
OUTPOST

DECEMBER 1994

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

GIs ON THE GOLAN: AN ISSUE IS BORN

Herbert Zweibon

Americans For a Safe Israel was the first U.S. organization to bring to public attention the issue of U.S. troops on the Golan Heights. AFSI questioned the feasibility of putting GIs on the Golan in a full-page advertisement in the Israeli newspaper *Ma'ariv* in 1993. Few took it seriously.

The reason that they didn't want to discuss it was because a calm, serious analysis of the issue would inevitably reveal the proposal's many flaws: the GIs would be sitting ducks for Hezbollah terrorists, American casualties would harm Israel's standing in U.S. public opinion, domestic U.S. pressure could result in a hasty withdrawal of the American troops --as happened in Beirut in 1983, and in Somalia just last year--and Israel would have neither the Golan nor its American "protectors."

Later in 1993, AFSI released a study by Dr. Irving Moskowitz entitled "Should America 'Guarantee' Israel's Safety?" Examining the history of American 'guarantees' to protect its allies, the study concluded that Israel should not depend on American or multinational forces for its defenses.

AFSI's early involvement in the Golan issue proved to be one of the catalysts for the formation of the Coalition for a Secure U.S.-Israel Friendship, in which AFSI joined hands with numerous Jewish and Christian pro-Israel groups to publicize the dangers of stationing GIs on the Golan. Several organizations that are members of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, such as the Jewish War Veterans, the Religious Zionists of America, the Rabbinical Council of America, the National Council of Young Israel, joined the Coalition, defying pressure from the Presidents Conference to keep the issue under wraps. Ads by the Coalition in the *New York Times*, the *New Republic* and various Jewish newspapers stimulated further public discussion.

In August, due to the efforts of Coalition members, the question of GIs on the Golan reached the halls of Congress. Senator Malcolm Wallop proposed a resolution asking for the Pentagon to study the pros and cons of the issue. AIPAC and the Israeli Embassy unleashed their big guns to pressure Senators against the bill, and it was defeated. But the Coalition did not give up. The Christian Zionist CIPAC group and the tireless Frank Gaffney, director of the Center for Security Policy, worked hard to have a second Senate amendment introduced. Sponsored by Senator Don Nickles, the amendment required the Administration to release a secret Rand Corporation study about putting U.S. forces on the Golan. The amendment passed, 86-14. In October, Rep. Robert E. Andrews sent a letter signed by a number of congressmen to Lee Hamilton, chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, requesting that Congress and the Foreign Affairs Committee be consulted on the issue of a Golan deployment in advance of any commitment of troops.

On November 21, after long months of denying, delaying and misleading, the Rabin government and the Clinton administration at last admitted, publicly and unequivocally, that they want to deploy American troops on the Golan Heights, between Israel and Syria.

While this would have simply slipped through Congress a year ago, thanks to the efforts of AFSI and other Coalition members, it will no longer be possible for anyone to suppress debate of this vital issue. The fact of a new Republican Congress may mean that the outcome will not be what Rabin and Clinton hope.◊

Herbert Zweibon is chairman of Americans For a Safe Israel.

IN THIS ISSUE:

<i>Should None Dare Call it Treason?</i>	..3
<i>A Sad Story of Lost Values</i>	...7
<i>Three Arab Voices</i>	...7
<i>Victims or Executioners</i>	...10

From the Editor
Ruth King

GIs ON THE GOLAN? U.S. PUBLIC SAYS "NO"

President Clinton should take note of the new public opinion survey showing that most Americans oppose stationing American troops on the Golan Heights. Asked if they favor or oppose deploying GIs on the Golan Heights as part of an Israeli-Syrian agreement, 64.3% of Americans said they were opposed. Only 17.9% said they were in favor. Another 17.8% replied that they did not know, or chose not to reply. A representative sample of 1,000 Americans were surveyed, by the professional polling firm of Fabrizio, McLaughlin & Associates on behalf of the journal *Middle East Quarterly*.

The poll results are a dramatic demonstration of American public opposition to the risky plan for deploying GIs on the Golan Heights, where they would be sitting ducks for local Arab terrorist groups.

The respondents were also asked if "previous American experiences with peacekeeping missions" made them "more likely to favor or less likely to favor" putting U.S. troops on the Golan. 64.8% said "less likely," 16.8% replied "more likely."

On the question of whether or not President Clinton should "obtain the approval of Congress before placing American troops on the Golan Heights," 70% were in favor, 17.1% opposed.

The American public has spoken. Let's hope the President is listening.◊

ARE THESE SOLDIERS FIT FOR COMBAT?

Proponents of stationing American troops on the Golan Heights often point to the American force in the Sinai as a precedent for a Golan deployment. But the latest American military unit scheduled for duty in the Sinai actually raises fresh questions about the ability of the U.S. to field such missions. According to *Army Times*, this new unit, the 4th Battalion, 505th Parachute Infantry Regiment, will begin its tour of duty in the Sinai in January. It consists of 80% National Guardsmen and reservists, reassigned from the 29th Infantry Division, in Virginia and Maryland. Just 20% of the men headed for Sinai are active duty soldiers. How would such troops fare in the event of an Egyptian military thrust towards Israel? Is the quality of the new unit indicative of the problems the Army is having, because of budget cuts? Would a unit sent to the Golan likewise consist primarily of National Guardsmen and reservists, and would they be able to stand up to terrorist

attacks or Syrian aggression? The point is that such units would not be able to defend Israel from future Syrian attacks.◊

NO "NEW TONE" ON ISRAEL AT THE U.N.

In recent months, spokesmen for the Rabin government have been crowing about the diplomatic gains that Israel has supposedly achieved as a result of its concessions to the PLO. Leaving aside for the moment the question of whether the gain of international praise is worth the loss of vital territories, let us consider the narrower issue: has the international community really changed its tone toward Israel? Case in point: the United Nations.

In July, the Security Council passed a resolution condemning the recent terrorist attacks against Jews in Argentina and England. But don't celebrate too soon. The resolution blandly referred to "acts of international terrorism," failing to make any mention whatsoever of the fact that Jews and Israelis were the targets of the terrorists.

A draft resolution currently being circulated by Egypt --supposedly Israel's friend and peace partner-- demands that Israel, and Israel alone, halt all development, production, acquisition and testing of nuclear weapons. The resolution is entitled "The Threat of Nuclear Armaments to the Middle East," but makes no reference to the fact that numerous Arab countries -- including Iraq, Libya, Syria, and Egypt itself-- are in the process of developing nuclear capabilities.

A new atmosphere toward Israel? It certainly doesn't seem much different from the old one.◊

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.

SHOULD NONE DARE CALL IT TREASON?

Rael Jean Isaac and Erich Isaac

Placards and cries of "Treason" and "Traitor" have been a feature of many anti-Rabin demonstrations in Israel. Understandably no charge has given greater outrage to Rabin's supporters, for treason is a word loaded with enormous emotional freight: it is the ultimate sin for a leader to betray his own country. Many of those who are staunchly opposed to Rabin's policies agree that the charge is abhorrent and false, and repudiate those who make it.

Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin himself is extremely sensitive to the charge, and on occasion uses it to shield himself from responding to clearly justified criticism of his behavior. For example, in July he stalked out of a Knesset debate shouting: "I don't have to reply

But is the charge of treason against Rabin in fact outrageous and without foundation?

even in the Knesset to anyone who provides a roof for people who call me 'traitor'...even if he does not say those things himself." Rabin thus avoided responding to Likud head Benjamin Netanyahu's reproach after Rabin accused Israelis who criticized his policies of being "partners with Hamas."

But is the charge of treason against Rabin in fact outrageous and without foundation? The answer depends upon how one defines treason, a term that historically has been (and continues to be) used in a number of ways.

When people instinctively repudiate the notion of treason as applied to Rabin, they are thinking of treason in its lead-off dictionary definition--as acting to overthrow one's government or to harm or kill its sovereign. In this sense it is indeed absurd to accuse Rabin of treason for he acts within the framework of the Israeli political system. Treason, moreover, to the average person, carries the notion of acting on behalf of a foreign government against one's own, whether for money or, as became common with the rise of Communism and National Socialism in the twentieth century, out of ideological conviction. No rational person believes Rabin is in the pay of an Arab power, or seeks to carry out the goals of an imperialist militant Islam. In this century individuals have also been convicted of treason on the grounds that they acted as tools of a foreign power against their own people after their country had been conquered: witness Quisling, Petain, among others. But Israel has not been conquered--although it can certainly be argued that its leaders, with their massive unilateral concessions, behave like those of a defeated country.

No matter how disastrous his policies prove to be, Rabin is never likely to stand accused of treason in a court of law. He has not acted alone, but as head of a duly elected government careful to obtain parliamentary support for its actions. And yet, this said, surprisingly, what Rabin has done (in cooperation with others in his government) might be considered treasonous under both American and Israeli law.

The United States is distinguished for an extremely restrictive definition of treason. It is the only crime defined in the United States Constitution. The founding fathers were highly sensitive on the subject of treason, both because of its history of abuse in England (where treason had been defined so broadly that it could be used to suppress any resistance to government policy) and because, from the English point of view, they were traitors. And so, while drawing on the language of the English Statute of Treason of 1350, the definition in the U.S. Constitution is much narrower. Treason is confined to two specific types of action: challenging the power of the nation by armed insurrection and aiding enemies during wartime. Note that spying for a friendly country is not treason, nor would spying for Germany or Japan have been treason prior to the U.S. declaration of war against those countries. Since treason was now defined as a crime against a constitutional democracy, not against a ruler, it was recognized in the debates on treason at the Constitutional Convention that the president himself might be a traitor. It was decided that the provisions for impeachment would take care of the case of a president who betrayed his country.

Yet under the Constitution's definition of treason, what Rabin has been doing is at least ambiguous, for it can be argued that he is aiding and abetting an enemy during wartime. It is in this sense that the PLO's refusal to change its charter assumes special significance. It may be objected that the PLO is an organization, not a state (hence, cannot be "an enemy" in the

Rabin repeats the tired truism that one makes peace with enemies, not friends, but this is on condition that enmity has terminated.

sense meant in the Constitution) but in 1988 the PLO declared itself a state. The Palestinian Covenant functions as its Declaration of War against Israel.

Rabin repeats the tired truism that one makes peace with enemies, not friends, but this is on condition that enmity has terminated. Recognizing this elementary fact, Shimon Peres, in *The New Middle East*, emphasizes the importance of obtaining the PLO's commitment to change the Covenant (or National Charter, as it is sometimes called). First, he points out what many fail to understand: that changing the Covenant does not mean doctoring a few offensive phrases.

(Continued on page 4)

CALL IT TREASON?

(Continued from p. 3)

Peres writes quite correctly that of the PLO National Charter's 33 articles, 28 call for Israel's destruction directly, the remaining five indirectly. Anyone reading the Covenant cannot fail to see that it constitutes a lengthy pledge to destroy the Jewish State and replace it with an Arab State of Palestine. That is *all* it is; the Covenant has no other content. In his book Peres writes that had the PLO, in the Oslo negotiations, not agreed to abolish the Covenant "we would never have been able to sign an agreement."

And yet the PLO has *not* abolished its National Charter. Nor is there any prospect that it will do so. Nor can Israel even cling to the pretense that Arafat

Under Israeli law, as jurist Yoav Efron explains in Nativ (November 1992), Rabin's repeatedly announced plans to give the Golan Heights to Syria can be considered treason.

himself, by his "peace agreement" with Israel, has made the Covenant inoperative. In August of this year, in his message to PLO officials in Arab countries, Arafat declared:

There are periods in the struggle of a nation in which it has to lower its head and agree to agreements which will lead it in the end to the desired breakthroughs. The Palestinian people deserves a Palestinian state and the Palestinian state is worthy of having within it the entire Palestinian nation. I will never give my hand to the annulment of one paragraph of the Palestinian National Charter.

Arafat could scarcely make it clearer that he views the so-called peace process as a tactical means to implement the traditional PLO goal of Israel's destruction and the document that enshrines that goal remains fully operative.²

Anti-terrorism expert Yigal Carmon points out that the importance of the Palestinian Covenant cannot be minimized. It is, he says, "the arbitral document, the thing that counts." Carmon observes: "It is a declaration of intentions behind which one cannot play games. By not changing the Charter, they are actually contradicting their declarations about Israel's right to exist. Such declarations have no meaning."

What this means is that Rabin is turning over territory to a sovereign body whose Declaration of War against the Jewish State (the Palestinian Covenant)

remains in force. It can also be argued that he is turning over his own citizens to the enemy, for Israeli communities in Judea and Samaria, under the unfolding peace process, will come under the control of those who remain formally dedicated to Israel's destruction. Is Rabin then abetting Israel's enemies, giving them "aid and comfort"? An argument that in this respect Rabin conforms to the definition of treason in the U.S. Constitution can surely be made.³

Under Israeli law, as jurist Yoav Efron explains in *Nativ* (November 1992), Rabin's repeatedly announced plans to give the Golan Heights to Syria can be considered treason. In 1981, the Knesset adopted a revised penal code. Chapter 7, entitled "Security of the State, Foreign Relations and Official Secrets," includes paragraphs covering treason which were incorporated verbatim from earlier revisions of the penal code adopted in 1957. Paragraph 97b reads: "Anyone who does something with the intention of removing territory from the sovereignty of the state or making that territory part of the sovereignty of a foreign state or has performed an act that is likely to bring this about--the penalty is death or life imprisonment."⁴

The Golan Plateau (unlike Judea and Samaria which, except for eastern Jerusalem and its environs, were never incorporated into Israel) is part of Israel's sovereign territory, annexed by the Knesset on December 14, 1981. The "Law of Ramat HaGolan" adopted on that date says: "The law and jurisdiction and administration of the state will apply to the territory of the Golan." Leftwing Israeli opponents of the annexation argued that application of Israeli law did not imply sovereignty and sought confirmation of their contention from the Supreme Court. It ruled against them. Said the court: "Wherever in the law it says Israel or the state of Israel, Ramat HaGolan is included." The court agreed that the mere fact of applying some Israeli laws somewhere outside of the state did not necessarily make that place part of Israel. However, said the court, "In the matter before us, the language of the law and the legislative purpose will lead to the conclusion that wherever there is reference to 'Israeli law', 'Israel', or another expression that refers to the state, Ramat HaGolan is also meant."

Early in 1992 eight Israelis appealed to the Supreme Court (acting as a High Court of Justice) to order the prime minister to abstain from any territorial concessions on the Golan on the grounds that it was part of the sovereign territory of Israel. The Court rejected the appeal, accepting the arguments of the government's attorney, who did not deny that the Golan was part of Israel, but asserted that the laws [of treason] cited did not apply to the government, for in another paragraph (91) of the law, there was the stipulation that the actions were treasonous "without legal authorization," which, he argued, cannot include actions by the government.

(Continued on p.5)

CALL IT TREASON?

(Continued from p. 4)

In other words, it was the government's contention that its leaders cannot commit treason. Interestingly, as Efron points out, over forty years ago, at the time of its original passage, the debate over the law defining treason had foreshadowed the issues that have arisen today. At that time Menachem Begin, then leading the opposition Herut Party, had argued vehemently against including the phrase "without legal authorization."

With what turned out to be extraordinary prescience, Begin argued that while it might be difficult to imagine a government or Parliament betraying their national mission in the four year time frame between elections, the "political wisdom of nations" was that it could happen. Other states provided mechanisms against such a possibility: e.g. impeachment, mandatory two-thirds majorities, etc. for certain critical steps contemplated by a governing executive.

There was also a moral issue, Begin said. The government says to the Israeli citizen: "If you commit an act which can bring about the removal, let us say, of Beersheba from Israel, you will be called to account and in wartime can be executed, but if we who rule negotiate and make the agreement you propose--to give up Beersheba for the sake of 'peace', we have something called 'legal authority' and we are entitled to do that."

Is it possible, asked Begin, "to give legal authority to treason? If a government should commit treason, will the government prosecutor challenge it? From the moral point of view how can you say that when we, who have been elected for four years, decide, based on the opinion of 61 representatives to yield territory belonging to the state, then intention is not intention, action is not action and treason is not treason?"

Begin's arguments at the time were countered by the ruling Mapai (Labor) Party's Shlomo Argov, then chairman of the Knesset's joint committee on legislation. The government, Argov maintained, has only one judge and that is the Knesset; anyone who acts with the authority of the Knesset cannot commit treason. Otherwise, Argov warned, an official who acted lawfully according to the decisions of one government, could be accused of treason by the next. Argov noted that Begin argued that some principles were so holy the Knesset could not decide upon them. Such issues, said Argov, should be decided when a Constitution was drawn up--perhaps, he conceded, the Constitution should require a two-thirds majority on some matters.

The ultimate decision was not in question in these 1957 debates: Mapai controlled the Knesset, and "without legal authority" remained. And despite many years of talk, Israel never developed the Constitution that might have restrained the government's power to dismember the state on razor-thin Knesset majorities.

But even under present laws, a tantalizing question remains: What if Rabin, Peres and their coterie drew up a "peace plan" calling for Israel to relinquish all or part of the Golan to Syria and then some Labor Knesset members rebelled with the result that the government could not muster the requisite 61 votes? Would Rabin and the others then have been guilty of treason? They had "intended" to give up the sovereign territory of the state assuming they possessed, but without in fact having, the authority of the Knesset.

Whatever the legal merits of the charge of treason against Rabin, there is another broader sense in which the charge unquestionably has weight. A secondary definition of treason in the Random House dictionary is "the betrayal of a trust or confidence; breach

What if Rabin, Peres and their coterie drew up a "peace plan" calling for Israel to relinquish all or part of the Golan to Syria and then some Labor Knesset members rebelled with the result that the government could not muster the requisite 61 votes? Would Rabin and the others then have been guilty of treason?

of faith." It is this which is the core meaning of treason over time and divergent cultures.

In the Bible, there are two terms for traitor, *boged* (etymologically from *beged* or coat, here as false garb) and *mo'el* (from *ma'al*, betrayal, etymologically from *me'il*, coat, in this sense meaning "wearing false colors"). Both are used to refer to the person who betrays God or fails to live up to a covenant he has undertaken. For example, in the Bible, the term *boged* is used for the individual who buys a young girl from her father with the understanding that she will become his wife and then sells her to another (*Ex. 21:8*). For the use of *boged*, in the sense of national betrayal, see, for example, *Jer. 12:1; Is. 24:16*.

Treason is also used more broadly for those who detach themselves from their own people. When, after assisting in the conquest of the lands west of the Jordan, the tribes of Reuben, Gad and the half-tribe of Menasseh returned from Shiloh to their lands in Transjordan, and began to build an enormous altar to God east of the Jordan, the other tribes became suspicious that they were planning to detach themselves from the tribes to the west of the Jordan. The Bible uses the term "treason" (*ma'al*) for this action, and the tribes of Israel threaten to embark on a war of extermination. This calamity is avoided when the eastern tribes affirm their loyalty, asserting that the altar was not for sacrifices, but intended as a monument to the unity of the people (*Joshua 22*) and their loyalty to the God of

(Continued on p.6)

CALL IT TREASON?

(Continued from p. 5)

Israel.

In German, the term *verraten* (betray) comes from *Rat*, meaning advice or the body giving advice, i.e., the council or ruler. *Verraten* meant to "give false support or advice," "to mislead," "to give over to," or "deliver into the hands of." In *Treason in the Twentieth Century*, Margret Boveri points out that in its original meaning *verraten* applies as much to the ruler as to the subject, that is, the ruler can as easily betray the people, by misleading them, as be betrayed by a subject.

It is this conception of treason as breach of a people's trust by a ruler, delivering the people into the

What Rabin and Peres, the architect of the peace plan, have done may go down in history as a new form of treason.

hands of the enemy, that Rabbi Yigal Kaminetzky, the Gaza regional rabbi, had in mind when, in September 1993, he wrote in his weekly Torah leaflet, "The heart is torn and bleeds in light of the horrible treason of this government toward our land, lives, faith and security." Implicit here is the accusation that Rabin is guilty of two forms of treason: betrayal of the nation-state (land, lives, security), and betrayal of the state's underlying ideas (its faith, i.e., Zionism and Judaism).

Trusted by the public (as Peres was not), Rabin campaigned on promises he broke once in power, among them not to deal with the PLO and not to come down from the Golan. Obviously, the landscape of democratic politics is littered with broken campaign promises, but not with promises that go to the core of the state's sovereignty, identity, and ability to survive. As head of a state resting upon a core of Jewish and Zionist values, Rabin has a responsibility to act in a manner that will not totally undercut them.

Yet Rabin is striking at the heart of those values. Whether this signifies indifference to the old pioneering tradition of Zionist labor, or to the religious-national bond to the land, or a conviction that there are compelling considerations overriding these is not clear. What is clear is that for him the settlers of Judea and Samaria are obstacles in his path, who can, as he put it, for all he cares, "spin like propellers." Rabin considers Israeli citizens who oppose his policies

enemies of the state. In a typical intemperate outburst in July, prompting opposition leader Benjamin Netanyahu to accuse him of "verbal hooliganism," Rabin declared: "The radical right wing in Israel is dancing on the blood of the victims of the radical Islamic murderers trying to turn these victims into a lever against the peace agreement. There is an evil, wicked circle of partnership between the Hamas murderers and the radical right wing."

Rabin is guilty of a moral enormity here. He seeks to delegitimize his opponents with the term "radical right wing" and equates them with the murderous Hamas. But Rabin's opponents are not "enemies of peace"; they believe that it is the PLO and Hamas who are united on the same goal even if they are split in the short-term on the tactics best adapted to achieve it. As Rabin's opponents, especially the settlers, see it, Rabin is in league with Arafat to betray *them*, making their communities increasingly vulnerable and eventually wholly unviable as PLO control is extended.

There are things about Rabin's abandonment of what had been bedrock principles of all Israeli governments that make his actions truly extraordinary. Israel is not a country defeated in war. Does Rabin believe that Israel will not be able to withstand its enemies in the future and so must make the best deal possible to avert approaching doom? But as Margret Boveri points out, "There is a line beyond which submitting to the so-called inevitable in order to alleviate momentary hardship and suffering may entail giving up an inner core of self-esteem without which neither a person nor a country can exist."

What Rabin and Peres, the architect of the peace plan, have done may go down in history as a new form of treason. Part of the difficulty with the notion of treason in this case is that treason normally involves betrayal in the service of something, whether money or another state or a powerful idea, as Communism was for a time (embodied in the Soviet Union), and Islamic fundamentalism is now in the Arab world (embodied in Iran). But Rabin and Peres are delivering up their country in the service of an idea which has no embodiment and no reality. Rabin is tying his country's fate to Shimon Peres's fantasy of a New Middle East in which "rivers of progress" replace "rivers of blood" to quote Peres's embarrassing rhetoric. But there is not a shred of evidence in the region for the emergence of this New Middle East. Israel may be the first country betrayed to a dream.◇

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

Notes

1. Rabin's Labor Party obtained 35% of the vote in the June 1992 elections, giving it 44 seats. Its ally on the left, Meretz, obtained 12 seats. Together they control 56 Knesset seats. The nationalist and religious parties

together gained 59 seats and would have obtained the 61 seats necessary to form a government had it not

(Continued on p.9)

A SAD STORY OF LOST VALUES

Nadia Matar

Some of our members and friends of the Women in Green, were witness to some frightening and grotesque action by the Israeli police on Thursday evening, October 27, 1994. The very foundations of the democratic society we pretend we in Israel are living in today, are threatened by such police behavior.

Unfortunately, the direction for such behavior does not originate with the police, but rather higher echelons in the government to whom the police are responsible. So while there is room for savage criticism against the police in this instance, it is the Minister of Police, Moshe Shahal, and Yitzhak Rabin himself, who must be held responsible for what occurred on this Black Thursday in our history.

There is no doubt that the police will eventually issue, through their spokesman, a 'kosher' explanation for their outrageous and brutal behavior in this matter. (Minister Shahal and Jerusalem Police Chief Amit have already told several Knesset Members inquiring on behalf of Women in Green different versions which were not only not credible and conflict with the previous versions given out, but were also false). It is a sad story of the loss of values when our highest officials and police officers will readily lie rather than

own up to wrongdoing, and move to correct this potential cancer in our society.

Our women gathered at the Central Bus Station in Jerusalem, at 8:30 PM on Thursday, October 27, 1994. Our plan was to have a protest vigil on one of the sidewalks near the Binyanei HaUma, where President Clinton was scheduled to hold a press conference later that evening. The subject of the vigil was the Golan Heights. Our message to President Clinton: The Golan is necessary for the security of Israel. Sending American troops as a substitute form of security is not acceptable to us; we are capable, and insist on defending ourselves, with the Golan remaining in our hands.

We had placards carrying these messages, and a coffin draped with an American flag. The purpose of the coffin was to remind America that in 1983, 241 Americans were killed in Lebanon by Arab terrorists, with Syrian involvement. We wanted to point out to them that this could well happen again on the Golan. America pulled out of Lebanon following an uproar in the U.S. calling for American soldiers to return home; we wanted to say that such a scenario would be disastrous for Israel, and we are not willing to risk being exposed to such a situation.

With President Clinton in Jerusalem, the city was clogged. Most of the streets were blocked or closed. As a result, not more than 15 of our members and friends showed up. We descended the steps adjacent to the Central Bus Station and proceeded through

(Continued on p.8)

THREE ARAB VOICES

J. S. Sorkin

On October 21 the *Jerusalem Post* reported that a day after a No. 5 bus moving north on Dizengoff Street was blown to smithereens, men from the *hevra kadisha* (burial society) still searching for human body parts on Bauhaus balconies, the tops of window air-conditioners and in the trees lining tiny Tel Aviv's answer to the Champs Elysses, found a human liver and some intestines on the roof above a boutique.

The same day the *Post* also ran a small article by Lamia Lahoud, an Arab staffer, whose lead was "PLO officials say the Palestinian authority in Gaza has no intention of cracking down on Hamas in response to the...bombing." A key Arafat lieutenant, Sufiyah Abu Zeidah, said, "The Palestinian Authority wants peace with Israel but peace inside the Palestinian house is more important...We reject the assessment that we must choose [between Hamas and Israel]."

But then a contradictory second Arab voice, identified only as a member of the Palestinian Preventive Security Service in Jericho (one of the numerous

and competing armed groups created by Arafat) said, "The Palestinian Authority would take action against Hamas activists preparing terrorist actions against Israelis." Abu Anonymous said it was time to disarm Hamas and others, and that the PA "cannot tolerate...an authority within the Authority."

And then there was a third voice. Riyad El Malki, a professor of engineering at Bir Zeit University (where, incidentally, the Dizengoff bombmaker nicknamed "The Engineer" had been an engineering student) and a spokesman for the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (George Habash's outfit) claimed that "most Palestinians were shocked and outraged by the magnitude of Tuesday's attack and the pictures of the victims shown on Israel television." He said he believes Arafat will "start disarming Hamas activists, if necessary by force, and has the green light of the international community to do so."

Three voices reflecting the thinking of Arabs west of the Jordan River. And on reflection, Sufyan Abu Zeidah seems to have spoken the greatest truth. The PLO will *not* take on Hamas, and don't be fooled by what happened on November 18, when Arafat's

(Continued on p. 11)

LOSS OF VALUES

(Continued from p.7)

the tunnel-underpass to reach the other side of the street, where Binyanei HaUma is located. We intended to set up our vigil on the wide sidewalk at the other end of the tunnel, even though it was quite a distance from Binyanei HaUma.

About five meters from the steps leading to the other side of the tunnel, large numbers of police were waiting for us. One of the policemen asked one of our women, who was carrying some placards, for her identification card. She gave it to him immediately. I was some three meters behind her, carrying a light coffin wrapped in a blanket, and gave it to one of our members to hold, in order to see what was happening to the member who was stopped by the police. When that policeman saw me, he lost interest in the woman he had stopped. The look on his face indicated that he recognized me from our previous demonstrations, and he demanded to see my identification. I gave it to him promptly. I then asked him for his name and police number as he was not wearing the tag with that information, as required by law. I looked around at the other policemen who were there, and many of them likewise were not wearing the required identification tags. In response to my polite request, the policeman gruffly remarked, "I ask the questions. Where is the coffin?" I said that I would not answer any questions until he gave me his name and police number. This infuriated him even more, and he began to shout, "Where is the coffin?" I told him I had given him my identification and was entitled to have him identify himself. He barked, "My name is Ovadia Kalimi and you are detained."

I said, "What? Why?" But he saw behind me one of our women holding the coffin and other placards. He and other policemen attacked, taking the coffin, tearing up and seizing the placards.

Our women then together began to chant, "Police state--the police are denying us the right to protest." They prevented us from getting our signs back from the police van. There appeared to be a number of foreign news photographers who were taking pictures of what was happening. All of this happened very quickly--less than a minute. None of our women touched any policeman. We remained at all times on the pavement protesting the violation of our rights. We were doing and intended to do nothing different than what we were peacefully doing each week since the signing of the Oslo Accords.

Suddenly I felt policemen pushing me forcefully. From the push I fell to the ground. When I was on the ground, policemen kicked me and hit me. Then the most beastly of them, Ovadia Kalimi, dragged me to my feet and brutally yanked my right hand, while pulling me, screamed, "You kicked me, and hit me, and impeded the fulfilling of my duty--you hit other policemen. You are going straight to the police van!" I was in

shock that he lied to my face. I did not believe my ears. I felt as if I was in a book of Kafka. They threw me into the van. While there, they handed me my hat which had flown off my head by their violence on my person, and a photographer snapped my picture while I received my hat. (I heard the next day that the policemen continued to hit our women, pushing them back to the stairs from which they had emerged. They also hit an aged husband of one of the women, punching him in the stomach while other policemen held him from behind; they then proceeded to break and tear up the unrolled banner he was holding.)

In the van, the driver was verbally aggressive toward me. He drove at a very rapid speed. When I asked him to drive slower because of the severe pain I was having, he started to curse me--"Whore, shut your mouth!" I started to feel enormous pains in my right hand, and mainly in my ribs on my right side, welling up inside me. Every breath was difficult and the

Suddenly I felt policemen pushing me forcefully. From the push I fell to the ground. When I was on the ground, policemen kicked me and hit me.

pains were intensified by the speed at which the van was traveling.

At the Russian Compound police station, they accused me of attacking policemen, unlawful assembly, interfering with a policeman's fulfillment of his duties, and more. I told them all the accusations were lies. I do not know why they arrested me. I only know the police hit me cruelly and I was suffering from tremendous pains in my right hand and ribs. I said that I wanted to appear before a judge so that the truth will come to light. I would not answer any other question until I was able to meet with my attorney. They then told me I would remain in detention for 48 hours. I asked to be checked by a doctor because the pains were tremendous and constant. A prison doctor did check me, and said some ribs might be broken, but did not send me for X-rays, on the grounds that there is no special treatment available for broken ribs. He gave me aspirin for the pain, and suggested I go for X-rays after being released from detention.

I was kept in jail all that night. I did not sleep the rest of the night, because of the real pain I was suffering. When I asked in the morning for a *siddur* for the morning prayers, they said they did not have any. At 10:30 AM Friday, I was released without going before a judge. I was required to post a bond of 10,000 shekels. The X-rays revealed no broken ribs, but the doctor observed the large hematoma present, as well as internal hemorrhaging and the great pain in my right

(Continued on p.9)

SPOTLIGHT ON THE EXTREMISTS

...The revival of the Detroit chapter of Americans for Peace Now was the subject of a recent front-page feature story in the *Detroit Jewish News*. Detroit Peace Now leader **Ken Knoppow** was quoted as claiming that "APN's focus is specifically Zionist." He did not explain whether he also regards the radical New Jewish Agenda organization, with which he has been affiliated, as "Zionist" too...

...The Association for Civil Rights in Israel (ACRI) failed to persuade Israel's High Court to prevent the Israeli Army from dismantling the home of Sallah Nazel, the Arab terrorist whose bomb murdered 22 Israeli bus passengers in Tel Aviv in October. ACRI attorney **Eliahu Abram** argued that there was no proof Nazel was the culprit--although Nazel left behind a videotape describing his plan--and that there was no proof Nazel had lived in the house--although Nazel's family said he did live there until shortly before the bombing...

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

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

CALL IT TREASON?

(Continued from p.6)

been for the "waste" of votes on small rightwing parties which did not obtain the 1.5% of the vote required for a Knesset seat. The Rabin government's Knesset majority of one vote for the agreement with Arafat rested on the five seats of two pro-PLO Arab parties.

2. For whatever reason, in November 1994, Rabin, who had resolutely ignored the issue of the Covenant (claiming variously that it was of no importance or that it had for practical purposes been abolished when Arafat sent a letter on September 9, 1993 promising to change it) suddenly announced that he would not agree to Palestinian elections until the PLO revoked the Charter. Rabin's record of holding the PLO to its commitments is so dismal, it is hard to take the new threats seriously, but it is interesting that he should belatedly acknowledge the importance of the Covenant.

3. It may be objected that Rabin does not intend to betray his people and a crucial element of treason is thus missing. But while few will question that Rabin is motivated by a desire to save lives by bringing peace to Israel, treason does not depend upon motivation. At the trial of Vidkun Quisling, the Norwegian whose name became synonymous with treason, the justices specifically addressed this question. A number of people testified to the defendant's good character and

Quisling's attorney insisted his client's motivation was to spare his native land unnecessary bloodshed. But the judges ruled, "The person who surrenders a place or a fighting unit in time of war to the enemy is guilty of treason, even if he saves human lives through doing so."

4. In providing the death penalty in a country which virtually has no death penalty, Israel is recognizing treason as the most serious transgression in the law code. Treason, typically, is considered worthy of specially severe punishment. In England, until 1814, the law provided that the traitor be hanged by the neck, cut down while alive, disemboweled, his entrails burned before his eyes, until, at last, mercifully, his head was cut off and his body carved in four quarters.◇

LOSS OF VALUES

(Continued from p.8)

hand with the slightest movement of that hand.

More than the ugliness and ruthlessness of the manner in which the police beat our women; more than the confiscating of the signs and the denial of the right of peaceful assembly and free speech--there remained the sad reality that the police were prepared to lie to justify their unlawful behavior. That their superiors join in such activities to suppress dissent is a sign that the very fabric of our tender democratic society is being destroyed.◇

Nadia Matar is co-chair of Women in Green.

EITHER VICTIMS OR EXECUTIONERS

Louis Rene Beres

Confronting what he once called "our century of fear," Albert Camus would have us all be "neither victims nor executioners," living not in a world in which killing has disappeared ("we are not so crazy as that"), but one wherein killing has become illegitimate. This is a fine scholarly expectation, to be sure, yet the effective result could only be an insufferable enlargement of pain, injustice and disorder, especially in the Middle East. Deprived of the capacity to act as a lawful executioner, the state of Israel would be forced by Camus' distorted reasoning to become a victim and, in relatively short order, to disappear.

Why was Camus, who was thinking, of course, in the broadest *generic* terms, and not about Israel in

The will to kill Jews, as citizens of a Jewish State should have learned from so many for so long, will always be unimpressed by Israel's particular commitments to Reason and Goodness. It follows that Jewish executioners have their distinctly rightful place in world politics...

particular, so sorely mistaken? Where, exactly, did he go wrong? By seeking an answer to this question, Israel can now learn a great deal about its own increasingly problematic survival.

My own answer to the question lies in Camus' presumption, however implicit, of a natural reciprocity among human beings and states in the matter of killing. We are asked to believe by the philosopher that as greater numbers of people agree not to become executioners, still greater numbers will follow upon the same course. In time, the argument proceeds, the number of those who refuse to sanction killing will become so great that there will be fewer and fewer victims. The problem, of course, is that Camus' presumed reciprocity does not exist, indeed, can never exist, all the more so in the Middle East. The will to kill Jews, as citizens of a Jewish State should have learned from so many for so long, will always be unimpressed by Israel's particular commitments to Reason and Goodness. It follows that Jewish executioners have their distinctly rightful place in world politics, and that without them there will only be more victims--victims like those

mothers, fathers and schoolchildren who died on a Tel Aviv bus on October 19, 1994, or in a Jerusalem shopping mall ten days earlier.

In the next-to-best-of-all-possible-worlds for Israel (the best of such worlds would be one where the Jewish State had *no* enemies at all), that country's most implacable foes would subscribe to the minimal settled norms of civilized international behavior. Here negotiations between Israelis and Palestinians might actually be sensible, and might even lead to generally gainful agreements for all parties. But Israel does not live in such an imaginary world; rather, it lives in a world wherein Jerusalem's desperate demonstrations of civility are interpreted by enemies as weakness and where Israel's repeated unwillingness to use appropriate force (because Israel wants to be "good") is taken as an invitation by uncivilized enemies to terrorize and murder.

Traced back to its origins, the barbarism of Israel's enemies (Hamas, PLO, it makes no critical difference) is rooted in frightful attitudes toward death, both individual and collective. So long as these enemies see some "remedy" for their own unbearable mortality in the killing of *outsiders*, in the killing of *Jews*, they will, as we have seen in the recent behavior of terrorists, prepare *gleefully* to become executioners. This leaves Israel with essentially three options: (1) create conditions whereby terrorist enemies of Israel can be detached from their frenzied (however unwitting) pursuit of immortality; (2) create conditions whereby these enemies can detach "final solutions" for their overriding fears of death from the killing and torturing of Jews; or (3) create conditions whereby erroneous Israeli presumptions about Reason and Goodness that have spawned more and more Jewish victims are quickly discarded, conditions favoring the prompt preparation of legal and purposeful "executioners."

Options 1 and 2, of course, are beyond the realm of possibility. Nothing Israel can do could ever affect its terrorist enemies' most deeply-rooted orientations to death and deliverance. Israel can only look seriously at Option 3, deciding to accept it, and thereby to survive, or to reject it, and thereby to "die." Although the professors and the pundits all over the world would grieve at such expressions of Israeli "inhumanity," this grief would represent little more than the altogether predictable lament of people who cannot see blood on their own hands, people with very limited intellectual capacity (in spite of their vaunted credentials) and people with very limited awareness of memory. Moreover, this pathetic and revolting lament would be far easier for Israel to bear than the consequences of a misplaced faith in Reason and Goodness, the sort of faith that presently underpins the obscene foolishness

(Continued on p.11)

THREE ARAB VOICES

(Continued from p.7)

"cops" killed 18 in a Hamas rally.

Voice No. 2 above was nameless because his remarks were tantamount to a self-proclaimed death sentence. Just expressing the thought of seriously squelching Hamas could get one killed, so while Abu Nameless may have spoken words pleasing to such as Rita Hauser and Thomas Friedman, his very anonymity speaks volumes more for the unpopularity and dangerousness of his views.

The PFLP's claim to fame in the 1960s, 70s and 80s--when not hijacking commercial aircraft-- was putting bombs aboard them and blowing one or more of them out of the sky. Habash is the mass murdering mastermind who dispatched a group of Japanese kamikazis into Lod airport in 1973 to grenade and spray the Arrivals Hall with machine-gun fire, killing and wounding dozens. (At that time too *hevra kadisha* workers were summoned to pick up human body parts and wash down walls running with human blood.) Yet here, Habash's lieutenant Malki feigns outrage when today's Hamas does more or less the same thing.

Voices 2 & 3 work to lull Israelis and the world into thinking there is hope for the Oslo process. But Sufyan Abu Zeidah was the truest voice. The so-called Palestinian Authority is not about to do anything about Hamas's Jew-killing. Peace inside the Palestinian house is more important than peace with Israel, says Abu Zeidah, exploding the Israeli government's inane strategy of hiring the PLO as body guards for the Jewish State.

The irony of the firestorm of madness

coursing through the Jewish people today--a false messianism far more dangerous than that of Shabbtai Zvi in the 17th century--is that the government in Jerusalem and its pathetic boosters in this country have adopted the discredited strategy the Likud tried in Lebanon, which these very same people hooted at and trashed (if for all the wrong reasons) a dozen years ago. Menachem Begin mistakenly believed Israel could team up with one Arab faction, the Phalange, against

Once upon a time Zionists understood that no one would fight their battles for them.

another, the PLO. But the Phalange betrayed Israel the moment the IDF crashed across the international boundary, and here is Labor deluding itself into thinking it can team up with the PLO against Hamas.

Once upon a time Zionists understood that no one would fight their battles for them. Before 1909, Jews in the Holy Land used to hire non-Jews to guard their property, but in that year a small intrepid group, admitting the failure of untrustworthy hired guns, formed *HaShomer* (The Guardian). In 1920 came *Haganah*; the *Irgun* and the Stern group came later, and then the Israel Defense Forces.

Today Israel has reverted to this failed pre-Balfour policy, and Heaven only knows why, as Heaven only knows how many more times a *hevra kadisha* will be summoned to collect Jewish body parts before this stiff-necked people wakes up.◇

J. S. Sorkin, before the word went out to applaud the Handshake, used to publish in a variety of publications.

VICTIMS OR EXECUTIONERS

(Continued from p. 10)

of a so-called Peace Process.

In the next-to-best-of-all-possible worlds for Israel, the Jewish State could choose to be neither a victim nor an executioner. But in the existing world, Israel and its terrorist enemies both operate amidst the "rules" of an authentic global anarchy, a decentralized system of power and authority wherein right is coincident with power and justice is dependent upon force. In this terrible and terrorizing world, a world whose security dynamics remain what they have been since the Peace of Westphalia in the seventeenth century and which will continue for the foreseeable future, Israel must recognize that genocide against Jews is far more than receding memory. Understood in terms of Israel's persistent unwillingness to be an executioner, it could also be a contemporary expectation.

Sadly, sometimes killing is a sacred duty! Camus failed to acknowledge this, a failure born of self-deception concerning human fears, human possibilities, and human *law*. Faced with such fears and possibilities, all law must rely, in the final analysis, on the executioner. To deny the executioner his proper place, as the ancient Hebrew, among many others, were aware, is to destroy civil society altogether, to make certain of us victims.◇

Louis Rene Beres, professor of political science at Purdue University, writes nontraditionally on matters concerning international relations and international law.

One Minute to Midnight
Dr. Irving Moskowitz

A COURAGEOUS COURT IN ISRAEL

"Israeli Military Court Sentences Palestinian to Death in Bombing," screamed the page 6 headline in the November 25 *New York Times*. The editors of the *Times*, and other likeminded liberals were shocked at the news that a three-judge Israeli military court had decreed capital punishment for an Arab involved in the Hadera bus bombing massacre last April. But ordinary Americans were not shocked. If anything, the American public would have been shocked to learn that no Arab terrorist has ever been executed by Israel.

Capital punishment for murderers is simple common sense, which is why the majority of Americans support it and why it has been the law of the land for so many years. Whether or not the death penalty deters other murderers is the subject of an intense debate among criminologists; what cannot be debated is the fact that capital punishment is the only real guarantee that the killer who has been sentenced will never again have the opportunity to kill.

This is especially the case in Israel, where the idea of life imprisonment is a joke. Terrorists who are supposed to spend the rest of their lives in jail are routinely set free in prisoner exchanges or as political "gestures." And many of them kill again.

Unfortunately, successive Israeli governments, Labor and Likud alike, have been afraid to use the death penalty because of their fear of international criticism. Thus prosecutors always ask for life imprisonment rather than the death penalty, and that's what they asked for in the case of the Hadera bomber, as well. But the three judges in the case, courageously defying political pressure and international opinion, sentenced the bomber to death anyway.

Prime Minister Rabin's spokesman, Uri Dromi, offered this comment: "This decision will generate a lot of debate, but I think the Israeli public as a whole will reject capital punishment." Dromi must be living in some fantasy world. For decades, every poll has found the overwhelming majority of Israelis in favor of the death penalty for Arab terrorists.

Unfortunately, the public does not have any say in the matter. Rabin doesn't seem to care what Israeli citizens think. The three judges did the only thing they could, and in so doing they spoke for the Israeli masses. But the sad reality is that somehow, Rabin will find a way to quash the court's wise ruling.◇

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