

OUTPOST

March 2005—Issue #176

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

A Turning Point?

Herbert Zweibon

As Yogi Berra would put it, it's déjà vu all over again. The Oslo "peace process" is on course as if it had never been tried and failed.

The needle of U.S. policy is once again caught in the groove of "territories for peace," the broken record U.S. administrations have played since Israel's birth. The result has produced Nobel peace prizes -- not peace. And this is inevitable, for what no U.S. administration has been willing to face, although the evidence mounts as high as Everest, is that the Arabs are not interested in a slice of Israeli territory, but are determined to wipe out the Jewish state.

In the 1950s there was Secretary of State Dulles's suggestion that Israel give up the Negev on the theory that peace would come once Egypt and Jordan would no longer have a frustrating geographic barrier between them.

Two years after Israel's victory in the Six Day War of 1967, Secretary of State Rogers advanced the so-called Rogers Plan calling for Israel to withdraw more or less to its prewar armistice lines. In the 1970s there was a new wrinkle as President Carter, in March 1977, called for a Palestinian "homeland" (up to then the so-called "West Bank" was to be returned to Jordan). In 1982 the Reagan Plan once again called for Israel to go back to the old armistice lines. Now Condoleezza Rice joins the long line of Secretaries of State promoting doomed-to-fail plans to bring peace through Israel's territorial amputation.

And so President Bush gears up -- along with the EU, Russia and the UN, all sworn enemies of Israel -- to implement the "Road Map" for a Palestinian state. As writer P. David Hornik notes, the conservative Bush administration should surely realize "that there is no reason why the inversion of all its principles -- not to compromise, deal with, or capitulate to terrorists, fighting evil, distinguishing between attacker and defender -- should produce good results uniquely in the Israeli-Palestinian case."

Indeed the results are likely to be uniquely terrible. Turning points are rarely recognized when

they occur but this is likely to be one. The moral scandal of Israel uprooting Jewish communities and establishing a Palestinian Arab state in the historical homeland of the Jewish people is likely to presage the end of Israel. We have the irony of a President of the United States, supposedly intent on bringing democracy to the Middle East, pursuing policies that will destroy the only democracy that exists there. It may deeply wound that democracy even before a renewed Arab *jihad*. As the Sharon government, in its efforts to accommodate pressures from the West, pursues its ethically and strategically indefensible actions it is producing internal turmoil and the government's reaction may well be massive detention of Jews without trial, undermining the state's democratic foundations.

While Israel is clearly the primary victim, the implications go well beyond Israel. Israeli retreat, the creation of a Palestinian state, the dissolution of internal Israeli cohesion, the snowballing assault on Israel's existence that all this is bound to produce, represent the triumph of the most evil forces in the world. It is the triumph of the bin Ladens, the al-Zarqawis, the Arafats, those imams who preach hatred each Friday from their mosques, the suicide bombers, Hezbollah, Hamas, those burning with hatred of the West and its civilization, who would, if they could, bring a new Dark Age upon the world.

And the triumph over Israel will energize those forces, not appease them, any more than Czechoslovakia's abandonment appeased Hitler. For the abandonment of Israel, far from persuading the Moslem world that the Christian world is their friend, tells the Islamists that the West has lost the will to defend its civilization, not merely the Europeans (that they already knew) but the United States.

In This Issue

| | |
|---|------|
| The Oslo Syndrome by Kenneth Levin | ...3 |
| Demolition Derby by Jack Engelhard | ...8 |
| Abdul Aziz al Saud and President Roosevelt: A Conversation | ...9 |
| Bat Ye'or's Eurabia by Rael Jean Isaac | ..10 |
| Oslo Redux by Ruth King | ..11 |

From the Editor

The Oslo Syndrome

In this issue, we have assembled excerpts from Kenneth Levin's excellent new book *The Oslo Syndrome: Delusions of a People Under Siege* (published by Smith and Kraus), which weaves together all the strands to explain the terrible suicidal course upon which Israel embarked in 1993 and continues to pursue. A psychiatrist, Levin focuses on the psychological mechanisms that shaped the way Jews responded to hatred and oppression in the centuries of Diaspora living, the extent to which they brought these dysfunctional attitudes with them to Israel and, confronted with relentless Moslem and growing European hostility, reenacted those responses. But the book is much more than a psychological exploration. It is also a history of the Jews and an in depth study of the Oslo years, clearly written, absorbing – and absolutely devastating. This book, like Bat Ye'or's *Eurabia*, which can be ordered from AFSI, is essential reading.

Turkey Overboard

We have warned in these pages that the influence of Ataturk (with his policies of secularization) has steadily eroded in Turkey, which has more and more succumbed to Islamist influences. Up to now this extremely serious development has received little attention in the media; indeed there have been obvious reasons why politicians have been eager to downplay it. European populations have been uneasy in the face of their leaders' plans (promoted by the U.S.) to incorporate Turkey into the European Union: the prospect of admitting a radical Islamist Turkey (and flooding Europe with potential *shahids*) could mobilize them.

But now Robert Pollock in *The Wall Street Journal* (Feb. 16) breaks the silence with a vengeance: U.S.-Turkey relations have collapsed, he writes, "And what a collapse it has been. On a brief visit to Ankara earlier this month with Undersecretary of Defense Doug Feith, I found a poisonous atmosphere – one in which just about every politician and media outlet (secular and religious) preaches an extreme combination of America-and-Jew-hatred that *voluntarily* goes far further than anything found in most of the Arab world's state-controlled press. If I hesitate to call it Nazi-like, that's only because Goebbels would probably have rejected much of it as too crude."

Pollock reports that the intellectual climate in which Eric Edelman, the U.S. ambassador to Turkey, is operating "has gone so mad that he actually felt compelled to organize a conference call with scientists from the U.S. Geological Survey to explain that secret U.S. nuclear testing did not cause the recent tsunami."

In the face of the most incredible media slanders, writes Pollock, "Turkish politicians have been utterly silent. In fact, Turkish parliamentarians themselves have accused the U.S. of 'genocide' in Iraq,

while Mr. Erdogan (who we once hoped would set an example of democracy for Moslems) was among the few world leaders to question the legitimacy of the Iraqi elections. When confronted, Turkish pols claim they can't risk going against 'public opinion.'"

Beyond Satire

IMRA (Independent Media Review and Analysis) sends the following item with the preface "Not a parody." "About 350 Palestinian gunmen will be incorporated into the Palestinian Authority security forces soon as part of a deal reached between PA Chairman Mahmoud Abbas and leaders of all the Palestinian factions." All of these men are on Israel's list of wanted terrorists, a number of them part of Hamas and Islamic Jihad. According to the PA's Minister of Agriculture, "the move is designed to protect them against Israeli assassination attempts....They are entitled to join the security forces because of their involvement in the resistance."

And this is the security force Sharon expects to "protect" Israel from terror and outright warfare in the years ahead?

Meanwhile, in abject appeasement mode, the Israeli government not only is set to release at least 500 terrorists (including, for the first time, those found guilty of murdering Israeli civilians) but, as Carolyn Glick reports, in a separate agreement, is allowing "the terrorists deported from Bethlehem in 2002 – after they took over, desecrated and laid siege to the Church of the Nativity for 39 days – to return to the city and face no charges for their crimes." The Christians of Bethlehem, writes Glick, are "in a blind panic" for in 2002 members of this group summarily executed more than a dozen Christians, raped Christian girls, took over Christian homes, extorted money from Christians and expropriated Christian lands.

From Moshe Dayan, 1965

"The essence of Israel's security in this region is deterrence. When we formed the State in 1948-9, we were very weak... Had the Arabs mounted another major invasion, we could have lost. We devised a solution to this problem. It was deterrence. Think about being lost in a forest and surrounded by hostile
(Continued on page 12)

Outpost

Editor: Rael Jean Isaac

Editorial Board: Herbert Zweibon, Ruth King

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

Americans For a Safe Israel

1623 Third Ave. (at 92nd St.) - Suite 205
New York, NY 10128
tel (212) 828-2424 / fax (212) 828-1717

The Oslo Syndrome: Delusions of a People Under Siege

Kenneth Levin

(Editor's note: As Israel blindly prepares to re-enact the failed Oslo peace process, Kenneth Levin's new book, of which we offer here brief excerpts, is especially important.)

The Psychological Roots of Oslo

The determination to hold fast to a particular comprehension of reality no matter what the strength of countervailing evidence, to be impatient with all invoking of such evidence and brook no debate, is virtually a textbook definition of "delusional." It is not surprising then that many observers responded with a sense of something being psychologically amiss in the avid and unshakable embrace of Oslo by its Israeli and Jewish-American enthusiasts (the latter typically no more open to countervailing evidence or tolerant of challenge than their Israeli counterparts). Thus, I found myself in September, 1993, and increasingly in the months and years that followed, being asked again and again by acquaintances, both Jewish and non-Jewish, variations on questions of the sort: Why are the Israelis doing these insane things? Why are Jews so self-destructive? So suicidal?

Such questions, and the events that prompted them, brought to mind the extensive literature dating back to the first decades of the twentieth century attempting to address what was perceived as a distinctively Jewish self-denying and self-destructive pathology. The literature related this pathology to the particular travails of Diaspora Jewish life in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. But those difficulties were, at least superficially, very different from the circumstances confronted by a free people in a sovereign Jewish state.

Yet the reactions of Diaspora Jews to the corrosive indictments and assaults they suffered in that earlier period are relevant to the delusions many Israelis have embraced in the face of chronic besiegement. Immigrants to the pre-state Jewish community in Eretz Israel and then to the state brought with them predilections learned in the Diaspora. While they may have foreseen in the prospect of being citizens of a Jewish state a release from the persecutions of life in exile, some also promoted in their new society self-deluding concepts of proper, accommodating Jewish behavior born of the Jewish predicament in Europe. They did so not only as parents but as teachers, journalists, and writers. And many Israelis, confronted with the chronic Arab assault, have reacted in ways reflecting those responses introduced into Israeli culture by Diaspora immigrants.

Clues to the psychology of those who embraced Oslo can be found in the rationales with which they sought to defend their position. Those arguments were very often either delusionally self-deprecating or delusionally grandiose.

Illustrative of the former was the burgeoning of a largely bogus revisionist history of Israel, the so-called New History, beginning particularly in the late nineteen eighties. This rewriting of the history of the state implicitly or explicitly placed the onus on Israel for perpetuation of the Arab-Israeli conflict over the previous half-century: It was Israeli militancy and Israeli occupation of the territories in the face of Arab openness to compromise that initiated and sustained the conflict. Therefore, Israel's ceding of the territories would end the conflict and bring about a new era of genuine peace.

Many Israelis were drawn in by the new historians' claims that, despite the Palestinian Arabs' rejection of the UN partition plan in 1947 and despite the subsequent invasion of Israel by five Arab armies, Israel was actually the villain in the story. They took to heart assertions that the Arab terror of the 1950s really was not so onerous and Israeli counteractions were too heavy-handed. But even someone unable to analyze the new historians'

specific claims and discern the lies in them should have been able to see the overarching lie in their authors' assessments of the nature of the Arab-Israeli conflict. There was abundant evidence of Arab intent available to any Israeli, evidence in the form of anti-Jewish rhetoric and policy reflecting an Arab perception that the only just outcome would be Israel's dissolution. It still, therefore, required a major exercise in self-deception to perceive Arab intentions as "moderate," as having always been "moderate," and as consistent with genuine peace were only Israel to change its ways and be forthcoming enough in its concessions.

At the same time, delusional grandiosity was also apparent, as in arguments that Arab quiescence could be won by Israel's proffering benefits to Arab partners in economic, environmental, medical, and other endeavors. According to this thinking, the lure of economic gains would drive the Arabs to enter into peace agreements and would assure Arab adherence to those agreements – if only Israel were sufficiently forthcoming. Such arguments ignore, of course, the relative inconsequentiality of the economic strength of Israel, however impressive for a country of six million, and the relative insignificance of opportunities potentially provided by cooperation with Israel, in the context of the vast Arab world of over a quarter billion souls.

It required a major exercise in self-deception to perceive Arab intentions as "moderate."

They ignore the obvious consideration that hostility to Israel may have a utility in the domestic and inter-Arab politics of Arab governments that far outweighs in those governments' calculations the benefits any rapprochement with Israel might provide. They ignore the fact that the fundamentalist threat to so-called moderate regimes is another reason for those regimes to keep Israel at arm's length. They ignore the example of Egypt, which has reneged on virtually all of the numerous accords touching on economic cooperation that were part of the 1978 Camp David treaty.

Both the self-deprecating and the grandiose distortions of reality have a common source: A wish to believe Israel to be in control of profoundly stressful circumstances over which it, unfortunately, has no real control.

Clinging to Oslo

What, in fact, followed on the initial Oslo accords was essentially what the doubters anticipated.

The end of terrorist acts against Israel was particularly touted by Rabin and his colleagues as one of the major benefits that would accrue to Israel as a result of the Oslo process. Arafat and his allies had foresworn in the 1993 accord their own engagement in terror and were now committed to acting against others responsible for attacks on Israel, particularly the Islamic fundamentalist groups. Moreover, Rabin emphasized that negotiations could not proceed in an atmosphere of violence, and a cessation of violence would be a test of the Oslo process and a condition for its continuation. An end to incitement to violence was similarly characterized as a key test of the Palestinian Authority's compliance with its obligations under the accords and so of the viability of the Oslo process.

But anti-Israel rhetoric and incitement by Arafat and his associates did not end. Indeed, on the evening of September 13, 1993, just hours after his signing of the Declaration of Principles and his handshake with Rabin on the White House lawn, Arafat, in a broadcast on Jordanian state television, assured his followers and the Arab world generally that the events of the day, rather than representing a shift in policy, were simply steps in the first stage of his 1974 Plan of Phases for Israel's destruction. In the ensuing months, allusions to the plan were a staple of Arafat's speeches to Arab audiences.

Arafat also at times stated his agenda even more explicitly, referring to areas within Israel that the Palestinians would ultimately possess. In a speech in 1995, he declared, "Be blessed, O Gaza, and celebrate, for your sons are returning after a long celebration. O Lod, O Haifa, O Jerusalem, you are returning, you are returning." In a speech broadcast in Novem-

ber, 1995, Arafat assured his audience, "The struggle will continue until all of Palestine is liberated."

There is a wish to believe Israel to be in control of profoundly stressful circumstances over which it, unfortunately, has no real control.

The Israeli government's response to this and other incitement by Arafat and his associates was muted. Most often, the incitement was entirely ignored. Israeli media, both government-controlled and independent likewise tended to ignore it. This was no doubt in part because the incitement was embarrassing and called into question government policy and the new-found faith in Arafat. But in addition to this, there seemed to be an assumption among many in government circles, and among those in the media sympathetic to government policies, that the incitement did not really matter, that the assurances of peaceful intent that Arafat and his lieutenants were conveying to Israeli officials were more important than the incendiary messages they were giving to their own people.

Many construed the Palestinians' receptiveness to incitement as a consequence of their not yet experiencing the full benefits of peace, and they saw the solution to Palestinian hostility in more rapid implementation of Israeli concessions. Indeed, if the stepwise nature of the Oslo process and of Israeli withdrawals was presented to the Israeli public by the government as a mechanism for testing Arafat's, and the Palestinians', intentions and trustworthiness, some in the government, particularly those Laborites around Yossi Beilin and ministers drawn from the Meretz Party, appear to have seen no need for testing. They unequivocally trusted both Arafat and the Palestinians to give Israel full peace for full withdrawal, would have preferred to institute territorial concessions much more rapidly, and saw utility in gradual withdrawal only as a device for acclimating the Israeli public to the new realities the government was creating.

In addition to the persistence of incitement, acts of terror likewise continued apace. If Arafat offered any condemnation at all, it was lukewarm and couched in statements that such attacks were against Palestinian interests. Even these pinched declarations were typically pried from him only after bombings that killed large numbers of Israelis and only when international attention was turned to Arafat's response. Moreover, such statements invariably avoided condemning Hamas and Islamic Jihad—the perpetrators of the bombings—by name. On the contrary, Arafat at times praised the terror groups, their leaders and their operatives.

Not surprisingly, Arafat did nothing to disarm Hamas and Islamic Jihad or dismantle their infrastruc-

tures. While he did occasionally arrest members of these organizations and murderers of Israelis, detainees were often soon released or given furloughs. This pattern quickly became known as “revolving door” imprisonment, and some such “prisoners” were even recruited into the Palestinian police.

In the fifteen months between Arafat's arrival in Gaza and the signing of the next accord, Oslo II, the initial Israeli government stance, that terror and the peace process were incompatible and that continuation of the former would mean termination of the latter, was effectively abandoned. Indeed, the government even cast Arafat and his Palestinian Authority as an ally against the terrorism despite the overwhelming evidence to the contrary. For example, in August 1995, addressing the issue of recent terrorism, Rabin declared: “This is a war against the enemies of Israel and the enemies of peace. It is a war which we are waging today, to some extent, together with the Palestinian Authority, whose enemies they are also.”

The primary target of the terrorists, the government argued, was the peace process itself; it was not Jews or Israelis per se they sought to kill, but the “peace.” So the proper Israeli response would be to accelerate the process and the pace of concessions and thereby frustrate the terrorists. For some in the government, this line of argument, and the protection of Arafat, were no doubt motivated by a desire to cast its Oslo gamble in a positive light despite the terror and Arafat's recalcitrance. But many in the coalition sincerely believed this rhetoric.

Of course, as was entirely obvious to numerous observers, this Israeli response essentially rewarded the Palestinians for terror. The more terror, the more the government urged a speeding up of the “peace process,” whose most tangible elements were Israeli withdrawals and other concessions. Not surprisingly, the terror did not diminish and Arafat continued on his course of tolerance toward and tacit, and at times explicit, cooperation with the terrorism's perpetrators.

Arafat Moves toward Open Warfare

After the outbreak of violence in September 2000, and the unraveling of the Oslo Accords, various senior officials in military intelligence and other Israeli intelligence services argued that they had informed the government of Arafat's noncompliance with Oslo's security provisions and of his continued commitment to a belligerent agenda but that government leaders chose to ignore the warnings. But the reality appears to have been more complicated. While the various branches of Israeli intelligence were providing the government with evidence of Palestinian malfeasance and

commitment to terror and ultimate confrontation, the leaders of the intelligence community were submitting contorted and hedged interpretations of the evidence that sought to reconcile it with the possibility of Arafat still being a genuine “peace” partner. It may well be that this reflected in part the intelligence leadership's simply providing the political echelon with what it knew the latter wanted to hear – a not uncommon phenomenon even though a dereliction of duty. But it seems that also at work here was an embrace by the intelligence community of the Oslo *zeitgeist* that blinded it to the full import of its own data.

The Israeli government's ignoring or downplaying of Arafat's repeated calls for Holy War and his other exercises in incitement, and the government's continually responding to terror not as a violation of Oslo commitments but as a reason to hasten forward into additional “agreements,” were accompanied by other government failures as well. There were additional examples of the Rabin administration refusing to allow Palestinian flouting of the first Oslo accords to halt or even slow more than briefly the parade of more concessions and more “peace” ceremonies.

Arafat quickly established armed forces substantially exceeding those allowed under the Gaza-Jericho accord, and his agents lost no time in organizing smuggling operations to bring into the territories weapons banned by the agreement. All this occurred with the full knowledge of Israel but with no impact on Israel's eagerness to pursue accommodation. The Palestinian's failure to extradite murderers of Israelis again caused barely a ripple.

Despite Oslo commitments protecting Palestinians who had cooperated with Israeli intelligence prior to the agreements, Arafat's forces immediately embarked on a series of “collaborator” murders that killed dozens. This too elicited hardly a murmur of protest from the Rabin administration. In addition, the Oslo accords included arrangements for cooperation between PA and Israeli security services, and Israel repeatedly passed on to the PA information about terrorist activities; but this very often led not to any significant moves by the PA against the terrorists but rather to the PA using the information to track down possible Palestinian sources of the Israeli intelligence and to attack them, once more with little Israeli reaction. But it should hardly be surprising that Israel was virtually silent about the murder of so-called Palestinian collaborators when it was so supine in its responses to the murder of Israelis.

While not all the steps taken by Arafat to impose his dictatorial control entailed violations of Oslo, some did; and insofar as the Israeli government acquiesced to those violations, its stance represented not simply passivity in the face of Arafat's course but vir-

The government even cast Arafat as an ally against terror despite the overwhelming evidence to the contrary.

tual collusion in it.

Arafat's assumption of control in the territories has been best described by Daniel Polisar, who at the time headed Peace Watch, the only Israeli group accredited by the PA to be an observer of its 1996 elections. Polisar documents "the rise of a regime characterized by a massive police force whose specialty was intimidation of political opponents; an executive branch in which Arafat alone made all major decisions and in which the civil service was reduced to a corrupt patronage machine; the institutionalized absence of the rule of law, and a judiciary that lacked any independence; and the intimidation of the media and human rights organizations, to the point that it became virtually impossible to transmit any message other than one personally approved by Arafat."

Arafat and his PA associates diverted a large percentage of the PA budget, much of it consisting of foreign contributions, to personal accounts and private use. A comptroller's report on PA finances for 1996 stated that \$325 million out of a budget of \$800 million had disappeared, either to "waste" or embezzlement by PA officials. In a protocol ancillary to the Oslo accords, Israel had agreed to reimburse the PA for taxes collected on imported goods destined for areas under Palestinian governance. Arafat insisted that the taxes be placed in accounts personally controlled by him, and Israel agreed to this. The transfers, until interrupted upon Arafat's launching of his terror war in September 2000, amounted to about \$2.5 billion.

The Palestinians had developed, under Israeli administration, the freest press in the Arab world: Arafat established PA-controlled newspapers to overwhelm the independent papers, and he ultimately intimidated and crushed the latter. A number of human rights groups had flourished in the territories during Israel's control. Either out of "nationalist" sentiment or because of Arafat's pressure, all retreated from high-profile human rights monitoring. The few individuals who refused to bend and chose to criticize PA practices were threatened, arrested, and accused of being Zionist agents. Not only was the Israeli government silent, but the Israeli Left in general was mute.

The major targets of the government's animus were those Jews who saw the self-delusion and terrible dangers in the Oslo path and voiced their opposition to it. All challengers were now attacked as "enemies of peace," often as the Jewish equivalent of those Arab "enemies of peace" who were perpetrating the terrorist attacks against Israel. It was perhaps not surprising that the government and its supporters were not prepared to respond seriously to the critiques of

So little was Palestinian behavior covered in the Israeli media that citizen groups emerged to do the job.

Oslo put forward by its opponents, that it limited its reaction almost exclusively to smears and name-calling. But its doing so was another mark of its eagerness to put aside all measured consideration in its embrace of the faith that sufficient concessions would inexorably yield a durable peace.

At the same time, the government sought to conceal from the public anti-Israel incitement by Palestinian officials and clerics and in Palestinian media and schools as well as evidence of Arafat's tolerance of and cooperation with Islamic fundamentalist and other groups perpetrating anti-Israel terrorism. In effect, government leaders saw themselves not as the public's servants but as paternal guiding figures, as philosopher kings, who could legitimately withhold information from a too benighted and emotional public in the interest of cultivating accommodation with Arafat and his associates and achieving "peace."

Both state and independent media followed the government in this as well. Indeed, so little was [Palestinian behavior] covered in the Israeli media that citizens' groups emerged to do the job: to monitor, for example, official Palestinian media, statements by Arafat and other Palestinian leaders, Palestinian school texts, and sermons by Arafat-appointed mullahs, and to inform the Israeli public and the wider world of their venomous anti-Israel, anti-peace and often anti-Semitic and annihilationist content.

"Peace" through Abandoning Zionism

[There was] synergy between the exertions of the nation's cultural elites and those of the political leadership, the former providing guidance to the latter and influencing the government in its undertaking of reforms of national institutions, perhaps most notably the national education system. These reforms were primarily aimed at making the state and its institutions less Jewish and less Zionist, weaning the public away from Zionist perspectives and Zionist verities and rendering it more accepting of radical concessions as its leaders pursued their delusions of peace.

The penetration of the anti-Zionist and post-Zionist perspectives so common among Israel's cultural and academic elites into national policy extended even to the military. Asa Kasher, professor of philosophy at the University of Tel Aviv, went beyond the harsh critiques of the state offered by many of his colleagues to criticize the very existence of Israel. Yet such views did not preclude his being selected by Ehud Barak, then chief of staff of the IDF, to chair a committee to develop a new code of ethics for the Israeli military. The "values" and basic principles" laid out in the code are generic universalist ones that might apply to any military. An IDF soldier's loyalty is to be to the state, its citizens and the principles of democ-

In Memoriam

AFSI mourns the loss of Helene Klein, a dedicated leader of AFSI and chairman of the San Francisco chapter.

racy. Nowhere is there any reference to the Jewish state, the Jewish people, or the land of Israel. As Yoram Hazony notes, the extensive missions undertaken by the IDF to rescue European Jews and to help persecuted Russian Jews escape the Soviet Union – as well as other missions on behalf of Diaspora Jews in distress – would be inconsistent with *The Spirit of the IDF*. For they were not undertaken in defense of the state, its citizens or democracy but rather out of loyalties and a sense of obligation and responsibility not to Kasher's taste. Despite its radical redefinition of the proper role of the IDF and its soldiers, *The Spirit of the IDF* was adopted by the defense establishment in 1994 virtually without protest or dissent.

The history of militant advocacy of "universalism" and antipathy to so-called "Jewish particularism" is suggestive of the connection of such sentiments to the siege. Jewish anti-Zionism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was fueled by fears that Jewish nationalism would fan anti-Jewish sentiment in surrounding societies in the Diaspora and instigate a rolling back of *de jure* gains by Jews toward civil equality in the West. Insistence on "Jewish" being comprehended as representing exclusively a religious identity and vocation with an exclusively universalist message and meaning, was likewise inspired by the wish to placate anti-Jewish sentiment.

But to insist that Jews alone, who have, in fact, pledged themselves in their faith for millennia to precepts entailing moral, ethical obligations both to their own people and to all of humanity, be proscribed the right of independent national life in the name of a universalist agenda is anti-Jewish bias and reflects the contorting of oneself to accommodate anti-Jewish indictments. Casting such a universalist agenda in moral terms, as representing some higher, more liberal, more humane sensibility, and refusing to acknowledge the underlying fear of anti-Jewish sentiment, largely reflects a cultivating of intellectual dishonesty and self-delusion in the service of that fear.

Shortly after the start of the Oslo process the writer David Grossman declared that to see the process to its fruition in peace Israelis must concede to the Arabs not only geographic territories but territories of the soul. They must surrender their belief that it is of overriding importance for the Jewish people to have the military capacity to defend itself in its own land, the belief that the Holocaust was further evidence of the necessity of this, and the belief that the willingness of Israelis to sacrifice for the defense of the country, and to want it to take an active role in that defense, is a

virtue. They must also give up the belief that the creation of Israel represents a national return for the Jews from a long and too often horrifyingly painful exile. They must even yield their belief in the value of Jewish peopledhood.

In this statement about the need for such concessions of the soul in the service of the Oslo process, Grossman takes steps toward setting aside the lie that his and others' advocacy of these concessions really represents some single-minded striving for "universalist" and "democratic" ideals. But the statement still, of course, perpetuates another lie, the delusion—based on exhaustion with the siege and a desperate and overwhelming desire for its end—that the right self-abnegations by Israel, the right mix of territorial and spiritual retreat, can win Israel the peace it desires no matter how much the objective evidence of words and deeds by the other side indicates otherwise.

Kenneth Levin is a psychiatrist. His essay Jews, Israelis and the Psyche of the Abused appeared in the December 1996 and January 1997 issues of Outpost.

AFSI Books (postage included in price)

Eurabia—The Euro-Arab Axis

Bat Ye'or—\$20.00

Jabotinsky Video (including original movie footage of the events and personalities that formed the Jewish state) - \$18.00

Battleground: Fact and Fantasy in Palestine

Shmuel Katz—\$5.95

The Political and Social Philosophy of Ze'ev Jabotinsky: Selected Writings — \$25

Dubious Allies: The Arab Media's War of Words Against America —\$5.95

What Shimon Says—Shimon Peres in His Own Words—\$3.95

Order from:
Americans For A Safe Israel
1623 Third Ave., #205
New York, N.Y. 10128

Demolition Derby: A Plan For Who Goes First

Jack Engelhard

I have a plan. I was about to say I have a dream, but as we all know, this is a nightmare; so, how to get out? Well then, here is my plan.

We will get to that in a few paragraphs -- and no fair speeding ahead, as I intend to get paid by the minute. Read slowly.

Let us agree, for argument's sake, that the expulsion of Jews from Gaza and elsewhere is for the greater good (the Sharon Disengagement Plan).

Let us agree that this entire process has set brother against brother. This is no argument; it is fact. In Israel, it is Left against Right, and even Right against Right. It gets worse.

In America, for instance, Jews of the Right are not on speaking terms with Jews of the Left. I know this personally. We ask, what makes Tel Aviv kosher and Gush Katif treyf? Conservative American Jews are split outside as well; "outside" being those of the national camp in Israel who, for whatever reason, have switched and given their nod of approval to Ariel Sharon. We are mad at them, too.

Oh it's a mess!

So, what's my plan? Okay. Resolved, that a leader leads by example; and further resolved, that Sharon is a leader. After all, he is the prime minister of Israel. What's more, he once heroically led men into battle and within the ranks, it is known that a leader of men goes first.

As noted, the expulsion controversy has caused a rift so wide that there is murmuring of ethnic cleansing, and talk of Altalena and civil war.

How can one man put us all together again?

One man can do it, and that man is Ariel Sharon. For the prime minister who speaks of "painful concessions", well, here's one, and it is painful and it is personal.

What Ariel Sharon has to do is uproot himself. Yes, lead by example. I do not mean that he should quit as prime minister. I mean that he should pack his bags and bring the bulldozers into his own home and farm. Let Demolition Derby commence right there, at the doorstep of the prime minister. If he agrees to this and proceeds, who can complain?

Even right-wingers here and there will have to gulp and choose silence. Left-wingers, what's your complaint about this egalitarian proposal? There will be no talk of ethnic cleansing of Jews, for Sharon will have cleansed himself and shown how it's done. He will have demonstrated that if uprooting is necessary, he stands in front of the line, as a leader must, if he is true to his convictions.

No, this is no joke and I am not kidding. I am

very serious. So serious that, if it is open to ridicule, I am willing to take full responsibility and call it the Engelhard Plan.

If Sharon takes this bold step of disengaging himself foremost, imagine the headlines - "Sharon Shows The Way.

He will have snatched honor from disgrace and preserved the remains of his legacy, that he is master of all his people, not just dictator of some.

Imagine the pictures. Sharon's home in the process of being demolished, as he and his goods are carted off by U-Haul to some relocation center. To complete the picture, the heavy lifting will be done by Rent-A-Terrorist, as taken from the ranks of those just being

released from prison at Sharon's signature. Further proof that this prime minister practices what he preaches about goodwill gestures in addition to painful concessions.

Scenes such as that will render us mute and win us all back.

Who, then, would dare to dissent from Sharon's plan? You won't hear a word of complaint from me, nor from the rest of us, most likely. We will be obliged to concede that, roundabout, Sharon acted upon the words of Hillel: Do not do unto your neighbor what is hateful to you.

People will be awestruck in admiration that Sharon has chosen to be first among equals, first among the outgoing settlers.

Just the other day, Sharon said something like, "I used to be one of them." So, here is his chance to be one of them again, and in a big way, a heroic way, for he also referred to the doomed-to-be-evicted "settlers" as heroic. Well, imagine the heroism credited to him if he became the first to pack his bags, dismantle and go.

But this is not the end of the Engelhard Plan. Actually, it is the beginning, for the rest must follow. These would be the ministers of the Cabinet who voted with Sharon, and these would be the ministers of the Knesset who voted with Sharon, and these would be the judges who endorsed the plan with Sharon, and these would be members of the Israeli media who readily embraced disengagement for others and not for themselves.

All of them must pack up or shut up.

Is there any reason why this should not be so? Do tell.

Jack Engelhard's novel The Days of the Bitter End is being prepared for movie production. He is currently working on a book on the media, The Uriah Deadline.



Memorandum of Conversation between His Majesty Abdul Aziz al Saud, King of Saudi Arabia and President Roosevelt, February 14, 1945, aboard the U.S.S. Quincy.

(Editor's note: AFSI member David Kirk first discovered this memorandum when he went through the Peter Bergson papers in Yale University library. He has confirmed its authenticity: the document is in the FDR library, President's Map Room Papers, Naval Aid's Files, Crimea Conference A/16. Saudi Arabia's attitude toward Jews comes as no surprise to anyone; Roosevelt's coldness to Jewish survivors of the Holocaust – resettle them in Poland! -- and apparent total lack of sympathy for Jewish claims to a homeland in Palestine may come as a surprise to some. It would appear to be fortunate indeed that Harry Truman, not Roosevelt, was President when Ben Gurion declared the birth of Israel and sought international recognition.)

I.

The President asked his Majesty for his advice regarding the problem of Jewish refugees driven from their homes in Europe. His Majesty replied that in his opinion the Jews should return to live in the lands from which they were driven. The Jews whose homes were completely destroyed and who have no chance of livelihood in their homelands should be given living space in the Axis countries which oppressed them. The President remarked that Poland might be considered a case in point. The Germans appear to have killed three million Polish Jews, by which count there should be space in Poland for the resettlement of many homeless Jews.

His Majesty then expounded the case of the Arabs and their legitimate rights in their lands and stated that the Arabs and the Jews could never cooperate, neither in Palestine, nor in any other country. His Majesty called attention to the increasing threat to the existence of the Arabs and the crisis which has resulted from continued Jewish immigration and the purchase of land by the Jews. His Majesty further stated that the Arabs would choose to die rather than yield their lands to the Jews.

His Majesty stated that the hope of the Arabs is based upon the word of honor of the Allies and upon the well-known love of justice of the United States, and upon the expectation that the United States will support them.

The President replied that he wished to assure His Majesty that he would do nothing to assist the Jews against the Arabs and would make no move hostile to the Arab people. He reminded His Majesty that

it is impossible to prevent speeches and resolutions in Congress or in the press which may be made on any subject. His reassurance concerned his own future policy as Chief Executive of the United States Government.

His Majesty thanked the President for his statement and mentioned the proposal to send an Arab mission to America and England to expound the case of the Arabs and Palestine. The President stated that he thought this was a very good idea because he thought many people in America and England are misinformed. His Majesty said that such a mission to inform the people was useful, but more important to him was what the President had just told him concerning his own policy toward the Arab people

II.

His Majesty stated that the problem of Syria and the Lebanon was of deep concern to him and he asked what would be the attitude of the United States Government in the event that France should continue to press intolerable demands upon Syria and the Lebanon. The President replied that the French Government had given him in writing their guarantee of the independence of Syria and the Lebanon and that he could at any time write to the French Government to insist that they honor their word. In the event that the French should thwart the independence of Syria and the Lebanon, the United States Government would give to Syria and the Lebanon all possible support short of the use of force.

III.

The President spoke of his great interest in farming, stating that he himself was a farmer. He emphasized the need for developing water resources, to increase the land under cultivation as well as to turn the wheels which do the country's work. He expressed special interest in irrigation, tree planting and water power which he hoped would be developed after the war in many countries, including the Arab lands. Stating that he liked Arabs, he reminded His Majesty that to increase land under cultivation would decrease the desert and provide living for a larger population of Arabs. His Majesty thanked the President for promoting agriculture so vigorously, but said that he himself could not engage with any enthusiasm in the development of his country's agriculture and public works if this prosperity would be inherited by the Jews.



Bat Ye'or's Eurabia

Rael Jean Isaac

Giselle Bat Ye'or's *Eurabia*: The Euro-Arab Axis is that rare and astonishing book which describes immensely important developments that somehow had gone unnoticed — even though they shape the fate of all of us. What Bat Ye'or uncovers is, as Daniel Pipes has noted, “a nearly secret history of Europe.”

The story begins in the early 1960s when President Charles de Gaulle, returned to the leadership of France after many years in the political desert, resolved to restore France's grandeur (a notion with which he was obsessed) by creating a counterweight to American power. He set out to do this with a double-pronged strategy: creating a unified Europe based on an alliance with Germany and reorienting French policy (which had been supportive of Israel — it was French-built mirage jets that destroyed Egypt's air force in the 1967 war) toward the Arab world. De Gaulle had been forced to relinquish Algeria but he would turn this setback to French *gloire* into an opportunity to expand French influence to the entire Arab world. A unified Europe under French leadership commanding the energy resources upon which the developed world depended — in de Gaulle's grand scheme this Euro-Arab geostrategic bloc could be a force to rival and challenge the United States on the world stage.

European unification has, of course, been carefully chronicled, the story known to all who care to follow it. But it is the details of the second aspect of de Gaulle's strategy, the effort to achieve close rapprochement with the Arab world, that have gone largely unremarked. And while European unification has proceeded in good part as de Gaulle hoped, the ties with the Arab world, as Bat Ye'or shows, have scarcely developed as de Gaulle, with his fixation on the superiority of French culture, could have imagined. For what has happened is that Europe has become an instrument of Arab policy. The countries of the European Union, France in the lead, impelled by a mixture of ambition for power, greed and, increasingly, fear of Arab terror have become satellites of the Arabs, obedient to their will, in effect, *dhimmis*.

Bat Ye'or chronicles the series of conferences and institutions which European leaders established to promote Arab-European concord, the most important of which, the Euro-Arab Dialogue, conceived by the French, began in 1973. It is true that many of the resulting agreements, signed by the leaders of European and Arab governments, contain verbiage about mutual respect for religious freedom, human rights, equality of women, etc. But these are totally ignored by the Arabs while the Europeans submissively fulfill

their side of the bargain. The most crucial demand on Europe is that it join the Arabs in their war on Israel and the EU slavishly follows the Arab political line on Israel. But more than this, writes Bat Ye'or, the EU has become the strategic center of anti-Semitism and anti-Israel propaganda with the result that “the war against Israel is now fought throughout European institutions, in universities and schools, the media, in trade agreements, among NGOs, by churches and even in the streets where Jews have to hide their identity.”

The bargain also requires that Europeans accept a host of Arab economic, political, cultural and religious demands. Arab countries are to be the continued privileged source of mass immigration into Europe (without the immigrants adapting to European mores). Huge payments must be made to Arab causes (the EU has provided billions to the Palestinian Authority, for example, and France still refuses to label Hezbollah a terrorist organization, enabling it to raise vast sums in Europe for its terrorist activities). In

addition money collected from European taxpayers, says Bat Ye'or, “is generously distributed to Arab dictatorships as a modern ‘poll tax’ to buy Europe's security.” School curriculums propagate what Bat Ye'or calls “the Andalusian myth” of a supposed vastly superior Islamic culture forming the basis of European civilization. In November 2003, French premier Jacques Chirac dutifully declared that “Europe's roots are as much Muslim as Christian.”

The most breathtaking demand of Europe's Arab “partners” is for the redefinition of Christianity. Bat Ye'or calls this the “cult of Palestinianism” but the phrase does not convey the depth of what is involved here. For in a sense this is worse than the old *dhimmitude*. Traditionally Christians in Arab countries may have been subservient but in pre-modern times at least they kept the sense of who they were, what their religious beliefs were and the origins of those beliefs. Now the Arabs demand that Christianity itself be Islamized, its roots in Judaism cut off and denied. The historical Jesus is no longer a Jew, but an Arab Palestinian. The suffering of Palestinians continues the suffering of the Palestinian Jesus and this holy synthesis, writes Bat Ye'or, literally sanctifies the Palestinian Arab cause. The mission of Palestinian Liberation Theology is to liberate the world by unveiling Israel's diabolic character and cement through Palestinianism a worldwide Muslim-Christian alliance. It becomes a divine mission to remove Israel from Arab Palestine, thus upholding the honor and truthfulness of both Christianity and Islam. The Gospels are to be attached to the Koran through adopting the Muslim inter-

What Bat Ye'or uncovers is, as Daniel Pipes has noted, “a nearly secret history of Europe.”

pretation of Jesus as a Muslim prophet (along with Abraham, Moses and other Biblical figures) and the Moslem belief that Islam is the first religion common to the whole of humanity. As Bat Ye'or notes: "It may seem of no consequence to a post-religious Europe whether Jesus was a Muslim prophet who preached Islam or a Jew inspired by the Bible, but on this question depends the core of Christian belief – as well as the fundamental values of the Judeo-Christian civilization, and their survival."

Bat Ye'or observes that an aging, confused and timorous Europe vainly hopes to guarantee its own security through tribute, support to terrorist states and groups and anti-Zionism – in other words, *dhimmitude*, which is based on peaceful surrender, subjection, trib-

ute and praise. She records a telling symbol of creeping *dhimmitude*: the first page of the report establishing the aims of the recently established Anna Lindh Foundation (named after the venomously anti-Israel Swedish Foreign Minister murdered in 2003 and designed to advance European-Arab relations) is adorned with a thirteenth century map of the Mediterranean, unusual in that it is turned upside down, with the Arab Islamic world at top in the north sitting above Europe.

French pride was the foundation of Eurabia. What it produced can only serve to corroborate the validity of the Christian view that pride is the worst of the deadly sins – with the most deadly consequences.

OSLO REDUX

Ruth King

When Prime Minister Rabin gave his hand to Arafat in the infamous handshake on the White House lawn in 1993, Americans for a Safe Israel was alone among organizations to denounce the entire event. The only public figure that joined us (writing in *Commentary*) was Norman Podhoretz. To be sure there were expressions of skepticism -- including calls for PLO "compliance." But many organizations which ostensibly supported Israel's territorial and historical rights refused to lend their names to a Zionist Conference assembled by AFSI to remind participants of those rights and to denounce Oslo. The late Emil Fackenheim came from Israel as did the courageous "refusenick" Ida Nudel and Yoram Hazony, then director of the Shalem Center.

A decade later those who rose to applaud Arafat on the White House lawn tripped over themselves to criticize him. Those who hailed Oslo as a "new beginning" now saw it as a failed process. Moreover, the terrible events of September 11, 2001 seemed to focus many minds on the international Islamist assault on the West. The Arab war against Israel was understood to be a part of the great *Jihad*. This was especially so when stunned Americans saw the exultation and celebration throughout the Arab world -- especially marked in the Palestinian Arab street -- when our skyscrapers and the Pentagon were attacked.

For a very brief period Israel paused in its hitherto demoralizing pattern of concessions to terror. To be sure, the UN and the Europeans paid their customary tribute to Islam with unrelenting hectoring of Israel. Even Tony Blair, staunch in his support of American initiatives, took time out from the Afghanistan War to reiterate his belief that nothing could be solved without a reconciliation of the Israel/Arab problem.....on Arab terms, naturally.

However, in America and Israel, there were

louder and more articulate criticisms of the entire Oslo process. Arafat was isolated in his Ramallah compound even as suicide bombing and rockets continued on an almost daily basis. Anti-Semitism escalated throughout Europe, frightening local and other Jews dispersed throughout the world in America, South America, as well as those residing in Israel. The imperative for a strong Israel loomed larger than at any time since the 1960s, particularly as anti-Semitism surged throughout Europe, frightening not only Jews in the countries affected but Jews in the rest of the world. Christian Zionists were apprehensive and energized in their support.

And then? Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, the most vocal and unrelenting critic of Oslo, declared the "disengagement" from Gaza, ineluctably to be followed by more retreats, more abandonment of Judea and Samaria, more flooding the streets with jailed terrorists, more appeasement and more surrender. He can get away with it because, as an outraged Sarah Honig wrote in *The Jerusalem Post*, Israelis have "distanced themselves from their own cause, aren't emotionally involved with Jewish and Zionist interests, don't love, don't hate, don't deeply care."

Meanwhile, in the United States, the heat was turned up as Arafat was replaced by a terrorist without the stubble and head scarf. The media gushed with descriptions of a grandfatherly Abu Mazen. I would not know since my grandfathers never attained his age. They were victims of the Holocaust which Abu Mazen denied ever happened. And now all those who finally said, albeit a decade too late, that Oslo was a tragic error, had to mentally retool and find a new policy.

And what they did they come up with? Why, Oslo again. Another highly photographed handshake of an Israeli Prime Minister with a terrorist, and more strategic surrender in exchange for a *Hudna* (truce). They can learn about Moslem "truces" from Hugh Fitzgerald, or Robert Spencer or Andrew Bostom or Ibn Warraq or Bat Ye'or. Or, after listening to Abbas declare that war is over, they might turn to Muir's *Life of Mahomet*, p. 173: "His reason for the toleration of his

(Continued from page 11)

Meccan opponents was present weakness only. Patience for awhile was inculcated by God on Mahomet but the future breathed of revenge and victory.”

Baker Redux

On February 13th, 2005, James Baker was interviewed on ABC by George Stephanopolous who asked if Prime Minister Begin had been right to destroy Iraq's nuclear reactor. Remember that Baker was then Ronald Reagan's Chief of Staff and his reaction had been apoplectic (his wrath no doubt increased by

the animus he felt for Israel even as a youth at Princeton University where his senior thesis argued that the U.S. should not have recognized Israel at its birth). Baker replied that Israel was right and the American administration was wrong. Of course Baker went on to promote more anti-Israel policies as Secretary of State in the first Bush administration.

Baker's confession that he was wrong should remind us that Israel must do unpopular things, despite short term consequences. History will remember Begin far more kindly for taking out the Osirak reactor than for Camp David, which will one day be seen for the folly it was, setting Israel on the path of "territory for nothing" on which it is still tragically embarked.

(Continued from page 2)

animals. If you light a torch, boldly approach them showing no fear – they will retreat. But if you show fear – they will attack and you are lost. We used this principle to save Israel during those early years.”

Ward Churchill

It can come as no surprise that prior to likening the 3000 people murdered at the World Trade Center to “little Eichmanns” Churchill had gone after the Jews. As Edward Alexander reports in the New York Sun (Feb. 8) “Prior to this incident, Mr. Churchill's scholarly reputation was based mainly on a squalid tract called *A Little Matter of Genocide* (1997) in which he

argued that the murder of European Jews was not a “fixed policy objective of the Nazis.” Churchill complained that Jewish scholars stressed the Holocaust in order to ‘construct a conceptual screen behind which to hide the realities of Israel's ongoing genocide against the Palestinian population.”

The President of Hamilton College, forced to rescind the invitation to Churchill to speak amid a hullabaloo from alumni, provides an explanation on the college's website: the gist is praise of Churchill's courage under fire (he offered to come in a flak jacket), sympathy for what he has been forced to endure, and sorrow for the school body, who will not be enriched by exposure to the ideas Mr. Churchill had to offer.

Americans For A Safe Israel
1623 Third Ave. (at 92nd St.) - Suite 205
New York, NY 10128

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