

OUTPOST

May 2010—Issue #232

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

How Could It Happen?

Herbert Zweibon

American Jews are now in a collective state of handwringing, asking “How could all this have happened? Who could have foreseen this terrible downturn of events?”

With all due respect, we at AFSI foresaw it in our conferences, on these pages and in the pamphlets that opposed the anti-Israel left and the dreadful policies of surrender and concessions that were demanded of Israel—and carried out by her leaders. Most appalling were the number of ostensible “supporters” of Israel who prodded the state to take so-called “risks for peace” in exchange for a risible “recognition of her right to exist” by a few Arab tyrants. The Jewish establishment, the media, and delusional pacifists fell for this absurdity hook, line and sinker.

With the Camp David Accords, land for nothing became the basis for Israeli policy. While Israelis and American supporters of Israel were still euphoric about Sadat’s visit to Jerusalem and the signing of pieces of paper with Egypt, we published, in 1979, *Sadat’s Strategy* by Paul Eidelberg, which exposed Sadat’s strategy as a trap: a temporary truce in the framework of a blueprint to reduce Israel to the untenable 1949 borders, preliminary to her destruction.

In 1977 AFSI published *The Palestinians: A Political Masquerade* by Arthur Kahn and Thomas Murray emphasizing that the so-called Palestinians were in fact “an anti-nation, one that derives its entire meaning and purpose from the desire to destroy another nation.”

We were the first to expose the real agenda of those purportedly Jewish groups which lent credibility to Israel’s enemies. In 1977 we published Rael Jean Isaac’s monograph on Breira, founded and funded by anti-war, anti Israel, and anti-American activists. In 1987, long before the Jewish treason of J Street, Isaac wrote *The New (Anti)Jewish Agenda* and in 1990, long before the recent flap in Israel over its activities, AFSI published Irving Moskowitz’s *The New Israel Fund: A New Fund for Israel’s Enemies*.

With *The Friendly Perversion* by David Kirk we became the first organization to expose the way the “right thinkers” (in this case Quakers via the American Friends Service Committee) were forfeiting moral credibility through moving into anti-Israel activism. Since then Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International have followed in those footsteps.

When Israel’s Lebanon War unleashed a torrent of media distortion, AFSI produced a documentary by Peter Goldman *NBC in Lebanon: A Study of Media Misrepresentation* which documented instance after instance of outright lies which were taking their toll on Israel’s case in the general public. While the Jewish establishment largely ignored us, the *New York Times’s* media critic John Corry, in the *Times* of February 18th, 1984, had this to say: “The documentary, judiciously using NBC’s own film, suggests that NBC was indeed taking sides and pressing the viewpoint of the PLO.”

AFSI was front and center in denouncing the Oslo surrender. We did not engage in mealy-mouthed appeals to the PLO to renounce terror and its genocidal charter. We denounced Oslo because it was another step in the dismemberment of Israel and abrogated Jewish rights. As Israel engaged in subsequent retreats with the Wye agreement and the Gaza withdrawal, we predicted these would lead the Arabs to the gates of Jerusalem. They are there now.

In *Outpost* we continually warned that a two state solution meant Israel’s dissolution, that the Moslems would not abandon their *jihad* and that once Israel was perceived as weak, anti-Semitism would become viral throughout the world, most especially in a Europe rapidly headed toward Eurabla. “Cassandra Says,” in these pages, gives more examples of AFSI’s visionary warnings.

Table of Contents

Cassandra Says	...3
The Declaration Of Principles by Netta Dor-Shav	...6
Biden’s Hypocrisy On Jerusalem by Dan Greenfield	...8
Britain’s Israel Derangement by Melanie Phillips	...9
Refuseniks: Heroes Of The Cold War by Ruth King	..10

From the Editor

Imposing Israel's Dissolution

Obama is considering imposing a so-called American "peace plan." It is being put together by a collection of long time foes of Israel, among them Brent Scowcroft, Gen. Jim Jones and Zbigniew Brzezinski. Apparently Obama has grown tired of the effort to jump-start negotiations between Israel and Abbas and wants to end the conflict in one fell swoop. As Daniel Greenfield points out, it's a nicer way of saying "Destroy Israel."

There can be little doubt that any Obama plan would be a Munich-in-the-making. He can be thwarted if there is sufficient resistance from Israel and from the American Jewish community which, if it mobilized, could muster substantial support from evangelical Christians and from Congress.

A Pathetic AIPAC

The outlook for vigorous confrontation of the administration is thus far not hopeful. When Hillary Clinton addressed the annual AIPAC convention (these are the folks supposedly most committed to Israel's welfare) she received a standing ovation. This despite the fact that she excoriated Netanyahu over the Jerusalem housing project (a "crisis" manufactured by Obama). When she had a word of blame for the Arab side, it was for Hamas, which she condemned for dedicating the town square in Ramallah to a killer of dozens of Israeli civilians. Only trouble is that it was Fatah (which can do no wrong in the lights of the Obama administration) which dedicated the square to a Fatah killer, a problem Hillary neatly resolved by transporting Ramallah to Gaza, an absurdity so transparent it's a wonder she had the nerve to pull it off.

As attendee Matthew Hausman points out, it was only after the fact that AIPAC offered any criticism. The time for meaningful rebuke passed the moment she left the room. Hausman notes that what AIPAC should have done was have a representative stand up immediately and address Clinton's misstatements point by point and then have her reactions recorded on videotape.

Netanyahu, Stay Home

Netanyahu decided to skip his scheduled trip to Washington to attend a nuclear security conference hosted by Obama. Although the conference was billed as dealing with the problem of preventing the spread of nuclear weapons to terrorist groups, Netanyahu feared that it would turn into a gang-up on Israel to demand that it sign the International Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

In fact, as long as Obama remains President, Netanyahu is best off staying clear of the United States. In the October 2009 *Outpost* we urged Netanyahu to stay home. We wrote then: "By coming

to the United States he merely strengthened Obama...what happened was wholly predictable. Netanyahu was berated by an irate and impatient Obama, and like a chastened and frightened school-boy hastened to say being beaten up was a salutary experience."

Not content with being bullied last September Netanyahu returned for yet worse treatment in March. This time, after failing to extract a written promise by Netanyahu to do as he commanded, Obama literally walked out on Netanyahu at the White House, saying he was going to have dinner, and urged him to remain to consult with his advisers and "let me know if there is anything new," i.e. if he had decided to cave in.

This episode also hurt Netanyahu at home. *Haaretz* seized on his humiliation to declare "The Prime Minister leaves America disgraced, isolated and altogether weaker than when he came."

Netanyahu would be better off urging Obama to visit Israel when he had anything new to offer—something other than Israeli concessions.

Upending Israel-U.S. Relations

Obama has blocked all major Israeli weapons requests while freely providing advanced weapons to the Arabs. Case in point: JINSA (Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs) reports that Israel's request for 4D Apache Longbow attack helicopters was blocked at the very same time the administration approved the sale to Egypt of those same helicopters.

Roepke on Israel

No, Wilhelm Roepke was writing in 1948 about prescient 19th century thinkers who foresaw the crises of the twentieth century but the words (we quote from J.R. Nyquist's summary) certainly apply to Israel (and the U.S.): "It appears that in all great crises of world history most people utterly deceive themselves as to where they stand...an optimistic self deception prevails...How slowly we grasp the meaning of facts. How tenaciously we struggle against a disagreeable awakening. How unready we are to admit that we have built our society upon an avalanche." •

Outpost

Editor: Rael Jean Isaac

Editorial Board: Herbert Zweibon, Ruth King

Outpost is distributed free to
Members of Americans For a Safe Israel
Annual membership: \$50.

Americans For a Safe Israel

1751 Second Ave. (at 91st St.)

New York, NY 10128

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

E-mail: afsi@rcn.com web site: <http://www.afsi.org>

Cassandra Says

(Below are samples of AFSI's record on the failed and phony "peace processes" on which Israel has engaged over the last 40 years—what we said at the time, not in the rear mirror.)

From *Sadat's Strategy* by Paul Eidelberg (pamphlet published by AFSI, 1979)

That the *goal* [eliminating Israel] had not changed, merely the desirable method of achieving it, was emphasized by Sadat once again in September 1977 [in an interview in *October* magazine] only weeks before his visit to Jerusalem: "The October War [of 1973] was only the spark that set off the conflict—a conflict that is as old as the Arab nation. This conflict started when we fought against the Tatars, and later, the Crusaders, in defense of our rights, land and honor. Today we are fighting against Zionism in defense of our land and values.... They are all links in the same chain. Therefore we must prepare ourselves for a prolonged conflict and all its relevant aspects."

The next stage in that conflict, for Sadat, was the Jerusalem "peace initiative." In his Knesset speech he laid down the peace terms—from which he has never since deviated: that Israel return to the borders of 1949 and set up a Palestinian state in the West bank and Gaza (including East Jerusalem). Upon returning home, he said in an interview for *October* magazine, "We must take what we can get as a means for taking all that we want." Those who had followed Sadat's earlier remarks prior to his trip could scarcely be in doubt as to what he meant by "all that we want."

Without in any way abandoning his long-range goal, Sadat was able to count major accomplishments from his trip to Jerusalem. Indeed Sadat has managed to win the world's accolades as a great peace-maker without once using the word 'peace' on his trip. He used in his speech over and over again the word "salaam" which was translated as "peace" but which means nothing more than non-belligerence. *Salaam* was Sadat's code message to the Arab world that he would never make *Sulh*, that is, real peace, with Israel. Nonetheless Sadat was able to disarm and divide Israel and neutralize the United States—remarkable accomplishments indeed....

It may of course be asked why, if Sadat is carrying out the pan-Arab goal of Israel's destruction, there has been so much hostility toward the initiative in the Arab world.... The very intensity of Arab hatred and the lack of sophistication of the Arab masses makes it difficult to accept and make understandable a subtle strategy of game-playing, maneuvering and carrying a ball around opponents. Once a peace offensive is in full swing, the goal can only be hinted, no longer stated baldly. In addition, inter-Arab rivalry for leadership of the Arab world makes even Arab leaders who understand what Sadat is trying to do take advantage of the inevitable ambiguities of his overt position to

rally support around themselves and against Egypt, whose position of traditional leadership of the Arab world has so far been hard for the other to challenge.

From "The Shame of the Jews" Herbert Zweibon, *Outpost*, October 1993

Only a few have raised their voices against the mindless euphoria [over the Declaration of Principles between Israel and the PLO], and they have spoken of the strategic mistake Israel is making. But for Jews who care about their people the prime emotion must be shame. September 13, when Israel's leaders signed an agreement with Arafat, while American Jewish leaders eagerly danced attendance, is a date which will live in infamy. A great people prostrated itself before a bankrupt thug. A people priding itself on its moral sensitivity committed an act of ultimate immorality, deliberately bestowing legitimacy on a mass murderer. As long as the Jewish people lives, this shame will adhere to them.

From "Israel in the Borders of 1949: Then and Now" Rael Jean Isaac, *Outpost*, October 1993

Many of those who are appalled by the actions of the Labor government seek consolation by telling themselves: "After all, what will be different from the situation prior to 1967? Israel survived in those borders, and, when necessary, conquered the territories she now relinquishes: she can do the same thing again if she must, and will thus be no worse off than she was thirty years ago." Unfortunately this is not true: Israel today, in the pre-1967 lines (or close to them), will be far worse off, politically, militarily, and perhaps most important of all, psychologically....

The altered political landscape will inescapably lead to new territorial demands upon Israel. Gaza will now be part of the same political entity as Judea and Samaria. There will have to be some way for the parts of the new state to link up with one another: it cannot be long before corridors through what is now Israeli territory are demanded by Arafat (or whoever heads the new Palestinian state)....

The psychological situation is the most serious, because an Israel which is divided, demoralized, and has deliberately forfeited the legitimacy of its claim to the Land of Israel will not be able to muster the internal strength and will to defend itself against ever more powerful and determined enemies (psychologically reinvigorated by the moral and political weakness Israel manifests).

True, Israel did not possess the core religious historical areas of its ancient homeland prior to 1967.

Nor would it have initiated war to obtain them. But the sense of historic entitlement remained, not just within the Herut Party (the claim was an integral part of its electoral platform from the outset of the state) but also in sections of Labor (notably the *Ahdut Ha'avoda* movement) and the religious parties. From now on Israel will have forfeited its historic claim, severing its connection to the Land of Israel....If Jews have no claim to the highlands of ancient Israel, to Hebron, Shiloh, and the Old City of Jerusalem, why should they claim the Philistine coast? For Israelis, the question "By what right do we exert sovereignty on this land?" will become more, not less, difficult to answer....

What makes the Labor government's actions potentially most psychologically devastating is that there has been no transformation of Arab attitudes toward Israel since 1967....[W]ith the growth of Islamic fundamentalism, hatred of Israel has only become more virulent. (Lest anyone cite Egypt as a supposed exception, only Iran can rival it as the center of anti-Zionist and anti-Semitic propaganda in the world.)

Nothing has changed in the Arab world since 1974 when Yasser Arafat decided that rather than insisting that Israel had to be eliminated in one blow (a view to which Hamas still clings), the PLO should pursue a phased plan for Israel's destruction. Following this strategy, the PLO would accept whatever land it could get and use it as a dagger against what was left of Israel. The plan was first urged upon the Arabs by Tunisia's President Bourguiba in the 1950s and at the time he was denounced for his pains. In the Arab way, Arafat has been perfectly open about his strategy and remains so today.

Thus the only change has been *in Israel*, whose leaders have abandoned all the tenets central to former governments, including Labor governments. But if nothing has changed except in Israel, Israel is making peace with itself. This is how the men of Chelm would go about making peace.

"The Handshake" David Isaac, *Outpost*. Dec. 1993

"Now join your hands, and with your hands, your hearts." With this line, Shakespeare reveals the potency of a handshake. It is a symbol of friendship, of common cause, of shared fate. Or in the case of Israel, a sealed fate. For by shaking hands with Arafat on a world stage, Rabin transformed Arafat from pariah to partner, and symbolically transferred to him the age-old rights of the Jewish people to the Land of Israel.

Until that White House ceremony and that

handshake, polls in Israel showed a majority opposed to the agreement with Arafat. How could they fail to do so? He was the arch-fiend, confined by circumstance to random murder of innocents, but dedicated to the death of the state and its Jewish inhabitants.

But with the handshake, as the world watched, Arafat, like the snake shedding his skin, gave the illusion he had cast off his evil essence....

But the handshake was something more. It was a culmination of a campaign of lies. After the Six Day War of 1967, when the Arabs recognized that the prolonged pan-Arab assault won Israel world sympathy, they redefined the conflict. No longer was it between Israel and Arab states, but between Israel and "the Palestinians." The PLO, crowned as "the sole legitimate representative" of this freshly fabricated people, now claimed that it was not the Jews but the Arabs who had been persecuted and oppressed, not the Jews but the Arabs who were without a homeland.



While their minions murdered, the PLO covered their tracks with moral makeovers and pious preaching for an end to Israeli occupation. Out of myth and mist they created the Palestinian whose identity was strikingly similar to that of the Jew. And what of the Jew? He became the Nazi. The propaganda succeeded, not least by weakening the will to resist of many Jews both in Israel and the Diaspora....

And so, with the handshake, Rabin proclaimed his willingness to abandon Jewish identity, Jewish national rights, Jewish *raison d'etre* to the Palestinians, a paper people.

From "Israeli Arab (Dis)Loyalty" Erich Isaac, *Outpost*, May 1995

It was never easy to be an Arab in Israel, but Israel's government is making the Arab community into a fifth column. Thirty years ago, when few thought about the problem, Azaria Allon, a prominent environmentalist, wrote in the Labor newspaper *Lamerhav* of the difficult choices faced by Israeli Arabs. There was no such thing as an Israeli nation. There was Israeli citizenship, but in terms of nationality, one could be either Jewish or Arab. Israel was a Jewish state and the Arabs were a minority who could not identify with the values of the majority—neither its language, its history or its holidays.

That left the Arab with three choices: to accept the state, even if reluctantly, as a reality; to leave; or to negate the state and seek to contribute to its destruction....

Allon pointed out in 1966 that the majority of Israeli Arabs were on the fence and whatever their

feelings, abstained from taking any active role in seeking to negate the state. But he pointed out that this could change if circumstances changed.

The circumstances have indeed changed in ways Allon could not have imagined...What the government will achieve—indeed to a large extent has already accomplished—is to push Israel's substantial Arab minority off the fence into the arms of militant Islam, into the ranks of those prepared to act to negate the existence of the state.

From "The Treason of the Intellectuals", Midge Decter, *Outpost* May 1996

The second thing that went wrong was that the State of Israel gave birth far too early to a professional, literary intelligentsia. This may sound facetious or flippant. It is not....A country only half a century old is not supposed to have a full fledged accomplished literary intelligentsia. Technicians? Yes. Men of enterprise? Yes. Adventurers? Yes. Soldiers? Yes. Scientists? Indeed, yes. But writers worthy of meriting international fame and regard? This is an extravagance only an old and stable country should be allowed to indulge in. For the price of admission to international literary fame, particularly for writers from small and far-off countries, is the capacity to transcend one's own narrow interests and to expose the foibles of one's own small parish. There are times and places and circumstances in which Nobel prizes are just too costly..... In the end, what their country is really guilty of in the eyes of Israel's upper intelligentsia is simply Zionism—mere, as they might put it, mere parochial nationalism.

What a joke. What a fantastic, terrible, bitter joke. The idea that the Jews must be a transcendent people is an idea born precisely from Diaspora powerlessness. Thus, Israel's beautiful people have brought themselves from *galut* back to *galut* in less than 75 years. That is why the country is now suing for peace with those committed to wiping it out. It is because the disapproval and the dark looks of the world outside are too much to bear that the head of Israel's government pronounces grandly about something called a New Middle East. The powerless indulge in fantasies of escape. That is why Israelis daydream of peace with Syria, to be guaranteed, of all sad things, by American peacekeepers. It is because the obsequious seek an intercessor, what in the shtetl they used to call a *shtadlan*—someone to protect their interests from the hands of the mighty.

The Israelis have been called upon to be brave beyond the imaginings of other nations. And they have responded and responded and are tired. They are entitled to be. But when they say they must have peace, for "What is the alternative?" they are speaking not the language of Zion but the language of those who have given up, or are in the process of giving up, on Zion. There will be no peace in these times except at the price of Zion.

From "The Missing Moral Dimension" by Roger A. Gerber, *Outpost* June 2005

The controversial "disengagement" plan proposed by Prime Minister Ariel Sharon has precipitated, in the words of Yossi Klein Halevi, "one of the most severe domestic crises in Israeli history"....[A]nalysts typically focus on the security, geostrategic, economic, and political ramifications of Sharon's plan [to leave Gaza] but omit the attendant burning moral issues. Yet it is the moral dimension that accounts for the depth and intensity of the passions that have been aroused by the plan that Sharon conceived, as he recounted to William Safire, "in consultation with myself."

Under what moral or legal principle does a democratic government expel by force from their homes and businesses 25 communities populated by its own citizens for the sole reason that they are Jewish? Pursuant to what principle does the government tell the citizens of Kfar Darom who reside on former swamp land purchased almost a century ago, that they are to be forcibly evicted? .[T]his plan strikes at the heart of basic moral codes, both Jewish religious and secular Zionist imperatives....

Sharon's firing of ministers who indicated that they would vote against his "disengagement" plan in the cabinet, his insistence upon a Likud party plebiscite which he pledged to honor when it appeared he would win and then promptly ignored when he lost overwhelmingly, his refusal to conduct a referendum, his failure to explain to the nation the reasons and goals of his traumatic plan, his incitement to violence by describing Israel as on the verge of a civil war, his delegitimization of the respected Likud leader and Knesset member Uzi Landau and other opponents as "extremists" for basically taking the same position he took in the national election less than two years previously, and his callous disregard of the trampling on the rights of citizens of Israel who disagree with his withdrawal and expulsion plan, have seriously diminished the ethos of democracy in the State of Israel.

From "In Pursuit of False Messiahs" by William Mehlman, *Outpost* November 2005

In Israel, the land that gave birth to messianism, the most recent and durable in the long line of bright, glowing messianic frauds is something called the "peace process." Its relentless promotion by a fanatical elite fixed on the notion that peace with an Arab world openly dedicated to the termination of Jewish national existence will flow from the systematic surrender of Israel's material and strategic assets and the creation of an enemy state within its borders must surely rank as the chef-d'oeuvre of all Jewish messianic delusions. Among the blessings it has already conferred on us is suicide bombings, rocket bombardments, a 50,000 man Palestinian army equipped with everything from Kalashnikovs to Sagger anti-tank missiles, the loss of control over nearly 40 percent of the

West Bank, the ruination of 25 Jewish communities and the lives of their 10,000 inhabitants in Gaza and northern Samaria and the creeping demoralization of the IDF, increasing numbers of which are no longer sure what they're supposed to be fighting for.

Unsullied by so much as a hint of peace, the "peace process" has written a new chapter in Arab anti-Semitism, historical revisionism and undisguised bloodlust...And every fresh Israeli concession adds gasoline to the fire.

Even as it threatens to burn the ground beneath their feet, the instigators of this conflagration seem deaf to all but the tinkling bells of their messianic mirage and the flattering "right-ons" of American and European clques to whom Jewish national existence has as much value as a pawn in a chess game.

If there is anything to be drawn from this messianic madness, it must surely be the tragic realization that with the fulfillment of the "peace process," the string of Jewish false messiahs will finally have run its course. So, in all likelihood, will the history of the Third Jewish Commonwealth. There is still time to write another ending to this story, but not much.

From "It Was Never About Borders" Ruth King, *Outpost*, April 2006

The scholar Bat Ye'Or, a Zeev Jabotinsky of our time, understood that the Arab war against the Jews of Palestine was always a jihad. She warned: "...

Israel represents the successful national liberation of a dhimmi civilization. On a territory formerly Arabized by the jihad and the dhimma, a pre-Islamic language, culture, topographical geography and national institutions have been restored to life...In 1974, Abu Iyad, second-in-command to Arafat in the Fatah hierarchy, announced: 'We intend to struggle so that our Palestinian homeland does not become a new Andalusia.' The comparison of Andalusia to Palestine was not fortuitous since both countries were Arabized, and then de-Arabized by a pre-Arabic culture."

As Bat Ye'or predicted when she coined the term Eurabia, Western European culture is now being gradually subjected to sharia law and Moslem demands.

For decades Israel and its Western allies concentrated on the Cold War, with Israel seen as a bulwark to thwart Soviet ambition. That role vanished with the fall of the Berlin Wall. The West ignored the growing aggressiveness of Islam, fueled by the wealth of oil producing Arab states...And it failed to see that Israel is a bulwark in the existential battle of the century—Islam against the infidel world.

Geography has dictated that Israel lives in the belly of the Moslem Arab beast and because of its large and potentially seditious Arab population, the beast also lives in Israel's belly. The failure to understand jihad is Israel's most colossal—it may well be fatal—blunder. •

The Probable Consequences of Implementing the "Declaration of Principles"

Netta Kohn Dor-Shav

(There were some in Israel who foresaw clearly what would happen in the wake of the "Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements" as the Oslo Accords were initially known. Dor-Shav, an Israeli psychologist, wrote this essay focusing on the psychological impact of the Accords not long after they were signed.)

Those who have taken a pro-Oslo stance can be expected to start out with a sense of achievement, a sense of victory. However, very soon, especially after the inevitable complications, the inevitable violence, the inevitable unreasonableness of the Arab partners come to the fore, we shall see more and more of what we, in psychology, call post-decision dissonance, i.e. the dissonance that emerges when, having made a decision, one has to live with it and doesn't necessarily like it. It is the time when the negative effects of the decision become all too apparent and the positive aspects of the options rejected appear more attractive than ever.

The increased violence and sense of loss for what was given up will inevitably lead—even for ad-

herents of the agreement—to feelings of guilt, loss and depression.

This depression, however, will not compare to the much more serious depression and despair among those who experience giving up parts of Eretz Yisrael as the ultimate betrayal, the ultimate separation, the ultimate loss. For them this will be not only loss of the beloved homeland but also loss of the Zionist dream with which they identified, for which they were willing to fight and die. It will be loss of their *raison d'être*. These people will feel helpless and impotent, beyond despair. They will become alienated; they will no longer feel part of the body politic; they will feel estranged from the government and that part of the citizenry which supported what they perceive as a destructive, wanton, auto-castration. Serious unrest and civil strife cannot be ruled out.

Massive *yerida* [out-migration], especially by those who come from Western countries, can be expected as well as alienation from all institutions in the country, including the army.

For the first time Zahal [Israel Defense Forces] will have ceased to be a transcendent value not only for the effete prima-donnas of Ramat Aviv, but also for that cadre of dedicated nationalists who helped to win the last three wars and had hoped to win a genuine and proud peace.

For the Jews of the diaspora, those who are

committed, those who care, the world will never be the same. The pride, the identification, the feeling of safety and security that the existence of the State of Israel brought to the diaspora, will cease. The proud, "new" post World War II Jew of Israel will have been vanquished. Having won four wars for survival, he will have put his own survival in question. His brothers abroad too will begin to hang their heads in shame again.

As a result of Oslo, Jews will have to face increased anti-Semitism the world over. Peres' fantasy of acceptance and integration in the Middle East and in Europe is just that—a fantasy. By acknowledging Arab rights in Eretz Yisrael, Peres will have put more than a question mark on our own. Denying our sovereignty, denying its historical basis, religious and national, betraying the sacrifices of those who fought, bled and died here, Peres says to the world: this is not our land; let's split it; let's make a deal. By doing this he delegitimizes our return, our successful national liberation movement which reclaimed our ancient homeland. Instead he validates the Arab claim that we are simply refugees from Europe, a Western problem.

Peres transforms us from a proud people-come-home to itinerant mendicants seeking shelter and suffrage. He mocks our strength and our valor, makes us again dependent upon the nations, seeking favor from them. He makes a mockery of the redemption "from *shoa* to *t'kuma*" and again makes room for the thesis that the Jews got what they deserved, i.e. reestablishes balance for those who cannot accept the Jew on the ascendant, the Jew victorious, the Jew asserting his rights. Now, again, the Jew will have been humbled, will have "gotten his come-uppance." He will have capitulated, his illegitimate tenure as sovereign in this land will have come to an end. For although technically the state might still be holding on to some small part of Eretz Yisrael, we will no longer be sovereign in our homeland.

The world, too, can be expected to react to the implementation of the agreement—perhaps after a short *pro forma* honeymoon period in which we will be praised for our "sacrifices" as we were praised for our "restraint" during the Gulf War—with a resurgence of international anti-Semitism, anti-Judaism and anti-Zionism. Having delegitimized ourselves as a nation, we will be seen as a legitimate target.

Rabin, Peres and Beilin et al. are playing into the hands of Israel's worst enemies, on the one hand making it easier for the Arab enemy to plan an attack from a much better position and on the other providing ammunition for attacks on our legitimacy and integrity as a nation and as a people.

As for the potential response of the Arabs, here again one needs to look separately at those among us and those without our gates. Those among

us, Israeli Arabs as well as those of the "Autonomy", will become impossible to live with; many leftists will come to rue the day they supported the present plan. It will be impossible to establish and maintain the much touted *du kiyyum* (coexistence) with the Arabs, because their arrogance and their demands will become intolerable. They will try to act as lords over us and Jews will become increasingly placating and subservient. For, as psychological studies have shown, the Arab is characterized by what is known as the "authoritarian personality"—one which knows not equality, but rather either authoritarian submission or authoritarian aggression, superiority and domination. Therefore, as we will have ceased to be perceived as

superior, as on the ascendancy, as bosses, we will be expected to submit to Arab superiority, to become subservient to Arab masters.

The loss of self-esteem, the loss of self-confidence, the feelings of helplessness that will

ensue will add to the causes of depression cited earlier and increase the danger to our survival by yet another factor.

As for the Arabs of the surrounding countries, they will see in our capitulation a victory of Arab nationalism, of fanatical Islam. Their appetite for hegemony will be whetted, not sated, and Arab countries can be expected to unite for a "final solution" of the Israeli problem—with over two million Arabs well-placed as a fifth column to facilitate their enterprise.

These predictions are frightening, the more so as it is apparent that those who are making decisions for us today are oblivious to the foreseeable consequences of their acts.

Author's comment: *Much of this has come to pass, most obvious, the prediction of increased anti-Semitism worldwide. But what has also been fulfilled is the prediction of depression and despair, feelings of helplessness and impotence, which help to explain the lack of effort, action and mobilization that sadly characterize the Israeli "right" today. In addition the prediction of increased aggression within our society has unfortunately come to pass as evidenced in greater criminal and intra-family violence.* •

As a result of Oslo, Jews will face increased anti-Semitism the world over.

AFSI Books (postage included in price)

The Jewish Wars—Reflections By One Of The Belligerents by Edward Alexander—special price: \$10.00.

Order from:
Americans For A Safe Israel
1751 Second Ave (at 91st Street)
New York, N.Y. 10128

The Full Measure of Joe Biden's Hypocrisy on Jerusalem

Daniel Greenfield

Not that long ago, Joseph Robinette Biden was supposedly gravely insulted by Israel announcing that potential housing to be built in Jerusalem had passed one stage of a multi-stage approval process. Biden was so insulted by this dastardly act that he stood up the Prime Minister of Israel for 90 minutes and then he and various Obama Administration officials proceeded to lambaste Israel for "insulting" Biden.

Hillary Clinton proclaimed: "It was not only an insult to Biden, but an insult to the United States." "There was an affront, it was an insult," huffed senior Obama advisor David Axelrod. Hundreds of newspapers penned editorials denouncing Israel's grave insult. The essence of it was that Israel had insulted Biden by laying claim to Jerusalem during his visit.



Netanyahu with Biden

There's just one problem with this. In 1995 Biden himself served as a co-sponsor of S. 1322, known as the Jerusalem Embassy Act. (Additional Senate co-sponsors included such obscure legislators as John McCain, Ted Kennedy, Harry Reid, Jesse Helms, John Kerry, Joseph Lieberman, Strom Thurmond and Bob Dole.) Let's look at the text of the Jerusalem Embassy Act.

Statement of The Policy Of The United States:

(1) Jerusalem should remain an undivided city in which the rights of every ethnic and religious group are protected;

(2) Jerusalem should be recognized as the capital of the State of Israel;

So if we believe the White House, in 1995 Senator Biden co-sponsored a bill in which he laid out a Statement of the Policy of the United States as that of an "Undivided Jerusalem," that is the undivided capital of the State of Israel, but in 2010 that same Biden was gravely insulted by a potential Israeli housing project in Jerusalem.

But surely that was an accident. After all, Biden might not have known what resolution he was actually co-sponsoring. Except that in 1992 Biden also served as co-sponsor of Senate Consecutive Resolution 113. It states:

"Now, therefore, be it Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), that the Congress:

(1) congratulates the residents of Jerusalem and the people of Israel on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the reunification of that historic city;

(2) strongly believes that Jerusalem must remain an undivided city in which the rights of every ethnic and religious group are protected as they have

been by Israel during the past twenty-five years; and

(3) calls upon the President and the Secretary of State to issue an unequivocal statement in support of these principles.

So in 1992, Biden "strongly believed" that Jerusalem should be Israel's undivided capital and even wanted the President to issue an "unequivocal statement" in support of that. Fast forward a bit and Biden is supposedly gravely insulted because Israel believes unequivocally that Jerusalem is its undivided capital.

Now certainly Senator Biden twice co-sponsored resolutions and bills that proclaimed Jerusalem to be Israel's undivided capital. But he couldn't for the love of god have done it three times? Or could he have?

In 1990 Senator Joseph Robinette Biden co-sponsored Senate Concurrent Resolution 106 which

stated: "Whereas ambiguous statements by the Government of the United States concerning the right of Jews to live in all parts of Jerusalem raise concerns in Israel that Jerusalem might one day be redivided and access to religious sites in Jerusalem denied to Israeli citizens; and Whereas such concerns inhibit and complicate the search for a lasting peace in the region: Now, therefore, be it Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress--

(1) acknowledges that Jerusalem is and should remain the capital of the State of Israel;

(2) strongly believes that Jerusalem must remain an undivided city in which the rights of every ethnic religious group are protected; and

(3) calls upon all parties involved in the search for peace to maintain their strong efforts to bring about negotiations between Israel and Palestinian representatives.

Now just so we're keeping track, Biden co-sponsored three Senate resolutions, all three of which insisted that Jerusalem should remain Israel's undivided capital and one of which insisted that it was vital for the peace process that Jerusalem should be affirmed by U.S. policy as Israel's undivided capital.

So naturally, like any good politician, he was insulted by Israel taking him at his word. To argue that Biden was gravely insulted by Israel is to argue that he was insulted by the policies he himself supported. Not just passively supported, but co-sponsored in three Senate resolutions which repeatedly stated that these were meant to be the policy of the United States.

But of course the hypocrisy train doesn't stop at Joe Biden Station. Hillary Clinton, who claimed that Israeli housing "was not only an insult to Biden but an insult to the United States," in 2007 issued a paper

stating "Hillary Clinton believes that Israel's right to exist in safety as a Jewish state, with defensible borders and an undivided Jerusalem as its capital, secure from violence and terrorism, must never be questioned."

And barely two and a half years later, Hillary Clinton is vocally doing the questioning. And the woman who not that long ago said that an "undivided Jerusalem" must never be questioned was pretending that Israel approving housing in Jerusalem was a grave insult to the U.S.

The question must then be asked, if Joe Biden and Hillary Clinton supported an undivided Jerusalem and if Israeli housing projects in Jerusalem are an insult to the United States, weren't Hillary and Joe insulting the United States? Or were they just insulting the Jewish voters who believed their empty promises?

But the "insults" don't stop there. In 2008 Obama gave a speech in which he said, "Jerusalem will remain the capital of Israel, and it must remain undivided." To be fair to Obama, he didn't waste too much time divorcing himself from the statement he had just made. It actually took him only a day to explain that he actually supported dividing Jerusalem, he just didn't want it divided by barbed wire. No, seriously. "You know, the truth is that this was an example where we had some poor phrasing in the speech. And we immediately tried to correct the interpretation that was given. The point we were simply making was, is that we don't want barbed wire running through Jerusalem, similar to the way it was prior to the '67 war, that it is possible for us to create a Jerusalem that is cohesive and coherent."

After a prolonged study by experts in semantics, it turns out that Obama felt that "undivided Jerusalem" was subject to all sorts of misinterpretations, such as it being undivided, when he actually meant that it should be cohesive and coherent. Unlike Obama himself. Since no one knows what in the world

"cohesive and coherent" might mean as applied to a city, that made it a safe statement to make.

So to sum up, Joe Biden, Hillary Clinton and even Obama were enthusiastic supporters of an "Undivided Jerusalem" not too long ago, but in the spring of 2010 they were gravely insulted because Israel moved housing in Jerusalem to be built on deserted land through one stage of a multi-stage approvals process while Biden happened to be in the country.

Now this dog just won't hunt. Either an "undivided Jerusalem" is a grave insult to the United States and completely destructive of the peace process—in which case Joe Biden, Hillary Clinton and Obama have all insulted the United States

and are destructive of the peace process—or they are completely shameless liars and hypocrites.

Just to close off this sad chapter with one more stop for the Hypocrisy Express at Joe Biden Station, let's tune in to Joe Biden circa 2001.

"Why is it that the one ally we have in that part of the world [Israel], that we have the right to publicly chastise them? We would not do that with any other friend ... As much as the Middle East is always on our minds, the best thing we can do is keep it off the U.S. and world press." Biden said that criticism "emboldens those in the Middle East and around the world who still harbor as their sacred goal the elimination of Israel ... It is not for you to tell them [Israel], nor for me, what is in their best interests. We should give them the right to determine what chances they will take."

Fast forward to 2010 where under the guidance of Barack Hussein Obama, Biden staged a very loud and public bashing of Israel.

One is reminded of the question, how can you tell when a politician is lying? Easy, his lips are moving.

Daniel Greenfield blogs as Sultan Knish. This appeared on his blog on March 31.

Either an "undivided Jerusalem" is a grave insult to the United States—in which case Joe Biden, Hillary Clinton and Obama have all insulted the U.S.—or they are completely shameless liars.

Israel Derangement Syndrome

Melanie Phillips

While Obama has opened the global floodgates of Israel-bashing, in Britain it is now open season on Israel and the Jews who defend it—with other Jews hostile to Israel often in the front-line of the charge. What is happening is both hideous and, quite simply, beyond reason. It amounts to a fanatical and obsessive verbal pogrom.

Item: in the *Telegraph*, two Labour MPs—Sir Gerald Kaufman, a veteran and poisonous Jewish Is-

rael-basher and Martin Linton, chairman of Labour Friends of Palestine—claimed that the Conservative party was in hock to both the Jews generally and Israel in particular. The *Telegraph* headlined its story: "Labour MPs accuse Tories of being too close to Israel" but what they actually said was much worse. Kaufman said that Lord Ashcroft, the wealthy Tory donor, owned one part of the party and "Jewish millionaires" the other. In other words, Jews had bought the Tory party. Linton, meanwhile, told a meeting at the House of Commons: "There are long tentacles of Israel in this country who are funding election cam-

paigns and putting money into the British political system for their own ends.”

The word “tentacles,” from which Linton later tried to distance himself, is of course straight out of the medieval and Nazi lexicon of Jew-hatred. Linton’s comments echo the ugly “Jewish conspiracy” theory aired on primetime British TV recently in Peter Osborne’s *Dispatches* programme, in which he claimed that wealthy Jewish supporters of Israel had bought up and suborned the Tory party. Like all “Jewish conspiracy” theories, this one flies in the face of demonstrable reality, since the Tory front bench is mostly indifferent to, disdainful of or even hostile towards the State of Israel.

Item: as the veteran ultra-leftist and Israel-basher Tony Greenstein boasts on his blog, anti-Israel bigots disrupted a performance of the Jerusalem Quartet at London’s Wigmore Hall this week— with the result that BBC Radio Three terminated its live broadcast of the concert. There is only one way to describe the mindset of these bullies who compare Israelis— who bear arms solely to prevent themselves from being wiped out—to Nazis, and describe Israel—whose Arab citizens have equal rights—as an “apartheid state,” and that is twisted and sick. As for BBC Radio Three, it was cowardly to have aborted its broadcast and thus surrendered to thugery and bigotry.

Item: in *The Independent* Richard Ingrams (he who once stated that “I have developed a habit, when confronted by letters to the editor in support of the Israeli government to look at the signature to see if the writer has a Jewish name. If so, I tend not to read it”) welcomed “the expulsion of a Mossad agent from London following the affair over the forged passports used by a gang of Israeli assassins in Dubai.”

A “gang of assassins,” eh? So what does that make the British and American forces regularly killing assorted *jihadi* leaders in the defence of the west against mass murder? If any of them find and kill Osama bin Laden, as they have been vainly attempting to do, will Ingrams call them too a “gang of assassins”?

Yet who can turn a hair over Ingrams when no less than the British Foreign Secretary David Miliband

referred in his Commons statement to the plight of the British passport-holder whose identity was used in the Dubai killing and who went to bed as an Israeli citizen “only to wake up as a wanted terrorist?” When a British Foreign Secretary equates a terrorist mass murderer with those who rid the world of such a menace, it is but a short step to sanitising the mass murderer and denouncing his victims. Which is precisely what has happened in Britain.

In his article, Ingrams foamed on: “What this amounts to is that these people are proud to be friends of a country that operates a system of apartheid in territory which it has illegally occupied and colonised, that subjects the people who live in that territory to

intolerable restrictions, that thinks nothing of killing large numbers of them, including women and children, to punish them for daring to launch rockets and that continually lies about its actions as it does about the criminal activities of Mossad.”

Once, this would have been considered the ravings of a lunatic, since it denies reality—not to mention morality—with virtually every word. Yet

now it is mainstream. In Britain, anti-Israel bigotry and Jew-hatred have gone viral.

Item: the explosion of racist bile on the readers’ thread on the *Guardian*’s “Comment is Free blog” below Stephen Pollard’s article, which pointed out that the outrage over the Israeli building permits in a Jewish area of Jerusalem just over the Green Line was a travesty of the truth, that far from Israel’s behaviour over East Jerusalem being the cause of the breakdown in talks, it’s the Palestinians who have come up with East Jerusalem as a fig leaf for their rejection of talks. For this simple statement of unarguable historical fact, Pollard was subjected to abuse such as, “Mr. Pollard has eaten too many kosher pies” and “I look forward to articles from child abusers telling us all how it’s a perfectly fine pastime” and “No wonder Stephen and his fellow Cabal members are worried.”

Actually, it’s Britain that should be worried. A country that turns on the Jews like this is itself heading over the edge of the cliff.

This appeared in the U.K. Spectator on March 31.

Refuseniks: Cold War Heroes

Ruth King

While much has been written about the Cold War—recently Glenn Beck’s fine documentary *Revolutionary Holocaust* detailed the horrors of Stalin’s and

Mao’s evil empires--there has been little attention to the heroic Russian “refuseniks” and the remarkable role they and their international supporters played in bringing down the Iron Curtain.

There were a disproportionately large number of Jews among the refuseniks. Demanding the right to emigrate, they faced job loss, systematic harassment,

(Continued from page 10)

beatings, indefinite confinement in “mental institutions,” long and brutal incarceration, and trumped up charges of “hooliganism” and treason.

The oppression of Jews in Russia is hundreds of years old. Pogroms, often instigated by a succession of Czars, contributed to the human tide of immigration to the United States. Between 1880 and 1924 when open immigration ended, 24,000,000 people came to America. Of those, roughly ten percent were Russian Jews. Unfortunately for them, an equal number of Jews remained in Russia seduced by the dream of equality under Communism. And although, ironically, most of the Jews of Eastern Europe who survived Hitler were rescued by the Red Army, they were then subjected to systematic abuse by the iron fist of Communist tyrants.

When Stalin died in 1953 and Nikita Krushchev openly denounced Stalin, there was some improvement. Under the “Krushchev Thaw” there were limited international exchanges with Western intellectuals and loosening of censorship in media and the arts. However, Krushchev was ousted in 1964 and replaced by Stalinist Leonid Ilyich Brezhnev, who reversed reforms and rekindled anti-Semitism.

Nonetheless, Israel’s Six Day War in 1967 inspired many crypto-Jews to identify with Israel and challenge their rulers. A young Moscow university student Yasha Kazakov fired the first salvo in the Jewish revolt. In an open letter smuggled abroad and published in the *Washington Post* he declared “*I consider myself a citizen of the State of Israel. I demand to be freed from the humiliation of Soviet citizenship.*” Within weeks he received a visa and went to Israel where he headed the office of liaison for Soviet immigrants.

Shortly after, another dissident, Boris Kochubiyeysky, did not fare so well, interned for three years in Siberia for sending this note to the Kremlin: “*As long as I am capable of feeling I will do all I can to leave for Israel. And if you find it possible to sentence me for that, it changes nothing. If I live until my release, I will be prepared to go to the homeland of my ancestors, even if it means going on foot.*” His letter was widely circulated and brought the plight of Soviet Jews to international attention, galvanizing a growing movement of support.

The Khrushchev “thaw” never extended to Georgia. After World War II there were violent rampages against synagogues and a continual recycling of blood libels. In 1969 large numbers of Jews applied for exit visas for Israel. Eighteen families wrote to the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations and in November of that year Prime Minister Golda

Meir read their famous letter: “*We will wait months and years. We will wait all our lives if necessary, but we will never renounce our faith or our hopes.*” Soviet resolve weakened and there was a steady flow of Georgian Jews to Israel in the 1970s—in all about 30,000 Georgian Jews went to Israel.

Elsewhere in the Soviet Union Jews also found their voice. In 1973, a young Soviet Jew named Anatoly Sharansky applied for an exit visa, inspiring a chain of applications—and harsh reprisals. As the “refusenik” movement gained traction, it drew the attention of American legislators. In 1974 the late Senator Henry “Scoop” Jackson and Representative Charles Vanik added an amendment that bears their name to the 1974 Trade Act, linking trade with the Soviet Union to allowing refuseniks to emigrate. It passed

Congress unanimously and was signed into law by President Gerald Ford in January 1975.

That August thirty-five countries, including the Soviet Union, signed the Helsinki Accords. From the point of view of Soviet leaders, the accords consolidated Soviet domination of the Baltic by giving official recognition to the post World War II borders. However, its provisions also included the following: “Respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief.”

These words would come to haunt Soviet leaders. In 1976, physicist Yuri Orlov and physicist Andrei Sakharov formed the Helsinki Watch Group to monitor Soviet compliance. The original group included Lyudmilla Alexeyeva, Mikahil Bernshtam, Yelena Bonner (Sakharov’s wife), Alexander Ginzburg, Pyotr Grigorenko, Malva Landa, Anatoly Marchenko, Gregory Rosenstein, Vitaly Rubin, and Anatoly Scharansky.

In October of that year, when 13 Jewish refuseniks petitioned for exit visas they were beaten, but their courage set off a wave of mass demonstrations followed by the arrests of 22 activists including Mark Azbel, Felix Kandel, Alexander Lerner, Ida Nudel, Valdimor Slepak and Michail Zeleny Sharansky. They were convicted of “hooliganism.”

In March 1977 Scharansky was arrested and charged with high treason, espionage and anti-Soviet activity. His trial and incarceration—he endured physical and emotional abuse in prison for nine years—was reported throughout the free world. Thanks to his wife Avital’s unrelenting struggle on his behalf, attention remained focused on Soviet abuses of human rights.

The refuseniks stepped up their defiance. On June 1, 1978, Vladimir and Maria Slepak stood on the balcony of their apartment displaying a banner which said “Let us go to Israel.” Ida Nudel held a similar banner on her balcony. They were arrested and



Refuseniks from l to r) back: Vitaly Rubin, Vladimir Slepak, Lev Ovsisscher, Alexander Druk, Yossi Beilin, Dina Beilin front: Natan Sharansky, Ida Nudel, Alexander Lerner

charged with violation of the Russian Constitution. Vladimir Slepak and Ida Nudel were convicted of all charges. They served 5 and 4 years in Siberian exile respectively. By the end of 1981, only three of the original founders, Bonner, Kalistrova and Meiman, were free and the Moscow Helsinki Group ceased operation in the spring of 1982.

But the international outcry and the determination of Jewish supporters in the United States did not diminish but rather grew in numbers and strength.

In 1986 Scharansky was released and joined his wife in Israel where he now resides. But he did not give up the struggle for Soviet Jewry. In 1987 during his second visit to the United States, Scharansky (I was his official guide for almost three weeks during that visit) met with the leaders of all the major Jewish organizations and inspired a march on Washington to coincide with the visit of Gorbachev that culminated on December 6, 1987 with 250,000 demonstrators converging on Washington.

In *The Reagan Presidency: An Oral History of the Era*, Gerald and Deborah Strober quote Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights Richard Schifter: "What the American Jewish community did was to put the Soviet Jewry issue on the U.S. government's human rights agenda. And the U.S. government, in turn, put it on the Soviet agenda. The rally in Washington took place on a Sunday. The following Tuesday, Gorbachev met with Reagan, and the person who was the note taker at the meeting told me that Reagan started out by saying to Gorbachev, 'You know, there was this rally on the Mall the other day.' And Gorbachev said, 'Yes, I heard about it. Why don't you go on and talk about arms control?' And for five minutes, Reagan

kept on talking about the rally and the importance of Jewish emigration to the United States, when Gorbachev wanted to talk about something else."

In 1989 the gates of the Soviet jail were opened and Jews flooded out to Israel and to the West. Their contribution to the fall of the Soviet Union has been summarized by Laura Bialis who made a documentary on the Refuseniks: "They were the first to realize that the Soviets actually cared about what others in the international community thought of them. The Refuseniks use that hunch to their advantage. They helped bring international attention to Soviet human rights abuses, delegitimizing the Soviet Union in the eyes of many Western countries. The ensuing pressure by governments around the world definitely had an effect."

As for the impact on Jews, Yossi Klein Halevi wrote in 2004 in *Azure*: "A generation later, the massive immigration of Russian-speaking Jews has transformed Israeli society, infusing the country with talent and energy. But arguably a no less powerful transformation has occurred among American Jews. The Soviet Jewry movement roused them from their passivity, and taught them how to fight a Diaspora-generated struggle and experience victory—not vicariously through Israeli heroism, but as active partners in their people's fate."

In this movement Glenn Richter and his mentor and inspiration Jacob Birnbaum, who created the Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry in 1964, are heroes who deserve special admiration and gratitude.

Alas, today American Jewry is hostage to political correctness and liberal cant which blinds it to the dangers facing the Jewish community worldwide..