construction of new Jewish housing in eastern Jerusalem. According to the State Department, such construction constitutes "illegal Jewish settlement activity." Yet Grossman's AIPAC refused to speak out against the State Department's outrageous position.

Perhaps part of the problem is the fact that Grossman is a veteran leader of the Democratic Party. He was chair of the Massachusetts Democratic Party before becoming head of AIPAC. He has close personal and political relationships with many in the Clinton administration. Is he willing to risk those relationships for the sake of Israel and Jerusalem? The record so far suggests that he is not.◊

---

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

Non-Profit  
Organization  
U.S. Postage  
PAID  
New York, N.Y.  
Permit No. 9418