
OUTPOST

SEPTEMBER 1995

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

FOR WHOM IS AIPAC LOBBYING?

Herbert Zweibon

Which Jewish organization lobbies for unrestricted U.S. aid to the PLO, endorses anti-Israel nominees to senior U.S. government positions, and tries to stop Congress from discussing the risks of terrorist attacks against American soldiers? Unbelievably, the answer is AIPAC, the Israeli lobby that is supposed to embody American Jewish support for Israel. Since the Oslo agreement, AIPAC's leaders have repeatedly made statements or taken actions that do not represent the feelings of most American Jews, and, in some cases, have not even reflected the views of the majority of AIPAC officers. A sampling:

JERUSALEM. In March 1994, AIPAC refrained from urging the Clinton administration to veto a U. N. resolution that called Jerusalem "occupied territory."

STATE DEPARTMENT REPORTS ON THE PLO. AIPAC President Steve Grossman praised the State Department's June 1, 1995 report on PLO compliance (*Forward*, June 9, 1995) —the same report that Congressman Ben Gilman called "a whitewash." As for the Peace Accord Monitoring (PAM) Groups, which monitor the PLO's violations of the Oslo Accords, Grossman says that there is "no need to get directly involved in the issue of monitoring compliance." (*Forward*, May 13, 1994)

U.S. TROOPS ON THE GOLAN HEIGHTS. AIPAC has repeatedly lobbied to prevent Congress from studying the risks of stationing U.S. troops on the Golan Heights. AIPAC pressured Sen. Thad Cochran (R-MI) to withdraw his sponsorship of an amendment requiring a Pentagon study of the issue (*N.Y. Jewish Week*, July 8-14, 1994). When Sen. Malcolm Wallop (R-WY) introduced the amendment, AIPAC lobbied to defeat it (*L. A. Jewish Journal*, July 15-21, 1994)

STROBE TALBOTT. AIPAC President Steve Grossman endorsed the nomination of longtime Israel-basher Strobe Talbott for Deputy Secretary of State (*Jewish Telegraphic Agency*, Feb. 1, 1994), even though the

AIPAC Executive Committee did not vote to authorize him to do so.

U.S. AID TO THE PLO. AIPAC President Steve Grossman has declared that he supports sending \$500-million in U.S. aid to the PLO, despite the PLO's massive violations of the Oslo Accords. (*JTA*, Dec. 5, 1994) While other pro-Israel groups endorsed legislation to pressure the PLO (e.g. the Specter-Shelby Amendment), AIPAC worked behind the scenes to "discourage congressional measures aimed at supervising administration grants to the PLO." (*Jerusalem Post*, Nov. 10, 1994)

Ironically, AIPAC still talks 'tough' when seeking funds. Its August 12, 1994, fundraising letter claimed that AIPAC is "working with Congress to give the President authority to grant direct assistance to the PLO only if they comply with the commitments made through the peace process"—while, in fact, AIPAC lobbies for U.S. aid to the PLO, regardless of the PLO's non-compliance. That same fundraising letter warned that Syrian leader Hafez Assad "speaks of peace, but prepares for war"—yet AIPAC is trying to facilitate a surrender of the Golan Heights to Assad by lobbying against Congressional discussion of the risks of putting U.S. troops on the Golan.

Under Steve Grossman, AIPAC has become a tool to advance the political agenda of the Rabin government. This contradicts AIPAC's stated purpose, which is to serve as an independent lobby to promote Israel's well-being and advance American interests in the Middle East. By parroting the Rabin government line, regardless of its impact on American interests, AIPAC is undermining American Jewish credibility on Capitol Hill and endangering the future of American-Israeli relations.◊

Herbert Zweibon is chairman of Americans For a Safe Israel.

IN THIS ISSUE:

<i>Israel's "Anointed"</i>	..3
<i>A Non-Sheeplike Jew</i>	...6
<i>Power and Survival</i>	...7

From the Editor

NO ATOM BOMBS--YET

The Israeli consulate faxes daily to the press, and to pro-Israel organizations, a potpourri of news items. This two-page summary of the day's events is entitled *Israel Line*, an unintentional reference to the fact that it faithfully toes the party line of the Labor government. On July 27, one of its more amusing news briefs quotes Foreign Minister Shimon Peres saying, "The government is striving to save the Jewish and Zionist character of the State of Israel." If this is true, it certainly has a peculiar way of going about it.

The July 27 article also quoted Peres boasting that since the Israeli Army's retreat from the Gaza Strip, "all fears that katyusha missiles would be fired at Ashkelon were proven wrong." Notice how the focus has shifted. When the Oslo accords were signed, Peres promised peace. Now, he says that the fact that katyushas have not fallen is proof of success. Once they have turned over Judea and Samaria and katyushas fall, we can anticipate that Peres will have new evidence that the critics of the "peace process" were wrong: "You see, not one atom bomb has fallen."◇

MERETZ LOGIC

In a June 27 interview, Minister of the Environment and Meretz MK Yossi Sarid explained the need to release Arab terrorists who had murdered Israelis. The terrorists, said Sarid, are not guilty since they were only following orders. "All of the activities were directed from above, even if a particular operation was not specifically ordered. This was a war against us and Arafat was the commander." If such is the case, the reader wonders, why do the Israelis not punish the man who, in Sarid's view, is solely responsible for the PLO's atrocities? The Meretz MK had an answer for this too, saying he was not concerned with the moral implications since "there are many world leaders who were guilty of war crimes."

Like Hitler.◇

MEDITERRANEAN HOUSEBOATS

On July 15, one of the featured guests on the Zev Brenner radio talk show was Lieutenant Colonel Gil Elon, an emissary for the Jewish National Fund, former paratroop commander and, said the talk show host, "a specialist in the Golan Heights."

Elon advocated withdrawal from the Heights, and from his remarks one can only conclude that he is either slightly mad or still suffering from a head wound sustained during military service. He opened: "As an Israeli I love the Golan Heights. I know the Golan Heights. I fought

on the Golan Heights. I'm familiar with them. I spent many summers there. I took my children when they were young to the Golan Heights and there's no question when you stand there and look down toward the Hula Valley or towards the Sea of Galilee that you feel the importance of it strategically. From the military point of view, Israel will be more secure upon giving up the Golan Heights."

The perplexed listener had little time to absorb Elon's peculiar logic, for the former Israeli Army paratrooper pressed on. The reason that Israel would be best served by abandoning the Heights for peace, he explained, is that it would be easier to mobilize Israeli troops in the event of war. "Today there are 14,000 settlers living on the Golan Heights. In five years, if the plans to settle the Golan Heights continue as they have over the last 15 years, there will be 50,000. Now can you imagine at the outbreak of a war on the Golan Heights the evacuation of 50,000 civilians on the roads that we will need to mobilize in the other direction?"

Following Elon's logic, the Israelis would be more secure vacating Tel Aviv, Haifa and Ashkelon. The pesky civilians could float on boats offshore, freeing the Israeli Army to concentrate solely on battling the invading Arab armies. Of course, the Mediterranean houseboats would still be subject to naval attack. Perhaps a better plan would be for all non-military personnel to burrow underground, like prairie dogs. Certainly, Elon would agree that this would save countless lives and ameliorate the Army's duties considerably.◇

NEW MIDEAST ELDERS

The introduction to an Egyptian translation of Shimon Peres' *The New Middle East* provides further evidence--if such was needed--of the Israeli foreign minister's total incomprehension of the Middle East. The Egyptian publisher treats Peres' vision of a Mideast economic Eden as proof that the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* was an accurate description of an international Jewish conspiracy because he interprets Peres' utopian bubble as a Jewish plan to take over the Middle East economically, politically and culturally.◇

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.

ISRAEL'S "ANOINTED"

Rael Jean Isaac

For many years, the prime concern of friends of Israel was the external threat to the state. But since 1993, much to our chagrin, the primary danger to Israel has come from within, worse, from her own government. For Jewish and Christian friends alike, the most puzzling question since the Oslo agreement has been "Why?" Why are the leaders of the Jewish State embarked on such a reckless course? What motivates them? What can they be thinking?

The closest we are likely to come to an answer is in Thomas Sowell's wonderful new book, *The Vision of the Anointed*. Sowell never mentions Israel; his focus is on domestic programs advanced by elites in this country with counterproductive results. But his description of the mindset of these elites --"the anointed ones"-- gives us insight into the ideas, assumptions and attitudes of Israel's leaders, helps us understand why they must demonize their critics, and explains how they can, indeed must, seal themselves off from any discordant feedback from reality.

The anointed, Sowell writes, have a vision that offers something deeply satisfying --"a special state of grace for those who believe in it." The vision becomes intertwined with the egos of those who believe it. "Despite Hamlet's warning against self-flattery, the vision of the anointed is not simply a vision of the world and its functioning in a causal sense, but is also a vision of themselves and of their moral role in that world. It is a vision of differential rectitude....Problems exist because others are not as wise or as virtuous as the anointed." For the anointed, it is never the theory that must be brought into line with reality, but reality that must be brought into line with the vision.

Thus, Sowell observes, a "common characteristic of the vocabulary of the anointed is that it puts off limits the question as to whether what is proposed is in fact achievable." Shimon Peres and his vision of "The New Middle East" in which Israel lives in happy symbiosis with its Arab neighbors immediately comes to mind. Indeed, for the anointed the vision, once conjured up, immediately assumes the weight and solidity of reality. It is only when we understand this that many of Peres's pronouncements become comprehensible. For example, in a recent interview with David Makovsky of the *Jerusalem Post* (International Edition, August 26), there is the following exchange.

Makovsky: You have suggested that when Arafat spoke of *jihad* or holy war in a recent videotaped appearance, it was merely rhetoric. Yet Arafat's critics charge that this reveals his true intentions. What is the basis for

your viewpoint? Why are the critics wrong?

Peres: Yes [it is rhetoric], partly said to justify the past. What counts is not the intentions of the Palestinians. What counts is the confrontation between two realities.

In part these words from the Foreign Minister of a beleaguered country sound insane (the intentions of the enemy do not count) and in part they seem to be gibberish (what counts is the confrontation between two realities). But once we recognize Peres as what the great sociologist Max Weber would call "an ideal type" of the anointed (someone who embodies the type to the highest degree), what he says can at least be understood. The two realities are the "old" reality of conflict and hatred, and the "new" reality which is Shimon Peres' vision of cooperation and harmony. By the very fact that he has conceived of it, this now is an "equal" reality.

But in his solipsism, Peres goes even further. "His" reality is the only one that matters, the only one that is, in fact, real. That is the underlying meaning of Peres' statement that Arafat's intentions are irrelevant. Peres has an inside track on the forces of history, which tells him that his vision must triumph, that, as he writes in his book, "The New Middle East is an idea whose time has

Why are the leaders of the Jewish State embarked on such a reckless course? What motivates them?

come." Peres' habitual response, when the "old" reality is inconveniently thrust upon him --whether in the form of statements by Arafat or another Arab leader vowing to incinerate Israel-- is to intone: "He belongs to the past." As Sowell points out, "[T]he purest example of an argument without an argument is to say that something is 'inevitable.' This is an inherently irrefutable argument, so long as any time remains in the future."

Underlying the vision of the anointed, Sowell notes, is the view that changing people's dispositions is the key to solving the most intractable of problems. "To those with the vision of the anointed," says Sowell, "to say that a particular plan or policy is contrary to human nature as we know it is only to say that human nature must be changed. Not surprisingly, then, we find in *The New Middle East* such statements as: "We can do it. We have to remove the desert from the land, the salt from the water, and the violence from the people."

For the anointed, Sowell writes, war is simply a product of misunderstandings. The source of conflicts is in "fears, suspicions, and misunderstandings." It follows that "personal contacts" between decision-makers will dissipate antagonism. Peres is constantly running to Arafat, smiling at him, holding his arm, embracing him, construing this as tangible evidence of "progress." And

(Continued on p.4)

ISRAEL'S "ANOINTED"

(Continued from p.3)

although it seems the ultimate in cynicism when Peres tells residents of Judea and Samaria that if they want to remain it is up to them to make the Arabs like them, the statement may simply indicate the staggering degree to which Peres views national conflicts in purely psychological terms and believes people's values and dispositions can be changed. Sowell points out that for the anointed "every deviation of the real world from the tidiness of their vision is considered to be someone's fault." For Peres, if Jews are not welcome in the new Palestine, it is clearly their own fault.

Sowell outlines a four-stage pattern that repeatedly emerges when policies favored by the anointed turn out to fail. Here is Sowell's description of the stages, followed by this writer's comments on their pertinence to Israel's anointed.

STAGE 1. THE "CRISIS." Some situation exists, whose negative aspects the anointed propose to eliminate. Such a situation is routinely characterized as a "crisis," even though evidence is seldom asked or given to show how the situation at hand is either uniquely bad or threatening to get worse. Sometimes the situation described as a "crisis" has in fact already been getting better for years.

The "crisis" Israel's anointed set out to "solve" was the unending Arab-Israel conflict, whose impact was being felt in Israel directly through the *intifada*. Yet if the Arab-Israel conflict showed no sign of ending, Israel's situation had improved markedly in important respects. The collapse of the Soviet Union meant that Arab states no longer could count on support of a superpower in confrontations with Israel, which also meant the United States would not feel the same pressures to prevent Israeli gains lest they trigger Soviet intervention. In addition, by backing Saddam Hussein in the Gulf war, Arafat and his "Palestinians" had become anathema to their major financial supporters, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. Arafat was lying on the ropes, financially and politically. And the *intifada* had died down, becoming more of a nuisance than a serious problem for Israel.

STAGE 2. THE "SOLUTION." Policies to end the "crisis" are advocated by the anointed, who say that these policies will lead to beneficial result A. Critics say that these policies will lead to detrimental result Z. The anointed dismiss these latter claims as absurd and "simplistic," if not dishonest.

Israel's anointed promised that the agreement with the PLO would finally end the Arab-Israel conflict. Terror would cease; Arab boycotts would be a thing of the past; the PLO Covenant would be abolished; Israel would become an accepted state in the region. There were voices (among them those of spokesmen for the settlements and Likud head, Benjamin Netanyahu) warning that the government's policies would bring disaster,

not peace. The Labor-anointed dismissed all warnings as absurd or false, the ravings of those who preferred barren hills and bloody conflict.

STAGE 3. THE RESULTS. The policies are instituted and lead to detrimental result Z.

All the warnings have proved accurate. Terror has escalated dramatically since the signing of the Oslo agreement. The PLO has not abrogated its covenant; on the contrary, Arafat keeps assuring his own public that he is implementing the staged plan for Israel's destruction that the PLO adopted back in 1974. Nothing the government promised has materialized; everything the opponents of its policies warned would happen, has happened.

STAGE 4. THE RESPONSE. Those who attribute detrimental result Z to the policies instituted are dismissed as "simplistic" for ignoring the "complexities" involved, as "many factors" went into determining the outcome. The burden of proof is put on the critics to demonstrate to a certainty that these policies alone were the only possible cause of the worsening that occurred. No burden of proof whatever is put on those who had so confidently predicted improvement. Indeed, it is often asserted that things would have been even worse, were it not for the wonderful programs that mitigated the inevitable damage from other factors.

In Israel, the anointed's response is even more audacious. As the terrible consequences of their policies become ever more evident, they insist that those policies must be pursued with even greater vigor for only

Nothing the government promised has materialized; everything the opponents of its policies warned would happen, has happened.

when they are fully implemented will the promised benefits finally flow. The anointed make no attempt to explain why, if giving the PLO Jericho and Gaza has doubled terror, turning over all the territory of Judea and Samaria will reduce or eliminate it. They simply proceed to turn over the territory. Underlying their policies is the arrogant position that Israel's existence as an embattled state is "unacceptable." Sowell observes that, confronted with uncomfortable realities, the anointed treat reality as if it were constrained by our acceptance of it.

Sowell points out that governments can indeed make dramatic changes in particular circumstances, but always at a cost--"however much such costs may be ignored, denied, or finally treated as bolts from the blue." In the case of Israel, the costs become a further argument for pursuing existing policies. Government leaders point out that matters will become still worse, should the

(Continued on p.5)

ISRAEL'S "ANOINTED"

(Continued from p.4)

policies be halted or reversed. This is an argument with the power to frighten the Israeli public because it has merit. Israel has armed a huge PLO force. Weapons have been pouring into the territory under Arafat's control and from there into those parts of Judea and Samaria still formally under Israeli control. The expectations Israel's anointed have raised among the Arabs are even more dangerous than the weapons. The government has created the conditions that guarantee that a changed course will indeed mean more violence in the short term. (Of course the anointed never mention that staying on the present course means the end of the state in the not-very-long term.)

To their opponents the anointed cry "But what is your alternative?" as if the burden for finding a "solution" rests on the opponents of the policy that is making matters infinitely worse. As Sowell puts it, "You cannot say that the emperor has no clothes until you have designed a whole new alternative wardrobe." For the anointed it is no answer at all to point out what, as Sowell observes, those with the "tragic vision" understand, that in the real world there may only be a limited choice between unpalatable alternatives.

Not for a moment do Israel's anointed accept the notion that *they* have a burden of proof to explain why their confidently-predicted improvements have not materialized. Instead, as Sowell predicts, they have a

plethora of "other factors" to blame for what has gone wrong: Hamas, Israeli settlers, failure of European powers to pour sufficient money into Gaza, etc. etc.

Sowell points out the inherently anti-democratic attitudes of the anointed. They are "moral surrogates to make decisions for other people" who are "seen as incapable of making the right decisions for themselves." Indeed, spurred by their sense that great dangers can only be averted by imposing their vision on the less enlightened, the anointed consider it their moral duty to ignore public opinion. Rabin makes no bones about this. He announces publicly that he is giving Israel what it "needs," not what it wants.

Sowell zeroes in on what he rightly considers the most important --and dangerous-- characteristic of the vision of the anointed, its resistance to evidence. Opponents are not people who evaluate evidence differently; they are the "benighted," morally inferior, unworthy of attention. Rabin's brutal dismissal of opponents in Israel, "crybabies," "ayatollahs," "let them spin like propellers," is typical of the perspective of the anointed. Opponents are accused of polarizing the country; the anointed never consider that their policies are responsible for the polarization with its potential for tearing the country apart.

One consequence of demonizing the opposition, Sowell writes, is to cut off retreat from positions which become progressively less tenable with the passage of time. It would be too devastating to admit the opposition was right, after all. Sowell observes that the vision becomes "self-contained and self-justifying--which is to say,

(Continued on p.10)

Herbert Zweibon

SENATOR HELMS' "COMPROMISE"

A report in the August 18 *Wall Street Journal* described "a remarkable turnaround" in Senator Jesse Helms' statements and positions since becoming chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. According to the article, Helms is now prepared to compromise on a number of issues that have always been dear to him, in order to achieve certain specific legislative goals.

Everyone understands the need to be flexible in order to obtain broader support for the issues that are uppermost on your agenda. But it is deeply disappointing that the issue of U.S. aid to the PLO seems to be one of the matters on which Senator Helms is now compromising. The Helms-Pell version of the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act, as it currently stands, places no meaningful restrictions on U.S. aid to the PLO. Helms' draft has plenty of tough rhetoric about the PLO's violations

of the Oslo accords—but all of that rhetoric is in the "Sense of Congress" section, where it has no legal standing. Even the section on the PLO Covenant, which sets a 6-month deadline for revising that death-to-Israel document, contains a huge loophole, by allowing the PLO to "effectively disavow" the Covenant rather than actually change it.

In the past, Senator Helms has been courageous and outspoken in denouncing the PLO's violations and insisting on repeal of the PLO Covenant. Sadly, the wording of his version of the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act does not match his own statements. Some media reports claim that the Act was watered down as part of a deal with the Administration on the State Department reorganization proposal. Restrictions on PLO aid should not be held hostage to that proposal. The PLO's dismal record of non-compliance with the Oslo accords and fiscal irresponsibility should disqualify it from receiving unrestricted U.S. aid--something which Jesse Helms, of all people, should understand.◇

Herbert Zweibon is chairman of Americans For a Safe Israel.

REMARKS OF A NON-SHEEPLIKE JEW

Herbert B. Sunshine, a retired professor of law and practicing attorney in Jerusalem, sent the following letter to Shimon Shitreet, the Labor government's Minister of Religion.

Dear Mr. Minister:

"Israel has acquired American culture," you publicly complained. This was your reaction to the successful mass protest, led by American *olim*, which delayed traffic in 40 places and sent a message of fear to the give-away government you advise.

You are furious at the "foreign implant" of non-sheeplike Jews. You, Mr. Minister, like many Israelis, love everything American, except the Americans themselves. It is not American culture which has invaded Israel, it is the vacuum of Israeli-Jewish culture which has invited it.

You fail to mention the tragic emigration of the flower of Israeli youth to America, caused by the lack of opportunity for all and by the emptiness of the binationalism that you espouse.

Sadly, a Bolshevik backwater has been stillborn here, in place of the Biblical "land of milk and honey."

You said to us, "these people with American-accented Hebrew--these people that were not born here..." Let me say, Mr. Minister of Religion (of what religion, who can say), that we Americans chose to live here, we were not subject to the accident of place of birth. Like the woman in the story of King Solomon, who loved the baby, she refused to have it divided. So with us who adopted this country, we love the land and we do not abandon it, or our brothers who live upon it.

Americans are, by and large, winners, not losers. Had we been victorious in five wars of invasion, there would not have been an enemy alien in sight, certainly not in ruling places in the government. Had Americans won five wars of annihilation, not one inch of land would be divested, and not one cowardly concession made to the defeated.

If you don't know, Mr. Shitreet, America was founded by the God-fearing, not by the godless. Americans have a constitution with "inalienable" rights for the individual, protecting him from tyrannic rulers. American representatives are responsible to the citizens, not to the party and the clubhouse for which it stands. Americans have courts that are not an arm of the ruling power and the right to bail before and during trial. There are no secret charges, no administrative detention and no military law in America. The flower of American youth does not emigrate.

Americans can all become rich by hard work and enterprise. Only the Israeli politicians and the other insiders bite the apple here. You, Mr. Shitreet, know

nothing about American democracy or American capitalism, for you won't learn from Americans who you feel threaten your grip on power.

For these reasons, Americans sparked the sit-ins and the demonstrations; they do not fear government and they know that peaceful protest is a legal way of petitioning against grievances. You owe all Americans an apology for your insulting, racist remarks.

With love of what you have left us of Israel,

Herbert B. Sunshine

JUSTIFIED SCORN

George E. Rubin

The Austrian Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Benita Ferrero-Waldner, is the latest in a long line of European foreign ministers who have gone out of their way to insult and humiliate the Labor government of Yitzhak Rabin and Shimon Peres. By visiting Orient House in eastern Jerusalem, they have all symbolically recognized the partition of Israel's capital city and confirmed that they and their governments consider the PLO-occupied Orient House to be the official seat of the Arab "state of Palestine." The Austrian official has piled on further insult to show her contempt for this Israeli government by only meeting with the PLO, not bothering with the Israeli government. Frau Ferrero-Waldner's patronizing and transparently false excuse for not meeting with Israeli officials was that it was the Sabbath (a matter of minor import to the secular Israeli leadership). Frau Ferrero-Waldner did not bother to explain why she could not spend a few more hours in Jerusalem to meet with the Israelis as a minimum gesture of respect.

Who can blame the Austrian Foreign Minister, the Irish and French Ministers and the others for making it crystal clear that they have nothing but contempt for the Rabin-Peres-Beilin regime? The self-abasement and self-immolation of Rabin and Peres and virtually every other member of the government in its relations with the Arabs and with other nations must be deeply offensive to the Europeans, as it no doubt is to the Americans and the Islamic world. The foreign officials who deal with Israel are nationalists who would never tolerate the insults and threats to their nation's sovereignty and honor that the Israelis routinely accept. It is, no doubt, incomprehensible to them that the Israeli leaders would permit an

(Continued on p.11)

POWER AND SURVIVAL

Louis Rene Beres

Elias Canetti, winner of the 1981 Nobel Prize for Literature, once wrote of *not being dead* as the essence of power. Confronted with what he called "the terror at the face of death," humankind--individually and collectively--seeks above all else "to remain standing." In the final analysis, it is those who remain upright (however temporarily) who are victorious. It is these fortunate ones, who have "diverted" death to *others*, who have power.

There is a lesson here for states as well as for individual persons, and for the State of Israel in particular. The situation of survival is the central situation of power.¹ Yet, as the Middle East "peace process" makes Israel's survival more and more problematic, this misnamed process now deprives Israel of its power. Left to proceed, this process will permit Israel's enemies to enjoy a triumph that still remains concealed, the triumph experienced by the living person who is confronted by one who is dying.

I refer to the triumph of power. Israel's enemies understand this power. Israel does not. Believing, naively, in a common international obligation to preserve life, Jerusalem fails to understand that death is identified by its enemies as a zero-sum event. It follows that anything done to sustain Israel's survival is *necessarily*, for these enemy states, a threat to their own continued "life" and a diminution of their own most essential power. Conversely, anything that is done to eliminate Israel enhances their own collective life and augments their own collective power. What is more, because of the intimate associations between collectivity and individual, the perceived enemy life-advantages of Israeli death and dying that are spawned by the "peace process" are enjoyed doubly.

"Normally" the living person never considers himself more powerful than when he faces the dead person; here the living one comes as close as he can to feelings of immortality.² The living state, in similar fashion, never regards itself as more powerful than when it confronts the "death" of an enemy state. Only slightly less power-giving are the feelings that arise from confrontation with the "dying" of this enemy state, precisely the feelings concerning Israel now generated in Arab capitals and in Iran by the Middle East "peace process." For both, the individual and the collective, convention and good taste requires that zero-sum feelings about death and power be properly suppressed. Such feelings are not to be flaunted, but they are vital nonetheless.

In world politics, power is so closely attached to the terror of death that it has been overlooked altogether. As a result, students of world politics continue to focus foolishly on epiphenomena, on ideologies, on territories,

on the implements of warfare. It is not that these factors are unimportant to power (indeed, they are not) but that they are of *secondary* or reflected importance.

During war, the individual soldier, who ordinarily cannot experience real power in peace time, is offered an opportunity at such experience. The presence of dead men here cannot be minimized. It is the central fact of war. The soldier who is surrounded by corpses and knows that he is not one of them is imbued with the radiance of invulnerability, with the aspect of monumental power. In

The Middle East "peace process" makes Israel's survival more and more problematic...

like fashion, the state which commands these soldiers to kill and not to die themselves "feels" similar power at the removal of its collective adversary. This surviving state, like the surviving warrior, is indisputably a source of power.

These points that I am making are hardly fashionable; rather, they appear barbarous, almost uncivilized. But I am seeking not to prescribe behavior for states, but merely to *describe* such behavior. True observations may be objectionable, but they are no less true.

In an apparent paradox, Israel's *non-state* enemies also seek to "remain standing" vis-a-vis the Jewish State, to seek power in the life-or-death struggle against a particularly despised *other*. I say "apparent paradox" here because some of Israel's terrorist enemies seem not only unconcerned to remain standing, but seek specifically to die themselves. Indeed, as we have witnessed the dreadful terrorist suicide attacks against buses in Tel Aviv, Ramat Gan and Jerusalem, it would appear that the perpetrators actually "love death."³ Consider, for example, a recent statement by Jamal Abdel Hamid Yussef, explaining operations of the Izzedine al-Qassam Brigades (military wing of Hamas) in Gaza: "Our suicide operations are a message...that our people love death. Our goal is to die for the sake of Allah, and if we live we want to humiliate Jews and trample on their necks."

What is important to understand here is that "to die for the sake of Allah" is, above all, *not to die at all*. By dying in the "divinely commanded" act of killing Jews (Jews, not Israelis), the Hamas terrorist actually seeks to conquer death (which he fears with special terror) by living forever. In this eternal life, Hamas videotapes reveal, there will be rivers of honey and 72 brides for each hero "martyred" fighting the enemies of Allah.

Hence, the "love of death" described by the Hamas non-state enemy of Israel is the ironic consequent of an all-consuming wish to avoid death. Since the death

(Continued on p.8)

POWER AND SURVIVAL

(Continued from p.7)

that this enemy "loves" is merely temporary and temporal, leading in "fact" to a permanent reprieve from death, accepting it as a tactical expedient is an easy matter. If, however, the death of the individual Muslim body in holy war against the Jews were not expected to ensure authentic life ever-after, its immense attractions would surely be reversed.

So, Israel's non-state terrorist enemies, in the fashion of its state enemies, also seek to "remain standing," and to believe that this objective can be realized only when Israel--as the Jew in macrocosm--has become the dead man lying down. When the civilized and decent human being watching the evening news about the latest bus bombing in Israel asks incredulously, "Why do they do this?" there is a correct answer: They do this out of passion for the ultimate form of power; the greater the number of Jewish corpses, the more powerful they feel. Real power, as a zero-sum commodity, is to gain in *aliveness* through the death of enemies.

There is more. An enemy of Israel, state or non-state, cannot possibly kill as many Israelis as his

passion for survival may demand. This means that he may seek to induce or direct others to meet this passion. As a practical matter, this points toward an undeniable impulse for genocide, an impulse that could be actualized by future resort to higher-order forms of terrorism (chemical/biological/nuclear) and/or unconventional forms of war.

Israel has much to learn. But before its leaders can fully understand the nature of enemy intentions and capabilities, they must first understand the connections between power and survival. Once it is understood that enemy definitions of the former are contingent upon Israel's loss of the latter, these leaders will finally be positioned intellectually to take remedial action. *At the outset, such action must entail a complete reversal of the so-called "peace process," which--if left to proceed--would fulfill the fondest enemy hopes for power.*

The true goal of Israel's enemies, a goal furthered by the "peace process," is as grotesque as it is generally unrecognized. It is to be left standing while Israel has been made to disappear. These enemies must survive Israel so that Israel does not survive them. They cannot

conceivably survive together. So long as Israel exists, they cannot survive themselves in any meaningful sense. So long as Israel exists, no matter how cooperative it may be, they will not feel safe, they will not feel powerful.

It is time that this true goal be recognized. Without such recognition, the dreadful foolishness of prevailing political "thought" in Israel's government and universities may continue to be taken seriously, a circumstance that could have a genuinely fatal outcome for the Jewish State. With such recognition, however, this foolishness could be revealed widely for what it is, the ill-conceived product of "experts," of poorly-educated specialists who have likely never had a serious original idea in their imitative professional lives.

What a mistake it is for Israel to believe that Reason governs the world. The true source of governance here is Power, and power is ultimately the conquest of Death. This conquest, which we have shown to display a zero-sum quality among Israel's enemies, is not by any means limited to conflicts in the Middle East. Rather, it is a generic matter, a more or less universal effort that is made especially manifest between Israel and its enemies. On this generic matter, consider the remark made by Eugene Ionesco in his *Journal* in 1966. Describing killing as an affirmation of one's own survival, Ionesco says:

I must kill my visible enemy, the one who is determined to take my life, to prevent him from killing me. Killing gives me a feeling of relief, because I am dimly aware that in killing him, I have killed death. My enemy's death cannot be held against me, it is no longer a source of anguish, if I killed him with the approval of society; that is the purpose of war. Killing is a way of relieving one's feelings, of warding off one's own death. ⁴

Significantly, while Israel's enemies accept the zero-sum linkages between power and survival, Israel apparently does not. While this may certainly suggest that Israel stands on a higher moral plane than its enemies, it also places the Jewish State at a marked security disadvantage, one that will make it difficult to "remain standing." Logically, this consequential asymmetry between Israel and its enemies may be addressed by reducing enemy emphases on power-survival connections and/or by increasing Israeli emphases on power-survival connections. The first option is effectively impossible; the second would require extraordinary national excursions from idealism toward *Realpolitik*.

Must Israel become a barbarous state in order to endure? Must the Jewish State "learn" to identify true power with its survival *over* others, a survival that cannot abide the endurance of its enemies? By no means! What

(Continued on p.11)

SPOTLIGHT ON THE EXTREMISTS

...The July 14 *Jerusalem Post* included a photograph of a recent demonstration by the "Rabbis for Human Rights" group, denouncing the ruling by leading rabbis that soldiers should disobey orders to dismantle Israeli Army bases in Judea and Samaria. One of the protesters in the photo was **Jeremy Milgrom**, a founder and board member of "Rabbis for Human Rights." Milgrom's participation in the rally was ironic, in view of his own association with "Yesh Gvul," the far-left organization that urges soldiers to disobey orders to serve beyond the 1967 border. Milgrom, appearing as a representative of Yesh Gvul, spoke on American college campuses during the Lebanon war. If Milgrom urges leftwing soldiers to disobey orders they consider immoral, and yet denounces rightwing soldiers for disobeying orders they consider immoral, one might conclude that Milgrom is not really concerned about the effect of disobedience on the Army, but rather is only interested in furthering his extreme-left agenda...

...The ancient Jebusites were, in fact, the "original Palestinian inhabitants" of Jerusalem, according to PLO official **Faisal Husseini**. He denounced the forthcoming Jerusalem 3000 celebrations for commemorating "the Jewish military occupation" of the city...

...Vienna-born **David Rubinger**, of *Time* magazine, wrote to the *Jerusalem Post* in August to blast a letter-writer who criticized Austria's Secretary of State for visiting Orient House (PLO headquarters in Jerusalem). Rubinger was especially upset because the letter-writer mentioned Austria's role in the Holocaust. "To single out the Austrian government and wrap a purely political problem with the Holocaust demeans the issue," Rubinger complained...

...**Robert Bogel**, president of the *Philadelphia Tribune*, a leading Afro-American newspaper, visited Israel this summer as a guest of Israel Bonds, accompanied by a number of Jews from that city. In an interview with *Ha'aretz* on June 21, Bogel had a few choice words to say about American Jewry: "The Jews of America are a hate group against my group. They perpetuate discrimination, segregation...The people traveling with me on the bus would gladly call me nigger with the same joy they did years ago..."

...Several members of the American leftwing group "Christian Peacemakers" were arrested in Hebron on two separate occasions in July. Two of them were detained for calling Israeli soldiers "Nazis." A week later,

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

Israel's Legitimacy in Law and History
by the Center for Near East Policy Research
\$4.95 (non-members: \$5.95)

Demophobia
by Paul Eidelberg - \$10.00 (non-members: \$11.00)

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

they, and two comrades, were rearrested for trying to smash open the gates of the Hebron Islamic College. The gates were shut in 1988 after the students repeatedly used the campus to launch violent assaults on Israeli passersby...

SPOTLIGHT ON THE RABIN GOVERNMENT

..."Who needs them?" Prime Minister Rabin said of the Jews living in Judea-Samaria, in remarks to a United Jewish Appeal delegation on August 16. Rabin said that the settlers "don't do anything for us" and constitute "a security burden"...

Rabin and his foreign minister, Shimon Peres, loudly ridiculed nationalist MK Rabbi Yosef Bagad when he recently staged a brief sit-down in the Knesset to dramatize his mourning over Rabin's numerous one-sided

concessions to the PLO. Rabin "broke out in laughter," the Israeli media reported, and Peres shouted "We should bring him a tent and a camel"...

...In a meeting with journalists in early August, Peres blasted American Jews for disagreeing with some of his policies. "They want to sit in Brooklyn and defend Hebron and Shechem from there?" Peres asked rhetorically. He did not explain why it is permissible for U.S. Jews to defend Tel Aviv and Haifa, but not Hebron and Shechem...

...Rabin's Minister of Police, Moshe Shahal, said on July 11 that rabbinical sages who counsel soldiers to resist immoral orders "have no place in our society"...

ISRAEL'S "ANOINTED"

(Continued from p.5)

independent of empirical evidence." To affirm it is to be one of us, to oppose it one of them. Logical argument is replaced by "preemptive rhetoric or, where an argument is made, its validity remains unchecked against any evidence, even when such evidence is abundant."

In Israel terrorism escalates. Rather than accept feedback from reality, Rabin & Co. indulge in rhetorical sleight of hand: "Peace," they say, not people, is the

In Israel, the Bible is being eliminated from the secular school system, the Holocaust is downplayed or universalized, and Israel's wars recast via "revisionist history" as aggressive ventures.

target of the terrorists. The answer to terrorism becomes an ever more determined pursuit of existing policies. If Oslo I is a disaster, proceed to Oslo II. As Sowell says, "insulation from evidence virtually guarantees a never ending supply of policies and practices fatally independent of reality."

With remarkable insight, Sowell observes that the anointed, not content with squelching contemporary voices, must also silence history, which is the memory of a nation. Nowhere is this need of the anointed more apparent than in Israel, where the Bible is being eliminated from the secular school system, the Holocaust is downplayed or universalized (as one of innumerable "holocausts" in human history), and Israel's wars recast via

"revisionist history" as aggressive ventures.

In the world of the anointed, writes Sowell, reality becomes "optional." "Divorce from reality is so nearly complete that the question rarely, if ever, arises as to whether the world inside the mind of the anointed differs from the world outside....The crucial role of a vision is that it enables a vast range of beliefs to be regarded as presumptively true until definitively disproved by unchallengeable evidence--something seldom encountered outside of science laboratories." One doubts that even Israel's destruction could shake the vision of such a specimen as Shimon Peres. Escaping on a raft from the Tel Aviv beach, coming up for air for the third time when the raft capsized, one suspects Peres would cry, "It was the settlers. The peace process would have worked had it not been for the settlers."

Alas, the words with which Sowell, paraphrasing Churchill, concludes his book are likely to serve as a fitting epitaph for Israel's leaders: "Seldom have so few cost so much to so many."◇

Dr. Rael Jean Isaac has written two books and numerous articles on Israeli politics.

POWER AND SURVIVAL

(Continued from p.8)

is required is not a replication of enemy barbarism, but a policy that recognizes such barbarism as the essential starting point for Israel's national security and national defense. With such recognition, the present "peace process" would be rejected immediately and a new peace process--one based on Israel's commitment to "remain standing" at all costs--could be implemented. ⁵ ◇

Prof. Louis Rene Beres is the author of 14 books dealing with international relations and international law. Born in Zurich, Switzerland in 1945, he lectures and publishes widely on Israeli security matters, always in non-mainstream fashion.

Notes

1. This idea is explored further by Ernest Becker in two very important books: *The Denial of Death* (Free Press, 1973) and *Escape from Evil* (Free Press, 1975). Both books explore the thesis that the root cause of human evil lies in the common struggle to transcend death. Becker, in turn, drew heavily upon the work of Otto Rank.

2. "All power," Ernest Becker reminds us, "is in essence power to deny mortality. Either that or it is not real power at all, not ultimate power, not the power that mankind is really obsessed with." (*Escape from Evil*, p.81)

3. Vocalization of the "love of death" is not unique to the Middle East, nor is it unprecedented in world politics. In 1936, on the occasion of a speech by the nationalist general Millan Astry at the University of Salamanca in Spain, the hall thundered with the general's favorite motto: Viva la Muerte! "Long live death!" When the speech was over, Miguel de Unamuno, rector of the University, rose and said: "Just now I heard a necrophilous and senseless cry...this outlandish paradox is repellent to me." The cry that was repellent to the philosopher was the passion of the Falangists and is today, for Israel, the lurid and potentially decisive undertone of certain Islamic terrorist beliefs about power and survival.

4. There are two separate but interdependent ideas here. The first is the rather pragmatic and mundane observation that killing someone who would otherwise kill you is a life-supporting action. Why assume that your intended victim would otherwise be your assassin? Because your own government has already clarified precisely who is friend and who is foe. The second, far more complex idea is that killing in general confers immunity from mortality. This idea (now familiar to us) of death as a zero-sum commodity, is captured by Ernest Becker's paraphrase of Elias Canetti: "Each organism raises its head

over a field of corpses, smiles into the sun, and declares life good." Or according to Otto Rank's *Will Therapy and Truth and Reality*: "The death feat of the ego is lessened by the killing, the Sacrifice, of the other; through the death of the other, one buys oneself free from the penalty of dying, of being killed."

5. In the best of all possible worlds, of course, individuals and states, liberated from the "terror at the fact of death," could reimagine power, detaching it from prevailing notions of survival at the expense of others. Here the ancient ideal of Epicurus would hold sway. In his letter to Menoecus, Epicurus counseled: "Become accustomed to the belief that death is nothing to us. For all good and evil consists in sensation, but death is deprivation of sensation. And therefore a right understanding that death is nothing to us makes the mortality of life enjoyable, not because it adds to it an infinite span of time, but because it takes away the craving for immortality." We are not yet ready, as a species, for the wisdom of Epicurus.

JUSTIFIED SCORN

(Continued from p.6)

autonomous "Palestine Arab entity" with a Covenant calling for the destruction of Israel to establish its seat of government in Israel's capital city in violation of Israeli law. They also must find it difficult to fathom a government that is willing to exchange its land, water and holy places for pieces of paper saying "peace" only fifty years after the Holocaust, with weaker, defeated Arab regimes and a terrorist chieftain.

It was understandable that the Austrian Foreign Minister treated the present government of Israel like Jews were treated in Austria before 1945, because the Rabin-Peres-Beilin triumvirate must remind her and her government of the *Judenrat* in occupied Europe. ◇

George Rubin is a member of the editorial board of *Outpost*.

One Minute to Midnight
Dr. Irving Moskowitz

THE LONDON REVELATIONS

On July 26 and 27, 1994, bombs ripped through an Israeli Embassy building and the offices of several pro-Israel organizations in London, injuring 14 people. Because the bombings took place just days after the attack on the Buenos Aires Jewish Center, which was attributed to Islamic militants, it was generally assumed that the London explosions were likewise the work of Hamas, Hezbollah, or some similar Muslim fundamentalist group.

But when charges were formally filed against the prime suspects in the London bombing case earlier this summer, it turned out that they were not Islamic fanatics after all. Contrary to the popular assumption that impoverished Muslim fundamentalists are the only terrorists, and that secular "Palestinian" Arabs are "reasonable" and "moderate," the London bombing defendants are well-to-do, secular, and affiliated with a faction of the PLO.

In sharp contrast with the image of Arab terrorists as unemployed Gaza Strip day laborers, one of the London defendants, Mohammed Derbas, posted bail of

\$160,000--in cash, drawn from his grandparents' London bank account. All three of the suspects are residents of the posh Knightsbridge section of London. And, according to documents that police investigators found in their apartments, the three are associated with a PLO faction, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine.

Supporters of the Oslo agreements like to pretend that the PFLP, like Hamas, is an independent "extremist" group over which the "moderate" Arafat has no control. In fact, however, the PFLP is still a member-organization of the PLO. Arafat never expelled it. If he is so opposed to the "extremists," one might ask, why hasn't he taken even the symbolic step of formally expelling the PFLP?

Around the same time that the London trial was getting underway, PFLP terrorists murdered two Israeli teenagers hiking in Wadi Kelt, south of Jerusalem. Arafat's Israeli defenders pointed triumphantly to news reports that the PLO quickly "cracked down" on the PFLP by arresting a number of their members in Gaza. A few days later, when the glare of the media spotlight had vanished, the PFLP men were set free. "The police took them, put them in jail for a day and then freed them without asking them a single question," said PFLP spokesman Younis Jarou. That says more than anything else about Arafat's true attitude toward those who murder Israelis.◊

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