
OUTPOST

APRIL 1995

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

THE COST OF U.S. INVOLVEMENT

Herbert Zweibon

Before the Clinton administration makes any additional American commitments in the name of Middle East "peace," Congress and the public have a right to know just what such commitments will cost.

Let us start with the financial costs, which, directly or indirectly, will come out of American taxpayers' pockets. The Israel-Jordan treaty--from which the United States gained nothing--will cost, for starters, \$488-million in debt relief for Amman. Military and financial assistance are sure to follow in the years ahead.

An Israel-Syria treaty will cost much, much more. There will be the matter of new aid for Israel to compensate for the security risks involved in giving up the Golan Heights. There have already been reports that Israel will need at least \$5-billion in new U.S. weaponry to protect itself without the Golan. U.S. financial assistance to Damascus is likely. The Syrians will surely demand a sum equal to that provided for Israel and the Clinton administration, desperate to appear neutral, will be hard-pressed to deny a "parity" request. Like Egypt, will Syria become another beneficiary of the U.S. foreign aid program?

Is it realistic to expect the U.S. to provide such astronomical sums, especially in this era of budget-cutting. (Senator Alfonse D'Amato has cited the Mexican bailout as a factor in the dollar's recent slide. What will be the effect of another \$10-billion outlay?)

Most important, consider the cost in human lives. The Clinton administration has said that it hopes to station American troops on the Golan Heights. The Hezbollah terrorists who murdered 241 Americans in Lebanon in 1983 are headquartered just miles from the Golan. As devout followers of the ideology of the late Ayatollah Khomeini, they will do whatever is necessary to drive America, "the great Satan," out of the Middle East. American casualties will surely be part of the cost of the Administration's ill-advised role in the Mideast. The number of American casualties will depend on whether the U.S. troops are pulled out at the first sign of trouble, as in Somalia, leaving Israel to fend for itself--or whether

they are kept in place for a number of months, while public resentment (against the government and against Israel) intensifies and eventually forces the Administration to bring our troops home.

Finally, there is the cost to be paid in America's credibility. The country which has sworn to promote democracy and freedom round the globe, and which has pledged to combat international terrorism, will be appeasing and bribing the world's most notorious tyrants and terrorists. The United States, by making concessions to terrorists and their patrons, will encourage further attacks on its own soil and that of its allies.

Paying off Arab killers and weakening Israel will ultimately cost the United States far, far more--in lives, in credibility, and in dollars--than would a policy of sticking to traditional American principles and helping Israel remain strong and independent.◊

Herbert Zweibon is chairman of Americans For a Safe Israel.

IN THIS ISSUE:

<i>Poverty and Terrorism</i>	...2
<i>The Left Targets the Israeli Army</i>	...3
<i>Demands Never Ending</i>	...5
<i>Rabin Races the Clock</i>	...6
<i>Israel and Non-Proliferation</i>	...7
<i>We Cannot Be Silent</i>	...8
<i>Spotlight on the Extremists</i>	...9
<i>Syria's New Demand</i>	...12

From the Editor
Ruth King

DOES POVERTY CAUSE TERRORISM?

Is poverty really the root cause of Palestinian Arab terrorism, as is often claimed by those who favor giving U.S. money to the PLO?

The answer is no, according to senior Israeli intelligence officials. The Israeli daily *Ha'aretz* reported on March 6 that during a briefing for the Rabin cabinet, intelligence officials asserted that "Contrary to the common assumption that economic despair increases the support for Islamic organizations, Hamas has many supporters within the elite of the territories." They also noted that while public support for Hamas in Judea, Samaria and Gaza is between 25% and 30%, support for Hamas in the Arab universities in the territories is from 40% to as high as 60%. That being the case, why in the world should the Clinton administration continue sending American money to the PLO?◇

THOSE PEACEFUL EGYPTIANS

The Israel-Egypt treaty of 1978-79 is often cited as the model for future Israeli treaties with other Arab regimes. It is therefore worth noting that although the treaty with Egypt prohibits Cairo from engaging in "hostile propaganda" against Israel, an editorial in the government-controlled *Egyptian Gazette* had this to say on January 16: "I have to congratulate Foreign Minister Amr Moussa on his terse reply to the Israeli foreign ministry's overweening declarations...It seems that Israel has forgotten the lesson of October 6, 1973, when its army was totally vanquished and its 'valiant' soldiers were chased in the desert like rats...The Foreign Minister slammed the Israelis, saying that he threw the Israeli newspapers into the only fit place: the waste bin. Apparently, the Israeli arrogance was so trying to Moussa's patience that he slammed them with the truth in plain terms...The problem with the Jews is that they are ungrateful and compulsive liars." ◇

THE "HOLY" COVENANT

The PLO has no intention of ever changing its National Covenant, says its director of "Education, Culture and Science," Mr. Jihad Karshuli. In an interview with the Jordanian newspaper *El-Ro'i* on March 7, Karshuli said that the Covenant "is holy to the Palestinian people." Before Israel asks the PLO to change its Covenant,

Karshuli declared, Israel "should void the charter of the Zionist movement which calls for the establishment of greater Israel from the Euphrates to the Nile."

Of course, no such "charter" of "the Zionist movement" exists, nor has any faction of the Zionist movement ever advocated taking over the area from the Euphrates to the Nile. Every faction of the PLO, by contrast, has been consistently loyal to the PLO Covenant, with its unholy calls for murdering Israelis and destroying the state of Israel.

As for Karshuli's remark about Israel "asking" the PLO to change the Covenant, there's no need for Israel to ask. Yasser Arafat already promised, as part of the Oslo accord, to change the Covenant. The fact that 18 months have passed since Arafat made that promise, with no sign whatsoever that he has any intention of fulfilling it, demonstrates yet again the utter worthlessness of Arafat's signature and, indeed, of the accord itself.◇

THE U.N., AGAIN

Those who thought that the Oslo accord would bring about a new attitude toward Israel at the United Nations were sorely mistaken. Veteran Jewish diplomat Morris Abram, who now heads the Geneva-based group "U.N. Watch," revealed at a Jerusalem press conference on February 27 that despite Israel's many concessions to the Arabs, there has been no fundamental change in the U.N.'s treatment of the Jewish state. "In 1994, there were still 21 anti-Israel resolutions passed in the General Assembly," Abram said. He also pointed out that the U.N. has taken no steps to rescind the many anti-Israel resolutions it has passed since 1948--so numerous, Abram said, that they take up more than five pounds of paper. Abram's remarks are a welcome dose of reality at a time when certain Rabin government officials still prattle about the imminent dawning of a "new world order."◇

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.

THE LEFT TARGETS THE ISRAELI ARMY: THE CASE OF THE NEW ARMY ETHICAL CODE

Erich Isaac

Israel's journalists, many of her professors, her best known (at least abroad) writers and poet, her actors and playwrights, revisionist historians, together have scored enormous successes in their efforts to blacken Israel's image abroad and to undermine among Israel's Jews the belief in the justice of their own cause. Yet for all the radical left's success in the cultural war, Israel's friends were confident that one crucial institution remained immune to the ideological onslaught--namely, the army. And as long as the army's morale remained high, the state, despite its ring of enemies, enjoyed reasonable security.

But now that the Labor government, dominated ideologically by Meretz, has joined the ranks of those who scorn traditional Zionism, the army has become the target of efforts to remove all traces of Zionism from Israeli institutions. The recently promulgated "new" ethical code for the Israel Defense Forces (Tzahal), entitled "The Spirit of Tzahal, Values and General Principles" has been two years in the making. The change that has received the most publicity--and hence is most widely known by the general public in Israel--is the deletion of "Ahavat ha'aretz" or "love of the land" as a component of the soldier's code. When there were protests from the public, the response was that "love of the land" could be taken for granted and therefore need not be included in the code.

However, an article in February 1995 in the Israeli journal *Nekuda* entitled "The Unkosher Document of Asa Kasher," by Meira Dolev, makes it clear that the change in the code was but a small facet of a broad effort to transform the army's values to correspond to the radical left's view of Israel's ethical mission--namely, to foster all nationalisms but its own. Member of Knesset Limor Livnat (Likud) has been collecting documents and publications put out by the army's education department since the Oslo agreement and has (thus far vainly) sought to persuade the Knesset to take up the issue of the ongoing deliberate effort to turn soldiers into "post Zionists"--to take Zionism and Judaism out of the soldier's moral frame of reference.

For the "Ethical Code: List of Basic Values, Their Definition and Components" does much more than remove the phrase "love of the land." In the original draft for the new code, the state of Israel was defined simply as "a democratic state" and nothing else. The draft said: "In a democratic state the highest value is accorded to human life" and "The state of Israel is a democratic state and all its organs operate according to democratic

principles." There is no mention of a Jewish state or a state of Jews or a Zionist state.

Dolev points out that the thread binding together the ethical code and the various documents, bulletins, questionnaires and other material Livnat has assembled is the ideology of a single man--Professor Asa Kasher. According to Livnat: "Asa Kasher determines the entire

There is no mention of a Jewish state or a state of Jews or a Zionist state.

program of education of Tzahal." Livnat says that there is not a provable connection to Kasher in the case of each of the documents in her possession, but his influence is felt through all of them. Kasher's office, notes Livnat, is next to that of the army's education officer and from this post he injects his ideological poison throughout the system. When, prior to its adoption, officers and soldiers debated the code (which was hammered out over a two year period) in various forums and protested the absence of any reference to Jews and Zionism, it was Kasher, the code's chief architect, who dismissed the objections. A Jewish State? But what of the Druze, said Kasher. Zionism? But there are a thousand definitions of Zionism.

Incredibly, despite some qualms, the general staff approved the final version of this anti-Zionist code, despite the fact that in all the official documents of the state, including the basic laws, it is said, unequivocally, that Israel is a Jewish Zionist state and not only a democratic state. In the end, a "compromise" was reached whereby for the sake of balance, "democratic" was dropped along with "Jewish" and "Zionist." Israel now had no distinctive identity at all according to the army's moral code. It was simply "a state."

The compound term "Eretz-Yisrael" also never appears in the new code. Not only is "Ahavat ha'aretz" (the love of the land) banned from the code (one of the senior officers tried, in vain, to restore it), but in every page only "the state" is used--although, ironically, "the state" is a concept generally looked upon with disdain in Israel's progressive circles, who imply that it is at least incipiently fascist. Yet "the state" becomes the highest value in this "progressive" moral code.

Dolev points out that the distortions of this moral code reach their pinnacle in the definition of the value of

(Continued on p.4)

THE LEFT TARGETS THE ISRAELI ARMY

(Continued from p.3)

loyalty. The "loyalty of the soldiers of Israel," says the code, "is their devotion to the state of Israel (*medinat Yisrael*), their homeland." Absurd, says Dolev. Since when is a state (*medina*) a homeland (*moledet*)? A state is a political creation and a political creation cannot be a homeland. A country is a homeland of a people, not a state. The word homeland was apparently put in by a worried general staff, which feared an outraged public reaction if it had said merely that the loyalty of the soldiers of Israel is to the state.

There are those who take pride that this moral code could be used by any army on earth. But as Dolev points out, it is precisely the will to be like any other army that shows how distorted this code is. It is difficult to believe that there is any army in the world whose soldiers lack attachment to their land, to their history, to their specific identity. There is no army that is not committed to the borders of its country and is not ready to fight for them if they are imperiled.

As an afterthought, a preface was attached to the code and this is the only place where any of the customary values of Israel's fighting forces are preserved. The preface refers to the traditions of the Jewish people as well as to democratic principles. But, as Dolev points out, "a preface is only a preface" and not integral to the document. Israel's soldiers are being indoctrinated in an ethical code empty of spirit.

Who, then, is Asa Kasher? A man of the outer left, he is professor of philosophy, with a chair in professional ethics at Tel Aviv University. Some samples from his writing:

In *Koteret Rashit*, October 31, 1984: "The status of the Old City [of Jerusalem] has to be modeled on that of the Vatican. In the framework of a peace treaty, and in accordance with the citizenship law, one can allow Palestinian refugees to return to Israel. According to my mind, one can return refugees to Jaffa...In order to keep the Jewish majority and the democratic regime of the state, it is possible it will be necessary to accord the Galilee a special status, for example, an autonomous region in a federative tie with Israel."

In *Al Hamishmar*, December 20, 1991: "I regard the Law of Return as a temporary law."

In *Ha'aretz*, September 16, 1988: "To call someone 'religious' means...to classify him in a special social group...I would not like to be catalogued in this particular drawer from which a nationalist, messianic and racist stench arises. It is clear that any decent man should speedily remove himself from there."

In *Ha'aretz*, September 16, 1988: "Today *Eretz Yisrael* is first and foremost the name of a malignant disease."

In *Al Hamishmar*, December 20, 1991: "To my

sorrow, to say that Begin and Shamir are racist is correct. It is correct on the level of their ideology and correct on the level of their policy."

In *Al Hamishmar*, April 17, 1992: "I am much closer to the feeling that from the point of view of values, and from a social point of view, this state is a lost cause. The clearest symptom of normalization that I can think of is emigration from Israel."

In *Politika*, September 11, 1988: "Power worship and messianism, which have entrenched themselves in the right, are among the sworn enemies of justice. An enormous abyss lies between them and us. We must struggle in various ways against the government's self-authorization to break international law in its activities in the territories conquered in 1967."

In *The Border of Obedience*, 1985: "It is a sign of the poverty of the Israeli government that among the fundamental laws is an empty declaration concerning Jerusalem."

Dolev points out that Livnat Limor collected Kasher's writings and submitted them to Rabin and Deputy Minister Mordechai Gur, who simply ignored them. The only responses she could obtain from the various ministries were letters reiterating the same irrelevant point: that Kasher never said Israelis should not serve in the army. When Livnat read from Kasher's writings in the Knesset, Gur was apparently genuinely shocked. "Is this matter before the Commission?" asked Gur. "Yes," said Livnat. "And despite the fact that I have provided all this material I keep getting the same answer, which has no relation to what I have written in my letters. What do I have to do so that someone will read this material and give me a real answer?"

But the only new answer Livnat has received from Kasher's defenders is that he is "the" expert on ethics. After all, he has the chair in professional ethics and the philosophy of practice at Tel Aviv University, the only chair of its kind in the country. He is Expert No. 1 in the area.

But as Dolev points out, one has to ask why he is proclaimed Expert No. 1 in an area which, like any academic area, is marked by sharply divergent standpoints. The expertise of Kasher is limited to a particular perspective on ethics, those with a different perspective will argue. In an area with sharply different approaches, there is no such thing as the top expert. So why was there not a

(Continued on p.10)

DEMANDS NEVER ENDING

J. S. Sorkin

Member of Knesset Ze'ev Binyamin Begin, son of the late Menachem who named him for his mentor, Jabotinsky, is a worthy successor to both his namesakes. Recently he exposed a top secret Israeli Army analysis supporting, willy-nilly, the Israeli right's view of the dreadful security situation and the Arab world's unrelenting negative intentions. And now he has brought to light (*Yediot Ahronot*, March 1, 1995) some of the material being published by the Palestinian Authority's Information Ministry, i.e. Fatah's born-again propaganda apparatus.

Two years ago, after a vicious 35 year-career, this writers' shop of anti-Israel hacks was near financial asphyxiation. Resuscitated by the Rabin government, which brought Arafat back to life, these anti-Israel scribes are back in business. The pamphlets offer an excellent insight into what the PLO conceives as the next stages of the "peace process." For example, PA Information Ministry Pamphlet No. 5 speaks of ongoing "Jewish immigration to Palestine and its destructive influence on the peace process." Translation: As a condition for "real" peace after the Oslo process has run its course, the Palestinian Authority will ask for restrictions on Jewish immigration. After all, peaceful coexistence requires that, since Palestinians and Israelis are destined to share the land west of the Jordan--all 45 miles of it--the Palestinians should have some say in the size of the Jewish population. Fairness dictates that the two peoples' shared natural resources must not be strained to the benefit or detriment of either party, and a population imbalance created by Jewish in-migration (*aliya*) might cause that...

Elsewhere, the pamphlet defines the state of Israel as an "area conquered in 1948." Translation: the 1947 United Nations boundaries are the "true" boundaries of the Jewish state, so Palestinians can be expected --after the Oslo process is complete and after they have their state-- to continue to demand that Israel rectify the past injustice of having expanded beyond the lines the UN assigned it in 1947 by returning to them.

While ideological leftists like Peres, Beilin and others may see an Arab state west of the Jordan as the end of the peace process, the Arabs give every indication they don't. Pamphlet No. 5 is evidence there will be no end to their demands.

In Pamphlet No.6, "Palestinian refugees and the right of return" is discussed, as the authors claim (falsely) that U.N. General Assembly Resolution 194 of November 11, 1948 "guaranteed the right of return of all Palestinians who wanted to return and live in peace with their neighbors."

Today the PA reckons their number at 2.7- million, while Safed-born Nabil Sha'ath has recently spoken of at least 100,000 returning to the Galilee alone as a condition for "real" peace.

According to the Palestinian Authority's Information Ministry, the Palestinian people have never accepted the Balfour Declaration and "The partition of Palestine was lacking any foundation and was illegal..."

Above all, the pamphlets complain that the state of Israel arose because "all the Arab and international attempts to convince the Jews to agree to accept an autonomous regime of self-government were condemned to failure." Translation: the tragedy of the Arabs was their failure to persuade the Jews before 1948 to live under autonomy offered by Arabs. And since then, the Arab world has been out of joint. In *Dar al Islam*, the Realm of Peace and of submission to divine and human diktat, it is not right for Jews to offer autonomy to Arabs; it is Arabs who offer autonomy to Jews. For fourteen centuries the Jews were *dhimmi*, a "protected" people shielded by the civil authority from the rabble's urge to pillage, rape and plunder. The Jews were a nation who had autonomy granted to them by the Faithful.

Jews do not even have the right to rule as a majority over an Arab minority within the 1947 lines, and sooner or later the Palestinian Authority will find a way to put the world back in joint.

All this, it bears repeating, is issuing from putative Arafat "moderates," those who promised just eighteen months ago to rewrite their blood-curdling Covenant but have not. One of the great untruths of the 20th century is the myth that Arafat and his minions are more "moderate" than other PLO groups. On the contrary, Fatah became the biggest and most popular precisely because its adherents were killing Jews in greater numbers than other gangs.

In a word, these pamphlets show how the same mindset which gave rise to the text of the PLO Covenant thirty years ago is still at work; that there has been no change of thought, let alone heart.

Some will scoff that any concern over these pamphlets and their rhetoric is excessive, an overreaction to Arab political discourse with its known penchant for bombast and hyperbole, and in any case the booklets were written with a domestic audience in mind.

But why, then, asks the estimable Mr. Begin, were they written in English?

It takes a special arrogance to believe with today's Meretz-Labor philosopher-kings that one can placate the Arabs by giving them a mini-state which (supposedly) will never constitute a danger to Israel; that the Arabs will be happy to live next to the bigger, richer, more advanced and above all more heavily armed Jewish state; that in this Levantine Lesotho the Arabs will feel no resentment and never attribute their inferior political, military and

(Continued on p.6)

Ruth King

RABIN RACES THE CLOCK

Israel's emissaries, in pleading the case for Israel's surrender of security and national rights before skeptical audiences, always proclaim their insistence on "normalization" of relationships before they sign treaties and accords. They then offer the example of the Camp David accords as an illustration of how wonderful it is when peace--a cold peace, but peace nonetheless--is obtained. Lately, these diplomats have been in high gear, racing against a clock which is ticking like a time bomb.

There are three real reasons for their rush. First, they are trying to push through an agreement with Syria based on a guarantee of American military "peacekeepers" on the Golan Heights. Although this is the only way they can convince some of the Israeli public to accept full withdrawal, the American public has indicated that it is broadly opposed to this policy. The second reason is that the agreements with the PLO are quickly unraveling, and it is quite possible that Yasser Arafat could lose Arab elections in Judea, Samaria and Gaza, discrediting once and for all the stupid notion that he either wants to or can put an end to terrorism. Their third, and major reason for the rush is the fact that the highly-vaunted Camp David agreement is soon to be relegated to the dustbin of

history. At the recent conference convened in Casablanca, among the thick notebooks of the agenda, were several maps of the region. Not one--repeat, not one--included Israel in the region, despite the fact that the conference was convened at Israel's behest. Furthermore, the government-sponsored media in Egypt is full of anti-Semitic cartoons, editorials, and the radio programs resound with anti-Jewish fulminations. Is this, one should ask the Israelis, the way to normalize relations?

Israel's government, its emissaries, and its so-called negotiators remind one not of serious statesmen and diplomats, but rather of those battered and abused women who come to believe that they somehow deserve the beating. When an outsider tries to intervene, he is told that it is a "private" matter. Bluntly put, these unfortunate women seem to say, "Hit me. The more you do, the more I love it." And no matter how brutal the beating, they keep going back for more.◇

DEMANDS

(Continued from p.5)

economic status to the Jews next door; that they will cease their violence and live in peace; that they will demand no more. The people of Israel will pay dearly for their arrogance.◇

J.S.Sorkin writes about Mideast issues for various publications.

SPOTLIGHT ON THE RABIN GOVERNMENT

..."What is most important is not what the people want. What is important is what is needed for the people." So said Prime Minister Rabin in a March 7 address to a convention of Reform rabbis in Jerusalem. Rabin was defending his intention to make more concessions to the Arabs, regardless of public opposition to his policies...

...Rabin's Minister of Communications, Shulamit Aloni, has proposed that the PLO be given control over territory in the Negev, within pre-1967 Israel, as "compensation" for Jewish construction in the Jerusalem area. "We must not give the Gazans the feeling that we're just getting rid of Gaza, and telling them to stay imprisoned there and sort out their own problems," Aloni declared on March 5. Peace Now leader Galia Golan said she "welcomes" the Aloni proposal...

...Following the March 19 attack on an Israeli bus traveling to Hebron, Rabin's Environment Minister, Yossi Sarid, said that if it were up to him, "the Jewish community of Hebron would be uprooted and taken out immediately." Sarid said that the presence of a Jewish

community in Hebron "interferes with the peace process"...

...Danny Miyodobnik, spokesman for Rabin's coalition partner, the Meretz Party, told an interviewer that "The problem is that the public does not differentiate between an attack [terrorist] against settlers inside the 'territories' and an attack in the heart of Tel Aviv"...

...At a March 9 press conference with Yasser Arafat, Rabin's Foreign Minister, Shimon Peres, for the first time referred to Arafat by the Arabic term *rais*, which means president. Previously, Rabin government officials had emphasized their refusal to use the term *rais* as evidence that Rabin will not permit PLO self-rule to evolve into statehood. Asked by reports about his use of that term, Peres replied, "the title of Mr. Arafat in the Arabic language is *rais*, in Hebrew it is *Yoshev Rosh* (chairman). We have difficulties only in English. When it comes to Hebrew and Arabic there are no problems"...

...Knesset Member Hashem Mahamid (Communist Party), one of five Arab MKs whose votes have given Rabin his governing majority, declared in an interview in March that terrorist attacks against Israelis in the territories are justified. "As long as there is occupation there is resistance, and any act of resistance is justified." No comment from Rabin...

ISRAEL AND NON-PROLIFERATION

Marian Leighton

Arms control is back in the headlines in the form of non-proliferation, and Israel is in the docket for its reluctance to join the bandwagon. The chief plaintiff is Egypt, leading a type of class action for the Arab League and also purporting to act as judge of Israel's alleged intransigence. At stake for the prosecution is an apparent need to talk tough to Israel in order to preserve a leading role in the nonaligned movement and to counter Islamic fundamentalist influence at home. At stake for the defense is national security and, potentially, survival in the face of enemy states wielding weapons of mass destruction.

Exhibit A in Israel's latest trial in the court of world opinion is the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), which comes up for renewal at an international conference opening on April 17. The pact was signed by more than 50 nations at a White House ceremony on July 1, 1968, and it entered into force in 1970 for an initial period of 25 years. The treaty now has 169 adherents. A majority (85) is needed for renewal.

The signing occurred only a year after the Six Day Arab-Israeli war--a conflict that strained Israel's ties with Washington on two counts: the Johnson administration's failure to react forcefully to Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser's *casus belli* closure of the Straits of Tiran; and the Israeli Air Force's attack on the naval intelligence ship USS *Liberty*. After the war, Washington sought to project an evenhanded policy between Israel and the Arab world by, among other things, resisting Israel's request for F-4 Phantom fighter planes to offset the introduction of Soviet MiG fighters into Egypt. Then, at a presidential news conference, journalist Dan Rather asked LBJ whether the United States had "the same kind of unwavering commitment to defend Israel against invasion as we have in South Vietnam." The president replied that despite a "very definite interest in Israel...we do not have a mutual security treaty with them, as we do in Southeast Asia." The cumulative effect of these events was to reinforce Israel's perception--first nourished during the Suez crisis of 1956--that America was an inconstant ally.

When the Non-Proliferation Treaty was drafted, Israel's nuclear weapons program was well advanced, the U.S. government's efforts during the administration of Lyndon Johnson to obtain an Israeli signature on the NPT proved unavailing.

Richard Nixon and his national security adviser, Henry Kissinger, were markedly more sympathetic to Israel's nuclear ambitions than was the Johnson administration. Moreover, they paid only lip service to the NPT and seemed to regard nuclear proliferation as inevitable and, in cases like Israel's, justifiable. In 1969 Nixon ended the inspections of Dimona that the United States had begun under the Kennedy administration. Aware of Israel's opposition to inspections by the International

Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), JFK had agreed to let an all American team do the job--and had tossed a contingent of Hawk missiles for Israel into the bargain. Nevertheless, the inspections were an irritant to the Israelis, who concocted clever stratagems to frustrate the team.

A relatively stable situation prevailed for most of the period after the NPT entered into force in 1970. Washington never formally extended its nuclear umbrella over Israel; but during the bipolar Cold war era, the U.S. commitment to Israel's security implicitly protected it against a Soviet attack. Meanwhile, Israel retained its status as an undeclared nuclear power; and the United States let sleeping dogs lie with regard to Israel's nuclear arsenal, even after Dimona technician Mordechai Vanunu publicly disclosed Israeli nuclear secrets during an extraordinary insider's interview with the London *Sunday Times* in 1986. Vanunu was kidnapped by Israeli agents and is now in prison.

In the 1990s a number of occurrences brought the issue of nuclear proliferation to the forefront of government agendas in Washington and elsewhere. First, Iraqi Scud attacks against Israel during Desert Storm sparked U.S. fears that chemical warheads would be fitted on the Scuds, forcing the Israelis to respond with the threat or use of nuclear weapons. Second, IAEA inspections conducted in Iraq after its defeat in the war revealed a widespread and well advanced nuclear weapons program by a nation determined to eradicate the presence of the "Zionist entity" in the Middle East. Third, the intelligence sources confirmed that several other anti-Western and anti-Israeli countries--notably Iran and North Korea--had embarked on an accelerated quest for nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. Fourth, the ramifications of the collapse of the Soviet Union--and particularly of its military forces and its military-industrial complex--became alarmingly evident. These included the sudden emergence of three new nuclear republics (Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan); the problem of "loose

***At stake for Israel is survival
in the face of enemy states wield-
ing weapons of mass destruction.***

nukes," i.e. tactical nuclear weapons deployed throughout the former Soviet Union under probably inadequate supervision, etc.

The key points of the NPT are a prohibition on the transfer of nuclear weapons or devices by nuclear states to non-nuclear states and an acceptance by all signatories of full-scope IAEA safeguard inspections of declared nuclear facilities, as well as challenge inspections of suspected facilities. The treaty permits the transfer to non-nuclear nations of nuclear technologies for peaceful purposes. Finally, Article VI of the NPT commits the parties to pursue "negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear

(Continued on p.8)

NON-PROLIFERATION

(Continued from p.7)

arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament and a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control."

The NPT's lack of sanctions or penalties for non-compliance gives nuclear wannabes a powerful incentive to sign the treaty, develop or acquire "peaceful" nuclear technologies, proceed to weaponization, and then opt out of the pact. Such situations create serious obstacles for democratic countries that might wish to respond in kind--a phenomenon seen in the U.S. agonizing over whether to declare a "material breach" of Soviet compliance with the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaties (SALT) that would require a U.S. response or to ignore the violations and continue to observe the treaty's provisions.

In a manner reminiscent of its attitude toward Soviet SALT infringements, Washington deems the NPT to be so important that it must be preserved despite proven circumventions by parties such as Iraq and North Korea. Moreover, Washington's handling of North Korea's defiance will encourage other rogue nations to accelerate their quest for nuclear weapons to use as bargaining chips for U.S. favors or as instruments of blackmail.

Nevertheless, a great deal of U.S. wishful thinking resides in the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and the confrontation with North Korea does not seem to have shattered American illusions. The NPT has attained a hallowed place in the U.S. pantheon of arms-control documents--so much so that Washington is pressing forward with a dubiously conceived Comprehensive Nuclear Test

Ban Treaty (CTBT) in the belief that visible progress toward such a ban will create the most propitious environment for permanent extension of the NPT. The fact that aspiring nuclear powers are motivated by considerations of regional rivalries, status and prestige, diplomatic advantage, and the ambitions of egotistical rulers rather than by weapons testing on the part of nuclear club members seems to escape U.S. arms-control enthusiasts. Israel's nuclear arsenal is a convenient pretext for the Arabs and Iranians to withhold their signatures from the NPT and pursue their own nuclear weapons programs.

The situation regarding Israel and the NPT is more perilous than that relating to the United States and SALT. America retained a robust nuclear capability under the SALT treaties, which were designed to cap the superpower arsenals rather than reduce them. In the case of the NPT, Israel would be required to commit to the dismantling of its nuclear arsenal. The only parties to the NPT that signed as nuclear-weapons states are the five declared members of the nuclear club: the United States, the USSR (succeeded by Russia), Britain, France and China. If the Israelis signed as a non-nuclear state (apparently the only option available to them since, while there is no specific stipulation that an NPT signatory must declare itself a non-nuclear weapons state, no precedent exists for adherence by undeclared nuclear weapons states) and moved towards nuclear disarmament, they could be fatally disadvantaged if one of their Middle Eastern enemies subsequently withdrew from the treaty and brandished a nuclear capability.

These are questions worth pondering as the U.S. campaign to promote extension (preferably permanent)

(Continued on p.11)

WE CANNOT BE SILENT

George K. Bernstein

Zion was a wilderness, Jerusalem a desolation. Our sacred Temple...was burned to the ground. We mourn its destruction, and the ruin of Jerusalem of old. And in gratitude and joy we celebrate Jerusalem of gold.

These words from the *Neilah* prayer service on Yom Kippur underlie the concerns of many with the evolving "peace process."

For almost 2,000 years, a central element of our prayers has been the restoration of the Jewish state and the return to Jerusalem. No individual or government, however well-intentioned, has the right to imperil the realization of those prayers.

Israel exists not just for its current citizens, but for all Jews, everywhere. It is a sanctuary and a sacred

trust to be held for every Jew--for today's, for those unborn, for those who died dreaming of a Jewish homeland and for those who perished because it wasn't there.

The state of Israel is the fulfillment of the yearnings and dedication of generations of Jews, throughout the diaspora. Until the Zionist movement only a century ago, those longings were mostly expressed in prayers by those who knew they would never see the promised land, but who lived and died in the hope that their descendants would.

Without the efforts of Zionists throughout the world, and particularly in America, "Next year in Jerusalem" might still be an unanswered prayer; the United Nations in 1947 would not have ended the British Mandate; May 14, 1948, would not have seen the birth of the state of Israel; and there might be no refuge for Russian, Ethiopian, Mideastern and other Jews fleeing oppression.

To recognize this debt in no way diminishes the sacrifice of Israelis who fought and died to establish and preserve the state and who continue at risk. But American Jewry has no more need to apologize for not making *aliyah* than did Herzl, and does not forfeit its right to champion Israel's survival. All Jews, not just those "on the

(Continued on p.10)

SPOTLIGHT ON THE EXTREMISTS

...A Palestinian Arab cameraman for Worldwide Television News, **Abdul Rahman Khabeisa**, was arrested in Nablus for urging Arab youths to throw rocks at Israelis so that he could film them. Another Worldwide Television News camera crew clashed with Israeli security personnel at the scene of the Arab terrorist attack in which Miss Ofra Felix was murdered, in February. The medical team trying to save Miss Felix's life asked the cameramen to leave, but they refused, and one of them reportedly struck a security officer...

...Just days after his election as chairman of the Jewish Agency, **Avraham Burg** held a meeting in his new Agency office with a group of eight Labor Party Knesset Members, to discuss ways to pressure the Rabin government to make more concessions to the Arabs. Burg's improper use of his Jewish Agency office was especially ironic in view of the fact that he had campaigned for the Agency job by emphasizing the corruption charges that led to the ouster of his predecessor, Simcha Dinitz...

...When **Milan Kubic** was the chief Mideast correspondent for *Newsweek*, from 1976-1988, he claimed to be an impartial journalist. But now that he is back in the U.S., Kubic is showing his true colors. In a February 4 letter to the *Washington Post*, Kubic blasted the Labor governments of the 1970s for permitting some Jewish settlements. "The Labor Party worked quietly while the Likud beat the religious-nationalist drums," Kubic complained. "Looking back on the whole history of seizing and populating Arab land, the so-called 'dovish' Labor party makes Likud look like a rank amateur"...

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Editor
Outpost
Dear Editor:

Steven Plaut ("The World According to B'Tselem," March) did a fine job of exposing the hypocrisy of the leftwing "human rights" group B'Tselem, especially its morally repugnant attempt to absolve the Arabs of responsibility for the death of Tirza Porat.

Miss Porat was one of the group of hiking students who were stoned by an Arab mob in the West Bank Arab town of Beita in 1988. The students' guard fired back at the Arabs, and at first succeeded in keeping them at bay, but several of the rioters managed to overcome him. In the process of their attack on the guard, a bullet from his gun hit and killed Miss Porat.

The media and the Jewish left had a field day with this incident, declaring that "trigger-happy" guard, a "rightwing," "Arab-hating" settler, was to blame for killing

April 1995

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 Yitschak 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

the girl. Although Mr. Plaut did not mention this in his article, the fact is that the Israeli Army's report on the Beita pogrom concluded that the Arabs, not the guard, were responsible for the girl's death. I was living in Israel at the time of the controversy, and I vividly recall how the leftwing elements in the Israeli media highlighted the accusations that the guard was to blame, but were virtually silent when the Army's report came out. The Army found that the bullet which killed her was fired either as the Arabs were stoning him into unconsciousness, or as they were grabbing his gun away from him. In other words, the Arabs either pulled the trigger themselves, or caused it to happen by their violent assault.

Marvin E. Berger
Great Neck, NY

WE CANNOT BE SILENT

(Continued from p.8)

ground," have both the right and the obligation to demand that the current trustees of the Jewish state do nothing to endanger its existence.

The prophet Isaiah recognized that obligation:

*For Zion's sake will I not hold My peace,
And for Jerusalem's sake I will not rest...
I have set watchmen upon thy walls, O
Jerusalem. They shall never hold their
peace day or night.*

When the future of Jerusalem and Zion is at stake, as it is today, we can do no less than openly debate the wisdom of strategies that affect that future: Is Israel best served by negotiating from strength or weakness? Is it wise to build up an enemy in the hope that it will become more peace-loving in that new-found strength? Can Israel, despite the fact that wars and territory are still won on the ground, safely rely on missiles and air power while abandoning such high ground as the Judean and Samaritan highlands and the Golan? Can Israel reasonably place its destiny in the hands of international "peacekeepers," whose nations have repeatedly demonstrated lack of commitment and staying power? Will the geography of the Golan, unlike that of the Sinai, invite terrorist attacks on such outside forces? Will any reasonably anticipated peacekeeping or monitoring force on the Golan constitute either a political or military deterrence to invasion by Syria? Will the presence of American forces constrain the ability of Israel to launch a 1967-type pre-emptive strike against Syria? And has adequate consideration been given to the chilling specter of Israeli and American troops in the Golan killing each other?

We cannot be dissuaded from raising these questions by charges of disloyalty, particularly from self-anointed "Peace Now" groups in the United States who for over a decade sought to bring down the government of Israel by questioning not just its tactics but its integrity and morality. These advocates of unilateral capitulation bear the guilt of having contributed to the demoralization of a strife-weary people, the defeat of its government and the undermining of the state so that it could be pressured to surrender precious land for unsecured promises. It ill behooves them to criticize any Jew for challenging the strategies or tactics of the current Israeli government.

We have the right and obligation to demand that the trustees of the Jewish state distinguish between unwarranted hopes and realistic expectations. Jeremiah rightly denounced those false prophets who detected "peace" when it was neither present nor likely. Blind hope of peace may be temporarily comforting, but it is self-deceiving when it obscures the very real and continuing threats to Israel's existence as a nation.

There is no Jew, anywhere, who does not desire peace, but it must be one that offers realistic hope of Israel's survival. There is little evidence of peace when the most important conditions of the "peace process" have been broken by the "Palestinians," and when the Arab

world, by words and deeds, is still committed to the destruction of the Jewish state. The "process" has, to many, become an end in itself, but without the "peace."

We understand the fatigue of a people in constant danger, but there are worse things than an absence of tranquility. Israel has not been invaded for more than twenty years--only because of her strength. Although murders of innocent Israelis by Arab terrorists are tragic, the alternative of mass attacks on vulnerable communities or even of a defeated Israel is unspeakable. Nor have the risks taken through the "peace process" been justified by the elimination or reduction of these murders--they have not only continued but have increased. Uncertainty may be painful, but it is preferable to an Israel that surrenders its defenses in the unrealistic expectation of good faith by sworn enemies.

An unfortunate trait of too many Jews is the need to be liked by non-Jews, even if it requires compromising legitimate self-interests. This characteristic may be unfortunate in individuals. It can be fatal in a nation. Better the survival of an Israel unloved by a world that holds it to suicidal standards observed by no other nation, than the destruction of a weakened but "acceptable" Jewish state. We do not need more Holocaust museums, reflecting the world's belated guilt over the next slaughter of our people.

We need not take issue with the good faith of Israel's leaders, but we cannot bear silent witness to actions that may deny us Zion and Jerusalem for another 2,000 years.◊

This address was delivered by George K. Bernstein on the occasion of his inauguration as president of the Louis D. Brandeis District of the Zionist Organization of America last year.

ISRAELI ARMY

(Continued from p.4)

committee of three or five academics to shape the code? There were committees but anyone who did not echo the views of Kasher was not invited again.

And so the army's ethical code reflects the views of a radical anti-Zionist. There are already many indications that the army's morale is at an all time low. The government is seeking to screen out "political undesirables" (i.e. those who believe in Israel's right to the Land of Israel) at the point of entry into the army, steering them into positions where they can do no "harm." Israel's last line of defense is crumbling with a rapidity that few recognize.◊

Erich Isaac, professor emeritus at the City University of New York, is a member of the executive committee of Americans For a Safe Israel and the editorial board of Outpost.

NON-PROLIFERATION

(Continued from p.8)

of the NPT swings into high gear.

On January 21, 1995, Robert Pelletreau, U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Near East Affairs, met in Egypt with Foreign Minister Amr Moussa. According to the *Washington Times*, his mission was to "try to ease a crisis between Cairo and Israel over the signing of the NPT." The *Washington Post* stated on January 19 that "after years of diplomatic partnership between Egypt and Israel, relations between the two countries have soured noticeably in recent months over Israel's refusal to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty."

This U.S. press coverage of the issue was considerably slanted, however. First of all, the "crisis" was created by Egypt's contention that it would not agree to renew its adherence to the NPT unless Israel signs (or at least commits itself to sign in the near future) and that it would urge the 22-member Arab League to follow its lead. Egypt's underlying motivations are to reassert its traditional leading role in the Arab League and the nonaligned movement, to divert attention from its domestic difficulties, and to steal some of the Islamic fundamentalists' thunder by demonstrating that it isn't soft on Israel. Secondly, the "diplomatic partnership" between Israel and Egypt has never amounted to more than a cold peace. Aside from establishing diplomatic ties with Israel, Egypt has not fulfilled any of its commitments under the 1979 Camp David Accord to normalize relations. Economic and cultural ties between the countries remain virtually nonexistent, Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak has never set foot in Israel during his 14 years in power, and anti-"Zionist" and anti-Semitic propaganda remain staple fare in the Egyptian mass media.

U.S. Secretary of Defense William Perry visited Israel shortly after Pelletreau's visit. Although Washington denied that it was exerting any pressure on the Israelis to sign the NPT, it is noteworthy that Perry's journey included stops in India and Pakistan, the two countries in addition to Israel that are undeclared nuclear powers and principal holdouts from the treaty. John D. Holum, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, has remarked: "I wouldn't say there is heavy [U.S.] pressure on Israel [to sign the NPT]....We believe Israel should be a member...[but] we understand [its] situation. A number of its neighbors insist on its extermination." Holum's carefully phrased remarks do not conceal the suspicion that the key word is "heavy." In general, American diplomacy and media coverage too often convey the unfortunate impression that--in the phrase of Charles Van Doren, a former deputy general counsel of ACDA--Israel is "the 'Achilles heel' of America's NPT policy."

Israel, citing the nuclear aspirations of Iran, Iraq and Syria, refuses to sign the NPT, although it leaves open the possibility of eventual adherence if the Middle East "peace process" moves forward in a favorable direction. That eventuality seems unlikely. The Arab countries warn that if Israel fails to renounce nuclear weapons, a new regional arms race could ensue as the

Arabs pursue their own nuclear options. In view of the known nuclear aspirations of Iraq, Libya, Syria, and Algeria (as well as non-Arab Iran), this argument misses the point.

One can argue much more readily that Israel's nuclear arsenal has helped to keep the peace in the Middle East for more than 20 years. Israel has never openly acknowledged its nuclear status. Its official position is that it will not be the first to "introduce" nuclear weapons into the Middle East. Since Israel's launching of a nuclear war would be suicidal, its arsenal is clearly intended as an equalizer and a necessary deterrent for a small country unable to match the conventional military forces of its numerous enemies. Israel's nuclear weapons pose no greater danger to peace than do those of the United States, Britain, or France, because all are democratic countries. Moreover, if Israel's nuclear capability--or Israel itself--disappeared tomorrow, the nuclear arms race in the region would persist. This contest is fueled by such phenomena as the rivalry between Sunni Iraq and Shi'ite Iran for hegemony over the Persian Gulf; by the hostility between Syria and Iraq, which represent rival branches of the Ba'ath party; by the prestige that would accrue to the country that fathers the "Arab atomic bomb"; and by radical regimes that regard possession of nuclear arms as a means of deterring a Western military presence in the Middle East. Israel's nuclear weapons, on the other hand, exist for the sole purpose of guaranteeing the country's survival. This is precisely why its enemies want these weapons eliminated. Is there any doubt that Israel's signature on the NPT would goad the Arab states and Iran to insist that Israel take immediate steps to honor Article VI and divest itself of its nuclear weapons? Before long, Israel could be reduced to the status of a nuclear power equipped only with "the sting of the bee," in Leo Szilard's memorable phrase. After it stung its enemies, the bee would die.

In the face of these dangers, protection will derive not from the Non-Proliferation Treaty (which, like most arms-control pacts, exerts restraint on law-abiding states and tempts evasion by outlaws), but on the threat of retaliation in kind. An implicit Israeli threat to unleash nuclear weapons may have deterred Saddam Hussein from putting chemical warheads on the Scud missiles that he lobbed at Israel during Desert Storm.

Since the United States clearly intends to retain a nuclear deterrent even if a CTBT prevents testing, why should Israel's deterrent be weakened? Washington should shelve any plans it might harbor to coerce Israel into signing the NPT. Such coercion would needlessly damage U.S.-Israeli relations and imperil Israel's ultimate survival without yielding any offsetting benefits. Pressure on Israel to sign the NPT without taking proper account of the regional security environment would indicate that Washington remains mired in the erroneous assumptions that the Arab-Israeli schism is the chief obstacle to peace in the Middle East and that the NPT is the most effective antidote to nuclear proliferation ♦

Marian Leighton is a defense contractor and international security specialist based in the Washington area. She has published widely on foreign affairs.

One Minute to Midnight
Dr. Irving Moskowitz

SYRIA'S NEW DEMAND

When one considers how many concessions the Rabin government has made to the Arabs so far, it is hard to imagine that there will be anything left for the Arabs to demand.

Rabin is in the process of surrendering control of Judea, Samaria and Gaza to the PLO. He has indicated his willingness to surrender all, or virtually all, of the Golan Heights to Syria. He has given up more than one hundred and fifty square miles of land, and precious water sources, to Jordan. He has blocked Jewish construction in the territories, including areas near Jerusalem. He has hinted that he is prepared to make concessions on Jerusalem itself. He has released thousands of convicted terrorists from Israeli prisons. He is even discussing the possibility of allowing hundreds of thousands of Arab "refugees" to flood Israel and the territories.

You'd think the Arabs would be satisfied.

Think again.

The Syrian government newspaper *Tishrin* announced on February 14 that there is yet another "pre-requisite" to establishing peace between Israel and the

Arabs: Israel must unilaterally dismantle all of its nuclear weapons. The Syrian demand is particularly ironic in view of the fact that just last year, *Jane's Defense Weekly* reported that Syria itself recently purchased nuclear reactors from China and is in the process of developing its own nuclear weapons.

This latest Syrian precondition to peace comes against the background of the hysterical Egyptian campaign to force Israel to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. If Egypt was sincerely interested in peace with Israel, it would not be bothered by the fact that Israel has nuclear weapons. It would understand that Israel needs to have such weapons to defend itself against Iraq, Iran, Libya, or whomever. Israel's nuclear arsenal does not threaten Egypt. It does not threaten any Arab state that is at peace with Israel. Its only purpose is to defend Israel against an Arab invasion. But neither Egypt nor Syrian has forsaken the option of invading Israel again in the future, which is why they don't want Israel to be able to respond with nuclear weapons.

Ultimately, no concession short of Israel's disappearance will truly satisfy the Arabs. Every Israeli surrender will be met with new Arab demands, until the Jewish state is turned into the state of Palestine or until it is absorbed into "southern Syria." Better to stop the concession process now, before Israel meets such a fate.◇

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