

OUTPOST



April 2013—Issue #264

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

43rd Year of Publication

Table of Contents

Keys to the Kingdom	William Mehlman	Page 2
From the Editor	Rael Jean Isaac	Page 3
We Apologize to the Turks	Gideon Rosenblum	Page 5
When Will They Ever Learn?	Rita Kramer	Page 6
The Faith Keepers	Emanuel Navon	Page 8
Idol Worship	Ruth King	Page 11
William Van Cleave - The Cold War's Unsung Hero	Frank Gaffney	Page 12
<i>Choosing Life in Israel</i>	Reviewed by Ruth King	Page 13

Keys to the Kingdom

William Mehlman

Barack Obama will have come and gone by the times these words appear, but if he departed Israel absent the realization that the goal posts, to put it in the sports jargon he favors, have been radically shifted in the ongoing struggle for the Jewish State's territorial integrity, he clearly will have misspent his 50 hours here.

Rather, assuming his antennae were sharp enough to cut through the fog of accolades and honorifics that attended his sweep through the neighborhood, he may on reflection back in Washington find himself fighting off flushes of nostalgia for the old Benjamin Netanyahu, the "Bibi" he so conspicuously loathed throughout the first four years of his presidency. The Bibi who could always rely on Ehud Barak to withhold his mandatory signature as defense minister to thwart or at least delay implementation of any concession wrung out of him by the troublesome "Settlers" and their supporters – that "Bibi" is history. Barak, who carried water for him at the White House and the State Department as well as the Pentagon (all off-limits to then Foreign Minister Avigdor Lieberman), is back on the lecture circuit, replaced by former IDF Chief of General Staff Moshe (Bogie) Ya'alon.

As gifts go, this was like a winning ticket in the powerball lottery for the 500,000 Jewish residents of Judea, Samaria and eastern Jerusalem. Ya'alon, who as head of the army opted for a pink slip from Ariel Sharon in 2005 rather than acquiesce to the IDF's involvement in the unilateral evacuation of 9,000 Israeli Jews and the destruction of their 24 communities in Gaza and northern Samaria, has, if anything, hardened his opposition to Israeli land concessions to the Arabs in the eight years since taking off his uniform and joining Likud. While not in principle opposed to some political *modus vivendi* with the Arab residents of Judea and Samaria, he has expressed serious doubts it can be achieved with a corrupt Palestinian Authority in Ramallah headed by a Holocaust denying Mahmoud Abbas. He has referred to "Peace Now," its most prominent tub-thumper, as a "virus," has spoken out against the demolition of Jewish outpost communities in Judea and Samaria and has made it clear he will not be taking up either side of the "good cop/bad cop" routine employed at the expense of the inhabitants of those communities in recent years.



Moshe Ya'alon

Son of a Holocaust survivor, Ya'alon swerved sharply right from his original Labor Zionist ideological base and his support of the Oslo Accords with a 2008 bylined article in the Shalem Center's magazine *Azure*. Entitled "Israel and the Palestinians: A New Strategy," the article took dead aim at what he called the "top-down" approach to peace with the "Palestinians" characterized by ineffectual "confidence-building" measures and meaningless high-sounding declarations emanating from "ostentatious international summits." He projected in its place a "bottom-up" strategy grounded in an economically and socially viable Palestinian society, reconciled to Israel's existence as a Jewish state and committed to an end to the indoctrination of its children with hatred of Jews and incitement against Zionism.

Ya'alon can expect no arguments on that agenda from MK Danny Danon (Likud-Beytenu), the former chairman of World Likud, who has been appointed his deputy – a double-header win for the nearly 10 percent of Israel's Jewish population living beyond the Green Line. "Prime Minister Netanyahu appears to have given them the keys to the kingdom," avers *The Jerusalem Post*'s Tova Lazaroff. While that would seem to imply far-reaching authority on new Jewish construction in Judea and Samaria – a

complete break with the Ehud Barak era – the final word on West Bank construction, she believes, “still lies in Netanyahu’s hands.”

Those hands haven’t been less certain of their control of the steering wheel since the advent of Mr. Netanyahu’s prime ministerial career. For beyond the tradeoff of a determined foe for a potential ally at the Defense Ministry, the January 22nd election armed the fighters for the territorial integrity of Israel with a weapon for which they have searched in vain through the more four decades of their struggle--a representative of their interests at the highest level of national policy formulation and decision-making. No longer Likud’s oft-spurned foster children, they and their hundreds of thousands of partisans beyond and within the Green Line have found in Naftali Bennett and his 11 partners in “Ha’Bayit Ha’ Yehudi” the champion of their dreams, one whose support is too critical to the prime minister’s political survival to be ignored.

That the young, fiercely pro-Settlement, religious Zionist Bayit Yehudi and the Naftali Bennett he had sacked as Likud’s former chief of staff were not the coalition partners Netanyahu had hoped for can only be regarded as the most emphatic understatement of the campaign. “He [Netanyahu] did everything he could to flee it, as if from a place plagued by boils, locusts, lice and pestilence,” averred *Ha’aretz*’s chief political correspondent Yossi Verter in a scathing post-election analysis. Precluded by the certain loss of TV journalist Yair Lapid and his 19 “Yesh Atid” mandates from reembracing his traditional Haredi allies, Shas and United Torah Judaism, Netanyahu was reportedly ready to turn the Finance Ministry into an ammunition depot for class-warrior Shelly Yachimovitch and her far-Left Labor Party, if only to keep Bennett and his party outside the tent. That got him no further than his attempts to create a rift between Bennett and Lapid. The harder he pulled the closer he brought them together.

It is beyond irony that it was the hated Bennett who engineered a deal that kept Lapid from abandoning the coalition talks at the 11th hour over Netanyahu’s refusal to grant his party the Education Ministry. Yesh Atid did receive it in the end, in return for giving back the less desired Interior Ministry portfolio, a switch that obviated a second election that might well have sent Netanyahu and Likud packing.

Yair Lapid may have been the star of the recent ground-breaking election, but it was Bennett who got the pieces to fit together. He has emerged from this effort as the 33rd Israeli government’s Economy/Trade Minister, with the Construction & Housing Ministry, the Religious Services Ministry and the influential Knesset Finance Committee firmly under his party’s control. With Religious Services returned to religious Zionist hands after 30 years in ultra-Orthodox captivity, the opportunity for an enlightened rabbinical revision of the draconian rules that have made marriage, divorce and conversion in Israel such a compassionless ordeal have never been brighter. It could, as one observer noted, herald “new dawn” for Judaism in Israel, perhaps matching in radiance the new hope rising in the hearts of hundreds of thousands of Israelis in the 120 Jewish communities of Judea and Samaria.

William Mehlman represents AFSI in Israel.

From the Editor

The New World

In a spasm of sycophancy, greeting President Obama in Jerusalem, Shimon Peres announced that Obama was “a historic friend of Israel. Of the Jewish people.” In fact, as former UN ambassador John Bolton puts it, “Obama has consistently demonstrated, both in his rhetoric and policies, that of all U.S. Presidents since 1948, he is the most hostile to Israel.” But Peres was not done fantasizing. He proclaimed that Obama’s “generosity enabled freedom to prevail all over the world.” Presumably in places like Syria, North Korea, Iran, Zimbabwe etc. etc.

In a recent speech to the EU Parliament, in which he professed to see peace with the Palestinians around the corner, Peres was as fulsome on the subject of the EU as he is on Obama, comparing the "miracle" of the EU's establishment to the miracle of the creation of the state of Israel. Regarding miraculous Europe, England's chief rabbi Jonathan Sacks in March chronicled in a fine speech to AIPAC the huge rise in anti-Semitism in country after country: "I have to tell you that what we grew up with, 'never again,' is beginning to sound like 'ever again.'"

Mea Culpa Replaces Never Again

Although prepared well in advance (see the WSJ, March 23), Netanyahu's apology to Turkey--and promise to pay reparations-- seems thus far (who knows what Netanyahu promised behind the scenes) the chief concrete result of Obama's visit to Israel. It is a deplorable result, with Israel's Prime Minister feeding the delegitimization campaign by conceding what Israel's enemies have been saying all along, that the boarding of the Mavi Marmora was an act of aggression. As Daniel Pipes aptly writes: "Erdogan's government has mastered the art of provocation and is being rewarded for it. The Israelis should not have apologized but should have demanded an apology from Ankara for its support to the terrorist-connected group that undertook this aggressive act." And as Pipes says, this is most unlikely to mark any change in Turkey's hostile policy toward Israel--the government will pocket the apology "and use it as a building block for its neo-Ottoman empire." Indeed, it rapidly emerged Netanyahu had been played for a complete sucker as Erdogan upped the ante and said the blockade of Gaza must be eliminated before relations could be restored.

"Maybe," writes Haifa University's Steven Plaut, "Bibi will next offer to pay the Palestinians compensation for the damages to their Qassam rockets that they shoot into Israel when these are shot down by Israel's iron dome anti missile system."

Egypt's Last Synagogue

Close to the Passover holiday commemorating the liberation from Egypt, the last active synagogue in Egypt has been shut down by the government "for security reasons." The Eliyahu Hanavi Synagogue in Alexandria was founded in 1354. Levana Zamir, head of the International Association of Egyptian Jews in Israel said: "It seems this is really the end of Jewish life in Egypt."

French City Glorifies Terrorist

In another illustration of the ties between the far left and Muslim terrorists, the Communist mayor of the French city of Bezons, ten miles northwest of Paris, awarded honorary citizenship to Majdi Al-Rimawi, who planned the murder of Israeli cabinet Minister Rechavam Zeevi in 2001 and sits in an Israeli prison, sentenced to life imprisonment plus 50 years. The mayor, Dominique Lesparre, in a speech at the ceremony called Al- Rimawi a "direct victim of this occupation...as are the 4,500 Palestinian resistance [fighters] who were imprisoned for having dared to defend their country."

Isi Leibler on Germany

In *The Jerusalem Post* (Feb.28) Isi Leibler, while crediting successive German governments--including that of Angela Merkel-- with upholding their commitments to the Jewish people, cites some extremely disturbing inversions of reality in Germany, on a par with those at which the so-called "human rights community" has become expert.

In August 2009, German President Horst Kohler awarded former Israeli communist Felicia Langer the Federal Cross of Merit, Germany's most prestigious award. Langer, who now lives in Germany, condemns the German government for supporting Israel, equates Israelis with Nazis, calls for Israeli leaders to be tried as war criminals and even praises Iran's Ahmadinejad.

Even more disturbing, because the occasion was purportedly a commemoration of Nazi atrocities, in 2010, despite protests from the Israeli embassy, Frankfurt's Mayor Petra Roth invited Alfred Grosser, a German born Jew whom Leibler describes as "frenziedly hostile to Israel" to give the annual Kristallnacht oration in Paul's Church. He used the occasion to draw parallels between the behavior of Israelis and Nazis, for which he was lauded by the media.

Equally outrageous, because it involves the government-funded German Center on anti-Semitism in Berlin, considered the chief institute in countering anti-Semitism, its head until last year was Wolfgang Benz who equates Islamophobia with anti-Semitism and who recently denied the Muslim terrorist murders in Toulouse had an "anti-Semitic dimension." Benz dismisses concerns about the Moslem Brotherhood as reminiscent of anti-Semitic phobias like the *Protocols* and complains that drawing attention to the fact that Moslems comprise 70% of Berlin prison inmates is comparable to Hitler's ravings over "the fact that 89% of Berlin pediatricians in the 1930s were Jews." In short, in Germany countering anti-Semitism is fast becoming a tool to demonize Israel and champion the Moslems who are the major force behind current anti-Semitism.

Beyond Satire

The inestimable Anne Bayefsky reports that even as Syria burns, the UN Human Rights Council is circulating a resolution called "Human rights in the occupied Syrian Golan." The Council "calls upon Israel to allow the Syrian population of occupied Syrian Golan to visit their families and relatives in the Syrian Motherland." As Bayefsky notes, nobody believes the residents of the Golan are currently longing to rush into mother Syria, but the Council is sure to rubber stamp the absurd declaration.

We Apologize to the Turks

Gideon Rosenblum

My 86 year old friend Moshe Klein was 21 years old when he was appointed by one of our defense organizations to take charge in one of the internment camps in which our people, arrested by the British, were held in Cyprus.

He reminded me of a shameful event for which the Turks were responsible which took place during the Second World War. It was so utterly shameful that no one should be allowed to forget it; it needs to be brought up again and again in relation to Holocaust Memorial Day. It is not only the Turks who need to be ashamed; the entire world should be ashamed.

On the 16th of December 1941, a rundown steam ship by the name of Struma left a Black Sea port destined for Israel (then Palestine) by way of the Dardanelles. On board were 103 children, 272 women and 393 men who had escaped the terror of Antonescu's fascist regime in Romania. Close to the coast of Turkey the engine gave out and the ship was buffeted by the waves. The Turkish authorities dragged the ship into a port nearby. The passengers were left on board and were not offered shelter, this although there was only a single bathroom for the many hundreds on board. The Jews of Istanbul provided food to the immigrants for about two months but the food ran out. Efforts were made to repair the engine but they failed. Jews in other parts of the world tried to find a solution but they did not succeed. (The Jewish Distribution Committee offered to create a camp on land for the Struma's passengers which it would fully fund, but the Turks refused.)

The Turkish regime instructed the Struma's crew to take it out of the Turkish port. When this was not done, the boat was tied to a Turkish tugboat and dragged out to beyond Turkish territorial waters in the Black Sea, a distance of about 8 kilometers from the coast. There, on the night of February

23, 1942, the ship was abandoned without food or water for the hundreds of people who crowded its decks. The ship was left, tossed about in the stormy sea, completely helpless.



The next morning a powerful explosion was heard. It was said the ship had come upon a mine (the Turkish suggestion), or maybe by error was hit by the torpedo of a Russian submarine. The ship sank almost immediately. Of the hundreds of people on the ship only two survived, an immigrant by the name of David Stolar and one of the ship's officers.

The two managed to climb onto a floating wooden beam. The sea was very cold and in the morning David discovered the officer was no longer able to hold on and died. David was pulled on to a fishing boat which came by. David Stolar thus became the only survivor who was left to tell the world the full story of the shameful behavior of the Turks.

This was the most serious disaster in the history of the efforts to reach Palestine "illegally" following the British White Paper of 1939 which made the Jewish National Home off-limits for Jews. In the enormous Turkish peninsula of Asia Minor, a quasi-continent, the Turks couldn't find temporary shelter for these desperate people. The Turks chased them away to their death.

We Israelis do not need to apologize. We will not forget and we will not forgive. If one of our readers knows Turkish, he should send this tale to Erdogan so that he too can be ashamed.

Gideon Rosenblum is a retired Israeli lawyer. He describes himself as an amateur scholar focusing especially on the Herodian period.

When Will They Ever Learn?

Rita Kramer

When two thirds of Jewish voters cast their ballots for the Democratic candidate last November some of them may have been voting for Franklin Roosevelt. Some still remembered him, others were brought up to believe he had been a friend to Jews in addition to having led the country out of the Depression and prosecuted the war that destroyed the Nazis. The love affair of American Jews with FDR's party has persisted through three generations despite growing evidence of his failure to do everything he might have done to save European Jewry in the crucial years before the gates of the death camps had slammed shut on them for good and in spite of evidence before their eyes of the present Democratic administration's less than friendly attitude toward the Jewish State.

The most thoroughly documented indictment of Roosevelt's inactivity in the face of the genocide was David S. Wyman's *The Abandonment of the Jews: America and the Holocaust*, published in 1984. The book revealed Roosevelt's role in turning down proposals that might have saved hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children from the gas chambers, refusing to admit Jewish refugees even when immigration quotas remained unfilled, and turning a deaf ear to suggestions for bombing either the railroad tracks leading to Auschwitz or the facility itself.

Now the Wyman Institute for Holocaust Studies is publishing a new book by its director, Rafael Medoff, *FDR and the Holocaust*, adding new evidence of FDR's less than sympathetic attitude and behavior toward the beleaguered European Jews as well as toward his Jewish fellow citizens. Among Medoff's revelations:

- In the 1920s FDR supported a quota on Jewish admissions to Harvard aimed at limiting the number of Jews who would be represented in universities and in some professions;
- In 1938 he blamed anti-Semitism in Poland on the economic prominence of many Jews;
- In 1943 he remarked that “the complaints which the Germans bore towards the Jews” were “understandable” because there were so many of them in law, medicine, and other professions; advised local leaders in Allied-liberated North Africa to limit the entry of Jews into the professions; and supported a plan to “spread the Jews thin all over the world” to encourage assimilation.



In defense of FDR's record, historians Richard Breitman and Allan J. Lichtman of American University have written *FDR and the Jews*, a work they describe as an attempt to balance the record and provide a neutral, more objective view of the controversy over FDR's wartime role toward the Jews. They map his changing attitude from the early years of the war when he refused to consider relaxing immigration laws to his creation of the War Refugee Board in 1944, toward the end of the conflict. Of course, it was too late for millions by then, although like other world leaders and members of his own administration, he had known details of the death camps since 1942. Faced with an isolationist Congress and an anti-Semitic State Department, the authors claim FDR had few options. Judging him neither a hero nor a bystander, they maintain that by and large he did what he could in face of the unavoidable political limitations he faced domestically, and in fact did more in the end than any other world leader in the

face of the annihilation of Europe's Jews. The bottom line, according to Breitman and Lichtman, is that although he could have done more, Roosevelt did the most important thing--he led the Allied defeat of the Nazis, which ended the enslavement and murder of so many, including the Jews.

One interesting item in this account of the wartime years is Breitman and Lichtman's assertion that Roosevelt--as one of the architects of Allied tactics--should be credited with defeating a German takeover of North Africa, an outcome that would have prevented the possibility of the nation that later was to become a refuge for Jews in the face of continued persecution. “Without FDR’s policies and leadership,” they say, “there may well have been no Jewish communities left in Palestine, no Jewish state, no Israel.”

That thought resonates in the context of recent revelations described in the *New York Times* (March 1, 2013) detailing the hitherto-unknown extent of Nazi centers of slavery and murder. The article details the findings of researchers at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum who, after years of study, have documented the existence of a staggering number of killing camps, as well as ghettos, forced labor camps, and “care” centers for forced abortions and killing of the aged and infirm--some 42,500 in all--throughout German-controlled areas from France to Russia. An accompanying map makes it clear that there was hardly an area occupied by the Nazi state in which it was not possible to be aware of the existence of these hells on earth. As the article concludes, in the words of one of the researchers, “They were everywhere.”

Oddly enough, the *Times* itself, despite its worldwide resources for coverage of news and local conditions, managed to downplay the story of persecution and murder during the prewar years of

Hitler's Germany as well as subsequent revelations of the Holocaust heard from witnesses as early as 1942. Such news was buried within the "newspaper of record" as it once was considered, even though--or perhaps because--it was owned by a family of Jewish origin.

Today, long after the suffering have been silenced, the *Times* seems more comfortable about dealing with their fate. Yet oddly enough its management, editors, and writers still do not seem aware of the implications of the events they report now but so tragically underplayed while they were happening. Whatever the authors of *FDR and the Holocaust* and *FDR and the Jews* say about the indifference of this country's leaders and that of all the countries represented at the Evian Conference that decided the fate of Europe's Jews in 1938, one thing is blindingly clear. They had nowhere to go, no place that would receive them.

Today there is such a place, a haven for Jews if and when the unthinkable should happen again. Which makes it ironic that the *Times*, so conscientious about reporting on what is past, cannot see the present need for a safe and secure Jewish state--the land of Israel they are so ready to fault and so careful to avoid defending against present-day threats from its enemies.

Rita Kramer's books include *Flames in the Field* and *When Morning Comes*.

The Faith Keepers

Emanuel Navon

Editor's note: Now that President Obama, on his Israeli trip, has once again attempted to resuscitate the "two-state solution" (even going so far as to call for an uprising for peace by Israeli "youth") Emanuel Navon's report on those Israelis who continue to flog this dead horse is particularly timely.

Attending the Herzliya Conference's panel on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is like following Woody Allen's therapy through his movies: you know that the patient is hopeless and that the new movie is going to be a mere repetition of the previous one, and yet you maintain the ritual out of snobbism. This year's panel, however, was more like a flashback. I felt like I was watching the ending scene of *Mighty Aphrodite*, when the Greek tragedy turns into a Broadway show.

The panel included seven speakers: Tzipi Livni (chairperson of the "Hatnuah" party), Shlomo Avineri (a Hebrew-U emeritus professor), Robert Danin (from the U.S. Council on Foreign Relations), Michael Herzog (from the Washington Institute for Near East Policies), Yoaz Hendel (chairman of the Institute for Zionist Strategy), Nati Sharoni (chairman of the Council for Peace and Security), and Dani Dayan (former chairman of the Judea and Samaria Council). The moderator was Barak Ravid, the diplomatic correspondent of *Haaretz*.

Supposedly, the purpose of a panel is to present different opinions and to have a debate. In this panel, however, all but one member expressed support for the "two-state solution" (the only minor differences between the speakers were about technicalities). Even the moderator clearly stated his opinion and sided with the six panelists who expressed their support for the "two-state solution." The only dissident was Danny Dayan, who was added at the last minute (his name was not on the original program, and an extra seat was squeezed-in for him right before the session started). In the end, seven speakers (including the "moderator") said that a Palestinian state must be established in Judea and Samaria, and one speaker begged to differ. It was a 7-1 ratio, or an 86% majority—an impressive display of pluralism and balance.

Tzipi Livni (whose party represents 5% of the Knesset) opened her remarks by claiming that she speaks for the majority. Then she explained why the establishment of a Palestinian state is so urgent:

soon Hamas will be in charge and when that happens signing a deal with the Palestinians will no longer be an option. Is Tzipi Livni aware of her argument's silliness? If, as she herself admits, Hamas will eventually take over, what is the point of signing with Fatah today a deal that Hamas will trash tomorrow? But what is telling about Tzipi Livni (and about the "majority" she supposedly represents) is not her comical twisted logic but the way she perceives Israel's rights. She said that a peace agreement is the Archimedes' point of Israel's existence, and that peace grants legitimacy to Israel. In other words, Israel's rights and existence are not *sui generis* but are only valid if the world (especially Israel's enemies) approve them.

Even Ehud Barak said during the Camp David negotiations in July 2000 that the Archimedes' point of Israel's existence (he used the very same expression) is the Temple Mount. For Tzipi Livni, this Archimedes' point is neither divine nor historical (I suspect Ehud Barak was referring to the second option). Rather, Israel only has a right to exist if its critics agree to it. Tzipi Livni has the same "externality" problem on a personal level, which is why she has metamorphosed over the years into the spokesperson of *Haaretz*. Precisely because Israel's self-proclaimed intellectuals will agree to grant you a certificate of intelligence only if you pledge allegiance to the two-state solution, and precisely because Livni is an intellectual lightweight who suffers from an inferiority complex vis-à-vis the *branja*, she became more royalist than the king. Tellingly, Shlomo Avineri publicly congratulated her during the "debate" for joining the exclusive club of the enlightened ones after years of darkness in the Likud grotto.

"Exclusive club" was the expression used by Barak Ravid to describe those who support the two-state solution. This is typically how the Israeli Left tries to intimidate those who don't toe the party line: we are the star-belly sneetches. Then Ravid harangued the audience about what he called "Israel's apartheid against the Palestinians" and claimed that, for this "apartheid" to end, a Palestinian state must be established as soon as possible in all of Judea and Samaria.

Robert Danin castigated the Israeli government for claiming that there is no partner for peace. When you keep telling people there is no partner, he said, they end up believing it. Danin didn't discuss whether or not the PLO is a reliable partner for peace. His argument was not about history but about psychology: if you can convince people that there is no partner for peace, then you can also convince them that there is a partner for peace. The truth or falsehood of the argument itself is irrelevant. What's important is to believe. This is precisely why I once wrote an article called "The Two State Religion." It's not about facts. It's about faith.

Michel Herzog made a point which I also find fantastic: we have to negotiate with the Palestinians so that we can say to ourselves and to the world that we tried. Well, what about Camp David in July 2000, what about Taba in December 2000, and what about the Olmert proposal to Abbas in 2008? Didn't we try then? Hasn't Herzog been around for the past twelve years?

Yoaz Hendel publicly confirmed that he agrees with Tzipi Livni (he had briefly considered running on her list for the 2013 Knesset elections). He also claimed that "the Israeli people accepts the two-state solution" (actually, over 50 MKs oppose it: 12 MKs from the Jewish Home, 28 MKs from Likud-Beitenu [if you exclude Netanyahu, Tzahi Hanegbi, and maybe Sylvan Shalom], and at least 2/3 of the 18 MKs from the two ultra-orthodox parties).

Nati Sharoni pledged to "get rid of the occupied territories" and played a short movie by Dror Moreh, the author of *The Gatekeepers*. The movie explains (with a soft background music) how to ethnically cleanse Judea and Samaria from its Jews.

Danny Dayan claimed that a two-state solution is unreachable because the gap is too wide between the maximum that Israel is willing to offer and the minimum that the Palestinians are willing to accept (as proven by Abbas' rejection of Olmert's proposal). He suggested improving the status quo by granting the Palestinians full civil rights under the rule of the Palestinian Authority, while maintaining Israel's exclusive security prerogatives.



Shlomo Avineri

To which Shlomo Avineri replied that Dayan's proposal meant denying the Palestinians full national rights, and that this constitutes an injustice. Finally there was a debate (this was the only interesting part of the panel). The difference between Avineri and Dayan on this issue is not that wide: Avineri doesn't really believe that a solution is possible, but he wants to keep trying nevertheless. Dayan really doesn't believe that there is a solution, and thinks it isn't worth anyone's time to keep banging your head against the wall.

But the debate between the two raised an important question: is it legitimate to grant the Palestinians full civil rights but to deny them national rights?

My answer to this question is positive, for four reasons.

First, because the "Palestinians" do not constitute a genuine people. They are part of the Arab nation, a nation that has 22 states.

Second, because the Palestinian narrative is a fraud and because the Archimedes' point (to use that expression again) of "Palestinism" is the destruction of Israel.

Third, because the Palestinians openly admit that they won't tolerate any Jewish minority in the "Palestinian state" (by contrast, there is a significant Arab minority in the Jewish state).

Fourth, because such a state would inevitably be militarized; it would incite its population (as the PA currently does) against Israel and the Jews; it would eventually be run by Hamas; and it would be an ally of Israel's worst enemies (especially Iran).

So, yes, there are very good reasons to grant the Palestinian Arabs full civil rights but to deny them national rights.

As the panel was coming to an end, Barak Ravid tried very hard to find out if Netanyahu might actually take concrete steps toward the establishment of a Palestinian state (the dream of the Israeli Left). Shlomo Avineri said he didn't think so because of Netanyahu's "revisionist" upbringing.

Referring to Netanyahu, Avineri said the following: "Beware of people who are true believers, because true believers never admit that they are wrong."

Well said, professor. You obviously didn't realize that you were unintentionally ridiculing the "two-state" believers such as yourself. But I had a good laugh: thank you for turning the Greek tragedy into a Broadway show.

Emmanuel Navon teaches at several Israeli colleges including Tel Aviv University. This appeared on his blog of March 13.

In Memoriam - Irving Eisenberg

We would like to acknowledge the generous legacy gift from Irving Eisenberg Trust Fund. Mr. Eisenberg was a passionate and generous supporter of AFSI's philosophy and mission for many years. We are very grateful that he has remembered AFSI in his will. His generous gift will help us carry on with our many worthy projects on behalf of Israel.

Idol Worship

Ruth King

Passover offers another message beyond freedom from bondage and the beginning of Israel's journey to the Promised Land. It was on this journey that Moses gave the Ten Commandments, revealed by God, to his people. The Decalogue, as they are known, provide the obligations for a decent life: to worship God, keep the Sabbath, honor parents, reject murder, adultery, the bearing of false witness, theft, and envy.

Most people do their best to follow these commandments. Except for the Second Commandment. The Second Commandment says: "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them." It has been roughly translated to mean "Thou shalt not worship false idols."

Modern false idols do not take the shape of golden calves, but cults and liberal cant that people worship with the same fervor. The very people who deride Creationism continue to worship at the altar of man-made global warming, despite the glaring absence of scientific evidence. Now that the world for the last two decades has refused to warm, they've switched the locution to undisprovable "climate change."

Environmentalism is an all embracing false idol – of the right and the left, Jews and Christians, rich and poor, smart and dumb.

My friend Daniel Greenfield eloquently denounces this destructive idol:

"Environmentalism has degenerated into a conviction that all human activity is destructive because the species of man is the greatest threat to the planet and all life on it....

"That is the dark side of environmentalism. The most active non-Muslim domestic terrorist group is environmental. The undercurrent of violence finds easy purchase in environmentalism's creed that the only real problem with the world is people. No amount of turning off the lights is enough. Eventually you come around to having to turn off the people. The Nazis were among the most enthusiastic environmentalists of their day, even the term 'Ecology' was coined by Ernst Haeckel, whose racial views served as precursors to Nazi eugenics. But while Nazi environmentalists believed that we were all animals, they insisted that some animals were better than others. Modern environmentalists believe that we are all worse than animals....

"The incompatibility of productive man with the natural world is a fundamental tenet of the environmental movement. Everything we do is destructive, because of what we are. We are tool builders, inventors and producers. And the environmental movement is aimed at convincing us to stop being these things. To turn off the lights, make do with less and march back to the caves with a few clever ad campaigns and a catchy tune....

"Man is the environmentalist's devil. He must be beaten, broken and subjugated....Blame him for the natural cycles of the planet and inevitable extinction of species that goes on whether he is there or not. Take away his technology and his inventions. Tell him that the humblest bacteria is better than him, for it is dumb and follows its natural instincts, while he insists on using his mind. Take away his primacy and his learning. And then leave him in the dark.

"The environmental movement is tenacious, fanatic and deceptive. Its creed is the undoing of all human progress."

An evil idol indeed. Perhaps this Passover Jews should ponder the Second Commandment with more than usual attention.

William Van Cleave - the Cold War's Unsung Hero

Frank Gaffney

Editor's Note: Van Cleave, a close friend of AFSI's great mentor Shmuel Katz as well as a friend of AFSI and AFSI's longtime leader Herbert Zweibon, saw Israel as a bulwark against Soviet expansionism in the Middle East, a strategic ally. He never lost sight of the fact that it was a two way street, with Israel providing crucial support to the U.S. just as much as the U.S. provided aid to Israel.

There's a certain historic symmetry that we mark the thirtieth anniversary of President Ronald Reagan's historic unveiling of his Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) within days of the passing of a man who played a central role in inspiring it. We must take the occasion of celebrating the former to honor the latter: Dr. William Van Cleave, an unsung hero of the War for the Free World, and most especially the part of that long and continuing conflict known as the Cold War.

How fitting as well that the same day Dr. Van Cleave died in his Southern California home, the Obama administration was forced publicly to reverse course on its systematic efforts to diminish the direct manifestation of Mr. Reagan's SDI program. Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel announced on March 15th that the modest array of U.S. missile defenses now in place would be enhanced in the face of a growing threat from the increasingly truculent regime in North Korea. Bill Van Cleave would consider that to be the very least we can do given Pyongyang's declaration that it is prepared to launch a nuclear attack against us.

More to the point, as one of the Nation's most longstanding and steadfast supporters of anti-missile systems and the imperative for their deployment in the most comprehensive, effective and efficient manner possible, Dr. Van Cleave would probably have sharply criticized the modest nature of Team Obama's new initiative. He was the sole critic allowed to testify against the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, and he would have recognized in the administration's abiding determination to limit the size and capability of our defenses in deference to Russian opposition a throwback to that happily now-abrogated accord.



The man who was one of Ronald Reagan's top advisors on national security matters during his successful 1980 campaign for the White House and chaired the President-elect's Defense Department transition team would likely have faulted the incumbent president for the several obvious inadequacies of the new anti-missile plans. The fourteen additional West Coast interceptor missiles will not come on line until 2017 – possibly years after the North Koreans achieve real intercontinental ballistic missile capabilities. It will

probably take even longer to put some on the East Coast. And the administration's own blueprint for defending us from Europe, announced after Mr. Obama dismantled one laid on by his predecessor, has been scotched – doubtless, as before to the Kremlin's delight.

Speaking of the Kremlin, few understood better than William Van Cleave its unchanging character and ambitions. He played an indispensable role in defeating the USSR during the Cold War with his service on what came to be known as "Team B." In 1976, this group of outside experts known for their clear-eyed warnings about the Soviet threat were invited by then-CIA Director George H.W. Bush to provide a second opinion on the advisability of the official (Team A) policy of appeasement known as "détente."

Ronald Reagan fully agreed with Team B's findings that this policy was dangerous and used them as his platform in the primaries that year against Gerald Ford and Henry Kissinger, and then in the

general election four years later against Jimmy Carter. More importantly, he employed the Van Cleavian Team B analysis as the foundation for the strategy for destroying the Soviet Union he adopted during his first term as president.

Over the years, Bill Van Cleave contributed mightily to the common defense through his service on various other public and private sector commissions and groups, as well. Notably, he was a member of: the American delegation to the U.S.-Soviet Strategic Arms Limitation Talks; the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency's General Advisory Committee; the storied Committee on the Present Danger; the Independent Working Group on Missile Defense; and the advisory board of the Center for Security Policy. Not least, he was also formerly an officer in the Marine Corps.

Dr. Van Cleave's most enduring legacy, however, is the cohort of extraordinary national security professionals he recruited, inspired and trained over his decades as a professor of defense and security studies, for many years at the University of Southern California and subsequently at Missouri State University. Among the best known of the alumni of his extraordinary pedagogy are former Deputy National Security Advisor J.D. Crouch, incumbent Air Force Secretary Michael Donley, former Assistant Secretary of State Paula DeSutter, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Keith Payne (who now runs the Van Cleave program in Washington), former National Counter-Intelligence Executive (and Dr. Van Cleave's ex-wife) Michele Van Cleave and former National Space Council Executive Director Brian Dailey.

Few of those whose lives were touched – and inevitably shaped – by Bill Van Cleave will forget his unflagging patriotism, formidable intellect and extraordinary grasp of history. And none will forget his ability to evoke in others a shared passion for the philosophy that his patriotism, intellect and understanding of history commanded, which his friend, Ronald Reagan, dubbed "peace through strength." These qualities, and Bill's wry humor and stalwart friendship, will be sorely missed as the nation he loved once again experiments with the doomed and reckless alternative: hoping for peace despite weakness.

Frank Gaffney is the Founder and President of the Center for Security Policy in Washington, D.C.

Choosing Life in Israel

Reviewed by Ruth King

David Hornik moved to Israel in 1984. In the preface to *Choosing Life In Israel* he states: "This book is both about my own choice to live in Israel and Israel's choice to live and thrive in the face of challenges."

Hornik's book is a compendium of personal and political essays he has written since he became one of Israel's most incisive journalists. Arranged in chronological order, they revisit in eloquent prose a besieged nation's triumphs and tragedies, its ancient stones and its modern cities, its beauty, its warts, the incalculable harm of mindless appeasement, and its holiness.

Hornik's heart is in Israel's history and the vision of Zionists restored to an ancient land, but his mind is also focused on politics and the hypocrisy of those whose aim is to tarnish and delegitimize the Jewish state.

In the internet age many excellent columns rapidly fade from memory, so this print anthology is a welcome reminder of events that shaped Israel's destiny and the contemporaneous reaction of a clear eyed observer.

The euphoria that accompanied President Obama's visit to Israel is reminiscent of the great optimism engendered by the Oslo Accords.

In "Intifada" written in 2003 and again in "Washington-Bibi is In. Peace is Dead" written in 2009, Hornik speaks sarcastically of the extent to which commentators and journalists disregarded the spree of terrorism that followed Oslo: "Many Israelis—if their charred bodies weren't long ago interred—have such pleasant memories of those years (following the infamous handshake between Rabin and Arafat) in which 200 Israelis died in terror attacks, a total far beyond any previous comparable period in Israeli history." He chides those architects and point men of Oslo who ignored the butchery and "...never stood up and said that perhaps this process should be stopped and the Israeli army should retake the areas from which Hamas, Islamic Jihad, and Arafat's PLO terrorists were now staging repeat attacks."

In 2005 in "The Wages of Appeasement" Hornik wrote: "...treating the likes of Hitler or Arafat or Stalin or Kim Il Sung, as benign, rational individuals....who just want to improve situations, is a very basic lapse of adult functioning." And, he presciently noted, well before Israelis focused on the threat of radical Islam: "The test is whether today's democracies can stand up to the jihadist assault with its unprecedented dangers."

In "The West's Denial of Evil" (2006) He reminds us that the West continues to fail the test: "Almost five years after 9/11, after Madrid, London, the terror war against Israel, and so on, the cowardice—the lunging to pin blame on one's own side, the eager abandonment of logic and fairness while rushing to embrace moral inversion and idiocy—all this is so strong as to suggest that the West's survival is anything but certain."

I recently asked one of Israel's top journalists, an American who, like Hornik, moved there many years ago, why the foreign press, including Jews, echo the complaints and outright libels of Arabs in writing of Israel. The answer: "All the foreign journalists -- and diplomats, for that matter, whose sport is bashing Israel -- love being stationed here even while they are trashing us in their columns. They stay in nice places in trendy neighborhoods because they get a lot of bang for their buck. They have fun, because there's always lots to cover and lots to do in their free time. There are great bars and restaurants and lots of beautiful women and men who fawn all over them. Israelis speak English, which makes it easy for foreign correspondents to talk to them. The Government Press Office which spoon feeds them translations and arranges trips and interviews, unlike the Arab countries they cover, does not penalize or threaten or ban them for any harsh criticism of Israel."

Here is how Hornik, in a 2011 column, describes one of those leading "columnists" of Israel. "Tom Friedman, of course does not live in a country surrounded by neighbors where journalists are beaten and sexually abused by a mob of 'democracy supporters,' where a terror potentate threatens invasion and conquest, or where much of the population is enamored of a mass child murderer. How much easier to visit the Middle East for a jaunt, hobnobbing with the Facebook and Twitter savvy youth in Tahrir Square, and direct one's bile at Israel."

But Hornik's book is not just an indictment of Israel's foes: it is also a paean to Israel and depicts the night life, the beaches, the cafes and the intensity and joy of life in Israel. In the "Epilogue-Some Things I Love About Living in Israel", he writes of the Land of Israel: "It's a varied, beautiful, and sacred land....it exudes sacredness." Of Jerusalem, he writes: " Whenever I think of its name, there's a heart fluttering sensation. It becomes the center of one's dreams and sentiments. Perhaps it can be that, too, outside of Israel, but it's different when one has known its stones and cypresses for years. To me it exudes holiness with the same undeniable, indeed sensuous immediacy that its stones exude soft light."

I asked him why he had originally decided to move to Israel, a land he describes as "living on a roller coaster ride with deep lows and dizzying highs." This is his reply:

"I grew up in what could be called a pro-Israel home, but not a Zionist home. Moving to Israel wasn't something that was encouraged or on the agenda. I was very attracted to the idea of Israel—a distant place where Jews spoke a different language, ran things by themselves, and where the Jewish

holidays—which made me feel very foreign in the part of upstate New York where we were living—were the national holidays. I also loved the Israeli songs I heard and the images of agricultural work. But all this was, at most, a latent passion, something in the background.

"In my twenties I became strongly interested in politics, with Israel's affairs as my most intense focus. My admiration grew as I came to understand better what the Jewish state was up against, how tough it had to be to survive. At the same time, I found myself amazed at how cynically—especially so soon after the Holocaust—the world's organizations, its democracies, and even U.S. administrations treated this struggling little state. These passions grew and grew until I felt my loyalty to Israel become my primary loyalty, meaning there was nothing to do but go and live there. It has been a productive and successful decision for me in every way, the best thing I've done."

Publishing this fine book is the second best thing he's done and a gift to his American readers. Buy it, read it, and give it to your friends and libraries. (it is available on Amazon in paperback and Kindle editions.)

Outpost

Editor: Rael Jean Isaac

Editorial Board: Ruth King, Rita Kramer

Outpost is distributed free to Members
of Americans For a Safe Israel

Annual membership: \$50.

Americans For a Safe Israel

1751 Second Ave. (at 91st Street)

New York, NY 10128

Tel (212) 828-2424 / fax (212) 828-1717

Email: afsi@rcn.com