JUNE 1994

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

RABIN'S POLICE TURN ON THE SETTLERS

Herbert Zweibon

What I found most startling on my recent stay in Israel was the mounting evidence that Israeli police officers are engaging in acts of abuse against those on the political right, particularly Jews who reside in Judea and Samaria. Whether such abuse is part of a calculated plan by the Rabin government to intimidate dissidents, or simply the result of the atmosphere of anti-settlement hostility created by the government, one thing is clear: the problem of police violence is bad, and getting worse.

On April 9, a group of Jewish children in Hebron were attacked by Arab rock-throwers. The children responded in kind, throwing rocks back in the direction of their tormentors. Israeli police on the scene responded by hurling a tear gas cannister at the Jewish kids, while the Arab rock-throwers slipped out of sight.

Three days later, there was a similar incident in Hebron, in which Arabs attacked Jewish children and the children retaliated. An Israeli police sergeant struck a 10 year-old boy who he thought was throwing rocks back at the Arabs. While the child lay on the ground, the sergeant kicked him.

The most shocking incident took place on May 4. again in Hebron. A group of children, between ages 6 and 13, were waiting for their school bus to pick them up. They were standing behind the 7 foot-high concrete wall that the Israeli Army recently erected to separate some parts of the Jewish community from adjacent Arab areas (the ghetto-like effect is chilling--but that deserves a separate analysis). A group of Arabs circumvented the wall and entered the Jewish area, illegally and in a menacing manner. Some of the children began shouting at the Arabs; others ran to alert a group of policemen stationed nearby. But when the fifteen policemen arrived at the scene, instead of detaining the Arabs, they turned on the Jews--and savagely. With their fists and their nightsticks, they pummeled the children. One child who escaped ran to the home of Rabbi Moshe Levinger, leader of the Hebron Jewish community. He and his wife, Miriam, rushed to the scene to protect the children. They were violently knocked to the ground by the police-The bruised and shocked children were men.

eventually hustled out of the area, and one adult who had witnessed part of the episode went to the Hebron police station to file a complaint against the offending officers. She was turned away; the Hebron police chief refused to accept the complaint. She drove to Jerusalem to file the complaint at police headquarters there; they, too, refused to accept it. She alerted the media; not one newspaper reported the incident, nor did the government-controlled television or radio stations.

Had an Arab been the victim in any of these incidents--or any of the many similar outrages that have taken place in recent months--human rights groups around the world would be up in arms. The United Nations Security Council would be meeting in emergency situation. Journalists would turn the episode into a second Rodney King case.

Yet when Jewish nationalists are the victims, the response is silence, and worse. A friend of mine, a housewife who lives in Judea, remarked to me that "the situation here, with Arabs constantly attacking Jews, with the police assaulting Rabin's critics, is literally beyond belief. It's so grotesquely unjust that sometimes I find it simply impossible to comprehend." These days, I find myself sharing her bewilderment.

Herbert Zweibon is chairman of Americans For a Safe Israel.

IN THIS ISSUE:

Senators Challenge Clinton on Golan	3
Morality and Powerlessness	4
Rabin's Reckless Bet	6
The Trap	7
No Shortage of Excuses	7
A Lesson from Normandy	10

FROM THE EDITOR

GENERAL HAIG'S FLAWED ANALOGY

In a recent interview with the Philadelphia Jewish Exponent, former Secretary of State Alexander Haig pointed out that he put together the Sinai peacekeeping force in 1982, and "that has worked ... a similar model might ease fears by the Israelis about returning the Golan Heights to Syria." Haig's analogy between the Sinai and the Golan is fatally flawed. The token force of U.S. troops in the Egyptian-occupied Sinai, between Israeli and Egyptian forces, is far too small and ill-equipped to protect Israel from future Egyptian aggression. What Israel does have to protect it from Egypt's forces is hundreds of miles of demilitarized Sinai desert--which is not preferable to what Israel had before giving up the Sinai (such as airforce bases and sophisticated warning systems in the Sinai), but it is still more effective than a few American soldiers with pistols.

On the Golan Heights, however, there is no such expanse of terrain protecting Israel from another Syrian attack. The Golan is less than 15 miles wide-- the Syrians could cross it in minutes without Israel having sufficient Whatever token force the Clinton time to mobilize. administration would place on the Golan would be helpless in the face of a Syrian assault. To make matters even more complicated, the Golan is literally just a few miles down the road from southern Lebanon, haven for the Hezbollah Islamic terrorists who have vowed to drive every non-Moslem out of the Mideast. They are the ones who attacked the U.S. Marine barracks in Lebanon in 1983 (killing 241), and they will surely regard every American on the Golan as a legitimate target. Clearly, the American public is in no mood to tolerate new U.S. casualties in the Middle East; a Somalia-like stampede to retreat from the Golan will inevitably ensue, leaving the Golan completely in Syrian hands. Israel will be left without the Golan, and without its American "protectors." Is this the kind of predicament into which the U.S. should drag its only reliable ally in the Middle East?0

POLLARD DESERVES TO BE RELEASED

President Clinton's refusal to commute the prison sentence of Jonathan Pollard was wrong, and he should be urged to reconsider it. The president's rejection of the Pollard clemency request is particularly shocking in view of the recent admission by Adm. Bobby Ray Inman that he prevented Israel from receiving intelligence data as punishment for Israel's raid on the Iraqi nuclear factory. Inman's admission is a reminder that Pollard was acting to correct the immoral attempt by some in the defense

establishment to prevent Israel from getting information that it was supposed to receive under the terms of its data-sharing agreement with the United States.

Meanwhile, a report in the Israeli daily Ma'ariv has raised important questions about the role played in the Pollard affair by Aldrich Ames, the recently-exposed Soviet spy within the Central Intelligence Agency. According to the report, it was Ames who, during the 1980s, deliberately leaked to the media rumors that information given by Pollard to Israel had supposedly fallen into the hands of a Soviet "mole" within the Israeli intelligence system. Thus rumor fueled the fury of then-Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, who pressed for harsh punishment of Pollard because of the Soviet connection. Now it is clear that Ames spread the rumors in order to deflect attention from his own espionage on behalf of the USSR: Weinberger's fears were baseless, and his actions against Pollard were unjustified. According to Rafi Eitan, the Israeli intelligence official who directed Pollard, it is "absolutely plausible" that Ames spread the anti-Pollard rumors in order to protect himself. "To the best of my knowledge," Eitan told Ma'ariv, "not even one letter of Pollard's material reached the Russians."

It is startling to note, moreover, that Clinton announced his decision on the eve of a major Jewish holiday (Passover) and on the day that the prime minister of Israel was arriving in Washington. It is hard to believe that a president would deliver this kind of slap in the face to any other ethnic group. American Jews must make it clear that they are outraged by the president's refusal to commute Pollard's sentence, and that they have every right to expect that the president will reverse his morally flawed decision. If he can reverse himself on Haiti in order to appease the tiny Third World lobbying crowd, then surely he can reverse himself on an issue that means so much to so many millions of Jewish and Christian friends of Israel.

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.

DON'T PUT U.S. TROOPS ON GOLAN, SENATORS URGE PRESIDENT CLINTON

May 4, 1994

The Honorable William J. Clinton The White House Washington, D.C. 20500 Dear President Clinton:

We are writing concerning the proposed use of American troops as peacekeepers in the Middle East following the signing of a comprehensive peace treaty between Israel and her neighbors. Following the contentious debate within the U.N. Security Council on Jerusalem, we feel that it is necessary to state that no agreements in the Middle East peace process should be finalized with the guaranteed use of American troops as peacekeepers in the region.

On September 12, 1993, on the CBS News program "Face the Nation," Secretary of State Christopher, responding to the question would U.S. troops be used as peacekeepers on the Golan Heights, following a Syrian-Israeli peace treaty, stated "absolutely" they would be. On February 23, 1994, at a Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing, Secretary Christopher stated that he would not exclude this, if the parties asked for it. Mr. President, this proposal is disturbing.

The suggestion that a U.S. troop presence is necessary to serve as a security guarantee against future Arab aggression is very troubling. If U.S. troops are required to guarantee the peace, then there likely is no real peace.

Can we commit ourselves to treaties with regimes in the Arab world that could one day be overthrown, or face the situation wherein the leader who signed the treaty with israel is assassinated and his replacement abrogates the treaty? We do not believe that the United States can afford to do so, nor should we.

Israel's security is important. The United States has long recognized this and has sought to provide her with the means necessary to defend herself. Israel, however, cannot one day face the situation of a changing American mood or a changing American capability. If some future president should one day decide that keeping American troops in the Middle East is too expensive, or too dangerous, where will that leave Israel?

Mr. President, in light of the recent experiences of the United States in peacekeeping operations, we feel that the Congress should be consulted before any commitment is made to provide U.S. troops to any peacekeeping operation related to future peace accords in the region.

	Sincerely,
Alfonse M. D'Amato United States Senator	Larry Craig United States Senator
Jim Saxton Member of Congress	Don Nickles United States Senator
	esse Helms

United States Senator

MORALITY AND POWERLESSNESS

Rael Jean Isaac

Editor's Note: Today, as Israel's government seems bent on destroying the state, a number of speeches at previous AFSI conferences and articles in early issues of Outpost resonate more than they did at the time they were first delivered or first printed. What follows is the text of a speech delivered by Dr. Isaac on March 17, 1986, at the AFSI conference, as well as excerpts from Jochanan Bloch's prophetic "The Trap," first published in Outpost nearly twenty years ago, in May 1975.

Arab and Moslem refusal to accept the existence of a Jewish state in the Middle East pose an obvious threat to Israel's survival. But Israel's survival is no less threatened by deep-rooted Jewish tendencies to deny realities that conflict with cherished values, and to pursue those values regardless of their impact on Jewish survival. Sometimes the eagerness of substantial segments of the Israeli public to grasp at the faintest straws when it comes to peace is laid to simple tiredness with war. One should not minimize this factor: Israelis are indeed fed up with a seemingly permanent condition of war and the threat of war: the emotional stress, the financial sacrifices, the loss of husbands, children and loved ones. But there is more to it than that. There are factors in Jewish pyschology and the Jewish value system that lead to counterproductive actions.

Consider the way some Jewish values, often admirable in themselves, work in such a way as to undercut Israel's ability to endure in a hostile environment. The first is the desire to see Jewish existence serve universal ends. When Zionism as a political movement arose near the end of the nineteenth century, many Jews distanced themselves from it on the grounds that it served only particularist Jewish needs. They had translated Jewish messianic hopes into faith in a secular socialist utopia which would eliminate all distinctions between people. The most vigorous Zionist movement of the period, Labor Zionism, did not dismiss these universalist claims but found a justification for Zionism in merging the particular and the universal. Zionism would not just provide a refuge for the Jews of Europe. It would not just lead to a specifically Jewish renaissance. Zionism would also build an ideal society that would be a light unto the nations. Later on, the fact that many of the so-called progressive peoples of the world saw Israel in negative terms would be very wounding. Far from being seen as a light unto the nations, Israelis found themselves, particularly after 1967, being accused of being imperialists, denying Palestinian Arabs the right to selfdetermination. And of course these were seen as ultimate sins, not just by progressive critics but by many of the

Israelis who were criticized. They were being attacked in terms of their own deeply held values. And Jews outside of Israel, for whom universalist aspirations were important, became increasingly critical of Israel. Since all too many Jews fall into that category, Israel did not lack for vocal and influential Jewish critics. One need only think of Anthony Lewis, hammering at Israel's sins for many years now on the *New York Times* op-ed page on what seems like a weekly basis.

The second value to consider is an emphasis on morality as a substitute for power, which can become a total rejection of power. Jews were powerless for so long that for many it became an article of faith that purity lay in powerlessness. Jews have been extremely reluctant to exert military power and even in Palestine the mainstream Jewish Agency for a long time placed the narrowest interpretation on the notion of defense. The Haganah excluded offensive military operations against Arab terrorist bases in the 1930s. The Israeli philosopher Jochanan Bloch, who died in a tragic accident some years ago, has written of the Jews' avoidance of political targets. Bloch wrote that what Jews "always wanted was to avoid the rough and tumble, the wretchedness and glory of political life, and to reject sovereignty with its inextricable component of awfulness. Hence the Jew is reluctant to accept the consequences of his own strength; he moves over; he wants less; always less--and in his heart is the burning belief, which is also the arrogant presumption, that he is entitled to a morally better existence."

Some Conservative and Reform rabbis in the United States have been particularly apt to identify morality with powerlessness. Reform Rabbi Arnold Jacob Wolf was almost relieved at the ambiguous outcome of the Yom Kippur War. He said Israel would learn to be "humble," "less arrogant." Another rabbi, Arthur Green, said his Holocaust hero is a Jew who likes to think he could have strangled the Nazi who came for him but chose to die with *sh'ma* on his lips and no blood on his hands. And Rabbi Green said that this "is why I choose, by the way, not to be an Israeli." Israelis are forced to exercise power, which he sees as necessarily an inferior moral choice.

Such universalism and rejection of power have consequences for the Arab-Israeli conflict. One consequence is a tendency toward self-blame. Jews feel it must be their fault that there is no peace. And self-blame is of course extremely corrosive. Those who do not believe in their moral right cannot defend that right. After the 1967 war, this tendency toward self-blame became more pronounced and widespread but it was there before. *New Outlook*, the journal associated with the leftwing Mapam party, through the 1950s and 1960s, as well as since that time, hammered away at the theme of Israeli guilt for the absence of peace. According to this

(Continued on

POWERLESSNESS

(Continued from p.4)

argument, the government of Israel repeatedly had opportunities to secure peace which it chose not to pursue.

A long forgotten one was the Goldmann Affair. Nahum Goldmann was allegedly approached by a chain of intermediaries concerning Nasser's desire to talk to him if he came with the approval of the Israeli government. Given the gap between Goldmann's views and that of the government and the fact that Goldmann was not even an Israeli--he was a Swiss citizen--Golda Meir's government decided that if Nasser wanted to talk to someone representing Israel's views it should not be Goldmann. Nasser was welcome to talk to Goldmann but not as a representative of the Israeli government. Nasser denied he ever wanted to talk to Goldmann and one might have thought that was an end to it. But the significance of the incident was the wave of ugly demonstrations that followed in which Israelis accused their government of not wanting peace and leading the state to destruction.

A peculiarity of the faith in missed opportunities is that once an opportunity has passed, those who saw it will quickly forget they had seen it. Uri Avnery, who for years was a Member of Knesset and published the first Israeli girlie magazine, was an expert at them. He would announce with each new opportunity that true, before this there never was a genuine opportunity but this time...

This tendency to blame Israel for the absence of peace leads to another potentially dangerous activity: the construction of abstract models for peace. Intellectuals have a tendency to create models and then confuse the ideal they have constructed for the real; Jews have more than their share of intellectuals and more than their share of such model-builders. While such model-building was not absent prior to 1967, once Judea, Samaria, the Golan, Sinai and Gaza came under Israeli control there was much more scope for their construction.

I was in Israel in 1969 studying the movements that arose in response to the 1967 war; both the Land of Israel Movement that wanted to keep all the territories and the peace movement. What today seems particularly interesting about all the models that were constructed in Israel by the peace movement at that time is how few of the modelbuilders advocated a Palestinian state on the West Bank and in Gaza. That was not, mind you, because peace activists wanted to keep Israeli control of the territories. They devised all sorts of ways to give them up. But many of them looked on the creation of a Palestinian state as an act of imperialism, the creation of a Vichy-style satellite state. To be sure, others in the movement seized on the idea, becoming pioneers in the advocacy of the notion that there was a specific Palestinian nationalism which should be given territorial fulfillment by Israel. Again there is perhaps no better way to appreciate how recent is the notion that there was a specific Palestinian nation than to

read the literature of the Israeli peace movement in the years right after 1967. Less than twenty years ago the notion that the key to everything was the satisfaction of Palestinian nationalism was so novel that it was a controversial concept even within the Israeli peace movement.

Once Sadat came to Israel the pressures grew immensely. He understood Israeli psychology--merely coming to Israel generated sufficient pressure so that the Begin government in the end caved in to all Egyptian demands. Peace demonstrations up to this point had been relatively small--now there were hundreds of thousands of supporters of a new peace movement, called Peace Now. The very name was revealing. Peace Now. As if peace was something available immediately on demand if Israelis just insisted on it. Whenever it looked as if Begin was dragging his heels, standing up to any Egyptian demands, Peace Now took to the streets. And there is no question those demonstrations had an

impact in pushing Begin into what Shmuel Katz describes in his book as *The Hollow Peace*.

In the U.S., Jews who blame Israel for the absence of peace work to strengthen the hands of Israel's enemies. Precisely because they speak as Jews, they give added credibility to the view that the blame for all the problems of the region lie with Israel, that solutions are available and Israel prevents them.

Because of a noticeable lack of sympathy for israel on the part of the media, Jews who attack Israel can be assured of disproportionate publicity for their efforts. There is even some legitimacy to this media interest in attacks by Jews on Israel--there is a certain piquancy, and therefore newsworthiness, to Jews attacking other Jews. And of course the *New York Times* loves to give space to those, like Arthur Hertzberg, who call for forcing peace on Israel.

Some things have changed, but the universalist longings of the Jews, the yearning for a morality that

(Continued on page 6)

Point of View

RABIN AND SYRIA: A RECKLESS BET

Frank Gaffney

In the face of the palpable failure of his first peacemaking gamble with the PLO, Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin is making the sort of mistake that keeps casinos around the world profitable: he is recklessly putting all his chips on an even wilder bet--a peace treaty with Syria.

Regrettably, in doing so, Rabin is playing with loaded dice against one of the most notorious hustlers on the international stage. Worse yet, the "chips" he is now playing fast and loose with are nothing less than the future survival of the Jewish State and--in the hopes of mitigating, or at least *sharing* the risk--the lives of American "peacekeeping" troops he apparently wants to install on the Golan Heights. In fact, without the prospect of such an ostensible U.S. safeguard, it seems unlikely that the majority of Israelis would tolerate any further risk-taking by the Rabin government.

Consequently, American Jews and others committed to the security of Israel will shortly be asked to support Prime Minister Rabin's bid to "bet the [Golan] farm" in this manner. They will be told that the deployment of a U.S. military tripwire there is a critical ingredient to both the future defense of Israel and the preservation of close U.S.-Israeli ties. Unfortunately, neither of these contentions is likely to prove true. To the contrary, enmeshing the United States in a Golan peacekeeping mission may translate into immense new vulnerabilities for Israel and add a highly corrosive element in this vital bilateral relationship.

A central tenet of the Rabin gamble on Syria is the proposition that its despotic ruler, Hafez Assad, is a man of his word. If he enters into a deal with Israel, so this reasoning goes, he can be relied upon to honor his commitments and he will have the power to ensure that his constituents do so as well. The Rabin government seems to believe that a new land-for-peace deal with a man who putatively exhibits these qualities is the only way to recover from the political costs of having made such a deal with Yasser Arafat, a man virtually everyone agrees does not.

In fact, the record of Israeli-Syrian agreements demonstrates that Assad can be as unreliable as Arafat. Indeed, Syria's dictator has repeatedly shown himself willing to violate his solemn commitments--or to allow them to be violated by his proxies--when it suits his purposes. Consider the following examples:

* Syrian terrorist and military attacks against Israel increased after Assad's Ba'ath Party came to power

in 1963, leading ultimately to Syria's involvement in the 1967 Six Day war in violation of the 1949 armistice agreement between the two states.

- * Major violations by Syria of the cease-fire and disengagement agreements occurred after the 1973 Yom Kippur war. Between October 1973 and May 1974, for example, Assad's violations of the cease-fire on the Golan Heights resulted in the deaths of 54 soldiers and six civilians killed and 176 soldiers wounded.
- * Shortly after the 31 May 1974 cease-fire was replaced by a disengagement-of-forces accord, Assad took a number of steps that deliberately violated the terms of that agreement. These included sealing the border and staioning larger numbers of weapons in a "reduced forces zone" on the Golan than were permitted. Ironically, it fell to then-Defense Minister Shimon Peres to reveal the latter violation.
- * In the following year, terrorists crossed the ostensibly "sealed" Syrian border to murder Israeli civilians and Syria beefed up its military presence and capabitilies on the Golan plateau: For example, it paved a road on the Mount Hermon ridge; it declined to relocate

(Continued on

p.8)

POWERLESSNESS

(Continued from p.5)

will dispense with power, remains. The vulnerability to illusions remains. The vulnerability to wishful thinking remains.

Perhaps there was no better--or perhaps I should say worse--example of it than the refusal of so much of German Jewry to acknowledge what was happening until it was too late. In his book on German Jewry, Sidney Bolkosky concludes that most German Jews adhered to their myths of Germans until physical reality invaded their lives and destroyed them. He writes: "The idea that Germans were not like German Jews was crushing, shattering. Narcisstically, German Jews had loved the reflection of their own image in the illusory and deceptive well of the German past. They drowned in that deep pool."

Jews today are easily mesmerized by words of peace into mistaking the illusion for the reality. They want to look at the Arab and find in him the reflection of their own attitudes. The myths of peace can be no less dangerous to the survival of Jews today than the myths that German Jews harbored were to them. The deep pool still beckons.

Rael Jean Isaac is the author of a number of books, including Israel Divided and, most recently, Madness in the Streets (with Virginia Armat).

THE TRAP

Jochanan Bloch

(Editor's note: in 1970, Dr. Bloch, professor of philosophy at Ben Gurion University in Beersheba, authored this essay in response to the decision of the Israeli government to accept a ceasefire at the Suez Canal. No Israeli newspaper would publish it. It appeared in Outpost in May 1975, and is just as relevant today.)

(...) The worse our position becomes, the more we will be dependent upon the help of the United States. Yet the more our situation deteriorates, the more the United States will hesitate to come to our assistance, for fear of confrontation with our enemies, and she will demand with greater sternness our retreat, a retreat we have in any case agreed to and signed. If we point to the dangers involved in a retreat, the principle of 'protection' will be extended whether we want it or not. As answer to any risk they will offer us the guarantees we have invited...

What the government does not realize at this point is that we will essentially have to retreat to the borders of 1949. A peace treaty we won't get; we'll get guarantees. Here there will be demilitarization; there will sit a UN force; here will be a corridor; there a mixed police force; here shared administration; there an enclave. Immigration will stop, for such a state will not be able to

attract newcomers. Emigration will resume and reach dimensions which we have never known...Defense expenditures will not decrease but grow in direct proportion to the worsening of our situation. And peace? It is clear that the Palestinian forces will increase their activity with the support of the Arab states; even if for the time being states don't enter into war wth us. Our defensive capability will be desperately handicapped in the choking collar of the 'peace borders', and the international guard forces. And then we shall turn to our friendly protecting powers, and will ask for their help. And it isn't hard to guess what they will say.

They'll tell us that they are not willing to get involved in a world war, that we must not bring war upon the world. The process of blackmail will begin. If immigration has not yet ceased by itself, they'll demand that we stop it. And the guaranteeing powers will explain to us that it is evil for us to exist on this outdated Zionist principle that can drag us to war...We will, in fact, be returning to the Mandate period and in two or three years they will say in America that the 'experiment of the Jewish state' has failed, and that it is necessary to find a resonable solution for the problem of Israel. And why not a Palestinian state in which one will 'guarantee' the lives of the Jews? What began with the silly slogan "territories for peace" is likely to end with the liquidation of the state, unless we can retrace our steps and escape from the nightmarish trap we have fashioned with our own hands."

One Minute to Midnight Dr. Irving Moskowitz

NO SHORTAGE OF EXCUSES

"He said those who point to continued terrorist attacks as evidence that PLO chief Yasser Arafat is not in complete control have not given Arafat enough time to prove himself...Arafat needs to be physically in the region to keep his word."

These words could easily have been spoken by one of those PLO officials like Nabil Sha'ath or Hanan Ashrawi, who appear regularly on "Nightline" and "The McNeil-Lehrer News Hour" to serve up the latest "explanations" as to why Arafat manages to violate every promise he made in the Israel-PLO accords. Sadly, however, they were spoken not be a PLO propagandist, but by Ken Jacobson of the Anti-Defamation League during a recent lecture to a United Jewish Appeal group in New Jersey.

For years, Jacobson and the ADL were denouncing the PLO as a terrorist gang that could not be trusted.

But thanks to the radical policy pursued by the Rabin government, Jewish establishment groups like the ADL have allowed themselves to be maneuvered into the bizarre position of furnishing excuses for Arafat.

And they're not even very good excuses. Consider, for example, Jacobson's line about Arafat having to be "physically in the region to keep his word." In fact, many of the pledges Arafat made in the Israel-PLO agreement can be fulfilled even before he is "physically in the region." He promised to condemn terrorist attacks. He could do that from anywhere in the world. He promised to give speeches urging the Palestinian Arabs to refrain from violence. He could do that over the PLO radio network. He promised to "discipline" PLO factions that commit terrorism. He could do that from PLO headquarters in Tunis. He promised to change the PLO Covenant (which still calls for the destruction of Israel). He doesn't have to be in Gaza or Jericho to do that.

Arafat is a leopard who hasn't changed his spots. No amount of excuses can change that.◊

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

RABIN'S GOLAN BET

(Continued from p.7)

civilians to the abandoned town of Kuneitra in favor of increased troop deployments there; and it installed mortars and tanks in excess of the levels allowed by the disengagement agreement.

* In March 1976, Assad reached an understanding with Israel limiting Syrian forces in Lebanon, then engulfed in civil war. It included: a ban on the deployment of Syrian combat aircraft, naval vessels, surface-to-air missiles, tanks and aircraft anywhere within Lebanese territory; a ceiling of one Syrian brigade there; and a complete ban on Syrian troops in South Lebanon. Within two months, Syria had 160 tanks and 6,000 troops-substantially more than a brigade--in northern Lebanon. Today, it has an estimated 30,000 troops there.

* In January 1977, Syrian forces moved south of the "red line," retreating only after Israel threatened action. Later that year, Assad reneged on a commitment to support the Christian Lebanese community against the PLO, encouraging the latter not only to attack the former but also to conduct strikes against Israeli civilians. Such behavior eventually precipitated Israel's "Operation Litani" in the spring of 1978.

* From early 1979 to June 1982 when Israel once again was compelled to strike at terrorists based in Lebanon, Assad's forces repeatedly violated the "red lines": Syrian warplanes began mixing it up with Israeli fighters over Lebanon; Syrian helicopter-backed army units launched devastating attacks against the Christian Lebanese community of Zahle; Syria deployed surface-to-air missiles in the Bekaa Valley and elsewhere in Lebanon; Syrian ground and air units also engaged Israeli forces during the latter's 1982 incursion into Lebanon.

* As recently as July and August 1993, Syria violated the "red line" agreements when it aided and abetted attacks against Israeli forces and civilians by assisting in the shipment of Iranian Katyusha rockets to terrorist organizations based in Lebanon.

What is more, Hafez Assad's untrustworthiness is not limited to his dealings with Israel. He has proven no more faithful to his commitments to fellow *Arabs* made in September 1989 concerning respect for Lebanese sovereignty and the redeployment of Syrian forces. These agreements were reached in Taif, Saudi Arabia under Arab League sponsorship and with the active support of the Bush administration.

In fact, Syria continues to violate the obligation freely assumed in those accords to withdraw its troops from all but the eastern Bekaa Valley by 22 September 1992. The government of Hafez Assad has, instead, continued to refuse to fulfill its commitment to relinquish physical control over Lebanon.

transformed from a thoroughly unscrupulous, devious individual into a model of integrity and dependability, one natty problem remains: he is an old man, reportedly afflicted with cancer. There are serious doubts about succession arrangements; there can be no certainty that the next Syrian despot will choose to honor this one's commitments, even if-against all odds--Assad chooses to do so.

Against this backdrop, it is obvious why the Israeli people are reacting with considerable skepticism to the idea of giving up the Golan in exchange for yet another set of promises from Hafez Assad. Even many of those who were willing to make a leap of faith concerning Rabin's September deal with Yasser Arafat--something increasing number of Israelis have already begun to regret--are much more cautious about any deal with Assad's Syria.

Consequently, the difficulties of selling an agreement that would return Golan to effective Syrian control may lead Rabin to ask that U.S. peacekeeping troops be deployed there. Little good is likely to come of such a deployment, however; should Hafez Assad and/or his Iranian allies and their terrorist cadres decide--once the strategic high ground of Golan has been regained--that they have little use for the peace the Americans are supposed to "keep," it is doubtful that a U.S. human "tripwire" will keep new blood from being shed there. In all probability, some of it will be that of the American forces.

Consider the following serious problems with such an American deployment on the Golan Heights:

* Terrorist Attacks Against U.S. Forces on the Golan: The Golan Heights' exceedingly limited road system would mean that U.S. troops operating there would be at considerable risk of ambush or violent harassment from a hostile population--a sort of *intifada* or Somalia on the Golan. Even though that population would likely be comprised predominantly of Syrian military personnel and their dependents (as was the case prior to the Six Day War), Damascus can be expected to disavow any responsibility for such attacks.

* Attacks From Lebanon Precipitating Israeli Retaliation There: Should Israel be compelled once again to respond to Katyusha rocket strikes or other terrorism in South Lebanon, geography dictates that it would have to use two lines of attack: the coastline road and the Hula Valley road at the foot of the Golan Heights. Mobilization along the latter could arguably pose a threat to Syrian forces on the Golan and be seized upon as a pretext for Syria to build up its armored forces in the vicinity. An outbreak of hostilities in areas where U.S. forces are deployed could easily ensue.

* Syrian Threats to Jordan: In the absence of Israeli control of the Golan Heights--offering Israel the inherent capacity for a swift armored move against Damascus--Syria may see fit to threaten Jordan yet again. The Syrian Black September operation in 1970 and military pressure on Jordan a decade later in connection with

Even if Hafez Assad has somehow been

SPOTLIGHT ON THE EXTREMISTS

...Arab propagandist **Edward Said** was given two-thirds of a page, in the middle of the news section of the May 4 *Washington Times*, to attack Israel. Among other things, Said denounced "political Judaism" as being just as dangerous as Islamic fundamentalism; accused Israel of "monotheistic xenophobia, exclusivism, and intolerance"; and alleged that there was, after 1967, "an unbroken string of Israeli assaults on Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Jordan, and Syria"...

...Arab-American groups came up with the usual "explanations" for the massacre of Israelis in Afula. **Khalil E. Jahshan** of the National Association of Arab Americans said that "the current round of violence is the direct product of endless delays in peace talks and the lack of tangible results on the ground." **Albert Mokhiber** of the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee asserted that the Afula massacre "underscores the need to end the root cause of the Arab-Israeli conflict, namely the occupation"...

...The radical Middle East Justice Network, based in Boston, responded to the Afula massacre with a press release demanding that Israel "begin dismantling settlements and withdrawing from the occupied Palestinian territories...as the only means for securing a lasting peace between Israelis and Palestinians." Reform rabbi Arnold Jacob Wolf and New Jewish Agenda's Hilda Silverman are members of the group's Advisory Board...

...**Michael Lerner** and his *Tikkun* magazine recently sponsored an ad in the *New York Times* calling for the transfer of all Jews out of Hebron and the Gaza Strip. Now Lerner has expanded his target. In an editorial in the May-June issue of *Tikkun*, Lerner declares that "only those settlements have a right to remain that are consciously and actively seeking to reconcile and live in peace with their Palestinan neighbors." Who will determine if a particular settlement is "seeking peace? Lerner, presumably...

...The crusade that **Merle Thorpe** initiated against the Jewish residents of Judea-Samaria and Gaza will continue despite his recent death. **Thorpe**, a veteran Israel-basher, was president of the Foundation for Middle East Peace, which publishes a bimonthly newsletter called *Report on Israeli Settlement in the Occupied Territories."* In the latest issue of the newsletter, **Lucius D. Battle**, the new president of the Foundation, reports that "in the last months of his life," Thorpe reached a "decision to continue to provide for the continuation of the *Settlement Report*...

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

<u>Books</u>

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)

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

...Jane Hunter, publisher of a newspaper that focuses on Israeli weapons sales to authoritarian governments, fears that the Israel-PLO agreement will not affect Israeli arms exports. "Israel can simply defend its gory trade as an employment plan for the men whose jobs suppressing the Palestinians may soon end," Hunter wrote in a recent issue of *Middle East International*...

A LESSON FROM NORMANDY

Ruth King

This summer we commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the Normandy invasion. Jews, for whom history was forever altered, have a particular sense of gratitude to the thousands of heroic soldiers--American and European--who served and sacrificed during World War II. This is not a time for ruminations on the failing of Roosevelt or Churchill, but rather a time to acknowledge the great leadership that countered and overturned national obsessions with pacifism and isolationism, and galvanized the vast military undertaking that liberated Europe and vanquished the Nazis. Today, there is a dreadful paucity of leaders with their vision, their energy, and their determination.

It is also a time to rehearse the history of Israel in the aftermath of the Holocaust. Zionism existed long before the German war against the Jews. It began when Jews were dispersed from our homeland, sentenced to dislocations, expulsions, massacres, ethnic cleansings and inquisitions. The Holocaust created the immediate necessity for implementing the Zionist dream of sovereignty in our ancient homes in Shiloh, Jericho, Hebron, Jerusalem, Ashkelon and Galilee. It created the need for an army of Jews, for Jews. It taught us never to depend on anyone for our survival or our sustenance.

The lessons resulted in the most glorious rescue in world history. In the aftermath of World War II, after Israeli independence was established, hundreds of thousands of Jews flooded Israel. They came from Arab lands, from Africa, from Asia, and included the wretched survivors of Europe., They came from every corner, speaking over a hundred different languages with different alphabets and customs. They were traumatized and haunted.

To the eternal credit of Israel and world Jewry they were fed, housed, clothed, resettled, given

vocational training, therapy, and arms. They created major social, scientific, and cultural institutions. Best of all, they learned Hebrew and they were never called refugees. They were home--the fulfillment of centuries of prayer, on their land, with a mighty army to protect them. This is Zionism, not the "feel good" trendy pacifism that is the hallmark of Israel's present government.

The April 28 issue of *Catholic New York*, the official publication of the Archdiocese of New York, includes an address to the Anti-Bias Committee of the new York State Supreme Court, given on Holocaust Memorial Day by presiding Justice Francis T. Murphy. Here is an excerpt from that eloquent speech:

Do not think that the Holocaust is an historical event that stands as surety for your protection. When weighed against the self seeking interests of nations, the Holocaust will be as if it never were... You who are children of Abraham, vou who are the people of the Covenant, keep, protect, and celebrate your identity. Be bold, swift and steadfast in answering attacks upon it. Cleave to the faith that sustains and unites you. You, descendants of a people driven across the pages of history from land to land, you...to whom the memory of the Holocaust has been entrusted, never turn away from Israel. Israel is your answer to and surety against the Holocaust.

We are grateful to Justice Murphy and to Catholic New York for the spirit and eloquence of this message. Israel is our answer to the enemies of Jewry and the best way to honor those who fought in Normandy and all the victims of World War II is to be patriotic Americans and strong Zionists.

Ruth King is editor of Outpost.

With the Rabin government on the verge of requesting that American troops be stationed on the Golan Heights, you need to read

SHOULD AMERICA "GUARANTEE" ISRAEL'S SAFETY?

by Dr. Irving Moskowitz Introduction by Senator Alfonse D'Amato

Just \$3.95 (\$4.95 for non-members) from: Americans For a Safe Israel - 147 East 76 St. - New York, NY 10021

RABIN'S GOLAN BET

(Continued from p.8)

Assad's campaign against the Muslim Brotherhood were properly seen as posing an existential risk to Israel. A repetition of such aggressive behavior in the future would surely be viewed the same way, possibly precipitating conflict on the Golan and elsewhere.

- * Israel Would Be Obliged to Rely Upon the U.S. for Early Warning: Today, Israeli facilities atop the Golan's Mount Hermon provide critical early warning of attack from Syria. The loss of these assets would increase Israel's reliance upon the United States for such vital intelligence. Even if such monitoring stations were not liquidated altogether and were instead turned over to American personnel to operate, this dependency--which the Gulf War suggests can be dangerous for Israel--would grow even as Israel would be obliged to rely ever more on preemptive strategies for its security.
- * U.S.Peacekeepers Would Have a Disproportionate Impact on Israeli and Syrian Options, Calculations: Short of a full-fledged U.S.-Israeli mutual security pact--which, for good reasons, is not under consideration by either the United States or Israel--it is probable that a deployment of U.S. forces on the Golan Heights will have marginal influence on Syrian decisions to attack Israel. After all, if Syria violates a peace treaty with Israel it will have accepted, and discounted, the risk of U.S. displeasure. Should Israel, on the other hand, conclude that--by virtue of its exposed position (akin to that it was in prior to the 1967 war rather than that it enjoyed in1973) preemption of threatening Syrian movement is necessary, the Jewish State is likely to find the presence of U.S. troops in the path to be a much more formidable deterrent consideration. Not only will going to war almost certainly mean ignoring American appeals for further diplomatic activity, it will mean endangering U.S. military resupply and other support that may be required to secure victory.

- * Americans Will Lose Their Lives on the Golan. When that occurs, U.S.-Israeli relations will ultimately pay the price. Inevitably, enemies of Israel will seize upon such a development to contend that American soldiers are being obliged to die for Israel's defense--something successive Israeli governments have properly and assiduously resisted.
- * israel Will Be More Vulnerable to Attack--Not Less--and Increasingly Dependent Upon the United States for its Security. Sixty years ago, Winston Churchill warned against the practice of weakening one's friends; it is no more prudent a policy today than it was then. The truth of the matter is that the United States is ever less able to fulfill whatever security guarantees it might make to israel. Unfortunately, it must also be noted that Washington has shown itself unreliable when asked to honor past security commitments to Israel (and, for that matter, to other allied nations).
- * Syria is Increasingly Capable of Exploiting Israel's Vulernability and Ever Less Susceptible to U.S. Pressure. With its ongoing build-up in conventional arms and weapons of mass destruction--including a recent \$500-million purchase from Russia--Syria is eliminating what remains of the Israeli military's "qualitative edge." With its drug trade, strategic relationship with Iran, growing oil revenues and counterfeiting of U.S. currency, moreover, Syria is more and more insulated from U.S. economic influence.

Under such circumstances, an Israel-Syria "peace agreement" built upon the return of the Golan, Hafez Assad and deployment of U.S. peacekeepers is a formula for disaster. It is incumbent upon those committed to both American and Israeli security and to strong relations between the two nations to refuse to go along with Yitzhak Rabin's reckless Syrian gamble.

Frank Gaffney is president of the Center for Security Policy, in Washington, D.C.

BALDERDASH

"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, editor of *Tikkun*, in the March/April 1994 issue of that journal

"I began to fear that [Rabin] was speaking exclusively for the folks back home and was going to miss the sense of occasion there in Washington [at the September 13 signing ceremony] until he got to the word 'Enough!'... Yitzhak Rabin's 'enough' now ranks right up there with Herzl's 'If I forget thee, O Jerusalem'..."

--Leonard Fein, in a speech at Congregation Ansche Chesed in New York, Oct. 4, 1993 "Clearly, nuclear proliferation has achieved a momentum in Israel unrelated to its legitimate security needs. The Israeli nuclear program is out of control."

--Bennett Muraskin, in the Winter/Spring 1994 issue of the leftwing *Israel Horizons*

"Could we be so close to ending Auschwitz--that is, healing the trauma of our displacement by healing the trauma of those whom we have displaced, and choose instead to continue Auschwitz, by denying a full, mutual, and interdependent empowerment to the Palestinian people?"

--Marc Ellis, self-described proponent of "Jewish liberation theology," in the January 1994 issue of *Israel & Palestine*

"The Reform, Conservative and Reconstructionist movements have been unwilling to challenge the logic of Settler Judaism..."

--Michael Lerner, editor of *Tikkun*, in the May/June 1994 issue of that journal

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