
OUTPOST



NOVEMBER 1994

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

THE WOMEN OF HEBRON

Herbert Zweibon

During my recent stay in Israel, I had the opportunity to meet with Rebbetzin Miriam Levinger and the other courageous Jewish women who reside in Hebron.

These days, with terrorists striking in downtown Jerusalem and Tel Aviv, one might say that it takes courage to live anywhere in Israel. And in a sense that is certainly true--although it is tragic testimony to the weakness of the Rabin government that living in Tel Aviv should now be considered an act of courage.

Still, Tel Aviv is not Hebron--in more ways than one. From the point of view of personal security, Arab violence against Jews is still infrequent in Tel Aviv, while it is commonplace in Hebron. There are rock-throwing attacks or firebombings aimed at Jews in Hebron on almost a daily basis, few of which are ever reported in the international press, or even in the American Jewish press, for that matter.

For the Jewish women of Hebron to brave such dire conditions requires extraordinary courage. On a daily basis, they are the ones who must sustain the Jewish stake in a city occupied by 70,000 or more Arabs. While their husbands are off to work, they and their children remain, maintaining and strengthening the ancient Jewish right to Hebron through their living presence.

"The Arabs understand full well the importance of Hebron and the Cave of the Patriarchs in particular," Mrs. Levinger told me. "They recognize Hebron's significance in the Arab-Jewish struggle. By controlling Hebron, the second holiest city in Judaism, they feel that they are scoring a triumph over the Jews--and they are right." The Arabs have always perceived the link between Judaism and Jewish nationalism. That is why they always insisted on a policy of "not beyond the seventh step" in Hebron--during the centuries of Muslim occupation of the city, Jews were barred from ascending past the seventh step on the stairway leading to

the Cave of the Patriarchs.

Fortunately, the Jewish women of Hebron also recognize Hebron's significance, and also perceive the link between Judaism and Jewish nationalism. The Israeli capture of Hebron and the shattering of the Arabs' apartheid-like "seventh step" policy reasserted the Jewish claim not only to the Cave of the Patriarchs, but to Hebron, and, indeed, to the entire Land of Israel.

The Jews who settled in Hebron, beginning in 1968, understood all of this. Their decision to reside in the city was a conscious attempt to stake a claim, precisely as secular, leftwing Zionists staked claims to other parts of the Jewish homeland earlier in this century.

When Israeli politicians dragged their feet on expanding Hebron's Jewish community, it was the women who changed history. Their takeover of the old Hadassah Hospital building in central Hebron in 1979 forced the government's hand and made Hebron's Jewish neighborhoods a reality.

Today, a visitor to Hebron can only marvel at the extraordinary progress of these Jewish women and their families, defying the odds and defying their hostile neighbors in order to fulfill the dream of Zionism--a dream that too many others have forgotten.◊

Herbert Zweibon is chairman of Americans For a Safe Israel.

IN THIS ISSUE:

<i>Integrating Israel into the Mideast</i>	...3
<i>An Illegal Nobel Peace Prize</i>	...5
<i>A New "Season"</i>	...6
<i>Ben-Gurion on Hebron</i>	...8
<i>Blaming Nobody</i>	...10

From the Editor
Ruth King

ISRAEL-BASHERS AND THE HOLOCAUST

President Clinton's decision to nominate Professor John K. Roth for a position on the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council should arouse the ire of every friend of Israel. Roth is a harsh critic of Israel who has publicly compared Israel to Nazi Germany, and should therefore be disqualified from a leadership role in any Holocaust-related institution.

Writing on the op-ed page of the *Los Angeles Times* on November 12, 1988, Roth compared the Israeli election returns of 1988 to the atmosphere surrounding the Nazis' Kristallnacht pogrom of 1938. He also accused Israel of wanting "to rid itself of Palestinians," and compared the Palestinian Arabs to the Jews of Europe in the 1930s. It would be an affront to the memory of the six million and a slap in the face to all friends of Israel, if Roth were to be appointed to the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council.

The Roth nomination is particularly worrisome in view of recent media reports indicating that two other prominent critics of Israel, Michael Berenbaum and Walter Reich, have been mentioned as leading candidates for the job of director of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum.

Berenbaum signed a 1982 newspaper ad attacking Israel; defended the Bush administration's policies toward Israel; and is a member of the Editorial Board of the radical-left magazine, *Tikkun*. Reich has written that "the Zionist idea of creating a Jewish state might have been flawed in its very conception"; has called for Israeli Arabs to be granted "self-governance"; and has accused Israel of responding to the Palestinian Arab *intifada* with "brutality."

The nomination of John Roth to the Holocaust Memorial Council, and the possibility that either Berenbaum or Reich could be hired by the Holocaust Memorial Museum, point to the frightening danger that individuals with long records of political partisanship regarding Israel might use the council or the museum as a vehicle for furthering their partisan interests.◊

SAVE US FROM TOM TUGEND

Tom Tugend is a freelance journalist in Los Angeles whose articles appear in a variety of Jewish newspapers. Readers of the *Jerusalem Post* may recall an op-ed essay Tugend wrote in that newspaper in November 1992, shortly after the U.S. presidential

election. In the article, Tugend attacked me--at the time I was on leave from the editorial staff of *Outpost* in order to serve as treasurer of the Jewish Election Committee--for expressing concern that James Baker's Jewish aides might be retained by the Clinton administration and shape the new president's foreign policy. His pen dripping with sarcasm, Tugend mocked me for my concern and concluded: "Save us from our self-appointed 'leaders' and spokespersons."

Two years have now passed. Just as I feared, three of Baker's four Jewish aides (Dennis Ross, Daniel Kurtzer, Aaron Miller) were kept on. A fourth Jewish critic of Israel--Peace Now supporter Sandy Berger--was added. And *Time* magazine's chief Israel-basher, Strobe Talbott, joined as Deputy Secretary of State.

The Clinton administration's Mideast policy has followed accordingly. The U.S. pressured Israel to permit the early return of the Hamas terrorists. The U.S. refused to veto a U.N. resolution calling Jerusalem "occupied territory." And in remarks during a recent Knesset debate, Deputy Defense Minister Mordechai Gur hinted broadly that the U.S. would refuse to provide Israel with "certain weapons systems" if Israel did not reach an agreement with Syria on giving up the Golan Heights.

President Clinton's Mideast trip drew attention to the pro-Arab tilt that Tom Tugend, in all his self-righteousness, never anticipated. When it comes to Arab dictators, whether in Syria or Saudi Arabia, the Clinton administration is all warmth and smiles. But when it comes to visiting Jerusalem, the president will not set foot in the Old City, lest the PLO grow angry at the implicit suggestion that America recognizes Israel's right to its capital.

My comment, then, is similar to Tugend's: Save us from our self-appointed journalists.◊

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.

HOW TO INTEGRATE ISRAEL INTO THE MIDDLE EAST

Ruth King & Rael Jean Isaac

In his book *The New Middle East*, Shimon Peres proposes to go far beyond the current peace process. His goal is to win Israel acceptance through making it an integral part of what he calls the great Middle East mosaic. He proposes to achieve this through economic projects, tourism, military cooperation, democratic freedom for all.

It won't work. As the song says, "Money can't buy you love." But there is no need to despair. Israel *can* integrate itself into the Middle East if it follows the ten commandments outlined below:

1. Shut down all newspapers except for official organs of the Labor Party.

2. Make Yitzhak Rabin Prime Minister for Life and jail the owner of any grocery store, newsstand, falafel stand and public convenience who does not post his photo.

3. Put women in their rightful place. Forbid them co-education, driving licenses and credit cards. There will be openings for ambitious and talented women, however, as terrorists.

4. No more an "eye for an eye." It's a hand for a pilfered tomato.

5. Brook no internal opposition. If beating and jailing all those who dare question government policy does not work, there's always the model of the Syrians at Hama. Put an end to trials and juries, and above all, commissions of inquiry and pesky civil rights groups like Tzedek-Tzedek and B'Tselem.

6. Put out a *fatwa* on heretical writers and their publishers. Actually it will be hard to find candidates because most writers toe the Labor party line. The great Zionist writers who would have been likely candidates for *fatwas* are all dead. Still, just to keep intellectuals on their good behavior, it's a good idea to put out a *fatwa* occasionally on someone who breathes a word of criticism--Aharon Appelfeld and Aharon Megged, who recently criticized their fellow writers for anti-Zionism, come to mind.

7. Censor every aspect of communications: magazines, movies, television, novels etc. Fill the airwaves with ranting speeches, martial music and incantations. Rabin already has one such incantation. As

murder follows murder, he intones lugubriously: "We will not let the enemies of peace halt the peace process."

8. Strictly control the foreign press. Menacing reporters makes them mellow. Kill a few, lock up a few, expel others. A side benefit will be the vast improvement in press coverage. Even PBS will run enthusiastic documentaries on "the new Israel."

9. Feed your people a steady diet of high-blown rhetoric, fantasies, false promises, and outright lies. The Rabin government has already made a wonderful start in all these respects.

10. Blame Israel for everything. Shimon Peres has made a good start by saying that the problems of the region can only be solved by eliminating their "root cause"--which, as everyone knows, is Israel.

By following these ten commandments, Israel will no longer offend its neighbors by its stubborn

Peres's goal is to win Israel acceptance through making it an integral part of what he calls the great Middle East mosaic.

adherence to values unique in the region. The Rabin government is making splendid progress, to the point that when its leaders assure us of something there is a better than 50% chance the opposite is true. However, Israel will know it has finally "arrived" as just another normal Middle Eastern nation when it violates every conceivable civil and human right and Amnesty International does not even notice.◊

Ruth King and Rael Jean Isaac are members of the executive committee of Americans For a Safe Israel.

SHOULD AIPAC KEEP STEVE GROSSMAN?

Michael Goldblatt

The summer of 1980 was a difficult time for Israel. Prime Minister Menachem Begin was in the hospital, recuperating from a heart attack. The Carter administration had recently condemned Israel for establishing Jewish "settlements" in Jerusalem. Israel's economy was suffering from the strains accompanying the withdrawal from Sinai. It was at that moment, when Israel most needed American Jewish support, that a group of leftwing American Jews decided to publish an "open letter" attacking the Israeli government.

The letter, which was organized by Leonard Fein, charged that "extremists" in the Israeli government, "guided by secular and religious chauvinism," were trying to "distort Zionism and threaten its realization." The letter went so far as to blame those Israeli government "extremists" for "advancing the vicious cycle of extremism and violence"—in other words, it blamed Israelis for Arab violence. The next day, at a press conference called to discuss the open letter, Fein denounced Israel's prime minister as "a liar."

What had made Fein's "open letter" so newsworthy was the fact that some of the 56 Jews who signed the letter were associated with major Jewish

organizations. But after Fein's remarks at the press conference, two of the most prominent signatories, Alexander Schindler and Theodore Mann, dissociated themselves from his statements. One of those who did *not* dissociate himself, despite Fein's outburst, was Steve Grossman, the campaign vice chairman of the Combined Jewish Philanthropies in Boston. Who could have imagined that in just 12 years, Grossman would be president of the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), the largest pro-Israel lobby in America?

When Grossman was named president of AIPAC in December 1992, two theories circulated. One was that he had become more moderate over the years,

and would not steer AIPAC to the left. The other view was that Grossman had not become more moderate, just better at masking his true views, and would soon change AIPAC. Today, after nearly two years, Grossman's record speaks for itself.

Grossman's first major act as head of AIPAC was to lobby the new Clinton administration to retain Dennis Ross, the State Department's most prominent "Jewish Arabist" (as *Moment* magazine once dubbed him). It may seem strange that the president of AIPAC would go to bat on behalf of the man who was the prime architect of the Bush-Baker Middle East policy—especially since more than 80% of American Jews voted for Bill Clinton in 1992, partly in response to the Israel-bashing of Baker and his Jewish advisers. Yet Grossman boasted to *The Forward* (January 29, 1993) that it was he who persuaded the Clinton team to hire Ross.

Among his other accomplishments as Baker's top Mideast strategist, Ross reportedly was responsible for the leaking to the media, in 1991, of false allegations that Israel illegally transferred U.S. technology to China. The Israeli press reported last year that Ross held secret meetings with PLO officials in the summer of 1992, in violation of standing U.S. policy; according to the report, he promised to push for restoration of U.S.-PLO relations. William Safire of the *New York Times* has reported that during his first months in the Clinton administration, Ross pressured Saudi Arabia to resume its financial assistance to the PLO (which the Saudis had suspended because of the PLO's support for Iraq). No wonder James Zogby, president of the Arab-American Institute, an anti-Israel lobby, praised Clinton's decision to hire Ross.

Grossman's controversial record as head of AIPAC does not end there. When Strobe Talbott, a vicious critic of Israel, was nominated to be deputy secretary of state earlier this year, Grossman praised him. When the Clinton administration was considering whether or not to veto a U.N. resolution calling Jerusalem "occupied territory," Grossman persuaded the AIPAC board that they should not call for a U.S. veto. When the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA) initiated the establishment of Peace Accord Monitoring Groups in the House and Senate, to monitor PLO violations of the peace accords, AIPAC refused to encourage members of Congress to join the groups. When the ZOA successfully lobbied for the passage of the Specter-Shelby Amendment, which restricts U.S. aid to the PLO, Grossman unleashed a barrage of false accusations against ZOA leaders.

In order for AIPAC to be effective, it must remain strictly neutral in American politics. It has to be able to work well with Democrats and Republicans alike. But Grossman, a former head of the Massachusetts

(Continued on p.11)

INTERNATIONAL LAW AND THE NOBEL PRIZE

Louis Rene Beres

"No crime without a punishment!" This major principle of international law, essential to civilized international relations, obligates all states to seek out and to prosecute the perpetrators of war crimes, crimes against peace and crimes against humanity. Today this authoritative obligation extends as well to those responsible for crimes of *terrorism*.

It is more than a little ironic, therefore, that Yasir Arafat, together, no less, with the Prime Minister of Israel, has now been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. Although the Nobel selection committee doubtlessly concluded that Arafat's presumed efforts toward "peace" were great enough to outweigh his prior disregard for justice, its calculations were altogether misguided. As recognized by pertinent international law, there can never be an authentic peace without justice. Moreover, presenting humanity's highest award for peace to criminals who warrant substantial punishment--in this case a criminal whose paramilitary units even served with Saddam's forces in occupied Kuwait--makes a mockery of the Nobel Prize itself, but also of essential world legal order.

In the final analysis, punishment is at the very heart of justice, and justice is at the very heart of peace. An important aspect of these linkages is the element of *memory*. Justice without memory is always an incomplete form of justice. To forget, to disregard the most elementary expectations of international criminal law, represents yet another triumph of *injustice*. Without the truthfulness of memory, crime becomes absolute, killing and torturing the victims yet again.

We all know of the multiple, egregious crimes committed over the years by the PLO, always under the direct authority of Yasir Arafat. We understand, by now, that these crimes were different from permissible forms of violence directed toward self-determination goals because of their persistent and deliberate targeting of civilian populations. We recall the extraordinary horror and ferocity of Palestine Liberation Army crimes against Kuwaiti women and children. We even recognize, thanks to recent comments made by Arafat's own senior advisor, that the Chairman *accepts responsibility* for all such crimes. Speaking on July 13, 1994, in the dispute over the arrival into Gaza of four PLO men who had planned the Ma'alot massacre (killing of Israeli schoolchildren by cutting their throats), Dr. Ahmed Tibi reaffirmed the compelling argument of "let the master answer." Said Tibi: "The person responsible on behalf of the Palestinian people for everything that was done in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is Yasir Arafat,

and this man shook hands with Yitzhak Rabin."

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

For the United States, which brokered the illegal Israel-PLO agreement of September 13, 1993, and whose president will surely add his heartiest congratulations to Chairman Arafat, the Nuremberg obligations to bring criminals to trial are doubly binding. This is because these obligations represent not only current obligations under international law, but also the requirements of a higher law embedded in the United States political tradition. By codifying the principle that basic human rights are now "preemptory," that they cannot be traded off for presumed benefits of "peace," the Nuremberg obligations reflect perfect convergence between international law and the law of the American

...the prize has now become a grotesquely ironic badge of dishonor...

Republic. Of course, all international law is already part of the law of the United States, an incorporation expressed by Article VI of the U.S. Constitution and by associated Supreme Court decisions.

The Nobel Peace Prize honors the very greatest achievements on this endangered planet. When it is bestowed upon an individual whose entire life has been dedicated to terrorist war directed almost exclusively at noncombatants, the honor can no longer be acknowledged. Standing in stark opposition to the most elementary legal principles of peace and justice, the Prize has now become a grotesquely ironic badge of dishonor, a sad reminder that the expectations of international law cannot be overruled by even the best-intentioned whims of the political moment.◊

Louis Rene Beres (Ph.D., Princeton, 1971) is the author of fourteen books and several hundred articles dealing with international law.

A NEW SEASON

David Isaac

*Poor naked wretches, wheresoe'er you are,
That bide the pelting of this pitiless storm,
How shall your houseless heads
and unfed sides,
Your loop'd and windowed raggedness,
defend you
From seasons such as these?*

--King Lear

It is reported that a new unit has been formed in the Israel Defense Forces. Its purpose: to suppress opposition by residents of Judea, Samaria, and the Golan in the event of a government order to evacuate them. According to the Israeli newspaper *Ma'ariv*, a prospective soldier for the unit is chosen with great care and is sworn to secrecy. He is asked a series of questions to determine whether he fits three criteria: 1) his political opinions must be far removed from those of the targeted residents 2) he cannot have friends or relatives who live in Judea or Samaria 3) he cannot have religious friends or relatives. Soldiers accepted to the new unit train in commando tactics, sniping, and fighting in built-up areas.

Although the government denies these reports, opposition parties claim they have testimony from witnesses who were recruited by the new unit.

The Rabin government's establishment of a special force to smash Jewish dissent, while shocking, is nothing new in the history of the Israeli Labor party. The obvious precedent is the "Season," the period from November 1944 until 1947, during which the leaders of the *Yishuv* (with some interruptions) attempted to root out members of the Irgun underground, handing them over to the British.

David Ben-Gurion entrusted the operation to 180 members of the Palmach, an elite unit made up chiefly of adherents of the far-left Zionist movements Hashomer Hatzair and Ahdut Ha'avoda, distinguished at the time for their admiration for Soviet Communism. Those who would participate in the "season" were carefully selected for their ideological reliability, and went through six special courses, where they received training in judo and "other skills."

The operation's command center was divided into three parts: tracing, identification, securing and imprisonment. The "season" turned more violent after two members of the Lehi underground assassinated Lord Moyne, the British Minister of Mideast Affairs, for his role in preventing Holocaust survivors from reaching Palestine. (Interestingly enough, the Palmach's special units never operated against Lehi, for while Labor could count on the Irgun not to attack fellow-Jews, whatever the provocation, it feared Lehi countermeasures.)

On November 7, 1944, the Jewish Agency declared its intention "to vomit out from its insides all the members of this demolishing and destructive gang [the Irgun], to deprive them of any asylum and shelter, and not to capitulate to their threats and to extend to the authorities all the necessary help for the prevention of terror and the eradication of its organization."

Ben-Gurion obtained the support of the entire Jewish Agency for this policy, with the exception of two of its members, Rabbi Y.S. Fishman (later Maimon) of the Mizrahi Party and Yitzhak Gruenbaum of the General Zionists. They compared the policy to the "handing over of opponents in Soviet Russia immediately after the Bolshevik revolution."

On November 20, 1944, the Conference of the Histadrut (General Labor Union) produced a series of anti-Irgun declarations. These called for removing Irgun members from their workplaces and schools, outlawing them from labor exchanges, denying shelter or cover "to these criminals who endanger our future" and collaborating with the British authorities in apprehending them. On December 8, Chaim Weizmann, president of the Zionist Organization, wrote to the British Prime Minister, "Our cooperation with the authorities in stamping out terrorism is proceeding satisfactorily. Five hundred names of suspects have already been supplied to the police, as a result of which over 250 have been arrested. Effective cooperation has been tendered also in other forms...It is confidently believed that severe blows have already been dealt to them and there is every determination to persevere with the campaign until decisive results are achieved..."

The fate of the *Altalena* (the literary pseudonym used by Jabotinsky) offers another example of the Jewish left's willingness to use force against fellow Jews, with disastrous consequences. The *Altalena* was an American landing ship bought from World War II surpluses, which the Irgun used to transport a vital consignment of arms, ammunition and trained fighters to Palestine during the War of Independence. The ship carried 920 soldiers, five thousand rounds of ammunition, one thousand grenades, three hundred Bren guns, fifty cannon, four thousand aerial bombs, nine tanks, fifty anti-tank guns, and quantities of medical supplies, desperately needed by Jewish forces suffering under an arms embargo imposed by Western countries, including the United States.

In spite of a go-ahead from the Ben-Gurion government, the ship was attacked by a Palmach unit when it reached the Tel Aviv shore. "The fact that the crew of the boat was waving a white flag," wrote Monroe Fein, the captain of the *Altalena*, "did not seem to diminish the firing." Fein relates that although a cease-fire was agreed to, firing resumed. "As soon as the gun started a second time, I struck the flag as a sign of surrender. We again inquired of the Palmach commander whether the cease-fire was in effect and the

(Continued on p.8)

PERES AND SYRIA: A SHOCKING ADMISSION

Frank Gaffney, Jr.

Question: What enemy of peace, what underminer of the Mideast peace process, what retrograde Likud-nik opponent of the Rabin government's diplomacy with Syria made the following statement on October 5, 1994?

Syria is likely to attack Israel even if a peace agreement is reached, if extremist elements in Damascus are disappointed by it. It is likely that leaders will arise in Syria who will deploy anew their tanks and planes, and therefore we must be careful.*

Answer: Israeli Foreign Minister Shimon Peres!

Peres--a charter member of the Labor Party's left wing, an unstinting enthusiast concerning the Mideast peace process and an architect of the Rabin government's so-called "land for peace" strategy with Syria and other Arab foes--is reported by the Israeli daily newspaper *Yediot Ahronot* in its October 5 editions as having offered this stunning explanation in response to press inquiries as to why the Rabin-Peres government was seeking to have American troops placed on the Golan Heights in the event of a deal with Syria.

One can only wonder at the impact such an uncharacteristically candid statement by Israel's foreign minister might have on an Israeli public already deeply uneasy about the wisdom of relinquishing the Golan Heights to Syria.** What is clear, however, is the following: The admission by a senior Israeli official that war is likely to ensue in a region where his government wants to have U.S. troops serve as a "tripwire" puts that proposition in a different--and *far more realistic*--light than has been done to date by either Jerusalem or Washington.

After all, Prime Minister Rabin told the Knesset on October 3, 1994: "We will ask nothing else of the Americans when we achieve a peace agreement with Syria on the Golan Heights [than to make a deployment like that in the Sinai]--the same thing." This is, on its face, absurd. There are, after all, major differences in geography and topography between the Golan and Sinai and profound differences in the relationship between Egypt and Israel on the one hand and Israel and Syria on the other (e.g., the point of Peres' comment), differences which invalidate any such comparison.

American officials have similarly tended to minimize the risks inherent in such a U.S. deployment on the Golan, arguing that it is premature to discuss this initiative and down playing evidence of continuing Syrian malevolence. For example, in testimony before the

House Foreign Affairs Committee on October 4, 1994, Assistant Secretary of State for Near East and South Asian Affairs Robert Pelletreau confirmed that Syria had begun production of lethal Scud-C ballistic missiles but averred that that step "is not inconsistent with Syrian intent to make peace with Israel."

The Center for Security Policy has long believed that the insertion of U.S. troops on the Golan Heights would: invite terrorist or other violent attacks against such personnel; possibly embroil the United States in a new Middle East conflict; encourage a false sense of security on the part of Israelis; and ensure strained relations between America and one of its most important allies, Israel. In light of Foreign Minister Peres' admission, however, the Center believes that the Congress must begin an urgent examination of the risks associated with any American deployment on the Golan and insist that the Clinton administration refrain from pledging the United States to such a course of action. Such a sequence of events would seem the bare minimum implied by Secretary Pelletreau when he testified on October 5 that the Clinton administration intended to "consider a request [for U.S. forces to be deployed on the Golan as part of peace between Israel and Syria] *within constitutional processes*" by which he said he meant "full consultation with the Congress...we want to hear the views of Congress."◇

Frank Gaffney, Jr. is director of the Center for Security Policy, in Washington, D.C.

* Syria's armored capabilities are awesome indeed. In April 1993, Major General Uri Saguy, head of the Israel Defense Forces' Intelligence Branch, noted that:

"...Syria has improved and is improving its tank fleet in a very impressive manner. If and when Syria will complete its procurement transactions that it has already signed, all of its armored divisions will be equipped with the latest model T-72 tanks. Today Syria has over 4,000 tanks and 300 self-propelled artillery tubes that provide it with an enhanced offensive capability in land battles."

** The same edition of *Yediot Ahronot* reports the results of a poll of young Israelis conducted by the respected School of Education at the Hebrew University. The poll found that fully 78% opposed a withdrawal from the Golan. Interestingly, the poll also indicated that a further 70% felt that the agreement with the PLO would endanger Israel's security and that terrorism would continue even in the event of peace. And 63% of those polled said that the continued existence of Israeli settlements in the territories was more important than peaceful relations with Arab neighbors.

DOCUMENT **BEN-GURION** **ON HEBRON**

(Editor's Note: In view of the Rabin government's eagerness to give up Hebron, it is interesting to read David Ben-Gurion's essay on Hebron's importance to Jews.)

...Yet, the importance of Hebron is not only due to the history of the forefathers and mothers of our nation. After Saul, the first king of Israel, fell on his sword during the war with the Philistines, so as not to fall in the enemy's hands, David, who succeeded him as king, had asked God: "Shall I advance towards one of the cities of Judea?" God answered him: "Advance!" then David asked: "Where to shall I go?" and God answered: "To Hebron." And David went up there, and Judah's people came and anointed David there as king of the House of Jehuda (II *Samuel* 2:4). At the end after the death of Avner, Saul's army leader, "all the tribes of Israel came unto David into Hebron and announced: "Behold, we are thy bone and thy flesh. In times past,

We shall make a terrible mistake if we are not going to settle Hebron...

when Saul was king over us, it was thou that led Israel out and in, and the Lord said to him: "Thou shalt lead my people Israel, and thou shalt be over Israel. "So, all the elders of Israel came to the king, to Hebron; and King David made a covenant with them in Hebron

before the Lord, and they anointed David King of Israel (II *Samuel* 5:1-3), and in Hebron indeed was the greatest kingdom Israel has had until this day.

The city of Jerusalem, which since the time of David's anointment as king until our days, has not only been our most beloved and holy city in Eretz-Israel, but one of the most revered cities of the entire world, has never been mentioned in the Five Books of Moses. Even after David ruled there, having conquered it from the Jebusites and turned it into the eternal capital of Israel, and after his son Solomon had built the Holy Temple there--the people of Israel, after King Solomon's death, anointed his son Rehavam not in Jerusalem, but in Shechem (Nablus). And out of the forty years of David's kingdom--seven and a half years he ruled in Hebron. Yet Jerusalem, which had not been mentioned in the first five books of the Torah, became by the greatest king of Israel, its holy city.

Still, let us not forget that the start of Israel's greatest king had been in Hebron, the town unto which the first Hebrew arrived about eight hundred years before King David.

We shall make a terrible mistake if we are not going to settle Hebron, the earlier forerunner and neighbour of Jerusalem, with an ever-growing Jewish community in the shortest time!

This will also bring a blessing to its Arab neighbours.

Hebron is worthy of being Jerusalem's sister.

(Signed)

D. Ben-Gurion

Sde Boker, January 25, 1970

(Excerpted from the preface by David Ben-Gurion to The Book of Hebron, Oded Avissar, ed.)

A NEW SEASON

(Continued from p.6)

reply came that the cease-fire was in effect but that he had been 'unable to contact all fronts.' Within a few seconds after the message was received, there was a direct hit on the ship which started a large fire in the cargo hold. The ship's crew made valiant efforts to put out this fire, but because of the nature of the cargo it proved beyond our capacity and I ordered all men aboard to prepare to abandon the ship." Sixteen Jewish fighters from the *Altalena* were killed, and scores wounded, many shot as they tried to swim to shore.

The Palmach commander who had promised, but failed, to bring about the cease-fire was Yitzhak

Rabin.

It is fitting that the former Palmach commander should be the one to start a new season, once again directed at the best of the Jewish people, those prepared to sacrifice for Israel's survival. Or perhaps, for Yitzhak Rabin, the season never ended.◇

David Isaac is a freelance journalist.

SPOTLIGHT ON THE EXTREMISTS

...How should Israel respond to the latest Arab terrorist massacres? **Jerome Segal** of the far-left Jewish Peace Lobby thinks he knows: Jewish residents of Judea and Samaria should be pushed out, the PLO should be given immediate sovereignty over Gaza and Jericho, the Israeli Army should quickly pull out of the rest of the territories, and the PLO should be given sovereignty there, as well. So declared Segal in a press release after the Tel Aviv bus bombing...

...Interviewed by the *Philadelphia Inquirer* about her reaction to the Tel Aviv attack, **Katharina Berges**, Mideast coordinator for the American Friends Service Committee (the Quakers) said she was worried that the attack "might be used to fuel anti-Arab, anti-Muslim feelings." (Anti-Jewish feelings were apparently not something about which she was particularly concerned.) Berges also warned that the Israeli government's anti-terror measures "will not in themselves prevent further violence against Israelis"...

...In the same *Philadelphia Inquirer* article, Reform Rabbi **Brian Walt** of New Jewish Agenda described his discussions with Jewish children about Arab terrorist attacks. While acknowledging the children's "sense of sadness and anger and pain," Walt said, he teaches them "to move beyond that, to build a world that's different"...

...The Los Angeles *Jewish Journal* recently published a glowing feature story about L.A. attorney **Luis Lainer**, on the occasion of his receipt of an award from the New Israel Fund. The *Journal* article recounted Lainer's life--but neglected to mention his radical political activities during the early 1970s, such as his public affiliation with the Committee on New Alternatives for the Middle East (CONAME), which lobbied against U.S. arms shipments to Israel during the Yom Kippur War. Lainer's brother, **Mark Lainer**, is on the board of the *Journal*..

...Israeli soldiers who defend themselves against Arab mob attacks are comparable to Nazis, according to Reform Rabbi **Stephen Pearce**, writing recently on the op-ed page of the *San Francisco Examiner*. According to Pearce --spiritual leader of Temple Emanu-El, one of the city's largest synagogues-- the Haganah's fighters were "terrorists," and attempts by Israelis to defend themselves against Arab aggression have polluted the "collective soul of the Jewish people"...

...On the morning following the Tel Aviv bus-bombing massacre, the editors of the *Los Angeles Times* could think of nothing more appropriate for their **November 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 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

op-ed page than an essay by Israel-basher **Alexander Cockburn**, which consisted primarily of quotes from another Israel-basher, **Edward Said**, placing the blame for the latest Mideast violence on the Israelis. "Just the other day, they took another 3,000 acres" of land in the territories, Said claimed. Or "take Jerusalem, a core problem. It's now expanded to some 25% of the whole West Bank. There are dozens of Palestinians whose land has been taken away, but who cling on in little shacks and simply refuse to move out." The PLO self-rule areas in Gaza and Jericho are "at best a Bantustan and at worst an Israeli protectorate," Said alleged. He also accused Israel of violating the Israel-PLO agreement by failing to withdraw from all the territories immediately and by failing to "pay reparations" to the Palestinian Arabs...

Reflections

Ruth King

WHO'S TO BLAME FOR TERRORISM?

Just who is to blame for Arab terrorism? When Israelis are murdered in Hebron, Yossi Beilin asserts that they should never have been there in the first place. When Israelis are murdered within the Green Line, Shimon Peres rushes to declare that Yasir Arafat is not to blame, and that peace and economic development will solve the problem. When an Israeli is kidnapped, Prime Minister Rabin insists that the terrorists are really trying to "kidnap the peace process."

Where does that leave us? The victims are not really victims--either it is their fault, or they are not the real targets. The killers are not really killers--either they are understandably attacking Israelis who had no business being in a particular area, or they are understandably acting out of frustration over their economic problems.

RENAMING THE ENEMY

The moment a terrorist outrage takes place, Rabin government spokesmen fall all over themselves insisting that the terrorists were from Hamas or Islamic Jihad, not from a PLO faction like the PFLP or DFLP, certainly not from Arafat's own Fatah faction. Before the police and military experts have even had a chance to investigate the attack, "senior foreign ministry

The victims are not really victims--either it is their fault, or they are not the real targets.

officials" are loudly absolving the PLO of any guilt.

This can be embarrassing, of course--as for example in the case of Haim Mizrahi, the Israeli

shopper who was murdered by Arab terrorists in Ramallah in October 1993. The government immediately insisted that he was killed by Muslim fundamentalists. Three days later, it turned out that Mizrahi had been murdered by Fatah. Sometimes the government is more successful. For example, there has been virtually no news coverage of the report that the car used for the Afula car-bombing in April was stolen by Fatah

Arafat and Hamas are free to continue the neat little division of labor that is working so well for both of them.

members who then gave it to Hamas for the attack.

In a similar vein, the government originally insisted that no Hamas member would be included in the latest prisoner releases. But after an ex-Hamas prisoner was found to have taken part in the Jerusalem attack in October, the government was again left with egg on its face--except that the Israeli and international media quickly lost interest, as they usually do when a story might embarrass Rabin or Arafat.

And so Rabin is free to continue acting as the PLO's top press agent, and Arafat and Hamas are free to continue the neat little division of labor that is working so well for both of them.

IF I FORGET THEE, HEBRON

When Teddy Kollek, former mayor of Jerusalem, was defeated, both his admirers and detractors felt that he would be "a hard act to follow." In fact, the beauty of the city does owe a great deal to Mr. Kollek's efforts. However, Ehud Olmert, Jerusalem's present mayor, not only fits into his predecessor's shoes, but gives them new shine. In his recent efforts, Olmert urged American audiences to reaffirm their commitment to the city's indivisible and inviolable status as the capital of Israel and the beacon for the faith of world Jewry. Yet he was rebuffed by the Conference of Presidents. In fact, Shoshana Cardin, past president of the Conference, remarked that she wanted to keep "politics" out of the city's 3000th anniversary celebration.

For shame. The Conference of Presidents has clearly lost its bearings. However, there should be no surprise in this, because he who can relinquish Hebron--the twin capital of the Jewish people, the home of Abraham and Sarah and the patriarchs--can relinquish everything, including Jerusalem. Following this trend, the mayor of Tel Aviv might also be rebuffed.

We must never forget Hebron; we must never forget Jerusalem. Governments are temporary. We salute Ehud Olmert for his efforts and pledge our commitment to both cities.◇

WHAT THE ARABS ARE SAYING

Excerpts from an interview with Syrian Foreign Minister Farouk a-Shara on Israel Television, October 7, 1994. The interviewer was Israel Television correspondent Ehud Ya'ari:

Ya'ari: So it is not yet time for President Assad to meet with Prime Minister Rabin?

A-Shara: No. Such dramatic appearances in our view are premature...if you remember the history of the conflict, you should not forget what has happened to the Arabs. Millions of refugees have been displaced, and at the same time they are replaced by new immigrants. Any Israeli citizen must think in an objective way, must see the feelings of the other side, in a human way, without prejudice.

Ya'ari: If I may ask you, Mr. Minister, as soon as the territorial dimension of the problem is resolved, what is your vision of peace--what we call in Israel 'shalom'?

A-Shara: ...I have already answered a number of questions in this direction.

Ya'ari: ...[W]hat do you make of this turmoil in Israel concerning the negotiations with Syria?

A-Shara: Well, this has a historic aspect as well as a current one...You know, the Israelis think that the Arab side was always the aggressor. This is not the reality. It might be true when it comes to the media, because the Israelis were very influential in the

international media, especially the Western and American media, they chose the facts upside down. Just remember that Israel was able to establish a state of its own, in Palestine, and it was [at] the expense of the Arabs. So this is the first hostile attitude, which in fact had to be a lot of suffering, a lot of agonies.

During the five wars, and I am talking now about Syria, Syria never shelled a civilian target in Israel, but the Israeli army shelled many civilian targets during these wars. And sometimes, in between the wars, they shelled civilian targets...

Ya'ari: I am sure, Mr. Minister, each view of the past was different--

A-Shara: It is the Arab side who would like to feel secure and assured when we talk about peace--putting hostilities and the war behind us.

Ya'ari: What kind of security arrangements can you foresee? American troops?

A-Shara: Security arrangements should be balanced, should be equitable, of course there will be an international force there...

GROSSMAN AND AIPAC

(Continued from p.4)

Democratic Party, does not seem to recognize the need for impartiality. The *Washington Jewish Week* recently revealed (October 13, 1994) that Grossman "has remained almost exclusively Democratic in his personal financial contributions"; out of \$108,500 in political donations that Grossman made during his first 23 months as AIPAC president, he gave \$103,250 to Democrats, and \$5,250 to bipartisan political action committees. "Regardless of political affiliation," the *Jewish Week* noted, "AIPAC presidents traditionally have given to candidates of both parties—the sole litmus test being the candidates' records on issues concerning Israel." Not so Grossman, who conceded to the *Jewish Week* "that the reason for his particular pattern of giving is the possibility that he may, someday, run for public

office." The *Jewish Week* quoted former AIPAC officials as warning that AIPAC's effectiveness could be harmed if "the top leader or the organization itself [is] too clearly tied to any political party in either the United States or in Israel."

Under Steve Grossman, that is exactly what has happened. Once known as the most effective advocate for Israel, AIPAC is fast becoming known as an advocate for the likes of Strobe Talbott and whatever Mideast policy the Clinton administration pursues. Such partisanship is turning AIPAC into a pale shadow of its former self. The time has come for the AIPAC board and lay leadership to consider AIPAC's future prospects if Steve Grossman remains its president.

Dr. Michael Goldblatt, a longtime member and financial supporter of AIPAC, is vice president of the Greater Philadelphia District of the Zionist Organization of America.

One Minute to Midnight

Dr. Irving Moskowitz

U.S. GENERALS SAY: NO GIs ON GOLAN

In recent months, the Clinton administration has repeatedly rejected calls by pro-Israel activists and leading members of Congress for a Pentagon study of the risks of stationing American troops on the Golan Heights. Dissatisfied with the administration's stand, a group of prominent former U.S. Army generals have taken matters into their own hands and authored a compelling analysis of the pros and cons of deploying American GIs on the Golan.

One glance at the credentials of the authors makes it clear that they know what they're writing about. They include, among others, Lieutenant General (Ret.) John Pustay, former president of the National Defense University; General (Ret.) Bernard Schriever, Commander of the U.S. Air Force Systems Command from 1959-1966; and Admiral (Ret.) Elmo R. Zumwalt, Jr., Chief of Naval Operations from 1970-1974.

The generals' study begins with a helpful summary of the strategic value of the Golan Heights,

particularly in this age of missiles. It then proceeds to an in-depth examination of the many risks involved in all the possible missions that a U.S. force might be expected to undertake on the Golan, such as monitoring for the purpose of providing an early warning about an attack; monitoring compliance with the peace agreement; political deterrence; military deterrence; or as a "tripwire" that would trigger automatic U.S. military intervention in the event of a Syrian invasion. The study also analyzes the impact that a U.S. deployment would have on Israel's ability to launch a pre-emptive strike against Syria; the threat to U.S. troops from Arab terrorist groups in the region; the effect of a U.S. deployment on American-Israeli relations; and the advantages and disadvantages of having a multilateral, rather than purely American, force on the Golan. There is also an interesting discussion about the flawed analogy between the U.S. force now in the Sinai and the proposed U.S. force for the Golan.

The study, entitled "U.S. Forces on the Golan Heights: An Assessment of Benefits and Costs," has been published by the Center for Security Policy in Washington, D.C. It is without doubt one of the most important documents about Israel to be published in recent memory, and no friend of Israel should be without it. Copies may be obtained by calling 202-466-0515.◊

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