
OUTPOST

JULY-AUGUST 1995

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

THE REPUBLICANS' MIDEAST SILENCE

Herbert Zweibon

The Republican victory in last year's Congressional elections aroused expectations of a dramatic change in the conduct of American foreign policy. The Republicans were expected to help shape a dynamic and assertive foreign policy to replace the weak and lethargic positions of the Clinton administration. Curiously, however, the Republican-controlled Congress has done very little in the area of foreign policy--and nowhere is this disturbing apathy more apparent than with regard to U.S. policy in the Middle East.

American voters, having given the Republican Party decisive majorities in both houses of Congress, had a right to expect the GOP to seek a revival of the successful foreign policy strategy of the Reagan years. Reagan's policymakers actively sought to extend American power and interests around the globe. They refused to compromise with Third World Marxist dictators. They recognized the evil of the Soviet empire, and they stood firm against it, thereby hastening its collapse.

A forceful Republican presence in the shaping of American foreign policy today would extend these principles to the Middle East.

Syria should be recognized as an aggressive and untrustworthy terrorist regime, to be confronted rather than coddled. That's how Reagan treated Nicaragua.

International thugs should not be feted at the White House and given hundreds of millions of dollars in U.S. aid. Terrorists and their sponsors should be smashed, not appeased and bargained with. That's how Reagan treated Libya.

Israel should be encouraged to defend itself, rather than be encouraged to surrender all of its strategic territory and seek the protection of foreign troops. That's how the Reagan administration responded to Israel's initial strike against the PLO in Lebanon in 1982. A weakened and shrunken Israel, dependent on outside forces for its defense, will not be able to serve American

strategic interests in the Middle East. The way things are going, by the time the "peace process" is concluded Israel will be so emasculated that its traditional role as a strategic American ally will have been badly eroded or eliminated altogether.

So far, there has been plenty of talk from prominent Republicans, but not much action. Several of the Republican senators and representatives who control the key Congressional foreign policy committees have said that they oppose putting troops on the Golan Heights and want to put restrictions on U.S. aid to the PLO (although any aid is an endorsement of the so-called "peace process"). But when it comes to translating that talk into action, suddenly those congressmen are silent.

No hearings have yet been scheduled to discuss the risks of stationing GIs on the Golan. No hearings have been scheduled to discuss whether this "process" is in the best interest of the American people.

The Republicans are abdicating their responsibility to the American public. Americans have a right to know all the dangers involved in placing their boys on the Golan Heights. Americans have a right to be sure that their money is not paving the way for the creation of an Arab terrorist state. Americans have a right to know the full costs--financial, political, strategic and moral--of the commitments that the Clinton administration wants to make in the Middle East. Americans have a right to know, and the Republicans have an obligation to find out and tell them.◇

Herbert Zweibon is chairman of Americans For a Safe Israel.

IN THIS ISSUE:

<i>Zion in Siberia</i>	...4
<i>Time Serves Israel's Enemies</i>	...5
<i>Capitals and Embassies</i>	..7
<i>Too Many Remembrance Days</i>	...10

From the Editor

ARAFAT'S SWISS BANK ACCOUNTS

Rep. Ben Gilman (R-NY), chairman of the House International Relations Committee, last year asked the General Accounting Office (GAO) to undertake a formal study of the PLO's financial holdings. Just how much money Yasser Arafat has stored away in Swiss bank accounts or elsewhere is something the American public has a right to know before Congress approves the Clinton administration's plan to send \$100-million a year, for five years, to the PLO. After all, if the British Intelligence Service was correct when it calculated, last year, that the PLO has \$8-\$10 billion in holdings and an annual income of \$1.5-2 billion, many Americans will legitimately wonder why the U.S. should give it more money.

The GAO completed its study in June. Ostensibly, this was perfect timing since the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act, the legislation that allows U.S. money to go to the PLO, will expire in mid-August.

The GAO study, rumored to reveal the true net worth of the PLO, has been declared "classified" in order to prevent its politically embarrassing contents from becoming widely known. Although some members of Congress have access to the report, none appear interested in taking up the cudgels for releasing it. Remarkably, Congressman Gilman, who initiated the study, has been equally silent.

Congressional apathy is another ghastly tribute to the effectiveness of the Rabin government's political steamroller, flattening all potential voices of reason.◊

JERICHO: A SUCCESS STORY OF TERROR

Two recent reports on the situation in Jericho make for an interesting comparison: "Misery and Terror Reign in Jericho," a May 1995 *Yesha Report* supplement, and "A Success Story in Jericho," an account of a trip by AIPAC lobbyists, which appeared in *Near East Report* (June 1995).

The first reveals that the 1,000 security men in the town have "imposed a regime there comparable to the glory days of the Soviet dictatorship," describing incidents of PLO police brutality and torture.

One particularly gruesome account is the torture and murder of Salman Jel'aita:

*They ripped his skin off with pliers,
bound him with wet ropes and hung him*

by the hands from the ceiling. They hit him in the face with punches, steel rods and gun barrels. I saw the body after they murdered him. There were bruises on the forehead, around the neck, the hands were broken, probably by a pipe. Salman was a swimmer, was never sick--how can these liars claim that they don't know the cause of his death. They didn't even give him water. One of the interrogators told me that Salman died while he was begging for water.

Salman's mother-in-law says, "I curse Israel for bringing these gangsters here. We don't want them here. Rabin is the one who brought them--so let him take them back...We don't want this Palestine. You Israelis come back to Jericho."

In "A Success Story in Jericho," sunshine and joy waft through the sleepy town. This "peace process" fluff piece in AIPAC's publication begins: "Nearly buried under the daily reports of confrontations and hatred lies a heartening story of friendly cooperation between Israelis and Palestinians." Israeli soldiers and PLO police patrol with warmth, Israeli and Arab cars intermingle without incident, and PLO police assigned to guard Jews praying in the town's sixth-century synagogue "are particularly proud of this assignment."

The story even relates how Israeli soldiers presented a PLO policeman with a birthday cake. The worst news is a traffic accident. "We were later relieved to hear that the injuries were not serious." In this Eden of cooperation, even car collisions are harmless.

Naturally, there is no hint that Jericho's residents are beaten, tortured, and murdered. The article ends with unintentional irony: "Hopefully, future Israeli-Palestinian agreements will be as successful."◊

Outpost

is published by
Americans For a Safe Israel
147 East 76 St.
New York, NY 10021
tel (212) 628-9400 / fax (212) 988-4065

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

"RENOVATING" MEMORIAL DAYS

Aharon Megged

(Translated from Yediot Ahronot, April 24, 1995)

Last Friday, I read in *Ha-Ir* (The City) a long article on the Kedma high school in Shikun Hatikva, whose principal is Sammy Shalom Shitreet, the author of erotic and politically provocative poetry. He has decided on changing everything connected with our national rituals.

Yom Hashoah (Holocaust Memorial Day), for example, will no longer "merely" commemorate six million Jews destroyed in Europe by the Nazis, but will also commemorate the holocaust of the Armenians, the Indians, the gypsies, the blacks, even the homosexuals. I shall present the Shoah, said Shitreet, "as a link in the chain of acts of mass annihilation in the course of history." Shitreet says that he does not accept the notion that we are talking about insanity and madness. "We must cancel out the exclusivity of the Jewish Holocaust." In other words, in the debate which has gone on for some years between a few German historians who argue that the Holocaust of the Jews of Europe in the 1940s was a fairly modest matter and the great majority of historians, Germans included, who point out the Satanic character of this Holocaust, planned and carried out from above as the implementation of a racial ideology focused on the total destruction of the Jewish people, poet-philosopher-historian Shitreet has decided in favor of those few German historians.

And so, while people throughout the world, even Germany, carry out commemoration ceremonies for the six million slaughtered Jews in Auschwitz and the other camps, in ghettos and the pits of destruction, the children in the Kedma school will light candles commemorating blacks, Indians and homosexuals.

A week later, Mr. Shitreet plans to carry out yet another revolution. The day of commemoration for the fallen of the Israel Defense Forces "will also include new messages. The students will learn the wars of Israel as part of the wars of the entire world, as part of the first World War between the imperialistic nations, as part of the Vietnam war, as part of the drug wars in Columbia, as part of the tribal wars of Rwanda." The spokesman for the Ministry of Education said, "Maybe a message will go out from Kedma to the entire system...[Education] Minister Rubenstein is firm in his support for Kedma." And surely the day is not far off when Kedma and indeed the entire system will determine that "the day of commemoration for the fallen of the IDF will also be a day of commemoration for the fallen of the Palestinians and the PLO."

And why not? Does not the attachment to absolute justice and equality for all human beings without

difference of religion and race, demand that? True, the most enthusiastic liberals in England and the most orthodox radicals in the United States have not yet proposed that their national memorial days for the victims of the Second World War should include lighting candles for the Nazis who fell in the war. But then "Who is like thy people Israel, unique on earth, pursuing justice and truth?"

He's a "courageous man," says the writer in *Ha-Ir*, expressing his confidence that the innovative texts read

And so, while people throughout the world, even Germany, carry out commemoration ceremonies for the six million slaughtered Jews in Auschwitz and the other camps, in ghettos and the pits of destruction, the children in the Kedma school will light candles commemorating blacks, Indians and homosexuals.

in Kedma will teach the students to be a little bit more human than the texts impregnated with nationalism that come to us from writers like Shlonsky, Alterman, Guri and Hannah Senesh.

What is so surprising? Anyone who has followed for the last twenty years and more, the majority of statements about the Palestinians in the Israeli press, anyone who follows the plays, the films, the satire, will know how much we "understand" the feelings of the PLO. Of course, we condemn the terror; we are shaken, naturally, by incidents of Arab suicide bombers (one always talks about "incidents" even when the number of victims reaches into the dozens). "Slaughter" only happens in the Cave of the Patriarchs (when a Jew is responsible). The burning, consuming hatred that cries out for drastic action, one keeps exclusively for the settlers.

And so, if we understand the Arabs so well--they are, after all, freedom fighters as we were in the old days --why should we not mourn their dead? One thing is beyond doubt. The strongest statements in those memorial ceremonies for the PLO will be written not in Arabic, but in Hebrew.

And may the redeemer come soon to Zion.◇

Aharon Megged is a leading Israeli writer.

CHECHNYA AND THE 'SIBERIAN ZION'

Benton Arnovitz

In the never-ending rounds of Middle East talks conducted in public forums, in back channels, and in backstairs closets, "land in exchange for peace" is the formula both the guileful and the conflict-weary guileless would use to draw Israel into concessions to those who claim the same territory. Never mind that Arab entities possessed the land of the "West Bank" and Gaza District and all of the Golan for decades; from those strategic positions their demonstrated objective was the complete eradication of the Jewish State. The continuing terrorist atrocities are all the more reason then that an experience-chastened Israeli leadership should not succumb to pressures from proven enemies and some perhaps latently perfidious allies. In this country only some believing Christians are likely to set any store by the fact that many believing Jews see the soil of Israel as having been deeded by a Supreme Landlord, coming under a

divine proscription against alienating any portion of a holy land from the people Providence has chosen to inhabit it.

Be that as it may, there is a chunk of Jewish land, larger, in fact, than the whole State of Israel, that may be coming onto the market to appease those who've sworn to wrest land from the Jews. The unwitting author of this unprecedented opportunity? Joseph Stalin.

The centrifugal forces that splintered the former "unshakable union" of Soviet socialist republics (the "big empire") now are mirrored by long-anticipated disruptive "regionalization" forces in the Russian Federation (the "smaller empire"). The Chechens are merely today's most militant of a host of subjugated peoples, with the Osetians, Muslim Tartars, Dagestanis, Ingush, and others bidding fair to realize their own long-stifled national aspirations. If any of the constituent autonomous republics and autonomous regions (oblasts) still confined within Russia proper are finally to have their day in the sun--as seems entirely possible if Russia is not to spend itself in tar-baby exertions of perpetual warfare along its southern and eastern marches--this foreshadowed chain of events opens the door to a providential opportunity to solve the world's most intractable problem.

Among the world's least known backwaters of empire, hundreds of miles up the Amur River, smack astride the Trans-Siberian Railway, and hard against the

Chinese border, there's been, of all things, a *de jure* Jewish state perched for more than sixty years. Birobidzhan, created by Stalin as a substitute Zion and "national home for Jews," is enshrined in retained and still-operative vestiges of the Soviet-era Russian constitution, and it exists to this day as the Jewish Autonomous Region. We need not trouble ourselves that Birobidzhan's Jews are outnumbered in their territory by members of other nationalities; the Latvians were a minority, say CIA figures, in the republic the United States government has been happy to recognize, as were the Khirgiz and Khazakhs in their newly-minted sovereign states. Trumpeted for decades as the legitimate alternative to Jewish Palestine and then Israel, the Soviets for a time actually encouraged immigration of foreign-born Jews to build Birobidzhan, succeeding in attracting some from Latin America, the United States, and even British Palestine.

The time is right, then, for a second Jewish state to line up for independence along with the numerous Muslim republics, autonomous republics, and autonomous regions of former Soviet Asia and the Caucasus, and to take its place in the forums of the world. It would not be the first time that there have been two Jewish states: the kingdoms of Israel and Judah coexisted for centuries during antiquity. Neither would this course occasion the first Jewish state on the land mass that eventually became the Soviet Union: the Khazar Empire was for other centuries the mightiest power in what is today the Ukraine and southern Russia. And if powerful elements in the sovereign republic of Moldova can work toward its incorporation into ethnically similar Romania, and the Turkic Tatars and other central Asians can proclaim their affinities for the established Moslem states to their south, why should not an independent Birobidzhan seek to link up with Israel?

Yet why is one so sure that this prospect, manifest in all the pregnant trends of these times, will find so little favor in Christendom and with the Islamic world? But perhaps, just perhaps, a deal can be struck--one that won't so rend the accustomed international fabric. In exchange for universal (read also Iranian, as well as Syrian, Iraqi, and Palestinian Arab) recognition of the Jewish State of Israel within borders approximating those of 1948 British Mandate Palestine, it is not too much to suspect that even World Jewry's most ardent claimants of land east of the Jordan would be prepared to see ceded to the Palestinians all the territory of Jewish Birobidzhan--an area, one should add, long described by the Palestinians' Soviet patrons as "the land of promise."

Farfetched? Only a dozen years ago it seemed that the process of Jewish dispossession had actually started. The May 1, 1983, *New York Times* ran an article entitled "Soviets Wooing Moslems to East." It read, in part:

"The Soviet Government, in an effort to populate

(Continued on p. 10)

TIME SERVES ISRAEL'S ENEMIES

Louis Rene Beres

I have often wondered why so many intelligent people, including strong supporters of Israel, are strong supporters of the so-called "Peace Process." How can it be, I ask, that they are so strikingly naive?

The other day, my wife Valerie offered an answer, a good answer: "These people," she volunteered, "don't really believe that Israel can die. They assume that the Third Temple is necessarily forever."

But the Third Temple is *not* necessarily forever.

Nowhere is it written that the State of Israel will survive irrespective of how it acts to defend itself. Quite the contrary! The State of Israel, in the fashion of every other state in the world, is altogether mortal. And the imminence of its mortality--the immediacy of dangers to its survival--depends largely upon its commitment to appropriate forms of self-defense.

Let us be candid. Confronted by the spread of ballistic missiles and unconventional weapons among its enemies, Israel now faces a plight that is decidedly *existential*.

Taken together with an ongoing "Peace Process"--a codified surrender of essential Israeli lands for unsecured and implausible promises of nonbelligerency--this plight is unprecedented for the Jewish State.

It follows that Israel must decide, quickly, whether or not its commitment to endure is overriding, and--if it is--what must be done to support that commitment.

In his timely work *The Firebugs*, Swiss playwright Max Frisch tells the distressing story of Gottlieb Biedermann, a cautious businessman who contends with an epidemic of arson by implementing a deadly series of self-deceptions. Ultimately, Biedermann invites the arsonists into his home, lodges them, feeds them a sumptuous dinner, and even provides them with matches. Not surprisingly, the play ends, for Biedermann on an incendiary note. It also ends, predictably, with a pathetic and revolting disclaimer from an academic "expert" who has counseled appeasement all along.

There is an enormously important lesson here for Israel. Faced with an epidemic of "arson," largely from militant Islamic terrorists, Jerusalem has responded exactly like the playwright's weak and foolish character. Inviting the terrorists into Israel's very home, because it believes that entreaty and capitulation are preferable to courage and struggle, the government of Israel, too, is prepared even to help light a fuse.

To a significant extent, the terrible harm that has been done to Israel by Rabin and Peres cannot be undone. Indeed, by creating the conditions whereby each successive act of anti-Israel terrorism now compels the

government to reaffirm its commitment to the Oslo Process, Rabin and Peres have created a lose-lose scenario. Should they begin to back off from such explicit reaffirmations, all those who have set out to destroy the Process will have been successful. Should they maintain such reaffirmations, the steady "progress" of the Process will ensure escalating levels of terror and of fatal or near-fatal forms of "arson."

What, then, must be done?

Again, it is time for candor. The "Peace Process" was destined to fail. Spawned by years of Israeli frustrations, but unsupported by even months of serious intellectual investigations, the Process not only destroys Israel's security by increments, it now even transforms

Why are so many intelligent people strong supporters of the so-called "Peace Process"?

heroic Jewish settlers into enemies of the Jewish State while it celebrates the PLO as "our Palestinian partners" (the obscene term used by the government only minutes after the Tel Aviv bus bombing).

There is more. Although virtually all indictments of the "Peace Process" have focused upon the terrorist threat, this Process also expands Israel's vulnerabilities to enemy state missile attack.

Israel, like every other state in the world, is a *system*. Assaults upon this "body" are not merely additive; they are synergistic. The interactive effects between multiple minor assaults are already combining to equal much more than the sum of their parts. Over time, these effects could so weaken Israel that certain enemy states, witnessing this weakening, could be encouraged to attack. Israel's enemies understand time. Israel does not!

Time is not on Israel's side. Crippled by the "Peace Process," Israel will sooner or later be a critically weakened "organism," a system no longer capable of warding off deadly "pathogens." Arab states and Iran understand this. Most of Israel does not! (By Arab states I include Egypt and, for the most part, Jordan).

Taken separately, Israel's ongoing surrender of territories, its consequent reluctance to accept certain indispensable preemption options (how long can Israel allow Iran to proceed with its uninterrupted nuclearization?) and its negotiation of "peace agreements" will not bring about an end to the Third Temple.

Taken together, however, these "insults," occurring, as they do, within a pattern of growing worldwide chaos and anarchy, will have a critically undermining effect on the Israeli "organism."

Permit me to return to time.

(Continued on p.6)

ISRAEL'S ENEMIES

(Continued from p.5)

Incremental territorial surrenders by Israel reduce the amount of time that Israel would have to resist particular military and/or terrorist assaults.

Moreover, such surrenders, considered cumulatively, provide time for Israel's enemies to await optimal strategic opportunity.

Hence, in an apparent but inauthentic paradox, time now serves Israel's enemies by both its diminution and by its extension. It is not yet too late. For Israel, there is still time to recover, still an opportunity to transform time from a source of debility into a source of power. To survive into the future, to ensure preservation of the Third Temple, Israel must now draw understanding from the ancient Hebrew experience of time as the essential flux of righteousness and strength.

While the Greeks experienced time as the decline of order, the Hebrews identified it as the source of unlimited opportunity and even of messianic liberation

and redemption. In this identification, of course, ancient Israel understood little concerning the coincident importance of political space.

There is something else.

For Israel, the power of time is made manifest not only by its relationship with space, but also as the source of *memory*.

By recalling the historic vulnerabilities of Jewish life in the world, and by recalling always that others will not recall, Israel's leaders could still begin to undertake needed steps back from Jerusalem's self-propelled dissolution.

Aware that tomorrow will be determined in large measure by yesterday, especially by the memory of yesterday, Rabin and Peres have yet another chance (a chance not to be missed) to recognize that time is power.

Sadly, it is not likely that the government will avail itself of this chance. Rather, this task will fall upon the next government of Israel--hopefully a Likud government that will act quickly and decisively to undo the terrible and terrorizing foolishness of the "Peace Process."

In so doing, this government should understand and acknowledge the fundamental illegality of the "Peace Process" itself, an illegality made manifest in terms of both domestic and international law.

From the standpoint of violations of Israel's

national law, a Jerusalem attorney, Howard Grief, has offered a compelling and authoritative jurisprudential argument (based largely on alleged Constitutional law violations committed by Rabin and Peres; non-compliance with Civil Law principles governing juridical capacity; and illegal usurpation of powers by the government assigned, by law, to the Knesset).

From the standpoint of international law, the case against the "Peace Process" is even more compelling, resting--as it does--upon the peremptory norm of *Nullum crimen sine poena*, "No crime without a punishment."

As the Oslo Agreement violates this peremptory or *jus cogens* rule (because it not only fails to punish terrorists; it dignifies and rewards them), abrogation of the "Peace Process" by Israel is not only permissible, it is obligatory.

No crime without a punishment!

This rule of law was reaffirmed at Nuremberg in 1945-46, and in particular response to crimes against the Jewish people. Further, the concept of no crime without a punishment was cited specifically by Gideon Hausner, Israel's Attorney General, in his prosecution of Nazi war criminal Adolf Eichmann.

This suggests that the current State of Israel has a *special* obligation to stand by this basic rule regarding PLO terrorist crimes and Israel's juridical relationship to the PLO--*an obligation greater perhaps than that of any other state in the world*. For Israel to willfully reject such an obligation, a rejection which has in fact already occurred, may be *especially* violative of international law and, as a non-jurisprudential aside, is *especially* shameful for the Jewish State.

There is another valid argument for abrogation. Israel's people and leadership should recall the warning of an early American president, Thomas Jefferson: "The nation itself, bound necessarily to whatever its preservation and safety require, cannot enter into engagements contrary to its indispensable obligations."

In his essay, "Opinion on the French Treaties" (April 28, 1793), Jefferson deduced permissible grounds for avoiding otherwise useful international agreements from what he termed "the law of self-preservation." Following Vattel, and in conscious opposition to Grotius, Pufendorff and Wolf, Jefferson declared that even treaties already in force "are null and not at all obligatory" where they may bring about the "ruin of the nation." Recall, here, that the Israel-PLO agreement is not even a treaty under international law.

One final word about current negotiations and Israel's security. These negotiations, by creating an illusory climate of peace, make it practically impossible for Israel to preemptively destroy enemy state unconventional weapons facilities (*hard* targets). Here, my most urgent concern is Iran and Iranian nuclearization. Should Iran be permitted to proceed any further with this

(Continued on p.11)

ON CAPITAL CITIES AND EMBASSIES

Lester Kinsolving

Thirty-five years ago, as part of the centennial observance of the Civil War, the Pulitzer Prize-winning historical writer MacKinlay Kantor wrote his brief but intriguing book, *If the South Had Won the Civil War*.

This giant hypothesis and imaginative rearrangement of history hinged on two possibilities that could very well have happened, but did not.

The first was a very large horse--brought along on the campaign to take Vicksburg, as a reserve steed for Major General Ulysses Grant. This huge animal was badly startled by the whistle of a nearby riverboat, along with a dog in hot pursuit of a cat. So this horse reared up on its hind legs, so suddenly that it lost footing and fell upon the general, crushing him.

This lethal accident occurred before the campaign could really get underway. After the funeral, command went to a "political general": John McClerand of Illinois, who proceeded to lead the Union Army into disaster and surrender.

Weeks later in 1863, on July 1st, in the Pennsylvania town of Gettysburg, the Union Army of the Potomac suffered a defeat, and retreated through the town to set up a battle line on Cemetery Ridge. But the Confederate Army corps of General Richard Ewell kept up a steady attack and occupied the high ground of Culp's Hill at the edge of Cemetery Ridge, in obedience to very definite orders to do so from the commanding general, Robert E. Lee. "I never thought Dick Ewell could move so fast!" Lee was heard to mutter by one of his aides.

Here, they brought up artillery which devastated the Union battle line. The following morning, Confederate infantry hit the artillery-battered U.S. forces from both sides; and J.E.B. Stuart's cavalry, which had arrived the previous night, helped complete the rout and near-annihilation. It was a disaster far worse than the battles at Manassas or Fredericksburg or Chancellorsville.

This resulted in the end of the war, after the White House was besieged by a mob. The President and his family were rescued by cavalry wearing rain slickers, to cover their Confederate uniforms. They were led by Major John S. Mosby, the famed partisan ranger, who conducted the Lincolns to Richmond. Lincoln was released from prison in the spring of 1864, after the Treaty of Washington, on December 16th formally ended the war. He returned to Springfield, Illinois and the practice of law.

Maryland opted to join the victorious new country, the Confederate States of America. The people and leaders of Maryland reasoned that their legislature had been seized, illegally, by Union troops under the command of General Benjamin ("Beast") Butler, who also

threatened to turn his artillery upon the strongly secessionist city of Baltimore.

Maryland and Kentucky were welcomed into the Confederacy by the newly elected President Robert E. Lee...Washington replaced Richmond as the capital of the Confederate States of America, among other reasons because it had been named for another Virginia rebel, of a previous century, in what was called the First War of Independence.

The new capital of the United States was

How would we feel...if the British, insisted upon having their Embassy located in a city that is not the capital of the United States?

Columbus, Ohio.

...Slavery was subsequently abolished in the Republic of Texas, which had seceded from the Confederacy and become an independent nation once more...[A]fter the Spanish-American War, Cuba, in gratitude for its liberation from Spain...opted to become a state of the C.S.A.

The three nations, Texas, the CS and the US, fought well as allies in both the First and Second World Wars. In 1961, during the Cold War, their Presidents and other Congressional leaders met together in the Confederate capital of Washington, for the purpose of a conference to plan the reuniting of the American peoples.

This conference opened on April 12, 1961, the 100th anniversary of what all three presidents referred to as "the tragedy of Fort Sumter."

It can be fascinating to play the game of "What if?"

Consider Queen Victoria's government, and their reaction to "The Trent Affair." The Union Navy detained the British packet ship *Trent*, from which they took Confederate diplomats Mason and Slidel into imprisonment --despite their being envoys to Great Britain.

What if Lord Palmerston, Britain's Prime Minister, had issued the following statement in the name of Her Britannic Majesty:

"The Lincoln government in Washington has violated every known tenet of diplomacy in kidnapping two fully-accredited diplomats from the government of the Confederate States of America to the Court of St. James.

"This atrocious seizure on the high seas is not only an egregious insult to the people of the British Empire and the Government of Her Britannic Majesty. But the Lincoln government has also trampled upon the rights of what was clearly recognized in the Treaty of Paris, as the free, sovereign, and independent state of Maryland, whose legislature has been seized by force of arms, and

(Continued on p.8)

CAPITAL CITIES

(Continued from p.7)

whose principal city of Baltimore has been threatened by artillery, while its citizens, including journalists, clergy and judges, have, without trial or right of *Habeus Corpus*, been imprisoned.

"Therefore, Her Majesty's Embassy to United States will immediately be removed--and relocated--in New York."

How would the people of the United States have reacted had the British, for 48 years, insisted upon having their Embassy located in a city that is *not* the capital of the United States?

How would we feel?

We would feel as outraged as most of the Israelis--at the spectacle of the United States Embassy being located in Tel Aviv, rather than in Israel's capital city of Jerusalem.

* * *

In the City of New York, which is the home of more Jews than live in Tel Aviv, Haifa, or Jerusalem, it is interesting to note the differences of editorial opinion in two of New York's most widely circulated daily newspapers.

One of these newspapers is owned by an at least nominally Jewish family, the Sulzbergers. The other is owned by a nominally Christian, naturalized American

citizen: a native Australian named Rupert Murdoch.

The Sulzbergers' *New York Times* is regarded by many Jews--especially Zionists--as one of the world's most subtle and insidiously anti-Israel newspapers.

Consider the *Times*' recent editorial, "A Republican Rush on Jerusalem":

"Bob Dole, the Senate majority leader, and House Speaker Newt Gingrich have managed a rare feat in the contentious Middle East--uniting the Israeli Government and the Palestine Liberation Organization against their efforts to move the United States Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. The legislation offered by the two Republicans would rush ahead of a second round of peace talks beginning next year, that are supposed to address Jerusalem's status.

"Israeli and Palestinian leaders understandably see this legislation intervention as ill-timed and a threat

to the already wounded peace talks. Fortunately, the Clinton Administration is alert to the danger. Similar legislation to move the embassy was vetoed by Ronald Reagan in 1984.

"Israel, which considers Jerusalem its capital, cannot formally oppose the Republican bills, but Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, on a visit to Washington last week, made plain his view that raising the embassy issue now embarrassed his government and primarily served the interests of Israel's hawkish opposition party, the Likud.

"The Palestinians, despite Israel's insistence that Jerusalem will forever remain unified, envision the old eastern part of the city as the capital of a hoped-for Palestinian state. As part of the Oslo peace agreements, Israel agreed to begin formal discussions on Jerusalem's status starting in 1996."

The *New York Times*, on the same day as the editorial, published on its op-ed page a column by Thomas L. Friedman, the *Times*' one-time Jerusalem correspondent.

I remember, vividly, watching Mr. Friedman at work, when we both covered the graduation address of President Clinton at West Point. An attractive lady major came to the speakers platform just before the arrival of the President and his party. This officer instructed everyone: "When the President and his party arrive, please stand and applaud." Since the United States Military Academy is no center of either dissent or defiance of orders, that is exactly what everybody did. The following morning I saw that Mr. Friedman reported that President Clinton had received "a standing ovation!"

Friedman's column, headlined "O Jerusalem," catches Sen. Robert Dole in conflicting statements about relocating our embassy in Jerusalem. But these statements are five years apart--not overnight, like Friedman's report of what happened and what really *did* happen, vis a vis "standing ovation"...

Friedman wrote: "Mr. Rabin is right. The pressing issue today is not the status of Jerusalem. Jerusalem is going to remain Israel's capital no matter what anyone says. The most important questions today are the status of the U.S., as the only credible mediator in the Arab-Israel conflict, and the status of the Israel-Palestinian negotiations. The U.S. has played an essential mediating role. Why should Washington now abandon that position and take sides--not with the Israeli government, but with the Israeli opposition parties, who want to use the emotional issue of Jerusalem to explode the whole peace process?...If the U.S. rams the embassy in there right now--and moves Jerusalem from the last stage of negotiations to center stage--the enemies of peace will have a field day, the Palestinian negotiators will be discredited, and the Arab states will surely slow their normalization with Israel."

Such effete, Foggy Bottom psychobabble shows

(Continued on p.11)

SPOTLIGHT ON THE EXTREMISTS

"Jerusalem must be the capital of the two states that will live side by side in this country--West Jerusalem, the capital of the State of Israel and East Jerusalem, the capital of the State of Palestine," declared an advertisement that appeared in Israeli newspapers in mid-June, signed by 143 Israeli leftists. Many of the signatories were veteran extremists, such as **Lea Tsemel**, the attorney who defends Arab terrorists pro bono, and **Yehoshua Sobol**, the radical-left playwright. There were, however, others who are not normally associated with the fringe-left campaign to redivide Jerusalem, including **Avishai Margalit** of Peace Now; feminist activist **Alice Shalvi**; historians **Ilan Pappé** and **Amnon Raz-Krakotzkin**; former *Jerusalem Post* reporter **Robert Rosenberg**; and attorney **Moshe Negbi**, who frequently appears in the Israeli media as a commentator on legal affairs. Although Negbi does not usually wear his opinions on his sleeve, his critics recall an unpleasant episode that took place in 1983, when Negbi was host of an Israel Radio legal affairs program called "Din U'Dvarim." Negbi deviated from legal commentary into attacks on the Begin government so frequently that the station managers finally had no choice but to change his show from a live broadcast to a taped and edited version...

...A recent news report distributed by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency suggested that Israelis were about evenly divided over whether or not the U.S. Embassy should be moved to Jerusalem. As evidence, it cited the recent appearance of two op-eds in an Israeli newspaper about the Embassy controversy, one for moving it and one against. The implication was that each represented approximately equal segments of Israeli opinion. The author of the essay against moving the Embassy was identified only as "commentator Ben-Dror Yemini." What the JTA reporter neglected to mention is that **Ben-Dror Yemini** is a far-left extremist whose views represent only a tiny minority of Israelis. Yemini was one of the founders, in 1985 of the radical-left "Oriental Front" organization, which specialized in holding highly-publicized, illegal meetings with Arab terrorist leaders in various European countries...

...A delegation from Americans for Peace Now visited Israel in July, and met with PLO officials **Faisal Hussein** (who spent time in prison for assisting an Arab terrorist cell) and **Nabil Sha'ath** at the PLO's Orient House headquarters in eastern Jerusalem--even though Israeli law prohibits the PLO from meeting foreign delegations there. A Peace Now spokesman was quoted by *Ha'aretz* as "explaining" that the meeting was held in Orient House because "that is Hussein's residence"...

NOW AVAILABLE FROM AFSI:

Videos

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

NBC in Lebanon: A Study in Media Misrepresentation
58 minutes - Purchase \$50; rental \$25

Books

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

Oleg in Peaceland: Cartoons by Oleg Schwartzburg
\$9.95 (non-members: \$10.95)

Eye on the Media: A Look at News Coverage of Israel
by David Bar-Illan - \$14.95 (non-members: \$15.95)

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

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

Monographs

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

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

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

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

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

...Two PLO youth leaders and a Jordanian associate were scheduled to visit Yad Vashem in March, accompanied by leaders of the Labor Party Young Guard and a delegation from the European Parliament's committee on youth affairs. Shortly before the visit, however, the three Arabs informed their hosts that they had to cancel, on orders from the PLO leadership in Jericho...

...In a letter to the *Jerusalem Post*, the historian **Martin Gilbert** publicly denounced an Israeli organization that sponsored an advertisement exposing the hypocrisy of international attacks on the Israeli government's Jerusalem land expropriations...

TOO MANY REMEMBRANCE DAYS

Eli Kenin

To the Israeli ear, the songs are familiar, the soft piano rhapsodies, the lyrics which speak of loss and broken worlds, of "tears that flow into the sea." They are the songs of Remembrance Day, the thoughtful prelude to Independence Day which immediately follows. Many are the same melodies carried through the air waves that reach Israelis in their homes, cars and offices on Holocaust Day, commemorated one week before.

Israel's national holidays and anniversaries have been crafted by history and design beginning with Holocaust Day and ending a month later with Jerusalem Day. The two days of sorrow counterbalance the two days of rejoicing in which Israelis celebrate the regaining of national sovereignty in 1948 and the recovery of the eternal symbol of that sovereignty, Jerusalem, in 1967. It is a cycle that reflects the symmetry between the sacrifices and rewards required to keep the dream of a Jewish homeland alive.

For a people who have endured so much for their independence, two days of thoughtful recollection are not excessive. Holocaust Day recalls a tragedy which convinced those remaining doubters of the need for a Jewish state. Remembrance Day commemorates those who have fallen defending it. Both memorial days, juxtaposed to the jubilation of Independence Day, are poignant.

This year, however, as we completed the cycle with Jerusalem Day, there was a feeling that we have heard those same sad songs all too much. It is a case of overkill...literally. Each mass murder by Hamas' s human bombs has been followed by a short radio announcement promising more details as they become available. Suddenly, the rock music, the talk shows and other daily fare of the Israeli airwaves fall silent, replaced by those same melancholy tunes of Holocaust and Remembrance Days. The exception to this was the Hadera bus bombing which itself took place on Remembrance Day 1994.

Afula, Hadera, Dizengoff Street, Beit Lid and Kfar Darom were tragedies whose human proportions seemed to go beyond the ever-increasing terrorist acts to which we have become overly accustomed. If one or two are killed, it becomes a news flash. Mass murder becomes a mass media event, a day when everyone remembers the terror that can erupt in the lives of ordinary Israeli citizens. This may fulfill the terrorists' objectives, yet it also reminds us of the feebleness of a government which promised Western-style peace and prosperity, but brought the terrorism of Lebanon to the heart of its cities.

"We stood here a year ago and prayed for peace, but we have not ceased to accompany the fallen to the

cemeteries, as we have been doing for the more than one hundred years of our struggle for the right to live here." These words were spoken on Remembrance Day this year, not by the opposition, but by Yitzhak Rabin himself. He went on to promise that "the Israeli nation will continue to struggle to bring peace, if not for us, then for the next generation." The Prime Minister's words were both a candid confession of personal failure and an expression of the self-delusion that threatens not only Jewish sovereignty over Jerusalem but the very existence of the State. For if we can learn anything from the cycle of Israel's national commemorations, it is that since the end of the Second World War, history is no longer measured in slow-moving generations.

This year, Holocaust Day coincided with the worldwide celebrations commemorating fifty years since the defeat of Nazi Germany. In just three short years between 1945 and 1948, the Jewish people rose from ashes of unparalleled human tragedy to become an independent people in their historic homeland. In just three short years in power, Yitzhak Rabin has gone a long way

(Continued on p.11)

'SIBERIAN ZION'

(Continued from p.4)

a Siberian region intended as a homeland for Jews...is now offering inducements to other would-be settlers, these from Moslem Central Asia. Advertisements promising free rail fares, the moving of up to 4,000 pounds of household goods at no cost and loans for buying a cow...have appeared...The campaign is intended to populate the so-called Jewish Autonomous Region...Three county-level districts were listed as the destination without specifying that they were in the Jewish Region...The districts include almost all of the Jewish region's farmland."

The irony, then, is as inescapable as Siberia. But Jewish Birobidzhan has had something of a modest rejuvenation in even more recent years. If (some would say Chamberlain-inspired) "land for peace" advocates and Israel's sworn enemies will but seize the moment, they may have a chance to forestall a Greater Israel anchored at both ends of the Asian continent, or at least to prevent a "Jewish bloc" on the diplomatic stage at the U.N. In her 1984 *Commentary* article "Siberian holiday," Fernanda Eberstadt reported on her journey through Birobidzhan, and characterized it as "precisely the sort of homeland the Palestinian Arabs might have wished for the Jews." With the running tide in the affairs of Russia, in short order perhaps, that appointed latter-day Zion can be Arafat's own.◊

Benton Arnovitz, currently director of academic publications at a major institution, is a book editor who has held positions at the Free Press, Collier Books, Macmillan, Chilton, and Stein & Day.

CAPITAL CITIES

(Continued from p.8)

the effect of the incestuous relationship between the *New York Times* and the Arabist-dominated Department of State, whose officials have so regularly shuttled from the *Times* to State, that there are smiling references to the "New York Times Chair" in the State Department Directorate.

How many more Israeli citizens must be murdered by the folk that Yasser Arafat is being paid to police? There have been more than a hundred--including one American woman--since the infamous Rose Garden Arafat-Rabin handshake. How many more murdered Israelis before Friedman and the *Times* emerge from that State Department cocoon of wishful--but lethally foolish--thinking?

As a welcome antidote, there is the editorial position of the *New York Post*, headlined: "Recognize Jerusalem Now":

"After more than a decade of election year promises by candidates throughout the land, Congress is finally forging ahead with a law that would require the U.S. to move its embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem--the capital of Israel--by 1997.

"The Clinton Administration is up in arms over the legislation; the Clintonites claim such a step could jeopardize the Middle East peace process...

"All discussion of an 'internationalized'

Jerusalem--as envisaged in the 1947 United Nations partition resolution--has vanished from serious discourse on the region's future. Although accepted back then by the Zionists, internationalization was rejected by the Arab states that set out to destroy the infant Jewish State. Events since then have foreclosed the option of redividing the Holy City, half of which came under Israeli rule after the 1948 war; the rest was captured by Israel when Jordan attacked 19 years later...

"The status of the city as Israel's undivided capital is not a subject for serious debate. Israelis, it should be said, have long memories. It isn't possible to look on the years between 1949 and 1967--when Jews were barred by Jordanians from the walled Old City and when every synagogue there was destroyed--with anything other than pain and rage..."

"Failing to move the embassy now only perpetuates a profoundly discriminatory policy. No other country is barred from assigning foreign embassies to the locations it deems appropriate..."

"As it happens, the proposed site of the new U.S. embassy is in the city's western section, which has been in Israeli hands since 1948. Refusing to relocate the American embassy even to west Jerusalem invites the bizarre fantasy that the status of the entire city is open to negotiation. Washington is unwise to make itself a party to that deception."◇

Lester Kinsolving is host of "Uninhibited Radio: The Les Kinsolving Show," which is broadcast in the Baltimore area on radio station WCBM, 680.

REMEMBRANCE DAYS

(Continued from p.10)

to threaten those remarkable gains. He continues rushing to tie future governments to international agreements signed with Arab leaders of doubtful stability, justifying his recklessness with the fact that these treaties are backed by the democratic world. Yet, the long-term commitments of these democracies have proven to be easily swayed by the public opinion that pulses through them with the speed and impact of a bullet piercing a young soldier's helmet on foreign soil.

"The crying was good because we could still cry, the tears good because they could flow," are the words to one of those songs so typical of Israel's two memorial days. "There is no end to the tears," Rabin solemnly pronounced during Remembrance Day ceremonies on Mount Herzl. Yes, Mr. Rabin, there will always be sacrifices. No one expects any government to put an end to terrorism. Yet we can expect the leader of the Israeli nation to strike a balance between realism and idealism, national security and the responsibility that it entails, sacrifice and the enjoyment of the fruits of those sacrifices. You, Mr. Prime Minister, have given us too many "Remembrance Days."◇

July-August 1995

ISRAEL'S ENEMIES

(Continued from p.6)

nuclearization, Israel's preemption option will no longer be possible (it may *already* be impossible; I am not sure). Should this happen, Israel would become vulnerable to *instant* annihilation, an almost incomprehensible vulnerability brought about by a so-called Peace Process. (A vulnerability widely underestimated because of excessive faith in Israeli nuclear deterrence.) For Israel, genocide is not only a dreadful memory; it is also an ever-present expectation. For Israel, this expectation, associated with enemy state missile attacks, must now be nurtured rather than denied.

Self-delusion can help only Israel's enemies.

Only then (when genocidal dangers are acknowledged: war and genocide are not mutually exclusive) can the Jewish State move purposefully away from misconceived agreements and toward long-term survival.◇

Louis Rene Beres (Ph.D., Princeton, 1971) is the author of fourteen books and several hundred scholarly articles dealing with international relations and international law. He is currently Professor of Political Science at Purdue University.

One Minute to Midnight

Dr. Irving Moskowitz

"ERRORS AND NO FACTS" STRIKE AGAIN

Readers of the Evans & Novak syndicated column know that Rowland Evans and Robert Novak are two of the most virulent Israel-bashers in the American media. They also have a reputation for paying little or no attention to factual accuracy when it comes to the Middle East, which is why they are often referred to as "Errors and No Facts." The latest Evans & Novak tirade, this one aimed at Likud leader Benjamin Netanyahu, is a prime example of errors-and-no facts. According to the column, Netanyahu has been sending "non-stop faxes from Jerusalem to Capitol Hill, telling pro-Israel congressional hardliners how to undermine the Mideast peace plan." According to Evans and Novak, such action constitutes "an unusual intrusion into U.S. politics by a foreign leader." Why, one wonders, have Evans and Novak refrained from complaining about a much more serious intrusion into U.S. politics--the frequent attempts by Israeli Embassy officials to pressure congressmen to refrain from

discussing the idea of putting U.S. troops on the Golan Heights, and to urge them to approve U.S. aid to the PLO.

Nowhere in the column do they offer Netanyahu's response--no surprise, perhaps, because Netanyahu would have told them that the allegation was simply false, and then Evans and Novak wouldn't have had a column. All of the "sources" quoted in the column are anonymous, with one exception--Senator Jon Kyl of Arizona (Errors and No Facts refer to him as being from Iowa), who is quoted as allegedly saying that Netanyahu "should be more careful." Kyl has firmly denied making any such statement. In fact, Kyl went further, and said, "I welcome the communications I receive from the Israeli government, its parliamentary opposition and other sources of insight about U.S. and Israeli interests in the Middle East."

Kyl's point is well taken. Even though Netanyahu did not "flood" Congress with faxes, he did issue a press release explaining why he thinks U.S. aid to the PLO is a mistake, and some copies of it did reach some congressional offices--and there's nothing wrong with that. When Congress is considering issues involving American commitments in the Mideast, it should be fully informed as to the views of both Labor and Likud--especially when polls show that the Likud represents the majority of Israeli public opinion.◇

Americans For a Safe Israel
147 East 76 Street
New York, NY 10021

Non-Profit
Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
New York, N.Y.
Permit No. 9418