
OUTPOST



MAY 1994 PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

FROM SOMALIA TO THE GOLAN HEIGHTS

Herbert Zweibon

The American mission in Somalia, which started with such a bang, ended with a whimper this spring, as noble humanitarianism gave way to cold, hard political considerations. Those who advocate stationing U.S. troops on the Golan Heights to "guarantee" Israel's safety should carefully note how American public opposition to the Somalia mission rose in direct proportion to the number of American casualties suffered there. There is no reason to believe that a Golan Heights experience would be any different.

The last time American soldiers were in that region was in 1983, when the U.S. sent troops to Lebanon as part of the deal to persuade the Israelis to withdraw. The idea is that the presence of American and other Western peacekeepers would help keep Lebanon from being used as a launching pad for Arab terrorist attacks against northern Israel. But when a Hezbollah carbomb-driver blew up the U.S. Marine barracks, killing over 200 Americans, there was a public outcry in favor of a U.S. withdrawal. The troops were quickly withdrawn. If American troops are now sent to the Golan Heights, they will be stationed just a few miles away from Hezbollah's Lebanon bases. It won't be very long until the Hezbollah gangsters start taking aim at their new American targets.

Another problem is the size and quality of the American force that would be placed on the Golan. It is unrealistic to think that Congress or public opinion would agree to a force large enough to stop a Syrian invasion. This is particularly the case when the entire U.S. defense program is being downsized. The journal *Army Times* recently revealed that a significant portion of the U.S. peacekeeping force in the Sinai will soon be made up of soldiers plucked from the National Guard and the Reserve army. "We simply do not have the numbers or the skills in the active component [of the regular U.S. Army] to do it all," said General Gordon Sullivan. "As the pace and duration of contingency operations increase, the nation must be prepared to go to the National Guard and Army Reserve." That means Israel could find itself relying for its protection upon a handful of lightly-armed

National Guardsmen and aging reservists. They would not be capable of mounting counter-terrorist operations against Hezbollah. And how would they be able to block a Syrian attack? What if Syrian dictator Hafez Assad would, at some point, decide that the time had come to use the Golan the same way Syria used it before 1967, that is, to attack Israel? Or what if Assad is replaced by a Moslem fundamentalist who declares that the time has come for a *jihad* to "liberate" the rest of "Palestine"? National Guardsmen waving pistols would have no effect on a column of Syrian tanks or a volley of Syrian Scud missiles. The American peacekeepers would simply be in no position to keep the peace.

Finally, there is the fundamental illogic of the proposal to put Americans on the Golan. If the Syrians have really become moderate and peaceful and trustworthy --as the State Department and Shulamit Aloni keep insisting-- then why is there a need for "peacekeepers" at all? And if the Syrians are not trustworthy, how can anybody suggest that Israel should take the chance of surrendering the Golan to them?◇

Herbert Zweibon is chairman of Americans For a Safe Israel.

IN THIS ISSUE:

Will Peace Now Take Over B'nai B'rith? ...2

Christians in the Moslem World ...3

We Don't Need the Oscars ...4

Prime Minister Ari Ben-Canaan ...5

Shlomo Gazit Is Upset ...7

RABIN JUST DOESN'T GET IT

A prime minister's most basic obligation is to ensure the physical security of his country's citizens. The dramatic increase in Arab terrorism since the September 13 White House signing ceremony demonstrates that Yitzhak Rabin has not fulfilled his duty as prime minister.

Presidents and prime ministers in numerous countries have, over the years, been forced to resign for a variety of relatively minor infractions, often involving financial indiscretions--including, of course, Mr. Rabin himself, who left office in shame in the spring of 1977 in a scandal over illegal bank accounts abroad.

How extraordinary, then, that despite Rabin's much more serious misbehavior now, he has been able to hang on to power, retaining his razor-thin majority in parliament thanks to the votes of two fiercely pro-PLO Arab parties.

And so Israel stumbles onward down the path of concessions and retreat, a path littered with the bodies of those who have been victimized by the Arab terrorism that was supposed to have vanished in this new era of "peace." Is this the "mandate for peace" that Rabin believes he was granted in the 1992 election? And is this the notion of "security" to which he pledged himself in order to win centrist votes? If it is, then one can only conclude by paraphrasing the slogan that became a catchword of the 1992 American presidential election: Rabin just doesn't get it. He just doesn't understand that slogans and handshakes can never substitute for real security, and that if he cannot provide Israel's citizens with security, then he must give the voters a chance to decide who can do the job.◊

"PEACE DIVIDEND": A DELUSION

Eliyahu Kanovsky, professor of economics at Bar-Ilan University, has written an illuminating study entitled "Assessing the Mideast Peace Economic Dividend." Kanovsky punctures the assumptions behind the rosy visions conjured up by people like Shimon Peres of a "new Middle East" where prosperity reigns and harmony follows. On the contrary, says Kanovsky, "it is unlikely that Israel-Arab peace accords will lead to any appreciable rise in the regional standard of living, to substantial cuts in military expenditures, to a sizable in-flow of foreign private investment, or to large-scale regional trade and tourism."

Kanovsky identifies a number of what he calls "myths" that are currently widely believed. A major one is that "Peace Means Large-Scale Foreign Investment." But Kanovsky points out that Arab countries are not attractive to foreign investors for reasons that go beyond the presence of peaceful conditions. They do not have

dynaamic economies. Nor is Israel likely to attract more investment than it does now.

Another myth is that "Rich Arab States Will Underwrite the Peace." In fact, says Kanovsky, neither Saudi Arabia nor Kuwait is in any position to extend massive assistance nor, given their attitudes toward the PLO, would they do so if they could. Yet another is "Peace Means Substantial Reductions in Military Spending." Continuing regional tensions and the nature of Arab regimes make that most unlikely, says Kanovsky. As for Israel, in the immediate future, the need for redeployment means its military countermeasures and the rise of fundamentalism will also be a bar to reduction in spending.

Kanovsky examines other myths such as "Economic Benefits Secure the Peace" when history shows that this is far from the case. Kankovsky's study has been published as a pamphlet and is available from the BESA Center of Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel.◊

WILL PEACE NOW TAKE OVER B'NAI B'RITH?

Delegates to the international convention of B'nai B'rith, to be held in Chicago in August, will be choosing a new president for their organization. The differences between the two candidates will, in most respects, revolve around internal B'nai B'rith matters. But in one respect they will touch on issues that affect the very survival of the State of Israel. One of the candidates, Daniel Thursz, is a partisan of the far left. He is on the editorial board of the radical *Tikkun* magazine, is on the Sponsoring Committee of the leftwing "Nishma" group, and has served on the Board of Directors of Americans for Peace Now--an organization that favors the creation of a PLO state and concessions on Jerusalem, among other things. Precious few members of B'nai B'rith share Thursz's extremist ideology; how sad and ironic it would be if they are misled into electing him to serve as their next president.◊

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.

THE PLIGHT OF CHRISTIANS IN THE MOSLEM WORLD: RECENT DOCUMENTS

"Suspected Moslem militants shot dead five Christians, including two priests, outside a Coptic monastery in southern Egypt, security sources said...The gunmen opened fire on a group of Christians as they tried to enter the Moharrak monastery in the town of Qussiyah, 180 miles south of Cairo. The group, who arrived on a minibus, were told by a guard that the monastery had closed to outsiders on March 7 to mark the beginning of the 55-day Coptic Christian fast for Lent...One of the priests, ur-Al-Qums Binyamin, and three of the visitors were shot dead on the spot. Another priest who was returning to the monastery was seriously wounded and died in hospital..."

--Reuters, March 12, 1994

"The approximately 5 million Copts are the objects of violent assaults by Islamic extremists and of discrimination by the [Egyptian] Government. In 1992, Islamic extremists killed at least 27 Copts, robbed and murdered Coptic shop owners, and burned scores of Copt-owned properties, including several churches...Extremists also obstructed church repairs and construction and harassed Copt-owned businesses. In some cases, extremists have also imposed "taxes" on Christian residents to protect their person and property. Security forces arrest extremists who perpetrate violence against Copts, but the Government does not always prevent attacks and does little to correct nonviolent forms of discrimination--including its own.

"Government discriminatory practices include: suspected statistical underrepresentation of the size of Christian population; delays in issuing church building and repair permits; the detention and mistreatment of some Muslim converts to Christianity; laws preventing Moslems from changing their identity papers to reflect their conversion to Christianity (upheld in a 1980 court decision); a requirement that public schools students--including Christians--memorize Koranic verses as a part of their Arabic studies; heavy emphasis on Islamic television programming--some carrying anti-Christian themes; job discrimination in the public sector, the police, the armed forces, and the government agencies...and underrepresentation in government. There are no Copt governors and few Copts in the upper ranks of the armed forces, police and diplomatic service."

--State Department Annual Human Rights Report

"The situation of Christians in Sudan is growing increasingly desperate. In southern Sudan (predominantly black and where the majority of Christians live),

tens of thousands of people suffer and die every day, with severe shortages of food, shelter, clothing, medicines, anaesthetics, etc. Government forces are holding hostage 250,000 civilians in Juba, the capitol of southern Sudan, who are crammed into churches and a football stadium. The airport is closed so little food or medicine can reach them, and they are on the verge of starvation. The area around Juba has been mined in order to prevent them escaping.

"The situation of Christians in the north (predominantly Arab and Moslem) is even worse than for those in the south. Many are southerners who fled to the north from the appalling conditions in the south. The government has forced large numbers into the desert without food, water or shelter; it obstructs relief efforts in the north, and intercepts food aid.

"In the Nuba mountains, an enclave inhabited by non-Arab Christians in the Moslem part of Sudan, at least 140 villages have been destroyed by the National Defence Militia. Countless men, women and children have been shot or burned to death, and more than a hundred Christian men have been crucified. Tens of thousands are moved every month to concentration-camp style compounds in South Kordofan Province. Men and women are separated. Some reports suggest that the intelligentsia are executed and the rest sent further north as slaves. Those who remain in the Nuba mountains are destitute, and the Khartoum government does not allow aid to reach them..."

"Sudanese Christians feel isolated and forgotten by the rest of the world, including the international Christian community. They believe that the Khartoum government is adopting a policy of ethnic genocide to rid Sudan of Christians. Christians in the government-controlled areas of the north have to give allegiance to Islam in order to receive the humanitarian aid they need to survive. Christians in the south feel that they are holding the line against the expansion of Islamization throughout East Africa."

--International Institute for the Study of Islam and Christianity

WE DON'T NEED THE OSCARS

Ruth King

The Holocaust is very much on people's minds this spring, for three very cogent reasons.

First, the 50th anniversary of the Normandy Invasion is being commemorated by hundreds of articles and broadcasts. This unparalleled Allied effort defeated the Nazis and, in effect, ended the war against the Jews.

Second, Steven Spielberg's masterful film, "Schindler's List," has been universally acclaimed and widely viewed.

Third, fundraising season just ended at National Public Television, and as is well known, these networks which bow to no one in anti-Israel bias, do know who the benefactors are, and telethon solicitations are always liberally peppered with Pavarotti and "Jewish interest programs" as the professionals call them. The Holocaust is always considered appropriate for "Jewish interest."

What rankles a bit is how we are manipulated and how "politically correct" the Holocaust is. Richard Dreyfuss, in nominating "Schindler's List" for an Oscar, spoke of his profound honor in doing so. Did he suffer even the slightest pang of dishonor when he aided and abetted Israel's enemies by having been such an enthusiastic

guns and took down their enemies, would they have been less acceptable? Would there be any Oscars or self-righteous accolades for a movie about the settlers of Judea, Samaria, Gaza and Golan? When these brave pioneers are attacked by rioting hordes of Arabs whose stated and repeated goal is the end of the Jewish State, if they are driven out and killed, does that make them the proper protagonists for a good movie or documentary? When they defend themselves and their historical, religious, strategic and legal rights, does that make them somehow less likeable?

In Holocaust movies, every one is moved by the victims' clinging to faith. In Spielberg's movie, a man driven from his home pries the *mezuzah* from the door, others cry the *Shema*--heroic affirmation of our faith in the face of their persecutors.

But when Jewish settlers today cling to the rocks and earth of Hebron, Israel's ancient capitol, and when they speak of God's Covenant with the Jewish People in their ancient homeland, they are called obstacles to peace, provocations, fanatics. No Oscar material there.

Can it be that only if the unspeakable happened --a war, or frightened, defenseless Jews driven from their homes, and an Arab onslaught implementing Phase Two of their strategy to dismantle Israel-- would Hollywood or the media see a story in it...?

Liam Neeson could play a 'good Arab', one who recognizes that acceptance of Israel, coexistence, and democracy are preferable to hatred and violence. Vanessa Redgrave could play Shulamit Aloni, and of course Richard Dreyfuss could play Rabin. And what about Peres and Beilin? They could play themselves.

That scenario is unacceptable and Jews must reject forever the role of victim. We don't need the Oscars or the documentaries or self-righteous eulogies. We need a strong, defensible state with Jerusalem and Hebron as its eternal capitols. ♦

Ruth King is editor of Outpost.

spokesman for Peace Now, even before that organization became so 'mainstream'? Liam Neeson, nominated for the role of Schindler, seemed genuinely affected by it. How does his future mother-in-law, Vanessa Redgrave, feel about it? When she was nominated for an Academy Award sixteen years ago, people protested her predilection for PLO terrorists whose hatred for Israel and Jews is every bit as implacable as the Nazis'. She dismissed them as "Zionist hoodlums" when she accepted her Oscar.

One can't avoid the uncomfortable feeling that the only kind of Jews the world tolerates are the cringing, defenseless, persecuted ones. Why, even the columnist Michael Kinsley, himself a Jew, once wrote in a column in the *New York Post* that he prefers cringing to a high profile aggressive role. If Schindler's Jews had Uzi machine-

Outpost

With the Rabin government on the verge of surrendering the Golan Heights in exchange for U.S. "guarantees," you need to read--

Should America "Guarantee" Israel's Safety?

by Dr. Irving Moskowitz
with an Introduction by Sen. Alfonse D'Amato

\$2.95 from Americans For a Safe Israel,
147 East 76 St. - New York, NY 10021

PRIME MINISTER ARI BEN-CANAAN

J. S. Sorkin

The lead article in the July 1988 *Midstream* praised then Defense Minister Yitzhak Rabin for his handling of the six month-old *intifada*, when many around the world were bashing him for his tough talk about breaking bones. The writer pointed out that Rabin knew what Peter Jennings & Co. never understood (perhaps because they do not want to), that the PLO did not ignite the uprising, that it was the maniacal, Jew-hating fundamentalists in Israel playing copycat to the Lebanese kamikazies who had driven the IDF back from Beirut and sent it scurrying into a "security zone." Rabin was praised for his tough stance and unsentimental recognition of, and resistance to, the menace of militant Islam.

But now, six years later, the writer is feeling if not exactly regretful than sheepish. Having had his eyes painfully pried open by events since September 13, 1993, I feel compelled (yes, it was me) to own up to having written that piece. But in self-defense, permit me to plead I was not alone: Who wasn't at one time enamored of Yitzhak Rabin, Israel's Chief of Staff during those miraculous Six Days in 1967?

It's not easy looking at an idol and discovering his clay feet. But helping me through this midlife crisis has been a friend and colleague, a former professional associate of the prime minister and one of Israel's leading experts on the Arabs, the PLO, and Islam. Knowing Rabin far better than this distant Diaspora Jew ever could, he says that contrary to the man's much touted "analytical powers," he really is a *teepshon kadoorie*, which very loosely translated means a "stupid little hayseed." Not so much stupid as hopelessly uneducated and provincial.

After all, Yitzhak Rabin is a man who on purpose received little formal education. He spent his boyhood in a private school founded by his progressive mother, Rosa Cohen, a Tel Aviv City Councilwoman and socialist activist who feared the public schools were corrupting the children by directing them toward university and the professions. Red Rosa, a rabbi's daughter who as a teenager in White Russia used to sneak from the house on Shabbos to be with her non-Jewish girlfriends, wanted something more in line with her socialist ideals, so she founded a school to ensure that her little boy got one of those progressive educations whose cognomen is the unstructured day during which the child tells the teacher what he wants to do. By design, academic subjects were de-emphasized; far more important was instilling socialist values and the idealism of working the land on a collective farm.

After high school, her handsome teenage son went off to the Kadoorie Field School in the Galilee for a two-year agricultural program and that was it; that was the end of

May 1994

Yitzhak Rabin's formal education (outside the army). And even those two years were interrupted by World War II and service in the nascent Palmach.

Such a minimalist education was typical of many in the "Generation of '48," the legendary founders of the state. Indeed, by some accounts, Rabin was a model for Leon Uris as he crafted the fictional Ari Ben-Canaan, the hero of *Exodus*. Like Ben-Canaan, Rabin was in on a prison break and in any case is a classic example of the mythical *sabra* of the 1920s-1950s, the revolutionary kibbutznik at war with his people's history. No pale *yeshiva bocher*, accountant, businessman or other urban professional, Ari was a man of the soil who did not dodge his (host) country's military draft but proudly picked up a gun to fight for his people like a man.

A wonderful image, a glorious era, but today it seems Ari Ben-Canaan, now bald and slowed at age 72, for all his virtues, can't escape having been that *teepshon kadoorie*, the uneducated product of a "progressive" education with more disdain for Jews and Judaism than love. In New York, Berlin and London in the 1920s-1950s, Jewish leftists sent their children to progressive lycea and in Palestine too, where the educational fare in Rosa Cohen's school was similar albeit wrapped in Zionism. She and husband Nehemiah, who used to lead the May Day parades in Tel Aviv waving a huge red flag, had abandoned Judaism for socialism, for the godless "religion" which called real religion the opiate of the

masses. When Rosa died, Nehemiah did not even light a *yahrzeit* candle because they did not believe in such things. Rabin himself, when entering politics in the early 1970s, spoke proudly of being raised in a socialist, "proletarian" home.

Taught to dismiss religion as superstition and reject all sentiment for the Land of Israel, he learned to sniff at Judaism as a hoax, and the dual notions of a Chosen People in a Promised Land as so much ethnocentric poppycock which only provokes antisemitism.

The question then asks itself: Why are we angry with Yitzhak Rabin? He is who he is. Of course he's ready to hand Judea and Samaria over to Arafat & Co. Those hills are so much rock and dirt. To his socialist mind, antisemitism was the product of Christianity and

(Continued on p. 6)

Outpost

ARI BEN-CANAAN

(Continued from p.5)

.the objective conditions of Jewish existence, but by building a new society among Muslims, who aren't antisemitic, and by turning the bourgeois capitalist Jew into a socialist farmer, antisemitism would disappear. Yes, the religious Muslims are a menace, but not secular people like Arafat. Anyway, unlike those *kippah*-wearing settlers, people like Rabin, Peres, Aloni and Beilin see themselves as "real Israelis" with nothing "Jewish" about them and believe the Arabs also see and love the difference.

It is thus beyond Rabin's ken that Islam is anti-Jewish; that Arabs still seem him as a Jew; that the old socialist dream of shedding unwanted religious identities has failed like other socialist dreams. Lots of Jews and others swooned at the century-old siren song of an

international brotherhood of socialists, though Rabin has yet to understand the Arabs never did and that it takes two to tango.

He seems not to know with whom he is dealing in a dissembler like Arafat, this punk assassin raised in the barbarous Muslim Brotherhood, or Hafez Assad, whose defense minister wrote a book-length tract about blood-thirsty Jews, *The Matzoh of Zion*.

Rabin believes he can satiate Arab hunger by handing over Israel's greatest territorial assets, the mountains of Judea and Samaria, which just also happen to be the real heart of the Jewish homeland.

Yes, as they say in Hebrew, *Rabin hoo teepshon kadoorie*, and may God have mercy on us all.◊

J.S.Sorkin, before the word went out to applaud the Handshake, used to publish in a variety of publications.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON ISRAELI SECURITY

Louis Rene Beres

All world politics, and all global strategy, move in the midst of death. To truly understand calculations of war, deterrence and defense, Israeli planners need to understand (1) enemy orientations to death, both individual and collective; and (2) Israeli orientations to death, both individual and collective.

* * *

Henrich von Treitschke, in his published lectures on *Politics*, cites approvingly to Fichte: "Individual man sees in his country the realization of his earthly immortality." Such "seeing" among Israel's current enemies (especially Iran) is a source of *particular*, even existential, danger. The danger is exacerbated by lack of symmetry with "individual man" in Israel, who most assuredly sees such "realization" much less in his own country.

* * *

There is great danger for Israel in presuming too much Reason in enemy decision-making and world affairs. Today the use of violence within and between states is often self-propelled and self-rewarding, effectively supplanting Clausewitz with De Sade. The Argument has been made most convincingly by Milan Kundera, in his book *The Art of the Novel*. Describing a sheer force of violence that wills to assert itself as force, he talks about

Outpost

this force as "naked, as naked as in Kafka's novels...The aggressivity of force is thoroughly disinterested; unmotivated; it wills only its own will; its is pure irrationality." If Kundera is correct, what is Israel to do about its enemies? What shall it assume about enemy decision-making processes? Should not Israeli planners throw out the handbooks of political scientists and strategic theorists in favor of Kafka and Kundera? And what, exactly, can they learn from the "fiction" writers?

* * *

To understand and predict global responses to Israeli actions in world affairs, Israeli planners must never forget that their country is always the Jew in macrocosm. For the world, macrocosm and microcosm are indistinguishable and indissoluble. Hence, for Israeli planners to except global responses to Israeli actions to be detached from millenia of prejudicial hatreds is foolish in the extreme. Israel is not just another state, one among many others. It is unique, *sui generis*, not in the sense that it is believed to warrant greater justice (a post-Holocaust conclusion one might expect in a world dominated by Reason) but in the sense that it allegedly deserves less, always less, than every other state. Israel and justice cannot be uttered in the same breath. Israel, the Jew in macrocosm, will always be despised, will always be kept distanced from justice. Israeli decision-makers *must* always plan accordingly.

* * *

With further regard to Israel and considerations of justice (again, a paradoxical conjunction of terms), it must

(Continued on p.11)

May 1994

Point of View

WHY IS GAZIT OFFENDED?

Bernard Smith

Why is Major-General (res.) Shlomo Gazit, a senior research fellow at the Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies, so troubled by a letter sent to him by one B. Brodsky of Brooklyn? General Gazit claims he is concerned about what he terms the crudity and extremism of a "certain group within the Jewish community," which has been critical of the Rabin-PLO negotiations. His concern is perplexing. If the group is small and atypical, why is he so agitated that he must produce an opinion article for the *Jerusalem Post* (January 11, 1994)? One suspects that General Gazit fears that Brodsky's words represent--if in harsher tones--the sentiments of a much larger, mainstream American Jewry, which is becoming increasingly less enchanted with the accords and negotiations. If they are, this is a signal failure for the Israeli left.

The left and the Labor-Meretz government have made great efforts to prepare and then quiet--nay, gag--American Jews so that no meaningful opposition to the great land giveaway, creation of a Palestinian Arab state and the endangerment of Israel would come from that quarter. One need only recall the attempt to have a group

of retired Israeli generals preach the "security without territory" theory to U.S. Jews.

Having formed a government, the left, still fearing that American Jews would not go along with their program, tried to play down their role, ensuring that they would not oppose Israeli government plans by lobbying the new U.S. administration and Congress. In spite of their efforts, these concerned Jews are attacking, and the Israeli government is on the defensive.

While the government prefers that American and Israeli Jews remain silent, it cannot force the Americans into submission. It can, however, attempt to restrict home-grown protest. This results in use of excessive force by the police against demonstrators and the Prime Minister's

May 1994

reaction to what he believes to be frequent television broadcasting of demonstrations. Rabin put an undemocratic foot in his mouth recently, when he faulted his communications minister for failing to suppress this sort of film footage.

Mr. Rabin is not the only one concerned by protest. Shlomo Gazit is doing his bit to dampen opposition. That is why he produces the Brodsky letter, which is merely a jumping off point for his attack on American critics under the banner of eradication of crudity in criticism. What he wants is not for them to reform their ways but simply to go away. To this end, he defames them, calling them extreme and "brainwashed," a community whose "depth of...ignorance about our realities here [is] startling." Gazit denies them the right to participate in life and death decisions, a position that ordinarily has merit. In this context, however, the term American Jew becomes another pejorative.

If crude remarks about elected Israeli officials were really Gazit's concern, we would have heard from him before. I will hazard the guess that the pages of Israeli newspapers will yield no Gazit rejoinder to or denunciation of detractors who pilloried Prime Ministers Begin or Shamir, having used among others the term fascist. Only now, when a leftist government is under attack for taking the most extreme risks with Israel's existence, risks which Gazit advocates, does he awaken to his distaste for the harsh and immoderate.

While filled with annoyance over American Jewish critics, did Gazit display public indignation towards the American Friends of Peace Now, who were so extreme in their denunciation of Israeli policy and their advocacy of the terrorist PLO and a Palestinian Arab state? Not likely. Gazit's displeasure is reserved for the critics of the right among those who have not made aliya. (Gazit might better spend his time pondering why so many Jews--even those in danger--refuse to come here and why so many Israeli Jews leave!)

Gazit has every right to defend his position on the accords and the negotiations. However, in this democratic society, neither Gazit nor the government may try to gag the opposition, not here nor abroad.◇

Bernard Smith is a member of the Board of Directors of The Jerusalem Institute for Western Defence and the Advisory Committee of Americans For a Safe Israel.

ONE MINUTE TO MIDNIGHT

Dr. Irving Moskowitz

ARAFAT'S SILENCE

On Shabbat morning, April 23, Muhammad Taamon, age 21, and Ahmoud Kidra, age 17, residents of the Arab city of Khan Yunis, in the Gaza Strip, decided to pay a visit to some of their Jewish neighbors.

Taamon and Kidra made their way to the Jewish town of Neve Dekalim and used a huge knife to cut their way through the metal security fence that surrounds the little community. By chance, they spotted Mrs. Sigal Sofer, a 23 year-old mother of two, nursing her 2 week-old infant on her front porch.

Unarmed women and children are Arab terrorists' favorite targets. Taamon and Kidra did not hesitate. While one acted as a lookout, the other stabbed Mrs. Sofer with the knife. Then he stabbed her again, and again, and again. Her screams of pain and horror elicited no pity in the would-be killer. He stopped only when the knife broke after the seventh stab. Then Taamon and Kidra fled.

The settlers who chased the two terrorists

managed to shoot Taamon dead, but Kidra was only wounded. An Israeli Army unit rushed and rescued him before a crowd of neighbors could finish him off.

Thus the tragedy of Israel today. The Israeli Army, its hands tied by the nation's political leaders, is unable to prevent Arab terrorists from striking. Israeli soldiers are reduced to the role of saving an Arab killer from the rage of his Jewish would-be victims.

And in Tunis, Yasser Arafat nods and smiles.

Whoever the terrorists were --whether they were members of Arafat's Fatah, members of other PLO factions, or members of some non-PLO group like Hamas--they were doing Arafat's work for him. They were trying to terrorize the Jews in order to hasten Israel's retreat from Gaza and Jericho today, from Hebron and Shechem tomorrow, and from Jerusalem, Tel Aviv and Haifa, eventually.

Arafat didn't condemn them, because he endorses their deeds. His silence in the face of such brutal outrages, and in direct violation of the Israel-PLO agreement, is further proof --as if any is needed-- that peace between Israel and the PLO is nothing more than a fantasy.◊

Dr. Irving Moskowitz is a member of the Board of Governors of Americans For a Safe Israel.

MIDDLE EAST UPDATE

...Egypt's ambassador to the United States, Ahmed Maher El Sayed, told the recent AIPAC conference in Washington that Israel is to blame for the **Hebron** killings because "the authorities bear the responsibility as an occupying power...I do not believe in collective guilt, but I certainly believe in collective responsibility that should be assumed and atoned for." Sayed gave no indication what steps the Egyptian government intends to take to "atone" for the Moslem terrorist massacre of Coptic Christians in **Egypt** on March 11...

...Lally Weymouth of the *Washington Post* interviewed Yasser Arafat in **Tunis** in early March, and during the course of their conversation reminded the PLO leader "that Palestinian terrorists have killed 33 Israelis during recent months and that Rabin has come under intense attack in Israel." But Arafat did not express any condemnation of the terrorism. Instead, Weymouth reported, Arafat "became angry, insisting that he was risking more than Rabin"...

...Meeting in **Cairo** on March 26-27, representatives of the countries that belong to the Arab League discussed the Arab boycott of Israel--and decided, once

again, to continue enforcing the boycott, despite repeated American request to drop or at least ease it. At the conclusion of the meeting, the Arab ministers went out of their way to thank the Arab Boycott Office in **Damascus** for its work...

...Some of the Hamas terror leaders who were deported to **Lebanon** in 1992 and then permitted to return to Israel last year probably had a hand in the car-bomb attack that killed eight Israelis in the city of **Afula** in April. A report in the leftwing Israeli daily *Ha'aretz* on April 7 cited "security sources" as saying that the Hamas terrorist who undertook the suicide mission did not have sufficient expertise to prepare such a sophisticated car-bomb. A more likely scenario, they said, was that the the car-bomb was actually prepared by some of the Hamas deportees who returned from Lebanon, because they are known to have undergone training in explosives techniques with their spiritual kinsmen in southern Lebanon, Hezbollah...

...The Israeli Army is suppressing information about Arab terrorism in the territories for fear of stirring more public opposition to the PLO self-rule plan, says Balfour Chakak, a prominent Israeli poet. Chakak's son suffered a serious head injury in a recent Arab rock-throwing attack near **Hebron**, but the Army did not report the incident. The Israeli journal *Inside Israel* says that the Army's behavior in the Chakak case was the rule, not the exception...

SPOTLIGHT ON THE EXTREMISTS

...Bishop **Edmund L. Browning**, the Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church, has called for "the suspension of any further [U.S.] loan guarantees to Israel" as punishment for Israel's failure to implement "complete disarmament" of all Jewish settlers and halt all Jewish construction in the territories, "especially in and around East Jerusalem"...

...**Robert I. Friedman**, the Israel-bashing journalist who has always claimed to be merely a "Jewish dove" criticizing Jewish hawks, is in fact not Jewish--so says Levy Cohen, who served as Friedman's bodyguard, driver and translator during Friedman's most recent visit to Israel. Writing in the "In Jerusalem" supplement to the *Jerusalem Post*, on March 25, Cohen revealed that Friedman had mentioned to him in a private conversation that his mother was not Jewish, and that he had attended the American University in Beirut. In their talks, Cohen recalled, Friedman "showed a visible contempt" for the Jewish residents of Judea and Samaria and "often uses classical Marxist terminology condemning 'Jewish colonialists exploiting cheap Arab labor'"--a far cry from the "objective reporter" image that Friedman likes to project to his readers. When discussing 'journalist ethics' with Cohen, Friedman told Cohen that "you have to be careful with people you write about. You can't appear to harbor malice, otherwise you're dealing with libel." Friedman knows a good deal about the subject: he has already lost one libel case against a Jewish nationalist (Friedman settled out of court by paying damages and signing a statement that he falsely labeled the man a "Kahane supporter"), and is presently facing a libel suit in Boston for statements he attributed to two other Jewish settlers...

...In his farewell speech upon retiring from his position as executive director of the American Jewish Congress, **Henry Siegman** let forth a few final blasts. He said that the Jewish residents of Judea and Samaria, the Serbian war criminals in Bosnia, and the Nazis were comparable because they were all exponents of "virtu-ent forms of nationalism" that is "shrouded in religious mythology." Siegman also blasted the AJCongress itself, for not being sufficiently critical of the Rabin government. He condemned the AJC for having "remained silent and said nothing" when Rabin temporarily deported 400 Hamas terror leaders to south Lebanon in December 1992. Siegman will now become president of the new "U.S.-Mideast Project" of the Council on Foreign Relations, which intends "to bring together investors, businessmen and policymakers from the United States

NOW AVAILABLE FROM AFSI:

Videos

After the Handshake: A Town Meeting with Martin Kalb
116 minutes - \$19.95 (non-members: \$21.95)

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 David 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)

The Hollow Peace
by Shmuel Katz - \$16.95 (non-members \$17.95)

Monographs

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

The New Jewish Agenda,
by Rael Jean Isaac - \$2.00 (non-members: \$3.95)

The 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

and the Middle East to promote economic development and cooperation for the entire region." Siegman has so far refused to divulge the names of any those with whom he will be working, but he did recently boast to one reporter that "Arab sources" will play a major role...

LETTERS THEY REFUSED TO PRINT

February 25, 1994

Letters to the Editor
Wall Street Journal

Dear editor:

A.L.Hunt's article on Jonathan Pollard (February 24) is empty rhetoric. My response as a parent must be based on facts which are available to Mr. Hunt:

1. Jonathan Pollard was indicted by the Grand Jury on one count of passing classified documents to Israel relative to the buildup of chemical and biological weapons in Iraq. He was not indicted for treason nor for intent to damage the United States.

2. He was seduced with promises of leniency if he accepted a plea agreement in place of a jury trial. This was violated by the prosecutors who signed the plea agreement. The plea agreement was not properly administered for when Pollard's sentence was reviewed by the federal appeals court, all three judges so held.

3. Reference to the appellate court selectively omits the dissenting opinion on Pollard by Appellate Court Justice Stephen Williams that "because the government's breach of the plea agreement was a fundamental miscarriage of justice...the sentence should be vacated and the case remanded for resentencing before a new judge." (March 20, 1992) At the hearing, John A. Fisher, representing the Department of Justice, said "the term 'treason' was a regrettable mistake." (September 10, 1991) The appeal was denied by Judges Silberman and Ginsberg on a technicality. They claimed that it was submitted too late. The conduct of the lower court prompted expert L. Gordon Crovitz to call it "sandbagging" (*Wall Street Journal*, September 4, 1991).

4. After being sentenced to life in prison he was held in a hospital for the criminally insane for 10 and a half months. When rescued by Rep. Lee Hamilton, Prison Director Quinlan stated in a letter to Hamilton that at no time was he considered a patient. Thereafter, he was held in solitary confinement in Marion Prison, America's most notorious prison, for 5 years. Jonathan Pollard must have disturbed some powerful political figures to have received such severe punishment, more severe than for any other person who worked with an ally.

5. In reference to money, the sentencing judge, bearing in mind the facts and circumstances of Jonathan's actions, declined to fine him. In contrast, Abdul Kader Helmy, who spied for Egypt (and indirectly for Iraq), bearing responsibility for the long range missiles which fell on Tel Aviv and on the coalition forces in the Gulf War, was fined \$250,000 and sentenced to 48 months in prison. Mr. Hunt cannot rewrite the scenario through inflammatory

rhetoric aimed at vigilante justice outside of the courtroom. In his pitiable attempt to trash my son in the guise of legitimate information, Mr. Hunt detracts from his credibility as a responsible journalist. I remind Mr. Hunt that it takes strength to be rational, and moreso, when the victim is not able to defend himself.

Morris Pollard
Notre Dame, IN

July 21, 1993

Letters to the Editor
Wall Street Journal

Dear Editor:

That Mr. Salam Al-Marayah should defend Islam in his letter (July 20) is fitting and proper. He is, furthermore, quite correct in his objection to the use of the terms "radical" and "fundamentalist" in describing religious sects or denominations. There is, however, an important issue which neither he nor Prof. William B. Goodenough address in their respective letters. Article 11 of the 1988 Hamas Covenant states: "Palestine is an Islamic *Waqf* land for generations of Muslims until the end of time...This is stipulated in the Islamic *Sharia*, and is to be treated like all lands forcibly conquered by the Muslims...It shall remain *Waqf* land as long as the heavens and earth exist, and any act that contravenes the *Sharia* with regard to Palestine is null and void." Furthermore, in Article 12 of the Covenant we find: "In the eyes of the Islamic Resistance Movement, nationalism is part of religious faith. Nothing is stronger or deeper than nationalism when the enemy trespasses on Muslim land. Then *Jihad* and volunteering against the enemy become a religious obligation, incumbent on every Muslim man and woman..."

From the above I conclude: Since large regions of Europe were "forcibly conquered by Muslims," is not the enemy (the non-Islamic Europeans) trespassing on Muslim land? Thus, *jihad* is "incumbent on every Muslim man and woman."

I claim no expertise with respect to the Koran or the *Sharia*, therefore I cannot comment on the validity of the claims of the Hamas. Is it, however, not incumbent on those who are experts in the Koran and the *Sharia* to tell us whether the claims of Hamas are valid? If the claims are not valid, should not the experts publicly denounce Hamas and other similar organizations?

Dr. Sheldon L. Matlow
Chairman
Americans For a Safe Israel
Santa Clara Valley Chapter
San Jose, CA

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON ISRAELI SECURITY

(Continued from p.6)

be recalled that histories of victimization have never conferred survival upon a people or a state, least of all upon the Jewish People. Such recollection stands in marked contrast to the oft-stated wish that terrible suffering, as in the matter of the Holocaust, cannot possibly be in vain. Eugene Ionesco, for example, offers the following passage from Andre Gide's *Journal*, dated January 29, 1932: "The idea that so much suffering can be in vain is intolerable to me, it kept me awake all night..."

As a "good Westerner," continues Ionesco, "Andre Gide couldn't help but think that suffering was the price of happiness, that suffering has to be rewarded." Yet, Israeli planners must not forget that the world hardly ever pities those who suffer; all the more those who suffer greatly. Often, suffering creates *scorn*. So it is today with Jewish suffering, the Holocaust, and the State of Israel.

* * *

Israeli planners are not philosophers. But they should recall Horace's recipe: "*Si vis me flere dolendum est primum ipsi tibi*"--if you want me to weep, you must first grieve yourself. Before Israel can expect concern from the world, for its past and for its future, its own population must "first grieve" itself; must care, deeply and profoundly and publicly, for its own history and its own essential continuity; for *surviving* at all costs.

Paradoxically, current government policies of sequential concessions and territorial "compromise" display the very opposite of such needed "grief," suggesting an unwarranted degree of "understanding" and inflated national self-confidence. Further, private sentiments, now widespread throughout Israel, that collective meaning for the post-Holocaust Jewish State is more discoverable in Los Angeles than in enduring Jewish values, also reject essential forms of "grief."

* * *

Regarding judgments of rationality and

deterrence, Israeli planners must never fail to put themselves into the shoes of enemy decision-makers. What will impact these decision-makers, and therefore Israel's safety, will not be Israeli perceptions or even some "objectively correct" set of facts, but only what *they* perceive as real. Hence, what may well appear prudent and rational in Tel Aviv could be taken as cowardly and irrational in Teheran or Damascus. I have in mind, particularly, differential views on Israel's decision not to retaliate for 39 Iraqi Scud missile attacks. What will be the long-term effects of this decision on Israel's overall deterrence posture? This is an important question, one that needs to be asked again and again and again.

* * *

Applied to Israel and the Middle East, the fashionable concepts of "security regime" and "confidence building measures" are sheer nonsense, the deleterious fabrications of academics dedicated to looking away from an uncomfortable reality. Exploiting Israeli frustration and fatigue, such concepts appear enormously tempting. They are, however, unforgivably dangerous, generating faith in a "Peace Process" that points only to Israel's dismemberment and eventual disappearance.

* * *

There is a marked tendency in Israel to imitate American strategic thinking. This is a serious mistake, as virtually all American academic strategists are paid *not to think* and, above all, not to depart from prudent (and therefore intellectually sterile) forms of prescription. To use the language of Jose Ortega y Gasset, whose *Revolt of the Masses* (1932) is one of the most important books of our century, today's Ph.D. "expert" in Washington or Tel Aviv is essentially a "learned ignoramus, which is a very serious matter, as it implies that he is a person who is ignorant, not in the fashion of the ignorant man, but with all the petulance of one who is learned in his own special line."

Louis Rene Beres is Professor of Political Science and International Law at Purdue University. This is an excerpt from a longer essay by Prof. Beres.

BALDERDASH

"Old hands at the State Department cannot remember such a lethargic, bureaucratic and hesitant secretary of state [as Warren Christopher]. Asked to comment about the fate of the occupied territories, he would have a ready-made answer: the peace process, and the process alone, is the solution. And what did the secretary contribute to that process? Twice a week he would grovel before Jewish functionaries and promise not to put pressure on Israel, God forbid."

--leftwing Israeli journalist Akiva Eldar, in the daily *Ha'aretz*, March 2, 1994

"[An Israeli newspaper referred to a wanted terrorist as having been "erased" from the wanted list...] regardless of what he was alleged to have done, the description of killing him as 'erasure' conveys dehumanization of a quality I have always associated with genocide. Ultimately those using such language, accepting it as 'appropriate'...will themselves become dehumanized. Ample signs in daily life in Israel itself already reveal that the process is well under way...During the first week of my stay in Israel, 28 people were killed in car accidents."

--"peace activist" Edna Hunt in the *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, April/May 1994

"Today, we need a Holocaust film that can relate Jewish suffering to the tragic aftermath in which our suffering...became our excuse to refuse to acknowledge the import of our actions...we have to explore the way we were oppressed and hurt and the way that we then inflicted pain on others."

--Michael Lerner, in the March-April 1994 issue of *Tikkun*

"The mosque massacre is not only an event in the political history of the state of Israel but another episode in the unending chronicle--the ganse megillah, if you will-- of Jewish torment and revenge. No wonder the goyim have a hard time understanding Jewish attitudes and behavior, and often get fed up."

--editorial in *The Nation*, March 21, 1994

"The massacre at the Ibrahimi mosque [in Hebron] was not the work of a lone gunman but of a government that has kept in place all the mechanisms of a brutal occupation..."

--New Jewish Agenda activist Rachelle Marshall, in the *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, April/May 1994

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