



THE ISRAELI DEATH WISH

Arieh Stav

A

How Prime Ministers Can Simultaneously Be Wrong and Right

Menachem Begin

Sadat, too, adopted the policy of “continuing the war employing alternative tactics”. This became apparent especially in the wake of the Yom Kippur War. In the interim agreement, Sadat made enormous gains without paying any real price. Therefore, he hopes to attain his remaining goals by adopting a policy which perpetuates the war without the fighting – and why not? That monstrous creature [the writer is referring to Hitler, admired by Sadat] preferred conquests without wars...

Sadat, therefore, is continuing this policy vis-a-vis Israel, a prolongation of the Yom Kippur War employing different tactics...The “peace” which he hopes to achieve on his terms, that is – a complete Israeli withdrawal (from Sinai) to the June 4, 1967 borders, in addition to that which he refers to as, “restoring the rights of the Palestinian nation”, in other words, simple and clear to anyone in this country with a molecule of sense in his head – means the obliteration of the Jewish state. If this goal can be achieved without war – all the better! This is his aspiration...this is not a peace agreement; it’s a war treaty...and I, Menachem Begin, will never sign it.¹

The autumn issue of the quarterly **Hauma** was published in October 1977. Two months earlier, at the end of August 1977, Begin had visited Bucharest and asked Ceaucescu to apprise Sadat of his readiness to relinquish Sinai to him. The surprised Sadat refused to believe the Romanian tyrant and, therefore, Moshe Dayan was dispatched to Morocco on September 16 for a meeting with Hassan Tohami, the Egyptian Deputy Prime Minister, where he repeated, in his presence, Begin’s promise to return to the June 4, 1967 borders. This time Sadat relented and the “peace” commenced.

In Camp David, Begin deliberately signed an agreement which he had a few months before characterized as a “war treaty”, including a paragraph calling for the “restoration of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian People”, which for all intents and purposes granted legitimacy to a sovereign Palestinian entity in Judea and Samaria; in other words in those “regions of Judea and Samaria which are the cradle of the Hebrew nation and the *raison d’être* of the Jewish People”,² to use his own words.

¹ From Menachem Begin’s article, “Modern Political Methods”, **Hauma**, Fall Edition, 1977, p. 339.

² The paragraph: “Legitimate rights of the Palestinian people” is among the principles of the agreement. The Hebrew version of the passage: “The legitimate rights of the Israeli Arabs” is a pathetic (self?) deception as the addendum to the agreement explicitly states that the English version is conclusive.

Yitzhak Rabin

Begin's autonomy plan is a catastrophe which leads directly to a Palestinian state...autonomy must be prevented...the Labor Party will vote against it.³

Secular, democratic Palestine which is supposed to be constructed on the ruins of the State of Israel...⁴

A Palestinian state...will be a time bomb which will drag the Arab world into war.⁵

Those who have lost their way and support granting self-determination to the Palestinians actively abet terror, the PLO and constitute a security hazard to Israel. This is political folly...in this way they intensify terror and actively support it.⁶

The above quotations are a representative sampling, together forming a clear, firm *Weltanschauung* according to which any sovereign Arab entity in western *Eretz Israel* would delegitimize the Jewish state and serve as a springboard for its physical destruction. Rabin was one of the main proponents of this view. However, once he entered the office of Prime Minister in 1992, the man changed his opinion drastically. His most conspicuous activity during his three and a half year tenure as Prime Minister was to establish an independent, sovereign Arab entity in Judea and Samaria.

It is unthinkable, that we, even in peace, will withdraw from the Golan Heights. Anyone who will consider withdrawal from the Golan Heights will jeopardize the security of Israel.⁷

A mere two years after making that statement, which is but one sentence from a long speech devoted entirely to the security value of the Golan Heights, Yitzhak Rabin committed himself to ceding the region to Syria. When asked about the drastic change in his positions (September 12, 1994) he said: "Anyone who speaks of peace with Syria with the Golan Heights is telling a lie than which there is no greater."

In his inaugural speech in the Knesset as Prime Minister (July 13, 1992), Yitzhak Rabin said:

This government like all its predecessors believes that there are no differences of opinion in this house in terms of Jerusalem's eternity as the capital of Israel. Undivided, united Jerusalem was and always will be the capital of the nation of Israel under Israeli sovereignty. The government is resolute in its stand that Jerusalem is not negotiable. Every Jew vows, "If I forget thee O Jerusalem, may my right hand forget her cunning."

Nevertheless, according to the Oslo Agreement, the fate of "undivided, united Jerusalem" will be negotiated; meaning the city will certainly be divided, if not – why raise the issue at all? When Shimon Peres, Rabin's Foreign Minister, was asked about this matter, he replied: "We'll go to international arbitration." Peres said this in full knowledge that Israel has no chance to emerge victorious in international arbitration because, other than El Salvador and Costa Rica, no one in the world recognizes Israeli sovereignty in Jerusalem, old or new. Two years later, in November 1995, the Congress in Washington passed a law mandating the transfer of the Israeli embassy to Jerusalem,

³ Rabin's remarks at a meeting of the Foreign Affairs and Security Commission as published in **Ha'aretz**, August 1, 1978.

⁴ Rabin, *Pinkas Sherut*, (Hebrew), Tel Aviv, 1979, p. 583.

⁵ Rabin, Interview in **Ma'ariv**, February 10, 1989.

⁶ Rabin, Lecture at the Rehovot Economic Forum, as reported in **Ma'ariv**, August 3, 1986. Incidentally, as ironic as it may seem, this statement is an incisive description of the actions of the man himself.

⁷ Rabin, in a speech in Katzrin, Golan Heights, June 10, 1992.

recognizing Jerusalem as Israel's capital. The US President, after consulting with Yitzhak Rabin, vetoed the bill – it did not pass.⁸

Shimon Peres

Like Rabin, Shimon Peres based his political-strategic attitude on two foundations:

- a. Neutralizing the danger posed by a Palestinian state.
- b. Establishing defensible borders because “without defensible borders the State will be annihilated in war.” Quotations from Peres could easily fill many volumes, as he is something of an author.⁹

Shimon Peres never ceased to caution that the lack of strategic depth is an innate structural fault in Israel's geography because “in the twentieth century with the development of the ability to deploy armies rapidly, the growing importance of the depth of security zones has increased...” And if Israel were to withdraw from present positions (i.e. control over Judea and Samaria):

The absence of minimal territorial expanse will leave Israel in a position of total non-deterrence...and will arouse in the Arabs an irresistible desire to attack and destroy the Jewish state. In wartime the borders of the Palestinian state will serve as an excellent springboard for mobile forces to immediately advance toward Israel's vital infrastructure, diminish the Israeli Air Force's freedom of action in Israel's air space and cause much bloodshed, using massive artillery barrages from just beyond the border.

I don't believe that there is even one Israeli who believes, even privately, that we established settlements only to evacuate them in the future. The IDF will remain, therefore, on the road to Damascus.¹⁰

In the late 1980s, a complete reversal occurred in his position, and ever since then, he has devoted his life to a comprehensive, systematic repudiation of his previously held beliefs. In 1992, he initiated meetings with the PLO which led to the Oslo Agreements. Today, he is the man leading Israel back to the 1949 borders, the division of Jerusalem and the establishment of a Palestinian state. The following are but a few quotations which present Shimon Peres' current world view:

The decision to reach a peace agreement with Syria stems from our arriving at a moral determination. We do not want to continue to hold Syrian land. The Golan Heights are Syrian land; we are occupying Syrian land.¹¹

The Syrian Heights are not part of Israel.¹²

The Palestinians thought that they would receive Gaza first and nothing else. They are wrong. We are energetically working to ensure that the entire West Bank follows in Gaza's footsteps.¹³

⁸ On June 11, 1997, to commemorate the 30th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem, an overwhelming majority in the Congress – the largest on a matter of foreign policy since World War II – united and legislated The Jerusalem Embassy Act – Public Law 45-104.

⁹ Arieh Stav, “Peres: ‘Without Defensible Borders the State will be Annihilated in War’, **The Israeli Death Wish**, (Hebrew), Modan Publishers, 1998, p. 228.

¹⁰ Ibid. p. 233.

¹¹ To King Hassan, during Shimon Peres' visit to Morocco on May 7, 1995 – a short time after the declaration of the Convention of Islamic States concerning “the obligation to liberate El-Quds (Jerusalem) militarily from the Zionist colonialists”. Hassan happens to serve as the Head of an El-Quds Committee of the Arab League.

¹² Peres, in a press conference at the UN, May 30, 1995.

¹³ **The Israeli Death Wish**, *ibid.*, p. 244.

In fact, Shimon Peres is working to destroy the State of Israel, by his own definition, as “without defensible borders the State will be annihilated in war.”

Binyamin Netanyahu

Netanyahu based his political path to the Prime Minister’s office on the total negation of the Oslo Agreements which he saw as an existential disaster for Israel. He expounded his political philosophy in an intelligent, articulate and powerful book which was published in 1995, one year before the elections, as his credo.¹⁴ The book in its entirety, from beginning to end, was designed to delegitimize the peace process step by step. Already in the introduction to the book, Netanyahu describes Israel’s territorial concessions as a nightmare resulting from the loss of its *raison d’etat*, physically and spiritually.

After concessions in territory and power which Israel will actualize by withdrawing to the 1967 lines, after celebratory propaganda ceremonies which will accompany the signing of these withdrawal agreements, the dust which has clouded our grasp of reality will clear and we will be left standing dwarfed and weakened before a bitter and pathetic reality, then from around us the all too familiar demands that we withdraw from territories which we “conquered illegally” “in contravention of the partition agreement” will be propounded more powerfully and internally, supporters will be found claiming that we have no rights even to the minuscule land which remains in our possession.

This is a process which will necessarily lead either to a new, terrible war or to the liquidation of the State through “peaceful means”. This is a process which must be halted. It can be stopped by abandoning the policy of uninterrupted concessions and exchanging it for a sensible, courageous policy which will rally the nation’s will to exist and will renew its firm belief in its future.¹⁵

As soon as he entered the Prime Minister’s office, Netanyahu ceremoniously declared that he would continue the previous government’s peace process. Indeed, only a few weeks later, Netanyahu appeared before Arafat in Gaza and shook his hand. At their Washington Summit meeting, during which he went out of his way to exhibit his obvious affection for the Chairman of the Palestinian Authority, he declared:

There is complete trust between myself and Mr. Arafat...the ice has been broken...Friendship and understanding have been established.¹⁶

The political issue which was on the agenda of the outgoing Peres-Rabin government, but had not yet been resolved, was the withdrawal from Hebron. Prior to his election, Netanyahu continuously described that political act as a tragedy which will serve as a precedent for the division of Jerusalem. In order to lend credence to his words, he celebrated the Passover *seder* in 5755 (1995) in Hebron where he said the following:

¹⁴ Binyamin Netanyahu, **A Place Under the Sun**, Yediot Aharonot Publishers, 1995. The book was published in English in May 1993, in other words, before the Oslo “disaster”. As a result, Netanyahu updated the Hebrew translation, including complete, “fresh”, chapters elucidating his beliefs.

¹⁵ Ibid. p. 19.

¹⁶ The author is aware that among readers on both sides of the political spectrum, there are those who claim that Netanyahu has run the peace process into the ground. But this approach, popular among the public – negative for some, positive for others – is clearly mistaken. Anyone taking the trouble to analyze the cumulative delay in the implementation of the Oslo Agreements will find that the primary procrastination accrued during the Rabin-Peres government. The accusation that Netanyahu is trying to dissolve the process, is part of the daily regimen of character assassination directed at him by the media. But, as usual, it has no basis in reality.

Whoever abandons Hebron, the most ancient Jewish city in the world, Jerusalem's older sister, will not only neglect the personal security of the Jewish community of Hebron, but betray 4,000 years of Jewish history. Whoever does this, his name will live in eternal infamy in the annals of the Jewish nation.

In January 1997, a half year after assuming the position of Prime Minister, and after he carried out the Hebron withdrawal agreement in exacting detail (including supplying weapons to the Palestinian Authority's police force), Netanyahu contentedly and proudly pointed out: "We have resolved the Hebron issue, something the previous government was unable to do." The incitement-filled speech delivered by Arafat the day after the withdrawal, in which he declared, to quote just one example, that "the liberation of Hebron will pave the way for the liberation of Jerusalem" was received warmly by Netanyahu who characterized it ("despite certain dissonance") as "moderate".

At the first Likud convention following the elections, the Prime Minister unequivocally declared, while raising his voice and banging his fist on the table: "There will be no Palestinian state; there will be no state; there will be no Palestinian state!" But a few weeks later, he already spoke (through his spokesperson, David Bar-Ilan) of "something less than a state but more than autonomy", and that "it seems that we will have to get used to the idea of a Palestinian state." When asked about the dramatic shift in his stance, he replied that we "must accustom ourselves to the fact that ideals on which we were raised are no longer valid".¹⁷ Later on, with his newly appointed Foreign Minister Ariel Sharon, he openly admitted that a Palestinian state is a *fait accompli*.

Until now, we have described the "*salto mortale*" (death leap in both senses of the term) which four Prime Ministers have accomplished. All four were correct, in turn, in their warnings:

1. Predictably, Menachem Begin did indeed sign the "war treaty". Egypt spearheads the hostility toward Israel in every international forum; Cairo is the world center of vitriolic anti-Semitism; the comprehensive Egyptian armament effort, reaching 28% of the Egyptian gross national product is intended, according to the Egyptian Defense Minister, for war against Israel.
2. Peres' and Rabin's signatures on the Oslo Agreements accomplished exactly what they predicted it would. Rabin's claim that "those who support...Palestinian self-determination are actually abetting terror, the PLO, and constitute a security hazard to Israel," was fully realized, to an extent Rabin never dared imagine. Within two years, from September 13, 1993 – the date on which Oslo I was signed until the signature on the interim agreement on September 28, 1995 (Oslo II), Arab terror claimed 164 Jewish lives. That is more Jews than were killed in acts of terror per annum than in any other period in Israel's history. The era of "peace" increased Arab murder 265% relative to the *intifada* years and 745%, relative to the previous decade which was the period of open war by terrorist organizations against Israel. Including those killed abroad and on the Lebanese border, the number reaches 294. The number of terror fatalities from the establishment of the State through September 1995 stood at 1,150. In other words, two years of "peace" accounted for more than 38% of Arab terror victims in the history of the State of Israel.¹⁸

Soldiers and civilians were killed within the Green Line and without. Men, women and children were burned to death on buses, car bombs were detonated, taxi drivers were murdered by their passengers and employers by their employees. Cars overturned after their drivers had been stoned, children on Purim vacation were murdered, youngsters on field trips and old men on public benches were shot to death.

¹⁷ In an interview to the **Jerusalem Post**, January 24, 1997.

¹⁸ Source: IDF History Department as detailed in the brochure "The Arab and Islamic Terror", published by the Government Information Center, Jerusalem, 1995.

164 Jewish fatalities in Israel are the relative equivalent of 8,000 in the United States. In the attack on Pearl Harbor, the Americans suffered 2,000 casualties (equivalent to 42 deaths in Israel) and that was considered justification for the declaration of war on Japan.

3. Netanyahu's claim that the "peace" process will necessarily lead either to a new and terrible war or to the liquidation of the State through "peaceful means", is also being realized, this time under Netanyahu's own leadership. Israel, exhausted by massive foreign pressure and divided within, is gradually divesting itself of the cornerstone of its national existence. Against open threats of war and a developing military coalition on the Cairo-Damascus axis, the Jewish state finds itself in a situation of progressively declining strategic assets and military budgets, demoralization of the IDF and the anticipated loss of potential allies. For the first time in the history of the State, an Arab fighting force already numbering more than 40,000 troops, is materializing on the outskirts of Tel Aviv.

Have Circumstances Really Changed?

Yitzhak Rabin and Shimon Peres tended to explain the abrupt turnabout in their political paths by citing the changed circumstances in the world in general and in the region in particular, corresponding to the end of the Cold War:

It is incumbent upon us to see the New World as it is now. We must join the journey towards peace, reconciliation and cooperation which is gaining momentum around the globe ...the region has taken the path to peace and we cannot allow ourselves to miss the train.¹⁹

Peres often speaks about "the winds of reconciliation and peace which are blowing in the Middle East". In the "New Middle East", which is the name of his book, he foresees an economic triangle like the Benelux countries between the Jordanian-Palestinian confederation on the one hand and Israel on the other. In Peres' confederation, a "democratic, free, prosperous and ever-changing...regime will govern". It is no wonder that among the foundations of the New Middle East, according to Peres, are "the blossoming of the desert, progress, prosperity, justice and personal freedom". Carried away on the wings of his vision, he proposed that Israel join the Arab League. Both the idea of the confederation and the suggestion that Israel join the Arab League were greeted in the Arab world with major amounts of ridicule and derision on the one hand, and presented as a Zionist plot to control the Arab world from within, in the well-known tradition of **The Protocols of the Elders of Zion**, on the other.

Netanyahu, too, continuously speaks in praise of peace, citing the agreements with Jordan and Egypt as examples of the far-reaching changes which have transpired in the region "among those nations who have decided to take the path of reconciliation with Israel".

It goes without saying that claims of the sort quoted above are intrinsically mistaken in the fundamental context of civilizational changes. The assumption that Islam, a proud, powerful culture which encompasses 20% of humanity, will change its ideals, essence and goals because of an incidental political conjuncture, is first and foremost, an insult to Islam.

That is on the civilizational plane. An analysis of the reality in the Middle East over the last decade, "a region which is a lethal combination of nationalistic extremism and Muslim fundamentalism armed with weapons of mass destruction", to quote the French philosopher, Jean Francois Ravel, is testimony to the depth and scope of the Jewish self-deception concerning an issue which goes to the very essence of the existence of the Jewish state.

Circumstances have changed indeed. However, in a direction opposite to the one posited by the Prime Ministers quoted above. There has been an increase in the level of conventional armaments (the

¹⁹ Rabin in the Knesset, September 22, 1993.

Middle East purchases 42% of the weapons sold worldwide, 20 times the world average); proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems, i.e. ballistic missiles; the spread of Muslim fundamentalism; and the expansion of extreme nationalism attempting to achieve regional hegemony.

These trends, individually and especially collectively (“a deadly cocktail” in the words of Newt Gingrich) are apt to reach a critical mass posing a threat to the world much more serious than that which existed during the Cold War. It is no wonder that they arouse deep concern in the West. Already, three capitals of NATO member countries (Ankara, Athens and Rome) are in ballistic missile range of Arab countries. The danger posed by warheads of mass destruction delivered on simple but effective ballistic missiles is perceived as the primary threat to world peace, which must be eradicated as quickly as possible.

Margaret Thatcher, the former Prime Minister of Great Britain, warned of the danger posed by the Islamic genie, a danger greater than that posed by the Soviet Union during the Cold War era.²⁰

The spread of Islamic fundamentalism raises serious concerns. The essay by Samuel Huntington – “The Clash of Civilizations” – in which he presented a bleak prediction of what can be expected from a culture “whose borders are marked with blood”, caused an unprecedented stir and became a cornerstone of western thinking in the face of developments in the Middle East.

Bernard Lewis, among the prominent Orientalists of our generation, wrote:

We are faced with a phenomenon of an ideological mood and movement, whose significance deviates greatly beyond the issues on the political agenda of governments. We are speaking of no less than a clash of civilizations, an irrational reaction perhaps, but undoubtedly a historically significant reaction of an ancient rival against our Judeo-Christian heritage, against our secular way of life and against the future of both.²¹

India’s apprehension due to the introduction of nuclear weapons into the Middle East forced New Delhi to publicize its nuclear potential in May 1998. Turkey, which fears the extensive strengthening of Iran and Syria, is rapidly increasing the size of its army and is turning to a strategic alliance with Israel against the threat of Arab regional hegemony.

The Khomeini revolution in Iran; the Iran-Iraq War; Saddam Hussein’s conquest of Kuwait as a first step to assuming control of the Saudi oil wells; the threat to the Persian Gulf posed by Iranian hegemony; the Sudanese civil war, in other words, genocide in an attempt to liquidate the non-Muslim minority; Syria’s domination of Lebanon and the elimination of the Christian entity; the Algerian civil war; the fundamentalist unrest in Egypt which is liable (according to the CIA) to put an end to Mubarak’s regime; social unrest in Saudi Arabia which threatens the royal family; involvement of the Arab World in Kosovo – all these and more are the hard facts and this is the reality in the region.

Israel – Loss of “Strategic Asset” Status

With the dismantling of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War era, Israel has lost its status as a “strategic asset” in the face of Soviet expansionism in this part of the world which is vital in its geo-strategic significance to the West. Washington has, ever since, subjected the Jewish state to the constant pressure of strategic abuse.

The loss of “asset” status was confirmed in the second Gulf War, when Israel was transformed into an embarrassing political burden. On the one hand, Israel was a target of Iraqi hostilities in a war in

²⁰ In remarks delivered on March 9, 1996 marking the fiftieth anniversary of Winston Churchill’s famous Fulton speech which laid the foundation for the Marshall Plan and NATO. For the complete speech, see *Nativ*, 1-2/97, p.82.

²¹ “The Roots of Islamic Rage”, *The Atlantic Monthly*, September 1990.

which it was not involved and on the other hand, was prevented from retaliating. Israel's role was limited to donning masks, crowding into sealed rooms, and serving as a passive punching bag until the danger passed.

This exhibition of weakness and panic predictably led to a further weakening of the IDF's deterrent capability. The rapid escalation in the development of ballistic missile systems in Arab countries since the Gulf War, whose only purpose is to cause maximal damage to Israel's rear, is a direct result of Israeli defeatism in its new role as "political burden".

Not only did the coercion of Israel to walk into the Madrid Conference trap under the heading of "land for peace" constitute at that stage a breach of the national consensus, but it also stood in contradistinction to the Arab countries' attitude toward Israel during the war, in the course of the war and thereafter, when manifestations of hostility toward Israel were even more extreme. This was Egypt's message in response to Washington's request that it join the coalition against Iraq:

We want to extend our hand of peace to the United States after it washes its hands of the Zionist filth. American interests must give precedence to 200 million Arabs who believe that the neglect of Palestine is the neglect of the Holy of Holies. Preference should be given to the Arabs over the Zionist gang which came for no reason to a land which is not theirs and may not remain there.²²

Another example was the wave of joy which inundated the Arab world, led by Israeli Arabs, in response to Saddam Hussein's declarations of intent to "incinerate half of the Zionist entity". Thus the Madrid Conference and its political results were another manifestation of strategic abuse on the part of Washington which was brought to bear in order to fulfill promises made to the Arabs before the war. The price was Jerusalem, a Palestinian state in Judea, Samaria and Gaza and cession of the Golan Heights. It is appropriate to note, as James Baker did repeatedly, that the United States does nothing that is not anchored in its official policy. Baker was right. Washington never recognized Israeli sovereignty in Jerusalem – east or west, negated the annexation of the Golan Heights and repeatedly asserted that the settlement of Judea, Samaria and Gaza is illegal.

Consequently, the political steps known as "the peace process" are the diametric opposite of the reality, the circumstances and the Israeli interests which go, as usual, to the very essence of the existence of the Jewish state.

The four Prime Ministers presented above,²³ turned their backs – each in turn in his own way – on their own firm beliefs, as they presented them time and again, and were at that moment at the very heart of the national consensus. Furthermore, the four initiated and implemented policies which are, according to their own characterizations, a formula for the destruction of Israel.

Strategic Abuse and Systems Failure

Strategic abuse transpires when a nation collapses under the critical mass of a threat from an implacable enemy. In this condition, the *raison d'etat* – physical and spiritual – gradually disintegrates. At a certain point, a process of self-destruction commences which finds expression in collaboration with the enemy.

The enemy, if perceptive enough, takes no radical action, that is, war, but rather takes full advantage of the strategic abuse to minimize its risk until all that remains of the threatened nation is an empty

²² Editorial in *Al-Ahram*, (the "Egyptian *New York Times*") and Mubarak's mouthpiece, August 7, 1990.

²³ In Yitzhak Shamir's defense it must be said, that though he erred in his lack of military reaction in the winter of 1991 and in his agreement to attend the Madrid Conference, at least he did each unwillingly. This in no way absolves him of guilt in the eyes of history, but at least he did not betray himself by presenting a national tragedy in the guise of a "peace process".

shell. At that point, exertion of force is usually unnecessary; the exhausted entity, which has lost its survival instinct, is ripe for the picking.²⁴

This schematic description, designed to arouse in the reader memories of the eradication of Czechoslovakia from the face of the map in March 1939, is transpiring before our very eyes in the Jewish state, albeit in a more gradual manner under the same semantic pretext of “land for peace” – a phrase which Hitler continually repeated until he received all the territories he demanded.

Illustrations of this are Arafat’s endless threats that:

The bloodbath, next to which the intifada will seem like child’s play, which will ensue if Israel does not fulfill the Oslo Agreements...whoever doesn’t believe me, I say to him, to drink Gaza’s seawater.²⁵

The well-orchestrated declarations of Hafez el-Assad on the one hand, and Hosni Mubarak on the other, concerning the rapidly approaching war unless “peace is achieved”, and if Israel does not withdraw from the last grain of holy Arab soil, are an exact replica of Hitler’s threats against Czechoslovakia in 1938.²⁶

The strategic abuse in which Israel has been floundering since the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War is designed to lead Israel to withdraw to that “last grain of holy Arab soil”; that is, to the cease-fire lines of 1949, or adjacent to them, in order to crowd them into the partition borders in anticipation of its physical liquidation. Israel’s reaction to the existential challenge is a long line of failures together forming a reality of systems collapse.

Systems collapse transpires when the state, subject to strategic abuse, reacts to the existential threat with a series of actions clearly contrary to its own interests and in most cases its very existence.²⁷

The term “systems collapse” was chosen carefully in order to distinguish it from the more conventional “political blunder” in describing a failure in foreign or internal policy. A “political blunder”, disastrous as its results may be, is nonetheless the result of balance of power, historical context, a politician’s folly, opportunism, short-sightedness, political foolishness, poor judgment and other innumerable factors which together form the historical mosaic.

However, in viewing the entire system of deception called “the peace process”, one is forced to conclude that we are not discussing an unfortunate combination of political blunders, severe as they may be (of the sort listed by Barbara Tuchman in **The March of Folly**) but rather a type of deterministic process of national suicide characterized concisely by the four Prime Ministers quoted above.

These are the projected results of “the peace process”.

²⁴ The Arab attempt to liquidate Israel by means of war in 1967 with no prior attrition which is the basis of strategic abuse, was a decisive error. A significant portion of Arab strategic thinking, in general and Egyptian strategic thinking in particular, is devoted to learning the lessons of that blunder.

²⁵ In a Palestinian Authority telecast of a student gathering at Palestine College in Gaza, June 25, 1998.

²⁶ Both repeat it daily. But Assad’s proclamation during his visit to Paris on July 20, 1998, and Mubarak’s before his party convention (the National Democratic Party...) on July 22, were unusually significant due to the venue at which they were declared.

²⁷ Soviet Russia before “Operation Barbarossa” and Czechoslovakia and France prior to the Munich Convention, are typical examples of this process. But it should be noted, that at no point were the three aforementioned countries threatened with the physical annihilation of their citizens, a luxury which Israel does not enjoy. See Arieh Stav, **Czechoslovakia 1938 – Israel Today**, Ariel Center for Policy Research, Policy Paper no. 15, 1997.

1. Loss of Strategic Territorial Assets

Without Judea, Samaria and the Golan Heights, the only three strategically significant territories in western *Eretz Israel*, the Jewish state will be left with indefensible borders. Without them, according to the characterization of Shimon Peres, as mentioned previously, “the state will be annihilated in war.”²⁸

2. Loss of National Existential Purpose

Conscious surrender of Judea and Samaria, which are in fact, “the cradle of Judaism and the *raison d’être* of the Zionist existence”, to quote Menachem Begin, “the division of Jerusalem (Zion), will rob Zionism of its substance and Israeli nationalism of its existential purpose.”

Abandoning the Jewish settlements in Judea, Samaria and Gaza to Arab sovereignty will be tantamount to establishing ghettos and creating an exile in the Land of Israel by the Jews themselves. The dismantling and evacuation, i.e. ethnic cleansing of the settlements means expulsion of Jews by Jews from Israel. Either way, it will be a mortal blow to the ethos of Judaism.

3. Loss of Nuclear Deterrence

The advocates of withdrawal to the ‘67 borders present Israel’s nuclear deterrent potential, primarily – MAD (Mutually Assured Destruction), as a guarantee to its existence. But nuclear deterrence, which is essentially a readiness to commit national suicide and therefore, an unthinkable absurdity, is contingent upon a conventional deterrent capacity. Since, at the 1967 borders, neutralized by the critical mass of WMD (Weapons of Mass Destruction), (or even worse, a nuclearized Middle East), Israel will have lost this capacity, it will be stripped of its nuclear deterrent capacity as well.²⁹

4. Abrogation of the Golan Law as a Stage in the Direction of the Partition Borders

The ordinary Israeli perceives the “Green Line”, that is, the 1949 cease-fire lines, as the unchallenged international borders of his State, and withdrawal to those borders as the ultimate withdrawal.

He naively believes that while it may entail painful concessions of parts of the homeland, military assets and strategic depth, nevertheless, formally, at least, he is returning home. He could not be more mistaken.

The cease-fire lines are defined as follows:

5(2). In no sense are the cease-fire lines to be interpreted as political or territorial borders and their delineation in no way affects the rights, demands or positions of any of the parties to the cease-fire agreements with regard to the final disposition of the Palestine question.

5(3). The fundamental objective of the cease-fire lines is to serve as a line beyond which the armed forces of each of the parties will deploy.³⁰

Israel, therefore, has no “safe and recognized” borders, and the cease-fire lines, as underscored and defined by the text, are unacceptable to the Arab countries and will be unacceptable to the

²⁸ For a comprehensive view of the topic, see the relevant chapters in **The Israeli Death Wish**, *ibid.*

²⁹ For greater detail, “The Deception of Nuclear Deterrence and the Issue of Strategic Abuse”, **The Israeli Death Wish**, *ibid.*, p. 207.

³⁰ In the agreement signed by Israel and Egypt in Rhodes on February 24, 1949. Similar paragraphs appear in the agreements with Jordan and Syria.

international community as soon as the issue is raised. Since the only internationally recognized borders in western *Eretz Israel* are the November 1947 partition borders under United Nations auspices, therefore all the territories captured during the War of Independence and, similarly, the Golan Heights and East Jerusalem, are occupied territories in every sense.

Abrogation of the Golan Law, which will necessarily follow a decision to cede the Golan Heights to Syria, will thus be an initial step in the dismantling of Israel **within the Green Line**. No one understands this better than the Palestinians themselves. So, for example, Nabil Sha'ath, head of the Palestinian delegation to the talks with Israel, publicly declared that as far as they are concerned, any agreement which does not include United Nations article 181 concerning the November 1947 partition borders, is null and void. Hanan Ashrawi, Saib Erikat, Faisal Husseini as well as the PA Ambassador to the UN concur. The issue is raised interminably on Palestinian Authority telecasts, in which Arafat is presented at various ceremonies listening intently to fiery speeches concerning the return to Jaffa, the Galilee, Haifa and Ramle. The entire Arab world views the issue in a like manner and there was no one who summed it up better than Anwar Sadat: "Our duty is to return Israel to the 1967 borders. The rest will be accomplished by the next generation." This principle of the step-by-step destruction of Israel achieved the status of canon when articulated by Sheik Abdel Hamid el-Saieh (the Chairman of the Palestinian National Council, number two in the Palestinian hierarchy after Arafat, who expressed in his remarks, the principles of the PNC):

We should take what is offered and then take the rest until we gain control over all Palestinian lands under occupation of the Zionist enemy. The PLO is committed to the liberation of Palestine in its entirety, but we must understand that we have to progress in concert with international legitimization of the Palestinian struggle. The holy objective must be achieved in stages.³¹

1. Ceding the Golan – Loss of the Moral Basis for Israel's Existence

A fundamental rule in international law based on the principle of justice (*ex iniuria non oritur ius* – from a wrong, no right can be derived) is designed to establish that an aggressor has no claim to territory lost in war. If that were not the case, it would encourage aggression and render the principle of justice a fraud. On the basis of this rule, for example, the Axis States in World War II, lost extensive territories. Germany alone lost Eastern Prussia, Pomerania, Silesia, Sudetenland and Alsace-Lorraine. The loss of Sinai in the Six Day War relied on the same principle of international law. Ceding Sinai to Egypt was, therefore, not only a strategic failure which finally ended Israel's chance to achieve the status of regional power, but also a precedent for crowding Israel into the 1949 borders. Relinquishing the Golan Heights – a Syrian springboard for three attempts to destroy Israel in three wars and countless acts of terror – will not only be an act which encourages Arab aggression, but also an acknowledgement of the Arab claim that Israel was the aggressor in all its wars. In this way, the moral basis for the existence of the Jewish state will be undermined.

This course of action will grant, for all intents and purposes, assurances to any potential aggressor that even if his attempted aggression fails, all territories lost in the attempted aggression will be automatically returned...a rule of that sort would be absurd to the point of lunacy. There is no such rule.³²

It is interesting that none of the leaders or their illustrious legal advisors take the trouble to ask themselves what the ramifications of the rejection of this fundamental tenet of international law will have on the legal status of all of western *Eretz Israel* captured by Israel in the War of Independence beyond the partition borders (i.e. Western Galilee, Beersheba, Jaffa, etc.).

³¹ **Le Soir**, Brussels, December 28, 1988.

³² Julius Stone, **Israel and Palestine**, London, 1981, p. 52.

2. The American Abandonment

The extent of the aid granted by a superpower to a small country stands in direct proportion to the benefit which the superpower accrues from its tiny ally, and that is the essence of the term “strategic asset”. The benefit ends – the aid ceases. Israel, an emasculated mini-state, compressed into non-defensible borders, will no longer serve the United States as a strategic asset and will turn into a political liability which will be abandoned at the first opportunity. As was mentioned above, this situation has been steadily developing since the collapse of the Soviet Union. The Czech-born, US Secretary of State (sic), Madeleine Albright, expressed it succinctly in an angry phone call to Binyamin Netanyahu: “Israel is no longer the exclusive interest of the United States in the Middle East.” Indeed, this is the key phrase describing the relationship between the American government and Israel since the end of the Cold War. In this sense, the Clinton-Albright team is faithfully implementing the Bush-Baker policies. Israel is no longer a geo-strategic asset, in the sense of a front-line entrenchment against Soviet efforts to achieve hegemony in the Middle East, but it is still an asset which can be exploited. The asset is Israel itself. Through its dismemberment, Washington hopes to gain Arab goodwill.

The US Policy is understandable. It is enough to glance at the map of the Middle East to discern the asymmetry between Israel and the Semitic domain expanse which stretches from the Atlantic Ocean to the Persian Gulf. However, the administration’s unqualified support of Arafat since Oslo, exacerbated since the 1996 change in Israeli government, is unprecedented in the troubled relationship between the two states and attests to the nadir to which Israel’s status has deteriorated in the eyes of the White House.

In case anyone has forgotten, Israel and not the PLO, is Washington’s official ally. Israel has five strategic cooperation agreements with the United States, signed in 1975, 1981, 1983, 1985 and 1987. The last, and most important one among them, characterizes Israel as a “non-NATO major ally”, equalizing Israel’s status vis-a-vis the United States with that of Britain, the Netherlands or Germany, in almost every sense. In all the agreements, save none, Israel’s security needs are emphasized, and it is unthinkable that either side would impose its view of the other’s security needs.

As a result, Israel is supposed to be, at least formally, Washington’s ally. On the other hand, Arafat and many of the heads of his organization are, under American law, habitual criminals, leaders of terrorist gangs, guilty of premeditated murder of American citizens, beginning with the Ambassador to Sudan who was murdered on Arafat’s direct order, continuing through the murder of hostages (the Klinghoffer episode is but one of many), ending with the murder of American citizens in Israel.

But all these considerations (not to mention “identity of values”, “the Bible as the cultural basis for both nations”, “the only democracy in the Middle East” and similar vanities recited in great seriousness on festive occasions) are collapsing under the weight of political Machiavellianism seeking short-term gains at the expense of a dull-witted junior partner.

Needless to say, American pressure at this point is nothing compared to what Israel can expect if it loses any more of the power multipliers that still remain. Cessation of the military aid, robbing Israel of its nuclear potential and a military embargo will be among the first steps taken against Israel once it returns to the 1949 borders. Justifiably, because “the United States has no interest in a half-state which has no oil and no security expanses and acts irresponsibly in abandoning its citizens to the goodness of those who wish to destroy it.”³³

It is appropriate here to quote General MacArthur’s speech before the Republican National Convention in October 1952:

³³ William Safire, *The New York Times*, August 13, 1981, in a destructively critical article concerning Israel’s willingness to withdraw from Sinai as a result of the Camp David agreements.

The defeatist is blind to history and its lessons, as history clearly teaches that defeatism leads to a war many times more severe and cruel than the war which created the defeatism. There is not one instance in the history of humanity where defeatism led to peace which was any more than a total fraud. Like extortion, defeatism only leads to gradually increasing demands, ultimately leading to a war many times more severe and cruel than the war which produced the defeatist attitude in the first place.³⁴

3. Loss of Water

Israel is a semi-arid country with an annual water supply averaging about 350 c.m. per person. The minimum recommended by the UN is 500 c.m.. Hence, even today, Israel is below the minimum recommended standard. The water potential of western *Eretz Israel* is 1.8 billion c.m. which is divided among a population numbering approximately 8 million. This means that the water supply per person is rapidly decreasing because while the population is growing at an accelerated pace, the water supply remains constant.³⁵ The three main water sources, which are exploited to the last drop, are the Sea of Galilee basin, the mountain aquifer and the coastal aquifer. This supply serves agriculture, industry and homes. On average, therefore, we are speaking of 225 c.m. per person as opposed to 1,200 c.m. in Egypt, 2,000 in Syria and 20,000 in the United States. Suffice it to state that the average water consumption in Israel which must serve agriculture, industry and homes is approximately equivalent to the amount allotted for watering gardens in California.

Relinquishing the Golan to Syria will include yielding 70% of the Sea of Galilee basin, the only above-ground aquifer in western *Eretz Israel*, which supplies the Transpipeline, the lifeline of the Jewish state. Loss of territorial control over the Sea of Galilee's sources – the Golan rivers – and their partial impounding by the Syrians will lower the Sea of Galilee to a level at which irreparable harm will be caused to the Lake.

The mountain aquifer which supplies approximately 600 million c.m. will be for the most part under the territorial jurisdiction of the Palestinian state, which possesses no other water sources. Four hundred million c.m. of the mountain aquifer's waters are directed to the coastal plain annually. According to international law, Israel can perpetuate the present situation, leaving the Palestinian Authority with 200 c.m. As the Palestinian intention is to settle those displaced in 1967 along with some of the 1948 refugees, totaling 4 million residents in the next decade, there will remain, on average, 50 c.m. per person, a negligible amount insufficient for home use, not to mention industry and agriculture. Is it really possible to imagine that the Arabs of Judea and Samaria will allow most of the water in their jurisdiction to flow uninterrupted to the Jews living in the adjacent lowlands?

The coastal aquifer, located almost completely within the Green Line, supplies 400 million c.m. annually, though most of the water is polluted by industrial sewage and excessive salination and, therefore, is unfit for drinking and is directed, primarily, to industry and agriculture.

Hence, the State of Israel within the 1949 borders will relinquish most of the water under its control and be left with a sewage canal. The significant solutions recommended based on future needs are desalination, importing water from Turkey or Yugoslavia, towing icebergs from the North Pole and liquidating agriculture which utilizes 1.2 billion c.m. annually. Towing icebergs from the North Pole is, indeed, a pathetic expression of Jewish madness, but the other suggestions are not much saner. The default option will be, therefore, the liquidation of agriculture which is already in its early stages.

³⁴ In his memoirs, **Reminiscences**, New York, 1963, p. 63.

³⁵ The recommended minimum was for Western *Eretz Israel* in the late 1960s, with a population of only 3.5 million people.

4. The Palestinian State

In Oslo, the Israeli government signed an agreement with an organization which was, at that time, and remains today, committed to the destruction of the State of Israel, as expressed in its name: “Palestine Liberation Organization”; in its “constitution”; the Palestinian Charter; the Fateh Charter in its political platform, that is the “doctrine of stages”, which presents the establishment of the state as a springboard for the destruction of Israel by the Arab States; and in its emblem, which is a map of all of western *Eretz Israel* with no mention of the Jewish state.

Establishment of a Palestinian state in western *Eretz Israel*, in addition to Jordan, is indeed a “transparent cover for the Arab battle to delegitimize Israel” (Yitzhak Rabin). Therefore, immediately after its establishment, it will be incumbent upon “Palestine” to work toward the destruction of Israel as per its constitutional, political and religious commitments. The first four actions which “Palestine” will take upon its establishment:

- A. Signing a military cooperation agreement with Arab states, almost certainly with Egypt and Syria. Israel will be unable to do anything about it, not in the context of international law, which allows a sovereign state to sign strategic treaties with whomever it wants, and certainly not in the context of military action, due to strategic inferiority dictated by the lack of viable borders.
- B. A demand to squeeze Israel inside the partition borders. The international community will have no choice but to support this demand, as those are the borders established by the United Nations for Israel in 1947, and they are the only borders regarding which there is international consensus.
- C. Deepening the schism within Israeli society as it develops into “a state of its citizens”, that is, the practical liquidation of the Jewish state by internal subversion. The steady, ever-deepening demoralization of the Jewish public will be exacerbated by the cooperation between Arab irredentism and the Jewish Left.
- D. Tilting the demographic balance in Israel in favor of the Arabs by inundating the country with refugees from Jordan, Syria and Lebanon. The flooding of Israel within the “Green Line” will be accomplished through the demand – expressed as an ultimatum – to reunite families, return property of 1948 refugees or alternatively pay exorbitant reparations which will undermine Israel’s economy.³⁶

The Consensus Heads to the Left

One of the fascinating issues in history is the question of who creates the critical mass which leads to fateful decisions – the decision-makers or the public at large? This issue is especially difficult in democratic regimes, where public opinion plays a critical role in determining the fate of the decision-makers. In this matter, at least the ruling elite in Israel, as embodied by the four Prime Ministers mentioned above, represents the national consensus. Public opinion polls on the subject prove that political acts, as implemented by Prime Ministers from Begin through Netanyahu, were anchored in public support.

The Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies of Tel Aviv University has, for twelve years (1985-1996), published a public opinion survey on matters of national security. The 1996 survey was taken

³⁶ The most absurd aspect of the refugee issue is the composition of the multilateral committee on the refugee problem. The committee members are: the Palestinians, to whom the right of return is national canon; Jordan, for whom the expulsion of its Palestinians is a national interest, as they comprise the majority in the Hashemite Kingdom; and Egypt, which incessantly announces that without resolution of the refugee problem, there will be no peace in the Middle East. All decisions are taken with a simple majority.

primarily in February and partially in March in the wake of two traumatic incidents: Rabin's assassination (November 1995) and the series of massacres, leaving 29 dead, which took place in February-March 1996. However, the effects of the two incidents on the general trend were negligible, and even they were short-term.³⁷ Like those preceding it, this survey presents a continuing decline of awareness regarding all security issues which stood at the center of the national consensus a decade ago.

Palestinian State

One key question is the matter of the Palestinian state. Since its establishment by Nasser in 1964, the PLO has been perceived as the spearhead of the Arab struggle which existed for the purpose of destroying Israel. This assumption reflected the broad national consensus of all the Zionist parties. The exceptions were the extreme Leftist fringe. As a result, during the 1970s, the issue was not discussed at all, nor were public opinion polls taken. But, already in 1987 (after a decade of Likud rule), 21% of the Israeli public supported the establishment of a Palestinian state. The support increased to 33% in 1991 (the year of the Gulf War, in which Arafat openly supported Saddam Hussein's call "to incinerate half of Israel"); to 39% in 1995 (at the start of the wave of murderous terror, unprecedented in its scope and cruelty in the history of Israel); and 46% in February 1996.

In a 1997 survey, a Jewish majority (51%) supported the establishment of a Palestinian state, although the pollsters assume, accurately, that the respondents were inhibited by remnants of the former national consensus. Therefore, a follow-up question was posed: "Disregarding your personal preference, in your opinion, will a Palestinian state be established in the next ten years?" Already in 1991, 48% responded in the affirmative (after 15 years of Likud rule) and 75%, an overwhelming majority of the Jewish public, in 1996. Unaffiliated surveys conducted in 1998, present a decisive majority of the Jewish public in support of a Palestinian state and an overwhelming majority (81-85%) predicting that it will be established. As a result, since today's objective assessment is tomorrow's active support, if and when Arafat declares a Palestinian state in May 1999, his act will win the support of the Jewish majority and the agreement of the Israeli public as a whole.

Arab Intentions Vis-a-Vis Israel

In this crucial issue, a far-reaching decline has taken place. As late as 1991, close to half of those surveyed (49%) responded that it is the Arab intention to destroy the State of Israel. In 1996, the numbers dropped to 28%. While in 1986, 37% of the public believed that is the Arab intention to conquer Israel, the number dropped to 24% in 1996. A large majority of the Jewish public assumes, therefore, that the attitude of the Arab states has undergone a far-reaching transformation which expresses itself in moderation and a willingness to accept Israel in the region.

Jerusalem

It is true that a decisive majority remains opposed to Jerusalem becoming the capital of the Palestinian state and only 14% support it, however 30% believe that such a possibility will be realized in the near future. Based on the precedent in the issue of the Palestinian state, it can be expected that very soon every third Israeli will support relinquishing Jerusalem to the Palestinians.

³⁷ **Jaffee Institute for Strategic Studies' Memorandum No. 46** – March 1996. The project coordinator is Prof. Asher Arian; there were 1200 people polled face to face. The field work was accomplished by "Modi'in Ezrahi".

The Golan Heights

Along with Jerusalem, the issue of the Golan Heights has been at the center of the national consensus for many years. In studies conducted by the Guttman Center for Public Opinion in Jerusalem in the decade between 1968-78, an overwhelming majority (as much as 96%) negated any possibility of negotiations on the Golan. In 1986, the negators still numbered 80%. Over the last three years a steady decline is evident in public opinion with the number of those opposing relinquishing the Golan decreasing to 50% in 1995, and in 1996, dramatically dropping to 35%. Correspondingly, 66% believed that the Golan will be returned to Syria within a decade.

Judea, Samaria and Gaza

A similar decline is evident in the issue of support for settlements in Judea, Samaria and Gaza. For example, agreement to disobey an order to evacuate settlers dropped from 32% in 1994 to 20% in 1996. The readiness to evacuate western Samaria rose from 30% in 1994 to 38% in 1996, and Gush Etzion – from 14% in 1994 to 20% in 1996. Until recently, both areas were accepted by the national consensus as an immutable part of the State of Israel.

Thus the situation has undergone a far-reaching transformation regarding issues that were marginal to the national consensus a mere decade or two ago, now standing at the center of the same consensus. In contrast, the national consensus of the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s has been forced into an ever-shrinking corner of the political map, populated exclusively by the so-called “extreme Right”.

These trends in public opinion reflect the policies of the Rabin-Peres governments as well as the Netanyahu government and lend solid support to the political process designed to return Israel to the 1949 borders. According to the situation described above, the public is working together with its leadership against the existential interests of the Jewish state based on a mistaken understanding of reality.

Walking the path to demise is not an anomaly in Jewish history. Jabotinsky’s words on the eve of the Holocaust, speak for themselves:

Even desperation, even overwhelming and passionate despair – is a response. Even worse, is what I detect among the Jewish masses in Eastern Europe, equanimity, fatalism, and surrender to fate...the people are acting now as if their doom were sealed. I have never encountered anything like this in history, even in literature; I never read of such acquiescence to fate. It is as if they put these people in a wagon, 12 million intelligent, experienced people in a wagon, and they pushed the wagon over a cliff. How do these people react? One cries, one smokes a cigarette, some read newspapers, one sings – and any attempt to find one person who will grab the reins and steer them to safety will be for naught. This is the atmosphere. It is as if some great enemy sedated their minds with chloroform. I approach them now to make an attempt; a last-ditch attempt. I call to you, end this situation! Stop the wagon, jump from it, place some obstacle in its path; do not go like sheep to the wolf!³⁸

The Lethal Triangle

And it shall come to pass on the day of the wars there will be neither sword nor spear in the hands of all the nation. (I Samuel: 13:22).

The Israeli systems collapse leads to fateful errors – a long list of them were cited above. But they were errors on the political level stemming from considerations of politicians – opportunists by their

³⁸ This quotation was taken from a speech delivered by him in Warsaw on 9 Av, 5698, August 6, 1938. Subsequently, it was published under the title, “Anesthetized with Chloroform”, **Hamashkif**, June 16, 1939. Cited from Moshe Bela, “Speeches, Volume II”, pp. 335-6.

very nature, who assess reality on the basis of their ability to survive politically. In this situation, the national interest becomes secondary and is lacking any system of rational considerations, especially in Israel, where the decision-maker has no systematic input from unaffiliated think-tanks, research centers, etc. The senior politician is surrounded, as a rule, by a group of spineless careerists (if they do have a spine, their life-expectancy in that position is very short). The feedback which they provide the politician, including the Prime Minister, lacks, for the most part, rational analysis of the national interest and concentrates completely on appeasing the boss on whom their existence, career, salary and standing depend.

This is not the case in institutions committed to long-range strategic thinking which are supposed to provide a viable and rational response to potential strategic threats. The Defense Ministry in a nation like Israel, which is under a constant threat to its existence, should function in that way. That is, at least, the expectation. Since the standard working assumption is that the strategic threat to Israel has grown over the last decade, in general, and in the area of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems in particular, it is incumbent upon the Defense Department to organize accordingly.

Beyond this, the issue of the escalating arms race is not politically controversial like other disagreements which divide Israeli society. The Left emphasizes again and again that the steps toward peace must be accompanied by a vigilant maintenance of military power because only with the support of a strong IDF can “far-reaching and painful sacrifices” be implemented, not to mention in a situation where all-out war will erupt in the region.³⁹ As a result, the response proposed by the Defense Ministry to the existential threat to the State of Israel must be analyzed from three perspectives:

1. The defense budget.
2. The response to the ballistic threat.
3. Protection of the civilian population from the danger stemming from anticipated gas attack.

1. The Defense Budget – Lack of Response to the Scope of the Threat.

The 1997 defense budget was 8.4 billion dollars. In 1990 terms, the sum is 5.9 billion dollars. In 1985, Israel’s defense spending was 7.1 billion dollars (in 1990 terms) and was, at that time, 17.4% of the GDP. 8.4 billion dollars of the present budget are 8.4% of Israel’s GDP which is approximately 100 billion dollars. These statistics lead to three conclusions:

- A. Israel’s defense spending (in adjusted dollar terms) decreased in the relevant period by approximately 20%.
- B. The gross national product, in non-adjusted dollars, increased in the same period by 100%.
- C. Had Israel maintained in 1997 the 1985 level of defense spending relative to the GDP, defense spending today would be 17.4% of the GDP, that is, 17.4 billion dollars.

During the same period a drastic increase transpired in the potential strategic threat to Israel which manifested itself in a number of areas:

- A. An almost 1,000% escalation in the deployment of surface-to-surface missiles in general and those armed with warheads of mass destruction in particular. Israel, which is actually the Greater Tel Aviv megalopolis, holding half the Jewish population of the country, is catastrophically vulnerable to the danger of ballistic attack.

³⁹ MKs Ori Orr and Efraim Sneh, both of the Labor Party, emphasized this aspect in speeches delivered before the colloquium of the Ariel Center for Policy Research, Beit Sokolow, February 15, 1998.

- B. The massive growth of the Egyptian army which is, according to General (Res.) Matan Vilnai, “Israel’s most dangerous enemy”.⁴⁰
- C. The manifold increase in the cost of weapons: The cost of a Nineties’ fighter plane, like the F-15 is approximately 70 million dollars. The cost of an Eighties’ fighter plane was about 30 million dollars (in 1997 dollars). This is the case regarding missiles, tanks and advanced weapon systems. The increase in this area alone reaches, therefore, approximately 200% and beyond.
- D. A 40% decrease in the value of American aid as it is not linked to the inflation of the dollar. As a result, 1.8 billion dollars in 1986 are worth approximately, 1 billion dollars in 1997 and less than 600 million dollars in the purchasing of weapons systems.

As a result, while the potential strategic threat to Israel has doubled and even trebled in the last decade. Israel has reduced its defense spending by 20% in real terms and by 50% relative to the GDP. Had Israel maintained its defense spending as a set%age of the GDP, at 1985 levels for example, the defense budget would be more than 17 billion dollars, an appropriate response to the increase in the potential strategic danger. Furthermore, due to the gradual nature of the increase – spread over more than a decade, the average citizen would have been untouched by the annual increase in the defense budget, especially because of the corresponding increase in the standard of living in Israel during the same period.

Another ironic aspect of the situation is the fact that Israel’s GDP (100 billion dollars) is 25% greater than the joint GDP of Egypt and Syria (80 billion dollars approximately), but its defense budget (8.4 billion dollars) is only 43% of the military expenditures of the two aforementioned countries, which declare openly that war is an option in case Israel does not concede to the “peace” dictated by Cairo and Damascus.

2. The Arrow – A Conceptual Error of a Weapons System Unsited to the Threat

In the defense budget, insufficient to cover Israel’s defense needs, the Arrow (which is in fact an American R&D project, therefore partly funded at this point by the Pentagon,) is rapidly commanding an increasingly greater share. With the research and development stage ending and the advent of the purchase and deployment stage, the possibility that the huge sums which will be needed – at least 5 billion dollars according to independent sources – will be provided by the Pentagon is but wishful thinking. It will, therefore, be incumbent on Israel to raise the money from its shriveled defense budget, which does not even suffice for Israel’s basic security needs.

The conceptual failure of the Arrow was already revealed in the euphemism used in characterizing it as a main weapons system in “active defense” (reminiscent of the description of fleeing from battle as “improving rear positions”). The Arrow is designed to intercept the enemies’ missiles in the last stage of their ballistic flight, in other words, a few dozen kilometers from their target, which for our purposes is Greater Tel Aviv. It is comparable to a duel between two gunmen, each participating under a different set of rules. The first may shoot his adversary in the head or the heart, while the second may only deflect the bullet (not even the casing) which was fired from his adversary’s gun. This absurd situation leads to a long line of structural failures which together render the Arrow project as a weapons system essentially inappropriate to deal with the threat. One of them is the economic aspect:

- A. The cost of a Scud B or C missile (a “flying junkpile”, to use General Schwarzkopf’s rather colorful description,) based on the technology of the 1940s, is about 250-500 thousand dollars.

⁴⁰ Shawn Pine, **Egypt’s True Defense Expenditures – 2.7 or 14 Billion Dollars?**, Ariel Center for Policy Research, Policy Paper no. 6, 1997.

The cost of the Arrow, chock-full of the latest state-of-the-art technologies of the year 2000, will be about 2 million dollars. However, due to the theoretical (and practical) margin of error, it will take 1.2 Arrow missiles to intercept each Scud, in other words, a kill ratio ranging between 1:4 through 1:8. With this absurd ratio, for every 1,000 Scud missiles fired (equivalent approximately to the profit accrued from pumping oil in Saudi Arabia for one or two days) 1,200 Arrow missiles will be required to intercept them at a cost equal to 25% of Israel's defense budget. However, even this theoretical assumption is clearly invalid as will be detailed below.

- B. The Scud possesses a long line of evasive and deceptive capabilities based on simple, available technologies. One of them, releasing dozens of secondary warheads in a radius greater than the interception capacity of the Arrow, will cause greater damage than anticipated from a single warhead on the one hand, and evade interception by the Arrow on the other. Needless to say, the brutality of the above scenario multiplies if we speak of secondary warheads armed with gas or anthrax.

An amusing expression of the problem, if it were not so tragic, is the reaction of Israel Aircraft Industries to the claims of the critics of the Arrow. In an article sent to me by Dov Raviv, the father of the Arrow project, the writer claims that:

In all predictions covering the next 15 years, the Arabs will be unable to fire more than 50 missiles simultaneously at Israel. As a result, production of 240 Arrow missiles will hermetically seal Israel's skies and provide an answer to the Arab world's stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction.

When I presented Raviv's claim (astonishing, I might add, in the face of available information vis-a-vis the armament efforts of the Arab states), to a group of aeronautical industry engineers with whom I met for the purpose of discussing an article about the Arrow, they each supported Raviv's data. When I briefly presented them the standard arguments relating to the intrinsic failures of the Arrow, they said nothing and led me to believe that the information is classified but there is nothing to worry about; all the problems will be solved.⁴¹

3. Detaining the Residents of Greater Tel Aviv in a Gas Trap

Therefore, the Arrow is not a response which suits the threat, and the residents of Tel Aviv will be left to their own devices as they were in the winter of 1991 with one major difference: The 39 missiles of that period may become hundreds of missiles in the battlefield of the future, and as opposed to the conventional warheads launched in 1991, they can anticipate a cloud of poisonous gas (the anthrax will remain unmentioned).

The safest solution in the face of a gas attack on heavily populated areas is the large-scale evacuation of the population to open, scarcely-populated areas adjacent to the big cities. Under those circumstances, passive defense could play a critical role in saving hundreds of thousands of lives.

The killing coefficient of gases of mass destruction is contingent on the nature of gases which are, for the most part, heavier than air and, therefore, tend to sink and accumulate in the valleys. The canyons formed in the streets of the cities between the houses are natural collection areas for gases dropped on heavily-populated regions. Conventional wisdom states that physical destruction of one third of the national strategic potential is, for all intents and purposes, destruction of the country. Since Greater Tel

⁴¹ Dr. Reuven Pedatzur, who has been sounding the alarm about the inherent defectiveness in the "Arrow" system, has, meanwhile, become a "public enemy". Pedatzur, Reuven, "The BPI as an Alternative", **Ballistic Missiles: The Threat and the Response**, (Hebrew), 1998, Yediot Ahronot Publishers. (To be published in May 1999 in English, Brassey's (UK) Ltd.)

Aviv contains 50% of Israel's Jewish population and a similar percentage of its means of production, extensive destruction of Greater Tel Aviv means the end of the Jewish state.

These basic facts are well-known to the enemy, testimony to which is the far-reaching escalation in the production of mass-destruction weaponry, especially gases, in the Arab nations surrounding Israel.⁴²

Faced with this, it would be expected that the Jews, for whom the memory of the mass gassing of millions of their people is part of their national trauma, would address the situation. Evacuation Centers are located in the hilly areas, one or two hours from city centers in order to enable transportation of masses of citizens via an extensive system of roads and railroads as quickly as possible.

The evacuation of Greater Tel Aviv in general and of Tel Aviv in particular is possible only to the east. To the north and south is clearly impossible due to the dense population. To the west is impossible due to the coastline. The evacuation eastward, is, therefore, the only artery available. The topographic formation of Samaria makes it the perfect evacuation center as less than 20 kilometers from the coast an extensive range of hills, twice the area of Greater Tel Aviv, begins. Furthermore, for historical reasons, the Arab population in western Samaria is relatively scarce. On the other hand, a well-developed infrastructure of Jewish settlement exists. The western Samaria region, which is 10-30 kilometers from the coastal plain, is approximately 2,000 square kilometers, in which the population of Greater Tel Aviv could be absorbed. For example, in the western Samaria rectangle between Elkana, Ariel, Kedumim and Alfei Menashe, an area of approximately 250 square kilometers, a population of 40,000 resides, half of them Jews. To this area alone, the whole school-aged population of Greater Tel Aviv can be evacuated.

In light of the non-conventional arms race, which at this point (prior to the introduction of nuclear weapons to the Middle East) is primarily various gases, it would be logical to expect that Israel would take extensive measures in preparing the infrastructure required to evacuate the population of Greater Tel Aviv eastward, raising them at least to the standards of western Europe, despite the fact that the potential threat to Israel is many times greater than that anticipated in the West at any point since World War II.

For this purpose, Israel should have annexed and asserted its sovereignty over the territory, all the while taking possession of state lands and transferring the negligible Arab population to alternative places. It should have put into place a transportation network including train and subway systems and a network of roads to the heart of Samaria. It should have decreased the population of Greater Tel Aviv by encouraging Jewish settlement in Judea, Samaria and Gaza in general and in Samaria in particular.

However, nothing was done. The only transportation artery connecting the heart of Greater Tel Aviv to Samaria is the so-called "Trans-Samaria Highway". This road is the number one strategic roadway in the State of Israel, on which the army is supposed to move toward the Jordan Valley with the onset of hostilities. Not only does this narrow and damaged road not provide a solution for the problem of a comprehensive evacuation of the civilian population, it is not even capable of answering the transportation needs of massive amounts of tanks, weaponry and troops.

The layout of the trans-Israel highway (the planned highway number 6) does run on the western slopes of Samaria but there are no plans for it to branch out eastward.

Since there is no plan available for moving masses of people to Samaria in the case of a gas attack, it goes without saying that no infrastructure for their absorption has been prepared. Therefore, on the day

⁴² Concerning the distribution of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East and their delivery systems, the reader can learn more from articles by Daniel Leshem: "Ballistic Missile Distribution in the Middle East" and Dany Shoham: "Mapping Chemical Weapons in Arab Countries and Iran", *Nativ*, 1-2/97.

of reckoning, when hundreds of thousands of people, protected by sheets of plastic and scotch tape (there is no money to replenish the gas masks whose value is very questionable in any case⁴³) will find their death through a slow process of asphyxiation in Tel Aviv, while the hills of Samaria remain, as they are today, bare and desolate.

Judea and Samaria are the cradle of the Hebrew nation, and contain within them the true significance of the return to Zion. Today, in the face of a threat to our very lives, the Hebrew homeland offers refuge to her children. In an historical irony which receives macabre reinforcement from anticipated developments in the battlefield of the future, Jews are abandoning the rescue area located on their doorstep in order to crowd, of their own volition, into the death trap awaiting them in the ghetto called Greater Tel Aviv.⁴⁴

To sum up the totality of the three factors as presented above:

1. Israel has no valid response to the general escalation of the potential danger due to a far-reaching cut in the defense budget.
2. Israel has no response to the threat posed by ballistic missiles armed with warheads of mass destruction as the weapon system which it is developing is incapable of addressing a threat of that variety.
3. Israel is doing nothing to save the population of the Greater Tel Aviv area, despite the fact that an ideal evacuation center is at its disposal a half hour to one hour away.

These three issues, as presented above, together create a critical mass of systems failure turning the physical destruction of Israel into a simple matter of mathematical probability.

The most severe aspect of the above analysis (so typical of systems failure) is that there is nothing new about it. No mysteries were solved by the undersigned nor does he reveal any earth-shattering secrets. The facts, as elucidated above, are known to anyone who has taken the trouble to learn them. It is an accepted fact that the defense budget is incapable of answering the IDF's needs. "The equipment grows old, the ammunition stocks are insufficient, the condition of the reserve bases is catastrophic" according to the State Comptroller's report, the air force is aging rapidly, and the army is unprepared for war. The silence accompanying the disintegration of the army reserve system stems from the lack of funds to finance its disposition if all army reservists were to report when called.⁴⁵

Since describing the situation realistically presents a systems failure, both physical and spiritual, both on the part of the decision-makers and on the part of the greater public, this phenomenon can only be described as cognitive dissonance at the core of the national existence. The second part of the

⁴³ Out of 102 million NIS needed to renew and exchange gas masks, the Ministry of Defense has budgeted a mere 20 million NIS. Consequently, "the rear is defenseless in case of a non-conventional war, especially in the case of chemical warfare": quoted from the report of the Knesset Committee for Auditing the IDF, as reported by the committee chairman, MK Efraim Sneh, on July, 29, 1997.

⁴⁴ Any attempt to elicit a response from the authorities in charge of protection in case of a deadly gas attack, like the atomic, biological and chemical branch in the Home Front Command or the national Training Department of the *Magen David Adom* (Israel's "Red Cross"), is greeted with an impenetrable wall of silence. Everyone admits that no evacuation plan exists. One of them, who requested anonymity, admitted that the issue was raised and rejected outright for "political" reasons.

⁴⁵ In light of the budgetary distress, the Ministry of Defense proposed that training maneuvers in the armored corps involving live ammunition should be limited to once tri-annually instead of the present bi-annual maneuvers. The incoming Chief of the General Staff, General Shaul Mofaz, cynically remarked about the combat readiness of a bank teller who trains in the operation of one of the most sophisticated weapon systems in the world, like the Merkava 3, once in three years. Mofaz neglected to mention that only one in three bank tellers will show up to reserve duty at all.

discussion will be devoted to an attempt to deal with the phenomenon on the pathological level, in other words, “the Israeli Death Wish”.



B

The Routine of Slander

On August 1, 1997, in a speech before the general staff of his army, President Mubarak informed them of Egypt's long-standing claim on territories in the Negev. The Egyptian president hinted that if Israel would not relinquish the land of its own volition, Egypt has “additional options” at its disposal. The makeup of the audience left little doubt as to the nature of the option referred to by Mubarak.⁴⁶

On November 20, 1997, Lena Hgelm-Wallin, the Swedish Foreign Minister announced: “Israel exists not by authority of historical or biblical rights but by the authority of a United Nations resolution.”⁴⁷

One month later, the president of France called the Israeli Prime Minister a liar; the British foreign minister, Robin Cook, publicly insulted the Prime Minister of Israel during his visit to Israel⁴⁸; Madeleine Albright declared that she did not trust Netanyahu; and the President of the United States compared the Israeli Prime Minister to Saddam Hussein.

Two months later, on Jerusalem Day which was celebrated at a Conference of Solidarity with the Palestinian Nation in March 1998 in Teheran, the participants agreed unanimously that the Zionist state must be “completely destroyed”. The guest of honor and the most vicious speaker at the conference was the PLO representative in Iran.

This random collection of incidents, each one individually enough to evoke a public uproar in any self-respecting country and in the case of the Egyptian and the Swede, almost certainly lead to the severing of diplomatic relations, were greeted in Israel with sounds of silence. Mubarak's speech was totally ignored by the print and electronic media. The threat of annihilation from Teheran merited a few lines in **Ma'ariv**, an Israeli daily newspaper. That was the case with the Swedish Foreign Minister's slander. In response to the smears uttered by Mrs. Albright and Mr. Clinton, Mr. Chirac and the British Foreign Minister, the majority of the Israeli media, united in their detestation of Netanyahu, applauded and supported them.

The condition (which is steadily escalating) of readiness to exhibit restraint in the face of a long line of diplomatic affronts (which are also steadily escalating both in severity and frequency) is eating away at the national resolve to stand firm in the midst of a difficult political process. Israel's response threshold is constantly declining, until at one point the Jewish state will no longer be acting to further its own interests but rather will be conducting a rearguard action which will engender acceding to a long line of dictates foisted upon it which clearly run counter to the national interest.

⁴⁶ See: **Al-Wasat**, London, August 5, 1997. This weekly, with connections to the Saudi royal family, is highly credible. In any case, no denial was forthcoming from the Egyptian President.

⁴⁷ One sentence taken from a series of slanderous statements which essentially blamed Israel for all maladies in the Middle East. These remarks were delivered in Upsala University marking the thirtieth anniversary of UN resolution 242. The transcript appeared in **Dagen**, a daily newspaper in Bergen, Norway, November 22, 1997.

⁴⁸ In response, Netanyahu canceled a scheduled lunch with Robin Cook. Not only did this extraordinary incident fail to arouse a negative reaction in Britain, on the contrary, in the public discourse which resulted in the British press (even in those publications affiliated with Labor) Netanyahu's action was completely understood.

Surrendering to strategic abuse, like any surrender under pressure, gains momentum to the point that a political act which just yesterday seemed totally unacceptable is today at the center of the national consensus, and will be the object of nostalgic longings tomorrow. So, for example, if we could travel back in the time tunnel a decade or two and present the average Israeli with the data concerning the degree of public support for a Palestinian state, he would be certain that he is the victim of a lame practical joke or that the pollsters have lost their minds. This is the case with the Palestinian state issue together with a long list of issues which go to the very root of Israel's post-Oslo national existence. Thus, the collapse of the survival instinct in the face of the adversity of existence appears to be the primary attribute of the Jewish state in its jubilee year.

The hardship of existence cannot be nonchalantly repressed with a shrug of the shoulders and the proverbial burying of the head in the sand. The cost of repression is high. Eventually it will rend the fabric of society causing the national consensus to crumble and the glue which unites the public into a nation to disintegrate. Self-deception, which the Jews have developed into a full-fledged art form, has replaced rational thinking. Basic truths and common sense are collapsing, making way for unfounded, illogical speculation. The enemies' hatred towards us is transformed into a self-hatred which in turn is translated into sectarian divisiveness. Cooperation with the enemy becomes the height of fashion under the semantic guise of Orwellian News-speak which defines an extensive sale of strategic assets as a "peace process".

The first part of the article has been devoted primarily to a comprehensive depiction of the symptoms of the terror syndrome – a direct result of the potential threat directed toward Israel. In the second part of the article an attempt will be made to analyze the roots of this phenomenon.

The Zionist Failure

In his book, **The Jewish State** (February 1896), Herzl claimed, as mentioned, that "when our plan just begins to be implemented, (i.e. the creation of the Jewish state), anti-Semitism everywhere will come to a halt because a covenant of peace will exist between us and the nations."⁴⁹ As a result, it is only natural that Herzl devoted only the following two lines of his book to the military issue:

I see the Jewish state as a neutral state. Its army will be but a garrison...whose job it will be to keep the peace internally and externally.⁵⁰

Herzl, clearly a product of the Russian pogroms and the Dreyfus Affair on the one hand, and of the springtime of nations and the positivism of the late 19th century on the other, saw the oppression of his nation as the contemptible result of the curse of exile. Herzl's belief, and that of the other founders of Zionism, that political sovereignty is the solution to anti-Semitism, became a categorical imperative of Zionism and a credo of the era of settlement and, in the wake of the horrible lesson of the Holocaust, of the State of Israel. From Ze'ev Jabotinsky to Ber Borochov, from David Ben-Gurion to Menachem Begin, everyone took great pains to underscore the claim that "the entrance of the Jewish nation into history" will rid it of the curse of anti-Semitism.⁵¹

However, not only did anti-Semitism not come to a halt, but the State of Israel inherited the world's eternal hatred of the Eternal People. In its brief history, Israel has stood against would-be destroyers in

⁴⁹ Translated by Asher Barash; Tel-Aviv, Mizpe Publishers; 5704, p. 87.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 79. On reading the sequel to **The Jewish State**, *Altneuland*, the Arcadia story is so touching in its *naïveté* that one cannot but compare it to another utopian flight of fancy, Shimon Peres' **The New Middle East**. But, in contrast to Peres', Herzl's *naïveté* was authentic.

⁵¹ It seems that among Israeli Prime Ministers, only Golda Meir was prepared to face the truth objectively. See the foreword to her autobiography **My Life**, in which she warns against the self-deception as if our Arab enemies could be appeased by territorial concessions.

five all-out wars and is forced to field the largest per capita army in the world. Israel calls the intervals between the wars – in which Arab terror runs rampant within its borders and wars of attrition rage on its borders – “peacetime”. The rapid proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in this region arouses the ghosts of the gas chambers as witnessed by the mass exodus from population centers during Operation Desert Storm. Not only does this factor, together with the Nazi character of Islam, which does nothing to hide its intentions and preparations to destroy Israel, contradict the fundamentals of Zionism, but it also gives them a macabre dimension, which Abba Eban once described so well when he referred to the 1967 borders as Auschwitz borders.

Consequently, after 50 years of sovereignty, not only does Israel remain the most dangerous place in the world for Jews, but the level of the threat is constantly rising in direct proportion to the escalation of the non-conventional arms race in the region. Israel’s choice, therefore, is to live with “one hand holding the weapon” (Nehemiah 4:11) or not to live at all.

This alternative demands a spiritual fortitude which might be an “edict which the community cannot endure” to quote a Talmudic saying, based on the dominant trends in Israel over the last decade as elucidated in this article. The development of symptoms endemic to the pathology of a victim is consequently obvious, I almost said, to quote our Sages, an (ironically) “unregrettable necessity”. Analyzing these symptoms in the special context of the Jewish anomaly will grant us greater understanding of the complicated issue of “the Israeli death wish”.

A Comment about the Jewish Anomaly

The Jewish anomaly, in other words, the reward and more, the punishment, foisted on Israel as a condition of its “Chosen People” status, places a heavy burden on the shoulders of the individual who struggles to bear it until he finally collapses under it. The unbearable chapters in Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28 bring, in excruciating detail,⁵² the series of horrors which will befall Israel...

If you (do not) walk in my statutes...then I will walk contrary to you also in fury and will chastise you...and you shall eat the flesh of your sons and the flesh of your daughters you shall eat...and your land shall be desolate and your cities waste...cursed shalt thou be in the city and cursed shalt thou be in the field...and thy carcass shall be food for all the birds of the air and for the beasts of the earth.

As if the curses promised in the Torah were insufficient, the prophet adds some of his own:

I will scatter them also among the nations whom they have not known... and I will send a sword after them till I have consumed them. (Jeremiah 9:15 and 24:10).

As a result, in light of the text, in the face of the conditions and the severity of the punishment to be administered if the pact is violated, it is highly doubtful that after calculating cost-effectiveness, any other nation would be willing to take so great a chance in order to achieve the status (which is, to say the least, somewhat misleading) of “Chosen People”. Bottom line, it is not clear who performed a kindness to whom, God to Israel, or vice-versa.

In any case (the somewhat humorous style is in no way intended to ease the severity of the problem), it would be a rather banal statement – to put it mildly – to say that the Jew fleeing his fate is a fundamental of Jewish history. The aspiration to be “like all the nations”, in other words, to be liberated from the yolk of chosenness in the sense of “none of your honey, none of your sting” unites the Second Commonwealth Hellenists, the German assimilationists and the Israeli post-Zionists. This

⁵² How typical – in **Deuteronomy** 28, 13 verses are dedicated to the reward and 55 terror-filled verses are dedicated to the punishment. Indeed, an accurate, statistical precis, reflecting the relativity in Jewish existence throughout history.

is the characteristic sign which unifies Jewish history no less than the succession of disasters which have befallen the Jews.

However, only in the independent State of Israel has this aspiration assumed so desperate and insoluble a form. The dialectic tension between the desire to be like all nations on the one hand, and the Israeli alternative which forces upon the assimilated Jew Y.L. Gordon's famous directive "be a man in public and a Jew in your home" on the other, is not even the lesser of two evils; it is a total failure. Our post-Zionist, caught in the nationalist trap, is destined to lose both worlds. In addition to the misfortune of Judaism which hangs over him, he now shoulders the yoke of the Zionist curse. If shedding the former was accomplished easily, fleeing the latter is tantamount to destroying the national home. Which is exactly what he is doing. Is it really done unknowingly?

Before placing the heavy responsibility of the death wish on the post-Zionist, it is only fair that we attempt to view reality from his vantage point.

Pathology of a Victim

For our purposes, it makes no difference whether or not there is any truth to Leo Baeck's famous saying: "The history of the Jews is an indictment of humanity." It is clear that humanity cannot agree with that. Holocaust denial should be seen as an attempt – contemptible as it may be – to avoid the mark of Cain which the Jews (by their very existence) want to attach to the forehead of said "humanity".

The endless chain of disasters which have accompanied the Jewish people since the dawn of history: the expulsions, the destruction, the pogroms, the Holocaust, the wars – converge to a kind of tragic determinism which the victim can interpret as he pleases. Sayings of the sort such as in the Biblical verse: "a nation that shall dwell in solitude", or as recited on Passover in the Haggada: "in each generation they rise against us to annihilate us," and the like, which grant Israel the rather macabre distinction of being the "Chosen People", attest to that fact. However, hard as they try, the Jews cannot force the ethos of the Jewish victim onto "humanity". Not only will an attempt of that sort fail in its initial stages, but the action itself will just exacerbate anti-Semitism. Indeed, in the dialectic principle according to which anti-Semitism is fueled by Jewish tragedy again and again, nothing has changed.

Determinism, by definition, contains within it the cause and the effect, the pretext and the conclusion. Therefore, there is no need to deny the existence of gas chambers in Treblinka in order to conclude that somehow the Jews are to blame for their tragic fate. What remains is just to search for the explanation. At this point, it is not far-fetched to posit that the Jew suffers from some inborn deficiency (in other words, a fixed component of congenital evil) which causes the whole world to hate him, and therefore he deserves his fate.

A visit to Yad Vashem supports this theory. The average VIP who visits Israel and is required according to custom and protocol to tour the Holocaust museum on Mount Herzl, knows that he is not being exposed to a one-time horror in the history of the Jews. He is aware that the Holocaust was not an anomalous anti-Semitic act (other than in its industrial dimensions) but rather corresponded to the norm in Jewish history, and the Nazis and their collaborators were legitimate constituents of the Christian West. It follows that as he walked through Yad Vashem's chambers of horror, he was well aware that the Jews had placed him in the dock. Therefore, the VIP's emotionless face and gloomy expression as he leaves the museum are not necessarily expressions of the moral agitation which the man experienced in the horror-filled corridors of the museum, but rather of the offense taken at the fact that the Jews are accusing him.⁵³ Etiquette prevents him from being forthright, but it is possible

⁵³ Not to mention visitors like Sadat, a Nazi spy during WW II, for whom the visit was an educational tour and a nostalgic sound and light show visit to the days of his much admired *Führer*.

that if his attitude towards the Jews was not crystallized before he entered, upon exiting he joins the ranks of anti-Semites.

The decisive influence of Christianity's doctrine on the Jewish question, on the spiritual world of the average western intellectual, needs neither explanation nor proof. Needless to say that this article does not seek to deal with the comprehensive issue of Christian anti-Semitism, but one need not be a devout Catholic to discern that in the eyes of the non-Jew, the Jewish tragedy is first and foremost an unprecedented existential failure in the history of humanity. This failure is especially apparent when contrasted with the impressive historical success of Christianity. This is a fact which the aforementioned VIP cannot help but consider, and any attempt to contradict it by exposing him to the annals of Jewish suffering is in bad taste if not a macabre farce.

Furthermore, 2,000 years ago, Judaism was offered the Christian alternative, a formula for certain success, as will be elucidated below. Rejection of the Christian Gospel by the stubborn Jews is yet another testament to their inborn deficiency, "and therefore there is no recourse but to conclude that the Jews are in love with their suffering," as Torquemada helplessly concluded after his failure to convert Segovian Jewry to Christianity despite the series of physical and spiritual torture to which he subjected its members.

Christianity is not alone in direct confrontation with the Jewish ethos. The Jewish attitude to a random list of figures from the past, and the status of those figures among the nations of the world, is testimony to the dissatisfaction of Jews with history, and more so, of history with the Jews.

Ramses II was one of the greatest Pharaohs in the glorious 19th dynasty in Egypt. Nebuchadnezzar was one of the great conquerors and builders of antiquity; Titus was one of the most enlightened and sympathetic Caesars of Rome; Saint Augustine was one of the great Christian philosophers if not the greatest; Thomas Aquinas was the outstanding humanist of the Middle Ages; Martin Luther was one of the significant German philosophers as were Fichte and Otto von Treitschke; Voltaire was one of the outstanding Enlightenment liberal philosophers; Chmelnitzki was the revered national hero among his people, etc., etc.

This fine group of virulent anti-Semites, among them some of the most wicked oppressors, whose names live in infamy in the annals of Judaism, are among the central figures in world history.⁵⁴

The spiritual world of the "Hebrew speaking gentiles", as someone accurately characterized the post-Zionists in Israel, is in essence identical to the western intellectual's attitude toward the Jews, as described above, but only in essence. While the aforementioned VIP will return to his home in London, Paris and New York, the post-Zionist is incarcerated in a Levantine ghetto where he is – oh the pain – unable to listen to his idol, Richard Wagner. He finds himself outside the pale of enlightened humanity, which views the German composer as one of the musical giants of the 19th century. He, on the other hand, because of his Jewishness, must renounce culture for its own sake just because Wagner happened to be a virulent anti-Semite. Well, wasn't everyone?

Compared to him, the status of the Diaspora assimilationist (Diaspora and not exile as with its negative connotations it is an improper expression in proper society) who assimilates into his milieu with the amazing aptitude of Jewish opportunism, is superior. The Israeli assimilationist is unable to do even that. For the first time in history, the Jew finds himself in a situation where he is unable to assimilate. Assimilate into what? Islam? Turn eating humus with pita bread into a cultural challenge

⁵⁴ See for example the admonishing words of Arnold Toynbee, a great admirer of the Roman Empire, criticizing the Jewish Revolt.

like the *Bildung* of the German Jews?⁵⁵ The spiritual world of the “Hebrew-speaking gentiles” is represented, among others, by a **Ha’aretz** journalist, Doron Rosenblum. Upon the death of Nissim Aloni, Rosenblum wrote:

While the politicians and the ruling majority in the country...haggle like merchants over every% and half% of rocky ground...yesterday, the most difficult and painful withdrawal took place. With the death of Nissim Aloni, the true homeland shrank by many%age points...Israel of the Hebrew language.⁵⁶

The grotesque disassociation between the language and the rocky land, in other words: a basic lack of understanding of the relationship between the language and the land, is responsible for the phenomenon of the common Israeli graphomaniac, and the above mourner is one of its wondrous expressions.⁵⁷

Other examples of the pathetic attempt at Levantine assimilation include the songs of praise which Amos Keinan composed to the mint leaves, the esthetic and architectural admiration inspired by the open stinking sewage and the crumbling shacks of the Arab town Kalkilya in the eyes of leading Israeli author, David Grossman and the Israeli sociologist, Shulamit Hareven’s claims about the kinship and common destiny which she feels toward the Arabs as opposed to the alienation which she feels toward the Jews of the Diaspora.

But that is a negligible minority, both because of the feeling of contempt which the Jewish obsequiousness arouses in the decent Arab who rejects him out of hand⁵⁸ and because of the constant suspicion that the Israeli Left’s attempts to court the Arabs are actually Zionist deceptions aimed at destroying Arab unity.

Consequently, it is no wonder that our post-Zionist seeks to escape his destiny at his first opportunity. In doing this, he continues the tradition of German assimilationists who, in their personalities joined Christian anti-Semitism on the one hand and their intellectual, secular heirs of the Voltaire school on the other, and who since Emancipation believed that cultural assimilation or conversion to Christianity would grant them a ticket (*entrée billet* as Heine expressed it with self-irony) into the drawing rooms of enlightened humanity and rid them, once and for all, of the curse of Judaism.

The assimilationists’ obsequiousness, which transformed them into “more German than German”, as anticipated, assumed a dimension of self-hatred. The “German of Mosaic Faith” projected the Nazi’s hatred towards him onto his Ost-Juden brethren and updated Treitschke’s famous saying “*Die Juden sind unser Unglück*” (which was the Nazi’s motto) into “*Die (Ost) Juden sind unser Unglück.*”

But the eager willingness to internalize anti-Semitism did not save the average Berlin assimilationist. He was, therefore, dragged from his home at dawn to the railroad station and sent to a concentration

⁵⁵ And why not? In one of the both amusing and ridiculous manifestations of this phenomenon, Ariel Hirschfeld devoted a whole page in the literary supplement of **Ha’aretz**, to a detailed exposition of the common themes in the songs of the Egyptian folk singer, Um Khultum and Beethoven.

⁵⁶ **Ha’aretz**, June 14, 1998.

⁵⁷ A sample of Bronovsky’s work which is on a par with Rosenblum’s, can be found in the article on the Israeli Left in Stav, Arieh, “Even if You Bray a Leftist in a Mortar... Yet His Foolishness Will Not Depart”, **The Israeli Death Wish**, *ibid.*, p. 166.

⁵⁸ Anton Shamas and Azmi Bishara are examples of this. Shamas and Bishara, who cleverly manipulate the Jewish collaborators for their purposes, openly scorn them. See Ari Shavit’s interview with Bishara, **Ha’aretz** supplement, May 29, 1998, and Shamas’ comments in the October 1987 issue of **Politika**. Recently, Arafat joined the ranks of those who are tired of the advances of Jews who squeeze themselves into his very busy schedule. Freh abu-Medein, the Justice Minister of the Palestinian Authority, mocked this phenomenon in a Palestinian Authority telecast on July 17, 1998, indicating that “now, the supporters of peace in the Israeli camp must coordinate an appointment with the *R’ais* (Arafat) a year in advance.”

camp, or even worse, to his *Ost-Juden* brethren's ghettos in Poland. The reviled letter "J" was stamped in his identity card, and next to it, his new first name. No more Franz, Hans, Max or Moritz – but Israel, God forbid. No longer Greta, Leni or Hilda, but Sarah. So, in the irony typical of Goebbels' sense of humor, the Nazis restored their Jewish identities to the assimilationists. And when he breathed his last breath in Treblinka or Dachau, he did it, at least, as a proper Jew, not as a spiteful apostate.

But not everyone reached the railroad station collection points. Many committed suicide, they and their families, beforehand. The Jewish assimilationist whose German identity was lost, was unable to bear the burden of the return to Judaism which the Germans tried to force upon him. The hatred for a Jew within him was so great, that he preferred to die rather than reassume to his identity.

Therefore, a hundred years of *Bildung* vanished into thin air, first with the Nuremberg Laws, then literally in the smoke of the crematoria. The shock treatment of the Holocaust was supposed to liberate the assimilationist from the delusion of the exile. The task of designing a new Israeli by healing the defect inherent in a stolen identity through the granting of an authentic being was imposed upon the State of Israel, where for the first time in two thousand years, faith and nationality have been united. However, not only has Zionism been unsuccessful in guaranteeing the Jew a "place under the sun", to quote the name of Binyamin Netanyahu's book, but the Mosaic principle of reward and punishment has been shattered as well; all the more surprising in light of the German experience, whose importance is decisive in both components of the historical lesson: the failure of assimilation on the one hand, and the Holocaust on the other.

The Germans, a nation of murderers, are among the richest, safest and most peaceful nations in the world. They recently reunited and due to their economic (and in the near future, military) might, are returning to a position of hegemony in Europe. Goebbels' vision of post-war Germany

which will flourish as it never flourished before, its desolate landscapes and districts will be rebuilt with new cities more beautiful than the old ones and villages in which peace will reign...⁵⁹

is being realized completely. In contrast, the victim nation is returning to the "ultimate finish line", to quote Alterman's cruel metaphor, with the vigorous aid of its former executioner which is arming Israel's present enemies with weapons of mass destruction.

The criminal ethos, as it was refined in the German-Nazi melting pot, therefore, makes a mockery of the Jewish principle of reward and punishment, renders meaningless the notion of a chosen people, grants a macabre dimension to the concept of divine neglect and provides an additional confirmation to our post-Zionist that he has no grounds for concern about turning his back on his country, as he is walking the legitimate path, dictated by history. The fact that the German lesson is another layer in the determinist dimension of the Jewish tragedy, is a welcome addition from his perspective.

Israel – The National Identity Trap

Zionism has once again forced upon the assimilationist a Jewish-national identity which has returned him, using a dialectic exercise (admittedly, a nasty one) of unifying opposites, to the ghetto. Not only has the State of Israel failed to provide succor to the Jewish destiny, but it has exacerbated the situation by establishing an armed ghetto. Not only has the verse "and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks" mouthed by the Jewish liberal in and out of context, assumed an ironic quality in the reality which has unfolded, since in order to survive he must fulfill its diametric opposite "beat your ploughshares into swords and your pruning hooks into spears" (Joel 4:10). It is no wonder that he finds himself agreeing with the characterization:

⁵⁹ Goebbelsreden 1939-45, Düsseldorf, 1972.

Israel is a ghetto albeit armed better than the Warsaw ghetto and better off financially than the Lodz ghetto, but the differences end there.⁶⁰

It becomes obvious that under these circumstances, the original ghetto is preferable like the variety referred to by Herman Cohen who tried to convince the Zionist Martin Buber that “the ghetto mentality is not a ghost of Judaism but the genuine soul of Jewish reality.”

In this sense, the statement made by Amos Oz, a foremost Israeli author, that longing for Rachel’s grave does not require territorial control over the place, just as Israel’s right over its land is contingent upon the agreement of the Palestinians,⁶¹ is a clear echo of Franz Rosenzweig’s words in the debate which he conducted with Gershom Scholem:

The Jew must long for his homeland but may not be sovereign in his land. His source is the exile where he must live with the Torah scroll in his hand.

Cohen and Rosenzweig wrote at the beginning of the century and it is said that had they lived in the days of holocaust and revival, they would certainly have modified their position vis-a-vis Zionism. Is that a fact? Maybe, in the context of the flight from Zionism in the Jewish State’s jubilee year, the two anti-Zionists understood the Jewish soul better than Buber and Scholem, the Zionists?

It is clear that our post-Zionist, who in the past was a “member of a clan of lepers”, (Kafka) is today a citizen in a “leper state”. “The Jewish cosmopolitan who flees Hebrew parochialism as from a plague” (Berl Katzenelson) finds himself suddenly returning, much to his chagrin, to the status of “a people who dwells alone”. Yehiam Weitz, a leading academic, expressed his disappointment with the national trap of the Jewish state articulately, as he quoted for his purpose George Steiner’s famous salt parable:

The Jews are like salt, when they are scattered among the nations they are a spice which adds flavor. In large doses they are unbearable, the unique quality of the Jews is only apparent when they are scattered among the nations.⁶²

As a result, Weitz rejects the provincial concept of “homeland” in which a man “might die a stupid, meaningless death in a terrorist action or even in war...” and he “might pay with his life not as an alternative to Auschwitz but for a blue and white flag on a trans-something highway”.⁶³

Death for the homeland in the style of Joseph Trumpeldor’s famous deathbed cry “it is an honor to die for our country” is, therefore, “a stupid, meaningless death”, if only because it is not an “alternative to Auschwitz”, in his phrasing. Total rejection of national sovereignty, to take Weitz’s statement to its logical, albeit absurd conclusion, robs the meaning even from death as a free man. It reasons, therefore, that it is preferable to die in the furnaces of Auschwitz, which is apparently “cosmopolitan and universal” than to die a provincial death for a “blue and white flag”.

The despair from Zionism, sovereignty and the idea of Jewish nationhood is common to the narrative of ever-growing numbers among the Israeli elite. The exile becomes the object of “yearning for exile” similar to the “yearning for redemption”. Herman Cohen, Franz Rosenzweig, Walter Benjamin, George Steiner and Noam Chomsky, to name but a few, among the cultural icons of the Left, are gradually assuming a more central role in shaping the existence of what is still called post-Zionism.

⁶⁰ This rather nasty (nonetheless accurate) quotation is attributed to General (res.) Benny Peled, former Commander of the Air Force. Peled views Israel as some sort of Jewish *shtetl a là* Shalom Aleichem’s “Yohupetz” or “Katrielevke” led by a community council, a polar opposite of his post-modernist spiritual world.

⁶¹ In an interview with him. See Yona Hadari, **Thinking it Over**, Yad Tabenkin, 1994, pp. 398-9.

⁶² A slight change in the parable is attributed to Sokolow: “The Jews are like manure; when together, they stink. When scattered, they fertilize.”

⁶³ Yehiam Weitz, **Politika**, October 1987.

But this, too, is only in the short-term. The phrase “post-Zionism” is a euphemistic lip-service to the remnants of the consensus, which comes to camouflage the Israeli Left’s anti-Zionism. It stands to reason, therefore, that the race to the radical fringe will quickly expose their true intentions. As to the Arab-Israeli writer Anton Shamas’ question: “Where is the first Jew who will declare that Zionism is dead?” the scope of the response will surprise Shamas himself. The Jewish assimilationist is preparing tools of exile for himself, this time from his own land.

Abandoning Zionism, which is a blueprint for the destruction of the Jewish state, requires two interrelated stages. Zionism must be slandered by affixing a mark of Cain to its forehead in order to render it a criminal entity which deserves to disappear and, at the same time, another nation must be invented in order to bequeath the land to it.

An Ex Nihilo Act of Creation of a Nation

The discovery of the Palestinian nation is completely attributable to Jewish radicalism. The founding father of the Palestinian state, and he who composed the blueprint for its establishment, was Jerome Segal, an American Jew.⁶⁴ The overriding impetus for this stemmed from the fact that the *Eretz Israel* Arabs lack virtually any criteria of a nation: race, culture, language, religion, heritage and homeland. Most were a motley group of immigrants who migrated to *Eretz Israel* in the second half of the 19th century. Among them were “Circassians, Algerians, Egyptians, Druse, Turks, Kurds, Bosniaks and others”,⁶⁵ who were drawn to then Palestine from the beginning of Zionism which redeemed the land from its desolation.

Israeli Arabs themselves do not ascribe themselves a separate national status. Even the Palestinian Charter, a political document utilized as a basis for the delegitimization of the Jewish state, explicitly characterizes the Palestinians as an organic part of the Arab nation. So, too, does the constitution of Fateh, the central organization of the PLO, headed by Yasser Arafat. Chapter I, paragraph I, states: “Palestine is part of the Arab world and the Palestinians part of the Arab nation.”⁶⁶

Ascribing nationhood to Israeli Arabs is a joke in the eyes of the Arabs themselves. Beginning with Hafez-el-Assad who goes to the trouble to remind Arafat that there is no Palestinian nation and that “Palestine is southern Syria,” through the Hamas and the Nasserites like Azmi Bishara, the Arabs deny the existence of the “Palestinian nation”. Even if one did exist, for decades it has possessed a homeland in Jordan where it constitutes two-thirds of the population and where it has actualized sovereignty with all its accoutrements: a flag, a passport, a national anthem, etc. Jordan is, therefore, a Palestinian state in every sense of the word, a fact acknowledged by a long line of Arab personalities headed by [the late] King Hussein.

The fact that the Jews seek to establish an additional state for a people lacking any characteristics of a nation, beyond the one in Jordan, plus another half-state by granting autonomy to the Israeli Arabs, and if that were not enough, seek to establish “a state for all its citizens” in place of the Jewish state, should suffice in displaying the strength of the Israeli death wish.

⁶⁴ Jerome M. Segal, President of the Jewish Peace Lobby, in his thesis “Creating the Palestinian State – Strategy for Peace”, lays the foundation for a Palestinian state. The focus of the article explains in detail how to overcome the vulnerable points in Israel’s objection to a Palestinian state.

⁶⁵ Joan Peters, **From Time Immemorial**, (Hebrew), Tel Aviv, 1988, p. 196. Peters’ book is undoubtedly the most comprehensive and best documented study of its kind. But it suffers from one unforgivable sin: it dares to reveal the Arab calumny regarding Zionism. It is no wonder that the work was greeted with contempt and ridicule by the majority of the Leftist academic establishment.

⁶⁶ This recently composed document was publicized in August 1998. See the Fateh website on the internet: www.fateh.org_public/constitution

In this manner, if the Arabs lack the characteristics of nationality, Israel will provide them. An illustration of this was supplied by Dalia Ravikowitz, a leading poetess, who traveled with a group of like-minded colleagues to greet Arafat upon his arrival in Gaza from Tunisia: “I am overjoyed that Arafat has returned to settle his patrimony,” the poet said, while singing Arafat’s praises. The importance of this statement, beyond its historical distortion and ludicrousness (as Arafat is a Cairo-born Egyptian), lies in the fact that it was uttered by a poet well-aware of the power of the metaphor. Ravikowitz’s hatred for the settlers on the one hand, while making use of the loaded phrase “patrimony” (“that the children of Israel may settle every man his patrimony” – Numbers 36:8), in reference to Arafat on the other, is a bill of divorce to Zionism.

This self-abasement, even lower than the obsequiousness of the German Jew toward Hitler: “Our beloved chancellor...”, is not the result of necessity or compulsion but of a desire whose obsessive nature is easily discernible. After Ravikowitz “restored” their patrimony without a second thought, the Arabs now needed a capital for their homeland. Naomi Hazan took it upon herself by stating: “Jerusalem is the most important Palestinian city.” This upgrading has great significance as Jerusalem, a marginal, unimportant and desolate city in Arab history, is not mentioned in the Koran nor is it mentioned in the Palestinian Charter.

Since “A Palestinian state...will be a time bomb which will drag the Arab world into war,” (Yitzhak Rabin), on “Israel in indefensible borders” (Shimon Peres), the establishment of a Palestinian state will necessitate the destruction of the Jewish state. It is possible, whether through war – according to the Palestinian National Council’s program of staged destruction – or through the delegitimization of the Jewish state, by destroying the moral basis for its existence, by slandering it and displaying it as a criminal entity. While Arafat is energetically pursuing the staged destruction program, the Israeli Left is carrying out the second alternative.

Using the Arab “Holocaust” to Deny the Holocaust

Creating a nation *ex nihilo*, a heritage and capital city (race, language and religion even the Jews have not yet been able to issue – though you never know) is very significant – although creation of the Arab “holocaust” is even more significant. Inventing a holocaust for the Arabs will grant them victim status. Thus the post-Zionist girds his loins and invents an Arab holocaust. During the visit of a parliamentary delegation to Germany, MK Yael Dayan explained to her hosts that “just as we were your victims and, therefore, you are obligated to us, the Palestinians are our victims and, therefore, we are obligated to them.”⁶⁷

Equalizing the Jewish Holocaust with the “Arab holocaust” or “*naqba*” which took place due to the establishment of the State of Israel requires one to conclude that Israel is a criminal state. Establishing a link between Zionism and Nazism is an overt form of Holocaust denial. The Jewish destroyers of Zionism, who taint its forehead with the Nazi mark of disgrace, do not require the physical denial of the Jewish Holocaust. But the “fact” that yesterday’s victims have become today’s executioners (see Dayan’s quotation above) robs the Jews of the moral right bestowed upon them as a result of their suffering in the Holocaust: in other words, the right of Jews to a state of their own. A rogue state must disappear. As with the Third Reich, so with the Judeo-Nazi entity. Ilan Pappé, a revisionist Israeli historian from Haifa University, claims that the right of national sovereignty is denied as a lesson learned from Jewish impotence in the Holocaust:

⁶⁷ It is not Dayan’s statement which is symptomatic of the Jewish pathology, but rather the fact that it became part of the public agenda with no reaction in the sense of “silence is tantamount to the admission of guilt.”

As a rule, it can be said that the Zionists have been successful in convincing sectors of world-wide public opinion that a connection exists between Zionism and the Holocaust.⁶⁸

Another expression, fascinating in its own right, of denying the Holocaust by ignoring it, in other words, the message and lesson which arise from it, is that of Orit Shohat, of the **Ha'aretz** daily: "The Holocaust is not part of our heritage. It is part of the German heritage."⁶⁹

The Arab MK Azmi Bishara, a radical communist and Nasserite, is among the leaders of the Israeli Arab irredentism. Bishara, who openly preaches for the disintegration of the Jewish state, with the enthusiastic support of a large group of Jewish radicals, is for that reason among the cultural icons of the Israeli Left. In an interview published in **Ha'aretz**,⁷⁰ Ari Shavit, a media star, opened with the question if, now, after 50 years of struggle and with the onset of peace, Bishara is ready to forgive the Jews (sic) for what they did to his people in 1948?

Needless to say, Bishara rejected the Jewish obsequiousness with contempt.

Forgive what? Three years after the Holocaust, Hitler's admirers, his allies and successors gathered to complete in Israel that which Hitler began in Europe – to liquidate the Jewish population "in a massacre unknown to mankind since the Mongols", to quote the Secretary-General of the Arab League, Azzam Pasha, in his speech on the eve of the invasion of the Arab armies. In a desperate war, a handful of Jews succeeded in overcoming those who planned to destroy them. From a historical perspective, the Arab aggression is in no way inferior to Nazism. But since they were unsuccessful in their attempt to annihilate the Jews, they declared a period of national mourning and characterized their defeat "*naqba*" – the holocaust.

This moral perversion which is – could it be otherwise? – a replica of the neo-Nazi claim regarding "the catastrophe which befell the German nation in May 1945 by the Jews and their allies",⁷¹ was adopted in its entirety by the Israeli Left, and in their wake, ever-growing sectors of the general public.

When the late Professor Yeshayahu Leibowitz of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem spoke of Israel as a Judeo-Nazi state, the listener could only conclude that life in the late Thirties in Germany was identical to present-day reality in Israel. In case his familiarity with reality is insufficient, Shulamit Aloni comes to his aid and describes the period of the Likud government "a period of Fascist chauvinism characterized by brutal populism...the melting pot of mystic-aggressive patriotism motivated by imperialist aspirations".⁷²

When Professor Adi Ophir, a philosopher from Tel Aviv University writes of "concentration camps on the West Bank" then one or the other is true: either the reality in Auschwitz was identical to that which exists in Arab villages throughout Judea and Samaria, or that the reality in the villages is identical to that which existed in Auschwitz. So, too, in the case of deporting terrorists, which the loyal members of the peace camp have unceasingly compared to the deportation trains which transported the Jews to the concentration camps.

The equation between Nazism and Israel is designed to render the establishment of Israel as the mother of all evils, Israel's wars as campaigns of conquest and imperialism in the style of Nazi Germany (Yeshayahu Leibowitz); mass deportations and ethnic cleansing (Uri Avneri, a leading journalist); dispossession and destruction (Peace Now); genocide (Peace Bloc); concentration camps (Adi Ophir); Hitlerism (Ya'akov Sharett, son of the late Moshe Sharett and an author); aggressive

⁶⁸ Ilan Pappé, **The Journal of Palestine Studies** (the PLO quarterly), Winter 1997.

⁶⁹ **Thinking it Over**, Ibid. p. 633.

⁷⁰ May 29, 1998, in other words, in honor of Independence Day in the Jubilee year of the Jewish state.

⁷¹ See the speech of Dietrich Korman, the neo-Nazi leader in Stuttgart, **The European**, May 15, 1995.

⁷² **Politika**, October, 1987

militarism and worship of blood and land (Shulamit Aloni); Gestapo units and *Hitlerjugend* (Professor Moshe Zimmerman, an expert on German Studies at the Hebrew University); and *Einsatzgruppen* (Amnon Abramowitz, a media star). The new historians of the Benny Morris, Avi Schleim and Ilan Pappé school, have taken it upon themselves to grant this description of the “Nazionistic” state the academic imprimatur of a quasi-historical study.

No one expressed this Nazionist trend more radically than Noam Chomsky and due to this fact, he achieved the status of cultural hero among the Israeli peace camp. The superlatives hurled at him during his visits to Israel are so extreme that they would perplex even Yeshayahu Leibowitz. It is no surprise that Chomsky’s continuing links to neo-Nazis do not disturb the peace camp. His book, **Political Economy of Human Rights** was published by the neo-Nazi publishing house – *La Vieille Taupe*, Paris which publishes among other titles, *Annales Histoire Revisioniste*, an anti-Semitic quarterly which specializes in holocaust denial. Chomsky has granted his patronage to Robert Fourison, a holocaust denier who was dismissed from the University of Lyon for that reason. Chomsky does not find in Fourison’s book “even the slightest hint of anti-Semitic allusions”.

Chomsky’s anti-Semitic book: **The Fateful Triangle**, is featured prominently among the publications of the California-based, neo-Nazi “Center of Revisionist History” alongside **The Protocols of the Elders of Zion**, **The Zionist Conspiracy** by Alfred Lillienthal and **Communism Behind a Mask** by Josef Goebbels. “The Zionists are like Hitler,” their State is based on “the genocidal chapters in the Bible”, their doctrine is the “Samson syndrome” and, therefore, “they intend to commit national suicide in the process destroying humanity the world over.”⁷³

In interviews which he was so kind to grant in Israel during his visit, Chomsky explained that:

Israel is up to its neck in massacres and torture... there is nothing that Israel loves more than the murder of its citizens... if it could only guarantee that the PLO would commit more and more acts of terror, it would be happy...

The war in Lebanon was initiated by Israel because “the Jews could not bear the fact that the PLO had stopped killing its citizens.”

Within the Jewish state, according to Chomsky, inherent evil is latent and it is a danger-filled entity lacking the most basic of human characteristics – compassion, whose whole being is rife with blind hatred for mankind which it is destined to liquidate.

So with Chomsky and so with another Jewish cultural hero, Arafat, whose ties to neo-Nazis are well documented, whose soldiers swear allegiance with the traditional Nazi salute after declaring that “drinking Jewish blood is accepted practice among us,”⁷⁴ and who just recently (August 1998) publicized his organization’s constitution which openly calls for the destruction of Israel.

The Denial of Reality

Employing voluntary *Zdanovism*, Israel created a system of denial of reality which conceals simple reality from its view. The data cited in this article, especially in its first part, is not, as was previously noted, a well-guarded secret. The details of the efforts in the Arab world to obtain weapons of mass destruction have been published in hundreds of papers in research centers in Oslo, Paris, London and Washington, but not in Israel, for more than a decade. Overt preparations for war accompanied by declarations of same, are publicized daily in the establishment Arab newspapers in Cairo, Damascus and Amman. Virulent anti-Semitism like that found in *Der Stürmer*, though with an immeasurably

⁷³ **The Fateful Triangle**, p.467.

⁷⁴ See, for example, the graduation parade at the Nablus Police Academy as filmed by the Palestinian Authority television, May 13, 1995.

greater circulation than its Nazi predecessor, is published daily week after week, in the Arab media in general and in the Egyptian, Jordanian and Syrian press in particular.

The Palestinian preparations to force Israel back to the partition borders are publicly and openly declared. The Authority's television is a daily source of anti-Semitic incitement. Murderers of Jews are treated as heroes and Arafat sings the praises of the suicide bombers of the Hamas, the Islamic Jihad and the Fateh. None of this is reported in the Israeli media. If something does find its way into a daily newspaper – usually as a quotation from the foreign press, Israel immediately sets into action an elaborate system of denial. A somewhat humorous illustration of this phenomenon were the words of incitement spoken by Arafat in a sermon delivered in a Johannesburg mosque in which he called for the destruction of Israel by *Jihad*. The recording was broadcast on *Arutz 7* (the "Settlers" radio station) and since it took place soon after the signing of the Oslo Agreements, it caused a public commotion. None other than Shimon Peres, the Foreign Minister, came to Arafat's defense, claiming insistently that the recording was a fraud and was nothing more than Right-wing propaganda. It was Arafat who contradicted Peres, when he confirmed openly and with no feelings of guilt, that those were exactly the words which he said.

Indeed, in contradistinction to the Nazi apparatus of deceit which was forced to conceal its true intentions from the public, the Arabs act in the open. The difference between Nazism and Islam is like the difference between a radical organization and a civilization. While the Nazis were forced to camouflage their schemes and acts in code words and a comprehensive system of disinformation in order to avoid arousing the antagonism of the Germans themselves and the nations of the world, the Arabs have no such limitations. They have the automatic support of the entire Arab nation. Just as Saddam Hussein's declaration that he will incinerate half of Israel aroused enthusiastic support among the Arabs in Gaza as well as residents in Nazareth, so too the bombing of a bus and mass slaughter in Tel Aviv receive massive support from the Atlantic Ocean to the Persian Gulf.

The examples of this phenomenon are countless. The instance which will be briefly elucidated below exposes the so-called "peace process" as an act of total system collapse, but in the Israeli reality it is merely another detail in the monotonous daily routine.

The Fateh Constitution

At the end of July 1998, after a lengthy process of rewriting and formulation, the Fateh Constitution was publicized. Appropriately in this age of internet, the Fateh Constitution was exhibited in its entirety on the Fateh website (www.fateh.org) on August 1, 1998.

The Fateh, headed by Arafat, is the largest and most significant organization in the PLO, and its authority in the Palestinian National Council (PNC) is decisive, due, among other reasons, to its uncontested control over the monetary sources of the Palestinian Authority. Most of the influential positions in the Authority are concentrated in the hands of Arafat's cronies, his chief supporters in the Fateh. Now, after the reorganization of the Palestinian Authority's Parliament (in the beginning of August 1998) the Fateh rules exclusively. This trend is consistent with the accustomed practice among the governing parties led by the *R'ais*, customary in the republics of the Arab world such as Egypt and Syria, not to mention the kingdoms as well.

Consequently, the Fateh Constitution, which does not contain an iota not directly approved by Yasser Arafat, is extremely significant in assessing the tendencies extant in what is called "the central, moderate trend" of the PLO, vis-a-vis Israel. Needless to say, the Fateh Constitution is the ideological foundation of the Palestinian state which is supposed to succeed the Palestinian Authority in the near future. Below are 13 of the 27 paragraphs:

Chapter One

Principles; Goals; Methods

Principles

1. Palestine is part of the Arab world, the Palestinians are part of the Arab nation and their struggle is part of the struggle of the Arab nation.
3. The Palestinian revolution plays a central role in the liberation of Palestine.
4. The Palestinian struggle is an integral part of the worldwide struggle against Zionism, colonialism and international imperialism.
5. The liberation of Palestine is a national duty demanding physical and spiritual assistance from the whole Arab nation.
7. The Zionist movement is racist, colonialist and aggressive in its ideology, its goals, its organization and its methods.
8. The foundation of Israel's existence in Palestine is the Zionist occupation, based on colonialism.
9. Liberating Palestine and protecting the holy places are Arab, religious and human obligations.

Goals

12. The complete liberation of Palestine and the economic, political, military and cultural elimination of Zionism.
13. Establishment of an independent, democratic state in all of Palestine with Jerusalem as its capital.

Method

17. A revolutionary military struggle as the sole method of liberating Palestine.
19. A military struggle is not a tactic but a strategy, and the military revolution of the Arab Palestinian nation is a decisive component in the struggle for liberation and the removal of the Zionist entity; the struggle will not be complete until the Zionist state is destroyed and Palestine, in its entirety will be liberated.
22. Opposition to any political solutions recommended as an alternative to the destruction of the Zionist occupation of Palestine.
25. Convincing the countries of the world to prevent Jewish emigration to Palestine as a method of solving the problem.

The words speak for themselves and not much commentary is required to comprehend this overt declaration of war, much worse, by the way, than the Palestinian Charter. But it is not the Arab candor, which is self-evident, that stands at the foundation of the problem, but rather the speechlessness which strikes the Jewish public, the object of the open declarations of intent to destroy. Everyone is silent, the media, which consciously serves the Arab interest, the Knesset, the parties, the Prime Minister, and his ministers. It is safe to assume that the average reader is encountering this for the first time and is almost certainly wondering why the author is making such a big deal of the matter.

Indeed, an incisive illustration of the words of the prophet:

And they said...evil will not befall us and sword and famine we will not see...a foolish nation with no heart, they have eyes but do not see, they have ears but do not hear...⁷⁵

Hatred as a Raison d'être

The self-hatred is a direct result of the deep frustration in which the Jewish assimilationist is steeped, aware of Arab hatred and unable to bear it. Choosing a reference group and transforming it into the object of the frustrations of the Israeli assimilationist, captured in the Zionist trap is, consequently, understandable. The Zionist State is indeed a rogue entity, however, not all Israelis fall into the category of Gestapo storm troopers, hence the Manichean distinction between the “children of light” and “children of darkness”. Between the “peace camp” which joins the Palestinian peace camp led by Arafat on one hand, and “Jewish mutants...people whose intellectual foundation, is a translation of the Nuremberg Laws...who act like groups of neo-Nazis”, (Yoram Kaniuk, a prize winning author) on the other; of “a Messianic cult insensitive and cruel, a gang of armed gangsters, criminals against humanity, sadists, pogromists and murderers” (Amos Oz); or “Gush Emunim...is among the deepest expressions of humanity’s despair in the twentieth century...the opportunity to torpedo the peace process through bloodshed excited the imaginations of the enemies of peace...acts of mass murder...their spiritual side is manifest in racist fervor and boundless hatred of others” (Avi Katzman, a media star).

This wild anti-Semitism, which finds expression in verbal violence imitating the style of *Der Stürmer*⁷⁶ is based on cynical lies and an interesting distortion of reality. “The era of peace” of the Rabin-Peres government (1992-96) saw an outbreak of Arab savagery, unprecedented in all the years of statehood: 264 “victims of peace”. The quotes from Kaniuk, Oz and Katzman are an exact description of the Arab barbarism, but in the view of the three, the blame lies with the victim, not with the murderer.

In this manner, the Jews have managed to turn Leo Baeck’s quotation on its head. Instead of “the plight of the Jews is an indictment of humanity,” the Israeli credo became “the plight of the Palestinians is an indictment of Israel.” But, as opposed to humanity, Israel is quick to adopt the quotation and to affix the mark of Cain – to its own forehead. This wide-ranging acceptance of the Arab’s indoctrination is now no longer a battle cry of the elite in Israel, but their existential purpose in their struggle to destroy Zionism.

“Rather than being a Lion among Lions, I Prefer to Die with the Lambs”, Chaim Nachman Bialik

However, as previously claimed, destroying Zionism will not be possible without destroying Israel. Consequently, in this campaign of self-emasculation on one hand, and the slander campaign conducted by the Jews in order to remove the moral legitimacy from their state on the other, they are sentencing themselves to oblivion. Not to oblivion in the abstract sense as a parable or metaphor, but in the sense of “victims of peace” according to the finest Arab tradition of “the Palestinian Nazis who succeeded to unite here in Israel the zoological anti-Semitism of Europe and the lust for the dagger of the Orient” (Berl Katznelson, the social-Zionist leader in the Thirties and Forties). The mass murders during the Rabin-Peres government were a dress rehearsal for what Israel can anticipate if it returns to the June 4, 1967 borders. It will be a dismembered and debilitated Israel, a fatally wounded nation which lost its spiritual and physical existential purpose, easy prey for those who want to destroy it.

⁷⁵ **Jeremiah**, 5:21.

⁷⁶ On the comparison between Israeli and Nazi anti-Semitism see “Comments on the Dialectic of Israeli Anti-Semitism”, **The Israeli Death Wish**, *ibid*, p. 93.

However, this time, in contrast to the past, the anticipated destruction is the Jews' own handiwork. It is not the sheer force of the Babylonian or Roman brutes that forces this upon them, but they themselves with their own two hands, as if possessed, are relinquishing everything to those who seek to destroy them. They yield their land, their eternal capital, the places holy to their nation, their water, the remnants of their meager righteousness and their existential purpose until, soon, "there will be no place left to hide their shame," to quote a great poet.

The Oslo Agreement, in which the Jew sold his soul to the devil, a waiver agreement on the land which he stamped with the blood of his heart – attested to by the "victims of peace" – is testimony to the collective death wish of Israel as a nation, one who had sovereignty forced upon him against his will and is only too glad to be rid of it now that he has found someone willing to take it off his hands.

Who is the alter-ego of the Zionist breakdown? None other than the Chieftain of the terror gangs, a hardened criminal who draws his existence from taking hostages and murdering them, drug dealing, money laundering and robbery, in the simplest sense of the word. The fact that this caricature of the Jewish ethos is destined to inherit the Chosen People in its land does not necessarily lend the situation a tragic dimension of an apocalypse but rather a touch of farce. It is an incisive illustration of Hegel's comment: "The Jewish tragedy does not arouse within me 'horror and pity' but alienation."

Afterword

The evil spirit of Jewish radicalism whose presence is felt throughout this article leaves no doubt as to the author's attitude toward the Israeli Left. But laying the blame exclusively on the Left is fundamentally wrong, not only because of its decisive role in shaping practical Zionism ("the border of Israel is the border of the plow" – Yitzhak Tabenkin, a leader of the Kibbutz movement) during the *Yishuv* era and in the formative years of the State, but first and foremost, because of its readiness – so typical of Jewish radicalism – to commit itself to an act of insanity against all odds. Zionism – judged by any objective standards – is, and remains, an act of noble insanity.

However, time has left its mark. The Zionist revolution was extinguished by its own fire. The ideological existential purpose of the Left went bankrupt with the collapse of socialism, and the Left was tossed into the trash can of history, indeed, an unwanted vessel.

In 1977, with the end of the "workers' hegemony", the Jewish state enjoyed a brief moment of opportunity. A true "national camp" could have been established rather than a bad joke at Jabotinsky's expense. They should have ruled, not pretended. But nothing was done. Menachem Begin, Yitzhak Shamir and Binyamin Netanyahu were and are only a cover. The Left, this time, as a cruel caricature of the Labor movement of the past, not only controls all the positions of power, but its hold is stronger than ever. In the middle walks a mindless human flock, addicted to the lethal drug which kills slowly but surely – "peace".

No, the Left is not leading to oblivion. It is just forging the path. The Jews are doing the bulk of the labor■