

OUTPOST

February 2005—Issue #175

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

Lifting the Demographic Fog

Herbert Zweibon

The case against Israel holding on to Judea, Samaria and Gaza is often put in demographic terms. Many believe Sharon's policy of territorial retreat from Gaza and northern Samaria is partially based on projections by Israeli demographers that Jews will soon be only 40-45% of the population between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean.

A recent study shows this dire prognosis is false. The study was presented by a team of American and Israeli researchers at the American Enterprise Institute and the Heritage Foundation in Washington and can be read in full at www.aei.org. It shows that the 2004 Palestinian Arab population was closer to 2.4 million than to the 3.8 million reported by Palestinian Authority officials and uncritically echoed by Israeli experts. The 1.4 million gap results chiefly from the fact that the PA numbers are based on Palestine Bureau of Statistics (PBS) 1997 projections, not on actual population counts. The PBS assumed immigration from abroad of 1.5% a year and an annual internal growth rate of 4-5%. But these expectations have not been met.

In fact – small wonder given the PA's dreadful governance and hence the deteriorating economic situation in the area under its control – there has been a steady net emigration each year since 1994. (Arab emigration would be much larger if Israel encouraged, rather than impeded, Arabs within the state who desire to leave.)

More significant, the Arab birthrate has fallen. Yoram Ettinger, head of the Israeli team, notes: "The research is based chiefly on Arab sources other than the PA's Bureau of Statistics, such as the PA Ministry of Health....The unanimous conclusion of all these sources is that there has been a very dramatic drop in the Arab birthrate in Judea and Samaria." Part of the reason, says Ettinger, is that the population has become less rural and more urban and poor. Also women are getting married 2-3 years later.

Outright deceptions account for significant over-counting. Jerusalem's 230,000 Arabs are

counted twice, both as part of the Palestinian Authority and by Israel as part of her own population. The PBS statistics also include 200,000 Palestinian Arabs who live abroad (those living abroad for over a year are 13 percent of those counted in 1997 and form part of the base on which population growth is projected, despite the fact they don't live in the territories.) And the PA keeps 150,000 Arabs who have moved to Green Line Israel on its rolls, so they too are counted twice.

Haifa professor Arnon Sofer, a geographer who has previously used the PA figures, has reacted angrily. While he says he is willing to acknowledge that the PA lies, and there are 400,000 fewer Arabs in Gaza and 400,000 fewer in Judea and Samaria, he insists that's "still a lot (of Arabs)." (If there are 400,000 fewer Arabs in Gaza than the PA claims, one has to wonder how many non-existent Arab "refugees" are in that number, blindly paid for by the U.S. taxpayer.) But the 800,000 fewer Arabs -- that Sofer himself concedes -- are not an insignificant number.

Sofer also disputes that the birthrate has fallen as much as the Israeli team says. But Dr. Michael Wise, one of the U.S. team members, an expert in mathematical modeling techniques, says that similar birthrate drops have been found in Egypt, Jordan and Iran. Dr. Wise points out that Jewish growth rates are the highest among the Western democracies, and only a small fraction below the Arab growth rate in Judea and Samaria.

In short the Jewish population west of the Jordan River, far from dramatically declining as a proportion of the whole, has remained stable. The true bombshell is that the demographic ticking time bomb is a myth. The real lesson to be drawn is that Israel can survive demographically even with defensible orders – and it may not be able to survive militarily without them.

In This Issue

- | | |
|---|-------|
| A Time To Resist, Soberly by P. David Hornik | ...3 |
| The Greatest Obstacle To Peace by Nidra Poller | ...6 |
| Reforming Islam by Hugh Fitzgerald | ...7 |
| What Happened to Sharon? by Moshe Dann | ...8 |
| On Barren Ground by Mark Silverberg | ...10 |

From the Editor

Jihad in New Jersey?

Daniel Pipes gives some background reinforcing the possibility that the Armanious family massacre was motivated by Islamic radicalism. His information comes from Robert Spencer of *jihadwatch* who spoke to a close friend of the murdered father.

This friend reports that the family had sought to convert several Moslems to Christianity but these converts were practicing *taqiyya*, or religious deception. The Coptic community believes that it is likely these converts murdered the family. It sees the murder as a warning to Copts that the first amendment and American law enforcement will not protect them.

Spencer believes the fate of the Armanious family is akin to Theo van Gogh's murder in Holland, an indication that Moslems in the United States do not unanimously accept American pluralism.

PA Hate-Speech is Back

After a lull of a few weeks, the PA is back promoting hatred. In a Jan. 5 speech broadcast on PA TV stations Prime Minister Abbas twice referred to Israel as the "Zionist enemy." (Abbas, often described in the West as a leader "uncompromised by terror," was one of the chief architects of the Munich massacre of Israeli athletes -- no less an authority than Mohammed Daoud Oudeh, the coordinator of the attack, has said that Abu Mazen/Abbas provided the funds and instructions to carry it out.)

The Friday sermons, broadcast by PA TV, are again as venomous as ever. Sample from Sheik Ibrahim Madiras' Friday sermon of Dec. 31: "No to the return to the 1967 borders. We are interested in returning to our genuine borders...We are interested in returning to the 1936 borders, to the revolution...and we are interested in returning to 1929 borders...[when] a group of our grandfathers and fathers became Martyrs for Allah in the Al-Buraq revolution, as they were defending the Al-Aqsa mosque from the Hagana gangs, Allah curse them and curse those who supported them." And here is the Sheik on Jan. 7: "Oh Muslims. The Jews are Jews. Their character and custom are corruption and destruction of this land. We keep warning you: the Jews are a cancer that spreads inside the body of the Islamic and Arab nation."

Tsunami Aid

Israel has taken great pride in its generosity toward the victims of the tsunami, most of them, of course, Moslem. As far as the half million dollars it has sent to Indonesia, Israel should have saved its money -- and its dignity. Indonesia has long treated Israel as an enemy: it maintains no diplomatic relations with Israel and does not even allow El Al planes to fly over its territory, let alone land in the country. The "reward" Israel is reaping for its generosity is more hatred and

abuse. An Indonesian government minister even denies the country has received aid from Israel (he says aid from individual Jews is acceptable, but aid from Israel "will not happen"). Moslem "intellectuals" have already begun to accuse "global Zionism" of pretending to provide aid and instead abducting children orphaned by the tsunami. For example, MEMRI's TV Project reports that Yemeni "professor" Al-'Ajai announced that "Zionist companies" are "abducting these children, while exploiting the circumstances of these painful events, and trading in them. Many studies have proven that a large percent of the slave market belongs to the forces of global Zionism, whose octopus tentacles spread evil throughout the world."

DOD v. Sy Hersh

The Department of Defense, which usually submits silently to Seymour Hersh's junk journalism in the *New Yorker* (Rumsfeld, Wolfowitz and Feith are regular Hersh targets) has come out swinging this time against a Hersh piece "The Coming Wars" in the *New Yorker* of January 24. Hersh (who confidently predicted war with Iran by summer on CNN's Lou Dobbs program of Jan. 17) claims super secret commando units are preparing the way by monitoring Iran's nuclear sites. The sources are the usual collection of anonymous characters, a former intelligence officer here, a former consultant there, a recently retired official, you name it, and what Hersh produces, as Michael Ledeen explicates so well (in "The Hersh File" on *NationalReview.com* of Jan. 25) is his usual incoherent output. The DOD declared of this article what is true of almost everything Hersh writes: "Mr. Hersh's article is so riddled with errors of fundamental fact that the credibility of his entire piece is destroyed."

While even CBS has now cleaned house, the *New Yorker* persists in publishing this meretricious stuff and journalism continues to shower its awards on Hersh (in 2004 the National Magazine Award).

While we don't hold our breath, we have our own touchstone for evidence of improvement in media standards: it's when Hersh is relegated to the supermarket tabloids (Two Year Old Gives Birth to 90 Year Old Woman) where he belongs.

(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

A Time to Resist, Soberly

P. David Hornik

The years 2001-2003 were the worst in Israel's history. Other periods -- the Independence War, the three weeks of the Yom Kippur War -- took a higher toll in lives. What set aside 2001-2003, though, was that despite a relentless terror assault against Israeli civilians and soldiers, Israel essentially did not fight back, even though it had a Likud prime minister with a reputation as a hawk and an army that was capable of defeating the terror at any time. Even after the Park Hotel massacre in March 2002, the military was given only a somewhat freer hand.

In trying to figure out what was happening, I conjectured that the blame lay mainly with the U.S. government for refusing to give Israel the diplomatic support it would have needed to fight the terror seriously. Bush, I reasoned, had probably told Sharon not to count on the U.S. preventing a UN reaction of sending "peacekeepers" to "protect the Palestinians," and Sharon had probably concluded that this would ultimately be even more harmful to Israel's security than the terror war itself. No doubt, it was emotionally easier to view it that way -- though, as someone who grew up in America and is still affectionately attached to it, not easy.

Recent statements, though, by two people who were Israeli cabinet ministers at that time (and still are) suggest that the reality was worse.

Natan Sharansky was, in those years, deputy prime minister and minister of housing and construction. In his recent book *The Case for Democracy* (with Ron Dermer, Public Affairs, 2004), he recounts: "Sharon cobbled together a national unity government and made Shimon Peres his foreign minister. Almost immediately, it became clear that there would be constant tension in the government. The sea change in Israeli public opinion . . . was not reflected inside Israel's parliament, and this was especially true inside Israel's Labor party. Most of the leading Labor ministers did not change their pro-Oslo views. They remained convinced that Arafat and the PA were the only alternatives and that nothing should be done to weaken them. Rather than meet the escalation of Palestinian terror with a firm response, they counseled restraint. According to the logic of their approach, the Palestinian terror attacks coupled with Israel's muted response was gaining Israel the sympathy of the world, and this sympathy could be used to

pressure Arafat into taking action against the terror organizations. A strong response, it was thought, would create international sympathy for the Palestinians and put no diplomatic pressure on Arafat to crack down on terror.



A strong response, it was thought, would create international sympathy for the Palestinians and put no diplomatic pressure on Arafat to crack down on terror.

And Silvan Shalom, who was deputy prime minister and finance minister in that government, related in a December 22 interview with the *Jerusalem Post*. "I said more than once that we would never be able to reach an agreement with Arafat, and I called for his expulsion more than three years ago. . . . I also always said it is easier for me as the deputy prime minister to call for Arafat's expulsion than for the prime minister to do it. I understand that. . . . But I think that if we would have done it three years ago, we would have saved hundreds of Israeli and Palestinian lives, even thousands. No mourning, no widows and orphans."

The implications of these two statements are grim. Both Sharansky and Shalom were high-ranking ministers in that government, and they both believe much more could have been done to protect us from the onslaught. Instead, it was hypothetical fears about world reactions -- especially strong among a group of ministers who did not represent the people's will -- that led to "restraint" -- in other words, letting us be butchered.

So it's with a feeling of bitter irony that I view the civil disobedience campaign that is now finally starting to take shape in Israel. That is, I view the campaign both as entirely justified and as too little, too late, and too restricted. Justified, because the government has no mandate for "disengagement"; instead, Sharon's dictatorial tactics are making a mockery of what's still proudly trumpeted as Israeli democracy. Too little, too late, and too restricted because disengagement-without-a-mandate is only the latest in a string of outrages that Israeli governments have perpetrated in the Oslo era.

It looks now as if not only the Rabin-Peres Oslo government during 1993-1996, and the Barak Oslo government during fall-winter 2000-01, essentially allowed Israelis to be slaughtered in deference to diplomatic concerns, but that the Sharon Likud-Labor "unity" government of 2001-2003 did the same thing. And we know that the whole blood-strewn "process" would have been stopped in its tracks with the Oslo II

vote in the Knesset in October 1995, except that Labor bought the votes of two conscienceless monsters (one of them now facing charges for massive drug smuggling). We know, too, that Barak pulled a trick of re-signing in December 2000 so as to prevent Knesset elections that undoubtedly would have resulted in a right-wing government that would have been much more likely to fight the terror instead of submit to it. And we also know that, after hundreds more funerals, we were finally allowed to elect such a government in 2003; that it did fight terror much more effectively on the whole; and that Sharon has now destroyed it in the name of the same Oslo approach of unilateral concessions while striving to bring the Osloites back.

In other words, an accumulation of outrages of which the specific disengagement from Gaza and northern Samaria is only the latest installment. And it continues; here are some examples:

The government informs us that Egypt will soon be handling our security concerns in Gaza. At the same time, it turns out that in return for releasing an innocent Israeli citizen who was judicially kidnapped in Egypt and held there in horrendous conditions for eight years, President Mubarak needs the release by Israel of over 150 convicted offenders, many of them terrorists, to show our appreciation. This in addition to the release of six Egyptian infiltrators who were caught while planning large-scale terror attacks, and who, upon returning to Egypt, were greeted with smiles and honors by their government. Never fear -- after the IDF leaves Gaza, 750 Egyptian border policemen will be guarding the Philadelphi Route for us, and Egypt will be "training Palestinian security personnel."

The newly emerging "unity" government creates a plethora of ministerial posts to stroke the egos of the various hacks who will constitute it, continuing a tradition started by Barak in 1999 when he used legal sleight of hand to expand the cabinet from the mandated 18 ministers to 24. Here, one might say, they're only stealing our tax money instead of letting us be killed. But economics and security are closely linked in Israel. At a time of deep cuts both in welfare payments and the defense budget, there's always enough money for useless ministers without portfolios and deputy ministers with fancy offices, staffs, and cars. And if this isn't enough, another Basic Law is altered to create a special, entirely redundant deputy-prime-ministerial post for -- none other than Shimon Peres, who got the Oslo nightmare rolling and still thinks it's a great thing.

Convicted and jailed mass murderer Marwan Barghouti was not only allowed to run for the presidency of the Palestinian Authority until he himself

bowed out of the race, but to continue playing a lively, influential role in Palestinian politics from his prison cell. Just last December 28, Barghouti was visited by Gaza strongman Mohammed Dahlan and told him that "Israel's decision to withdraw from the Gaza Strip and

the northern West Bank is a victory for the Palestinian resistance." Other recent visitors to this honored figure include Member of Knesset Taleb a-Sanaa and PA minister Kadura Fares. This while Barghouti's murder victims can only be visited in their graves.

Government by trial balloon: In the latest "trial balloon" episode, Minister Ehud Olmert announces that the Gaza/northern-Samaria disengagement is just the start of a larger withdrawal process that will leave Israel as a huddled, indefensible ghetto surrounded by deadly enemies. Sharon immediately denies Olmert's

words. Yet when, a few months ago, Sharon's personal aide Dov Weisglass proclaimed that the Gaza/northern-Samaria disengagement would be final and was aimed at keeping the rest of the land under Israel's control, Sharon similarly issued a flat-out denial. Sharon here exposes himself as a liar, since it cannot be that both Olmert and Weisglass are wrong. Instead of a government that respects a population that is enduring a terror war, and speaks openly and honestly to us, we get a government of trial balloons, lies, and trickery.

What can be concluded from all this?

A nonviolent civil-disobedience campaign against disengagement is, to repeat, completely justified. If a majority of Israelis believe disengagement constitutes *pikuach nefesh* (saving lives) and is in our interest, then the government has a right to implement it. But we don't know if a majority of Israelis believe that; all we have are polls that say so. In other democracies, referendums are held on much less weighty issues than the life-and-death issue of disengagement; we, however, aren't granted a referendum, only polls. Nevertheless, a civil-disobedience campaign focused on settlement evacuation runs the risk of distorting what is at stake: even if there had never been a single Israeli settlement in Gaza or northern Samaria, evacuating these areas now, handing them over carte blanche to *jihadi* terror, would to the exact same degree be a suicidal step that leaves other parts of Israel indefensible and signals, once again, that relentless terror is "the way to go" and always leads Israel to cave eventually.

Nevertheless, it is natural for the settlers and their supporters, who have initiated the civil-disobedience campaign, to focus on the issue of evacuating settlements. Which leads to the question: where are the rest of the people -- that is, the majority that is not leftist -- and where have they been amid

It is with a feeling of bitter irony that I view the civil disobedience campaign that is now finally starting to take shape in Israel.

these ongoing outrages? This question perplexes many people, including supporters of Israel abroad; I can only suggest some possible answers:

1. The Israeli population is a uniquely traumatized and bewildered population. In addition to the battering of violence and hatred, it seems to have internalized the lessons that votes are meaningless, leaders do not mean what they say in any case, and activism is not only useless but often counterproductive, bringing the opposite results to what one intended. Remaining active and assertive in such a situation requires special strength; the settler community, being fired by a religious ideology, has the strength, while the rest of the non-leftist population does not, or not enough of it.

2. The Rabin assassination seems to have had a special traumatizing effect. Before it, I used to go to anti-Oslo rallies and see many people who, like me, lacked head covering. Since the Rabin assassination, the religious Right has been -- until recently -- much quieter too, but head-coverings have been predominant at the demonstrations that were held. I can't account for the depth of the Rabin-assassination effect on the population, especially since it happened nine years ago and since then far more Israelis have died as a result of government policy; but, apparently, it is there.

3. "Sharon knows things we don't know; he knows what he's doing." The belief in Sharon as a sort of security genius has been an important factor, from 2001 to the present, in inducing passivity in the population. People felt that, in 2001 and especially 2003, they had at last elected someone who knew how to deal with the situation, and could sit back and let him work his wonders. I too was afflicted with this malady; I only got over it totally in 2004. The question of why Sharon has turned into an Oslo-style leftist who ignores security realities in pursuing a blind capitulationist strategy is less important than the fact that he has indeed become one. Among people who are neither leftists nor firm opponents of disengagement, the psychological resistance is still potent -- "It doesn't make sense, but he must know what he's doing." Hopefully intelligence chief Avi Dichter's warnings about the dire security consequences of disengagement can help chip away at the syndrome.

Much of the damage wrought by our feckless, spineless leaders of the Oslo era cannot be undone; the dead cannot be brought back. The only hope of

widening the civil-disobedience campaign beyond the settler community and making it more effective, is to

reduce the emphasis on settlements and increase the emphasis on security while trying to remind people what horrors their trust and passivity have already enabled. The focus should be on the security implications of: abandoning territory in the midst of a war against a fanatic enemy; rewarding hostile, dangerous, anti-Semitic Egypt with power and prestige it has done nothing to deserve; leaving

Sderot, Ashkelon, and the surrounding area -- and future areas in further disengagements -- defenseless against missiles and infiltrations; letting Gaza become an importer and incubator of ever-more-advanced weaponry including WMD; strengthening Iran's already-strong position in the land between the Mediterranean and the Jordan; very likely necessitating a reinvansion of Gaza and a larger, more costly war; further legitimizing total Israeli retreat as a "solution" to security situations and giving huge encouragement to our enemies; and so on.

The situation requires both passionate involvement and cool heads. A civil-disobedience campaign that spirals into violence and chaos will make the anti-disengagement cause look fanatical and do more harm than good.

P. David Hornik is a freelance writer living in Jerusalem. This article appeared on israelinsider.com



A Pro-Settlement Demonstration

We should try to remind people what horrors their trust and passivity have already enabled.

AFSI Books

Battleground: Fact and Fantasy in Palestine
Shmuel Katz—\$5.95

The Political and Social Philosophy of Ze'ev Jabotinsky: Selected Writings — \$25

Dubious Allies: The Arab Media's War of Words Against America —\$5.95

What Shimon Says—Shimon Peres in His Own Words—\$3.95

Order from:
Americans For A Safe Israel
1623 Third Ave., #205
New York, N.Y. 10128

The Greatest Obstacle to Peace

Nidra Poller

The greatest obstacle to peace? The peace process, of course. It's something worse than processed cheese, but it doesn't seem to bother the altermondialistes, ecolo-purists, and fins gastronomes.

Arafat was Allah's gift to peace. But when he died, for some mysterious reason all those who were claiming that he was the Key and the Door and the Road and the Way to peace suddenly discovered that great hopes were dawning.

Yes, we know why. It's because Mahmoud Abbas shaves. And the same people who spit on advertising wouldn't be expected to give Gillette the credit for this tsunami of peace hope. No, it's not the razor, it's a *je ne sais quoi* of Abbas that somehow soothes our souls and makes our eyes shine like Christmas bulbs.

Here's a guy you can peace process with. He doesn't snarl, he smiles like a sweet grandfather as he's carried around on the shoulders of an arch-terrorist serial Jew-killer. He makes extravagant election promises about flying the Palestinian flag from the minarets of Jerusalem (existing, and to come...like in movie contracts), burying Arafat in Jerusalem, ending the occupation (of



Mahmoud Abbas

West Jerusalem, of course, but it's that famous French *non dit*, fulfilling the dreams of Arafat, and fulfilling the goals of Hamas. He can talk about dismantling the Jewish state by stages;

the world's press

takes things one at a time. A state, a state, a state in Gaza and the West Bank, Reuters just repeated it for the 8 millionth time, that's what the Palestinians want, what Hamas wants, what the Qur'an wants, what Allah wants. And since there are no borders to the West Bank and Gaza on Palestinian maps, Reuters can be trusted. All they want is a state.

A state of war. But as long as they only say it to each other, and never in English, why worry?

What's wrong with the peace process is that Israel hasn't caught on. Israel keeps trying to deal with facts on the ground. They want a state in Gaza? OK, we'll pull out of Gaza. And too bad for a bunch of cranks who want to live there because they don't un-

derstand peace processes. And, as all the world can see, the Palestinians are *thrilled*.

You're pulling out of Gaza? Oh how thrilling, how did you know, it's exactly what I wanted. I'm just so excited, I'm bursting with Kassams. How many Jews can I kill before you pull out of Gaza to prove to you how much I love you and to encourage you to pull out of the West Bank and Tel Aviv and all those other territories you've been occupying since Methusaleh.

The peace processing world looks on, frowns, points a finger at Israel and says "Hey there, you better stop attacking these Palestinians if you want to show you're serious about peace." Revisionists revise history and the Peace Processors are revising the road map. Suddenly if you want to get from point X to point Y, you should begin at point Y. (Come to think of it,

why didn't I think of that?) You want a Palestinian state? The road map says that's Y and to get there you must start at X, namely stop killing Jews, You improve the road map. There is no X. You begin with a Palestinian state at Y. Check out your favorite media this week and you'll see how many talking mouths are going that way for 2005.

Because the pundits are logical. If you give them a state (that's what they want) they'll stop killing Jews. It's logical. You have to be some kind of Zionist extremist or ultra talmudist to think otherwise.

The problem with the peace process is that Israel is always trying to create facts on the ground. Why can't we do like Abbas? We announce to the world the glad tidings: we are pulling out of Gaza. We have decided that being in Gaza is counter-productive. In exchange, the world should give us a free pass to respectability, and repeal all UN resolutions. (All of them? Why not just the ones that are anti-Israel? Oh yeah, I see what you mean. Why make an exception for the other two?)

And then we just sit tight in Gaza, mow our lawns and putter around in our greenhouses and let the years go by. If a Reuters journalist happens to come by, we send out a spokesperson to declaim: we are going to pull out of Gaza. for the sake of peace, for the sake of the process, for the sake of the peace process. In fact, the person might add, we realize that it was a mistake to ever go into Gaza. But what can you do, that was thousands of years ago...

Abbas says he won't touch a hair on the rifle of a single Palestinian terrorist? Great! Neither will we. We proclaim that we have decided to stop killing Jew-Killers. No no no, it's not lowdown word play. We

We proclaim that we have decided to stop killing Jew-Killers. We are going to peace process them.

aren't going to eliminate them, liquidate them, target them or any such thing. We are going to peace process them.

You see what I mean? Public opinion is not asking for miracles. Public opinion doesn't expect Abbas to end homicide bombings, rocket launchings, tunnel diggings and assorted atrocities, they just want to hear him say that it would be nice if those things could finally achieve their goals and be phased out. So... that rickety little fence we stretched out between Israelis and their designated killers is not a Wall of

Shame, an Apartheid Wall, a Barrier to Peaceful Justice, it's just a line of thought, and in fact, to our minds, it doesn't even exist. Of course we'll pull it down the first thing tomorrow morning as a sign of good faith, but in the meantime people shouldn't get hung up on it. What matters is good intentions, Abbas intends to demilitarize the jihad and we intend to pull down the fence...

Nidra Poller is a novelist and journalist who lives in France.

“Reforming” Islam

Hugh Fitzgerald

When such contemporary would-be “reformers within Islam” as Canadian Irshad Manji are given attention, the admiring interviewer does not bother to raise the awkward question – just how does one “reform” a religion when all of its canonical texts, Qur’an, Hadith, and Sira, are immutable.

In the modern history of Islam, the heyday of supposed “reformers” was the period 1900-1930. This corresponded to the revelation, to the most advanced people in the Muslim world, of the weakness of Islamic societies, and the understanding that their political and economic and intellectual and social failures were attributable to the tenets of Islam itself, and the attitudes they engendered. But there is no such recognition today. Islam is cushioned from its failures by the accident of geology that provides oil wealth to some, by the solicitousness with which Infidel countries hasten to supply foreign aid, including military aid, to others, and by the attitude of extreme deference toward Muslim sensibilities that, if continued, will have catastrophic consequences for the Infidels themselves, and for those who, within Islam, would like to create the conditions where Muslims themselves will have to do something about Islam, whether to interpret away its literalism, or to constrain its practice in the manner of Atatürk.

In Islam, no Infidel state, whatever its dimensions, can be permitted, for that would violate the essence of Islam. Islam, said Mohammad, is “to dominate and not to be dominated.” No land once part of *dar al-Islam* can ever fall under Infidel control again. The land on which Israel now sits, and other lands, including the Balkans, much of south-central Europe, much of Russia, most of India, and of course Spain, were once all part of *dar al-Islam*, and must be returned to it. But Israel, an Infidel sovereign state run by the despised Jews, and sitting smack in the middle of

dar al-Islam, is particularly disturbing.

If the Islamic basis for Arab opposition to Israel were understood, then much that confuses commentators would become clear. It is irrelevant what Israel's borders are; if it exists, it remains an affront, an outrage, a catastrophe, the greatest injustice in the history of the world (as Arab spokesmen routinely say).

The very phrase a “final peace settlement” rings hollow to anyone familiar with the tenets of Islam.

Israel remains the greatest injustice in the history of the world (as Arab spokesmen routinely say).

For there can never be a “final peace settlement” between Moslems and non-Moslems. The model for treaties is the agreement made between Muhammad and the Meccans in 628 A.D., the Treaty of al-Hudaibiyya. It was supposed to be a “truce” treaty that would last 10 years. It lasted scarcely 18 months, when Muhammad, feeling that his forces had grown sufficiently, breached the agreement on a pretext, and attacked the Meccans. As Majid Khaddui notes in *War and Peace in Islam*, this Treaty of al-Hudaibiyya became the model, and the basis, for all future “treaties” with Infidel peoples and polities.

Public discussions about Arab-Israeli negotiations and assorted peace-processes never devote attention to the long and grim history of agreements and treaties between Israel and the Arab states. The Arabs were not interested in any agreements with that Infidel state for, despite the Israeli victory in 1949, they thought they could, within a reasonable period, go in for the kill. And so there were no “peace treaties” but, at Arab insistence, only agreements that did not recognize any final borders, just armistice lines. Despite the fact that those agreements included a cessation of hostile acts, more than 19,000 separate acts of terrorism against Israel took place between 1949 and 1956, from Egyptian-held territory alone. The Sinai Campaign of 1956 was launched to end that terrorism; Israel won the entire Sinai. In the mid-1950s, the heyday of John Foster Dulles, Islam was seen not as a threat to the West, but only a much-touted “bulwark” against Communism. At the same time, it was believed that certain Arab Muslim states had to be bribed to keep from falling into the Communist camp. Both beliefs,

though contradictory, led to American pressure on Israel to withdraw, for some flimsy guarantees, from the Sinai.

When he was President of Egypt, Nasser broke every commitment he made to President Eisenhower about freedom of shipping in the Straits of Tiran, about allowing Israeli ships to pass through the Suez Canal, about terrorist attacks launched from Egypt. That the Israelis continue to be surprised that the agreements they make with Muslim Arabs are eventually breached by the Arab side, testifies to their own remarkable insouciance, in failing to investigate what the law of war and peace in Islam expresses in such crystalline fashion.

And today Israel prepares to make "peace" based on some "road map," in order, it is hoped, to arrive at something called a "two-state solution." This time there is a more plausible, milder-mannered "Palestinian" leader than the late Arafat. Yet the doctrines of Islam remain, and those doctrines will continue to fashion the deepest impulses and beliefs of Muslims. Whatever Arafat or Abbas or anyone else

claims or feigns, and whatever any war-weary Israeli hopes, or whatever any useful Western tools or fools Muslims may exploit believe, no real and durable peace can be made with any Infidel sovereign state. It is the duty of Muslims, mandated by Islam and the example of Muhammad, to renew conflict, whatever agreement has been signed, as soon as the Muslim side is stronger. This means that deterrence, and only deterrence, can keep the peace. The doctrine of necessity, or *darura* – i.e., the fact of an Infidel enemy possessing, or seeming to possess, overwhelming power, is the only thing that Arab leaders, or at least those reluctant to make war, can use as an excuse not to do so. This is why, if one were genuinely interested in preserving peace between Israel and the Arabs, one would be looking at every possible way to strengthen the perception of Israel as impregnable – and to do nothing which, to Muslims looking at a map, might make them gain a different impression.

Hugh Fitzgerald is a frequent contributor to Outpost. This is excerpted from a much longer article Islam for Infidels that can be read on www.Jihadwatch.org.

What happened to Ariel Sharon?

Moshe Dann

What lies behind Ariel Sharon's sharp about-face? Are his plans to leave Gaza and parts of Judea and Samaria an admission of defeat? A betrayal? The next stage of "Post-Zionism"? All three? No one seems to know.

Since becoming Prime Minister, Ariel Sharon has reversed the pro-settlement policy upon which he was elected. He now endorses the idea of a Palestinian state in Judea, Samaria and Gaza and announces



that Israel is an "occupying" power. He is set to implement his plan for unilateral retreat and is building a controversial fence/barrier along the 1949 armistice lines (with some variations) that will become the de facto (although unlikely de jure) border of Israel.

Reputed to be a brilliant military tactician, Sharon has often failed as a strategist. His current policy appears to be another failed strategy, launched without critical thinking, embracing what he long -- rightly -- opposed. Neither he nor his advisors have offered any serious answers to challenging questions. No press conferences. No explanations.

Reputed to be a brilliant military tactician, Sharon has often failed as a strategist.

One commonly accepted rationale is that Sharon wants to trade all of Gaza and most of Judea and Samaria in order to secure American agreement for keeping three major settlements blocs. Another is that Sharon believes the IDF cannot retaliate with full force against terrorism as long as Israel is seen as an "occupying" power, condemned by the world for violating "international law" and "Palestinian human rights." Once we are no longer "occupiers" it's one state against another and we can do what we want with international approval. If Sharon is operating under either of these assumptions, he is deluding himself.

To begin with, Israel is not an "occupying" power, ruling Palestinian Arabs; that ended a decade ago. The Palestinian Authority controls nearly all Palestinian Arab towns and villages.

When the IDF enters PA areas to arrest terrorists and stop terrorist attacks in-process, it is in order to save lives. It's called self-defense.

Three years ago, when Palestinian terrorism was rampant throughout Israel, Prime Ministers Barak and then Sharon exercised "restraint." In retaliation for terrorist attacks, empty buildings in areas under Palestinian Authority control were blown up. However, the massacre of guests at Netanya's Park Hotel on the eve of Passover in 2002 was a turning point. Sharon then assumed that he had American (and to some extent European) approval to strike back. Despite warnings from the Israeli Left ("the peace camp") that there was no military solution to terror, the IDF proved that

there was.

But "Operation Defensive Shield," battles in UNRWA "refugee camps" like Jenin – reputed to be the "terrorist capital of the world" – and assassinations of high-profile terrorist leaders, though successful, were cut short because of pressure from America, Europe and the UN. Israel was condemned; the IDF was withdrawn; terrorists struck again.

Since 2000, failure to deal decisively with terrorism because of a perceived need to pacify foreign interests has led to the murder of one thousand five hundred Israelis; ten thousand have been seriously wounded. Families have been destroyed; the nation traumatized.

Recently, once again, Palestinian Arab terrorism has been significantly reduced because of forceful action by the IDF and Israel's security services. But now that Israeli buses and cafés are no longer being blown up on a regular basis, pressure is again building for Israel to make strategically harmful compromises.

According to military and intelligence experts, once Israel withdraws and evacuates Jewish communities, the Gaza Strip will turn into a major center of terrorism. Terrorist organizations like Hizbullah are already at work in Gaza and the West Bank. Sderot, within the old Green Line, has already declared a citywide "Day of Mourning," seeking to force the government to act more forcefully against the nonstop Kassam rocket attacks from Gaza that have already made life intolerable there. Without Israeli control over borders, air and sea ports, troops and weapons will flow in to terrorists. Major population centers in Israel and vital installations will be at risk. A defense industries expert is quoted in the Israeli daily

Sderot:

Removal of Kassam rocket.



If Sharon's plan for withdrawal is extended to Judea and Samaria, all of Israel will be vulnerable. Since it is unlikely that a Palestinian government would openly condone terrorist attacks (and may even officially condemn them), it would be difficult for Israel to launch a retaliatory action, let alone a pre-emptive one. Attacking a sovereign Palestinian state with treaties of mutual defense could trigger a full-scale regional conflict that could involve WMD. (According to

intelligence reports at least some of Iraq's WMD are hidden in Syria.)

Arguing that Israel's only option is to engage a more powerful Palestinian terrorist state is like offering your opponent in a duel a machine gun, instead of a pistol, because you are a better shot.

It is in Israel's security and strategic interest to defend itself against Palestinian Arab terrorism and to protest incitement. Will offering a mini-state and sovereignty to terrorists, even those who are democratically elected," bring peace? The Left thinks it will. But even in the unlikely event that there were to be a temporary short-term reduction in terrorism, another much larger problem is on the horizon: Iran.

Sharon may think he's buying time, but more important, he is giving Arab terrorists a larger and more secure base from which to attack.

Perhaps it is Iran that is the key to Sharon's thinking? With Israel in Iran's nuclear bombsights (assisted by Egypt and other Arab countries), perhaps he asks himself "Can Israel go it alone?"

Does Sharon believe that by leaving Gaza and most of Judea and Samaria Israel will gain time in the nuclear race to destroy us, and perhaps even head off that nightmare? Is Sharon willing to risk removing the Jewish presence in Judea, Samaria and Gaza in return for not being isolated and abandoned? Sharon may think he's buying time, but more important, he is giving Arab terrorists a larger and more secure base from which to attack.

Sacrificing some Jews and Jewish property is like cutting out someone's intestines so that a tape worm will have less to eat. Amputating limbs to save the body, as the Left metaphorically envisions, works only so long as there are more limbs to sacrifice. Is Israeli reliance on America, Europe, or NATO to protect us in reduced boundaries realistic? Or, will it bring us closer to doomsday, a simultaneous missile attack from terrorist bases in the Palestinian state and surrounding Arab countries, assisted by anyone else who wants part of the action?

The great tragedy of Israeli leaders, especially those with which we are "blessed" today, is that they are unable to speak about the place of Israel in Jewish history and Jewish destiny, the reasons why "settlements" are not peripheral but essential.

The question is not whether Israel can go it alone; we have no choice. The question is on what basis do we act and in whom do we trust? The struggle for Gush Katif and the other communities may yet awaken a consciousness of who we are and what we are doing here in Israel in the first place.

And perhaps in trying to understand Ariel Sharon we will also understand more of ourselves.

Moshe Dann is a writer and journalist living in Jerusalem.

On Barren Ground

Mark Silverberg

Palestinian elections notwithstanding, it is important for Western leaders to consider whether a democratic Palestinian society can be harvested from ground that has been sown with hatred, prejudice, murder and the belief that the promise of the afterlife holds greater fortune than any earthly treasure. Is it conceivable that a society bent on the destruction of a neighboring state both for religious and political reasons can somehow search its inner soul and find the foundation for a new tomorrow?

The creation of a democratic Palestinian state depends not only upon an established set of rules enacted by duly elected representatives, but on intangible and complex bonds of individual responsibility and trust. While there has been considerable debate in recent years about nation building, the truth is that democracies are not things that you just "build."

Like liberty, democracy cannot be laid down like Astroturf. It is not a commodity that the US can export or donate. Rather, democracies are about consensual government, an independent judiciary, obedience to the rule of law, a free press and minority rights, and they require a very different set of beliefs from those required for survival under tyrants, dictators and despots.

Democracy is also more than just voting and elections (despite what you may hear). The existence of these processes (or even any subsequent constitution produced as a result of them) do not ipso facto mean that a cultural shift has suddenly occurred in the Palestinian mindset. Remember that the constitution of the former Soviet Union was among the most democratic ever written, but that did not stop the purges, the NKVD assassinations, the Doctors' Plot, the banishments to Siberia or the slaughter of millions of Russians by a paranoid megalomaniac.

In real life (as opposed to textbooks on civics), democracy is an acquired taste that Palestinian Arabs (at least to date) have shown little if any inclination to acquire. Palestinian Arab society has produced a political, religious, educational, and popular culture that is virulently anti-Semitic, anti-American and anti-Western; that is unrelenting in its efforts to destroy Israel, and that has indoctrinated a significant portion of its society into believing that murdering Jews is an act of faith condoned by Allah.

To have any real hope of working, Palestinian Arab democracy must evolve from within its own culture and that will not be a simple thing. For the West, it took eight hundred years of feudalism, the Renaissance, a series of religious wars, and an Industrial Revolution to establish what we call "Democracy." It

didn't just "happen."

Part of their problem is that they lack a Washington, a Madison or a Marshall as a guide. That is, they lack a universally revered democratic hero as a role model. They lack a consensus builder who understands that democratic society is comprised of many autonomous groups and associations; one who can convince others that common ground must be found for the common good of the people; and they lack a genius of constitutional law who can so persuasively

interpret a constitution that the prestige of his court (and of law itself) ensures national compliance.

Which leads to the role of religion in Palestinian politics. Like Christianity, Islam is a universal faith that envisions the ultimate transformation of the world in its image. But unlike Christianity, Islam has yet to consider the option of religious pluralism. Democracy cannot exist in an environment without true political parties, but Islam condemns the dividing of the Muslim *ummah* (community) into such parties and groups. Unless the Islamic

elements in Palestinian political culture are resolved, a democratic Palestine will remain a pipe dream.

Having said that, what realistic benchmarks can be set? In Palestinian society, true democracy will come only with an end to religious and political terrorism; when Palestinians detoxify their society with messages that actively promote peace and economic progress; when they can freely question the reasons for the failure of their government to raise the living standards of its citizens; when Palestinians are free to discuss the benefits of economic liberalization, privatization and development; when they institute broad educational reforms; when they are prepared to systematically eradicate government corruption; when they eliminate the culture of martyrdom as expressed through their posters, videos, TV programs and in their schools, mosques, stores, marketplaces and editorials; and when they can discuss issues relating to open access to information, professional organizations, trade unions, fair laws and the judiciary without fear of being executed by Palestinian death squads.

In the meantime, neither the Bush nor the Blair administrations do Israel (or their own countries) any service by suggesting that the death of Yasser Arafat has somehow changed or diminished this medieval mindset. Abu Mazen has already made it clear (in Arabic) that he is not opposed to the use of violence, only such violence as interferes with the strategy of forcing Israel to create a Palestinian state.

Like liberty, democracy cannot be laid down like Astroturf. It is not a commodity that the US can export or donate.

The Palestinians will have to fundamentally change their world-view not because it is politically ineffective but because it is morally wrong. As Itamar Marcus of Palestine Media Watch wrote recently: "The day we start seeing educational and religious messages promoting peace on Palestinian Authority TV is the day we'll know a peace process has begun." Given how far we are from that day, when

President Bush stated: "I am convinced that, during this term, I will manage to bring peace," I could not help but wonder what the steady stream of would-be Palestinian "martyrs" were thinking as he spoke.

Mark Silverberg is the executive director of the Jewish Federation of Northeastern Pennsylvania.

Ruth King

The Kassam Rockets

On Friday, January 21, 2005, 17 year old Ella Abukakis died. She had been critically wounded when a Kassam rocket exploded just as Ella and her siblings were walking to their home in Sderot. Her brother Tamir survived because Ella, on hearing the warning sirens, covered him with her body.

Did you ever wonder where the name "Kassam" comes from? The deadly rocket is aptly named after Sheikh Izz al-Din al-Qassam (circa 1882-1935). In 1921, al-Qassam moved to Palestine from Cairo, settled in Haifa and became an influential imam. He preached *jihad* against all non Moslem occupants of Palestine, most especially armed struggle to free Palestine from Jews.

After the riots of 1929 al-Qassam ratcheted up his calls for violence, and in the early 1930s established a secret association, called 'The Black Hand' (*al-kaff al-aswad*), whose aim was to kill Jews and terrorize the Jewish population. In 1935 he was killed by the British. Almost immediately Qassam became a martyr and his gravesite a shrine. His disciples continued his tradition of terror and his legacy inspires *jihadists* unto this day. Hamas Brigades are named after him as is the deadly rocket that targets Israeli civilians. He remains a cult figure to Israel's Arab enemies.

(I am indebted to Dr. Andrew Bostom M.D. who detailed the bloody life and times of Qassam in his speech to the AFSI conference on December 5th, 2004. His entire talk "The Legacy of Jihad in Palestine" can be read at www.frontpage.com.)

Sharon and History

In September 1982 during the Lebanon War, while Beirut was under Israeli control, Christian Phalangist troops entered the Sabra and Shatilla camps and killed between 470 (Lebanese figures) and 800 (Israeli numbers) Palestinian Arabs combatants, and roughly 45 civilians. The bloody episode, perpetrated by Arabs, occasioned a media assault against Israel with the International Red Cross bruiting the number of deaths as high as 3500.

The Kahan Commission, established by Israel to investigate Israel's role, released its findings on February 8th, 1983, faulting General Ariel Sharon for ignoring the danger of bloodshed and revenge occa-

sioned by the assassination of Maronite President-elect Bashir Gemayel.

The irony should not be lost. Arabs murdered Arabs and Israel convened a commission of inquiry which blamed an Israeli general. Years later it was established that the assaults, known in Arabic as "the night of the long knives," was silent, so no gunshots could be heard. Nonetheless, Sharon was removed from his post as Defense Minister.

On February 21, 1983 in an article on the Kahan Commission's findings, *Time* magazine stated "Sharon discussed revenge with the Gemayel family after the assassination of Bashir Gemayel." This brief sentence, buried in the article's thousands of words, led Ariel Sharon to bring a libel suit against *Time*. The suit ended with each side claiming victory. Although *Time* was exonerated from acting maliciously, the magazine was scolded by Judge Abraham Sofaer for acting irresponsibly.

At the time, asked why he bothered with a suit over a few words, Sharon's response to a small group of supporters (I was present as was AFSI Chairman Herbert Zweibon) was that he could not live with a footnote in history that would allege he collaborated in any way in such a bloody episode.

Sharon was dismissed, but in the view of real friends of Israel, not discredited. In his subsequent public life, he was principled, denouncing Oslo, supporting Jewish rights in all of Palestine, defending Israeli sovereignty over a united Jerusalem, notably the Temple Mount, and rejecting territorial concessions. He inspired all of us in the Diaspora who support a safe Israel.

As Prime Minister, he has betrayed each of his earlier previous commitments. He has become General Huff and Puff, blowing out stout talk, then collapsing into preemptive surrender. His statements about Abbas are actually silly. "No I won't deal with him" quickly followed by "I have to deal with him" and "maybe I'll deal with him" to "I'll show him" ...it's like a hide and seek game between children. In fact, General Huff and Puff is negotiating with himself, telling Abbas and all Israel's enemies that no one will dictate to him: he'll retreat and concede and surrender without so much as consulting them.

This is the footnote to his biography that will stick. Far worse than anything *Time* could have done. Maybe Sharon will sue *Outpost*.

(Continued from page 2)

Adopting a Settlement

We have a request from Israel that synagogues in North America "adopt" a settlement in Judea, Samaria and Gaza, most especially (but not only) those under immediate threat of evacuation. It will be an important encouragement to the beleaguered communities, and helpful in making both the Israeli and American government understand that these people are not isolated and alone, but that Jews abroad support their right to live freely in the Land of Israel. Any synagogue or other organization wishing to join in such an effort should contact AFSI and we can put them in touch with the Gaza or Yesha Council or with any individual community with which they might wish to link.

On Post-Zionism

Edited by Shlomo Sharan, *Israel and the Post-Zionists: A Nation at Risk* brings together a frightening series of essays that focus on the collapse of much of Israel's intellectual "elite" into self-hatred and yes, anti-Semitism. Edward Alexander's essay "Israeli Intellectuals and Israeli Politics" is alone worth the price. The book is available through <http://www.sussex-academic.co.uk>.

A Prophecy

Israel's great nationalist poet Uri Zvi Greenberg was famous for his prescience. He foresaw the

Holocaust, writing of the murder of millions of Jews in Europe in 1922. He even foresaw specific horrors that would indeed take place: in his poem "Holy of Holies" he described the murder of his mother -- he would say that he simply recorded what he saw in a dream with his mind's eye. In his book *Free Jerusalem* (Devora Publishers, 2003), Zev Golan reports on the dream that, by his own account, led Greenberg to write "I'll Tell It to a Child", which had an enormous influence in bringing young people, including Menachem Begin, to the Jewish underground. "I dreamt one night...I saw the Temple Mount, above it an eagle, and around it circles and circles of Jews, and from the Mount a slope inclined straight to the sea. On either side were lines of soldiers from all the world's armies. In the dream I felt that the Divine Presence, Shechinat Israel, was leaving the Mount."

As we watch the folly of Israel's leaders, we are forced to wonder if Greenberg will again prove to be a painful prophet.

Jihad on Campus

Some campuses have already gone beyond mere anti-Israel and anti-Jewish demonstrations. Joe Kaufman (*FrontpageMagazine.com* of Jan. 21) describes the way Florida Atlantic University has become a center of Islamic radicalism with professors tied to Hamas and invited lecturers including neo-Nazis and others who have been convicted of raising money for Islamic terror organizations.

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