

OUTPOST

June 2004—Issue #168

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

Israel at 56

Ruth S. King

May 14th, 1948

This Government has been informed that a Jewish State has been proclaimed in Palestine and recognition has been requested by the provisional Government thereof.

The United States recognizes the provisional government as the de facto authority of the new State of Israel.

Harry S. Truman

These simple, straightforward words by the President of the United States were released to the press before they were made available to the State Department or to the U.S. delegation to the United Nations. A day later the Arabs declared war, a war that has continued to this day, notwithstanding temporary truces, agreements, lulls in activity, two peace treaties (with Egypt and Jordan) and so called "peace processes."

In spite of the overwhelming numerical odds, Israel won the wars of 1948, 1956, 1967 and 1973 (more accurately these were battles in the ongoing war). Israel has been less successful politically than militarily, frequently embarking on counterproductive, and in the case of Oslo, suicidal actions in pursuit of the chimera of peace with Arab enemies who have interpreted these actions, as Steven Plaut has put it, as evidence Israel is "on the run, exhausted, unwilling to fight, and ready to capitulate."

And yet, Israel is a nation that has so much to be proud of. It has welcomed and successfully absorbed millions of Jews from the most disparate backgrounds, beginning with the death camps of Europe. Wherever Jews live under threat they know there is the welcoming harbor of a Jewish State.

Israel has developed a superb military in which the overwhelming majority of citizens serve, where volunteering runs high for the most dangerous and difficult units. Israel has outstanding scientific institutions; its research and development of new medical technologies are cutting edge. Israeli contributions to computer science and production are second only to those of Silicon Valley (and many Silicon Valley

companies maintain branches in Israel). Israel's advanced weapons technology is world-recognized and Israel's agricultural achievements have made her expertise widely sought after. Israel's artistic world abounds with performers, writers, painters, novelists and composers. There are advanced social institutions to protect the population's national and civil rights. In Israel's free wheeling democracy, there are many newspapers, endless debate and a million opinions on everything from the direction of the nation to the best recipes for brisket. Religious shrines -- Jewish, Christian, Moslem, Bahai -- are scrupulously maintained and guarded.

Those who seek the pioneering spirit can easily find it among the settlers. One remarkable example is the brave woman who took her two toddlers and one infant-in-arms to start a new community in the arid hills above Hebron where only rodents and spiders lived. She set up a tent and put down an oriental carpet and potted plants. She hung up a mezuzah and invited the gathering journalists and photographers from the *New York Times* into her new home.

When one considers that the Arab war against Israel -- the multi-Arab state attacks of Israel's War of Independence and of 1967, the sneak attack on Yom Kippur of 1973, the so-called "intifada," the unrelenting terrorism -- has not abated for a single moment of its existence, Israel is indeed a miracle.

Every birthday is a milestone and every hour in Israel's existence in such difficult circumstances is Israel's finest hour. Despite everything, Israelis have kept their courage and their decency, never sinking to the level of their enemies. Israel is the source of our confidence in every corner of the Diaspora. It is the locus of our prayers and our aspirations to survive and thrive as a people.

In the finest meaning of the words, Israel remains a light unto the nations. Happy birthday Israel.

This Issue:

Israel's 56 Year War by Rael Jean Isaac	...3
American Jews by Ruth King	...6
Douce France by Hugh Fitzgerald	...8
Disengagement by Moshe Saperstein	...10

From The Editor

SY HERSH REDUX

Seymour Hersh is at it again, this time with a convoluted *New Yorker* piece seeking to tie Donald Rumsfeld directly to the Abu Ghraib prison scandal. Citing interviews with anonymous intelligence officials Hersh accuses Rumsfeld of approving a highly secret operation encouraging "physical coercion and sexual humiliation of Iraqi prisoners." The Defense Department describes the article as "outlandish, conspiratorial and filled with error and anonymous conjecture." That, of course, is par for Hersh's course. Readers of *Outpost* can explore Hersh's abysmal record of being taken in by conmen, spinning conspiratorial fantasies, and misquoting the responsible people whom he claims to quote by clicking on Mideastoutpost.com.

MORE FROM WAHABI-ON-HUDSON

As Carolyn Glick, the *Jerusalem Post's* superb columnist and editor, puts it in a scathing letter to Columbia University President Lee Bollinger, "Columbia today is not a fount of liberalism in the spirit of John Stuart Mill but an incubator of hatred and lies," lies and hatred directed against both the U.S. and Israel. The death of the vitriolic, imitation-terrorist Edward Said (who was caught on camera hurling rocks at Israeli forces at the Lebanon border) should have been greeted with a sigh of relief from Columbia: instead, as Glick points out, the university endowed a professorship in his name and conferred it on Rashid Khalidi, another anti-Semitic, anti-American terrorism apologist.

Khalidi is in congenial company. Joseph Massad was appointed in 1999 to the same Department of Middle East and Asian Languages and Cultures. Jonathan Calt Harris in the *New York Sun* gives a run down on some of his "academic" contributions. "The Jewish state is a racist state that does not have a right to exist." This was Massad in a lecture at Oxford University. Poverty is caused by "the racist and barbaric policies of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank." Massad ridicules the very existence of a "so-called Islamic 'threat'" and blames the United States for what passes for it: the suicide bombing in Beirut in 1983, in which 241 Marines were killed, was payback for "U.S. imperialist aggression." The Holocaust is a self-serving Jewish rewrite of history invented for reasons of propaganda. And on and on in the same vein.

As Glick points out, anti-Americanism and anti-Semitic poison are not confined to the Middle East Studies department but permeate such departments as English, History and Political Science, making Columbia "a clearinghouse for lies posing as scholarship that then enter the public sphere and infect our culture in this time of global war."

Columbia is now embarked on a major fund-

raising campaign from alumni as it seeks to expand its campus northward. This offers a splendid opportunity for graduates to inform Bollinger and his fund-raisers what they think of the university's direction.

FROM ISRAEL'S MAD HATTER

In his dotage, Shimon Peres becomes more unhinged by the day. Early in May, at a Labor Party meeting, Peres announced "there was no choice but to announce early elections since it was only recently made clear that the previous elections were forged." Forged? The Likud was victorious by a landslide as the electorate repudiated Barak for his huge territorial concessions that simply had the effect of encouraging Arafat to launch outright war. Two weeks later, on May 16, *The New York Times* quoted Peres: "Eighty percent of Israelis want peace, and just one percent are trying to block it." What Peres was referring to, of course, was the lopsided Likud vote to reject Sharon's "disengagement" plan, i.e. his plan to dismantle Gaza's 21 Jewish communities and other Jewish communities in Samaria in what could only be perceived in the Arab world as a huge victory for terror. Needless to say, the majority in the Likud voted against it, not because they oppose peace, but because they believed the plan would exacerbate the ongoing Arab war against Israel. Worst of all, Sharon might yet make this malevolent clown Foreign Minister again, in some potential alliance with Labor against his own right-wing constituency.

CALLOUS SYMPATHY

British Foreign Secretary Jack Straw has issued a statement of sympathy in response to a recent Arab terrorist outrage: "My sympathies are with the friends and families of all the victims of this horrific attack...The perpetrators of this atrocious attack clearly have no respect for innocent lives. We cannot let the terrorists succeed." But as writer Naomi Ragen points out, Straw was not referring to the murder of Tali Hatuel in her eighth month of pregnancy, to the point-blank shots into the head of her two year old daughter Meirav, strapped into her car seat for safety, or 7 year old daughter Roni or nine year old Hadar or eleven year old Hila. No, Straw was talking about the attack

(continued on page 12)

Outpost

Editor: Rael Jean Isaac

Editorial Board: Herbert Zweibon, Ruth King

Outpost is distributed free to
Members of Americans For a Safe Israel
Annual membership: \$50.

Americans For a Safe Israel

1623 Third Ave. (at 92nd St.) - Suite 205
New York, NY 10128
tel (212) 828-2424 / fax (212) 828-1717

Israel's 56 Year War

Rael Jean Isaac

For all its huge achievements, as its 56th year dawns, modern Israel faces the bleakest prospects in its short history.

Yes, one might argue the future looked more perilous in 1948 and 1949, when the small Jewish population of the new-minted state, attacked by all its Arab neighbors, subject to an arms boycott by the Western powers, fought to survive. But then there was hope, determination, unity of purpose, a sense among Israelis -- and Jews abroad -- that they could not, dare not, fail. Most of the world, horrified by the Holocaust, identified with the gallant battle of the Jewish remnant to create a state that would give them, after two thousand years, once again their own place in the sun. Today, after 56 years of the Arab-Israel war (with only brief lulls in the fighting) the people of Israel seems uncertain and divided. The world's media (and politicians) are in competition to see who can turn reality more absurdly on its head. As Cynthia Ozick puts it, they use "sleight-of-hand trickeries--such as the hallucinatory notion that the defense measures of a perennially beleaguered people constitute colonization and victimization; or that the Jewish state is to blame for the aggressions committed against it."

While it is tempting to wrap the Jewish state in the mantle of hapless victim of the world's baseless hate and the Arab world's malignity, Israel, reluctant as we may be to confront this, bears much of the blame for her current parlous condition. The state, under a series of leaders of both major political parties, has weaved and wobbled. In an excellent, largely unremarked essay in *Azure* (Winter 2003) entitled "On Jewish Character," Yoram Hazony focuses on Israel's failure to produce sufficient individuals with the character "for maintaining political and cultural independence over time." Hazony identifies this missing essential quality of character as the ability "to stand firm before adversity."

In terms of building character, early Zionists, writes Hazony, had two expectations for the state. The first was that the state would free Jews from the struggle to be accepted in European society, where the promise of social advancement was dependent on renunciation of one's Jewishness in a manner irreconcilable with the commitments of character. Only in a national Jewish society would a Jew be able to pursue personal success in every field without having to break faith with his past. In this, Hazony says, the state has unequivocally succeeded: within Israel, Jews have been restored to the "inner wholeness" of which Herzl spoke, where there is unity between "our ambitions as individuals, and our loyalty to our forefathers and to our people." But this first and fully realized expectation, argues Hazony, is only a formal condition, opening the door to the second substantive Zionist expectation: that the state would establish "traditions and

institutions capable of inculcating character in successive generations of young Jews."

Hazony points to something that has long troubled this writer: the unwillingness of recent Israeli leaders, regardless of party, to speak clearly to the public about the need for sacrifice and hardship to achieve long-term goals. In regard to external threats, this means, Hazony writes, "setting out a course of diplomatic confrontation and war that may require long years of sacrifice and suffering in order to lay the foundations for a better postwar order." But where is the Israeli leader who will speak the truth, who will say, like Churchill, that he has nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears and sweat? Instead each Prime Minister promises the voter peace and security just around the corner if he only pulls the right lever in the voting booth.

But where is the Israeli leader who will speak the truth, who will say, like Churchill, that he has nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears and sweat?

It is worth quoting Hazony at length on this point: "One may interpret this reluctance [to speak the truth] on the part of our political leaders in one of two ways: Either much of Israel's political leadership is without the strength of character necessary to risk electoral defeat in order to tell the public the truth; or else this leadership does have such strength, but is prevented from making use of it because the public lacks the character to bear such news and would reject a leader who comes forth with such a message. But whichever explanation one chooses, its implications with respect to the political personality of the Jewish state are not flattering. A democratic regime in which elected leaders refrain from persuading their public of the need for painful policies is one that is limited to choosing between that which is least painful and that which can be obscured by dishonesty...Such a state is one that is crippled by an inability to maintain a difficult course in the face of duress. It is crippled by lack of character."

While Hazony avoids specifics, successive Israeli Prime Ministers, cabinets and legislatures are testament to the failure of character. Only in the first two decades of Israeli statehood was there some steadiness of purpose: it was reflected in the slogan *Ein breira*, "There is no choice," no choice but to stand firm against Arab aggression. But Israel's victory in the Six Day War of 1967 seduced Israelis into the delusion that there were now "alternatives." Thus, in the immediate aftermath of the war the Israeli government announced its willingness to return all territories in exchange for peace. When this was met with the three

nos of Khartoum (no negotiations, no recognition, no peace) the Israeli government floundered. It clung to "territories for peace" awaiting some radical Arab change of heart (instead the Arabs launched the Yom Kippur War of 1973). But it also established new Jewish communities, at first in response to grass-roots Jewish settlement groups, later from strategic considerations (e.g. the Gaza communities).

In the wake of the 1973 war, under U.S. pressure, Israel made partial withdrawals in the Sinai and on the Golan Heights. But the massive withdrawals, the undermining of Israel's legitimate territorial claims, were the result of Israeli government initiatives; they reflected the inability of her leaders to hold steady and maintain their commitments. The first to cast off life-long principles was Menachem Begin. To obtain Egyptian President Anwar Sadat's signature on a peace treaty, Begin not only gave up the Sinai in its entirety (including the bustling Israeli town of Yamit) but in effect forfeited Israel's claim to Judea and Samaria, central to his Herut Party's ideology. The piece of paper Begin received in return turned out to be worthless, its many clauses promising cooperation in all areas, crafted with enormous care by Israel's legal experts, soon violated by Egypt down to the last comma.

The first to cast off life-long principles was Menachem Begin.

The next major Israeli initiative, this one truly catastrophic, was Oslo. The Labor Party, headed by Yitzhak Rabin, promised, if elected, to bring peace promptly. At American insistence, pro forma negotiations between Israel and representatives of Arab states were being conducted at Madrid, but they were going nowhere. Determined to achieve the promised "peace," Shimon Peres and a group of like-minded officials and academics in Labor decided to negotiate with the PLO (then illegal under Israeli law). Rabin, confronted with the "achievements" of the coterie, went along. And much of the public, which until that point, with virtual unanimity, had viewed Arafat and his PLO as a terror gang incarnating the evil against which Israel struggled, turned on a dime. The government said that peace was at hand and had a letter with Arafat's signature to prove it. (Never mind that the very same Labor government had issued a study months before showing that Arafat had violated all 200 agreements he had made with Arab states.)

It must be emphasized that this shameful Labor policy of bringing Arafat and his terror cohorts from Tunisia to control Israel's heartland was not the result of overwhelming external pressures. By 1992 the PLO was in severe decline. It had backed the wrong horse in the first Iraq war of 1991 and not only the United States but the PLO's chief funders, Kuwait and

Saudi Arabia, were furious. Kuwait was so angry, it had expelled its huge seditious Arab Palestinian population. Indeed it was precisely the PLO's seemingly terminal condition that seems to have encouraged Labor's leadership to rescue it, so that in presumed "gratitude" Arafat and his cohorts would come to terms with Israel.

But now long-hunted mass murderers of Israelis would be given safe passage into areas under Israel's control.

Transforming Arafat overnight from world terror master into Israel's "partner for peace" had another serious consequence: it made a mockery of yet another of Israel's supposedly steadfast tenets, that there would be no negotiations with terrorists. The famous rescue of the Israeli airliner at Entebbe, led by Benjamin Netanyahu's brother Jonathan, typified Israel's readiness to act, and act daringly, on its principles. Moreover, terrorists who murdered Israelis could count on being hunted down around the world. The killers of Israeli athletes at the Olympic games in Munich found that European countries offered no safe haven. But now long hunted mass murderers of Israelis would actually be given safe passage into areas under Israel's control: people like Abu Abbas, the murderer of wheel-chair bound Leon Klinghoffer. (Abbas was finally arrested by U.S. forces in Baghdad in 2003.)

For all the elation in much of the Israeli left, there were many in Israel who were horrified by Oslo and prophesied the catastrophe that would follow, Likud leaders Benjamin Netanyahu and Ariel Sharon prominent among them. As Oslo transformed Israel from one of the world's safest countries into a land where commuter buses blew up regularly in major cities (the victims were described by the imperturbable Rabin as "sacrifices for peace"), the public turned against the government. Had he not been assassinated, he would have lost the next election, as Shimon Peres did, despite his mantle as the heir of the martyred Prime Minister. Yet, tragically, as Prime Minister Netanyahu showed no greater steadfastness. In his election campaign he did not have the courage to say Oslo has been a hideous failure. Rather he made the same dishonest promise to bring Israel peace and security. With his unsteady hand at the helm, Israel lurched forward with Oslo, despite the many opportunities Arafat gave him to call off the absurdly named "peace process." And so it has been ever since.

But when it came to his goal of eliminating Israel, Arafat had all the steadfastness Israel lacked. Although Barak, under Clinton's prodding, basically offered to return to the borders of 1949, negotiations collapsed when Arafat insisted on an unfettered "right to return" for Arab refugees, i.e. the end of the Jewish

state.

Sharon has proved the most unsteady leader of them all. His government became a paragon of giddiness, as Foreign Minister Shimon Peres publicly contradicted Sharon's announced policies, and Sharon contradicted himself. Sharon then rammed through his cabinet acceptance of the Road Map. A leader with character would have refused to accept a document that was as much a *diktat* as the Munich agreement of 1938 dismembering Czechoslovakia. Four power centers, three of them deeply hostile to Israel (the European Union, the UN and the Soviet Union), without any consultation or input from the Israeli government, imposed a formula for what amounted to Israeli retreat to the 1949 borders. Incredibly, when the Road Map foundered on the single requirement for the Palestinian Authority – an effort to control terror – Sharon produced a plan for unilateral Israeli withdrawal from Gaza (including the 21 Jewish communities there) and from northern Samaria.

Why a policy of preemptive surrender? Since the action defies logic, we are forced to look at Sharon's own explanation(s).

Sharon claimed, and this was echoed by Defense Minister Shaul Mofaz, that otherwise "initiatives that are detrimental to Israel may be brought up." Presumably then, by coming up with his own plan for limited withdrawals, Sharon was staving off more radical proposals from the "international community" in the offing. But Sharon had already agreed to a far more detrimental plan in the Road Map. So what was he staving off? The Quartet met

in the wake of the Sharon plan and all four, including the United States, applauded the initiative as the "first step" in implementing the Road Map.

That leaves the second "explanation" Sharon has proffered: "One thing is clear to me. The people of Israel did not elect me to sit idly by for four years. I was elected to find the path that will lead this people to the tranquility, security and peace they so deserve." First of all Sharon was not elected. The Likud Party was elected, made Sharon Prime Minister and has now repudiated his plan. The last sentence is the ludicrous boilerplate that has been the centerpiece of election promises, as if any Israeli government had it in its power to bring Israel "tranquility" and "peace" when the Arabs are determined to destroy the state. It is not Sharon's mission, as he seems to think, to "do something," ("not sit idly by") if those restless maneuvers are going to reduce Israel's security, demoralize its public and energize its enemies. What else can possibly be the effect of Israel's retreat under terror? Sharon's timing is also bizarre. He was proposing retreat at a time when the Palestinian Authority's im-

age was hurt by its identification with the Iraqi insurgents and the massive Palestinian Arab demonstrations on behalf of the the brutal murderers of the civilian contractors in Fallujah. As for President Bush, he had priorities far more urgent than a Palestinian state.

Making shahids of the Palestinian Authority and the numerous terror factions would doubtless cause a temporary clamor, but no more than the ineffectual limited actions Israel already takes.

The usual cry that goes up is "But what is the alternative?" The alternative all along has been to show steadiness of purpose under adversity. If Israel had maintained that simple principle of "no negotiations with terrorists," Oslo would never have happened and Israel would not be facing the forbidding landscape she does now.

Today, steadiness of purpose requires military action to obtain victory over the terror factions that Israel so recklessly enabled through Oslo. In "The Trap of 'A Limited Conflict'" (*Outpost*, April 2004) Israeli Col. Yehuda Wegman describes the need to obtain a decisive military decision – which the Israel Defense Forces could easily achieve – if they were not prevented by the government's suicidal policy of a "prolonged, decisionless attrition." Making shahids of the Palestinian Authority and the numerous terror factions would doubtless cause a temporary clamor, but no more than the ineffectual limited actions Israel already takes.

And then "character" would require Israel to stand firm behind another principle, one that it should have adopted decades ago. And that is insistence that Israel's precondition for negotiations is that the Arab refugee problem be solved – by the 22 Arab states. As Ruth King and I noted in *Outpost* of September 2003 "Putting First Things Last: The 55 Year Failure to Address the Arab Refugee Problem" the "right to return" of over four million Arabs to a Jewish state comprising a mere 8,000 square miles and housing only six and a half million people, is an insane demand. If the Arabs are serious about accepting a Jewish state, they must show their good faith by absorbing all those registered as refugees with UNRWA, including the 655,000 registered in Judea and Samaria and the 907,000 in Gaza. If they are not serious, there is nothing to negotiate.

Were the government of Israel to display character, the state would be subject to far less pressure than it experiences today. Israel's unsteadiness invites outside pressures. Because of its moral weakness, Israel makes itself the world's punching bag. Even now, as President Bush, in the wake of the Iraqi prison abuse scandal, casts around for a way to prove to the Arab world that he wishes it well, he is already, as

Fouad Ajami noted in the *Wall Street Journal* of May 12, paying in Israeli coin. If Israel's position were firm and predictable, her governments might be accused of stubbornness and intransigence, but they would be respected. If it were understood that on core principles the government of Israel would not budge, the rest of the world would be forced to consider how Israel's pre-conditions could be met. The refugee camps would cease to be an immutable given; doing something about them would be forced on the world's agenda.

What would happen if Israel had a leader of character? It is possible that such a Prime Minister would be repudiated at the polls. Perhaps Israel plays

out a Shakespearean tragedy where a fatal flaw of national character determines the outcome. But we do not know. We do not know if a leader could rally the nation because no leader has tested the nation. We do know that there are many in Israel who cry out for such leadership. On May 14 the Israeli newspaper *Hatzofeh* published a "Prayer before Going to Battle" which concludes: "Please save us from our leaders. We can already handle our enemies." And so surely, before the curtain falls, the people of Israel, who have achieved so much in so many areas in the first half century of their modern state, deserve the chance to be tested.

American Jews as Israel Turns 56

Ruth S. King

The columnist Joseph Sobran, no friend to Israel or Jews, once quipped that American Jews were the most powerful minority because they pretended to be powerless. If weakness is to be measured in population numbers or in a historic legacy of abuse, torture, expulsion and genocide, there is no pretense. If strength is to be measured in participation and representation in the arts, science, the professions, and business, as well as political influence, then American Jews certainly have been a powerhouse. And, there is no question that the advent of Israel and its image as a scrappy democracy did more to bolster Jewish confidence and prestige than any other factor.

In 1977 the election of Menachem Begin rocked the Jewish leadership, the majority of whom were Democrats.

After World War II anti-Semites were intimidated as the world confronted the horrors of the Holocaust. When the gates to Israel were finally opened in 1948, American Jews rallied to the rescue of the European survivors as well as those Jews from Arab countries who were forcibly expelled after centuries of *dhimmitude*. American Jews participated in the epic rescue with everything from the ubiquitous blue and white cans collecting coins for Israel to the sophisticated and efficiently administered Jewish philanthropies and service organizations. For the leftist Hashomer Hatzair as for right wing friends of the Irgun, the locus of their energies was Israel. For their part, the Israelis fought valiantly against the combined forces of five Arab states and won, winning the respect of most Americans.

In the decades that followed, Jewish organizations focused on defending Israel and fighting vigorously against anti-Semitism in all its manifesta-

tions. The Presidents Conference of Major Jewish American Organizations, AIPAC, the Anti-Defamation League, Hadassah, to name just a few, were courted by legislators, cabinet members, and candidates for office. They were routinely invited to the White House for breakfasts, briefings and receptions. Benefits for these organizations filled large stadiums and the rallying cry was "We are one." In politics, Jewish fundraising for candidates demanded a quid pro quo -- namely, unstinting support for Israel.

In 1977 the election of Menachem Begin rocked the Jewish leadership, the majority of whom were Democrats and had identified with Israel's perennial Labor governments. Rabbi Alexander Schindler, then head of the President's Conference, nonetheless set the proper example in squiring Israel's hawkish Prime Minister to meetings with Jewish organizations and U.S. government officials. Begin often spoke of the courtesy and respect shown by Rabbi Schindler.

This is not to imply that Jewish efforts encountered no obstacles. The oil industry was a countervailing force. The State Department was generally indifferent or openly hostile. But the Jewish lobby scored important successes with both houses of Congress on both sides of the aisle. Many of those seeking office known for their antagonism to Israel were defeated, even in states with small Jewish populations.

As we noted earlier in *Outpost* ("Farewell to Political Influence", Feb. 2000) this remarkable Jewish political influence is now in decline. In past years every perceived insult -- such as Andrew Young's meeting with the PLO while he was U.S. ambassador to the UN -- was followed by briefings and explanations as high level government officials sought to allay Jewish concerns. Today, with the exception of AIPAC, whose main function has become promoting foreign aid to Israel and assisting those legislators with good records of support to meet Jewish donors, most Jewish organizations have little impact. The issue of support for Israel has become a minor blip on the political radar screen. Formerly the convention platforms of both parties included strong statements of support for Israel

and opposition to anti-Semitism. Today, these are not even mentioned. When candidates cite their support for Israel, it is often to declare their commitment to the phantom "peace process."

Why did Jewish political influence fall so precipitously? In an interview on May 2, 2004, Daniel Pipes, noted scholar on Islam and protagonist of Israel, attributed what he called the decline of the Jewish "golden age" in America in large measure to the growth of the American Moslem population, and to the academies, where Moslems are attempting to close down debates on key issues. But it is hard to believe that Moslem prestige in America is growing. Our citizens have been subject to mass murder by Moslems in the World Trade Center and Pentagon bombings; we have had two wars with Moslem antagonists; we have seen the viciousness of Moslems close up with the beheadings-on-video of Daniel Pearl and Nicholas Berg; we witness the suicide bombings in Israel, Bali, Madrid, all of this in the name of Islam.

It is our own conviction that the Jewish "golden era" is over because the majority of organizations charged with defense of Israel and Jews lost their focus.

Moreover, the decline of Jewish influence preceded these developments. It is our own conviction that the Jewish "golden era" is over because the majority of those organizations charged with defense of Israel and Jews lost their focus. The root of the problem goes back to the hijacking of their boards and platforms by the radicals who emerged in the 1970s from the anti-Vietnam War movement.

With the end of the draft, the anti-war movement splintered and the civil rights movement became inhospitable to Jewish participation. Seeking new organizational frameworks, many radical young Jews turned to communal Jewish organizations and reshaped them to fit their own agendas -- emphasis on non-Jewish issues such as gay rights, abortion, environmentalism, affirmative action and Palestinian Arab rights. Others joined university faculties, became journalists or entered political life. A hawkish Israel became less attractive than the myth of Palestinian Arab dislocation and subjugation.

To be sure, when it came to Israel, there was some initial resistance from the old guard. Breira, one of the first projects of these "Movement" Jews, met with a hostile reception despite the heavy representation of Hillel rabbis in its membership. But ever receptive to "progressive" fashion, the Jewish community did not long resist the newcomers. Breira was followed by New Jewish Agenda and Peace Now, the latter becoming part of the Conference of Presidents. Samuel Berger, a Peace Now alumnus, became National Security Adviser to President Clinton.

It is ironic that Hadassah, whose membership exceeds that of any other national or international women's organization, is helpless to defend Jews and Israel at international women's conferences. Hadassah has been so busy with abortion rights that the right to life of Israelis has taken a back seat. It is appalling that the Anti-Defamation League published a brochure accusing evangelical Christians, Israel's chief supporters, of anti-Semitism. (After doing the damage, the ADL's chairman recently did an about-face with an article praising evangelicals for their love and support of Israel!)

Hadassah has been so busy with abortion rights that the right of life of Israelis has taken a back seat

A March 2002 poll conducted by John Zogby (brother of leading American-Arab political operative James Zogby) found that while support for Israel was high among both Republicans and Democrats, Republicans were more stalwartly pro-Israel by a margin of three to one -- this in spite of the fact that Jews and their organizations have remained loyal to the Democratic Party by a ratio of three to one. If Israel were a priority, Jews would be supporting those candidates most outspoken in her defense.

When leaders of Jewish organizations are challenged to defend their leftist, pro-Arab Palestinian programs, they often invoke the notion of "tikkun olam"-- the repair of the world. This "repair" includes every people or species that is perceived to be endangered, but Israeli communities in Judea, Samaria and Gaza are not among them. It is hard to see how repair of the world can coincide with abandonment of Israel, a remarkable democracy threatened by the same enemies which now threaten America. This is the repair of the world turned upside down.

Many Jews are apprehensive about the decline of American Jewry and some have begun to work for a Jewish revival. However, as Dr. Kenneth Levin has pointed out in *Outpost* (April 1999), "Some in the forefront of this Jewish revival movement, in the development of these new educational programs, comprehend them and pursue them as an alternative to the emphasis on Israel in American Jewish communal activities."

In sum, Americans Jews have forgotten that our relationship with Israel is symbiotic. Israel depends on us to present its case fairly, especially in view of the miasma of media bias, and we depend on Israel to flourish. Jews without Israel cannot survive, no matter how friendly a corner of the Diaspora we live in. A beleaguered Israel cannot survive unless it is the number one priority for the Jews of America.

Douce France

Hugh Fitzgerald

Imagine that you are a cosseted member of the French elite. One child is doing the *khâgne*, aiming for rue d'Ulm. Another is now a *politechnicien*. You are very comfortable, working for the state. You and your spouse are journalists, or writers, or one of that vast tribe of people conducting "recherches" and life is comfortable, good, the way it should be. Yes, you do notice more and more Muslims about you as you walk, no longer in the *banlieues*, but in the center of Paris, or Toulouse, or Lyon. And you remember how uneasy you felt, four years ago, when you happened to be walking on the Cannebière in Marseille. You decided, then and there, that you would not return.

In the schools, the teachers cannot even cover the subjects of World War II, the Resistance, and the murders of the Jews as the state prescribes.

And you have friends who live in the south. And they tell you that the *beurs* – some call them *maghrébins* -- make life hell for everyone. They attack French children on the way to school. They vandalize cars. They threaten, and do more than threaten, anyone who is still foolish enough to walk out wearing a kippah or a cross. Whole areas of cities in the south, as in the north, and east, and west, have become off-limits to non-Muslims. In the schools, the teachers have lost authority. They cannot even cover the subjects of World War II, the Resistance, and the murders of the Jews as the state prescribes; they fear, with reason, the violent reaction of the Muslim students.

And as the schools become more and more dangerous for non-Muslim students and teachers, with more time and resources devoted to discipline rather than to learning, French parents and would-be parents are now silently factoring into their childbearing plans the present value of the future cost of what, they see, will now have to be added: private school tuition. And that means, of course, that those French people will plan on smaller families. And they will also be factoring in the growing cost, paid by them, those French taxpayers, for the whole expanding edifice of security, the guards in the schools, the guards at the train stations and métro stations and airports and at government buildings everywhere, the costs of keeping the gravestones from being vandalized, the costs of protecting the synagogues and the churches, the costs for all those tapped phones and agents in mosques, and subsidies to lawyers and judges to hear charges and try cases against Muslims, and the costs of monitoring da'wa in the prisons (more than 50% Muslim).

But the Muslims are indifferent to expenses incurred by the French state. France is part of the

world; the world belongs to Allah, and to his Believers. That doctrine has remained immutable for 1400 years. Imam Bouziane, the one they keep trying to deport, had 16 children by two wives, all living on the French state: a representative Muslim man. Over time, the difference between average family size of Muslims and non-Muslims steadily increases. And, over time, the education system continues to disintegrate. Right now, perhaps, you cannot see it. Your children go to the best schools, followed by the best lycées. You vacation in Normandy, or Brittany, or the Ile de Ré. And you do not take the metro often enough, or walk in the right districts, or work in the right factories or offices, to understand what tens of millions of your fellow Frenchmen now have to endure. You, for the moment, are still immune, still willfully unaware. You have spent the last few decades learning about the Muslim world from Eric Rouleau, and his epigones (after they silenced Peroncel-Hugoz, the one journalist who reported the truth) in *Le Monde*. You are deeply-versed in the constantly reported-upon, endlessly dilated-upon, perfidy of the mighty empire of Israel. You know what we have all had dinned into us: that the Arab Muslims are reasonable people, with clearly-justified grievances, grievances so reasonable and so limited in scope, that justice demands they be satisfied. Everyone agrees on the "solution." It is called a "two-state solution" and of course it is a "solution" for otherwise, of course, it would not have been called a "solution."

And everything looks the way it always has looked: the linden trees, the river, the bridges, the *réverbères*, the *étalage* in the neighborhood boulangerie. *Douce France, cher pays de mon enfance*. At the end of the school day, chic mothers still congregate in little towns, or small cities, outside the school – this or that Ecole Jules Ferry -- waiting to pick up their children. Here come the littlest ones, from *Maternelle*, running up now -- just look at how small they are. And here are the CE1 group, with those huge *cartables* on their tiny backs. Run, run, run, to Mommy. Oop-la. And then the years of study, study, study marked by ever-larger *cahiers* -- "*cahier*" and "*cartable*" are the words that identify French DNA better than Piaf or gauloises, isn't that true? And now we will read the books, and study the subjects, set down so completely and precisely by the Ministry of Education. And now we are up to the final year, preparing for the *Bac*, with copies of blue-backed BALISES, guides to *Les Châtiments* and *La Peau de Chagrin*. And just look at the results listed in the newspaper: Claire-Alix has a *mention très bien*. Fantastic. Everything is fine, everything will always stay the same, whole countries cannot change. It's not possible.

But it is changing, coming apart, quietly, slowly -- let's not look too closely, we mustn't pay too much attention -- the streets, the schools, the hospitals, the

ability to speak the truth about things, about life as it is lived, *la vita vissuta* as they like to say in a neighboring country. Dominique de Villepin always knew there was nothing to worry about; he was born, after all, in Salé, next to Rabat, even spent a few years of his infancy there; of course he knows his Arabs, his Muslims. And surely Eric Rouleau, who for decades in *Le Monde* was the resident expert on the Middle East (he was so knowledgeable that he never had to so much as mention the teachings of the Qur'an and Sunna), surely he knew everything, didn't he? And those French translations of Edward Said that denounced with such passion the Islamophobia, and those vicious clichés with which the blind and rotting West has always caricatured the Arab Muslim world. Oh, we have been so terrible to the Arabs, we colonialists, we French, we Westerners. And then there is the never-ending outrage of Israel, that running colonial sore. Of course, they have every right, those Muslims, to come here to France. We went to their countries once, now they come to ours. And they have every right to hate us, Don't they?



So now we have decided not to understand, and to cut all ties of sympathy to, Israel -- and how did we ever have any sympathy for it in the first place, the way some of our parents did back in 1948 or 1956 or 1967? How could they not have seen what the "Palestinian people" had to endure? Hanan, Yasser, Said, Saeb, Aziz, Walid,

Rashid, Mohammed -- you have won our hearts and minds. Take us, do with us what you will.

No one will mention what is happening or what kinds of things we must begin to think about doing to save ourselves. No one of any decency. And whatever Le Pen and Megret say, we must say the opposite (except, of course, when they show their hostility to "the Jews"). Do not say those things, do not think them. Free thought is all very well in theory, but really -- consider the consequences. Don't dare to think outside that box brimming with *idées reçues*. *Défense de penser au dehors du box*.

No, everything will be all right as you stroll down the Avenue Paule-Anne. Those Muslims will never be a match for us. Why, just look at those legionnaires marching *à pas lent* down the Champs-Élysées, think of that string of desert victories. Inside our heads, it is 1930 and over here is the Exposition coloniale. You remember, *tu t'en souviens*, that painting by le Douanier Rousseau, don't you, with the burnoosed Arab standing next to the black Senegalese? I have it right, don't I? France will always be France. Nothing will ever change.

At a certain point, and despite everything that causes you not to see what is staring you in the face, you realize that something has gone irreparably wrong

with your country, and you, and your children, are in danger of losing that country, down to every village and house, *qui m'est une province et beaucoup davantage*. And you do not know what to do, or how to explain this feeling to others, or in whom to confide your secret fears, or what can be done. It is so confusing, and so upsetting. You cannot vote for Le Pen. You cannot endorse "cowboy" Bush or those ridiculous Americans. You have no place to go.

Most likely all those Moslems will simply convert. I mean they do that, don't they, quite easily I'm told. The situation is always saved in time.

And then you learn what Jacques Chirac -- who now has a Muslim grandchild himself -- and Dominique de Villepin, do not wish you to learn. For if you did, you might be very angry. You discover that 1 out of every 3 babies born in France today is a Muslim baby. And that means, in 20 years, one of every three 20-year-olds in France will be a Muslim twenty-year-old. And that means, twenty years after that, at present rates of reproduction, France will have a majority Muslim population. Where shall we hide the statues from Marly-le-roi? And the Venus de Milo? And what about all those paintings of animated life -- all those portraits in the Louvre, and the Grand Palais, and the Musée Guimet down there in linden-lined Aix, and everywhere else in art-filled artful France, *mère des arts, des armes, et des loix* -- that are absolutely forbidden according to the immutable strictures of the Qur'an. Should they be sent for safekeeping to those Americans across the seas? By then most of the Jews in France will have left, gone across the oceans for their own safekeeping, to Israel or to English-speaking Canada (they were worried about the Muslim population of Quebec, you see, which had been allowed to grow under the Province of Quebec's policy of encouraging francophone immigrants, preferring North Africans to potential immigrants from Italy, Greece, Spain), and above all, to America. What luck those Americans have had. No more bequests to France by the likes of the Rothschilds, or Nissim Camondo. No more Donatiens from another Pierre Lévy. Enjoy the Kufic calligraphy; some find it endlessly fascinating.

For the moment, you allow yourself to believe that something will come up. Most likely, all those Muslims will simply convert. I mean, they do that, don't they, quite easily I'm told. Of course, why didn't I think of it, that is exactly what will happen. The situation is always saved in time. Just like during the war. Nothing to worry about. Nothing.

Hugh Fitzgerald, a frequent contributor to Outpost, is a lecturer on the manipulation of language for political ends.

Disengagement From Reality

Moshe Saperstein

As a former New Yorker living in Israel for the past 37 years I am delighted that the internet allows me to read the *New York Post* every day. Permit me, then, to express my disappointment at "Sharon's Set-back" by Eric Fettmann, a columnist I usually admire.

I live in Neve Dekalim, the largest of the 21 communities that make up the Gush Katif bloc of Jewish habitation in the Gaza Strip. Not one inch of the land on which our homes, farms and factories are built was taken from Arab residents. They were built on sand dunes which we, as foretold in the Bible, have transformed from desert into a small paradise. It would be bitter enough if our reward for steadfastness in the face of three and one-half years of unceasing and unrelenting Arab warfare would be expulsion for some greater benefit to the people and State of Israel. With heavy hearts we would accept the need for our sacrifice. But to be expelled in exchange for nothing? That is unbearable. Not one single benefit claimed by Mr. Sharon stands up to examination.

The plan is called a Disengagement Plan. Disengagement means separation. But according to the plan Israel continues to provide Gazan Arabs with food, water, electricity and fuel, and Gazan Arabs can continue to work within the Green Line and to ship their products for sale in Israel or transshipment abroad through Israeli ports. Clearly the only thing being separated are Jews from their land.

Mr. Sharon claims that leaving Gaza will increase Israel's security. The late Yitzhak Rabin, no friend of "settlers", stated that "If Gush Katif didn't exist we would have to invent it." He explained that the existence of Jewish communities in Gaza provided the reason for an Israel Defense Forces presence in the area, a presence that would keep Gazan Arabs from organizing large scale attacks on Jews within the Green Line.

If the Israel Navy radar base opposite my home is dismantled how will we know of arms smuggling by small ships? Unless we have developed a method of examining planes in flight, how will we prevent arms being flown in to the Dahaniya airport in Gaza? As to troops in the so-called Philadelphia Corridor separating Gaza and Egyptian Sinai, Mr. Sharon has already agreed to American requests that the IDF stay be of limited duration.

Mr. Sharon has stated that chaos will reign in Gaza, and that various Arab factions will be busy killing each other. Even if this doubtful proposition is accurate, for how long will such a situation continue? Two days, two weeks, two months? Following which they will return to their favorite activity of killing Jews. Is our expulsion worth a short period of relative quiet? Mr. Sharon states that the absence of Jews in Gaza

will deprive Arabs of an excuse to attack. Since when have Arabs needed an excuse to attack Jews? Excuses aplenty are provided to the Western media hungry to justify Arab atrocities. But in the Arab media it is clear that the simple existence of Jews is justification for their extermination.

Perhaps Mr. Sharon's greatest success has been in convincing people that he has won President Bush's approval for his plan that will strengthen Israel's hold over settlement blocs in Judea and Samaria. But even a cursory examination of the Bush letter indicates that other than a photo-op Mr. Sharon received nothing. The much-touted comment about not going back to the 1967 borders because of demographic facts covers the Jerusalem neighborhoods built since the Six-Day War. And nothing else. As Secretary of State Powell stated the day after publication of President Bush's letter, "America's Middle East policy has not changed."

As to the so-called "security wall that Sharon is building", the wall may be solid but the security is a mirage. Though politicians view it as the Holy Grail, military people who haven't metamorphosed into politicians view it as the Maginot Line. The large wall separating Gush Katif from Khan Yunis hasn't prevented over 4000 mortars, missiles and rockets from being fired at us since Rosh Hashanah 2000. And just yesterday tunnels were discovered under the wall leading in to our community. "Yet the plan," Mr. Fettmann writes, "... surely has the support of a large majority of Israelis." Might I remind him that a week before the Likud referendum polls gave Mr. Sharon a double-digit majority, yet he lost by 60%-40%. Israelis bought the Brooklyn Bridge when we agreed to the Oslo Accords. We're not going to be suckered again. The average Israeli has twice the common sense of the politicians that lead us, and four times the common sense of our intellectual elite.

One last example of the absurdity of Mr. Sharon's plan. Clause Five mandates that Israel will once again provide military training and arms for the "Palestinian Security Services" at a time when Sharon declares that there is no reliable Palestinian peace partner. Don't Mr. Fettmann and his colleagues see the logical disconnect?

Mr. Sharon's so-called disengagement plan represents Jewish despair. The Israeli citizens of Judea, Samaria and Gaza represent Jewish optimism. And in Israel it is the dreamers, not the pragmatists, who are the realists.

Moshe Saperstein lost an arm in the Yom Kippur War in defense of his country. In early 2002, despite being wounded in his other hand, he heroically attempted to run down a terrorist who had just shot and killed a young mother driving in the car in front of him.



Abracadabra — It's Magic!

Jack Engelhard

We had our bags packed right by the door, and one day it happened. Father rushed in from his visit to the gendarmes and said, "We're going," and so we went. Up over the Pyrenees and down into Spain and then to the legendary ship Serpa Pinto and finally to relative safety—and oh, this is a long story. The short of it is this—we had our bags packed.

Some 60 years later, all of Israel has its bags packed. Who thought it would come to this? But please listen up, O Israel. If you think you're any safer in Tel Aviv than in Gush Katif, think again. They will come for you, too. All of Israel is territory and all of it is occupied.

Yes, I understand the logic. Give up on Gaza, give up further parts of Judea and Samaria, and Israel will be secure against being swamped demographically. What's more, the IDF will have less to worry about, and what's even more, the Arabs will be ready for their 23rd homeland. The world will cheer that Israel has shown good faith in the name of peace. Congratulations will arrive from Annan, Bush, Rice, Powell, Straw and Blair. So the thinking goes, and it certainly appears to be good politics.

Most experts tell us that Prime Minister Ariel Sharon is in partial mode (like being slightly pregnant), meaning that after his plan to cleanse Gaza of Jews went down to defeat, he is approaching Plan B, to do the uprooting bit by bit, so as to assure the world, "Look, I'm doing your work," and, on the other hand, to show Israel, "Look, I am kosher. See? I have split hooves."

Sharon is indeed the magician people say he is. "See what I can do? I can make Jews disappear slowly or in a snap. Poof. Now you see them, now you don't." Magic.

Of the Likud results, Deputy Prime Minister Ehud Olmert did the math and discovered that minus is plus, a loss is a win. More magic.

Over here in the United States, the person (or the referendum) who gets the most votes wins. Doesn't matter how many people cast ballots. In fact, most local elections get about a 30 percent turnout, and even some nationwide elections grudgingly attract 50 percent of eligible voters. (About the same number of the Likud showed up to be counted.)

Still, a win is a win. Not so, apparently, by the leadership and opinion-makers in Israel. Editorialists keep reminding us that, suddenly, Likud is only Likud, not Israel.

We can be sure, however, that had the results gone the other way, in favor of Sharon and Olmert, the headlines would have been entirely different: "The people of Israel have spoken! Uprooting begins immediately." In fact, it's as if Likud never spoke. Powell and his Quartet hardly mention the will of Likud.

Where have you gone Bret Stephens of the *Jerusalem Post* and Eric Fetsmann of the *New York Post*? Who are your new friends? Your thinking is clever. But all of it still means that Jews live on quicksand. This cleverness still leaves Jews without roots, Israel without sovereignty. Do you truly believe the beast that devours will ever be satiated?

The designs of the nations could not be more obvious. For the Olympics, Greece refuses to name Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. Mary Robinson, the former president of Ireland, but more famous for chairing the Israel-bashing bonfire of the vanities at Durban, is given a seat at Columbia. Academics and diplomats from east, west, north and south insist on boycotting Jewish Israel, which is virtually the only place in the Middle East where Arabs enjoy freedom of expression and Christians are free to attend church.

Few tears were shed over the murder of a pregnant Israeli woman and her four daughters. Amnesty International finally got a grip and offered a rare voice of pity for Tali Hatuel and her family. No apologies were demanded of the Arab world. None given. (But see how fast we run to them in contrition for our alleged sins of "abuse".)

In an act timed to reward this latest genocide, and in a sacrificial bounty to a generation that has no heart, hours after the Hatuel slaying the U.N. General Assembly voted to give the Palestinian Arabs complete sovereignty over Gaza, the "West Bank" and East Jerusalem. The vote was 140 to 6, a sign of plans to come.

The big plan, the real plan, the master plan, is to set all of Israel packing. Sorry to be so blunt. But that's how it is. They can fool the rest, but they can't fool me. I am wise to the abracadabra that turns showers into ovens, and in we marched. Uri Geller can bend a spoon with his mind. That is nothing compared to what they can bend with their boycotts, resolutions, accords, Quartets, road maps and peace processes.

But let's pretend that Olmert's plan succeeds by whatever trickery he uses as the self-anointed king of post-Israel. Okay, so here's another plan. If Jews may not live with Arabs in Arab lands, then let's be fair. Arabs, therefore, may not live with Jews in Jewish lands. This means that the million and a half Arabs that live in Israel must be sent packing as well.

Anyone who singles out Jews exclusively for ethnic cleansing is surely a bigot. Of course, no one wants to be called a bigot in this age of political correctness.

So if we go, they go, and let Barenboim go with them and forever fiddle Wagner in Ramallah.

Jack Engelhard is the author of the bestseller Indecent Proposal and the award-winning memoir Escape from Mount Moriah.

(Continued from page 2)

in Saudi Arabia at an Exxon refinery resulting in the death of British and American nationals. Straw took no notice of the murder of the Hatuel family. Meanwhile David Hatuel spoke as he buried his entire family on a Sunday evening in a cemetery in Ashkelon. "You were my flowers. I am all alone and there is no one left."

HONORING YOUR ENEMIES

In the November 1999 *Outpost* we published "By Those They Honor Ye Shall Know Them" chronicling the extent to which Israel's prizes for excellence were being awarded to those who undermined and denigrated the state.

Israel continues to honor her enemies. This year musician Daniel Barenboim received the Wolf Foundation Prize -- and a standing ovation -- at the Knesset, as he used the occasion to launch one of his typical tirades against Israel: "I ask today whether a situation of conquest and control can be reconciled with Israel's Declaration of Independence? Is there logic to the independence of one people if the cost is a blow to the fundamental rights of another people?" He promptly announced he was donating the \$50,000 prize to the "Palestinian people."

Meanwhile the Israel Prize was awarded to third rate sculptor Yigal Tumarkin, who defames Israel rhetorically and in his works defames Judaism (e.g. his pig wearing tefilin -- the phylacteries Jewish men wear during morning prayer).

STATE DEPARTMENT ARABISTS "PROTEST"

Taking their cue from British former diplomats in

the Arab world who sent a letter to Prime Minister Blair, fifty former American diplomats have denounced President Bush for his alleged bias toward Israel (even the British Arabists could not find much fault with Blair on this score). "By closing the door to negotiations with Palestinians and the possibility of a Palestinian state, you have proved that the United States is not an even-handed peace partner" write the diplomats. Would that this were true. President Bush, of course, keeps reiterating his commitment both to negotiations and to a Palestinian state. Bush is accused of "unqualified support of Sharon's extra-judicial assassinations, Israel's Berlin Wall-like barrier, its harsh military measures in the occupied territories and now your endorsement of Sharon's unilateral plan."

The letter's bizarre "complaints" sound as if they came directly from the Arabs -- and in a sense, they do. The letter was published under the auspices of the American Educational Trust which produces the virulently anti-Israel *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, published by former U.S. ambassador to Qatar Andrew Killgore, the letter's chief signatory. And in May's *Outpost* Hugh Fitzgerald points out the extent to which former diplomats to Saudi Arabia wind up on the Saudi payroll.

As the *Jerusalem Post* (May 5) points out, what Americans are getting is an Arab lobby within and alongside the State Department -- and the letter "should serve as a wake-up call to Bush that he needs to ensure that his Mideast ambassadors and foreign service officers are with him, not against him. He is, after all, their boss."

Americans For A Safe Israel
1623 Third Ave. (at 92nd St.) - Suite 205
New York, NY 10128

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