
OUTPOST



April 2014—Issue #275

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

44th Year of Publication

Table of Contents

The Peresian Succession	William Mehlman	Page 2
From The Editor		Page 3
The Origins of AFSI	Erich Isaac	Page 6
Talking Peace and Preparing for War	Moshe Sharon	Page 10
<i>The Israeli Solution</i>	Reviewed by Spengler	Page 14
On Rabbi Meir Kahane	Ruth King	Page 18

The Peresian Succession

William Mehlman

The scramble to succeed Shimon Peres as his seven-year presidential term draws to a close is not a sight for sore eyes. With the exception of the still (at this writing) unofficially declared Uzi Landau, Minister of Tourism in the Likud-Bayit Yehudi coalition and inarguably worthy of consideration as “our national collective paradigm,” as Sarah Honig asserted in a recent *Jerusalem Post* column, the field of contenders is as uninspiring a collection of hacks, has-beens wanna-bes, tired old faces and delusionaries as has lately been assembled on a single list.

The early leader of the pack of declared candidates (it requires the support of 10 sitting members of the Knesset to be qualified to run) is Benjamin Ben-Eliezer, ex-general, ex-defense minister, ex-national infrastructure minister, ex-Labor Party chairman, ex-anything else that might come to mind. Having recorded no achievements of note in any of these posts, Ben-Eliezer’s overriding mission, Honig submits, is “to remind people of his existence.” His election platform should certainly do the trick. “Fouad,” the nickname by which he is best known, says his first task will be to assure the “moderates” among the Palestinians that he is four-square for the two-state solution, ostensibly with a slice of Jerusalem as the capital for their new state. In the same breath, he insists that Israel can only close a peace deal with “strong” Arab leaders. He isn’t clear on whether the latter are synonymous with the aforementioned “moderates” but he’s dead certain that the one and perhaps only Arab “leader” with enough clout to close the “deal” is Marwan Barghouti, the former Tanzim terrorist chieftain currently serving a couple of life terms in an Israeli lockup for personally executing five Israeli citizens and for issuing the orders resulting in the murder of an additional 20. “It’s imperative,” Ben Eliezer is quoted as declaring, “that we free him [Barghouti] to have someone to talk to--the sooner, the better.”

Mr. Ben-Eliezer would have been a candidate for a padded cell 65 years ago when the presidency of Israel was created as a politically castrated ceremonial gift to Chaim Weizmann from a dominant David Ben-Gurion. Weizmann famously remarked of his divorce from all influence over the nation he helped create that “the only place I’m still allowed to stick my nose is my handkerchief.” Handkerchiefs have gone the way of tailfins and so has the image of Israel’s president as a mummified ribbon cutter. Most of the credit for that belongs to Shimon Peres. Over the seven years of his presidency, with the guile of a master prestidigitator, he has transformed himself from “an indefatigable schemer” (Yitzhak Rabin’s words) into a powerful and beloved national institution and global icon. How he pulled it off is the stuff of books yet to be written but the fact that 64 percent of Israelis in a recent presidential poll announced themselves in favor of non-candidate Peres—a margin of 47 percent above the nearest announced declarer—speaks for itself.

The mechanics behind the Peresian makeover may have been revealed in an interview the president gave AP editors Dan Perry and Joe Federman on the eve of his 90th birthday last summer. “For me what is important is tomorrow, the next day,” he told them. “What happened until now is unchangeable; I’m not going to spend time on it. I am really living in the future.” The man “living in the future” was, in effect, acquitting himself of the human and material havoc wrought by the Oslo Accords he was so instrumental in fashioning and of promoting the

relocation to the Land of Israel of Yasser Arafat and his terrorist entourage from a dead-end Tunisian exile under the rubric of a "New Middle East."

The Israeli public's apparent dismissal of those grim realities reflects not so much a shortness of memory as its hunger for peace. It has been fed by a "Peres Peace Center" whose



"mini-Davos" conferences have become a magnet for the glitterati of the political, diplomatic, business, academic and entertainment worlds, all furiously committed to "Israel's best interests." The June 2013 bash, aptly headlined *A Macher's Paradise* by the *Daily Beast's* Elisheva Goldberg, featured \$500,000 keynoter Bill Clinton referring to Peres as "the world's social Einstein," only to be topped by Tony Blair's observation that "we in Britain have our Queen and you in Israel have your Shimon Peres." As Barbra Streisand belted out a pop rendition of "Avinu Malkenu" to the birthday boy, Chicago mayor Rahm Emmanuel and former

Harvard president and National Economic Council head Lawrence Summers were huddling in one corner while Hollywood's Robert DeNiro and Sharon Stone adorned the room. Who could fault the ordinary Israeli's conviction that their exalted president must be on to something?

Though he'll hang around until July, Mr. Peres' presidency will effectively expire sometime in May when the Knesset votes on his successor. Any notion that he will go quietly into the gentle night should not be seriously entertained. "The mention of old age startles him or even a vacation, which he regards as a 'waste of time,'" the AP's Perry and Federman report. Freed of whatever restraints his "golden presidential handcuffs" may have imposed on him, opines *Israel Hayom's* David Weinberg, we can bank on Peres coming out "gloves off" and "ready for a fight." While at 90, his insistence that he is "not running for anything" (or "away from anything") seems credible, Peres, Weinberg predicts, "will strike blue ribbon commissions to study and reach conclusions about the urgent need to establish a full-fledged Palestinian state with Jerusalem as its capital. He'll convene the biggest and most highly publicized international conferences we've ever seen...Look for an aggressive, focused Shimon Peres," he cautions, "out to create Palestine, remake the Middle East and save Israel, as only he can."

Fasten your seatbelts. There may be turbulence ahead.

William Mehlman represents AFSI in Israel

From the Editor

Boycott It

In his "Boycott the New York Times" Italian journalist Giulio Meotti has some (deservedly) harsh words not only for the *New York Times* but for the Jews addicted to it. What triggered Meotti's op-ed was the latest example of the *Times* anti-Israel poison, an article by Jodi Rudoren "Remaking a Life, After Years in an Israeli Prison."

A few excerpts from Meotti's op-ed:

"Salah killed Israel Tenenbaum, a Holocaust survivor and security guard at a beach hotel in Netanya, hitting him on the side of the head with a metal rod.

"*The New York Times*, by telling us the daily routine of a veteran of terror and by presenting his 'version' of the events, consistently downplays the genocidal anti-Semitism and corrosive hatred that governs Hamas and Fatah, described therein as "militant" groups concerned with the social welfare of Palestinian Arabs and their families.



Giulio Meotti

"The goal of this most recent article is to continue to humanize and exculpate Arab-Islamic Palestinian terrorists who commit atrocities against Jews and stimulate the ever-increasing genocidal Arab fantasies and expectations.

"The only things more repugnant than the glorification of terrorism are all the ignorant fellow Jews who subscribe, who support and who finance the "Grey Nazi".

"If you treat Holocaust survivors killed by terrorists as a mere footnote to a narrative of Palestinian innocence and redemption, I intend to boycott you. Readers should do the same as I have with the *New York Times* and its Jewish

collaborators."

Negotiating for What?

Is Netanyahu mad? Why else should he desperately seek to extend negotiations that cannot possibly lead to any good end? It's not as if he can run out the calendar on Obama who is in place for another three years. Abbas now demands a thousand convicts selected by the P.A. plus a freeze on all Israeli construction over the green line, plus the transfer of additional territory to the control of the P.A.

As AFSI contributor Roger Gerber writes: "And what does Abbas offer in exchange for these impossible demands? An extension of the negotiations to the end of the year, at which time one can be certain that he would make additional demands for the privilege of negotiating with him further....Israel's reported offer [to release an additional 400 convicts] came only after strong pressure from Obama/Kerry for further Israeli concessions which were extracted in exchange for absolutely nothing except continuing the farcical negotiations beyond the arbitrary deadline imposed by Kerry, who now faces embarrassment if he is unable to obtain Abbas's consent to extend the talks. A possible collateral objective of both Abbas and Kerry is to cause the dissolution of the Netanyahu governing coalition if, in addition to West Bank Palestinian Arabs, duly convicted Israeli Arab murderers are released in order to obtain an extension of the talks."

The well-meaning but ever more foolish Alan Dershowitz has written an article on the proposed release of Pollard as a U.S.-provided sweetener entitled "Pollard-for-Peace Deal--a No Brainer." The deal would better be called "No brains."

Lights Out on Civilization

In obeisance to the absurd apocalypse known variously as Global Warming and Climate Change, there is "Earth Hour", sitting in the dark for an hour to atone for our wicked use of fossil fuels.



Daniel Greenfield is eloquent on the subject:

"Earth Hour stigmatizes human accomplishment as the root of all evils....Don't build, don't create and don't do are its mandates. Turn off the lights and feel good about how much you aren't doing. Environmentalism has degenerated from valuing how much the skies and the oceans, the butterfly and the beaver, the still lake and the blade of grass enrich our humanity into a conviction that all human activity is destructive because the species

of man is the greatest threat to the planet.

"Kill yourself and save the planet. Put out the lights, tear down the city and let the earth revert to some imaginary primeval paradise free of all pollution; whether it is the carbon breath of men, dogs and cows or the light pollution of their cities.

"Embrace the darkness."

Very Good News from Israel (via Michael Ordman)

The FDA has approved SYNRIPO from Israel's Teva for the treatment of patients with Chronic Myeloid Leukemia who failed therapy using tyrosine kinase inhibitors.



Israeli biotech XTL Biopharmaceuticals is gearing up for a Phase II trial of its hCDR1 compound for the treatment of Lupus (Systemic Lupus Erythematosus--SLE). HCDR1 is the first new treatment for Lupus in 50 years and was given special orphan status by the United States FDA.

Canadian army experts are looking at how the Israeli Defense Forces have successfully combated Post Traumatic Stress Disorder. The rate of suicides in the IDF is lower than that of the national population, thanks to several key support practices.

Professor Dan Peer of Tel Aviv University has devised a cluster of nano-particles that use chemotherapy to directly target tumor cells. It has achieved a 25-fold improvement in effectiveness with a dramatic reduction in toxic effect on healthy organs.

The Origins of AFSI

Erich Isaac

As a founder and the first chairman of Americans for a Safe Israel, I have been asked a number of times to say something about the origins of the organization, now forty-three years old.

To my knowledge, the only information in print is in Shmuel Katz's *The Hollow Peace* (which centers on the Camp David accords) published in 1981. This is Shmuel's brief account:

"In 1970 there arrived in Israel, for their sabbatical, a uniquely scholarly couple from the United States, Professor Erich Isaac and his wife Rael Jean. They both took an interest in the Land of Israel Movement, on which Rael wrote a doctoral thesis. They also encouraged me to implement an idea of mine and of fellow members of the movement--that I should go to the United States and there try to establish a framework for the dissemination of the movement's doctrine. Thus it came about that in the spring of 1971 I started out on my trip to the United States. With the help of the Isaacs, my first sponsors, I began to create a series of contacts there."

There is more of a back story and much more of a forward story, for Shmuel goes on to describe his meetings with leading politicians and major figures in the Jewish community rather than saying more about AFSI's founding.

As far as the back story is concerned, Rael's thesis, the research for which she did in Israel from 1969-1970 (Shmuel mistakenly said we arrived in 1970), was on the divisions the



Rael and Erich Isaac

1967 war had caused in Israeli politics and focused on both the Land of Israel Movement and the opposing peace movement. Apart from the fact that we found the Land of Israel Movement had much the most cogent arguments, it was a far more interesting movement, for it brought together prominent individuals from the hitherto bitterly ideological poles of Israeli politics. Shortly before the Six Day War, a left wing kibbutz had invited Palmach veteran Benny Marshak to debate Shmuel Katz.

Marshak had refused on the ground he would not enter the same room with Katz. Now these men, and others whose differences were no less intense, were working together on the executive of the Land of Israel Movement. (The peace movement was comprised of squabbling groups that could agree on neither the scope of retreat or to whom the relinquished territories should go.)

I was struck by how little awareness there was in the United States that the Land of Israel Movement even existed and was invited by the movement to speak on this issue at their conference in November 1969--my title "The Lack of the Movement's P.R. in the U.S." The speech was printed in the November 21, 1969 issue of *Zot Haaretz*, the movement's biweekly publication. Here is an excerpt: "At a recent meeting this month between Golda Meir and representatives of American Jewish organizations at the home of Eli Wiesel in New York, the



Shmuel Katz

idea of Erez Yisrael Hashlema (that territorial sacrifice is an existential calamity) was not even brought up in the discussion. An effort must be made to present the view that the entire land belongs to Israel, for only if the effort is made will it be possible to discover if there are potential supporters of this position." I went on to describe the most likely--and least likely--places in the Jewish community to find such support.

This need to develop support in the United States clearly touched a chord that soon resonated more deeply as the Land of Israel Movement's concerns over U.S. pressures for retreat grew. In December 1969 the Rogers Plan called for Israeli withdrawal from the Sinai and this was soon expanded by Charles Yost, U.S. ambassador to the UN, to include Israel's return to the 1949 armistice lines with Jordan.

In August 1970 Rael and I returned to New York (with our six week old sabra David in tow) and around nine months later Shmuel arrived, challenging me to put my money where my mouth was, and help in forming an organization that would advocate the perspective of the Land of Israel Movement in the United States. Shmuel felt we should emphasize the Arab doctrine of annihilation of the Jewish state and Soviet plans for expansion in the area, against which a geographically significant Israel (in the post 1967 borders) could serve as a bulwark.

Before his arrival in April 1971, Shmuel wrote to me that he had several people in mind to serve as the nucleus of the new organization, including businessmen Bernard Deutsch and Leo Bella, journalist Shlomo Ben Israel and professors Milton Arfa and Haim Leaf. City College professor Marnin Feinstein would also become part of that first core group, as did my wife's brother Joakim Isaacs and a young Nissan Teman (now, these many years later, a retired police officer in Israel). I became the group's chairman, Rabbi Nathan Schorr the first executive secretary. Initially we named ourselves Americans for a Secure Israel, until we discovered that name was already taken and we substituted Americans for a Safe Israel, under which we incorporated in New York State in 1973.

Since our goal was to influence the political debate, we produced ads against Israeli retreat (for which money needed to be raised, with my talents in this area leaving much to be desired), position papers, pamphlets and a newsletter, *Outpost*, edited by Rael. (Rael would once again become its editor in October 1996, replacing David Isaac, the infant with whom we returned from Israel in 1970.) While the references in our position papers to Soviet expansionism are now out of date (although Russian efforts may be resuming), most of what we wrote in 1971 remains up to the minute, e.g. "The Arab desire for Israel's destruction is not a result of the territory held by Israel since 1967, but of Israel's existence in any frontiers at all...It is accompanied, moreover, by a virulent anti-Semitism—directed, that is, against the Jews as such—which has adopted the demonological content and contemptuous tone that infused Nazi propaganda thrusting towards the extermination of the Jewish people a generation ago. Israel's withdrawal, to necessarily less defensible and more vulnerable lines will feed Arab ambitions to destroy her, reviving the Arab's hope of winning a future war."

Our first pamphlet, published early in 1972, was called *Contra Elon*. Like a number of AFSI's subsequent pamphlets, it exposed Jews who denigrated Israel, in this case Amos Elon, whose book *The Israelis: Founders and Sons* had made a huge splash. Attacks on Israel, especially by Israelis, then as now were championed by the *New York Times*—in Elon's case,



Herbert Zweibon

with a splashy review on the front page of the Sunday book review section. The book became a sort of "instant" campus classic on Israel partly because it was well-written but most important because of the piquancy of its ideological message: an Israeli endorses the fundamental Arab position that Israel's existence is grounded in guilt, the guilt of Jews who displaced the rightful Arab owners of the land. (In 1972 this had much greater

shock value than today when a cottage industry of Israeli academics accusing Israel of this, and worse, has grown up.) *Contra Elon* included essays by distinguished Israeli writer Moshe Shamir, *Jerusalem Post* literary editor Moshe Kohn and American writer Marie Syrkin, among others; it focused on Elon's misinterpretations, skewed perspective and errors of fact. Nissan Teman provided the translations from the Hebrew.

Rhisa Teman, Nissan's wife, designed *Outpost's* first masthead, with an arrow pointing to Israel as a bull's-eye within a huge Arab world. The first six page issue appeared in June 1972. The initial *Outpost* introduced a theme that would run through AFSI's work, the failure of Jews to distinguish friend from foe. We described the Jewish romance with Democratic Presidential candidate George McGovern despite the fact that as a Senator he was, of all the major candidates, "the *least* sensitive to Israel's problems." At the same time we described the surprising indifference of Jews to the candidacy of Democrat Senator Henry M. Jackson although "from the Jewish point of view surely Jackson constituted a candidate so perfect that no public relations man could have dared dream him up."

We livened early *Outposts* with poetry. For example in our third issue we printed a translation of the ironic poem by Nathan Alterman (a member of the Land of Israel Movement) entitled "Palestine is an Arab land." A couple of stanzas will have to suffice here:

"Stars shine and sparkle and wink,
Their trembling light exude
On the tranquil city El-Kuds
Royal seat of the King Daud.

And from there they look out on the town
El-Halil in the distance dim.
Where Ishak's father lies buried—
The Patriarch Ibrahim.

There was attrition in the original group Shmuel and I had assembled, and in the search for more adherents, I turned to my synagogue in Dobbs Ferry. There I found several sympathizers

and struck what would soon prove to be gold with Herbert Zweibon. There is no question that my chief contribution to AFSI was in recruiting Herb. What turned his initial mild interest into a lifelong passion was hearing Shmuel Katz speak at my home on his second visit in 1973. Herb would ever after only half-jokingly refer to “Katz’s curse,” for that meeting transformed Herb’s life. Herb and I were co-chairmen of AFSI for some years but Herb overwhelmingly carried the responsibility for moving AFSI forward and I bowed out, although remaining on the board of the organization.

Shmuel continued active from the sidelines with a steady barrage of letters, phone calls and periodic visits to the U.S. He loved *Outpost* (after *Outpost* No. 3 I received a note it was “so good, so easy to gobble up quickly”) our pamphlets and assorted publications, but was dissatisfied with the extent of AFSI’s reach and said as much in *The Hollow Peace*.

Shmuel never reconciled himself to the fact that a group that held fast to the ideology of



the Land of Israel Movement as AFSI did (we kept faith although the Land of Israel Movement dissolved in Israel) was never going to be a mass movement in the Jewish community. This was despite the fact that he himself ran into the central problem. He writes in *The Hollow Peace* that in trying to persuade Jewish sympathizers with Israel, he would be told “Surely Golda Meir and Moshe Dayan know all you are saying but they don’t agree with your conclusions.” It has proved far

easier to mobilize critics of Israel from the left. In clamoring that Israel is not doing enough for peace, they echo U.S. government and progressive opinion, including virtually all the media (with the added bonus they can posture as “brave dissenters”).

As time went on and Israel made major territorial concessions, each time to enthusiastic worldwide support, it grew progressively harder to find support for AFSI’s perspective. Convinced that at the end of the road Israeli retreats would bring, not peace, but national suicide, we were strongly opposed to the Camp David Accords with Egypt. To this day that treaty is considered a great achievement. Yet Israel gave up the entire Sinai, its oil, air bases, strategic depth, in return for empty promises. Egypt agreed to end demonization of Israel and normalize relations—neither of which it did. The agreement with Arafat in September 1993 on the White House lawn was so popular that Mort Klein, long time ZOA head, who thought no better of it than we at AFSI did, said it was impossible to oppose given the political climate. As a result ZOA settled for demanding “compliance” with its terms. Of course Arafat never complied but no one cared any more than they did when Egypt failed to comply with its treaty obligations with Israel earlier.

AFSI benefited not only from Herb’s unstinting devotion but from his under-appreciated excellent political imagination. It was he who initiated the outreach to Republican lawmakers (Jews were incorrigibly focused on Democrats as their supposedly natural allies) and to

evangelical Christians (staunch supporters of Israel who were woefully neglected when they were not actually vilified by Jewish organizations). Herb also recognized long before most others the danger posed by a resurgent Islam not just to Israel but to the West. In this he surpassed his political mentor, for Shmuel was slow to focus on the religious rather than the pan-Arab nature of the challenge.

Any history of AFSI has to be devoted primarily to the years under Herb's stewardship because this was when AFSI grew into a genuine organization (if never on the scale Shmuel hoped for) and made its chief contributions. This brief report is in the nature of a footnote, to give what may be future chroniclers an account of AFSI's origins, otherwise likely to disappear from the record into the historic mist.

Talking Peace and Preparing for War

Moshe Sharon

(Editor's note: This is excerpted from a much lengthier piece which Sharon wrote in February 1996 and to which he returned in October 2011. Sharon observed then that nothing had changed: "The situation in the Middle East is the same, the ideas are the same and the dangers to Israel are the same or even greater." In March 2014, the same holds true.)

There has been no change in the language or contents of the material published in the Arab countries about Israel or the Jews in the wake of the political process hailed by the Israeli and Western media as a "peace process." There has not been even the slightest attempt to get the Arab public used to what is seen in the West as a "new era."

The most outspoken in the rejection of the normalization of relations with Israel, let alone its legitimization, or its right of existence, are the Arab teachers, university lecturers, writers, and other intellectuals responsible for educating the children and young people, the would be implementers of peace.

On the other hand, since the fall of the ghetto walls in the 19th century, Jews have been at the forefront of the liberal movements in Europe and America. When the State of Israel was established these same humanistic and liberal ideas governed its political, cultural and social life.

Peace has always been the expressed policy of the government of Israel which was translated into a program of education. In the schools of Israel peace is a subject taught as part of the ordinary curriculum. Hundreds of songs about peace are constantly transmitted by the electronic media, and there is hardly a political discussion which has not touched upon the subject of peace, one way or another.

Moreover, the Israeli Left has gone out of its way in the sacrifices which it is ready to make for peace and the risks which it is ready to take, jeopardizing the virtual existence of the State. From "Brit Shalom" ("Covenant of Peace") in the thirties and the forties to "Peace Now" today, there is one straight line of thinkers, educators, artists, writers virtually begging the Arabs for Peace.

In September 1995, Israel suggested that Egypt, Jordan and Israel cooperate in a joint operation to clean the coasts of the gulf of Eilat-Aqaba. The operation was presented as a symbolic act demonstrating the peace prevailing between Israel and its two Arab neighbours. The actual cleaning of the coasts was to be carried out by students from the three countries. On September 18 the Israeli students from the University of Tel-Aviv arrived at the border pass at Taba to receive the Egyptian students. They had also presents ready for the Egyptians. They waited four hours only to be eventually told that the Egyptian side had canceled all the joint programs with the Israelis. The Jordanians had already sent a message that they refused to take part in the operation “because of political considerations.” The Israeli students, in their eagerness to demonstrate their yearning for any sign of acceptance from the Arab side, bought the bus tickets to Eilat and the presents to the Egyptians from their own pockets. “The peace is very important to us; we were eager to meet them and we are very disappointed” their spokesperson said (*Maariv*, 19.9.95).

In many cases Jewish self-hatred has brought Jews, in Israel and in the Diaspora, to condemn their own people, and their own government, whenever they can, and take the Arab side even if it involves the de-legitimization of the State of Israel, and the negation of Jewish history.

A typical case of this kind is the murder of an Arab Youth in the village of Halhul at the beginning of September 1995. Without waiting for the investigation to begin, the Left accused “Jewish extremists” as the perpetrators. Shimon Peres, then Israel Foreign Minister, immediately issued a statement: “If the murderers are Israelis this is a moral stain on the state.” This is very much in line with the practice so common in the world to accuse all the Jews for a crime of one person. A delegation of leftists, rushed to Halhul to offer condolences to the family of the deceased, and to point their accusing finger at the Jewish inhabitants of Judea. (No such delegation has ever gone to comfort the hundreds of victims of Palestinian terror). By September 17 it was clear that the murderers were Arabs--to the great disappointment of the left, whose spokesmen still would not admit that they had been wrong.



Moshe Sharon

Self-hating Jews go so far as to desecrate the memory of the Holocaust, the greatest crime ever perpetrated in human history. A university professor from Jerusalem was quick to liken the Israeli soldiers serving in Judea and Samaria to the Nazi SS murderers, and compared the children of the Jewish settlers in Hebron, one of the most important locations in Jewish history, to the Hitler Youth. The Bible, he said, was more dangerous to the human race than the notorious *Mein Kampf*. Such evil analogies are readily used by the Arabs and strengthen their arguments against the physical existence of the Jews. For after all, these are Jews who testify against themselves, and what better testimony can there be than that of the victim justifying his own executioner?

Self-hating Jews are not a new phenomenon in Jewish history. In ancient times these were the like of Zimri, or the Hellenized Jews, who were eager to introduce the foreign cults, religions and cultures into the midst of Israel and eradicate its moral fabric. Their real goal was

to see Israel melt away into “The New Middle East,” if one may use a modern hallucinatory term coined by Peres, namely, the disappearance of Israel as an independent religious and national entity.

There can hardly be a question that in Israel today many facets of Jewish self-hatred are disguised as part of a campaign for peace. Self-hatred is a sickness with which the Arabs and the Moslems have never been afflicted; moreover the Arabs have never relinquished the belief that the whole truth is on their side.

Ancient history is being re-written to suit the Palestinian’s political aim at discrediting any historical claim of Israel to the country in which it had created a great nation, an eternal culture whose ideals formed and guided Western civilization. For the last few decades, the Arab historians have been telling the world that the Canaanites, whose land ancient Israel conquered, were Palestinian Arabs, and this means that the Arabs were the original inhabitants of Palestine before Israel.

The fact that the name Palestine was given by the Greeks and then the Romans to the southern part of Syria after the name of the Philistines who had invaded the country from the islands of the Mediterranean is conveniently glossed over. The fact that the Canaanites spoke a language akin to Hebrew and thus could not have been “Arabs,” is also comfortably ignored. In the concerted effort to re-write history, the Second Temple period, no doubt the most important period in Jewish history and culture and a crucial period in the history of Christendom, is completely ignored, simply by presenting it as the period of Greek and Roman rule. And as far as Christ is concerned, Yasser Arafat has declared that he was a Palestinian freedom fighter--which makes the inhabitants of Judea in his time not Jews but Palestinians who fought against the Romans, and early Christianity an ancient version of the PLO. If the Palestinians were not so serious and self-convinced about this “historical” presentation, it would be a silly joke.

However, this is far from being a joke, because behind these supposedly “scholarly” theories lies the basic aim of the Arabs to negate any connection between the Jews and their ancient homeland.

This is also the basis of the Palestinian Covenant. The fact that an Israeli government gave recognition to an organization with this covenant is in itself the enigma of the century.

Let us remind ourselves of a few of the Clauses of this covenant:

Article 1: Palestine is the Homeland of the Arab Palestinian people; it is an indivisible part of the Arab homeland, and the Palestinian people are an integral part of the Arab nation.

This means that the Jews have no rights whatsoever to it.

Article 2: Palestine, with the boundaries it had during the British mandate, is an indivisible territorial unit.

This means that there cannot be a partition of the country.

The covenant also speaks about the means by which the “Palestinian people” are going to implement these ideas: “the armed Palestinian revolution to reject all solutions which are substitutes for the total liberation of Palestine (Article 21).”

Article 23 is even more explicit: *The demands of security and peace... require all states to consider Zionism an illegitimate movement, to outlaw its existence, and to ban its operations.*” In other words, let the whole world help the Arabs to destroy Israel.

Two thirds of the total membership of the National Congress of the Palestine Liberation Organization are needed to amend this document, which is still in force, while Israeli leaders are setting up for the Palestinians the territorial, political and military foundation for its implementation.

There can hardly be a question that the Arab side views any agreement with Israel as a strategic maneuver in the long war against the Jewish political entity, whereas the Israeli Left regards such agreements as the path to everlasting paradise. The Arab attitude to the Oslo agreements was precisely depicted in a cartoon in the Arabic (pro-PLO) daily *Al-Quds* published on December 4, 1994. It shows Rabin trying to free his leg from the letter "O" of the word "Oslo," which turned out to be a trap into which he fell.

Israeli peace movements have no counterparts in the Arab world. It goes without question that there are no programs dedicated to teaching peace in schools, there are no songs written about peace transmitted by the media. And one may ask oneself where are the present negotiations leading if future generations are being educated on the same programs of hating the Jews as before.

The peace with Egypt is nothing more than a prolonged armistice with ambassadors. No cultural relations, no tourism from Egypt, escalation in the hostility of the media. And this is supposed to be the model for peace with other Arab countries.

An overall Arab policy now being implemented with the help of the Israeli government aims at diminishing Israel to its "natural size," i.e. to totally indefensible borders.

This is why the military fervor in the Arab public has to be maintained. The "peace" should not go beyond the level of what Islam permits, *hudna*, an armistice for a limited period. In short, a half-time in the game of war, postponement of *Jihad* until the conditions to renew the war are optimal.

There is a fundamental mistake in the way this Israeli government chose to conduct the negotiations, if one may indeed call the steady withdrawal of Israel from every position which had been the guarantee for its existence "negotiations." The mistake is that major problems have not been put on the table from the very beginning. These problems are: the 1948 "refugees," the borders of the state and the future of Jerusalem. If these problems were presented from the very beginning it would have been clear whether there was anything to talk about. By postponing the major problems for a later stage while withdrawing from most of its strategic and political positions, Israel will always be in an inferior position. When the Arabs come with another new demand, there will always be the foreign minister at hand to shout "And for this we are going to jeopardize the whole peace?"

The Arabs lost their wars against Israel, but they learnt that the outcome of the war can be changed, not only because they command diplomatic supremacy over Israel, but because of the strong yearning for peace in Israel itself. The Arabs learnt, with the help of many Israeli advisers, to use the love for peace in Israel, and the intoxicating influence which this word has on the Israeli public, to create internal pressure on the Israeli government to gamble on Israel's existence by agreeing to terms which the Arabs dictate as a "price" for peace. The Arabs also know that Israeli society is an open, free and democratically motivated society. They know that Israel has a free press. They know that they can talk directly to the Israeli in the street, via his own media, and they use all these elements in order to weaken any logical assessment of the situation on the basis of past experience.

And what about the solutions?

Two points must be taken into consideration in the discussion of any possible solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict. The first is that peace between Israel and the Arabs, in the usual meaning of the word in the West, with normal and friendly relations on all levels is, as far as the eye can see, an impossible goal.

This is the bitterest and most intricate conflict in the world, involving politics, culture, religion, economy and emotions. Israel can, at maximum, be tolerated, for lack of ability to destroy it, but not legitimized.

This is why the Madrid formula was a hundred times better than the Oslo agreements. Both sides were coerced into Madrid, and the process of negotiations promised to be long and tiring. But, then, it had very important advantages: the PLO was out of the game, weak and devoid of any legitimacy. Israel negotiated directly with the Palestinians living directly under its jurisdiction, and the Syrians came to the table with very weak cards: associated with terror and implicated as directly involved in perpetrating terror actions against international aviation.

It is very possible that Madrid would not have led to "peace," but to some arrangements which would have given the Palestinians one form of autonomy or the other, and a non-belligerency agreement with the Syrians (formalizing the existing situation). This arrangement, as far as Israel is concerned, is probably better than formal peace. After all, the peace treaty with Egypt, for which Israel withdrew from the whole of Sinai, is not very much more than that.

One may say that solutions of this kind take into consideration mainly Israel's interest. This is true. Naturally we are concerned with Israel's interests, for it is not Israel that wishes to destroy the Arabs but the other way round. The Arabs can make many mistakes and they will always be safe. Israel is not allowed even one. Her first mistake would be her last.

Solutions of the kind suggested here enable Israel to retain the few strategically vital positions it has left, and prevent her from finding herself in a vulnerable situation --small and easily accessible, a tempting prey to any Middle Eastern despot with an arsenal of missile and chemical weapons who wishes to be a new Saladin.

Moshe Sharon is professor emeritus of Islamic history at the Hebrew University.

The Israeli Solution by Caroline Glick

Reviewed by Spengler

(Editor's note: The "solution" offered by Caroline Glick, treated here as "audacious" and "bold," is of course what AFSI has been advocating since its founding 43 years ago.)

By any standard, the Palestinian problem involves the strangest criteria in modern history.

To begin with, refugees are defined as individuals who have been forced to leave their land of origin. A new definition of refugee status, though, was invented exclusively for Palestinian Arabs, who count as refugees their descendants to the nth generation.

All the world's refugees are the responsibility of the United Nations High Commission on Refugees, except for the Palestinians, who have their own refugee agency, the United Nations

Relief and Works Agency for Palestine. Among all the population exchanges of the 20th century--Greeks for Turks after World War I, Hindus for Moslems after the separation of India and Pakistan after World War II, Serbs for Croats after the breakup of Yugoslavia during the 1980s--the Palestinians alone remain frozen in time, a living fossil of long-decided conflicts.



Caroline Glick

Some 700,000 Jews were expelled from Muslim countries where they had lived in many cases more than a thousand years before the advent of Islam, and most of them were absorbed into the new State of Israel with a territory the size of New Jersey; 700,000 or so Arabs left Israel's Jewish sector during the 1948 War of Independence, most at the behest of their leaders, but few were absorbed by the vast Muslim lands surrounding Israel.

Instead, the so-called refugees were gathered in camps (now for the most part towns with a living standard much higher than that of the adjacent Arab countries thanks to foreign aid) and kept as a human battering ram against Israel, whose existence the Muslim countries cannot easily accept.

Some 10 million Germans who had lived for generations in what is now Russia, Poland and the Czech Republic were driven out at the end of World War II (more than half a million died in the great displacement).

Imagine that Germany had kept these 10 million people in camps for 70 years and that their descendants now numbered 40 million--and that Germany demanded on pain of war restitution of everything from the Sudetenland to Kaliningrad (the former Königsberg). That is a fair analogy to the Palestinian position.

It is a scam, a hoax, a put-on, a Grand Guignol theatrical with 5 million extras. Because polite opinion bows to the sensibilities of the world's 1.4 billion Muslims, it is treated in all seriousness.

As a matter of full disclosure, I want to put my personal view on record: The mainstream view amounts to a repulsive and depraved exercise in hypocrisy that merits the harshest punishment that a just God might devise.

In this looking-glass world of hypocrisy and hoax, though, the most noteworthy deception is the physical existence of the Palestinians themselves: in Judea and Samaria (sometimes called the occupied West Bank), there are perhaps half the number of Arabs as the Palestinian Authority's census has counted, or the international community acknowledges. As *Jerusalem Post* reporter Caroline Glick reports in her new book, Israeli researchers have demonstrated that the 1997 Palestinian census was a fraud. The Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics [PCBS] had exaggerated the Palestinian population figures by nearly 50 percent, or 1.34 million people... First, it had inflated the existing Palestinian population base. In the 1997 census, the PCBS had included 325,000 Palestinians who lived abroad. It had also included 210,000 Arab residents in Jerusalem, who had already been accounted for in Israel's population count.

The Palestinian census had included an additional 113,000 persons whose existence was not noted in the 1996 Israeli civil administration. When the data was compared to the voter base published by the Palestinian Central Elections Commission (PCEC) in 1996 and 2005, the PCEC data substantiated the Israeli data. That is, the 113,000 people did not exist.

Taken together, these three moves increased the Palestinian base population by 648,000 people or approximately 27 percent. Imagine if the US Census Bureau had predicted that, in 2012, the United States would have a population base of 400 million, instead of its actual 2012 base size of 314 million. The second stage of the population inflation involved exaggerating future growth. First, it predicated the projections for future growth on a population base that--as we have seen--was massively inflated. Every annual growth assessment based on an inflated population model is necessarily false and inflated.

This fundamental problem was compounded by other factors. The PCBS inflated birthrates and massively inflated immigration rates. Moreover, it ignored the high numbers of Palestinians who immigrated to Israel by marrying Israeli citizens. All told, the PCBS census claimed that the compound annual growth rate of the Palestinians in Judea, Samaria, and Gaza was 4.75 percent - the highest population growth rate in the world. Significantly, just as the Palestinians were claiming to be the fastest-growing population in the world, the Arab world, and the larger Muslim world, was entering a period of unprecedented demographic contraction, even collapse.

The data are well known and long-debated; I took the same position as Ms Glick in a 2011 essay for the Jewish *webzine* *Tablet*. But Ms. Glick, an American immigrant to Israel and a former captain in the Israel Defense Forces, draws a bold conclusion: Israel should annex Judea and Samaria just as it did the city of Jerusalem. Jews will comprise a demographic majority well in excess of 60% between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean. As Palestinians continue to emigrate and Jewish immigration picks up, she adds, "some anticipate that due almost entirely to Jewish immigration, Jews could comprise an 80 percent majority within the 1949 armistice lines and Judea and Samaria by 2035".

Under Ms. Glick's plan, Israel would offer to West Bank Arabs the opportunity to apply for Israeli citizenship; all would have full civil rights, and those who chose Israeli citizenship would have voting rights as well. Israeli no doubt would earn the anathema of the international community were it to annex Judea and Samaria, but from Ms. Glick's way of looking at the matter there is little to lose.

As an American friend of the State of Israel, I do not instruct Israelis as to which of the unpleasant choices they should choose among the many that confront them. Caroline Glick's one-state plan, though, stands on its merits. As she reports, it has been obvious since the Six-Day War of 1967 that Israel required most of the West Bank in order to defend itself.

Just weeks after the end of the war, President Lyndon B. Johnson instructed the US Joint Chiefs of Staff to prepare a map of the territories that they believed Israel would require in perpetuity to ensure its ability to defend itself. A few weeks later, General Earl Wheeler, chairman of the Joint Chiefs, presented a map to Johnson that included most of Judea and Samaria, parts of the Golan Heights, the Gaza Strip, and the eastern Sinai, as well as Sharm el-Sheikh, along the Suez Canal at the southern tip of Sinai.

If you read only one book about the Middle East this year, it should be Caroline Glick's. Whether or not you agree with her conclusions, she illuminates the contorted landscape by

pointing to an audacious solution. It is only by considering alternative actions that we understand our present circumstances, and Ms. Glick concentrates the mind wonderfully.

What are the chances that the Palestinian regime might implode and force Israel's hand? The Palestine Authority, established two decades ago by the Oslo Agreements, is in extreme disarray. Its president, Mahmoud Abbas, is in the seventh year of a four-year term and loathe to call new elections, for he might lose to the Iran-backed rejectionists of Hamas, who have ruled Gaza since 2007. Abbas last year dismissed the one senior Palestinian official who might be viewed as a moderate, Salam Fayyad.

In theory, Israel might beneficially maintain the messy status quo indefinitely after the American-mediated peace talks collapse, as they inevitably must. With Syria in full-scale civil war and Egypt and Iraq in low-intensity civil war, and Turkey in a major internal crisis, the entire surrounding region is in disarray, excepting the small Kingdom of Jordan.

To presume that the bitterly divided Palestinian kleptocracy might create an island of stability amid the surrounding chaos seems whimsical. No Palestinian government can agree to a formal end of conflict with Israel on any terms without meeting violent opposition from its rejectionist constituency, much less acknowledge that Israel is a Jewish State, so there will not even be the charade of a peace agreement.

It is hard to imagine Israel executing Ms. Glick's approach unless the Palestinian Authority broke down into chaos. A powerful constituency inside Israel, with the support of the majority of the American Jewish leadership, continues to take at face value the Palestinians' own population count. The Hebrew University professor usually characterized as Israel's foremost demographer, Sergio della Pergola, continues to warn of demographic disaster for Israel (on the strength of numbers that Ms Glick and the critics have shown to be at least questionable and at worst fabricated out of whole cloth).

The chairman of one of America's largest Jewish organizations assured me recently that he continues to believe della Pergola's version of Palestinian demographics. I cannot think of another occasion in history when the question of the self-determination of a people revolved around the factual question of whether the people were there or not. The matter will be settled on the strength of the facts eventually, but clarification of the facts will not make liberal American Jews any happier.

The so-called world community, to be sure, would express outrage at the annexation that Ms Glick advocates. No doubt the European Community might try to punish Israel with economic measures, but the risk of Israeli isolation is far smaller than timid minds conceive. The efficacy of international law has been thinned by the corrosive effect of having been bathed in hypocrisy for decades. Historical rights of the kind that Israel might assert to Judea and Samaria have a certain resonance: think of China in Taiwan and Tibet, or Russia in Crimea.

Spengler is channeled by David P Goldman, author of How Civilizations Die (and why Islam is Dying, Too) published by Regnery Press. This is a slightly shortened version of the review which appeared in the Asia Times of March 31.

In Memoriam – Sheila Zweibon

We extend our deepest condolences to the Zweibon family on the recent death of Sheila Zweibon, beloved wife and helpmeet of our late Chairman Herbert Zweibon.

In Genesis [2:18](#) it says, "*And the Lord G-d said, It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make a helpmeet for him.*"

May the whole family find peace and comfort in happy memories of Sheila and Herb.

We also wish to extend particular gratitude to their son Mark Zweibon who has continued the Zweibon legacy with such generosity and grace.

On Rabbi Meir Kahane: 1932- 1990

Ruth King

Rabbi Meir Kahane, who founded The Jewish Defense League (JDL) and the Israeli political party Kach was controversial, charismatic and unrelenting. He was killed in November 1990 by an Arab gunman after delivering a fiery speech in a Manhattan hotel. Andrew McCarthy, prosecutor and author of several books on Islamic terrorism, has cited that murder as the first act of *jihad* committed in the United States by Al Qaeda.

Kahane's legacy as a staunch Zionist is blotted by the opprobrium heaped upon him, some of which he deserved.

The Jewish Defense League's vandalism and violence, in my opinion, accomplished nothing. Bombing Soviet diplomatic, cultural and trade missions did not free a single Russian Jew. The 1972 attack on impresario Sol Hurok's office for booking Soviet artists was inexcusable and caused the death of a young employee who was the daughter of a committed Zionist.



In 1971 Kahane emigrated to Israel where he was arrested more than sixty times on charges that he fomented violence in his speeches and writing. In 1984 his party Kach won a seat in Israel's parliament. Kach's platform called for a state based on Jewish law, annexing Judea, Samaria and Gaza and offering local Arabs monetary compensation to leave in order to keep a Jewish majority. Shunned and vilified by the

establishment, his popularity increased and his supporters had strong hopes for more seats in the 1988 elections. These hopes were crushed when, in 1985, probably fearing that his supporters' hopes were justified, the Knesset passed an amendment barring "racist" candidates from running.

The Knesset's banning of Kach while it tolerated openly treasonous Arabs in parliament is a blot on Israeli democracy.

With time, more and more, Kahane's writings look prescient. Here are some excerpts.

From "Amman and Jerusalem" 1968:

"There is great agitation and indignation within the United Nations today. It all centers around demands for return by Israel of the land won from Jordan last year. What land? The area that is commonly known as the West Bank of the Jordan. There is really more than a little irony in this demand. Indeed, it approaches the heights ofchutzpah. It is not only that a state which attempted to destroy another one and lost has the gall to demand terms more properly suited to a victor. It is not even the fact that the land Jordan demands was never legally and rightfully annexed by it in the first place. It is really the fact that the state that calls itself Jordan is an entity that is illegal, *per se*.

As the great holy war swung into its full gear, the little king of the little Kingdom called Jordan began to rain his shells into Jewish Jerusalem. His troops crossed the armistice line and seized territory in the no-man's land in the city. His words and acts were thrown into the battle to wipe out Israel and decimate its inhabitants.

Alas, Allah was unkind to Russia and the king's legion, and uniforms flung aside, aircraft burning, shoes cast away – the Jordanians fled east. From the plunderer came forth plunder and the Israelis swept to the Jordan to put an end to the insanity of a border that, in one place, was only fifteen miles from the Arab devil to the blue Mediterranean Sea.

The land that was taken, however, was not 'Jordanian.' It was part of pre-1948 Palestine; it was part of Eretz Yisroel, it was Jewish soil from the time of Abraham."

From "Alone" 1989:

"For as long as the Jew has even one ally, he will always convince himself that his salvation was due to that gentile. A secularized people that has lost its moorings, its anchor of Judaism, has lost, too the ability to even conceive of life in a way that transcends what it calls "logic" and "practicality" and "reality." It will always cast its bread upon the waters of the gentile ally, and it is only when they are so soggy that they sink, and the Jew is left starving, that there exists even the remotest possibility of his returning to the one and only hope – the God of Israel.

And so Israel slides towards isolation. Not the isolation that God demands, the deliberate move of the Jew towards separation and isolation and trust in the All Mighty. But the forced isolation of nations moving away from Israel either through support of its enemies or by taking an "even-handed" stance. The *ally*, American is becoming much less than that today, and tomorrow it will be worse."

From Islam and Judaism 1974: (This was written when many Israeli and Western academics—including Bernard Lewis—offered Panglossian visions of the compatibility of Islam and Israel)

“Because of the relative tolerance accorded Jews under Islam during the Middle Ages, in contrast to the terrible persecution they endured under the Christian Church during that period, a myth has arisen about Islam’s attitudes to Jews and its general tolerance in relation to other faiths. Nothing could be farther from the truth, and it would do well to examine some of the references to Jews in the Koran and in Islam in general.

All his (Mohammed’s) statements concerning Jews are filled with hate and enmity. Thus, they are called the enemies of Allah, of Mohammed of the Angel, they have disobeyed God, they practice injustice, they are a vile and treasonous lot, they have murdered Allah’s prophets, and they will be punished by hellfire.”[Kahane documents all these statements with passages from the Koran.]

This basic attitude towards Jews on the part of the Moslem religion meant that at any time of crisis the Jew could expect the hatred to rise up, and the rise of Israel brought forth pogroms, massacres and expulsion of Jews from Arab lands.

During the weeks preceding the Six-Day War”, every Friday the Mosques around Cairo read the Koranic texts dealing with the treacherous Jews. Books appeared inciting hatred and enmity against Jews.”

Kahane concludes: “The feeling that Islam is the last and perfect religion gives the Moslem a feeling of destiny and superiority that finds him incapable of accepting defeat and humiliation. The display of power by Israel and its crushing defeat of the Arab Moslem armies was a disgrace the Moslem will not accept, and those who do not understand this fact will be unable to understand the reason why Israel cannot hope to compromise with the Arabs.”

From *Christians for Zion* 1975

“.....the problem with leaders of Israel is..... they are not capable of seeing the most potent weapon Israel has in the United States, a weapon that believes itself and can convince others that the United States’ true interest is total and unconditional backing for the Jewish State.....I refer to the tens of Fundamentalist and Evangelical Protestant Christian sects, whose members number in the millions whose leaders have influence and international prestige.....They are people who believe that any effort to defeat the Jewish State is an effort to defeat the Divine plan of destiny.....They are people who believe in that which the government of Israel should believe and whose grasp of the reason for the rise of Israel--the Jewish State is, ironically and tragically, clearer than that of Yitzhak Rabin.”

There are literally hundreds of essays, some published from prison, some Messianic, but one common thread runs through all. Meir Kahane was a Zionist who was mistreated by the one country for which he would proudly have given his life.

Outpost

Editor: Rael Jean Isaac

Editorial Board: Ruth King, Rita Kramer

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

Annual membership: \$50.

Americans For a Safe Israel

1751 Second Ave. (at 91st Street)

New York, NY 10128

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

Email: afsi@rcn.com