

---

# OUTPOST

---

JANUARY 1994

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

---

## **CLINTON'S BIGGEST FOREIGN POLICY FAILURE**

*Herbert Zweibon*

The notion that President Clinton "needs" a "foreign policy success" has been circulated so vigorously by media pundits that it has become an undisputed assumption in Washington circles. The Middle East, they say, is the likely candidate, and so they urge the Clinton administration to work for PLO "self-rule" and an Israeli surrender of the Golan Heights. Secretary of State Christopher's recent visit to Damascus was thus widely applauded among those who see Israel's vulnerability as a welcome opportunity for President Clinton to score points in the polls.

But the pundits are often mistaken. In this case, not only will the Middle East not become Bill Clinton's major foreign policy success--it is certain to become his greatest foreign policy failure.

It is true that the Rabin government itself initiated the agreement with the PLO and anticipates a Golan withdrawal, so that one can scarcely place primary blame upon the United States for recent developments. On the other hand, the United States, in a series of "plans," starting with the Rogers Plan in 1969, has set forth Israeli withdrawal from the territories it captured in its 1967 war for survival as the basis for achieving "peace." The United States has thus consistently refused to recognize the nature of the conflict, which is over Israel's existence, not its boundaries.

Now a tired and dispirited Israeli government adopts the false U.S. (and European community) dogma. In a pathetic "New Year's Message" to Israel's "friends," Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin says that "the whole world is no longer against us." The United States bears much responsibility for this belief that territorial surrender means international acceptance.

Moreover, the United States should have kept its distance when the Israeli government chose as its negotiating partner the world's premier terrorist organization. Instead Clinton has not only endorsed the Israel-PLO agreement, but he is providing the funds to start building the PLO state in Judea-Samaria-Gaza. On the Syrian front, it is common knowledge that U.S. troops have been offered as "peacekeepers" to ensure Israeli

withdrawal on the Golan. In addition, the *Jerusalem Post* recently reported that the U.S. has offered to give (and raise) funds to pay for the transfer of Jews out of the territories.

In doing all this, the United States is betraying its own values, the standards that give us pride as a nation and let us serve as a model to others. What has happened to our belief in human rights when we applaud the coming to power of an army of capricious thugs drawn from the jails of the Middle East? These are the unpunished killers of American citizens, American diplomats, as well as of countless Israelis.

Sooner rather than later, the failure of these policies, misrepresented as *realpolitik*, will become all too apparent. The new PLO "homeland" will soon be importing Chinese and North Korean weapons, any paper demilitarization to the contrary. The world will be saddled with yet another radical Arab dictatorship, aligned with Iran, Iraq and Libya, wreaking havoc in a region crucial to Western interests. American peacekeepers will feel the impact of Hezbollah terrorists from nearby southern Lebanon.

President Clinton will find himself blamed for a foreign policy debacle that will make Somalia and Haiti look like triumphs. As the disaster unfolds on the ground, the President will also be blamed for having helped separate the Jewish people from their homeland. To many millions of believing Christians, no less than religious Jews, it is no small matter to repudiate the biblical covenant.

The "foreign policy triumph" Clinton's advisers anticipate will rapidly become the worst foreign policy disaster of this administration. And President Clinton will be in the unenviable position of going down in history as one who forwarded the aims of those who would destroy the Jewish people.◇

*Herbert Zweibon is chairman of Americans For a Safe Israel.*

### IN THIS ISSUE:

<i>Murdering Peace</i>	...3
<i>Those PLO Policemen</i>	...4
<i>Autonomy and Occupation</i>	...7

## **A VITAL LESSON FROM LEBANON'S HISTORY**

Lebanon recently marked the 50th anniversary of its national independence, and the news services ran the expected story about how the Lebanese are still struggling to recover from their 15-year civil war. The fact that Lebanon is still under Syrian military occupation was downplayed. The most startling aspect of the news coverage, however, was the treatment accorded the PLO. Anybody who is even remotely familiar with the history of the Lebanese civil war knows that it was ignited by the PLO, which had turned a large portion of Lebanon into its own state-within-a-state, and joined hands with Lebanese Moslem extremists to destroy the country's Christian populace. Yet the Associated Press's coverage of the Lebanese independence anniversary recapped the main facts of the civil war without once mentioning the PLO.

The reason for this whitewash of the PLO is painfully obvious: any reminder of what the PLO did when it was permitted 'self-rule' in Lebanon could raise questions about what to expect from the PLO when it is given 'self-rule' in Judea, Samaria and Gaza. When he was recently asked how the PLO would manage the difficulties of self-government in view of its lack of experience at governing, Yasser Arafat replied that the PLO had plenty of experience at governing, when it was in Lebanon. Arafat's p.r. advisers were no doubt horrified at their leader's candor, and he is not likely to make such a remark again. But since he has already made it, friends of Israel have been warned. We know what the PLO did in Lebanon, no matter how hard the AP and its ilk try to hide it. Should Arafat be given the opportunity for a repeat performance, this time in Israel's heartland?◇

## **NO STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS ON MURDER**

A petition recently submitted to the Israeli High Court of Justice raises an important question: has the Rabin government decided to forgive and forget the PLO's murder of thousands of Israelis during the past three decades?

The petition was filed by a legal activist group called Tzedek Tzedek: The Jewish Civil Liberties Center. It asks the Court to order the Attorney General to arrest any PLO official entering Israel who has been directly involved in terrorism in the past. Many PLO leaders fall into this category, such as Arafat adviser Bassam Abu Sharif, who was an airplane hijacker 20 years ago. Israeli law, of course, requires the arrest and prosecution of such

controversy will ensue if some of its negotiating partners are arrested. But since when should political considerations outweigh the rule of law?

Unfortunately, the substitution of politics for law and common sense has become one of the themes of the Rabin government, thereby making the activities of groups like Tzedek Tzedek all the more vital. It was recently reported, for example, that Rabin has ordered the Army to stop pursuing fugitive Arab terrorists unless there is clear reason to believe that they might murder again; the fact that they had already murdered was not sufficient reason to apprehend them, according to Rabin. The *Jerusalem Post's* account of this development noted that Rabin had specifically complained about the recent arrest of members of the "Hawks" faction of Yasser Arafat's Fatah movement. Evidently Arafat's pique at the arrest of his terrorists was considered by Rabin to be of more weight than the need to arrest those who have shed Jewish blood. But does Rabin's morally repulsive calculation conform to Israeli law? Perhaps the courts will yet decide.◇

## **FIFTEEN THOUSAND COLIN FERGUSONS**

The horrifying massacre of innocent commuters on the Long Island Railroad in December gave New Yorkers a small taste of what life is like in Israel, a country whose citizens are victims of Arab versions of Colin Ferguson nearly every day of the year.

Yitzhak Rabin's plan to permit the PLO to create a 15,000-man "police force" means, in effect, that an entire army of would-be Colin Fergusons will soon be in charge of enforcing order in Judea, Samaria and Gaza.

Why do the polls show that most Israelis now oppose the Israel-PLO accord? Because Israelis have come to realize that they don't want their fate to resemble that of the Long Island Railroad passengers.◇

*Outpost*

*is published by*  
Americans For a Safe Israel  
147 East 76 St.  
New York, NY 10021  
(212) 628-9400

**Editor:** Ruth King  
**Editorial Board:** Erich Isaac, Rael Jean Isaac,  
Herbert Zweibon. *Outpost* is distributed free of  
charge to members of Americans For a Safe Israel.  
Annual membership: \$50.◇

# MURDERING PEACE

Rael Jean Isaac

Following the Rabin-Arafat handshake on the White House lawn, a wonderful transfiguration occurred. There was, as all those caught up in the euphoria had hoped, an end to the killing of Jews.

To be sure, there were renegade die-hards incapable of perceiving the new joyful reality who cited names and perpetrators they claimed proved that on the contrary, the pace of killings of Jews had accelerated.

Kindergarten teacher Shalva Ozana and seminary student Yaakov Weinstein shot down in cold blood as they stopped to repair a tire: the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine, a PLO member organization, took credit.

Haim Mizrahi murdered by five Fatah operatives as he bought eggs.

Dror Forer and Eran Bechar, shot, stabbed and battered with large rocks, their bodies dumped in the stream, as they walked in the popular Wadi Kelt hiking area in the Judean desert. The Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine was responsible.

Yigal Vaknin stabbed to death in a citrus grove near Ra'anana, a note from Hamas pinned to his back.

Efraim Ayoubi killed from a moving car as he drove Gush Emunim leader Rabbi Haim Druckman on a road near Hebron.

Thirty Israelis in a bus travelling from Jerusalem to Shilo hurt by a suicide bomber: Hamas and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine vie for credit.

Baruch Ben Yaakov stabbed outside the Cave of Machpelah in Hebron: the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine takes credit.

A 32 year-old reservist shot dead on a bus in Holon: Islamic Jihad proclaims victory.

Mordechai Lapid and his son are gunned down at the entrance to Kiryat Arba.

Over and over Prime Minister Rabin and other government leaders patiently pointed out what the die-hards seemed incapable of understanding: it was not people who were the target of the assassins but peace. The killers were trying to murder peace, and the government of Israel would stand rock-firm in its defense. Its leaders would not give one inch to the enemy. Let the murderers of peace multiply their evil deeds a hundred-fold, the government would only become more unswerving in its dedication to the cause of the victim, peace.

One can imagine an exchange between Prime Minister Rabin and a father who labored under the misapprehension that his daughter was the victim of a vicious terrorist murder.

*Father:* What are you doing to apprehend my daughter's murderers?

*Rabin (lugubriously):* It is not your daughter who was murdered. It is peace that was murdered. You can rest assured we will leave no stone unturned so as not to permit the murder of peace.

*Father (confused):* I'm glad you'll leave no stone unturned. Have you located the murderers?

*Rabin:* The matter is not so simple. Your daughter contributed to the murder of the victim, peace, by being where she was. She should not have been there. Then we must remember what my partner Chairman Arafat has said: "Have I asked Rabin to uproot the opposition on his side? If he respects those opposed to him, I also respect the opposition on my side." If we upset Chairman Arafat by arresting the opponents of his peace policies, we become co-conspirators in murdering peace. We would be doing what the peace-murderers wanted. We would be playing into their hands. Surely you would not want us to carry out the wishes of the murderers.

*Father:* I don't think it's the wish of the murderers to be caught and punished. That's what I want.

*Rabin (even more lugubriously):* I have explained, but you do not understand. Even if they are arrested I will let them out with the next prisoner release to bolster peace.

*Father:* You said they were murderers of peace. How does releasing the murderers of peace bolster peace?

*Rabin (disdainfully):* It is too complicated for ordinary minds. Excuse me, I have to go to an important meeting with American Jewish leaders to raise money for Chairman Arafat. But rest assured. The government of Israel will neither slumber nor sleep until the murderers of peace are foiled in their plans. Let them stab, shoot or stone hundreds, thousands, millions. They will not deter us.

And so the leaders of Israel march bravely in their much admired new clothes. Those benighted ones unable to see the beautiful threads and wonderfully fine weaving may see only blood. But future historians will set everyone straight. The Declaration of Principles was a watershed. Before them, Jews were murdered. Afterward, while burials mounted, only peace died.◊

*Rael Jean Isaac serves on the Executive Committee of Americans For a Safe Israel and is the author of israel Divided and Parties & Politics in Israel.*

# ABOUT THOSE PLO POLICEMEN...

J. S. Sorkin

Since about a third of the so-called Palestinian police force in Gaza, Judea and Samaria will come from outside Israel, a document published by the Palestine National Council (PNC) five years ago deserves fresh scrutiny.

Called a political communique, it was one of the two major documents to issue from the PNC's historic, three day pow-wow in Algiers in November 1988. The other was the more famous declaration of independence for an Arab state in the heart of the Land of Israel.

The declaration, naturally, got all the media play. But in the penultimate paragraph of the obscure communique lie clues as to what Israel can expect when the Palestinian "police" take up their posts.

The PNC was then complaining about the plight of PLO cadres imprisoned not in Israel but the Arab world. The conferees expressed their "intense anguish over the continued detention of hundreds of our people's combatants in a number of Arab countries" and "vehemently deplore[d] their continued detention and call[ed] upon those countries to put an end to this irregular situation and to release the combatants in order that they may resume their participation in the fight and in the struggle."

In other words: the PLO was in a funk because many of its RPG (rocket-propelled grenade) boys and other gun-toters driven from Lebanon in 1983 by the IDF were still--five years on--restrained in their countries of refuge. And why was that? Why had the Arab countries, after being pressured by the U.S. and other Western powers into rescuing the PLO, chosen to isolate the evacuees, some in desolate desert camps? And why were these "heroes" of the Battle of Beirut still penned up?

The answer is simple. The Arab governments knew--as Messrs. Rabin, Peres, Beilin and Ben Eliezer apparently do not--with whom they were dealing: not heroes, not even soldiers, but the thieves, bullies, protection artists, muggers, punks and a cross-section of other murderous riffraff common to the Arab world.

Arab dictators, like everybody else, watch television. They had seen the convoys of trucks grinding through the streets of Beirut toward the port and the ships waiting to carry Abu Ammar's "freedom fighters" to safety; those boys jubilant in their open-air lorries wildly squeezing off AK-47 bursts in "victory" celebrations. Though they were being chased out of Lebanon, they were, after all, still alive. Indeed, they had become the pride of the Arab world. They had survived Israel's onslaught! They had even won the right to retreat and fight another day. Why shouldn't they carry on in traditional Arab fashion?

Thomas Friedman of the *New York Times*, in his book, waxed positively bathetic over the PLO's piteous

farewell to Beirut. Forced to pull up stakes again, as in 1970, as in 1967, as in 1948; forced to depart their latest temporary home for another station of the Cross along the "ancient" Palestinians' Via Dolorosa...

Arab dictators, though, sitting in front of their televisions--men who would never be mistaken for Western liberals like Friedman--that snot-nosed Brandeis University grad with the Christian saint's name who for eight years in Beirut and Jerusalem spat a continual stream of venom at the Jewish State--surely they did not see things his way. No, these potentates, especially those who had offered asylum, saw no "heroes." They saw trouble. They knew that, for the most part, here was lowlife. Not lost on them either was the fact that despite the media adulation other Arabs too--especially the dozen or so Beirutis accidentally killed or wounded during the PLO's delirious gunplay--thought so too.

This is why the PLO, upon reaching their new countries of asylum, found themselves quickly locked away from the local population. Your average Arab dictator understood--as Messrs. Rabin, Peres, Beilin and Ben Eliezer apparently do not--that this is an irresponsible, undisciplined element, that while many young Arab men aspire to a decent livelihood, to be a pharmacist or teacher, craftsman or merchant, some of them just want to carry a gun and shoot people. And this is the element which Yitzhak Rabin, Israel's defense minister *davka*, has chosen to insert into Eretz Yisrael by the thousands, and provide with weapons, these veterans of the PLO's heyday in Lebanon where that largest terrorist group on the planet tyrannized the locals in a "state-within-a-state."

Now only the G-d of Israel knows why solons such as Sarid, Beilin, Peres and Rabin, in the land of (Amos) Oz, believe that by bringing over Jordan thousands of these hoodlums, Israelis will feel and actually be safer. All Israelis, including those living in false security on Rehov Shenkin in Tel Aviv, will be in much greater danger. Of course, most immediately affected will be the 130,000 Jews in Judea, Samaria and Gaza. Those dozen poor devils a decade ago in Beirut were *accidentally* struck down by PLO bullets: these people, these Jewish men, women and children, will regularly and *deliberately* find themselves in the crosshairs of PLO gunights. For the PLO has vowed to do its damndest to terrorize them out; even many "moderate" Arafatians have said they won't stop their violence until Judea, Samaria and Gaza are completely *judenrein*.

And why should they? Though booted by Arabs out of Jordan; though bid good riddance by Arab Lebanese, they finally will be living out a dream come true: they'll be armed and on the loose in the hills of Judea and Samaria and on the dunes of Gaza, sent there by the highest officials--by Jews--in the Government of Israel.◊

*J.S Sorkin's articles about the Middle East have appeared in the Wall Street Journal, National Review, Midstream and elsewhere.*

# DEMOCRACY STOPS AT PEACE AGREEMENTS

Rael Jean Isaac

Israel prides itself not only at being the only democracy in the Middle East but one of the most democratic countries in the world. However, when entering into peace agreements, Israeli leaders on left and right have shown contempt for democratic process--with disastrous consequences.

Rabin and Peres's modus operandi was described in the November (1993) *Outpost*, drawing upon the revelations in *Israel Shelanu*, the New York-based Hebrew-language newspaper. The other cabinet ministers did not see the agreement until they were told to vote on it. They did not have a single evening to think about an agreement with such momentous consequences for the future of the state. Similarly the chief of staff of the Israel Defense Forces was permitted only the most cursory glance before the vote, while the rest of the generals on the general staff were not allowed to see the document at all until after the government had voted.

Begin and Dayan's modus operandi in reaching the agreement with Sadat has been described by Shmuel Katz in *The Hollow Peace* (Dvir, 1981). Both the autonomy plan for Judea, Samaria and Gaza and the abandonment of the Sinai peninsula were presented as *fait accomplis* to the cabinet. It is worth quoting Katz at some length.

*"The fact is that this fateful document on autonomy was prepared by the Prime Minister without consulting anyone but the Foreign Minister...The Ministers who attended that Tuesday meeting--including the Minister of Defense and the Chief of Staff--then heard of the plan for the first time. Without time for serious study, following one brief discussion that was of necessity superficial, they were asked to express their views."* Katz continues:

*"Another subject about which I knew absolutely nothing was discussed at that same meeting: the plan for Sinai. Its main points were of course made public within a few days. At that meeting Dayan reported that the plan had already been submitted to Egypt at a meeting he had had with Sadat's emissary, Hassan Touhemi, in Morocco. There Touhemi had been told of Israel's willingness to withdraw from Sinai.*

*"The proposal was so comprehensive that it did not need many paragraphs. The Sinai peninsula was to be 'returned' to Egypt unreservedly....*

*"In time the amazing fact came to light that this decision too had been taken by Menachem Begin and Moshe Dayan without consulting anyone else, as though they were relinquishing some unimportant piece of property. Presumably they devoted some thought to this*

*fateful step, too, but this was not apparent. They did not avail themselves of assistance from teamwork, nor did they call for any military, strategic or economic survey. They did not try to find out the ramifications for Israel of the loss of Sinai. There is no sign that they considered the fate of Israel's security without Sinai, when Israel would have no foothold there, and would again have to crowd itself behind the 'international boundary.'"*

Thus for all the vaunted talk of democracy, allegiance to its fundamental principles seems less than skin deep among the leadership. Growing awareness of this has produced unease even in academic circles not ordinarily critical of "peace agreements," however spurious their content. The *Jerusalem Post* notes "a rising tide of disapproval among academics who had not previously identified with any political party but who felt growing unease about the agreement or the way it was reached."

Legal expert and Hebrew University Professor Michla Pomerance complains: "When agreements are so fateful for the future of a state, it is unconscionable for them not to be debated at length by the legislative branch. No American president could get away with signing an agreement like this without bringing it to the Senate first." Pomerance notes that American presidents spent 19 years getting approval for the Panama Canal Treaty, which was "not anywhere near as critical for American security as are the issues in contention between Israel and the Palestinians."

Why do Israeli leaders shrug off the elementary principles of democratic decision-making when the most momentous issues are at stake? Presumably they fear that the process of debate, in which reasoned argument on both sides of the issue would reach the public, could derail their plans. They believe, correctly, that it is much easier to rally public support for *fait accomplis*. It is one thing to oppose a *proposed* policy, quite another to repudiate internationally recognized agreements entered into by one's elected leaders. The public does not want to believe that their leaders would enter into agreements that imperil the state's survival.

And so we have the spectacle of Arafat as upholder of democratic process while Israeli leaders show contempt for it. Arafat proclaims that the Palestine National Covenant can only be changed by the vote of the Palestine National Council. Rabin and Peres sign an agreement with a group that remains formally committed to Israel's destruction. The psychiatric term for a delusion in which more than one participates is a *folie a deux*. Such a delusion now determines the fate of the Jewish State.◊

Rael Jean Isaac serves on the Executive Committee of Americans For a Safe Israel and is the author of *Israel Divided and Parties & Politics in Israel*.

## **MIDDLE EAST UPDATE**

...The Egyptian government has forbidden newspapers from publishing interviews with Moslem fundamentalist terror leaders. "These groups should not have any backing," explained Interior Minister Hassan Alfi, who was himself injured in a terrorist bombing last August. "Their interviews should not be published because they are provocative." One wonders how the Egyptian government would respond if Israel prohibited pro-PLO Arab newspapers from publishing interviews with terrorists...

...It is "not in the public interest" to take legal action against Arabs who have engaged in illegal construction on the Temple Mount, attorneys for the Jerusalem Municipality told Israel's High Court of Justice on November 15. Representing the viewpoint of the outgoing Kollek administration, attorney Assa Eliav warned that any prosecution of Arabs for illegal building on the Mount "could harm Jewish-Arab relations." At an earlier hearing on the case, last September, Justice Menachem Elon sharply criticized the Jerusalem authorities for not enforcing the law on the Temple Mount, and pointed out that the

Court had rejected recent suits against the Municipality on the basis of Mayor Kollek's promise to stop turning a blind eye to illegal Arab construction...

...Israeli Energy Minister Moshe Shahal has provided Egypt with top-secret information about the location of uranium deposits in the Sinai peninsula, charges Rafael Eitan, leader of the nationalist Tsomet Party. Israel discovered the uranium deposits back in 1980, when Eitan was Chief of Staff of the Israeli Army, but kept the information secret even after surrendering the Sinai to Egypt, because the uranium could be used to manufacture nuclear weapons. After receiving a tip-off that Shahal had recently told the Egyptians about the uranium, Eitan conveyed the information to Israel Radio correspondent Haim Hecht, who confronted Shahal at Ben-Gurion Airport upon his return from Egypt in mid-November. According to Hecht, Shahal smiled and said "Congratulations--you are the first and only one to get this story." Shahal said that he consulted with Prime Minister Rabin before going to Egypt, "and the two of us decided to give the maps for two reasons--the Egyptians knew we had conducted the surveys and had we given them the maps without the uranium sitings, it would have looked ridiculous, and after 16 years of peace, we decided that there was no danger"...

---

## **BEHIND THE NEWSMAKERS**

...The Cable News Network, which recently received an award from the Anti-Defamation League for "excellence in reporting," exhibited extreme anti-Israel bias in its coverage of recent Arab terrorism against Israelis. When Avraham Zarbiv was attacked by axe-wielding terrorists in Hebron on November 15, suffering deep head wounds before he shot dead one of the attackers, CNN began its story by declaring that a Jewish settler had murdered an Arab after having suffered "a few head scratches and a broken finger." Later in the day, CNN correspondent Reid Collins reported that the Arab was killed by a Jew who "claimed" to have been attacked. Three days later, CNN broadcast a film segment with the comment, "Israeli settlers were rioting in the occupied territories for the second day running, showering cars with a hail of rocks." What the film actually showed, however, was a mob of *Arabs* throwing rocks at *Israeli* cars...

...An Arab terrorist boarded a bus in the Israeli town of Holon on December 5 and opened fire on the passengers, killing one and wounding another before his gun jammed and a soldier on the bus shot him dead. The editors at the *Columbus Dispatch* apparently decided that

the death of the terrorist was more significant than that of his victim. They headlined their story, "Palestinian Gunman is Slain After Bus Attack..."

...The Associated Press continues to insist that the target of Arab terrorists is not the Jews, but rather the "peace process." The AP's description of the December 1 murder of an Israeli kindergarten teacher by Arab terrorists began, "In the latest assault on the Mideast peace process..." The next day's AP dispatch, drawing a false moral equivalency between Arab terrorists and Jewish critics of PLO self-rule, began by announcing that "extremists on both sides" were trying to undermine the Israel-PLO accord. Only later in the story could a reader learn that Arab extremists were calling for the murder of more Jews, while the Jewish "extremists" had merely tied up traffic for a few hours to protest the Arab murders...

# AUTONOMY AND "OCCUPATION"

Louis Rene Beres

Israel's September 13th agreement with the PLO on "limited autonomy" threatens that country's essential security. A major reason behind this unfortunate agreement lies in Jerusalem's persistent failure to challenge prevailing media characterizations of the territories (West Bank and Gaza) as "occupied." Indeed, over time, leaders of the Jewish State never advanced the *informed* argument that such characterizations were markedly propagandistic and that Israel was not the "occupier" (let alone "brutal occupier") so often depicted in the world's newspapers and magazines. Had they done so, a decidedly different view of Israeli territorial governance would have emerged, and the PLO would likely have been denied its substantial victory in Washington.

Words matter! Yasser Arafat's political achievement was built upon a prior linguistic victory. Ironically, the language describing "occupation" conveniently overlooks the pertinent history of West Bank/Gaza, especially the unwitting manner in which these lands fell into Israel's hands after Arab aggression in 1967 and the overwhelming security considerations involved for Israel.

Contrary to widely disseminated but wholly erroneous allegations, a sovereign state of Palestine did not exist before 1967 or 1948. Nor was a state of Palestine promised by authoritative UN Security Council Resolution 242. Indeed, a state of Palestine has *never* existed.

Even as a nonstate legal entity, Palestine ceased to exist in 1948, when Great Britain relinquished its League of Nations mandate. When, therefore, during the 1948-49 War of Independence, the West Bank and Gaza came under illegal control of Jordan and Egypt respectively, these aggressions did not put an end to an already-existing state or to an ongoing trust territory. What these aggressions *did* accomplish was the effective prevention, *sui generis*, of an Arab state in Palestine. It cannot be said often enough, in this connection, that the original hopes for Palestine were dashed not by the new Jewish state or its supporters, but by the extant Arab states, especially Jordan and Egypt.

Let us return, for a moment, to an earlier history. From the Biblical Period (ca. 1350 BCE to 586 BCE) to the British Mandate (1918-1948), the land named by the Romans after the ancient Philistines was controlled only by non-Palestinian elements. Significantly, however, a continuous chain of *Jewish* possession of the land was legally recognized after World War I, at the San Remo Peace Conference of April 1920. There, a binding treaty was signed in which Great Britain was given mandatory authority over Palestine (the area had been ruled by the Ottoman Turks since 1516) to prepare it to become the

"national home for the Jewish people." Palestine, according to the Treaty, comprised *territories* encompassing what are now the states of Jordan and Israel, including West Bank (Judea and Samaria) and Gaza. *Present day Israel, including West Bank and Gaza, comprises only 22% of Palestine as defined and ratified at the San Remo Peace Conference.*

In 1922, Great Britain unilaterally and without any lawful authority split off 78% of the lands promised to the Jews--all of Palestine east of the Jordan River--and gave it to Abdullah, the non-Palestinian son of the Sharif of Mecca. Eastern Palestine now took the name Transjordan, which it retained until April 1949, when it was renamed as Jordan. From the moment of its creation, Transjordan was closed to *all* Jewish immigration and settlement, a clear betrayal of the British promise in the Balfour Declaration of 1917, and a flagrant contravention of its Mandatory obligations under international law.

In 1967, almost 20 years after Israel's entry into the community of states, the Jewish State, as a result of a stunning military victory over Arab aggressor states, gained *unintended* control over West Bank and Gaza. Although the idea of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war is enshrined in the UN Charter, there existed no authoritative sovereign to whom the territories could be "returned." Israel could hardly have been expected to transfer the territories back to Jordan and Egypt which had exercised unauthorized and substantially cruel control since the Arab-initiated war of "extermination" in 1948-49.

These have been the essential historic reasons why the territories have not been "occupied" by Israel. Other valid reasons stem from Israel's incontrovertible legal right to security and self-defense. The relinquishment of those territories, which is now incremental and well underway, is partially the result of Jerusalem's own failure to understand pertinent international law.

International law is not a suicide pact. Anyone who takes the trouble to look at a map of the region will discover that Israel and the territories, comprising an area less than half the size of San Bernardino County in California, cannot afford to yield its already minimal strategic depth. The fact that it has already begun to yield, in defiance of its own survival needs, is due largely to many years of *linguistic* surrender. This capitulation in the realm of language, accepting erroneous enemy characterizations of territory as "occupied," has led Israel to its current policy of "limited autonomy." Unless it is reversed quickly and emphatically, it may soon lead Israel to accept a Palestinian state, an acceptance that could become the beginning of its destruction.◊

*Dr. Louis Rene Beres, who was educated at Princeton, has authored 14 books and several hundred scholarly articles dealing with international law. His newest book, soon to be published by Transnational, is Force, Order and Justice: International Law in an Age of Atrocity.*

# ***BELIEVE IT OR NOT***

Cartoonist Robert Ripley became internationally famous for collecting surprising facts. After a while, it must have taken quite a bit to astonish *him*.

But even Ripley would have been astounded by the behavior of the government of Israel. Here are some items that surely should head the list in any political "Believe It or Not" collection.

1. Eager to reduce tensions with the PLO caused by the Israeli Defense Forces searching and arresting those who have murdered Israeli citizens, Prime Minister Rabin instructed military officials that "the IDF should no longer chase those fugitives who killed in the past, but only if they are specifically suspected of still seeking to kill Israelis in the future." How do you know if someone is going to kill again, until he does so? What this means is that the Prime Minister of the Jewish State has made Jews free game for murder!

The source for this information was a cabinet minister sufficiently disgusted to tell *Israel Shelanu*, which under the editorship of Shmuel Shmueli is today easily the best source of information on the "murder process" which, in this Orwellian world, is called the peace process, *Believe it or not*.

2. From now on, when you give to some Israel-bound charities, will you be contributing to the PLO army? The PLO, which has yet to receive promised funds from Europe and which is still out of favor with its former Arab funders for its support of Saddam Hussein in the Gulf War (the Israelis have already forgotten the Scuds and the PLO celebration of them), is counting on funds from Israel to finance its "police" force (actually its terrorist army). So the government of Israel in effect is asking Jews the world over to buy the guns with which to murder fellow Jews. *Believe it or not*.

3. Israeli cabinet ministers have reacted to the murder of young Jews by blaming the victims. After 24

year-old kindergarten teacher Shalva Ozana and 19 year-old yeshiva student Yitzhak Weinstock were shot to death as the car in which they traveled was being repaired by the side of the road, Agriculture Minister Yaakov Tsur went on Israel Radio to accuse the settlers of "exploiting" terrorist

incidents; he declared "I never did think that they should settle and get themselves stuck in places that are in the points of greatest friction."

Not to be outdone, Deputy Defense Minister Mordechai Gur said on Army Radio that he couldn't understand "what all the hysteria is about every time something special happens." The leaders of Israel have found a new euphemism for killing Jews--it is when "something special happens." And then there's Minister of Culture Shulamit Aloni (that this woman should have been made Minister of Education and now "culture" in itself ranks as a "believe it or not"), who accused the settlers of "cynically exploiting the blood that has been spilled." Watch the Newspeak here: victims are the bad guys--they "cynically exploit." The "blood that has been spilled" is in the passive tense, with no indication of how it came to be spilled, a force of nature, perhaps. *Believe it or not*.

Let us hope that the worst "Believe It or Not" will not come to pass: that the Israeli public sit passively much longer as their berserk government careens onward.◇

***R.J.I.***



## **Point of View**

**Victor H. F. Sharpe**

### **FROM DUBLIN TO TUNIS**

There was much anguish in Britain when Gerry Adams, President of Sinn Fein, the political arm of the Irish Republican Army, eulogized a gunman who was killed when his bomb exploded prematurely. The outrage was especially strong because Gerry Adams was also currently engaged in "peace talks" with John Hume, an Ulster Protestant M.P., who was negotiating on behalf of the British government.

One newspaper lamented that Hume's parleys with the anti-British Sinn Fein leader gave Adams "a status which he does not deserve and enables him to make noises about peace without having to foreswear violence." The paper complained that the IRA might succeed, through murder and terrorism, in "pushing the greatest military power in Western Europe out of a portion of its territory."

Substitute the PLO for the IRA and Arafat for Adams and you see an eerie resemblance. Arafat's villainy, of course, makes most IRA leaders look like Bing Crosby in *The Bells of St. Mary's*. But where was the outrage in Israel or the United States when Arafat reiterated his pledge to destroy Israel the day he signed the "Declaration of Principles" on the White House lawn?

In his Washington hotel, after the ceremony, Arafat explained that the PLO was merely implementing its 1974 decision to occupy all areas from which Israel withdraws. The report, carried on Israel radio, failed to mention that this 1974 decision was the PLO's longstanding "Phased Plan" for Israel's destruction.

There are some similarities between Britain's willingness to deal with the IRA and betray the Protestants of Northern Ireland and Israel's deal with the PLO at the expense of the Jews in Judea, Samaria and Gaza. However, there is a great difference between the two "deals." Great Britain's very existence is not in mortal danger.◊

*Victor H. F. Sharpe is the co-publisher of a pro-Israel newsletter in Portland, Oregon.*

### **NOW AVAILABLE FROM AFSI:**

#### Videos

*NBC In Lebanon: A study of media misrepresentation.*  
58 minutes. Purchase \$50. Rental \$25

#### Books

*With Friends Like These....: The Jewish Critics of Israel*  
by Edward Alexander (ed.) - \$10.95

*Eye On the Media: A Look At News Coverage of Israel*  
by Davd Bar-Illan - \$14.95 (non-members: \$15.95)

*Politics, Lies, and Videotape,*  
by Yitschak Ben Gad - \$15.95 (non-members: \$18.95)

*Minorities in the Middle East,*  
by Mordechai Nisan - \$29.95 (non-members: \$32.50)

*If I Am Not for Myself...: The Liberal Betrayal of the Jews*  
by Ruth Wisse - \$21.95 (non-members: \$22.95)

#### Monographs

*Should America "Guarantee" Israel's Safety?*  
by Dr. Irving Moskowitz - \$3.95 (non-members: \$4.95)

*The Hidden Alliances of Noam Chomsky,*  
by Werner Cohn - \$1.00 (non-members: \$2.95)

*The New Israel Fund: A New Fund for Israel's Enemies,* by  
Joseph Puder - \$2.00 (non-members: \$3.95)

Order from: **Americans For a Safe Israel**  
147 East 76 St. - New York, NY 10021

# **AFSI CONFERENCE DECRIES RABIN POLICY**

*David Isaac*

NEW YORK- AFSI's 1993 National Conference, on December 12, 1993, came at a time of escalating violence and widespread disillusionment in Israel over the Israel-PLO peace agreement. AFSI, of course, has maintained from the beginning that Judea, Samaria, and Gaza are an indivisible part of the Land of Israel.

Speakers referred to the peace accord as a unilateral surrender, an abandonment of Jewish national rights, an uprooting of Jewish spirit, and "warfare by another name."

Yoram Hazony, the youthful director of the Israel Academy of Liberal Arts at Eli, in Samaria, in an electrifying speech, noted that not only do all the polls in Israel show a majority against the agreement but many in the Labor Party, including those to the left of Labor, have contempt for the peace pact with Arafat.

He dismissed the very idea of 'autonomy' or an interim period before the creation of a Palestinian state, pointing out that in not one of the documents signed does the word 'autonomy' appear. To think there will be a waiting period is "simply misunderstanding the facts in the field--any district, any town, any street that is vacated by the Israeli Army becomes 'liberated Palestine' instantly." He explained that Arafat declared his state, which has since been recognized by numerous countries, in 1988. Hazony said that the words 'State of Palestine' appear on stamps and coins which are being produced and on the form for joining the Palestine police force. He noted that the form has an emblem with a map of Palestine. It is a map of all of Israel.

Hazony dismissed as myth the belief that Israel and the PLO have joined forces to eliminate the fundamentalist terror group Hamas. He said "nowhere in English, Hebrew, or Arabic has a PLO leader admitted that there is an alliance with Israel against Hamas." According to Hazony, it is precisely the contrary, with PLO leaders like Feisal Hussein demanding that all Hamas prisoners be released. Nonetheless, the government continuously repeats that such an alliance exists, in order to help sell the peace agreement to the Israeli public.

As a result, Israel's true allies in the Mideast sense they are to be abandoned to the PLO and Hezbollah. Hazony said that the commander of the Southern Lebanese Christian militia went on Israel Radio to beg the Israeli people "Don't turn your backs on us. Don't give us away to our enemies. Our lives are in danger here." Hazony said that Rabin has decided "to betray all of those alliances which Labor and Likud have spent 25 years building and switch sides, to say 'We are taking the

side of the PLO now and to hell with all those other people who helped us."

Hazony said that he numbers himself among those who believe that one of the main reasons for Israel's existence is to be a "light unto the nations." And he said that Israel had fulfilled this role, for example, in the fight against terrorism. The Israeli Entebbe Operation in 1976 led to a series of counter-terrorism actions by other countries, from Danish special forces liberating people held by South Mollucan terrorists to the U.S. capturing the Achille Lauro murderers in mid-air. However, by signing a treaty with the PLO, the most infamous terror organization, Israel extinguished its light. Hazony noted that Rabin had done "something much worse" than uproot the reason Jewish boys are willing to fight. He has "eliminated the possibility of Israel being something that pursues justice."

Hazony maintained that Israelis "are not physically weary from being shot at. They are not tired. They're broken. They're not physically exhausted. They're clinically depressed. It's a whole country that needs to be on Prozac."

*Commentary* editor Norman Podhoretz painted the bleakest picture of the day. Unlike Hazony, who concluded by saying "I believe the government will fall," Podhoretz saw no prospect of the Labor government either being changed or changing its policies. He offered several possible scenarios, including a future PLO state becoming a mini-Lebanon, with bloody struggles between factions, permitting Syria, which considers the area southern Syria, to intervene. Israel would be pulled into war. He added, to the dismay of the audience, that Syria "is going to get the Golan Heights back as surely as we sit here in this room today."

In the morning session, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Douglas Feith pointed out that contrary to the universal impression, the peace agreement is not a 'land for peace' deal. It is a 'unilateral withdrawal.' 'Land for peace' involves a 'credible and authoritative pledge of peace' followed by the Israelis then effecting a withdrawal. The steps of the current peace process are out of order. The Declaration of Principles was signed before the mutual recognition agreement. Feith said the Israeli government was intent on leaving the territories regardless of whether or not it made peace. He illustrated this by quoting a surprising statement by Foreign Minister Shimon Peres, who said on CNN that "Israel would implement the Declaration of Principles even if the PLO failed to make the peace pledges required for Israeli recognition."

Feith also examined the issue of national rights. Since Israel is the embodiment of the Zionist dream, national security cannot be defined "without reference to

# LETTERS THEY REFUSED TO PUBLISH

Letters to the Editor  
*Seattle Post-Intelligencer*  
Dear Editor:

December 12, 1993

Edmund Hanauer is known to *Post-Intelligencer* readers as a Johnny One-note columnist. Year after year, every column he has ever contributed to the paper has sought to blacken the moral image of Israel. In his latest (Dec. 10) effusion, for example, he writes at length about what *Israel* is obligated to do by Security Council Resolution 242 passed in the aftermath of the 1967 war, but makes no mention of the fact that 242 prescribes that there should be no Israeli withdrawal at all until "a just and lasting peace" is made; after that there can be a complete withdrawal, a partial one, or none, depending on what the parties decide; also unmentioned is the fact that Israel has already, in its peace treaty with Egypt, withdrawn from almost 90% of the territories in question. Hanauer also delicately avoids mention of who started the 1967 war and of this ever pertinent question: Why, if the "occupied" territories are the cause of the "conflict" in the Middle East, did the Arabs, who had full control of these territories from 1948-67, nevertheless go to war against Israel in 1967? But half-truths and facts out of context are the standard tricks of the propagandist's trade, and one must not begrudge Hanauer full use of them.

What is far more objectionable is the P-I's

identification of Hanauer as "an American Jewish political scientist." When was the last time you identified one of your columnists as a "Methodist political scientist" or an "Episcopalian sociologist"? Would you rush to print the ugliest of anti-Polish accusations, including a call for cessation of aid to Poland, by someone willing to be identified as "a Polish-American political scientist"? Should not your readers be allowed to judge the merit of what this particular scribbler has to say on the basis of his evidence and argument rather than his religious affiliation?

The more the Arab nations and organizations have been able to discredit Israel, the more have liberal and leftist Jews like Hanauer sought to dissociate themselves from a people under attack by advertising their own goodness. But why should the P-I lend itself to such an advertising campaign?

Edward Alexander  
Professor of English  
University of Washington

---

## AFSI CONFERENCE

(Continued from p. 10)

the principles of Zionism." The peace agreement is clearly an abandonment of these principles. He warned "There are some things a nation can never trade away unless it is willing to change its basic character. Nations that try to buy peace with aggressive neighbors by trading national rights often wind up with neither sovereignty nor peace."

Thomas Moore, a professional staff member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, looked at the growing need for missile defense in America and Israel. He said that the number one threat to this country and Israel is missile proliferation. America has "artificially handicapped" its missile defense capability by clinging to the 25 year-old ABM treaty. Moore revealed that there are those involved in arms control who want to force Israel to abide by the ABM treaty, placing its missile defense program, the Arrow, in jeopardy. It is essential, Moore said, that "Israel can go forward with its missile defense program and be able to defend itself against either direct  
*January 1994*

attack or against coercion and blackmail by Syria and other Arab powers."

Rael Jean Isaac, one of AFSI's founders, spoke of Egypt's massive violations of her treaty with Israel, which she had detailed in the December *Commentary*. The lesson of the Egypt-Israel treaty was that Israel's other neighbors would fail to live up to their agreements as well, and that Israel's territorial vulnerability in shrunken borders would invite another Arab assault upon her.

The annual AFSI award was given to Dr. Irving Moskowitz, whose monograph "Should America Guarantee Israel's Safety?" exposed the dangers of placing American troops on the Golan long before most Americans were aware of such a possibility.

National chairman Herbert Zweibon presented a plaque to Dr. Moskowitz which read: "Americans For a Safe Israel Annual Award is presented to Dr. Irving Moskowitz for his heroic efforts on behalf of the Jewish people and the Land of Israel."◇

*David Isaac is a freelance journalist.*

# BALDERDASH

*"When we came into office, we couldn't get our people invited to speak anywhere in the United States."*

--Yitzhak Herzog, head of the Labor Party's Diaspora desk, in the *Jerusalem Report*, December 16, 1993

*"Opponents on both sides sound remarkably alike...Jewish religious nationalist and Islamic fundamentalists...speak in exactly the same strident tones."*

--Michael Walzer in *The New Republic*, October 4, 1993

*"Peace is another step in the remarkable covenantal journey of the Jewish people in our time, as Israel reaps the fruits of responsible and ethical self-empowerment in the light of the Holocaust."*

--Irving Greenberg in the *Jerusalem Report*, November 18, 1993

*"The governments of Menachem Begin and Yitzhak Shamir tried war, assassination, repression, settlement and the expropriation of land, mass deportation, collective punishment, and the creation of a climate of intolerance and inflammation. And here they still are, these fear artists, worrying about the problem of terrorism and the problem of the Palestinians."*

--Leon Wieseltier in *The New Republic*, October 4, 1993

*"Jews did not go to Palestine to grab land or oppress Arabs. We were jumping out of the burning buildings of Europe, and we unintentionally landed on the backs of Palestinians, often hurting them."*

--Michael Lerner in *Tikkun*, November-December 1993

---

**Americans For a Safe Israel**  
**147 East 76 St.**  
**New York, NY 10021**

NON-PROFIT  
ORGANIZATION  
U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
NEW YORK, N.Y.  
PERMIT NO. 9418