

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library

Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection:

Green, Max: Files, 1985-1988

Folder Title:

National Jewish Coalition Bulletins

Box: 33

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

Contact a reference archivist at: **reagan.library@nara.gov**

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-support/citation-guide>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

PRESERVATION COPY

F Lichen: Cuckoo w Bush & Zorad

Antlers speech

Killer speech

Hill - Loran to find down.

four

Robt Polino 18 Strength -

Wed. 1:00
Wolfe

Sandinista Anti-Semitism and Its Apologists



NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

Max M. Fisher
Honorary Chairman

Richard J. Fox
National Chairman

George Klein
Gordon Zacks
Co-chairmen

Ivan Boesky
Finance Chairman

Executive Committee

Bernard H. Barnett
Paul Borman
Marshall Breger
The Hon. Matthew Brown
Joseph B. Gildenhorn
Michael Goland
Leonard Greenberg
Samuel Kane
Robert R. Mazer
Ruth Miller
Louis A. Morgan
Jacob Stein
Philip Winn

Chris Gersten
Executive Director

Howard Kohr
Deputy Director

A. Mark Neuman
Political Director

Sandinista Anti-Semitism and Its Apologists

*Joshua Muravchik, Susan Alberts,
and Antony Korenstein*

This article first appeared in *Commentary* September, 1986; reprinted with permission. All rights reserved.

In May 1983, the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), an organization dealing with instances of anti-Semitism worldwide, issued a statement denouncing Sandinista Nicaragua as "a country without Jews, but not without anti-Semitism." The statement set forth the complaints of a number of Nicaraguan Jewish refugees who said that they had been compelled to leave the country on account of threats and harassment by the Sandinistas, that their personal property had been unjustly confiscated, and that their synagogue had been expropriated. The ADL went public with these charges only after having worked fruitlessly behind the scenes for a year-and-a-half to persuade the Nicaraguan government to make restitution to the Jews and to return the synagogue.

Nicaragua: a country without Jews, but not without anti-Semitism.

The White House quickly invited the ADL's spokesman on this issue, Rabbi Morton Rosenthal, and a couple of the Jewish refugees to address one of the weekly meetings of its Central America Outreach Group, and President Reagan himself was soon echoing the charges of anti-Semitism in speeches defending his policy with regard to Nicaragua.

Joshua Muravchik is the author of *The Uncertain Crusade: Jimmy Carter and the Dilemmas of Human Rights Policy*. Susan Alberts is a consultant to Prodemca, and the Center for Democracy in the Americas, organizations concerned with U.S. policy toward Central America. Antony Korenstein is director of research and information for the National Jewish Coalition.

The Sandinistas were as quick to respond to the ADL's public charges as they had been slow to respond to its private appeals. They vehemently denied that they were anti-Semitic, pointing to the presence of five Jews in leading positions in their own government. As for the synagogue, it had been expropriated, they said, because it was part of the personal property of Abraham Gorn, a wealthy Nicaraguan who had been president of the Jewish community and who was a "Somocista."

As it turned out, the five "Jews" cited by the Sandinistas as evidence of their philo-Semitism may all have had Jewish ancestors, but not one was identified with the Jewish community. The only ones in the group with any religious affiliation at all were practicing Roman Catholics, including Minister of Education (now Ambassador) Carlos Tunnerman and Minister of Culture Ernesto Cardenal. Cardenal, a Jesuit priest, gained worldwide attention during Pope John Paul II's visit to Nicaragua when newphotos captured the kneeling priest seeking to kiss the papal ring and receiving instead a stern lecture from the pontiff on the duty of obedience to his bishop. Further to the discredit of the Sandinistas' argument, the Jewish refugees produced a deed of ownership to the synagogue, showing clearly that it was the communal property of the congregation and not of Mr. Gorn.

But if the Sandinistas were less than adept at defending themselves against the charge of anti-Semitism, they soon got help from Americans, some of whom were their supporters, others of whom were not. Ironically, the most important help came from the U.S. embassy in Nicaragua. Ambassador Anthony Quainton looked into the allegations and reported, according to newspaper accounts of his leaked confidential cable to Washington, that "the evidence fails to demonstrate that the Sandinistas have followed a policy of anti-Semitism or have persecuted Jews solely because of their religion." Being "a member of the Jewish religion," the cable went on, "is neither a necessary nor sufficient condition to result in...persecution" by the Nicaraguan government.

Harassment of Jews by the Sandinista Front began during the year prior to its seizure of power.

Although no one questioned the diligence of Ambassador Quainton's investigation, he himself agreed in a letter to Rabbi Rosenthal of the ADL that there was an important gap in his research: virtually all the Jews had already fled

Nicaragua, and he was unable to interview them. Moreover, despite the fact that he seemed to deny the gravamen of the accusations of anti-Semitism, Ambassador Quainton's conclusion contained a note of ambiguity, acknowledging as it did that Jewishness could indeed have constituted one contributing factor among several that led to the persecution of Nicaragua's Jews.

During a Friday-night service in December 1978, an incendiary device was hurled at the syna- gogue, igniting its wooden doors.

Next, Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum of the American Jewish Committee joined the argument, becoming embroiled in a dispute with Rabbi Rosenthal in the pages of the Jewish press. Rabbi Tanenbaum agreed that some "anti-Semitic acts" had been committed, but he maintained that "anti-Semitism, as opposed to anti-Israel foreign policy, was not Sandinist official policy," and that "the real problem with Nicaragua was one of political anti-Israel positions rather than classical theological anti-Semitism, and therefore requires a different response." The quarrel between the two rabbis grew rather heated, but it seemed to be less about the facts of the case than about how to react to them.

The debate over Sandinista anti-Semitism intensified in 1984 when a group called New Jewish Agenda sponsored a delegation to Nicaragua to look into the issue. New Jewish Agenda describes itself as a voice for "progressive" Jews, and takes positions that are often at variance with those of most other Jewish organizations. Domestically, it advocates the use of racial quotas in hiring and promotion; in the Middle East, it calls for the creation of an independent Palestinian state through negotiations between Israel and the PLO.

The delegation's report, signed by eleven of its thirteen members, including Rabbi Marshall Meyer, a prominent former leader of the Jewish community of Argentina, and Hector Timerman, son of Jacobo, said that the group had "searched for any evidence to support charges of anti-Semitism" but that "none were found." The report was rather upbeat about Nicaragua in general, concluding: "It was made abundantly clear to us and confirmed by leaders of the Sandinista government that Nicaragua welcomes Jewish participation as well as participation from any group in the reconstruction of a pluralistic society." The delegation urged Nicaraguan Jewish refugees to "consider taking the government of Nicaragua at its word—that they are welcome

back," and it volunteered to "monitor and report on" the treatment of any who returned to Nicaragua.

Despite the claim that no evidence of anti-Semitism could be found, however, the delegation's report itself contained some evidence. It referred to articles in the Sandinista-controlled newspaper, *Nuevo Diario*, alleging that Jews control world finance, and headlines such as "Jews Bomb Beirut." The report did condemn these expressions, but attributed them to "sloppy journalism" and to Nicaragua's "history of sensationalistic, yellow journalism."

The Sandinista-controlled newspaper, *Nuevo Diario*, alleged that Jews control world finance, and printed headlines such as "Jews Bombed Beirut."

The report also acknowledged as fact the Jewish refugees' assertions that the Managua synagogue had been attacked with an incendiary device during worship services in 1978. But the delegation claimed that it could not "satisfactorily resolve" whether the attack had been conducted by Sandinistas, as the worshippers who witnessed it charged, or "was instead attributable to Somoza provocateurs," as Sandinista supporters now suggested.

Finally, in the words of the report, "the question of whether property was confiscated because of its ownership by Jews, or whether regulations governing confiscation were applied to Jews in a discriminatory manner, lies at the heart of allegations of anti-Semitism." The delegation concluded that the answer to both of these questions was no.

But these were not, in fact, the questions at the heart of the charges of anti-Semitism. The heart of the charges was that the Sandinista Front had conducted a campaign of harassment and intimidation aimed at Nicaraguan Jews, which caused them to flee. Astonishingly, the report simply failed to address this issue—even though it had been presented directly to the delegation by three of the refugees who met with the group at the Miami airport as it was en route to Managua. Although the report's introduction contained a paragraph describing this meeting, the body of the report omitted any mention of its substance, merely noting in passing: "It is clear to us that [the Jews who fled], many of whom are refugees from the Holocaust, did feel frightened and threatened by the violence and disorder that accompanied the toppling of Somoza. It is not our purpose or place to judge whether...such fear was reasonable or justified."

This is all the more astonishing since the refugees themselves had told the delegation that what made them feel frightened and threatened was not the random violence and disorder but specific incidents of Sandinista hostility. And the question of whether their fears were generated by real as opposed to imagined persecution was in fact the central question to be raised.

The one member of the delegation who did address this issue was Rabbi Francis Barry Silberg of Milwaukee, who refused to sign the group's report and instead issued a public demurrer. In it he said: "While there appears to have been no program of persecution of Jews in Nicaragua, the Sandinistas' actions have certainly created a climate of concern sufficient for the mass emigration of Jews after the 'triumph of the revolution.' These actions include...their inability to distinguish between Judaism and Zionism... Subsequent developments...confirmed the wisdom of that flight."

While Rabbi Silberg's dissent received scant attention, the delegation's report was covered in the major media, and it was echoed in two articles in *Moment*, a Left-liberal Jewish monthly, by delegation members Robert Weisbrot, an assistant professor of history at Colby College, and Cynthia Arnson, a congressional aide and a former staff member of the Institute for Policy Studies.

What made the Jews feel frightened and threatened was specific incidents of Sandinista hostility.

In her article, Miss Arnson charged the Reagan administration with knowing that the claims of anti-Semitism were false. In support of this contention she quoted Ambassador Quainton's cabled doubts that the Sandinistas "have persecuted the Jews solely because of their religion"—but she omitted the word "solely" (without indicating an ellipsis), thus altering the meaning of the passage. She also presented selective quotation from Michael Gale, President Reagan's liaison to the Jewish community, and from Undersecretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger, to argue that these two "representatives of the administration had denied that anti-Semitism was involved in the Nicaraguan saga." In truth, Gale was in the forefront of publicizing the issue of Sandinista anti-Semitism within the administration and Eagleburger, in the very same paragraph from which Miss Arnson quoted, went on to refer to the ADL's allegations. Miss Arnson also reported that a delegation from the State Department's human-rights bureau had

visited Nicaragua and investigated the charges of anti-Semitism, finding them baseless. But Elliott Abrams, then the head of the bureau, has denied that such a delegation existed, and Miss Arnson, when challenged, has refused to name its members.

The community's 70-year-old president was imprisoned by Sandinista authorities and compelled to sweep streets.

Still more zealous in defending the Sandinistas against the charge of anti-Semitism was Rabbi Balfour Brickner of the Stephen Wise Free Synagogue of New York, a long-time leader in the Union of American Hebrew Congregations (Reform). In 1984 Rabbi Brickner visited Nicaragua; he wrote afterward that it made him feel the way Israel had made him feel "in the late 50's and early 60's," when he liked Israel better than he does today. "Then, Israeli government leaders were as informal and accessible as members of the junta are in Nicaragua today," he wrote. "The inescapable fact," he went on, "is that Israel has been deeply involved in thwarting popular forces for democratic and social change in Latin America, forces similar in ideology to those which brought Israel into existence," and he added: "No wonder she is viewed with sometimes not so quiet resentment and smoldering distrust." As for the Nicaraguan government, not only does it not persecute Jews, "it doesn't persecute Catholics or Protestants either. It does challenge, and sometimes expels, those who, in religious garb, conduct counterrevolutionary activities."

If in this last formulation Rabbi Brickner began to approach the rhetoric of the Sandinistas themselves, a subsequent rumination on the subject went even further toward embracing Sandinista views. Writing in *The Washington Post*, he said: "If Jews fled Managua after the revolution, it was not because the incoming government was anti-Semitic; it was because that government wanted to isolate and strip power...from supporters of the dictator who had been overthrown. Of the few Jews who had remained in Managua after the 1972 earthquake, many were strong supporters of Somoza." Where the New Jewish Agenda report had simply elided the refugees' tales of intimidation and persecution, Rabbi Brickner now took the further step of implying that the persecution was justified by the Jews' own past actions.

How did Rabbi Brickner know that the Jews were

"Somocistas" without having interviewed them? Apparently, the Sandinistas told him so. They also seem to have told him they were not responsible for the firebombing of the Managua synagogue. Doctoring Ambassador Quainton's words *a la* Cynthia Arnson, Rabbi Brickner characterized the allegations of Sandinista anti-Semitism as a "canard," adding: "and we Jews know it."

Rabbi Brickner's version soon achieved the status of received wisdom. When, earlier this year, President Reagan again cited anti-Semitism on his list of Sandinista misdeeds, Rabbi Alexander Schindler, the president of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, replied that "It is woefully inappropriate for the President to resurrect these discredited canards." Perhaps more significantly, *The New York Times* relied upon Rabbi Brickner in an editorial criticizing the President: "Of the millions who heard Mr. Reagan describe the 'desecrating and firebombing' of Managua's only synagogue, how many will catch up with the rejoinder, by Rabbi Balfour Brickner...? He says the building was abandoned during street fighting in 1978, a year before the Sandinistas seized power. The rabbi's own investigation in Nicaragua failed to sustain Mr. Reagan's charge in virulent anti-Semitism." On the same day, *The Washington Post* ran a lengthy "news analysis" column by reporter Joanne Omang. She wrote: "Reagan said 'the entire Jewish community [was] forced to flee Nicaragua.' [But] Nicaragua's few Jews closed their synagogue for lack of use, and most who left had backed Somoza. A 1983 State Department inquiry found no evidence of anti-Semitism." Even the *Washington Jewish Week* dismissed the story of persecution as emanating from the testimony of only two refugees.

The Sandinistas were unable to separate their anti-Zionism from their anti-Semitism.

Curiously, while various groups and individuals purporting to examine this issue traveled to Nicaragua, where virtually no Jews were left, none sought to track the story to its source—the refugees themselves who were now living mostly in Miami or Costa Rica. In the last few months we have endeavored to do exactly that, interviewing members of each of the refugee families we could locate and who were willing to talk to us. Of the seventeen families that comprised the bulk of the Jewish community prior to the rise of the Sandinistas, we now have accounts from all but two.* From

comparing individual stories, we believe that we are able to piece together a pretty clear picture of what happened to Nicaraguan Jewry.

Until the Sandinista triumph, the Jewish community comprised approximately fifty individuals. The breadwinners were virtually all engaged in business or commerce, some with small enterprises and some with rather substantial ones. The community maintained a synagogue; although it did not have a rabbi, it conducted regular worship services, and one of its number was always designated as its president. Today, all but two or three individuals live outside of Nicaragua.

Harassment of Jews by the Sandinista Front (FSLN) began during the year prior to its seizure of power. Most Jewish families began receiving abusive and threatening telephone calls, some of them every day, others every few days. The callers identified themselves as Sandinistas, used foul and abusive language, made specific derogatory reference to the Jewishness of their respondents, and uttered death threats both against the heads of households and against their children. In some cases, similar threats and abuse were conveyed in postcards or in graffiti sprayed on Jewish homes and places of business. Some received warnings from friendly employees with links to the Sandinistas, a few were followed or approached with threatening messages by men on the street whom they did not recognize.

**Sandinismo, a variant of Marxism,
inherited from that ideology a
hatred of the middle class and a
predisposition to extend that
hatred to Jews.**

These threats were underscored by an event that occurred during a Friday-night service in December 1978. That night, an incendiary device was hurled at the synagogue, igniting its wooden doors. When some of the worshippers emerged from

*All the interviewing was done by Susan Alberts. Although we have no means of evaluating definitively the accuracy of the details of each of the individual accounts we heard, the stories were all compatible. In their general outlines, and in many specific details, they were mutually corroborating, and in no significant respect were they contradictory. In the past, Sandinista representatives and others have challenged the veracity of one or another individual Jew whose complaints were publicized. We find it impossible to imagine that the various stories we heard from refugees living in different countries and cities could have been fabricated and still be as mutually consistent as these were. Indeed, we found no reason to doubt the veracity of any of the individuals we interviewed.

the building they were confronted by a carload of armed men, recognizable to them as Sandinistas, who pointed guns at them and ordered them back inside. Eventually the assailants fled and the fire was extinguished; the building was not destroyed and none of the worshippers was seriously injured.

Contrary to Rabbi Brickner's assertions, there is evidence to corroborate the victims' claims that the attackers were Sandinistas. Mauricio Palacio, who at the time was employed by one of the Nicaraguan Jews, and is now himself a refugee in the United States after having grown disillusioned with the Sandinistas, has given a signed statement confessing to his part in the 1978 arson attack against the Managua synagogue. The aim of the attack, he says, was not to injure but further to intimidate the Jews. In this it was successful.

**President Reagan's liaison to the
Jewish community was in the
forefront of publicizing the issue
of Sandinista anti-Semitism.**

As the fighting between FSLN insurgents and Somoza's National Guard reached its climax in the summer of 1979, several Nicaraguan Jews left the country. When the Sandinistas triumphed, these individuals, as well as a couple of others who coincidentally found themselves out of the country on business, had to decide whether to try to return. One who did was the community's president, Abraham Gorn, an elderly businessman and reputed friend of the first Somoza (who had ruled the country until the mid-1950's). Shortly after his return, Gorn was imprisoned by Sandinista authorities for a few weeks, during which time he (like some other prisoners) was compelled to sweep streets. Upon his release he sought refuge in the Costa Rican embassy and secured safe passage out of the country with the assistance of the Costa Rican government.

Another who attempted to go back after the revolution was Sarita Kellerman. (Her husband, Oscar, whom both Kellermans deemed to be in greater danger, remained in the United States.) Night after night, her house was searched by uniformed armed men claiming to look for weapons and pocketing whatever possessions struck their fancy. After a few weeks, she left, not to return.

Some who left the country because of warnings that their lives were in danger never considered returning. Isaac Stavisky was told at gunpoint: "Next time we'll get you, you Jew." Gyula Pinkes and Laszlo Gevurt, business partners, suffered repeated attacks on their homes, during which FSLN

combatants shouted, "We know Jews live here." After being warned by a friend, whom they took to be well-connected, that the FSLN was "coming after the Jews," they fled.

Those who remained after July 1979 suffered a pattern of petty harassment which within a year or two impelled them to leave as well. Against the background of these threats, the large radical Arab presence that soon materialized in revolutionary Nicaragua seemed particularly ominous.

The Sandinistas had close and longstanding ties with the PLO and Libya. Many, including Nicaragua's Interior Minister Tomas Borge, had received guerrilla training in PLO camps in Lebanon, and some had participated in PLO operations, such as the 1970 hijacking of an El Al airliner. After the Sandinista revolution, these relations became formalized: both the PLO and Libya began providing economic and military aid, including training, and the PLO opened a fully accredited embassy in Managua, employing scores of operatives. Borge publicly pledged to Yasir Arafat that "the PLO cause is the cause of the Sandinistas."

Like Jews the world over, Nicaragua's Jews felt a sense of emotional attachment to the Jewish state. One, in fact, had acted as Israel's "honorary consul," or good-will ambassador, to Nicaragua. Since the harassment experienced by the Jews was accompanied by the shouting of anti-Israel slogans and the daubing of graffiti associating Zionism with "Somocism," the increasingly strong Sandinista-PLO ties and anti-Zionist tirades in the Sandinista-controlled media became a source of fear for the remaining Jews.

Reagan said that the entire Jewish community [was] forced to flee Nicaragua.

To add to their fears, the stragglers received hints of other perils lying in wait. Some were told by acquaintances that Sandinista authorities were looking to arrest them or were intending to arrest their colleagues or relatives if they returned to the country. One Jewish store-owner was told by a customer who worked in the prosecutor's office that there was "a file on everyone in the Jewish community."

Within a few years, virtually all the remaining Jews had left. Almost all had their property confiscated, either under a decree aimed at those who "adhered" to "Somocism," a hopelessly vague accusation rarely applied with anything approaching due process, or under a decree declaring that anyone who remained out of the country longer than six

months would forfeit his property rights. In addition, the synagogue was expropriated.

All in all, the story of the persecution and flight of Nicaragua's Jews is rather a simple one. Why, then, did it become enmeshed in so much confusion and controversy? In part, the answer is that the Sandinistas work hard at presenting their case, and benefit from the assistance of Americans eager to lend their talents and voices in defense of "the revolution." But in part, too, the fact that the main motivation of the Sandinistas' persecution of the Jews seemed to have been an intense animus against Israel may have led various observers who were not necessarily predisposed in favor of the Sandinista government to conclude that what was at work here was not anti-Semitism but the distinguishable phenomenon of anti-Zionism.

The Sandinistas have close and longstanding ties with the PLO and Libya.

In truth, however, it was the Sandinistas who were unable to separate their anti-Zionism from anti-Semitism, just as their Soviet and Palestinian and Libyan brethren have been unable to do. Thus, for example, during the war in Lebanon the Sandinista newspaper, *Nuevo Diario*, frequently lapsed into explicit anti-Semitism. One story contained the sentence: "Zionists, from Wall Street, the U.S. Congress, and other powerful sectors of the establishment install and depose Presidents [and] determine fundamental aspects of foreign and domestic policy." A week later one could read: "In accordance with the Bible, Israel had committed a capital crime for which she has not yet repented, that is condemning to death and killing the Lord Jesus Christ. . . Christian revolutionaries are called upon to redouble their efforts against the theology of death." And a week later: "For many years the Jews, who crucified Christ, . . . have used the myth of being God's chosen people to justify massacres of the Palestinian people." Two days after that: "The world's money, banking and finance are in the hands of descendants of Jews, eternal protectors of Zionism." Perhaps most revealing was the headline, "Jews Bomb Beirut," and the speculation that President Reagan—in view of his pro-Israel policy—must have some Jewish blood in him.

In other words, although hatred of Israel rather than hatred of Jews *per se* may have been what motivated the Sandinistas to persecute Jews, persecute them they did—if only because they saw the Jewish community as a whole as an ex-

tension of Israel.

The Sandinistas and their apologists now often claim that the Jews were Somocistas, but in fact there is little evidence of this. Abraham Gorn and perhaps one or two others of the wealthiest families did have business and/or social relations with Somoza clan, but the majority of Jews did not. Moreover, there is little reason to believe that even those who did have ties to Somoza contributed in any material way to keeping him in power, such as by participating in military or political life. The Sandinistas claim to have a letter showing that Gorn made deliveries of supplies to the National Guard, but Gorn was in the textile business, and no one has shown that the supplies in question were anything but clothing.

What is true is that, as a group, Nicaraguan Jews were middle class, and this made them natural targets of Sandinista hostility. Sandinismo, after all, is a variant of Marxism, and along with everything else it has inherited a hatred of the middle class and a predisposition to extend that hatred to Jews. It was Marx who wrote: "What is the worldly cult of the Jew? Huckstering. What is his worldly god? Money." In an echo of this, Herty Lewitas, the Sandinista Minister of Tourism, son of a Catholic mother and a Jewish father who separated himself from the Jewish community some decades ago, told the New Jewish Agenda delegation, "I remember when I was growing up that many of the Nicaraguan Jews used to say, 'Our country is the world, and our flag is the dollar.' " It is more likely that Lewitas was "remembering" not something Jews themselves said but something that was said about them.

Whatever the motivations behind Sandinista behavior toward Jews, the essential fact is that a tiny community—some fifty individuals—was compelled to flee. This is not a very big story; it pales in comparison, for example, with that of Nicaragua's Miskito Indians, thousands of whom have also been compelled to flee and hundreds of whom have died. But it is a true story, and a revealing one—revealing about the regime that has perpetrated this evil, and unfortunately revealing as well about those in this country, including some Jews, who have denied or defended it.

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

The National Jewish Coalition is a political and educational organization that provides an alternative voice for American Jewry.

The NJC is engaged in building support for the policies it believes to be in the best interests of America, American Jews and the State of Israel. These policies include support for a strong U.S. defense posture and a commitment to democracy around the world. The NJC also advocates such domestic positions as a free-market economy, and seeks to achieve equal opportunity for all Americans without recourse to racial quotas in hiring and education.

The NJC also seeks to build ties between the Jewish community and those Republican officials and members of Congress whose contact with American Jews has been limited in the past. The purpose of these contacts is to promote better understanding of the concerns of American Jewry, and to encourage support for a strong U.S.-Israel relationship. At the same time, the NJC works to educate the Jewish community about the importance of supporting democratic movements and nations world-wide, such as the anti-Soviet resistance groups fighting in Angola, Afghanistan and Nicaragua.

As part of this effort, the NJC has actively sought to inform America and American Jewry about the nature of the Sandinista government of Nicaragua. Its activities in this area have included:

- * Holding press conference where victims of Sandinista anti-Semitism relayed their experiences;
- * Hosting Nicaraguan Jews at forums held in synagogues around the country where American Jews learned about Sandinista anti-Semitism;
- * Educating members of Congress about the Nicaraguan government's hostility towards its Jewish community and about the Sandinistas' close ties to the PLO;
- * Publishing articles about this issue in the secular and Jewish press.

If you would like to help the NJC to continue its important work, please complete and return the coupon on the next page.

National Jewish Coalition

415 Second Street, N.E., Suite 100
Washington, DC 20002

I want to help the National Jewish Coalition.

I have enclosed my check for

\$ _____ ☐ \$250 ☐ \$100 ☐ \$35 ☐ \$5 (Student)

_____ I cannot send a check at this time, but please
add my name to the growing number of Jews
who share the same commitment to a strong
America and a secure Israel.

_____ Please send me more information about the
National Jewish Coalition.

Name _____

Occupation _____

Please provide us with both home and business addresses:

Home address _____

Home phone () _____

Business address _____

Business phone () _____

Please make checks payable to: National Jewish Coalition

415 SECOND STREET, N.E.
SUITE 100
WASHINGTON, DC 20002
(202) 547-7701

NJC Bulletin

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

INSIDE

GREECE: 2
A TERRORIST'S FRIEND?

CAPITAL WIRE 2

ANTI-SEMITISM IN CENTRAL
AMERICA: THE UNTOLD STORY 4

JULY 1985

Soviets Step Up Anti-Semitic Activity

"In late July 1984, Soviet authorities began a major, sustained crackdown on Hebrew teachers and other Jewish cultural activists. By the end of January 1985, eleven activists . . . had been arrested and four sentenced to terms in Soviet labor camps. The arrests were accompanied by a series of searches, beatings and threats which have sent shock waves through the Jewish community."

— *US Department of State Report,
January 29, 1985*

In a report issued earlier this year, the State Department expressed deep concern for the safety of Soviet Jews in the light of a resurgence of official, state-sponsored anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. The report cites evidence that points to an intensive, long-term campaign by the Soviet government "to discredit and destroy the revival of Jewish culture in the Soviet Union."

On July 26, 1984, Soviet authorities arrested Aleksandr Kholmianski, a Moscow Hebrew teacher, and charged him with "hooliganism." In a search of his apartment, police reportedly found a loaded pistol. In September, another Hebrew teacher, Yuli Edelshtein, was arrested. In this case, the police search located narcotics in Edelshtein's parents' apartment. Based on this evidence — believed by the State Department to have been planted — the two men were tried and convicted. Kholmianski received a sentence of eighteen months in a labor camp, while Edelshtein received three years.

The report also describes the brutality of this new campaign. Iosif Berenshtein, who was sentenced in December to three years hard labor for resisting the police, was beaten and stabbed while in custody, suffering deep facial wounds that caused the loss of sight in one eye and severe damage to the other. Other reports tell of Dr. Evgh-

eny Lein, a former Leningrad prisoner of conscience, who was severely beaten by the KGB. Deaf in one ear, Dr. Lein was held at knifepoint by agents who deliberately beat him around his good ear.

The increase in arrests, violence, imprisonment and harassment of individuals has been accompanied by an increase in official anti-Semitic propaganda. The Soviet media have given prominence to the activities of the "Anti-Zionist Committee of Soviet Society." Established by the Soviet government in 1983 to discredit and deny the presence of the Soviet Jewish emigration movement, the Committee has labelled emigration activists as "purveyors

of Zionist propaganda." It has also been responsible for spreading false reports of Israeli "atrocities" in Lebanon and of a "criminal alliance between the Zionists and the Nazis" during World War II.

The resumption of arms control talks between the United States and the Soviet Union led some observers to hope for a reduction in Soviet anti-Semitic activity and an increase in Jewish emigration from a low of 896 emigrants in 1984. To date, these expectations remain unfulfilled.

On June 14, 1985, the State Department issued a follow-up report providing details of additional cases of anti-Semitic persecution in the Soviet Union. The report concluded: "We wish to emphasize the extreme seriousness with which we regard these developments . . . We call upon the Soviet Union to end this tragic and needless campaign. Soviet commitments freely undertaken . . . require it, and simple human decency demands it."

Administration Postpones Jordan Arms Sale

The Reagan Administration is delaying its decision on whether to sell sophisticated weaponry to Jordan. During his visit to Washington in late May, King Hussein sought the support of senior Administration officials for his request to buy \$750 million-worth of arms including advanced fighter aircraft, Stinger anti-aircraft missiles and transport helicopters. While this request has been shelved for the moment, the Administration has agreed to provide Jordan with \$250 million in economic aid as a gesture of support for the King's efforts towards peace in the Middle East.

A major factor contributing to the Administration's decision was the opposition the sale encountered in Congress. Sev-

enty-two senators had signed a resolution calling on the President to refrain from selling additional weaponry to Jordan until King Hussein agrees to join the Middle East peace process. Had the Administration pursued the sale, Congress appeared ready to vote down the foreign military sales credits needed to finance the sale.

The events surrounding the sale have raised debate over the role arms sales should play as a tool of U.S. foreign policy. In seeking Congressional approval for the sale of the advanced AWACs surveillance planes to Saudi Arabia in 1981, the Administration claimed that the sale would

Continued on page 3

CAPITAL Wire

REYNOLDS NOMINATION QUASHED

A coalition of Democrats and liberal Republicans on the Senate Judiciary Committee has blocked the nomination of Bradford Reynolds to be Associate Attorney General. Mr. Reynolds, who is presently the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, has been responsible for implementing President Reagan's policy of making America a colorblind society by eliminating quotas that favor particular groups.

Two Republican Senators — Charles McC. Mathias of Maryland and Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania — used their votes to ensure the nomination's defeat. The Senators claimed that their opposition to the nomination was based on the question of Mr. Reynolds' "credibility." However, beneath their public posture many of Mr. Reynolds' opponents were merely pursuing their policy of refusing to confirm any Reagan Administration nominee who opposes the discriminatory quotas.

Although quotas have proved damaging to the interests of American Jews, the Jewish community remained all but silent on the Reynolds nomination. Richard J. Fox, the National Jewish Coalition's national chairman, was among the few Jewish leaders to testify on Reynolds' behalf, praising him for having "breathed new life into the idea of equality for all under the law."

The Committee's defeat of the Reynolds nomination may yet prove to be a Pyrrhic victory for the proponents of quotas. Mr. Reynolds has announced that he will remain in his present position as chief of the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department. From there, he will continue to lead the Administration's drive for fairness and equality in America.

SENATORIAL LETTER EXPRESSES CONCERN OVER SOVIET JEWRY

Writing in a letter signed by twenty-one Republican senators, Sen. William Armstrong (R-Colo.) told the Secretary of State that Soviet anti-Semitism represents a "dangerous element of a sophisticated psychological warfare campaign

being waged against us. Consequently, it is a matter of U.S. national security. . ."

The senators urged the U.S. to go "beyond [the matter of Jewish] emigration" and confront additional issues, such as the harassment and Soviet imprisonment of Jewish culturalists and refuseniks.

The letter also called for stronger action by the State Department on behalf of the many other oppressed groups in the Soviet Union. Noting that "believers are subjected to what amounts to religious *apartheid*," the senators asked the Administration to use "every possible area of potential leverage with the Soviets" to show our concern on this matter.

Senator Armstrong's reference to Soviet oppression of non-Jews as well of Jews represents an important initiative in the campaign to promote human rights in the Soviet Union. Through coordinated efforts, Jewish and Christian groups in the West can enhance the effectiveness of the campaign to free their Soviet co-religionists.

"RADIO MACCABEE" PROPOSED

Senator Paula Hawkins (R-Fla.) has introduced an amendment aimed at establishing a special program of Russian-language radio broadcasts specifically designed for Soviet Jewry. The program, to be known as "Radio Maccabee," would be established as a special unit of Radio Liberty.

Senator Hawkins told the Senate that Radio Maccabee would "provide a lifeline of encouragement and support for the Soviet Jewish community." It would broadcast "items of general cultural, intellectual, political and religious interest to the Soviet Jewish population, as well as Hebrew education courses."

Although the Senate endorsed the Hawkins proposal, the future of Radio Maccabee is uncertain. A House amendment dealing with the issue recommends only that the possibility of establishing such a program be studied. A committee of House and Senate members must work out the differences between the two proposals before the amendment can be signed into law.

Greece: A Terrorist's Friend?

The hijacking of TWA flight 847 focused the world's attention on the growing terrorist threat and raised the question of how to combat it. One of the major problems facing the governments of the free world is that of identifying the sources of terrorism — not only the terrorists themselves but also the individuals, groups and nations who aid them.

. . . US intelligence sources believe that the hijackers received high-level assistance from Greek officials.

The major terrorist groups and their sponsors are often well known. More difficult to identify are governments which, though outwardly respectable, facilitate and sometimes encourage terrorist operations. These governments pose as great a threat to the effective combatting of the war against terrorism as the terrorists themselves.

The TWA hijack revealed that one U.S. ally — Greece — may fall into this category. The Greek government of Andreas Papandreou has never concealed its antipathy towards the United States. Although a NATO member, Papandreou's Greece has maintained close relations with Moscow, believing that "the USSR cannot be called an imperialist power like the United States." The Greek government has also repeatedly threatened to withdraw from NATO and to force the United States to dismantle vital military facilities in Greece.

Western Governments are increasingly concerned about the practical effects that Greece's policies now appear to be producing. Evidence cited by the *Washington Times* indicates that the Greek government was more than an innocent bystander in the

Continued on page 3

Jordan Arms Sales

Continued from page 1

encourage the Saudis to support U.S. policies in the Middle East.

Since the approval of the AWACs sale, however, the cooperation and assistance that the Administration expected from the Saudis has failed to materialize. Indeed, on several occasions the Saudis have actively thwarted U.S. policy in the Middle East. In 1983, for example, the Saudis' refusal to support the United States caused the failure of a painstakingly-crafted accord intended to produce a simultaneous Israeli-Syrian withdrawal from Lebanon.

The disappointment over Saudi policy since 1981 prompted concern that the same mistake not be made with Jordan. The Administration hoped to provide King Hussein with the weapons he requested as a "reward" for what some perceive as his more flexible position on peace talks with Israel. The sale's opponents, however, point to the fact that very little progress has in fact been made and that much more remains to be done. They expressed their fear that if the Administration agreed to the sale at the present time, the King would lack any substantial incentive to join in direct negotiations with Israel.

Of additional concern was the possibility that selling such advanced weaponry to Jordan would set off a new arms race in the Middle East. Such a development would prove extremely burdensome to Israel at a time when the Israeli government is attempting to impose an austerity program that includes cut-backs in government spending.

With the concept of "linkage" between the Jordan arms sale and King Hussein's willingness to enter peace talks with Israel achieving widespread support on Capitol Hill, the Administration sought another

The disappointment over Saudi policy . . . prompted concern that the same mistake not be made with Jordan.

way of demonstrating "goodwill" towards the King. The Administration believes that the King requires some degree of American support if he is to pursue his recent "initiative" in the face of opposition from Syria and Moscow. Failure to make such a gesture, it is felt, could jeopardize such prospects for peace as may exist and perhaps cause King Hussein to turn to Moscow for the arms he seeks.

In order to resolve this dilemma, the National Jewish Coalition urged the Administration to delay selling arms to the Jordanians until such time as meaningful, face-to-face negotiations have been achieved. At the same time, the Coalition recommended that the Administration

grant the King's request for economic assistance. The Administration could thus demonstrate its support for the King's efforts while providing the incentive for him to go further.

This is the position that the Administration appears to have taken, hoping that the coming months will produce sufficient progress to justify rewarding the King's efforts towards peace. In the meantime, even the economic aid package, shorn of the arms sales provision, faces stiff opposition on Capitol Hill. Congressional opponents seem to be questioning the sincerity of King Hussein's commitment to direct talks with Israel while his pursuit of peace appears to be contingent on how much U.S. aid he receives.

Greece

Continued from page 2

recent hijacking. The *Times* reports that U.S. intelligence sources believe that the hijackers received high-level assistance from Greek officials. According to the report, these men not only sympathized with the hijackers, but looked the other way when the arms used in the seizure were smuggled aboard the plane in Athens. One of these men is Agamemnon Koutsogiorgas, Greece's Interior Minister, the other, Costas Laliotis, a former under-secretary to the Prime Minister.

Also of concern was the Greek government's response to the seizure of the plane. Its first reaction was to release a Shiite Moslem suspected of being a member of the hijack team. And despite (or perhaps because of) evidence that the weapons used in the hijack were smuggled on board the plane at Athens airport, it took ten days before an enquiry into the incident was initiated by the Greeks.

The Papandreou government has long voiced the most anti-Western and pro-Soviet views of any ally of the United States. Nevertheless, until the hijacking of flight 847, none of these views produced results that seriously undermined Western security.

This time, however, things were different. One American is dead and thirty-nine others were held hostage because of a terrorist act that appears to have been carried out with Greek complicity.

The Reagan Administration responded by warning Americans against travelling to Athens airport. The Greek government should view the warning as a sign that America has run out of patience with states that countenance terrorism.

NJC Bulletin is published monthly by the
National Jewish Coalition.

MAX FISHER Hon. Chairman	GEORGE KLEIN Co-Chairman
RICHARD J. FOX Nat'l Chairman	GORDON ZACKS Co-Chairman

CHRIS GERSTEN
Executive Director
ANTHONY KORENSTEIN
Editor

NJC Bulletin welcomes comments and letters to the editor. These should be sent, along with any address changes, to:

The Editor,
NJC Bulletin,
415 Second Street, NE, Suite 100,
Washington, DC 20002.

(Clip & Send)

☐ YES, I'm different! I would like to be part of the growing movement within the American Jewish community away from the failed liberal policies of the past.

The National Jewish Coalition is activating a new generation of American Jews on a broad range of issues that concern the Jewish community.

HELP US TO "SPREAD THE WORD"!!

Please put us in touch with your Jewish friends and neighbors by sending their names and addresses to us at: National Jewish Coalition, 415 Second St., NE, Suite 100, Washington, DC 20002.

Name _____ Name _____ Name _____

Add. _____ Add. _____ Add. _____

Tel. () _____ Tel. () _____ Tel. () _____

Anti-Semitism in Central America: The Untold Story

SENATOR CHIC HECHT

The responsibilities I bear as a Jew lead me to write here of a government that so persecuted its Jewish population that the entire community was driven from the land it once called home. I speak not of Spain under the Inquisition, nor of Russia under the Czars, ~~nor even of Germany under the Nazis.~~ I speak, rather, of Nicaragua under the Sandinistas.

The story of Sandinista anti-Semitism is one of which most Americans and even most Jews remain unaware. But one of the first anti-Semitic attacks by the Sandinistas occurred even before they had seized power. One Friday evening in 1978, while members of Managua's Jewish community were gathered for services in the city's synagogue, a fire-bomb was thrown at the building. As the congregants tried to escape, masked gunmen blocked their way, gunmen who identified themselves as Sandinistas.

Once they took power, the Sandinistas adopted more formal and systematic means of persecuting Nicaragua's Jews. Sandinista agents visited Jewish homes every day, terrorizing their occupants who were held at gunpoint and often beaten as their homes were searched and looted. At the same time, new laws enabled the government to confiscate Jewish property on ~~the spurious grounds that the owners had either abandoned it or were unable to manage it.~~

The Sandinistas also maintain close ties with the PLO. So close is their relationship that Tomas Borge, the Sandinistas' Interior Minister, made this pledge to the PLO leaders: "We say to our brother Arafat that Nicaragua is his land and the PLO cause is the cause of the Sandinistas."

Today, the Sandinistas are among the PLO's foremost supporters outside the Arab world. Granted diplomatic recognition by the Sandinista government, the PLO maintains a fully-accredited "embassy" in Managua. The Sandinistas have also provided the PLO with support in the United Nations, joining an Arab-led

effort to expel Israel from that body while accusing Israel of "mass genocide" in Lebanon of a kind "not seen since Hitler."

The Sandinistas' support for the PLO is consistent with the assistance they provide to many other terrorist organizations throughout the world. Terrorists from western Europe and Latin America, many of them fugitives from justice, receive refuge and often training and financial backing from the Sandinistas who have helped to make Nicaragua a center for international terrorism. And just as these terrorists were once able to travel freely using Lebanese passports, the papers they now carry are often issued by the government of Nicaragua.

"We say to our brother Arafat that Nicaragua is his land and the PLO cause is the cause of the Sandinistas."

—~~Commandante Tomas Borge,~~
~~Nicaraguan Minister of the~~
~~Interior.~~

We now have a responsibility to protect Jewish communities elsewhere in Central America. The Sandinistas are attempting to undermine the security of their neighbors by sponsoring insurrections. Furthermore, the Sandinistas have expanded Nicaragua's Soviet-equipped army from fewer than 10,000 men in 1978 to over 125,000 today. These developments gave rise to concern in El Salvador, Costa Rica and Honduras that the Sandinistas are preparing to launch what Commandante Tomas Borge has described as "a revolution without borders."

The anti-Semitism inflicted on their co-religionists in Nicaragua has made Jews in other Central American countries especially concerned. This concern was heightened recently when a Nicaraguan-trained terrorist confessed to plans to kidnap leading members of the Costa Rican Jewish community.

Dr. Jaime Daremblum, a leading member of that community and a prominent journalist in San Jose, expressed the concern with which Jews throughout Central America view the Sandinistas' policies. Dr. Daremblum called on the United States "to fulfill its duty as the most important member of the democratic community that we would all like to see survive in this hemisphere . . ." by helping to promote and preserve democracy in the region.

It is time for American Jewry to speak out on behalf of the Jews in Central America who are today threatened by the expansionist policies of the Nicaraguan communists. By supporting the Administration's policies towards the anti-Sandinista rebels, American Jews can help ensure that Jew and gentile alike will enjoy freedom and human rights, safe from a government that seeks to spread its policies of violence and anti-Semitism throughout the region.

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

415 Second Street, NE., Suite 100
Washington, DC 20002

Bulk Rate
U.S. Postage
PAID
Merrifield, VA
Permit No. 2446

NJC Bulletin

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

INSIDE

CAPITAL WIRE **2**

SENATOR HELMS IN ISRAEL **2**

BLOOD OF ABRAHAM:
A REVIEW **3**

SEPTEMBER 1985

Shifting Alliances On Foreign Aid To Israel:

An Interview With Representative Vin Weber

On July 11, 1985, the House of Representatives passed a bill authorizing \$12.6 billion annually in foreign aid during the fiscal years 1986-87.

Reflecting the growing determination on Capitol Hill to confront communist expansion around the world, the bill's provisions include aid for anti-communist forces in Cambodia, Afghanistan, and Nicaragua, and a repeal of the 1976 Clark Amendment that banned aid to anti-communist rebels in Angola. In addition, the bill provides Israel with an all-grant aid package worth \$4.5 billion.

Rep. Vin Weber (R-MN), chairman of the Conservative Opportunity Society and a major architect of the bill, granted an interview to the *NJC Bulletin* in which he addressed the implications of the bill's passage. He observed that a historic shift is taking place in Congress. For the second year in a row, growing numbers of young Republicans demonstrated their strong backing for foreign aid, while many liberal Democrats emerged as the foreign aid bill's most vocal opponents.

NJC: This year Congress passed a foreign aid bill for the first time since 1981. What changes have occurred in the past four years to make this possible?

Rep. Weber: I think that the most important change is the increase in conservative and Republican support for the Foreign Aid Bill. That is based on a growing realization that the Republican party is America's majority party and therefore the party responsible for governing the country.

Republicans today simply cannot be opposed to foreign aid as many were in the past when we were in the minority. Now we have an obligation to govern and we must use tools such as foreign aid that

advance America's interests around the world by promoting democracy and resisting communism.

NJC: Why was this foreign aid bill able to pass in the Democratic-ruled House, which has long resisted the sort of conservative measures that the bill includes?

VW: I would explain the dynamics this way. The Democratic party in the House is increasingly dominated by a left wing that is isolationist in its foreign policy. Nevertheless, there remains a substantial minority

of Democrats who don't share that position.

In the past, many Democrats who were caught in the middle on the question of resistance to communism and the use of force, went along with their party even though it was dominated by this isolationist left wing. Recently, though, there has been a growing realization that the Democratic party is shrinking, in part because it is viewed as weak and unwilling to defend America and America's interests. As a result, many middle-ground Democrats have broken with the majority of their party and have come over to the Republican side on foreign policy issues—including this year's foreign aid bill.

NJC: Is this a Republican-driven change?

VW: I think it's driven by two dynamics. First of all, you cannot understate the significance of the Democratic party's move to the left. With George McGovern's

Continued on page 4

Afghanistan: How Good People Can Ignore A Holocaust

DENNIS PRAGER

"A whole nation is dying. People should know."

—Afghan Doctor

"Whole villages are bombed into oblivion, sometimes as a reprisal after a guerilla attack, sometimes for no reason at all. Soviet soldiers enter the villages, selecting non-combatant men, women and children at random to be shot, dynamited, beheaded or burned alive.

"Mothers are forced to watch their infants being given electric shocks. A young woman who had been tortured in prison described how she and others had been forced to stand in water

that had been treated with chemical, which made the skin come off their feet."

—Jeri Laber, *Helsinki Watch*,
New York Times, November 22, 1984

Right now there is something akin to a Holocaust taking place in Afghanistan. The systematic destruction of villages and the murder of all their inhabitants precisely parallel the infamous Nazi atrocity at Lidice. Nearly one out of every three Afghans, four to five million people, have fled Afghanistan, and approximately one

Continued on page 5

CAPITAL Wire

REP. FIEDLER SPONSORS NICARAGUA RESOLUTION

Citing a variety of anti-Semitic acts by the Sandinistas, Rep. Bobbi Fiedler (R-CA) has introduced in the House of Representatives a resolution condemning "the actions of the Nicaraguan Government that hinder freedom of religion."

The resolution calls upon the President, when dealing with Nicaragua, "to raise the issue of religious persecution and the issue of compensation for members of the Jewish, Miskito and other communities forced to leave their homes because of interference with freedom of religion."

Under the Sandinista regime, the resolution says, the Nicaraguan Jewish community "suffered such persecution, imprisonment, and confiscation, including the firebombing of the Managua Synagogue while the congregation was at worship, that virtually the entire community has had to leave Nicaragua..."

In the House, the Fiedler resolution has been cosponsored by 76 Republicans and six Democrats. An identical resolution introduced in the Senate by Sen. Alfonse D'Amato (R-NY) has been cosponsored by 17 Republicans and one Democrat.

SCHROEDER AND THE SANDINISTAS

Eighty-two members of the House of Representatives and 18 senators have cosponsored the Fiedler-D'Amato resolution condemning the anti-Semitism and human rights abuses of the Sandinista regime. But while these legislators have taken a stand

for democracy in Central America, Rep. Patricia Schroeder (D-Colo) has been busy raising funds for a pro-Sandinista organization called Nicaragua Network (N.N.)—a group devoted to "reversing our country's misguided policy towards Nicaragua."

N.N. supporters, including Schroeder, remain undaunted by President Daniel Ortega's recent pilgrimage to Moscow. Schroeder has recently signed a fundraising letter for N.N. which, says Schroeder, "has channelled over \$320,000 in direct material aid to Nicaragua...Its goal for 1985 is to deliver another \$300,000."

Overwhelming evidence to the contrary notwithstanding, N.N. reports that "any problems with Jewish Nicaraguans arose not because they are Jewish, but rather because they had certain connections with the Somoza regime or did not follow the Sandinista line."

FOREIGN AID BILL PASSED

On July 31, 1985, Congress gave final assent to the first foreign aid bill to be passed since 1981. The bill's provisions included aid for anti-communist freedom fighters in Cambodia, Afghanistan, and Nicaragua and the repeal of the 1976 Clark Amendment which had prohibited aid to anti-communist guerrillas in Angola. The bill also provided an aid grant of \$4.5 billion to Israel.

This landmark legislation exemplifies the reversal of foreign policy roles that has taken place in Congress. By voting overwhelmingly for the bill, Republicans affirmed a commitment to contain Soviet expansionism by taking an activist role in supporting America's democratic allies.

Remarkably, 27 out of 31 freshman Republican members of the House (a ratio

of 7:1) voted in favor of the foreign aid bill. This extraordinary support among "new Republicans" reflects the National Jewish Coalition's success in working with these congressmen on issues of concern to American Jewry.

In contrast to the strong Republican support for aid to Israel, the bill was opposed by many liberal Democrats in the House. The bill's opponents included several Jewish members—Reps. Beilenson, Boxer, Yates and Weiss—who chose to vote *against* critical aid to Israel rather than support measures that confront the Soviet threat. These liberal Democrats not only abandoned Israel but opposed legislation that their fellow Democrat and House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Dante Fascell called a "bipartisan measure...vital to American interests abroad."

POVERTY RATE DROPS

Poverty in America is declining. The Census Bureau reports that in 1984, the poverty rate—which measures the proportion of the population living on an annual cash income of less than \$10,609 for a family of four—fell sharply from 15.3 percent to 14.4 percent. The number of people living in poverty also fell by almost two million to 33.7 million.

The drop, which affected all socio-economic groups, was attributed to the fall in unemployment and the rise in income levels that accompanied the economic recovery. Patrick J. Buchanan, the White House Director of Communications, called the decline in poverty "unambiguous good news." "This is not only a triumph for the Reagan policies," he said, "But a triumph for the Reagan philosophy."

Senator Helms In Israel

Senator Chic Hecht (R-Nev.) and his brother, businessman Mr. Marty Hecht,

accompanied North Carolina Senator Jesse Helms and his top aide, Jim Lucier, on their first trip to Israel in August. During his eight-day stay, Senator Helms met with senior members of the Israeli government.

As his trip concluded, Senator Helms told a press conference that "as an American senator, I hope the American people will understand that Israel is the only reliable

ally we have in this area which is anti-communist, with impeccable moral principles."

On returning to from Israel, Senator Hecht observed with satisfaction that the trip had been as successful as he had hoped. "This may have been Senator Helms' first trip to Israel," said Hecht, "But I'm sure it won't be his last."

Jimmy Carter's

"The Blood Of Abraham"

A Book Review By Joshua Muravchik

Jimmy Carter's new book, *The Blood of Abraham*, will do more to tarnish than to reinforce the former president's reputation as a Middle East peacemaker. In this book, Mr. Carter discards his role as an honest broker, emerging as a full-fledged partisan of the Arab cause and a rather nasty critic of Israel.

It is not just the current diplomatic positions of the Arabs that Mr. Carter favors over those of Israel; he recapitulates the entire history of the Arab-Israel conflict with the same bias. In 1948, when the Arab armies attacked the newborn Jewish state, "there was some doubt about their specific objectives," says the former president. He is apparently unimpressed by the declaration at the time of the attack by Azzam Pasha, secretary general of the Arab League, that: "this will be a war of extermination and a momentous massacre

which will be spoken of like the Mongolian massacres and the Crusades."

In 1967, according to Mr. Carter's chronology, "Israel launched pre-emptive attacks on the airfields" not only of Egypt and Syria, but also of Jordan. This is simply false. It has been widely reported and verified that Israel, through U.S. intermediaries, appealed to Jordan to stay out of the 1967 war and struck at Jordan only in counterattack after King Hussein spurned the appeal and commenced hostilities. There are many other such distortions.

Throughout, Mr. Carter casts Arab rulers and their positions in a flattering light, while portraying Israel darkly. Jordan's King Hussein, who attacked Israel in 1967, who has refused ever to talk peace with Israel and who joined the Arab extremists in breaking diplomatic relations with Egypt to protest the Camp David accords, is characterized by Mr. Carter as "a constant force for stability and peace."

Mr. Carter concedes that Syria's President Hafez Assad "rejects the concept of bilateral discussions between any individual Arab state and Israel", but adds reassuringly that the Syrian leader "has reiterated to me and others his willingness to negotiate with Israel and other interested parties on the basis of U.N. resolutions 242 and 338."

Mr. Carter forgets that in his own memoirs, published in 1982, he described Assad as "the man who...sabotaged the Geneva peace talks by refusing to attend under any reasonable circumstances."

Mr. Carter's deep animus toward Israel sometimes drives him to the very boundaries of respectable debate. There is a faint echo of the "Zionism is racism" accusation in his bitter suggestion that Jews regard themselves as a chosen "race." In fact the notion of a "chosen people" is non-racial: it has to do with obeying God's laws and anyone may become a member of this people by conversion.

This mean-spirited book will make no contribution to the search for peace. Its partisan thrusts, intended to be self-serving, succeed only in revealing the petty sanctimoniousness that played so poorly against Ronald Reagan's geniality in the 1980 election. The book may win plaudits from some Arab partisans, but it casts a dark cloud over Jimmy Carter's reputation as a peacemaker.

Mr. Muravchik is a senior policy fellow with the Washington Institute for Near East Policy. This piece is adapted from a review by Mr. Muravchik that appeared in the Washington Times.

Brad Reynolds and Civil Rights

MAX GREEN

More than one man's advancement was at stake when the Senate Judiciary Committee considered Bradford Reynolds' nomination to the post of Associate Attorney General. As Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, Reynolds has sought to return to the original civil rights vision of a color-blind society, to realize Martin Luther King's dream that his children would one day be "judged by the content of their character, not the color of their skin." The Civil Rights Division under Reynolds' leadership continues to file suits in cases in which blacks are the victims of discrimination

in voting, employment and housing. But Reynolds opposes not just discrimination motivated by conventional bigotry; he also opposes the discrimination that is sometimes practiced in the name of affirmative action.

When the city of Memphis, Tennessee was ordered by a federal judge to lay off white firefighters in order to save the jobs of blacks with less seniority, Reynolds argued forthrightly that blacks who were not individual victims of discrimination were not morally or legally entitled to retain their jobs at the expense of innocent whites. The Supreme Court agreed with Reynolds in a decision that approvingly quoted Congressional assurances that the Civil Rights Act "does not permit the

ordering of racial quotas..." Reynolds sought to have quotas for municipal hiring imposed by lower courts revised in accord with the Memphis decision. Doing so earned him the bitter enmity of the civil rights establishment, which opposed his confirmation from the beginning.

Presidents are normally entitled to appoint persons in whom they have confidence and who share their views. The Congressional confirmation process is not supposed to be a means for resisting the results of an election or making it harder for a President to govern. No serious objections were ever offered to Reynolds. When asked about a two-year-old civil rights case.

Reynolds mistakenly asserted that he had himself spoken to the plaintiffs, when in fact only his staff had done so. But prior to his good faith but erroneous testimony, the Democrats on the Judiciary Committee were opposing his confirmation on the forthright if unprincipled grounds of policy differences. Using a simple memory lapse as an excuse, two committee votes shifted,

Max Green is Acting Staff Director of the United States Commission on Civil Rights.

Continued on page 5

Shifting Alliances

Continued from page 1

nomination in 1972, isolationism emerged as a growing trend in the Democratic party. Ever since then, that trend has accelerated until today isolationism prevails.

But there is another, more recent, dynamic and that's the change in the Republican party. Republicans today understand that America has an obligation to lead the free world and to honor its international commitments and alliances.

So you have the two movements: Democrats retreating and the Republicans evolving. Together these have produced a dramatic change in the way Congress makes foreign policy.

NJC: This year, in a rather unusual step, the House passed the Foreign Aid Bill on a voice vote. Why wasn't a more usual recorded, roll-call vote taken?

VW: The Democrats wanted to avoid a roll-call vote more than anyone because their liberal members were in a terrible quandary. If you look at the 1984 foreign aid vote, a majority of Democrats voted against it and a majority of Republicans voted for it. The Democrats who voted "no" did so almost exclusively because of Central America. They did not want to send aid to the region if it would be used to fight communism. That's part of the left-wing isolationism.

They were very nervous about opposing the '84 bill, though, because most liberal Democrats run as friends of Israel and like to be in a position to support Israel. However, when push came to shove, on the vote that is critical to Israel—the vote for foreign aid—they voted "no". They said that it was more important to oppose our effort against communism in Central America than it was to support Israel.

This year, as the Foreign Aid Bill evolved through the legislative process, the anti-communist measures that were adopted made it even more unpalatable to the left-wing House Democrats than the 1984 bill.

As this happened, the Democratic leadership in the House became anxious to avoid a vote in which a majority of Democrats—most of them claiming to be friends of Israel—voted to kill the Foreign Aid Bill for the second year in a row. And that's exactly what would have happened if we had had a roll-call vote.

NJC: Do you think that the increasing Republican support for Israel is part of the overall trend towards a more activist approach to foreign policy?



Photo: Terry Arthur, White House

As President Reagan signs the Foreign Aid Bill into law, Vice President George Bush, Sen. Richard Lugar, Rep. William Broomfield and Secretary of State, George Shultz look on.

VW: Absolutely. I think Republicans have generally been supportive of Israel, although there has been, we have to concede, an element on the right that was not. Today, this pro-Israel sentiment is strengthening as conservatives formulate a comprehensive world view appropriate to a majority party. That clearly means strong support for our friends around the world—and America has no better friend in the world than Israel.

Thus, as conservatives continue to move towards being the new internationalist majority, their commitment to Israel is growing—and will continue to grow.

The Republican party offers a far more solid base of support for Israel than does the Democratic party.

NJC: What significance do you think this trend will have for the future conduct of U.S. foreign policy?

VW: The most significant fact about the foreign aid bill this year is that it reflects the Reagan Doctrine, which is emerging as a doctrine of support for resistance to Soviet colonialism.

The decision by this Administration and this Congress to provide support for anti-communist liberation movements around the world is, I think, the most important development in American foreign policy-making in a decade. And I believe that the Reagan Doctrine, which it reflects, will be

the cornerstone of our foreign policy into the 1990's.

NJC: What do you think the implications of the Reagan Doctrine are for party politics in America?

VW: Well, first of all, there is no question that Republican support for an activist American foreign policy will continue to grow as Republicans recognize their responsibility to provide international leadership. I don't see any chance, whatsoever, that that will be reversed, halted or even slowed.

As to how the Democratic party is going to move, that's a more difficult question. There are obviously voices in the Democratic party that understand that left-wing isolationism is poison for their party and will relegate them to minority status for as long as such thinking prevails in the party.

But I don't think that the Democrats can make the changes that are needed to return them to the majority. Some people say that the Democratic party, in order to regain its majority status, has to separate itself from all the interest groups with which it has become identified in the last ten years. But that's what the Democratic party is today: if you take away those interest groups you are left with basically nothing.

The bulk of middle American Democrats are strong foreign policy Democrats in the Truman/FDR mold. But these Democrats have left the party—been driven out—and many have become Republicans instead. What remains is, increasingly, just a militant left wing.

So, it's going to be extremely difficult for moderate Democrats to bring the party back to the center on any issue, but particularly on foreign policy. Because if there's

Continued on page 5

Afghanistan

Continued from page 1

million have been killed. Neutral observers are unanimous in concluding that the Soviets are literally destroying rural Afghanistan—emptying it of its population and starving those who remain.

The Soviets are, for all intents and purposes, destroying Afghanistan. Unless they are stopped, Afghanistan will cease to exist as such, and will become a Soviet republic in everything but name. Islam is being destroyed, tens of thousands of children from the major cities have been sent to the Soviet Union to be indoctrinated in Russian and Communism, and the rest of the country's population either submits to Sovietization or flees.

We Jews have always wondered how the world could basically go on during the Holocaust as if nothing were happening. Ever since Pol Pot and the Communist holocaust in Cambodia, I have understood how easy it is for people to go on with their normal lives while a nation is slaughtered. Afghanistan now provides another example.

Is the analogy to the Holocaust invalid? The Holocaust was unique, and there is no Auschwitz in Afghanistan, but on the other hand:

- The Jewish nation, religion, and culture have survived the Nazis. It is not likely the Afghanistan nation, religion, and culture will comparably survive the Soviets.

- You and I know much more about Afghanistan than nearly anyone in the West knew about the Holocaust, so our silence is unforgivable.

- Once people learned of the Holocaust, no one denied how evil the Nazis were. Today, on the other hand, despite all we know about the Gulag Archipelago, Afghanistan, the systematic destruction of Judaism and Christianity in the Soviet Union, and

other Soviet atrocities, to call the Soviets evil is to be considered a "cold warrior", "a reactionary".

How many Afghans will the Soviets have to burn, how many countries will they have to extinguish, how many more tens of millions will they have to murder, before Soviet cruelty becomes the primary item on the agenda of people who care about people?

We Jews must cry out on behalf of Afghanistan, and do so *davka* as Jews. Jewish organizations must speak out, take out ads and organize demonstrations to remind the world that we, who have endured the first Holocaust, have the duty to scream the loudest at events that approach its unique evil.

Then we will continue to be in a moral position to protest the silence that accompanied our Holocaust.

In the meantime, however, if you ever wondered how good people could ignore a holocaust, look around right now.

Dennis Prager is a social and political commentator. His extensive writing on issues of Jewish concern include Ultimate Issues, a quarterly report which he publishes and from which this article is reprinted. Ultimate Issues may be obtained by writing to: U.I., 2265 Westwood Blvd., #508, Los Angeles, CA, 90064.

NJC Bulletin is published monthly by the National Jewish Coalition.

MAX FISHER
Hon. Chairman
RICHARD J. FOX
Nat'l Chairman

GEORGE KLEIN
Co-Chairman
GORDON ZACKS
Co-Chairman

CHRIS GERSTEN
Executive Director
ANTONY KORENSTEIN
Editor

NJC Bulletin welcomes comments and letters to the editor. These should be sent, along with any address changes, to:

The Editor,
NJC Bulletin,
415 Second Street, NE, Suite 100,
Washington, DC 20002.

Shifting Alliances

Continued from page 4

any area where the Democratic party today is rigidly left wing it is in foreign policy.

NJC: What do you think the implications of these trends are for the Jewish community?

VW: Since the days of FDR, the Jewish community has been an integral part of the Democratic coalition. That has had implications for Israel because, although Israel has many friends outside the Jewish community, Jews obviously constitute the core of support for Israel. As a result, American support for Israel was traditionally tied to the Democratic coalition.

But that coalition has now changed. Friends of Israel in this country—and particularly in the Jewish community—must question whether Israel's security is best guaranteed in a Democratic party dominated by a left-wing, isolationist view of foreign policy which opposes resistance to communism and the use of force.

I think that friends of Israel will conclude that the Republican party offers a far more solid base of support for Israel than does the Democratic party.

Now, while I would like to see all foreign policy—including support for Israel—become a bi-partisan or non-partisan concern, that simply is not happening today. We have to face up to the fact that the Democratic party is dominated by left-wing isolationists. They are not going to permit the forging of a genuinely bi-partisan foreign policy that is activist and anti-communist in its orientation, even though it is just such a policy that is most conducive to support for Israel in America.

NJC: Thank you very much.

Reynolds . . . Civil Rights

Continued from page 3

producing a 10 to 8 vote against Reynolds. Most opponents do not even bother to pretend that Reynolds was defeated for any reason other than his view of civil rights.

For those of us committed to equal rights for all, Reynolds' loss is a defeat. Let us hope that it is also a lesson that will help us prepare for future battles.

Clip and Send to: National Jewish Coalition
415 Second Street, NE, Suite 100
Washington, D.C. 20002

☐ YES I'm different!

I would like to learn more about the National Jewish Coalition. Please send me membership information.

Name _____

Address _____ Phone (H) () _____

(O) () _____

South Africa: No Easy Solutions

SENATOR CHIC HECHT

If we are to believe the demonstrators outside the South African embassy, the United States is not doing enough to end apartheid. These demonstrators attract attention to their cause, but, in doing so, they also promote a simplistic interpretation of the problem and a solution that will cause more problems than it solves.

~~Although many of the protestors are~~ well-meaning citizens, they are unaware of the agenda that the protest movement's leaders hope to advance. These leaders propose tough economic sanctions aimed at forcing South Africa to dismantle apartheid forthwith. They support the restrictions recently passed by Congress, but ultimately seek complete American disinvestment from South Africa.

Instead of bringing about a peaceful end to apartheid, economic sanctions would hurt those they are supposed to help—South African blacks. Blacks would be hurt by the removal of American firms who have implemented the Sullivan Principles—a code of practice that promotes equality in the workplace South Africa—and by the unemployment that disinvestment would cause. Blacks would also be hurt by the reaction of hard-line apartheid “purists”, whose opposition is a constant threat to the moderate whites who desire change.

This view is supported by several black opposition leaders in South Africa, most notably Mangosuthu Buthelezi, tribal leader of a third of South Africa's blacks. Chief Buthelezi has called disinvestment “...a strategy against black interests and not a punitive step with which to beat apartheid.”

Why, then, do the protest leaders advocate disinvestment? The answer can be found by identifying the leaders and understanding their motives.

After President Reagan's reelection, a group of radical black leaders formed the Free South Africa Movement (FSAM) as a forum for the policies that had been resoundingly repudiated at the polls. Prominent among FSAM's leaders is Randall Robinson, director of TransAfrica, the

black lobby for Africa and the Caribbean. Sympathetic to many radical causes, Robinson's TransAfrica supports PLO terrorism, claiming that both Israel and South Africa “represent examples of a similar phenomenon, ‘settler colonialism’ or arrogant, aggressive racialism.”

The problem posed by the FSAM's radical leadership can be understood if we consider that Robinson also supports the African National Congress (ANC), a Marxist South African rebel group that uses terror to achieve its goals. The ANC would be a major beneficiary of disinvestment which would hurt and therefore radicalize South African blacks. This might help the ANC to bring about change, but it would be revolutionary change that would “free” South Africa by replacing apartheid with Marxist totalitarianism.

South Africa is the only major source outside the Soviet Union of several vital strategic metals. A pro-Soviet, Marxist revolution would cut off this source. It would also place all South Africans under a one-party socialist state along the model that has so demonstrably failed throughout Africa.

The Reagan Administration supports an alternative to revolution: *evolution*. Through its policy of “constructive engagement,” the Administration is keeping its lines of communication to Pretoria open, encouraging reforms that will make South Africa truly free.

The past four years have seen rapid and substantial reform in South Africa. Most significantly, South Africa's constitution

was amended, creating a tricameral legislature and enfranchising the country's Coloured and Asian citizens. The government has indicated that additional reforms—aimed at accommodating the black majority—will follow. A recent government-funded report presented a possible blueprint for such change, recommending an end to segregation, the abolition of racial classifications and *the sharing of political power by all races*.

The radical leaders of the Free South Africa Movement reject these important reforms as “too little, too late.” They prefer a policy of disinvestment that would bring about a revolution. This would benefit the Soviet Union, the ANC and TransAfrica, but would it benefit the United States and South Africa's blacks? The answer is a resounding “no”.

This will concern all freedom-loving Americans, but especially American Jews. The anti-Israel, pro-PLO sentiment of the FSAM's leaders and their fringe-left allies, suggests that once democracy is defeated in South Africa, they will try to destroy the only democracy in the Middle East—Israel. Moreover, while South Africa's 100,000 Jews have long led the movement for change there, the Marxists who gain from disinvestment are likely to forget this contribution in the anti-Semitism that is an integral part of Marxist practice.

The Reagan Administration has persuaded South Africa to begin the long and difficult process of reform. That this process is now well underway is plain for all—even the FSAM—to see. In this light, the campaign for disinvestment appears as an effort, not to make South Africa free and democratic, but to promote the agenda of the same radical groups who seek to undermine America's interests throughout the world.

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

415 Second Street, NE., Suite 100
Washington, DC 20002

Bulk Rate
U.S. Postage
PAID
Merrifield, VA
Permit No. 2446

Chic Hecht is a Republican Senator from Nevada.

NJC Bulletin

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

INSIDE

BREGER PROMOTED: 2
NEW FACE AT WHITE HOUSE 2
SDI AND ISRAEL 3
ARAB-AMERICANS SLAM 3
ISRAEL'S FRIENDS 3
AMERICAN JEWRY'S 4
"UTOPIAN DILEMMA" 4

OCTOBER 1985


NJC Applauds U.S. Capture Of Terrorists

As the hijacking of the Achille Lauro ended, the world learned that PLO terrorists, under the leadership of the notorious Abu Abbas, had committed yet another crime against the free peoples of the world. With the murder of an elderly and infirm American Jew and the release of his murderers by the government of Egypt, the United States responded by capturing the terrorists through the restrained yet effective use of force.

After hearing of the American action, the National Jewish Coalition sent a telegram to President Reagan applauding the steps he had taken to bring the hijackers to justice. The NJC supports the forcing down of the EgyptAir jet and the administration's efforts to bring Abu Abbas to trial as invaluable contributions to the war against terrorism.

The Coalition's telegram read as shown below:

MAILGRAM SERVICE CENTER
MIDDLETOWN, VA. 22645
11AM



4-032863S284002 10/11/85 ICS IPMTZZ CSO WHSB
1 202547701 MGM TDMT WASHINGTON DC 10-11 -311P EST
NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION
415 2 ST NE
WASHINGTON DC 20002
202547701 MGM TDMT WASHINGTON DC 10-11 -311P EST
ZIP
PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN
WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON, DC 20500
DEAR MR. PRESIDENT:
THE NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION CONGRATULATES YOU ON THE LEADERSHIP AND RESOLVE YOU DEMONSTRATED IN CAPTURING THE TERRORISTS WHO MURDERED LEON KLINGHOFFER ON THE ACHILLE LAURO. THE COURAGE YOU SHOWED IN TAKING THIS ACTION BRINGS HOPE TO ALL WHO SEEK THE ERADICATION OF THE TERRORIST SCOURGE THAT THREATENS THE FREE WORLD.
WE FEEL SURE THAT YOUR ADMINISTRATION WILL CONTINUE TO ACT DECISIVELY IN IDENTIFYING, TRACKING DOWN AND BRINGING TO JUSTICE THOSE WHOSE FANATICISM HAS LED THEM TO PLAN AND EXECUTE ACTS OF TERRORISM. ONLY BY SHOWING THE WORLD THAT THE UNITED STATES WILL NOT BOW TO THE FORCES OF VIOLENCE CAN TERRORISM BE DEFEATED.
THE NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION, AND THE ENTIRE JEWISH COMMUNITY, WILL CONTINUE TO STAND BY YOU IN ANY SUCH EFFORT YOU UNDERTAKE TO ELIMINATE THE THREAT OF TERROR.
15:10 EST
MGMCOMP

Black Community More Conservative Than Black Leaders

A recent survey published in *Public Opinion* magazine shows that the nation's black leaders are far more liberal on social issues than the black population as a whole. The survey was conducted by Linda Lichter, co-director of the Center for Media and Public Affairs.

Among the survey's findings:

- Sixty-eight percent of black leaders considered themselves liberals while only twenty-seven percent of the black population classified themselves in the same way.

- On the issue of affirmative action, blacks were asked whether or not minorities should receive preferential treatment to make up for past discrimination. Seventy-seven percent of the leaders said that they favored such treatment, while the same percentage of the black public said they opposed it!

- While seventy-four percent of the leaders said they had experienced job discrimination, sixty percent of the black public said they had not.

- Asked if blacks were making progress or slipping backwards, sixty-one percent of the black leaders said that they were slipping backwards; sixty-six percent of the black public said that they were advancing.

Such disparities are in evidence throughout the survey. Lichter points out that the survey is significant because it illustrates that the black community is not a "monolith". As Lichter observes, the apparent conservatism of the black public on social issues may make that community more "up for grabs politically" than either political party may realize.

The survey poses a difficult problem for the liberal black leadership. If they are truly to represent their community,

Continued on page 4

CAPITAL *Wire*

JORDAN ARMS PACKAGE PROPOSED

On September 27 the Reagan administration notified Congress of its intent to sell a package of sophisticated weapons to Jordan. The package includes 40 advanced fighter aircraft (either the F-20 or F-16), 12 improved Hawk surface-to-air missiles, 300 AIM-9P4 air-to-air missiles, 72 Stinger missiles and 32 Bradley M-3 tanks. The advanced nature of these weapons would constitute an additional threat to Israel's security, forcing Israel to make further sacrifices in order to defend herself.

Major congressional opposition to the sale has developed. A joint resolution of disapproval aimed at preventing the sale will be introduced shortly and requires a simple majority in both houses to pass. The president then has the authority to veto the resolution after which two-thirds of each body would be needed to override his veto and block the sale.

Congressional Republicans are playing a critical role in this debate. In the House, Reps. Vin Weber (R-MN), John McCain (R-AZ), and Mark Siljander (R-MI) are leading the opposition, joined by Democrats Dante Fascell, William Gray, Larry Smith and Mel Levine. John Heinz (R-Pa.), Robert Kasten (R-WI), Robert Packwood (R-OR), Alfonse D'Amato (R-NY) and Rudy Boschwitz (R-MN), along with Edward Kennedy, Alan Cranston and Daniel Inouye are leading the opposition in the Senate.

SENATORS APPROVE KOZINSKI NOMINATION

On September 12, the Senate Judi-

ciary Committee voted to approve the nomination of Alex Kozinski to the Ninth Circuit U.S. Federal Court of Appeals based in Los Angeles. The committee vote cleared the final major hurdle to the nomination, which is now expected to be approved by the full Senate.

Mr. Kozinski presently serves as the Chief Judge of the U.S. Claims Court in Washington, D.C. On confirmation, Mr. Kozinski, at age 34, is expected to become the youngest Federal Appeals Court judge in the country.

Judge Kozinski's appointment was vigorously opposed by the Institute for Policy Studies, a left-wing Washington "think tank." Rep. Pat Schroeder (D-Colo.) was also involved in the effort to halt confirmation of the Jewish immigrant from Romania.

However, Kozinski's nomination drew broad support from the legal profession. It was welcomed by Appeals Court judge, John P. Wiese, who describes Kozinski as "a superb intellect tied to an unbending commitment to excellence."

Involved in numerous Jewish philanthropic activities, Judge Kozinski also served as a volunteer attorney for the 1984 Reagan-Bush campaign.

ADMINISTRATION ACTS ON ISRAEL BONDS TAX

Assistant Treasury Secretary, Ronald A. Pearlman, recently alerted the Senate and House tax committees of a 1984 tax law which could unintentionally impair the marketability of Israel Bonds. The new law places a tax on artificially low interest rates which would directly penal-

ize holders of four percent Israel Bonds.

Israel Bonds serve to bolster the Israeli economy and are not viewed as a tax shelter. The new tax would inhibit the purchase of bonds and undermine the Israeli economic recovery.

As a result of the Administration's disclosure, Sen. Pete Wilson (R-Cal.) and Rep. Charles B. Rangel (D-N.Y.) sponsored legislation to exempt the bonds from tax penalties.

GOP LAWMAKERS OPPOSE TALKS WITH PLO

The National Jewish Coalition and Rep. John R. Miller (R-Wash.), produced and circulated an unprecedented congressional letter urging President Reagan not to abandon America's long-standing policy of prohibiting government officials from negotiating with PLO terrorists.

The letter, the first of its kind on the subject of negotiating with the PLO, was delivered to the White House on September 10. The letter called to the President's attention the recent surge of terrorist attacks planned by the PLO, and reiterated an American law which states that "no officer or employee of the United States . . . shall negotiate with the Palestine Liberation Organization."

Rep. Miller's initiative gained the broad support of House Republican leaders. Those signing the letter included key members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, a majority of the newly elected Republican members of the House and the membership of the pro-Israel Conservative Opportunity Society.

Continued on page 5

Breger Promoted: New Face At White House

President Reagan has chosen Marshall Breger, special assistant to the President "for liaison with the academic and Jewish community," to become chairman of the Administrative Conference of the

United States. In his new position, which carries with it a rank equal to that of an under-secretary, Breger will be responsible for making recommendations to improve the operations of other federal departments and agencies.

Mr. Breger has served in his current position since 1983. He was formerly a fellow at the Heritage Foundation and is on leave from the faculty of New York University's School of Law.

The Jewish community's new point of contact at the White House is Max Green. Mr. Green, who becomes Asso-

ciate Director of Public Liaison, has responsibility for Middle East policy and Soviet Jewry, and for broader defense and foreign policy issues.

Mr. Green moves to the White House after serving as acting director of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. During his tenure there, he worked closely with representatives of the major Jewish organizations and was responsible for reorganizing all 50 state advisory councils to the Commission. Prior to entering the federal government, he spent ten years with the United Federation of Teachers.

The Strategic Defense Initiative And Israel

Lt. Gen. Daniel O. Graham, (USA, Ret'd)

During the continuing debate over President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) opponents and advocates have focused their arguments either on the program's technical feasibility or on its implications for the U.S./Soviet strategic balance. Very little has been heard of the program's implications for "Third World" nations, including those in the Middle East.

This is unfortunate. For in the day-to-day conduct of international relations, the real importance of the nuclear balance—and the effect on that balance of U.S. ballistic missile defenses—is its effect on the ability of the super-powers to extend either domination or security in the Third World.

To understand this more fully, we must first understand why the Soviet Union attaches such great importance to the achievement and maintenance of strategic superiority. The Soviets tend not to view superiority at the strategic level as something to be used directly in a nuclear first strike against the U.S. Rather, they believe that Soviet nuclear superiority has the indirect effect of making the United States more circumspect with regard to such Soviet policies as support for "National Liberation Movements" in the Third World.

Behind this Soviet view lies the belief that an American attempt to stand in the way of the Soviets at low levels of conflict carries with it a risk that the conflict will escalate. Since the Soviets are strategically superior, they believe that they will be better able to cope with that escalation than will the Americans. The Soviets thus conclude that in order to avoid such an escalation, the Americans would avoid challenging Soviet policy in the first place.

Lt. Gen. Daniel O. Graham is founder and director of High Frontier. He was an advisor to President Reagan during the 1976 and 1980 campaigns and has served as Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency and as Deputy Director of the CIA.

The possibility of another Arab-Israeli war similar to the 1973 Yom Kippur war illustrates how such a scenario might unfold. In the midst of that war the Soviets made several threatening gestures, including the airlifting of the headquarters of two airborne divisions to Damascus and the dispatch of several ships—possibly carrying radioactive cargos—to Egypt. The United States responded by raising its level of military alert. This American move, backed by U.S. strategic strength, convinced the Soviets to back down from their threat to Israel.

But this incident took place in 1973, when the United States still enjoyed rough parity with the Soviets in strategic systems. Since then, the Soviets have added thousands of new warheads to their inventory and have dramatically increased the capacity of their civil and air defenses. As a result, the Soviets may now possess the capacity to launch a first strike against U.S. land-based strategic forces and to survive the kind of uncoordinated response which might—or might not—follow.

Under these new conditions it is not at all clear that a U.S. military alert of the sort raised in 1973 would bring about

Soviet compliance with American wishes. Instead, it might only bring about a similar Soviet alert. At that point an American President would have to decide whether the United States should fight a war which it did not choose, and might well lose, or whether to allow the destruction of an ally whose demise would be a serious blow to, but not necessarily the end of, the United States itself. Given this choice, the United States might well opt for the latter over the former. Moreover, this possibility increases with every day that Soviet offensive power and defensive capabilities continue to grow and the United States remains offensively inferior and naked to nuclear attack.

Should ballistic missile defenses of the sort envisaged by SDI be deployed to defend America, this situation would change. The United States would not have to fear intimidation at the hands of the Soviet Union's superior offensive forces, and its active and passive defenses. As a result, the United States would be far more able—and therefore far more willing—to act in defense of its allies and far more willing to stand in the way of Soviet policy when it threatens their security. To put it simply, a defended America is more likely to aid its allies than a vulnerable America!

Another reason why the SDI is of great value to U.S. allies such as Israel lies in the specific systems that the effort will produce. Not only Israel, but also our European and Pacific allies, live under the threat of Soviet or Soviet-supplied tactical ballistic missiles such as the SS-21, -22, and -23. These offensive weapons are especially threatening to

Continued on page 5

Arab-Americans And Israel's Friends

Adina Weiner

During the September 1985 convention of the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee (ADC), two thousand delegates gathered to hear a discussion on the Middle East. The forum, however, was not a balanced debate on U.S.-

Adina Weiner is a research analyst with the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC).

Middle East policy nor was it devoted to furthering Arab-American rights in this country. Of thirteen panels, eight were blatantly hostile to Israel, to the special U.S.-Israel relationship and to the pro-Israel community.

One of the most well-attended and acrimonious panels was that dealing with "The Unholy Alliance: Right wing Evangelicals and the Arab-Israel Conflict." The evangelical/fundamentalist-Christian community represents one of the strongest pro-Israel constituent groups in this country. The strength and growth of this support has made the evangelicals the target of attack from anti-Israel forces in the United States.

Continued on page 4

Murray Friedman's "The Utopian Dilemma"

**A Review By
Rabbi Morton M. Kanter**

Milton Himmelfarb, observing the political behavior of American Jews, has said that they have incomes like Episcopalians but vote like Puerto Ricans. The question of why American Jewry is the most liberal white group in America is examined by Murray Friedman in his recent book, *The Utopian Dilemma* (Ethics and Public Policy Center/Seth Press, P.O. Box 130, Bryn Mawr, PA, \$7.95).

Jewish leaders in this country, both religious and secular, will welcome Dr. Friedman's essay. By providing a studied overview of the Jewish organizational approach to public policy since 1945, the essay lends insight into the present political attitudes of American Jewry.

Friedman's study makes it clear that

liberals always have answers. For them, the solution is always easy: follow liberal ideology, no matter what results or how little good it does. For example, Friedman cites the strong support among the liberal-leaning Union of American Hebrew Congregations (UAHC) for the liberalization of abortion and for government-aided abortions for poor women. Friedman relates the testimony of Rabbi Alexander Schindler, president of the UAHC, before a Senate subcommittee wherein he argued that a proposed "Human Life" bill "would impinge upon Jewish practice, thereby denying Jews the opportunity to apply their faith's moral standards."

Liberal opponents of the bill also objected to the use of history as a source of support for pro-life advocacy. Jews, in particular, felt a distaste for the "statements of some pro-life advocates who have likened abortion to the Holocaust."

Liberal supporters of abortion on demand use traditional Jewish sources and recent history to back their demands. Conservatives, too cite the same sources in opposing abortion, yet they frequently fail to examine the moral fall-out. Friedman correctly asks whether or not abortion should be available as a matter of

convenience or as a form of birth control? He concludes: "[Liberal] Jewish groups seem to be approaching the issues from the viewpoint of Planned Parenthood . . . But Jewish groups are not Planned Parenthood . . . They were brought into existence to guard Jewish interests . . . and bring Jewish values to bear on public policy issues."

Friedman also points out that the Jewish conservative is stymied by semantics. Any re-examination of past policies is branded as a move to the "Right" and therefore considered as "reactionary." Too many Jews are too embarrassed to admit that they feel more comfortable with the politics of a conservative politician than with those of a liberal. They can only whisper, "We trust Reagan more than we trusted Carter, because he's not so ready to make concessions to the Russians just to make himself look good."

Recent surveys by the American Jewish Committee have indicated that a substantial number of American Jews have ceased practicing their religion and have only the most tenuous sense of religious identity. When this conclusion is coupled with the fact that "individual Jewish congregations are basically autonomous, and compliance with resolutions of central bodies . . . is voluntary," it should be clear that American Jews do not always follow historical precedent or adhere to social or Biblical laws. The politics of the conservative movement will draw increasing support from American Jews when it acknowledges that Jews act on the basis of their feelings, their tastes and their wills.

Rabbi Kanter served as Deputy Commissioner of Youth Development in the Ford administration and has led congregations in Ohio, New York and Michigan.

ADC

Continued from page 3

The anti-Israel community's concern with the alliance between fundamentalist Christians and pro-Israel groups was explained by Rev. Donald Wagner, director of the Palestine Human Rights Campaign (PHRC). Noting that President Reagan and Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger were fundamentalists, he commented that "this is serious business. It is shaping the political process . . . the foreign policy decisions of our country. And we must stand to counter it."

Three outspoken critics of Israel relayed their views on the coalition: Rev. Wagner; Khalid Bin Sayeed, political studies professor at Queen's University in Canada; and Rabbi Elmer Berger, founder of American Jewish Alternatives to Zionism. Cal Thomas, vice-president for communications for the Moral Majority presented the pro-Israel view.

Rabbi Berger condemned the fundamentalist Christian and Jewish coalition as "Mr. Falwell's moral majority blank check for the Zionist state" and "the so-called Jewish people." He accused Fal-

well of stifling debate over U.S.-Israel relations and of "inhibiting the right to free speech with totalitarian cant." Aside from attacking Falwell and other pro-Israel Christian leaders such as Pat Robertson and Jimmy Swaggert, Berger analyzed passages in the Old Testament which, according to his interpretation, show no justification for a Jewish state. Berger concluded that pro-Israel activists have "polluted Judaism" by "equating it with Zionism."

Professor Sayeed also turned to the Bible to discredit the concept of a Jewish homeland. Sayeed presented a scenario whereby Jews and Christians would "wage a war against all of Islam." In condemning Israel's supporters in the U.S., he said, "What kind of Israel are you supporting? . . . You think democracy will be built on neo-fascism . . . on this kind of racial intolerance?"

It was here that Sayeed inserted another popular theme of the conference—the "Israel-South Africa link." Sayeed spoke of a "link between Falwell, Kahane and South Africa" as an "inexorable"

Continued on page 5

BLACKS . . .

Continued from page 1

they must address the various disparities illustrated in the Lichter survey.

However, many black leaders, including NAACP Executive Director Benjamin L. Hooks and the Reverend Jesse Jackson, dismissed the survey's findings. But one NAACP official, spokeswoman Felicia Kessel, was more candid. Kessel summed up the implications of the survey by observing that "the black community as a whole is more conservative [than the black leadership]—not that we're happy with that, that's just the case."

College Republicans Adopt Strong Pro-Israel Platform

The College Republican National Committee, convening in Atlanta this past June, adopted a forceful statement in support of U.S./Israel relations as part of their platform. The NJC was represented in Atlanta—the first time a Jewish group has had an official presence at a CRNC convention.

The platform took note of Israel's war against the PLO, calling on the Jewish state "not to jeopardize its security by making territorial concessions to Arab dictatorships." The platform applauded President Reagan's statement that Israel is America's strategic asset in the Middle East. It noted, "as long as Israel is the only genuine democracy in the Middle East, Israel is the only lasting ally that America can have in the Middle East."

In Chicago, NJC field director A. Mark

Neuman addressed the Young Republican National Federation convention participating in a forum with Reps. Andy Ireland of Florida and Steve Bartlett of Texas. The panel discussed the process of bringing non-traditional Republican constituencies into the Republican party.

The YRNF platform committee unanimously adopted a resolution offered by the NJC which "repudiates and completely disassociates itself from the people, organizations, publications and entities which promulgate the practice of any form of bigotry, racism, anti-semitism, or religious intolerance."

The YRNF resolution also "condemns, in the strongest possible terms, the introduction of such language into American politics during the 1984 Democratic presidential primary campaign. Neither the off-the-cuff slurs of the Rev. Jesse Jackson, nor the vicious racism and ugly bigotry of Louis Farrakhan and the Ku Klux Klan, have any place in our free and tolerant society."

SDI

Continued from page 3

Israel which lies only a short distance from such potential missile bases as Damascus.

One of the first technologies likely to emerge from SDI research is that needed for anti-tactical ballistic missiles. These

weapons would enable Israel actually to defend itself against this threat rather than simply to attempt to deter it by threat of retaliation. The ability to defend rather than simply deter with a promise of retaliation is especially important in the Middle East, populated as it is with a number of so-called "crazy states" whose leaders may not be deterred by threat of retaliation.

But the Israeli prime minister, Shimon Peres offered an additional reason why SDI is worthy of support. Speaking to the Israeli army magazine, *Bamahane*, Mr. Peres said: "Star Wars is not just another United States strategic move. It is a new dimension in the technological, scientific and strategic spheres... a departure from earth and a journey to a world with completely new conditions."

SDI offers new horizons to the United States and its allies. Its scientific promise alone would demand our commitment. But its importance to our security and to the security of the free world demands that we pursue it with full rigor—no matter what we may discover.

ADC

Continued from page 4

association and said that Falwell is "inviting racism of the worst kind."

Rev. Wagner personalized his speech by discussing his shift from being a pro-Zionist Christian to becoming an anti-Zionist Christian. Although Wagner professed empathy with the Jewish people's oppression throughout history, he pronounced that "the Holocaust is used on Christian guilt" by the Jews. It appears that Wagner has overcome his guilt: he is a leading anti-Israel activist and a supporter of the terrorist PLO.

Confronted by anti-Israel speakers and an audience which applauded speeches on "Jewish Nazism," Cal Thomas delivered a sound, articulate and informed account of his belief in the state of Israel and the special U.S.-Israel relationship. Undeterred by the audience's booing, hissing and heckling, Thomas spoke of the religious, humanitarian and strategic reasons for supporting Israel. He delved into the history of Israel's legal claim to statehood, argued for Israel's desire for peace through direct negotiations, and contrasted treatment of its Arab population with the treatment they receive in Arab countries. Throughout his speech, Cal Thomas reaffirmed his complete support for Israel and for the alliance between pro-Israel groups and fundamentalist Christians in America.

GOP LAWMAKERS

Continued from page 2

CONGRESSMEN OPPOSING TALKS WITH THE PLO

John R. Miller (R-Wash.)	Joe Barton (R-TX)
Ben Blaz (R-Guam)	Joseph J. Dio Guardi (R-NY)
Mac Sweeney (R-TX)	Fred J. Eckert (R-NY)
H. James Saxton (R-NJ)	Vin Weber (R-Minn.)
Robert J. Lagomarsino (R-CA)	Robert K. Dornan (R-CA)
Lynn Martin (R-IL)	Jim Lightfoot (R-IA)
H.W. Fawell (R-IL)	Rod Chandler (R-WA)
Jack Kemp (R-NY)	Robert S. Walker (R-PA)
David Monson (R-UT)	Ben Gilman (R-NY)
Larry E. Craig (R-ID)	Jerry Lewis (R-CA)
Howard Coble (R-NC)	W. Henson Moore (R-LA)
Dean A. Gallo (R-NJ)	Ken Kramer (R-CO)
Sonny Callahan (R-AL)	Bill Green (R-NY)
F. James Sensenbrenner (R-WI)	Bill Cobey (R-NE)
Henry J. Hyde (R-IL)	Tom Petri (R-WI)
Newt Gingrich (R-GA)	Jim Kolbe (R-AZ)
Bill Broomfield (R-MI)	Mark D. Siljander (R-MI)
Beau Boulter (R-TX)	John E. Grotberg (R-IL)
Bill Thomas (R-CA)	Tom Delay (R-TX)
	Robert C. Smith (R-NH)
	Marge Roukema (R-NJ)

NJC Bulletin is published monthly by the National Jewish Coalition.

MAX FISHER	GEORGE KLEIN
Hon. Chairman	Co-Chairman
RICHARD J. FOX	GORDON ZACKS
Nat'l Chairman	Co-Chairman

CHRIS GERSTEN
Executive Director
ANTHONY KORENSTEIN
Editor

NJC Bulletin welcomes comments and letters to the editor. These should be sent, along with any address changes, to:

The Editor,
NJC Bulletin,
415 Second Street, NE, Suite 100,
Washington, DC 20002.

Clip and Send to: National Jewish Coalition
415 Second Street, NE, Suite 100
Washington, D.C. 20002

☐ YES I'm different!

I would like to learn more about the National Jewish Coalition. Please send me membership information.

Name _____

Address _____ Phone (H) () _____

(O) () _____

Why Liberals Opposed Aid To Israel

On July 31, 1985, Congress gave final assent to the first foreign aid bill to be passed since 1981. This landmark legislation, which Rep. Dante B. Fascell, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, called a "bipartisan measure ... vital to American interests abroad," represents a new congressional resolve to confront Soviet colonialism.

In an historic move, the \$12.8 billion aid package included assistance to anti-communist guerrillas in Cambodia and Afghanistan, and \$27 million in humanitarian aid to the freedom fighters resisting the Sandinista government of Nicaragua. The bill also repealed the Clark Amendment which had prohibited any U.S. aid to anti-communist guerrillas in Angola. This came as the Soviets escalated the battle against the Angolan democratic resistance, UNITA, complementing Cuban troops with Soviet tanks, planes and personnel.

The aid package also contained critical assistance for Israel, including \$3 billion in military and economic assistance, plus an additional \$1.5 billion in emergency economic aid. And, for the second year in a row, the Reagan Administration opted to convert the aid from a combination of grants and loans to all grants in order to ease Israel's debt burden.

The strong internationalist aspects of the bill indicate a trend in Congress away from the "blame America first" isolationism that has come to dominate foreign-policy thinking among liberal Democrats. Led by Republicans, Congress is now using foreign aid to uphold America's global security interests.

In 1984, Republicans played a pivotal role in passing legislation that provided important assistance for Israel and embattled El Salvador, supporting it 115-46. But liberal Democrats, unwilling to recognize the need for America to support her allies, opposed the bill. Despite its importance to Israel, House Democrats voted *against* the bill, 160-96, because it would have provided assistance to anti-communist guerrillas in Nicaragua. When given a choice between supporting Israel or retreating into isolationism, many liberals chose the latter.

This trend continued in 1985. In the Senate, 40 of the 48 Republicans voting supported the aid legislation. Many conservative Republicans, including Bill Armstrong, Phil Gramm, Charles Grassley, Mack Mattingly, Gordon Humphrey, Steve Symms and Jeremiah Denton, all demonstrated new support for foreign aid.

When given a choice between supporting Israel and retreating into isolationism, many liberals chose the latter.

In the House, the freshman members who represent emerging congressional attitudes, provided firm evidence that Republican support for foreign aid is strengthening as Democratic support weakens. While freshman Republicans supported the foreign aid bill 27-4—a ratio of 7:1—support among new Democrats dwindled to less than 2:1.

Behind this growing Republican support lies the recognition that American passivity in foreign affairs encouraged Soviet expansionism. Congressional Republicans have seized foreign aid as an invaluable tool for combatting this Soviet threat.

In Congress, where Democrats once led the way in supporting Israel, it is now Republicans who direct attention to the threat that the United States, Israel and democracies everywhere face from the Soviet Union. In response, Republicans are supporting the cause of democracy world-wide by promoting foreign aid to Israel and other freedom-loving peoples as a moral obligation and an investment in our own security.

This year's foreign aid vote also demonstrated that many liberal Democrats are not willing to take the steps that will make America and Israel strong. Paradoxically, many, including Les AuCoin and Bruce A. Morrison, obtained Jewish campaign backing on the basis of their avowed support for the security of Israel. They, along with several Jewish congressmen, such as Sidney Yates, Barbara Boxer, Ted Weiss, and Anthony Beilenson—all liberal Democrats—abandoned Israel by voting against the foreign aid bill because it provides anti-communist forces with a few million dollars in U.S. assistance. In fact Rep. Boxer, eager to dampen Jewish criticism of her opposition to the bill, called a meeting of fifteen of her Jewish colleagues and urged them to vote against aid to Israel. Fortunately, most were as outraged at Boxer's suggestion as other Jews will be.

Friends of Israel must understand the importance of these votes for the future security of Israel and America. The Republicans have embraced policies that will ensure the freedom of Israel and America in the years to come. Their support for foreign aid represents a determined effort not to let liberals who "blame America first" dictate our foreign policy.

C.G.

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

415 Second Street, NE., Suite 100
Washington, DC 20002

Bulk Rate
U.S. Postage
PAID
Merrifield, VA
Permit No. 2446

NJC Bulletin

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

INSIDE

CAPITAL WIRE **2**

REPEAL ZIONISM-IS-RACISM **2**

PRO-ISRAEL PACS
BACK GOP SENATORS **3**

NOVEMBER 1985

Jordan Arms Sale Delayed

In a significant victory for opponents of the administration's proposed arms sale to Jordan, Congress passed a joint resolution stating that the sale not proceed until March 1, 1986 unless direct peace negotiations between Israel and Jordan are underway. The resolution passed on a voice vote in the House and by 97-1 in the Senate.

The delay is being viewed as a major setback for State Department officials who had argued that the sale was essential to achieving progress in the peace process, and who lobbied actively for the sale to proceed. As recent developments indicate, however, the peace process remains alive despite the congressional action.

The joint resolution took on greater political significance as a result of the Republican role in convincing the administration to delay the sale. Prior to the votes delaying the sale, letters of outright disapproval were circulating in both houses of Congress in the hope of securing enough votes to override a potential Presidential veto. In the Senate, 74 senators co-sponsored a resolution opposing the sale spearheaded by Democrats Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) and Daniel Inouye (D-Hawaii), and Republicans John Heinz (R-Penn.), Alfonse D'Amato (R-N.Y.), Rudy Boschwitz (R-Minn.) and Robert Kasten (R-Wisc.). Eventually, 28 Republicans co-sponsored the resolution. Facing such solid bipartisan opposition, the administration had no alternative but to agree to the delay.

For some cosponsors of the Kennedy-Heinz resolution, this was the first time they had opposed an arms sale to an Arab country. While on most foreign

policy matters these senators—including Jesse Helms (R-NC), Steve Symms (R-ID), Gordon Humphrey (R-NH), Thad Cochran (R-Miss.), Don Nickles (R-OK), Charles Grassley (R-Iowa), Mack Mattingly (R-Ga.) and Frank Murkowski (R-AK)—form a solid bloc of support for the administration, on this occasion they felt constrained to oppose what they viewed as an unwise sale.

Opposition to the sale developed largely because of the lack of progress towards peace in the Middle East. Jordan has failed to take steps to enter negotiations with Israel, and the sale's opponents are reluctant to send more arms into an already volatile area when there is no sign of getting anything in return.

In addition, there is a new awareness of the degree to which the sale would undermine Israel's security. This results, in part, from trips that several members have taken to Israel recently. Jesse Helms, for example, returned from his first visit to Israel with a new understanding of Israel's vulnerability. Sens. Gordon Humphrey and Frank Murkowski, who also visited Israel recently, returned with a similar appreciation of Israel's problems.

Also contributing to this awareness is the Republican Party's view of foreign policy which favors support for America's democratic friends around the world. Israel, as a democratic and strategically valuable ally, unquestionably meets standards that call for strong U.S. support.

With Republicans now playing a leading role in supporting Israel, the political dynamics involved in foreign policy-making with regard to the Middle East have changed in recent years. When, in 1981, the administration proposed to sell

Continued, page 3

Bennett Addresses School Prayer

Speaking before the National Jewish Coalition's board of directors at the White House this month, Secretary of Education, William J. Bennett addressed Jewish concerns over the issue of church-state separation. The Secretary discussed his view of the role religion should play in American society, and examined specifically the question of prayer in public schools. It was his first address to a Jewish group since taking office.

Observing that the American experience cannot be understood without reference to the Judeo-Christian tradition, Secretary Bennett argued that our democracy is closely tied to the vitality of that

tradition. Bennett expressed his belief that the Founding Fathers had shown their religious commitment in the Declaration of Independence by writing: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights. . . ." The Secretary interpreted this introduction as indicating that the Founding Fathers based their belief in human rights and the dignity of man on the Judeo-Christian tradition.

The Secretary reiterated opinions he explained in a speech before the Knights of Columbus earlier this year. "We are not a Protestant, nor a Catholic, nor a Jewish nation," he told the Catholic group. "But we are, as Justice Douglas said, 'a religious people . . .' When we have disdain for our religious tradition,

Continued, page 3

CAPITALWire

NJC URGES END TO QUOTAS

The President will soon consider several proposals to revise Executive Order 11246 which sets hiring obligations for federal contractors. The revisions, proposed by Attorney General Edwin Meese, would eliminate the requirement that federal contractors use quotas and other discriminatory hiring practices to achieve statistical parity with the surrounding labor market. The use of voluntary goals and timetables would remain permissible, so long as they do not discriminate.

American presidents have historically used unilateral declarations to put the federal government in the forefront of the fight against discrimination. In 1968, the Labor Department issued regulations implementing President Johnson's order calling for "affirmative action" by federal contractors in recruiting and hiring. These regulations asked contractors for the "numbers" of their employees in special categories, such as "Black" and "Hispanic," and encouraged the employment of individuals from these groups.

By 1970, the regulation required employers to submit in writing detailed plans of action aimed at meeting recruitment and hiring goals, and in 1971, the guidelines began using statistical means to judge whether an employer was guilty of discrimination. Finally, through further judicial and bureaucratic action, these numbers became the standard for hiring minorities, even where discrimination was absent. Over time, a *de facto* system of quotas was created, changing an effort to secure equality of opportunity to one that sought to guarantee equality of

results.

Richard Fox, chairman of the National Jewish Coalition, has written the President urging that he adopt the revisions which would return the executive order to its original intent: insuring equality of opportunity for all individuals and equality of treatment under the laws regardless of gender or minority status.

The N.J.C. is a founding member of the Coalition Against Quotas. Morris Abram, Vice-Chairman of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, Richard Leshner of the Chamber of Commerce, Nathan Perlmutter of the Anti-Defamation League and Walter Berns of the American Enterprise Institute, are among the many business, ethnic, and professional leaders whose organizations are involved in the CAQ's efforts.

RAISING SOVIET JEWRY IN GENEVA

Before his departure for Geneva, President Reagan was urged by members of Congress to press Mikhail Gorbachev to increase Jewish emigration. Legislators active on behalf of Soviet Jews, such as Sen. Alfonse D'Amato (R-N.Y.), are concerned over the intensification of anti-Semitic persecution since Mr. Gorbachev assumed power.

A letter initiated by Sens. Charles Grassley (R-Iowa), Paula Hawkins (R-Fla.), Alan Cranston (D-Calif.) and Robert Dole (R-Kan.), and co-sponsored by 85 others, urged Mr. Reagan to do his utmost to secure freedom for Soviet Jews. Senate Majority Leader Dole also discussed the issue privately with the

President.

In the House, a bi-partisan letter to the President dealing with Soviet Jewry was sponsored by Reps. H. James Saxton (R-N.J.), Dean Gallo (R-N.J.), Peter Kostmayer (D-Pa.) and Hamilton Fish (R-N.Y.). The letter alerted Mr. Reagan to the Soviets' campaign of disinformation about Soviet Jewry, and urged him to make the matter a top priority at the summit.

NJC'S WALDMAN, SOLL IN NEW POSTS

Bruce Soll, former executive director of the Jewish Coalition of the Republican National Committee and deputy director of the National Jewish Coalition, has assumed a new appointment as finance director of the Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation. In this capacity, Mr. Soll, an attorney, will oversee the funding, design and construction of the Ronald Reagan Library and Center for Public Affairs.

Ben Waldman, who was director of the California Jewish Coalition for Reagan-Bush in 1980, and executive director of the Reagan-Bush Jewish Coalition in 1984, recently became Associate Director of Presidential Personnel at the White House. Prior to assuming his new position, Mr. Waldman was a special consultant to the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Both Mr. Soll and Mr. Waldman will retain close ties to the Coalition as members of the NJC's board of directors. Mr. Soll will also continue to serve as the Coalition's counsel.

Reagan: "Repeal 'Zionism Is Racism'"

Ten years after the 1975 United Nations General Assembly resolution labeling Zionism as "a form of racism," President Reagan called for the resolution's repeal.

When the resolution was passed, then-U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, Daniel P. Moynihan, said that the United States "... will never abide by [and] never acquiesce to this infamous act." In a message to a conference on Israel, Zionism and the U.N., the President wrote: "Today, I am proud to reaffirm that promise and, further, to pledge my support to the removal of this blot from the United Nations record."

Speaking at the conference, chief Israeli delegate to the U.N., Benjamin Netanyahu, noted that the resolution has

provided legitimacy for its supporters' hostility towards Israel and the Jewish people. The resolution has served as a justification for efforts to ostracize Israel and as a pretext for anti-Semitism around the world.

The President's message follows congressional action against the resolution. Led by Sen. Alfonse D'Amato (R-NY), Congress unanimously passed a motion that "formally repudiates [the resolution] and calls upon the parliaments of all countries that value freedom and democracy to do the same."

Pro-Israel Pacs Back GOP Senators

During the first six months of 1985, Republican candidates for the U.S. Senate received more than half of all campaign contributions made by pro-Israel political action committees (PACs). According to a *Washington Post* survey, the ten largest PACs, gave a total of \$167,150 to Republicans, and only \$139,450 to Democrats.

The increase in PAC contributions to Republicans represents a shift among American Jewry away from automatic support for Democrats. This has resulted from the increase in support for Israel among GOP senators.

The Jewish community has witnessed

a marked improvement in U.S.-Israel relations under the Reagan administration. U.S. aid to Israel has increased dramatically and has been converted from a combination of grants and loans to all grants. In addition, the U.S.-Israel strategic relationship has been strengthened, and a U.S.-Israel free trade area established. These developments have helped make relations between the two countries closer than ever.

Support for Israel has also increased among congressional Republicans. The trend is partially a product of the internationalist world view that has achieved currency in the Republican Party. This view holds that the United States should support the forces of democracy worldwide, especially when a democratic nation such as Israel is a staunch and strategically valuable ally.

The depth of the Republican legislators' commitment to Israel was evident in their positions on two issues of importance to the Jewish State. This year, Republican support for foreign aid was overwhelming, and included that of several conservatives who had never before supported such a bill. And when the administration proposed a sale of sophisticated arms to Jordan in October, the opposition of Republican senators was crucial to achieving the sale's postponement.

Among the Republican senators facing re-election in 1986 are some of Israel's most consistent supporters. The support they have received from pro-Israel PACs reflects a growing belief among American Jews that tapping Republican support will help preserve Israel's security in the coming years.

BENNETT, *Cont. from page 1*



Secretary of Education, William J. Bennett.

we have disdain for ourselves."

After that speech, Mr. Bennett commented, some accused him of supporting school prayer as a means of promoting his own "brand of Christianity." But Mr. Bennett, who supports voluntary, non-prescribed school prayer, argues that the Founding Fathers opposed religious sectarianism, not religion itself. He said that the reaction to his Knights of Columbus speech had revealed a mindset among many, which disdains religious life and treats religion as a disease against which public life must be protected. This, he said, is not neutrality towards religion, but outright antagonism towards it.

In response to questions from NJC board members concerning the impact of school prayer on young children belong-

ing to minority religions, Bennett recalled his own school days, in Brooklyn, New York. He told the group that as the only Catholic in a class that was almost entirely Jewish, he had grown up thinking that most of the world was Jewish. This experience, he said, not only made him sensitive to Jewish concerns, but also made him conscious of how members of minority religions feel in America.

"The Founding Fathers opposed religious sectarianism, not religion itself."

William J. Bennett
Secretary of Education

Secretary Bennett said that he recognizes that prayer in schools is a "delicate matter." But, he said, not having prayer in schools is also delicate. Prayer, he believes, is an important symbol of the values and standards of morality that many Americans would like to see restored to America. Providing the opportunity for prayer in schools, he said, is important to achieving this restoration.

JORDAN ARMS, *Cont. from page 1*

AWACS surveillance aircraft to Saudi Arabia, opponents failed to stop the sale. The failure resulted largely from the inability of the pro-Israel community to develop ties to Republicans whose help was essential to the effort to block the transfer.

The change from 1981 to 1985 also represents a change in the level of Jewish political sophistication. The Jewish community is becoming increasingly aware of the need to develop support among members of Congress whom the community had previously perceived as opponents of Jewish interests.

No president has ever had an arms sale blocked by Congress. If opponents of the Jordan arms sale are to win this round, they will find that congressional Republicans will be critical to their success.

NJC Bulletin is published monthly by the
National Jewish Coalition.

MAX FISHER
Hon. Chairman
RICHARD J. FOX
Nat'l Chairman

GEORGE KLEIN
Co-Chairman
GORDON ZACKS
Co-Chairman

CHRIS GERSTEN
Executive Director
ANTHONY KORENSTEIN
Editor

NJC Bulletin welcomes comments and letters to the editor. These should be sent, along with any address changes, to:

The Editor,
NJC Bulletin,
415 Second Street, NE, Suite 100,
Washington, DC 20002.

After The Geneva Summit

In an address to Congress and the nation after the Geneva summit, President Reagan reported on his meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev. The leaders, he said, had discussed U.S. proposals for nuclear arms reductions, proposals which Mr. Reagan believes "would make not just for a world that seemed safer, but that really is safer." On his return, Mr. Reagan renewed his commitment to policies designed to achieve a safer world: a willingness to discuss mutual problems with the Soviets, coupled with a refusal to accept any agreement that compromises Western security interests.

"Preparations for the summit," the President told Congress, "Started . . . five years ago when . . . we began strengthening our economy, restoring our national will and rebuilding our defenses and alliances." During this period, the Reagan administration has pursued policies whose goals are the preservation of U.S. and Western security. The President's recognition that arms control is a means for ensuring security rather than an end in itself, and his rededication of America to its own defense and to the defense of freedom, have, for the first time, created an opportunity for serious superpower talks that can lead to an arms control agreement that brings greater, not less, security.

By returning home without an accord on arms control, Mr. Reagan resisted considerable pressure from the Soviets and from many in the West to reach a quick agreement—one that would favor the Soviets. The President stood firm on his commitment to the Strategic Defense Initiative, resisting the temptation to remove what the Soviets have described as the "major obstacle" to an arms control agreement. By displaying the patience necessary of a statesman, Mr. Reagan made clear to his Soviet counterpart that the United States will not bargain away the promise of true security in the future for the sake of a meaningless treaty now.

The discussions in Geneva, sharp though they often may have been, produced what both sides regard as a fresh start in East-West relations. And because

the two sides are now talking, it is possible that opportunities have been created to deal with other issues of concern to the free world, particularly that of Soviet Jewry.

Holding true to his pre-summit commitment, Mr. Reagan raised in Geneva the issue of widespread human rights abuses by the Kremlin, discussing at length the status of Soviet Jews. Mr. Gorbachev, however, has continued to deny abusing human rights, claiming that there are no political prisoners in the Soviet Union and that "the so-called problem of Jews in the Soviet Union does not exist."

Mr. Gorbachev said that "the so-called problem of Jews in the Soviet Union does not exist."

Despite the pessimism evoked by Mr. Gorbachev's public posture, the President's refusal to ignore the issue raises the hope that some progress on the question of Soviet Jewish emigration may be forthcoming. For while the Soviet leader is eager to achieve an improvement in bilateral economic relations with the

United States, there are indications that the administration will not comply unless the Soviets dramatically increase the number of Jews allowed to emigrate.

During the talks, the President also reiterated his administration's refusal to countenance Soviet expansionism and the brutality that accompanies it. Having sought to make regional conflicts a focal point of his discussions, the President criticized Soviet actions in areas from Afghanistan, to Central America, to Angola.

The President reaffirmed that the United States will continue to support the forces of democracy around the world by providing aid to anti-communist freedom fighters. He also told the nation in his November 23rd radio address that the United States will only continue to comply with the unsigned SALT II agreement if the Soviets set a date for their withdrawal from Afghanistan.

The full implications of the Geneva summit will not be known for months or even years. However, certain trends have emerged from the meeting, trends that suggest that Ronald Reagan understands what is required in dealing with the Soviets: a strong America, an America firm in support of its values, an America no longer willing to accept easy solutions to complex problems.

"We are not like you Americans," a Soviet foreign ministry official was quoted as saying. "We do not expect everything to happen tomorrow." This readiness to hold out for an agreement that satisfies national concerns has long been a mark of Soviet diplomacy. That it now appears also to be a mark of American diplomacy justifies cautious optimism that Western interests will be preserved, whether or not a U.S.-Soviet agreement results.

C.G.

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

415 Second Street, NE., Suite 100
Washington, DC 20002

Non Profit
Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Wash., DC
Permit No. 27396

NJC Bulletin

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

INSIDE

WILL ARAFAT BE PROSECUTED? **2**

"THE MEDIA'S WAR AGAINST ISRAEL" **3**

CAMPAIGN '86: AN OVERVIEW **5**

DECEMBER 1985

A Policy For Angola

Moshe Leshem

In an address to the United Nations on October 24th, President Reagan raised the issue of the world's regional conflicts. In a pre-summit signal to the Kremlin, the President warned that the United States will not acquiesce silently to the Soviet use of force to advance its influence. Among the conflicts he mentioned was that between the Soviet-backed Marxist government of Angola and democratic rebels.

But while the United States now aids anti-Soviet resistance groups in other countries, such as Nicaragua, Cambodia and Afghanistan, it has hesitated to support those in Angola. Aid to the democratic forces in that country was banned for a decade by the so-called Clark amendment. This summer, though, Congress repealed the amendment and opened the way for the provision of U.S. support to the Angolan resistance.

Despite the amendment's repeal, opposition to any U.S. involvement in Angola remains strong. Opponents claim that the ruling party in Angola, the MPLA (the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola), poses little threat to U.S. interests. To support this position, they point to the thriving oil trade that American companies conduct with the Angolan government.

American interests in the region, though,

Moshe Leshem is a retired Israeli diplomat with extensive experience in African affairs. He served for four years as Israel's ambassador to Zaire, and three years as head of the African Division of the Israeli Foreign Ministry.

are far more extensive than those who oppose aiding the freedom fighters suggest. This fact is well-recognized by the Soviet Union which has invested much in the effort to keep the Angolan government in power. Some 35,000 Cuban troops are in Angola, fighting to prevent the overthrow of the Marxist government, while the PLO maintains a training camp for Angolan troops north of the capital, Luanda. In addition, the MPLA has asked for a further 13,000 military personnel from the Soviet Bloc, including 5,000 North Koreans, to bolster this effort.

The policy planners in the Kremlin are not in the habit of wasting their strained



resources in order merely to prop up an unpopular regime in a distant country. They have chosen to do so because of Angola's strategic importance.

Angola is located close to the enormous mineral wealth of Namibia and South Africa; it also shares a long border with one of Africa's largest nations, Zaire, which the Kremlin views as a potential target for destabilization. Because of its vastness—it stretches from

Continued, page 4

OPINION Halting Attacks On The ADC

In recent months, the Arab-American Anti-Discrimination Committee (ADC) has been the victim of three attacks against its staff and premises. Not only have these incidents caused extensive damage to property, they have also resulted in the death of the organization's West Coast director who was killed by a bomb explosion in October.

The use of terrorism must be deplored by all who espouse freedom and democracy. As full and equal members of our society, Arab Americans enjoy the same civil liberties available to all Americans,

liberties which they must be allowed to exercise, however distasteful the ADC's views might be.

Since its inception, the focus of the ADC's activities has not been on reducing anti-Arab prejudice in America, but on attacking the State of Israel and its supporters in this country. As such, it has proven itself to be implacably hostile to the interests of American Jews. But freedom of expression is one of the pillars on which democracy stands: acts that abridge the right of any person or group to speak freely, weaken the entire body politic.

The Jewish community, especially, must voice its opposition to such attacks. History has taught Jews of the dangers of intolerance. Jews have long been vic-

Continued, page 3

CAPITAL *Wire*

WILL YASIR ARAFAT BE BROUGHT TO JUSTICE?

A detailed legal brief has been submitted to the Attorney General, Edwin Meese, outlining a case for the Justice Department to indict PLO leader, Yasir Arafat, on charges of murder. The brief relates to the 1973 kidnap and murder of the US ambassador to the Sudan, Cleo Noel, and the charge d'affaires, George Moore, by Palestinian terrorists.

Interest in the case was sparked by the revelation of evidence indicating that Mr. Arafat personally ordered the terrorists holding the American diplomats to murder them. Israeli and US intelligence sources are said to possess a tape recording of a telephone conversation between Arafat and the terrorists in which the order was given. The existence of the tape has been confirmed privately by the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, Vernon Walters, and by other former and current senior administration officials.

Although such evidence would provide firm grounds for prosecution, the decision on whether to do so has yet to be made. The decision is being delayed by wrangling between the State and Justice Departments over jurisdiction in the case, and by political questions.

As news of the incriminating tape's existence spreads, however, pressure is mounting for Mr. Arafat to be indicted. In the Senate, a letter has been written to the Attorney General by Senator William Armstrong (R-Colo.), chairman of the Senate Republican Policy Committee. The letter urges Mr. Meese to expedite consideration of this matter and, if Mr. Arafat is indeed implicated, to pursue his indictment forthwith.

EXTRADITION TREATY PROPOSED

As part of its effort to combat terrorism, the Reagan administration has signed an agreement amending the Anglo-American extradition treaty. The amendment makes the extradition of suspected terrorists easier by limiting the scope of the "political exception." Numerous terrorists have escaped trial by fleeing to the

United States and claiming that they could not be extradited because their offenses were "political" in nature. If the proposed amendment is ratified by the Senate, terrorists would no longer be able to avoid extradition for violent crimes such as hijacking, hostage-taking and murder, by claiming that the crimes were politically inspired.

In testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the State Department's legal advisor, Abraham Sofaer, argued that the extradition of "political" offenders was permissible between stable democracies because "the political system [of the country requesting extradition] is available to redress legitimate grievances, and the judicial process provides fair treatment."

Once the amendment is ratified, the Anglo-American treaty will form the basis of similar agreements between the United States and other nations, including Israel. Such a treaty would enhance Israel's own efforts to combat the terrorist threat she faces from the PLO.

BOYCOTT OF LIBYA TIGHTENED

President Reagan has issued an executive order which has tightened a congressionally mandated embargo on oil imports from Libya. The President signed the order after learning of attempts to circumvent the embargo which became law earlier this year.

The embargo was originally proposed as part of the effort to combat terrorism. In May, Representative John Miller (R-Wash.) offered an amendment banning U.S. aid, loans and assistance to Libya and calling for an international civil aviation boycott of both Libya and Iran. Subsequently Congress passed the Miller amendment, along with another proposed by Rep. Benjamin Gilman (R-NY) and Senator Arlen Specter (R-Pa.). These required the President to "prohibit any article grown, produced, extracted or manufactured in Libya from being imported into the United States," notwithstanding any other provision of law.

As the embargo took effect, however, it became clear that the Libyan government was taking advantage of a loophole

to export petroleum products to the United States. Rep. Gilman, concerned at the violation, wrote alerting the President to the fact that "Libyan oil is being imported into the United States through a variety of subterfuges" in violation of the embargo.

In response to these concerns, President Reagan signed the executive order on November 15th. The order states that "considering that the Libyan government actively pursues terrorism as an instrument of state policy . . . no petroleum product refined in Libya . . . may be imported into the United States, its territories and possessions."

D'AMATO STRONG AMONG N.Y.C. JEWS

Recent polling data show New York senator, Alfonse D'Amato, with high approval ratings among Jewish voters in New York City. According to an NBC News poll, 66% of Jewish voters rated the New York Republican as doing an good or excellent job as senator. A further 17% of those polled believed that D'Amato was doing a fair job, and only 11% considered his performance poor. Jewish support for the junior senator from New York was actually twelve points higher than that he received from the population in general.

The strength of D'Amato's support among Jews may have influenced the decisions of other potential candidates on whether to challenge D'Amato for his Senate seat next November. Both Elizabeth Holtzman, who ran against D'Amato in 1980, and former congresswoman and vice-presidential candidate, Geraldine Ferraro, have announced that they do not intend to run in 1986. A *New York Post/ABC News* poll taken in the late summer showed D'Amato leading Ferraro among registered Jewish voters. A December poll indicated that Jews supported him three-to-two statewide.

The increase in Jewish support for D'Amato from the 8% he received in 1980 reflects the Senator's efforts on behalf of the state's Jews. He has developed close ties to the Jewish community and has become a congressional leader in support of U.S.-Israel relations and Soviet Jewry.

"The Media's War Against Israel"

A Book Review by Charles Brooks

Since 1948, Israel has been forced to maintain a state of armed vigilance to deter and combat the repeated attacks of her adversaries. The price has been high in terms of lives and economic costs, but necessary for survival. A new book, *The Media's War Against Israel*, (Steimatzky Publishing, New York/Jerusalem, 1985) documents the battle-front on which Israel encounters what is perhaps her greatest tactical disadvantage.

The Media's War Against Israel, edited by Peter Goldman, director of Americans For A Safe Israel, and Stephen Karetzky, a specialist in mass communications, is an indispensable resource for anyone interested in the Middle East. The book brings together essays by some of America's foremost intellectual writers which examine media attitudes towards Israel. In their essays, such writers as Norman Podhoretz, Rael Jean Isaac, Edward Alexander, Frank Gervasi, and David Bar Illan, analyze the lack of objectivity, use of injudicious sources, irresponsible reporting, and in some cases, overt propagandizing practiced by many of America's leading news organizations.

The importance of this collection is not to be underestimated. Israel is a tiny country whose vitality and security are directly affected by each partial and distorted newscast. The book's contributors are unanimous in their belief that anti-

Israel media bias has encouraged terrorism, exacerbated anti-American sentiment abroad, eroded world support for Israel and has cost Israel millions of dollars in lost tourism and investments.

This book's uniqueness lies not only in the illuminating and potent nature of the essays, but also in their diverse approaches to the problem. David Bar Illan, a prolific scholar/writer and host of the television public affairs program, "International Dateline," dissects the media's coverage of the recent terrorist hijack of TWA Flight 847. Bar Illan concludes that the "tragic spectacle of an impotent, bewildered and helpless America, venting its frustration and rage on Israel instead of on the terrorists, was largely brought about by journalists." Similarly, author Rael Jean Isaac's piece on "Time Against Israel" outlines the magazine's "subversion" in standing "facts, words and moral principles on their heads to achieve [Time's] portrait of the Arab-Israel conflict."

The majority of the essays focus on the media's anti-Israel excesses in reporting Israel's intervention in Lebanon. Ze'ev Chafets, who served as director of Israel's government press office, delivers a revealing, first-hand, account of how journalists deliberately distorted coverage of Israel during the conflict. He documents numerous cases of PLO intimidation against reporters and cites the failure of the American press to provide coverage of major events or of Arab atrocities such as the Syrian government's massacre of 20,000 of its own citizens on one day in the city of Hama. Frank Gervasi, of the Center for International Security, elaborates on many of Chafets' findings and suggests that the reader contemplate the parallels between the media's manipulation of facts relating to the Lebanon

war, and Orwell's "Newspeak" in his prophetic 1984.

In the spirit of Emile Zola's classic work, Norman Podhoretz, editor of *Commentary* magazine and author of five books, presents his own version of "J'Accuse." Podhoretz, as always, provides a penetrating analysis that will elicit rage against "journalists" who have built their careers on foundations of hypocrisy and denunciations of Israel. He contends that many of the media's attacks on Israel were a cover for a loss of American nerve, acquiescence to terrorism and appeasement of totalitarianism. He accuses all those who have joined in the attacks "not merely of anti-Semitism, but of the broader sin of faithlessness to the interests of the United States and indeed to the values of Western civilization as a whole."

It is difficult to do justice in so short a review to a book that contains work of such consistently high caliber. Professor Edward Alexander's cogent critique of NBC News' bias against Israel could almost serve as a lawyer's brief. But perhaps Peter Goldman and Marvin Maurer best summed up the views of all the writers. In their concluding essay, "Lessons of the Lebanon Campaign," Goldman and Maurer write that the media "sought to undermine the moral legitimacy of the State of Israel and its democratically elected leaders while simultaneously idealizing the PLO."

The Media's War Against Israel provides more than essential reading for friends of Israel: it provides ammunition for fighting the battle of words that the media are likely to wage in the future. At a time when journalistic prejudice seems to be increasing, it is imperative that all misinformation and damaging propaganda be challenged. This book is an invaluable weapon for those who wish to do so.

Charles Brooks is the NJC's Outreach Director.

ADC, cont. from page 1

tims of terror perpetrated in the name of Arab nationalism: now, we must condemn similar violence when it is directed against those whose views differ from our own.

Beyond the moral argument against terror lies the practical fact that the attacks against the ADC weaken the interests of the Jewish community and strengthen those of the ADC. Whether or not Jews were responsible for the attacks, it is on Jews that suspicion has first fallen. Under such circumstances, the claim of

Israel and her supporters to favor democracy loses credibility as the ADC and its allies point to Jewish violence and intolerance.

In fact, the ADC has already used these attacks to further its cause. The organization has long received frequent and prominent coverage in the media. But, its leaders are now seeking to capitalize on the public sympathy generated by the attacks to claim that their views are not heard, and that "Zionist forces" are at work to deny Arab Americans

their right to liberty and justice.

The Jewish community will continue to condemn the violence suffered by the ADC or any others. The community joins the rest of the nation in urging the authorities to conduct a thorough investigation and to prosecute those guilty to the full extent of the law. But while the nation is united in an effort to ensure that such a tragedy is not repeated, it is regrettable that the Arab-American leadership should cynically seek to turn the attacks into a propaganda weapon.

ANGOLA, cont. from page 1



the Sudan in the north to Tanzania in the east—Zaire dominates central Africa. It also possesses considerable mineral wealth, including sixty percent of the world's total reserves of cobalt.

While U.S. support for Zaire has been less than the country's strategic importance warrants, Zaire's president, Mobutu Sese Seko, is the most pro-American head of state in all of black Africa. Moreover, at the considerable risk of alienating the Arab world, Mobutu took the bold step of renewing diplomatic relations with Israel three years ago. For the United States, then, protecting an ally, Zaire, and denying the Soviets a firm foothold in the region are legitimate policy aims. They are also realistic ones. The forces that can oust the Soviets and their proxies from the region are in place. Two major democratic resistance groups are active in Angola. Only one, though—UNITA (the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola)—has

attracted American attention. After the Clark amendment forbade U.S. aid to UNITA, its leaders turned to South Africa as the only source of assistance.

Some 35,000 Cuban troops are in Angola, while the PLO maintains a training camp for Angolan troops.

As a result of this help, UNITA is now the best armed and best organized opposition force.

UNITA is an important player in the struggle against the Marxist dictatorship in Luanda, having succeeded in tying down government forces and their Soviet-bloc allies. Yet its impact is limited by geography. UNITA operates in the southern region of the country, a desert-like, sparsely populated area, which is far from the hub of political life—the capital.

For this reason, UNITA is unable to win the guerrilla war alone. For the democratic forces to triumph, UNITA will need the assistance of the second major group, the FNLA (National Front for the Liberation of Angola). The FNLA

Protecting an ally, Zaire, and denying the Soviets a foothold in the region are legitimate U.S. policy goals.

operates in the northern part of the country, in terrain ideally suited to guerrilla operations. Yet because it has refused South African assistance, it lacks the material assistance which would enable it to carry the battle into the streets of Luanda.

In order to put strong military pressure on the present government of Angola, the transformation of the opposition into a credible and well-equipped fighting force is essential. To do this, the United States must support not only UNITA but also the FNLA forces who hold the key to ultimate success, but who have so far failed to attract interest in Washington.

If the pressure on the MPLA can be made strong enough, U.S. interests in the region may be preserved. The question of whether it will be the United States or the Soviet Union which will prevail, though, depends on American determination to give Angolans who risk their lives for freedom the tools they need to do the job.

Campaign '86: An Overview

The congressional elections to be held in November, 1986 will be among the most critical of the off-year elections held in recent years. The two parties will be vying for control of the Senate which the Republicans have held since 1981 and over which the GOP currently holds sway by a margin of 53-47.

The Republican majority is especially vulnerable because so many of the Senate seats to be contested next year are Republican-held. Of the thirty-four seats that are open, twenty-two are currently held by Republicans, and only twelve by Democrats.

With twice as many Republican incumbents as Democrats not seeking reelection (four to two), the GOP is likely to find it difficult to maintain its present Senate majority. A number of incumbents, previously considered to have been clear favorites for reelection, have announced their retirement. The Republicans who will not seek reelection are Arizona's Barry Goldwater, Nevada's Paul Laxalt, Maryland's Charles McC. Mathias and North Carolina's John East. Democrats Thomas Eagleton of Missouri and Russell Long of Louisiana have also decided not to run again in 1986.

Among GOP senators seeking reelection, several are considered by strategists of both parties to be heavy favorites to win. They include: Alaska's Frank Murkowski, a member of the Senate Foreign

Relations Committee; Dan Quayle of Indiana; Charles Grassley of Iowa; Majority Leader, Robert Dole of Kansas; Oregon's Robert Packwood (a leader in the fight to defeat the 1981 AWACS sale to Saudi Arabia); Jake Garn of Utah, Slade Gorton of Washington; and Warren Rudman of New Hampshire. New York Republican, Alfonse D'Amato, who had expected to face a tough challenge, is now favored for reelection since the announcement by two potential opponents, Geraldine Ferraro and Elizabeth Holtzman, that they will not run.

On the Democratic side, Daniel Inouye of Hawaii, ranking minority member of the foreign operations subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, and Foreign Relations Committee-members, Christopher Dodd of Connecticut and John Glenn of Ohio, are expected to win easy reelection. Other Democrats con-

sidered to have safe seats are Alan Dixon of Illinois. Wendell Ford of Kentucky and Ernest Hollings of South Carolina.

Among other races, whose outcome appears less certain, Jewish votes and support are expected to play a vital role. These include Florida's Paula Hawkins, who faces a serious challenge from the state's Democratic governor, Bob Graham, and the chairman of the important foreign operations subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, Robert



New York senator, Alfonse D'Amato



Florida senator, Paula Hawkins



Wisconsin senator, Robert Kasten

Kasten (R-Wisc.). In California, Jewish financial support will be important to candidates of both parties.

During the coming months, the *NJC Bulletin* will profile a series of key races across the country. In the first of this series, the races in New York, Florida and Wisconsin will be examined.

NJC Bulletin is published monthly by the
National Jewish Coalition.

MAX FISHER
Hon. Chairman
RICHARD J. FOX
Nat'l Chairman

GEORGE KLEIN
Co-Chairman
GORDON ZACKS
Co-Chairman

CHRIS GERSTEN
Executive Director
ANTONY KORENSTEIN
Editor

NJC Bulletin welcomes comments and letters to the editor. These should be sent, along with any address changes, to:

The Editor,
NJC Bulletin,
415 Second Street, NE, Suite 100,
Washington, DC 20002.

Clip and Send to: National Jewish Coalition
415 Second Street, NE, Suite 100
Washington, D.C. 20002

☐ **YES I'm different!**

I would like to learn more about the National Jewish Coalition. Please send me membership information.

Name _____

Address _____ Phone (H) () _____

(O) () _____

U.S.-Soviet Trade And Soviet Jewry

"The so-called problem of Jews in the Soviet Union does not exist." With these words, the Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, dismissed the issues of Soviet anti-Semitism and Jewish emigration. Speaking during the Geneva summit last month, Mr. Gorbachev appeared to confirm what many had begun to fear: that Soviet Jewry will suffer under his rule as they did under his predecessors.

With the Kremlin hiding behind the pretense that U.S. concern for Soviet Jewry is unfounded, the Reagan administration faces a problem. Although the commitment of the President and his aides to securing freedom for Soviet Jews is indisputable, the question of whether the United States will pursue a policy that can achieve that goal remains in doubt.

To overcome the Soviet pretense that Soviet Jews are happy and content, and achieve increased emigration, the United States must make such an increase a condition for concessions in areas in which the Soviets have particular interest. The area in which the Soviets are most eager to see improvement, and which therefore is most likely to yield dividends in terms of emigration, is that of bilateral trade.

As he seeks to bring growth to the abysmal Soviet economy, Mr. Gorbachev has made modernization a priority. In order to modernize, however, he needs extensive non-agricultural trade with the United States. Although the President refuses to relax restrictions on trade in high-tech, strategic items, he is under pressure to improve trade in other areas.

Congress has long recognized the value of linking U.S.-Soviet trade to human rights issues. In December, 1974, it passed the Jackson-Vanik amendment, tying trade benefits to the Soviets to the Kremlin's emigration policy in an effort to persuade the Soviet Union to allow greater emigration.

But in recent months, the lessons of Jackson-Vanik have been neglected. As tension between the superpowers eased prior to the summit, so did trade rela-

tions, and during 1985, the Soviet Union has doubled its orders of American-made machinery and equipment. Despite receiving nothing in return for this improvement—only 345 Soviet Jews have been allowed to leave during the past three months—some propose that U.S.-Soviet trade relations be eased further.

In fact, Commerce Secretary, Malcolm Baldrige, recently joined U.S. business leaders at a conference in Moscow which examined ways to improve the trade climate. While in the Soviet capital, Mr. Baldrige spent three hours discussing the issue of trade with Mr. Gorbachev and also met separately with the Soviet trade minister. At a press conference afterwards, he expressed satisfaction with the talks, saying that he hoped that commerce between the two countries would soon improve. Despite being pressed on the subject of human rights, the Secretary declined to discuss the fact that there has been little emigration in recent years to justify the increase in trade he supports.

Those who advocate this approach, though, claim that if the United States demonstrates goodwill towards the Soviets, they will respond by allowing more Jews to leave. To support this position, advocates point to Soviet indications of a willingness to comply with this arrangement.

The Kremlin, however, has frequently shown itself to be adept at hinting at flexibility only to maintain its inflexible

position. When Secretary of State, George P. Shultz, travelled to Moscow to prepare for the summit earlier this year, for example, reports circulated that a sharp increase in Soviet Jewish emigration was imminent. Some two hundred Jews who had applied for permission to emigrate were called into government emigration offices, suggesting that they would soon be allowed to leave. The anticipated surge in emigration, however, failed to materialize. Yet by successful manipulation, the Soviets succeeded in temporarily defusing a contentious issue at a sensitive time.

The notion of giving the Soviets the trade they seek without a guarantee of greater emigration appears dubious. Only by adhering to the linkage laid down by Jackson-Vanik can the United States force the Kremlin to release more Jews. In short, this means that no improvements in bilateral trade should be allowed unless and until the Soviets have established a record of allowing Soviet Jews to emigrate.

In July of this year, Joseph Mendelovich, a former prisoner of conscience who now chairs the Soviet Jewry Education and Information Center in Jerusalem, appealed for support for such a policy. Speaking for all Soviet Jews, he wrote: "Any attempt at renewal of trade . . . with the Soviets, any attempt to cancel the Jackson-Vanik amendment under present circumstances, would be viewed by us as a betrayal of our struggle."

Trade is the most potent weapon available to the President as he seeks to free Soviet Jews. For their sake, let us hope that the Commerce Department and others in the administration choose to use it wisely.

C.G.

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

415 Second Street, NE., Suite 100
Washington, DC 20002

Non Profit
Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Wash., DC
Permit No. 27396

NJC Bulletin

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

INSIDE

VICE PRESIDENT ON TERROR AND ANTI-SEMITISM	2
CONGRESS FACES BUSY AGENDA	3
SEN. HELMS ON ISRAEL	4
CAMPAIGN '86	7

JANUARY 1986

Convincing America to Fight for Soviet Jewry

There was a bitter irony in the prison sentences that five Washington-area rabbis served recently in a federal correctional facility in Virginia. The rabbis had broken the law by protesting Soviet anti-Semitism within 500 feet of the Soviet embassy in Washington, D.C.

The sentences were greeted with consternation by many, both Jewish and non-Jewish. Despite declining to prosecute thousands of anti-apartheid demonstrators who had protested illegally in front of the South African embassy, the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia had seen fit to charge the rabbis.

But the irony of the rabbis' imprisonment lies beyond the mere fact that they were prosecuted when others were not. For, as the rabbis were being punished by a federal court for publicizing the plight of their fellow Jews, steps were being taken within the business community that would weaken efforts to achieve freedom for Soviet Jewry.

In early December, Secretary of Commerce, Malcolm Baldrige, accompanied a group of 400 American businessmen on a visit to Moscow for the annual meeting of the U.S.-U.S.S.R. Trade and Economic Council. While in Moscow, Mr. Baldrige also met with the Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, and with the Soviet trade minister. The purpose of the meetings was to develop trade and economic ties between the two countries.

Mr. Baldrige's visit is the most visible example of the efforts now underway to make it easier for the Soviets to acquire the technology they seek to modernize their economy. But, as Mr. Gorbachev pointed out after the Geneva summit, there are significant "political obstacles" that have to be overcome before U.S.-

Soviet trade relations can be improved.

The business world is eager to see these obstacles removed. The overwhelm-

ing majority of the 400 businessmen who visited Moscow signed a statement urging the administration to de-link the issues of human rights and Jewish emigration from that of trade. Having noted Mr. Gorbachev's irritation at the political obstacles that now hinder trade, these businessmen are seeking to eliminate the policies that have kept the Soviet market closed to their corporations' products.

Continued, page 6



Washington-area rabbis shortly before their arrest outside the Soviet embassy.

Union of Councils for Soviet Jews

Gramm-Rudman: Opening Pandora's Box

Congress has returned to deal with the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings "Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act", passed with bi-partisan support last December. This legislation forces the government to eliminate the federal deficit by 1991.

Federal spending cuts required to reduce the deficit are certain to be far-reaching, involving some very tough choices. Inevitably, major focal points of Jewish concern will be affected by the act—social welfare programs, America's

strategic defense capabilities, and aid to Israel.

Gramm-Rudman aims to reduce the budget deficit incrementally over the next five years. Thus, the budget deficit will be reduced to:

- \$171.9 billion in 1986
- \$144 billion in 1987
- \$108 billion in 1988
- \$72 billion in 1989
- \$36 billion in 1990
- \$0 in 1991.

Continued, page 5

CAPITALWire

BUSH CONDEMNS TERRORISM, ANTI-SEMITISM

On December 15, Vice President George Bush addressed Yeshiva University's Hanukkah Convocation. Primary among the topics he discussed were terrorism and anti-Semitism, and the threat they pose to the values of Judaism and western civilization.

Terrorism, Mr. Bush suggested, cannot be excused by saying that "one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter." He said that terrorism perpetrated against innocent civilians is an evil which threatens to undermine the values and traditions of our civilization. "We must be clear about this—the goal of the terrorism we see in the world today is to undermine western democratic society." He indicated that to understand this, one has only to recognize the states which sponsor terrorist attacks—Iran, Libya, Syria, Nicaragua, North Korea, South Yemen, Cuba and the Soviet Union. These, and any other governments or organizations that embrace terrorism, he stated, should be treated as outcasts.

First among these, he asserted, is the PLO. With an appalling record of sponsoring terrorist attacks against innocent civilians, PLO leaders now want to be included in peace negotiations. But he reaffirmed that the administration will neither recognize nor negotiate with the PLO until that organization "explicitly accepts Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, renounces what it calls 'armed struggle' and recognizes Israel's right to exist."

According to Mr. Bush, anti-Semitism represents a serious challenge to civilized values. In this regard, the Soviet Union has been a prime offender—both in its treatment of Soviet Jewry and in its attempts to spread "obscene invective" in such bodies as the United Nations.

Just as American values require us to fight against racism, Mr. Bush argued, so too they require us to support the forces of freedom and democracy worldwide. Thus, "Israel—because of our shared values—is our foremost strategic friend in the Middle East." Understanding that only a strong, viable Israel can protect

these shared values, the Vice President asserted that the administration is "committed to maintaining Israel's qualitative edge in armaments over any possible combination of adversaries."

Summing up his speech, Vice President Bush pointed out the right—indeed the duty—of Jews and others to advocate the causes and values that they hold most important. "I've heard criticism of the American Jewish community for its vocal support of Israel and of other issues its members believe in. I don't go along with that. I, for one, am deeply disturbed when . . . someone takes the allegedly traitorous conduct of a single individual—such as Jonathan Pollard, the man accused of [spying for Israel]—and tries to make generalizations about 'divided loyalties.'" These innuendos are little different from overt anti-Semitism, he said. "Let no one tell you that the causes you advocate represent 'special interest politics.' Citizen advocacy strengthens our country. It gives America vitality. It's part of why America is so great."

ISRAEL EXPANDS DIPLOMATIC TIES

Sources in Washington report that Togo and Gabon may be the next African states to recognize Israel. This information comes at a time when a number of countries in Africa, Europe and Central America are moving to establish, upgrade or re-establish relations with Israel.

Last month the president of Ivory Coast, Houphouet-Boigny, issued a joint declaration with Israel's prime minister, Shimon Peres, pledging to renew relations between the two countries. According to the Israeli Embassy in Washington, details and appointments are expected to be worked out very soon.

The Ivory Coast was one of several African states that succumbed to Arab pressure and broke diplomatic relations with Israel in 1973 and 1974. In 1982, Zaire was the first of these to re-establish ties, followed shortly after by Liberia.

On January 16, it was announced that Spain would become the 79th nation to maintain full diplomatic relations with Israel. At a meeting with Arab envoys in Madrid, Spanish Foreign Minister

Ordonez gave notice of his government's plans to recognize Israel, saying that the two nations would exchange ambassadors within six months. Prior to this announcement, Spain, which has traditionally maintained a policy of friendship with the Arab world, was the sole member of the western bloc to shun Israel.

In Central America, El Salvador, which had no resident ambassador in Israel last year, recently appointed Enrike Gutfreund to reopen and move San Salvador's embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. Neighboring Honduras has announced that it will open an embassy in Tel Aviv. The new Honduran ambassador is expected in Israel sometime in February. The Israeli government, which has had diplomatic relations with Honduras for some time, plans to open an embassy in Tegucigalpa as soon as possible.

GRASSLEY OPPOSES RACISM IN FARM BELT

Senator Charles E. Grassley (R-Iowa) has condemned the rising tide of racism and anti-Semitism in the nation's farm belt. In a statement submitted to the *Congressional Record* in December, Senator Grassley warned that racist groups have been exploiting the depression among rural communities and farm families to stir up hatred.

The Senator cited examples of this racism. Neo-Nazi groups have charged that the farm economy is hurting because of an international Jewish conspiracy or because blacks and Jews are importing America's former enemies—the Japanese, Chinese and Vietnamese.

Iowa's farm economy, Grassley explains, is in a great state of turmoil, and as a result, people who are desperate have begun to believe this kind of vindictive rhetoric. Bigotry and hatred, he said, will poison life in rural America, stealing hopes of recovery. Recovery can be achieved, he believes, only if the real causes of the farmer's problems are recognized and remedied.

We must take every opportunity to improve our economy, he said. "Recovery is possible if we all work together. . . . Let's not let unfounded conspiracy theories and hatred take that hope away from us."

Congress Faces Busy Agenda In '86

The second session of the ninety-ninth Congress is expected to be a hectic one. As November's congressional elections approach, legislative action will take a back seat to election-year politics.

Overshadowing all other legislative activity throughout both this session and those in the coming years will be the implementation of the **Gramm-Rudman-Hollings** deficit-reduction measure which the President signed into law at the end of 1985. The deficit-reduction act mandates cuts in a wide range of domestic programs, as well as in the defense and foreign aid budgets.

Following the President's submission of his budget on February 3rd, Congress will consider how to divide the cuts. As a result, groups of every political stripe will be vying to protect their special interests from the worst of the reductions (*See article on page 3*).

Other items of importance due to come before Congress in the coming months include:

Tax Reform

The Senate Finance Committee is scheduled to begin hearings in February on the tax reform bill, the administration's major piece of domestic legislation of the session. Senator Robert Packwood (R-OR), the committee's chairman, has indicated that, in drafting the Senate bill, he will follow the basic guidelines set forth in the version passed by the House in December.

The House bill retains the deduction for state and local taxes, paying for the deduction by setting the maximum tax rate for individuals at 38 percent instead of at 35 percent as proposed by the President. The bill also lengthens the time over which the depreciation in the value of plant and equipment may be written off by investors, and requires many businesses which do not now pay taxes to do so. The White House and some congressional Republicans have expressed concern over some of these provisions, and a prolonged Senate debate is expected.

Arms Sales to Arab Countries

As Congress returns from the holiday

recess, legislators will again face the issue of the administration's proposed arms sale to Jordan. The arms package includes such sophisticated weaponry as 40 F-16 or F-20 fighter planes, Mobile Hawk missiles, AIM 9P4 missiles, Bradley troop carriers and Stinger missiles.

The proposed package has met with stiff resistance on Capitol Hill. The arms would pose a serious security threat to Israel, escalating the arms build-up in the region. At a time when the Jordanian leader, King Hussein, has done little to achieve progress towards peace with Israel, opponents are reluctant to support the sale. As a result, a congressional resolution passed in November required that the administration wait until March 1st before proceeding with the sale unless direct peace negotiations between Jordan and Israel had previously begun.

Administration efforts to gain approval for the package after March 1st will encounter resistance from the 74 senators and 286 members of the House who previously opposed the sale. The National Jewish Coalition, which played a central role in earlier efforts which achieved the sale's postponement, will be in the forefront of the opposition to the sale as the March 1st deadline approaches.

In addition to the Jordanian arms package, the administration is also expected to propose a sale of weapons to Saudi Arabia. The package, worth \$1 billion, includes Harpoon, Stinger and Sidewinder missiles and Black Hawk combat helicopters and serves to upgrade weapons previously sold to the Saudis.

This package would serve to erode Israel's technological edge over her neighbors and would strengthen the Saudis, who have frequently worked to thwart U.S. policies in the Middle East. As a result, this sale, too, is expected to be strongly opposed in Congress.

The Genocide Treaty

Ratification of the Genocide Treaty, which codifies genocide as an international crime against humanity, is expected to be considered by the Senate in early February. Despite its importance as a fundamental human rights document, it has remained unratified since it was first submitted for Senate consideration thirty-eight years ago.

In a letter to Senate Majority Leader, Robert Dole (R-Kan.), the NJC urged approval of the treaty. The letter also called for approval of eight provisions drawn up by Senators Richard Lugar

(R-Ind.), Jesse Helms (R-NC) and Orrin Hatch (R-Utah). The provisions, which were adopted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, address concerns over the treaty's impact on the constitutional rights of American citizens.

Aid to Democratic Forces in Nicaragua

With the expiration in March of the appropriation of humanitarian aid to anti-Sandinista forces in Nicaragua, a major vote on a new aid package has been scheduled. In addition to proposing the continuation of humanitarian aid to the guerrillas, the package also calls for military assistance to be provided. The package is expected to be the subject of a major confrontation between House Democrats and the administration.

Since seizing power in 1979, the Sandinista government has established a record of human rights abuse and anti-Semitism, formalizing its policies under a state of emergency imposed late last year. The regime provides support for a variety of terrorist groups, including the PLO, and has supplied arms and other aid to rebels in near-by countries such as El Salvador and Colombia.

The National Jewish Coalition has supported efforts to restore democracy to Nicaragua, and backs the provision of both humanitarian and military aid to the democratic anti-Sandinista forces.

Aid to Anti-Communist Forces in Angola, Afghanistan and Cambodia

Renewed efforts to continue aid to anti-communist forces in Afghanistan and Cambodia will be made during the coming session. Although considerable opposition to such aid is anticipated from congressional liberals, advocates of continued funding are thought to have sufficient votes to gain approval.

Less certain of passage is a proposal to provide assistance to the democratic forces fighting the Soviet-backed government of Angola. Reps. Claude Pepper (D-Fla.) and Jack Kemp (R-NY) are leading an effort to provide humanitarian support for two rebel groups, UNITA and the FNLA. In a separate bill, Rep. Mark Siljander (R-Mich.), a co-sponsor of the Pepper-Kemp legislation, has proposed that UNITA receive military aid.

The NJC has supported the Pepper-Kemp proposal, testifying at congressional hearings on the issue during the

Continued, page 7

Senator Helms On Israel

Speaking for the first time before a major Jewish organization, Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC) expressed strong support for Israel and accused Syria and Iran of each being "responsible for half the terror and tension now coming out of the Middle East."

Helms addressed 150 representatives of the Jewish and conservative communities attending a January 22nd dinner forum co-hosted by the National Jewish Coalition and new right leader Paul Weyrich's Coalitions for America. Sam Kane, a member of the NJC's executive committee and chairman of the forum, said that "We of the National Jewish Coalition believe that it is in our interest to seek out conservatives and establish a relationship with them. There are differences between us, but on those issues we have agreed to disagree. For it is our belief that in America today, more unites Jews and conservatives than divides us."

In introducing Senator Helms, NJC chairman, Richard J. Fox, welcomed the opportunity that the evening provided for each community to hear from the other. Fox lamented the lack of communication which had long prevented Jews and conservatives from cooperating on matters of common concern. However, Fox noted that since leaders of the two communities had begun to seek out one another, they were finding that on many issues, particularly in the area of foreign policy, Jews and conservatives had much on which to agree.

Excerpts from Senator Helms' speech follow:

Sen. Helms: When I first heard about the meetings between the National Jewish Coalition and Coalitions for America, I thought to myself, "this is natural." That's not what some other people said. Some people thought it rather strange and improbable that representatives of the Jewish and conservative communities should be sitting down together to discuss political strategy.

In some quarters there has been an unexamined "assumption" that the natural allies of the Jewish community were all on the liberal wing of the political spectrum. To me, that assumption

amounts to a libel against Jewish common sense. . . .

. . . . There is one issue . . . of intense interest to both Jews and conservatives that needs discussion at meetings such as this. I am talking about Israel. I believe that Israel is vital to the survival of western civilization.

I know that some people are thinking . . . "Aha! I've never heard Jesse Helms talk like that before. He sure has changed. We know he has one of the worst anti-Israel voting records in the Congress." What they really mean . . . is that I have always voted against foreign aid, no matter whom it is for

"I believe that Israel is vital to the survival of western civilization."

Senator Jesse Helms

No, Jesse Helms hasn't changed I have always been opposed to foreign aid and now many Israelis realize that excessive dependence upon U.S. foreign aid has compromised Israel's independence of action, and has resulted in U.S. State Department pressures which could threaten Israel's survival. . . .

. . . . I once thought that some portions of the West Bank were negotiable in the search for a settlement. But with the massive military build-up in Syria in the past six years, aided and directed by the Soviets, I do not see how any part of the territory now administered by Israel can be given up.

Indeed, I am appalled by the evident conviction of the State Department that Syria is somehow a "workable" ally for the West. In fact, I believe that Syria is responsible for at least half of the terror and tension now coming out of the Middle East. The other half comes out of Iran. . . .

The secular, Pan-Arab plan of Syria, and the fundamentalist, Pan-Moslem plan sponsored by Iran, both are in collision with the West, and together are the source of the terrorism directed against Israel and the West. No rhetoric against Qadaffi, or even armed strikes against Qadaffi will stop this terrorism. We can stop Qadaffi, but not Syria and Iran with such plans.

. . . The so-called "peace process" with Jordan inevitably must fail. Syria is opposed to an independent Palestinian state created out of supposed Greater Syrian territory, especially such a state associated with Jordan, itself illegitimate in Syria's eyes. Iran is opposed to Arafat's plan for a secular state . . . which would even be a threat to Jordan itself. . . .

None of these countries can compromise with Israel, since Israel stands for values which are in total opposition to both Pan-Arab racial ideology and Moslem fundamentalism. They have never accepted the existence of Israel, and I doubt that they ever will.

Continued, page 6



Sen. Helms (center) with Israeli ambassador, Meir Rosenne (left) and NJC chairman, Richard J. Fox.

Gramm-Rudman,

continued from page 1

Each year, the President and Congress will have an opportunity to design a budget that achieves the reduction required by the legislation. If they fail to do so, spending across the board will be automatically cut or "sequestered" to assure that the target level is met. Automatic cuts will slice evenly into military and unprotected domestic programs. Social Security, eight other low-income programs, and interest on the national debt will be exempt—items that comprise approximately 50% of the non-military budget.

Because only seven months remain in the current financial year (1986), the usual process has been amended. This year, Gramm-Rudman fixes a mandatory automatic cut of \$11.7 billion.

According to the administration, this year's cut can be achieved with a minimum of disruption. Military cuts will be applied to a range of weapons, spare parts and research programs. Under a provision which grants the President some flexibility in allocating cuts in the 1986 budget, military pay and the Strategic Defense Initiative have been sheltered from sequestration. According to federal officials, the \$5.85 billion reduction in unprotected domestic spending will be applied across-the-board, with most programs having to share part of the cuts, but with none being cancelled outright.

Most agree that this year's cuts are manageable. But, with the 1986 deficit expected to reach \$220 billion, another round of deeper, less easily absorbed automatic cuts are anticipated next year. Because the deficit is projected to be higher than expected, cuts of \$76 billion will be needed to reach the \$144 billion target for 1987. Such cuts are \$26 billion greater than originally anticipated, making it even more difficult for the President and Congress to reach the mandated target without sequestration.

The President is determined to protect two elements of the "Reagan Revolution"—tax cuts and rearmament—against growing challenges to both. He has accepted the relatively small defense cuts for 1986 in the hopes of convincing Congress to protect defense in the future. Mr. Reagan is expected to propose meeting subsequent deficit targets through cuts in domestic spending only, slicing \$50 billion or more from medical entitlement, retirement programs, and remaining gov-

ernment functions—everything from student aid to Amtrak subsidies.

These proposals are not likely to be greeted with enthusiasm by Congress. Nevertheless, legislators will have to agree to some of the proposals if the less discriminating sequestration is to be avoided. Faced with these prospects, Jewish organizations that receive government grants to provide social services like care and housing for the elderly, child care and refugee resettlement, are worried about the future.

The new law's effect on U.S. defense capabilities should be a subject of concern for American Jews. Under the Reagan administration, the rebuilding of U.S. defenses has gone hand-in-hand with unwavering commitment to the security of America's strategic allies. This has

Sizable defense cuts will result in a growing gap between U.S. and Soviet strategic forces

produced a close strategic relationship between the United States and Israel, a relationship which helps preserve both Israel's security and U.S. interests in the Middle East. Massive defense cuts could weaken the United States and threaten her ability to maintain the level of commitment to U.S. allies worldwide.

According to military budget planners, U.S. strategic forces could be headed for serious trouble. After 1986, the Pentagon will have no flexibility to protect favored programs, and the automatic cuts will be more damaging if Congress and the President cannot agree on another way of reducing the deficit. Expecting Congress to reject Mr. Reagan's 1987 budget, military budget planners have prepared a backup spending package in an effort to divert automatic sequestration. The Pentagon recently disclosed details of \$13.8 billion in budget cuts—marking the end of six years of military buildup. Of the \$13.8 billion, \$5.4 billion would have been spent this year and the rest in the future. According to the Pentagon, sizable defense cuts, considered unavoidable, will result in a slowing of Mr. Reagan's

modernization plan and a growing gap between U.S. and Soviet strategic forces.

The foreign aid budget, which includes economic and military aid to Israel, will also be affected by Gramm-Rudman. Israel received \$1.2 billion in economic aid for 1986 at the beginning of this fiscal year. But following a request from the State Department, Israel offered to return \$51 million in order to help the administration meet the requirements of Gramm-Rudman.

\$1.8 billion in military aid was allotted to Israel for 1986. Under the new law, this aid could be subject to a 4.3% reduction—about \$77 million. Israeli officials predict that this cut is unavoidable, despite an agreement between the two governments that the \$1.8 billion was the minimum required for Israel's defense purposes. Although a tentative agreement was reached for 1987 to raise military aid to \$1.9 billion and to maintain economic aid at \$1.2 billion, Israel fears that the Gramm-Rudman process will prevent these levels from being met.

With a sizable amount to be pruned from the deficit each year, aid levels are likely to be reduced. If the President and Congress can reach appropriate budgets for 1987 and beyond, future cuts could be minimal. But if deeper automatic cuts are triggered, aid levels will be more significantly diminished, impairing Israel's defense capabilities.

Beginning in February, Congress will face intense pressure, as everyone fights to preserve his own programs. With his plan to hold out against tax increases and defense cuts, President Reagan will face efforts by legislators to protect their constituents from the cuts.

But the President and Congress will also be under considerable pressure to compromise in order to avert automatic sequestration and a budget crisis just before November's midterm elections. With 22 Republican seats and control of the Senate at stake, President Reagan and Republicans on Capitol Hill will seek to avoid public discord over the budget.

President Reagan originally embraced Gramm-Rudman enthusiastically, believing that it would "attack budget deficits in the right way." But he may find that solving the deficit problem requires more sacrifice than he bargained for. One thing is certain: under Gramm-Rudman, there will be no easy solutions for America's fiscal problems. Like everyone else, the Jewish community will be seeking to protect its interests, and hoping that the budget ax is not too sharp.

Soviet Jewry,

continued from page 1

The political obstacles that the businessmen are assaulting are the trade restrictions that the past and present administrations have used in the effort to achieve greater Soviet Jewish emigration. Since the passage of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment in 1974, the United States has sought to link improvements in bilateral trade to Soviet behavior on the issue of Jewish emigration. However, the efforts now underway to improve U.S.-Soviet trade come at a time when anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union is increasing and Jewish emigration is decreasing—a time when the Soviets are least deserving of concessions from the United States.

Mr. Baldrige is not alone within the administration in his desire to increase the flow of U.S. goods to the Soviet Union. When Senator Jake Garn (R-Utah) sponsored a bill last March aimed at curtailing Soviet access to hard-currency loans and trade credits, his efforts were opposed by the White House. The Garn Bill would enable the President to ban loans made to the Soviet Union by U.S. banks, loans which help to subsidize Soviet purchases of western goods.

Without such credits, the Soviets would have to find alternative ways to finance their purchases of the industrial technology they need to modernize their economy. The powers the bill would provide would therefore enhance current efforts to persuade the Soviets to increase Jewish emigration. Yet at congressional hear-

ings held at the end of 1985, the administration, represented by Assistant Treasury Secretary, David Mulford, testified against the bill. By opposing even the discretionary powers that the bill would provide, the administration is sending mixed signals to the Soviets concerning its policy of linkage, suggesting a softening of U.S. policy while continuing to call for greater emigration.

Soviet Jewry must not be sacrificed for improved trade.

Why might a shift away from linkage be taking place? The administration is under pressure from several quarters to increase bilateral trade. In addition to the Commerce Department's support for improved trade, many in the State Department and White House are eager to keep alive the "spirit of Geneva" produced at the Reagan-Gorbachev summit. An easing of trade relations, some argue, would represent a gesture of goodwill that could entice the Soviets to allow more Jews to emigrate. Such a gesture, though, would, in effect, reward the Soviets now in the hope that they will earn that reward sometime in the future.

To date, the administration has stopped

short of a total reversal of its policy towards trade and human rights. The issue of Soviet Jewry continues to be raised privately at meetings between U.S. and Soviet officials, such as that between Mr. Baldrige and Mr. Gorbachev. Furthermore, when Mr. Baldrige went to Moscow, he delivered a private message from President Reagan to Mr. Gorbachev in which U.S. concern over human rights was emphasized.

The degree to which the administration is committed to the policy of linkage is soon to be tested. On January 20th of this year, export controls on sales of U.S. oil and gas drilling equipment to the Soviet Union are due to expire. Even if the controls are lifted, little would change: the Soviet market for this equipment is now dominated by European firms. However, the controls carry great symbolic importance. By renewing them, the President would send a clear signal to the Kremlin that his administration is firm in its resolve to withhold trade benefits until the gates of the Soviet Union have been opened to Jewish emigration.

Did the imprisonment of the Washington rabbis mark the beginning of a new administration approach towards Soviet Jewry? It is, as yet, too soon to tell. However, the rabbis' imprisonment has deflected attention away from the efforts to achieve de-linkage. The American Jewish community must recognize the implications of such a development and move quickly to ensure that linkage is not abandoned for the sake of business interests.

Helms, continued from page 4

This is why Israel is so important to the survival of western civilization. Our . . . roots spring from that soil, no matter whether we are Christian or Jewish. That's why we must consider Israeli control of all the territories it now administers as non-negotiable.

[My recent trip to Israel, made me realize] . . . how closely intertwined are the religion, culture, and history of our own nation and [those of] Israel . . . And it is there in Judea and Samaria where that history took place. . . .

. . . . In so many ways, this is what the negotiations are all about. This area called the West Bank is the heart of ancient Israel, the very land that the Bible is all about. Nor is it just history or religion that is involved . . . these areas are crucial to the modern defense of

Israel. . . .

If Jordan and Israel are to negotiate, what will they negotiate about? In other words, what will the situation look like if Jordanian-Israeli negotiations are successful? Will the result be an Israel that is no longer viable as a nation and that can't be defended. . . . ?

There is no piece of paper sufficiently strong to uphold regional arrangements that do not meet the dictates of common sense. The animosity of the neighboring Arab countries does not spring from concern for the present inhabitants of the so-called West Bank, or the fact that Israel exercises administrative and military control over that territory. The animosity springs from the fact that Israel proper exists. Concessions on the West Bank territory would only whet the appetite of animosity, not appease it. . . .

Thus the strategy of separating Israel from Judea and Samaria is only the first step. By imposing indefensible boundaries on Israel, Israel is disarmed. . . .

Why the U.S. State Department would consider imposing such a fatal condition on Israel defies rational analysis. It is not for the United States, or even a U.S. senator, to lay down pre-conditions that virtually guarantee an Israel whose defense depends entirely on the fragile goodwill of its Arab neighbors and on massive amounts of U.S. cash to keep that fragile Arab goodwill alive. Such an Israel would not be an Israel worthy of the name, and I will never be a party to trying to put Israel in that position.

(A complete transcript of Senator Helms' remarks is available on request from the National Jewish Coalition)

Campaign '86: New York, Florida and Wisconsin

Among the twenty-two Republican senators facing reelection this year are the sixteen freshmen who won their seats in the Reagan landslide of 1980. Included in this freshman class are three senators who were elected with little Jewish support but who have been among Israel's staunchest and most consistent friends in the Senate. They are Senators Alfonse D'Amato (R-NY), Paula Hawkins (R-Fla.) and Robert Kasten (R-Wisc.).

New York

Sen. D'Amato won election in 1980 with only four percent of New York state's substantial Jewish vote, defeating the incumbent Republican senator Jacob Javits and Democrat Elizabeth Holtzman in a three-way race. On taking office, he became a leader of the pro-Israel effort in the Senate, using his seat on the Senate Appropriations Committee to help increase and improve the terms of U.S. aid to Israel. As chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, he has also been active in monitoring Soviet compliance with the Helsinki Accords, including the provisions dealing with human rights.

Polls indicate that D'Amato has succeeded in building a considerable base of Jewish support. This support is expected to translate into both campaign resources and votes, with D'Amato expected to draw a greater proportion of the Jewish vote than even Senator Javits drew at the height of his popularity. The 39 percent of the Jewish vote won by Javits in 1974 is the highest ever attained by a Republi-

can senator from New York.

D'Amato had been expected to face a tough challenge either from Elizabeth Holzman or from the former vice-presidential candidate, Geraldine Ferraro. Both, however, declined to contest the seat, as did a third Democrat, American Stock Exchange chairman, Arthur Levitt, Jr. Levitt was reported to have been dissuaded from running by major campaign contributors who told him that they were satisfied with D'Amato's record, especially with regard to Israel.

Florida

The junior senator from Florida, Paula Hawkins, faces a much tougher reelection challenge than her New York colleague. Her opponent is the state's popular governor, Democrat Robert Graham.

Although Graham enjoyed an early lead in the polls, recent independent polling data show that Hawkins has gained ground, closing the gap between the two candidates. Hawkins' improved standing is partially the result of a television campaign which raised public awareness of her record over the past five years.

For two years during her tenure, Sen. Hawkins held a seat on the Foreign Relations Committee where she proved very supportive of Jewish concerns. She became a leader of efforts on behalf of Soviet Jewry and was one of only four freshman Republican senators to oppose the 1981 AWACS sale to Saudi Arabia.

She later relinquished her seat on the Foreign Relations Committee in order to enable her to focus on other issues on

which she has been active, such as the problems of the aged and abused children. She has, however, remained in the forefront of support for Israel and Soviet Jewry, currently opposing the administration's proposal to sell arms to Jordan. If re-elected, Hawkins is expected to rejoin the Foreign Relations Committee.

Wisconsin

Robert Kasten's defeat of long-time Democratic senator Gaylord Nelson five years ago was one of the major upsets of the 1980 elections. As a self-described neo-conservative in a predominantly liberal state, though, Robert Kasten could face a tough battle for reelection. With the state's governor, Anthony Earl declining to run, Kasten's Democratic opponent is expected to be Ed Garvey, former Deputy Attorney General and executive director of the National Football League's Players' Association.

Kasten is a member of the Budget and Appropriations Committees, two of the most powerful in the Senate. Along with Rep. Jack Kemp (R-NY), he led the movement among Republicans for tax simplification.

He is also chairman of the Appropriations Committee's subcommittee on foreign operations which deals with foreign aid to Israel. In this capacity, he has become a leading advocate of U.S. aid to Israel. He supported the increases in aid to the record 1986 level of \$4.5 billion and helped achieve the conversion of aid from a combination of grants and loans to all grants.

Kasten was another of the freshman Republicans who opposed the 1981 AWACS sale. He was also a strong backer of the U.S.-Israel free-trade area agreement signed last year. This unprecedented accord will eliminate trade barriers between the two countries, opening the important U.S. market to Israeli goods.

Legislation, cont'd from p. 3

last session. A major legislative battle over the Angolan aid proposal is expected, however, with liberal members opposing U.S. support for the two groups.

Affirmative Action

President Reagan is considering revisions to Executive Order 11246 which sets affirmative action hiring obligations for federal contractors. The revisions, proposed by the Attorney General, Edwin

Meese would eliminate the requirement that contractors employ quotas to achieve a work force that reflects the racial makeup of the surrounding area.

Should the President decide to amend the Order, the Democratic-controlled House of Representatives is expected to pass legislation reversing the action.

The NJC has written to the President urging that he adopt Mr. Meese's revisions, thereby returning the Order to its original intent of ensuring equality of opportunity without discriminating.

NJC Bulletin is published monthly by the National Jewish Coalition.

MAX FISHER
Hon. Chairman
RICHARD J. FOX
Nat'l Chairman

GEORGE KLEIN
Co-Chairman
GORDON ZACKS
Co-Chairman

CHRIS GERSTEN
Executive Director
ANTHONY KORENSTEIN
Editor
SUSAN HOFFINGER
Associate Editor

NJC Bulletin welcomes comments and letters to the editor. These should be sent, along with any address changes, to:

The Editor,
NJC Bulletin,
415 Second Street, NE, Suite 100,
Washington, DC 20002.

Terror: The Need For An Effective Response

In 1981, Ronald Reagan placed the fight against terrorism at the center of his administration's foreign policy, pledging "swift and effective retribution for terrorist acts." But the President's weak response to the most recent atrocities at the Rome and Vienna airports reveals a policy lacking in substance. Almost without exception, the President has pursued a dangerous course of talking tough and acting weak.

On January 7, the President announced plans to sever all remaining direct American commercial ties to Libya, and, once again, to seek help from Western Europe in isolating Muammar Qaddafi. On its own, the United States has only limited economic leverage over Libya. With U.S.-Libyan trade already at relatively low levels, administration officials concede that the U.S. ban would do little to end Qaddafi's sponsorship of terrorism unless our allies follow suit.

Experience should teach us that this is not likely to occur. Since taking office in 1981, Mr. Reagan has attempted to make a pariah of Qaddafi. Although there has been a consensus among our European allies and Arab friends that Qaddafi is a menace whose activities should be curtailed, there is no consensus with regard to what action should be taken against him. This was demonstrated when the Islamic Conference Organization—which includes such countries as Saudi Arabia and Tunisia, that profess to be pro-Western—voted 45-0 to support Libya in its confrontation with the United States.

In Europe, Italy, West Germany, France, Spain and Great Britain still maintain extensive financial relations with Libya, even though Qaddafi has sponsored terrorist attacks perpetrated in these countries. Europe's governments still have not learned that appeasement will only make it easier for aggressors to carry out their bloody operations. The attacks on Italy and Austria—two of Europe's leading advocates of cooperation with the PLO—demonstrated that governments that attempt to buy the friendship of terrorist groups will be sorely disappointed.

In contrast to the United States and

Europe, Israel continues to press its message that terrorist activities carry a heavy price, both for the perpetrators and for those governments that support them. The threat of Israeli military retaliation has prevented Syria, Jordan, and most recently Tunisia, from allowing their countries to be used as centers from which terrorists may launch attacks.

Retaliation cannot be left to Israel alone. Terrorism threatens the entire free world.

But retaliation cannot be left to Israel alone. Today, terrorism is a problem that afflicts the entire free world. The Vienna-Rome slaughter is only the latest manifestation of terrorist aggression aimed against Western targets. Libya, Iran and Syria have been waging anti-Western campaign, aided and abetted by the Soviet Union and its allies. All are committed to undermining moderate govern-

ments by supporting terrorist groups—the PLO as well as Italy's Red Brigades, West Germany's Red Army Faction, and insurgents in Guatemala and El Salvador.

Responsibility for taking resolute action to counter this threat to the free world falls to its leader—Ronald Reagan. Until now, though, the United States has looked to Israel to fulfill that role. President Reagan has indicated that he is ready to assume leadership by calling for a coordinated ban on trade with Libya. But sanctions are merely a first signal that terrorism will not be tolerated. In the end, only applied force will drive the point home.

Within the administration, however, there is resistance to taking resolute action unless certain criteria are met. These include protecting innocent lives from risk, identifying and targeting only those terrorists responsible for killing Americans, and, in this case, establishing conclusively that Libya sponsored the terrorist activity. These criteria are so strict that, if applied fully, they would almost never permit force to be used. By hiding behind such criteria, while expecting Israel to act according to less stringent standards, the United States is employing a double standard with regard to the use of force.

President Reagan has indicated that he is not permanently forsaking the use of force: "If these measures do not end Qaddafi's terrorism, I promise you that further steps will be taken." Concerned about the 1,500 Americans still living in Libya, he has ordered them to quit Libya by February 1. In the coming weeks, he may be preparing for significant military action, or may once again be posturing with no plan of applying strength. The time is ripe for President Reagan to provide leadership to the free world. Let us hope that he does so.

C.G.

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

415 Second Street, NE., Suite 100
Washington, DC 20002

Non Profit
Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Wash., DC
Permit No. 1062

NJC Bulletin

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

INSIDE

GENOCIDE TREATY PASSED **2**

SDI IMPLICATIONS FOR
ISRAEL'S DEFENSE **3**

CAMPAIGN '86 **5**

FEBRUARY 1986

Shcharansky Release: A Perspective

On February 11, Anatoly Shcharansky, human rights activist and campaigner for Soviet Jewish emigration, walked across the Glienicke bridge to freedom after eight years of detention in the Soviet Gulag. Shcharansky's release was the high point of a carefully orchestrated East-West exchange that has been hailed as one of the most concrete and dramatic results of the November Reagan-Gorbachev summit meeting.

Although there has been conjecture as to precisely how the release came about, it is clear that the personal commitment and determination of both President Reagan and Secretary of State George Shultz were instrumental in the process. From the summit meeting in Geneva to lower level discussions, Shcharansky's case was raised at every opportunity by administration officials.

Political analysts agree that it was the Reagan administration's strong posture at Geneva, its commitment to a strong defense and unflagging determination to pursue development of the Strategic Defense Initiative, which persuaded the Soviets to come to the negotiating table. The decision to release Shcharansky in the wake of the summit was made in the hope that such a gesture would soften the American position on bilateral issues such as trade and arms control.

Some, however, have adopted the Soviet interpretation of the events leading up to the release: that it was the warming of relations at Geneva which created a "climate" in which the swap could occur. According to this view, Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union is linked to America's pliability on issues of concern to the Soviets. But what brought the Soviets to the table in the first place,

and what, in the weeks following, persuaded them to release Shcharansky, was, in fact a tough U.S. stance and consistent public pressure.

Harvard law professor Alan Dershowitz, Mr. Shcharansky's U.S. attorney, maintains that his client's release was the product of an "eclectic diplomacy"—years filled with contacts and pressures from various quarters. Certainly, the efforts of Shcharansky's wife Avital and of the tireless Soviet Jewry activists were important. The letters, rallies and petitions provided constant pressure on Congress and on successive administrations to work for Shcharansky's freedom.

This public and diplomatic effort also

had its impact on the Soviet Union. The relentless pressure from the West may have made a nuisance of Shcharansky, making his continued detention more costly to the Soviet image than his release.

It has also been suggested that the decision to allow Shcharansky to emigrate is part of the Soviet campaign to crush whatever remains of the refusenik movement in Russia. Ya'acov Gorodetsky, former leader of the Jewish cultural movement in Leningrad, announced that the Gorbachev regime was interested in releasing key Zionist dissidents in order to further weaken the movement by depriving it of leadership. Gorodetsky and Rabbi Eliahu Essas, another Jewish leader, were released just before Shcharansky, in early February.

Soviet policies of repression have lar-

Continued, page 4

From AWACS to Jordan Arms

The Reagan administration's recent decision to postpone the sale of \$1.1 billion-worth of arms to Jordan represents a singular victory for the Jewish community. It is a victory which contrasts sharply with the defeat suffered by the pro-Israel community in 1981 when it failed to prevent the sale of AWACS (Airborne Warning and Control System) surveillance aircraft to Saudi Arabia.

The Jewish community failed in 1981 largely because it had neglected to develop working relationships with those outside the Democratic Party. In a Republican-controlled senate, GOP support was essential to block the sale. But with-

out significant ties to the Jewish community, and under strong pressure from the administration, 41 of 53 Republican senators voted to provide AWACS to Saudi Arabia.

The AWACS defeat marked a turning point. Having failed to prevent a sale that threatened to undermine Israel's security, the Jewish community was compelled to re-think its political strategy. In doing so, the community came to recognize that in order to ensure the preservation of Israel's security, it had to foster broad bi-partisan support for Israel.

The decision to take a new approach

Continued, page 4

CAPITAL Wire

ARAFAT INQUIRY URGED

In a letter to the Attorney General, Edwin Meese, forty-four senators have urged that the Justice Department give top priority to the investigation of PLO chairman, Yasir Arafat's involvement in the 1973 murder of U.S. ambassador to the Sudan, Cleo Noel, and his charge d'affaires George Moore. Documentary evidence, including a tape recording of a telephone conversation between Arafat and the terrorists holding the diplomats, reportedly exists showing that Arafat directly ordered the murder of the two men.

The letter, initiated by Senators Charles Grassley (R-Iowa) and Frank Lautenberg (D-NJ), states that "these allegations, if substantiated, leave little doubt that a warrant for Arafat's arrest should be issued and a criminal indictment filed against him."

Among the signers of the letter are thirteen senators who comprise a majority of the Senate Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction in the matter. In addition to Sen. Grassley, these members include Senators Paul Laxalt (R-Nev.), Orrin Hatch (R-Utah), John East (R-NC), Jeremiah Denton (R-Ala.), Arlen Specter (R-Penn.), Mitch McConnell (R-Kentucky), Joseph Biden (D-Del.), Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.), Howard Metzenbaum (D-Ohio), Dennis DeConcini (D-Ariz.), Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.) and Paul Simon (D-Ill.)

HUMAN RIGHTS GROUP CITES SANDINISTA ABUSES

The London-based human rights monitoring group Amnesty International has released a report outlining a "...pattern of intimidation and harassment" of dissidents by Nicaragua's Marxist Sandinista government. The report's publication comes in the wake of Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega's announcement on

October 15, 1985 of a new state of emergency which suspended virtually all civil liberties in his country. Its contents confirm White House assertions that the Sandinistas are escalating their attack on basic freedoms in Nicaragua.

According to the Amnesty report, the Nicaraguan government is guilty of arresting political, business and labor leaders, holding and interrogating them under harsh conditions. Detained in small cells, the report states, prisoners must endure the constant glare of an electric light bulb, threats of indefinite imprisonment and being awakened every ten minutes during the night. Using special powers under a state of emergency imposed in March 1982, the Interior Ministry's State Security Service routinely holds prisoners incommunicado in response to Nicaraguan rebel attacks. The report also noted a number of unsolved killings and disappearances of persons detained by Sandinista forces in 1981 and 1982.

Nicaraguan Ambassador to the United States Carlos Tunnermann defended his government's detention policy. Tunnermann claimed that the prisoners "...were not arrested because they are civilian leaders but because they were helping to destabilize the country's economy, which is against the law, or preaching against the draft or cooperating with the counter-revolutionaries..."

LIBYA AIDS SANDINISTAS

According to a report in the London *Sunday Times*, Libya has provided a total of \$400 million in aid to Nicaragua's Sandinista regime over the past four years. In addition, Libya has also supplied the Managua government with aircraft, arms, oil and military advisors, as well as civilian pilots to replace those who have left Nicaragua since the 1979 revolution.

Roman Catholic and human rights organizations also report that forty Libyans are currently working with Nicaragua's political police, advising them on "interrogation techniques." These organi-

zations also report that Libyan advisors are stationed in army training camps near the war zones in Nicaragua, while a further forty Libyans are reported to be assisting the army in the Managua suburb of La Colonia las Colinas.

The strong Libyan-Nicaraguan connection has reportedly been strongly backed by the Sandinista Interior Minister, Tomas Borge. Borge, whose ties to radical Arabs have grown since he received training in PLO camps during the 1960s, praised the regime's ties to Libya during a 1984 trip to the Libyan capital, Tripoli, saying "Our relationship with Libya is eternal."

GENOCIDE TREATY RATIFIED

On February 11, the Genocide Convention Treaty was ratified by the Senate, thirty-seven years after it was first submitted. The treaty, which codifies genocide as an international crime, passed by an 83-11 margin.

Although the organized Jewish community has been urging the Senate to ratify the Convention for nearly four decades, these attempts repeatedly failed. In the end, it was a combination of President Reagan's support for the treaty and the efforts of leading Senate Republicans that achieved passage.

After the President called for ratification at an October 1984 convention of B'nai Brith, Senate Foreign Relations Committee chairman, Richard Lugar (R-IN) held hearings on the treaty. After months of negotiation, the committee endorsed the treaty, and it was brought to the floor for a final vote by the Senate Majority Leader, Robert Dole (R-KS).

Several senators who ultimately voted for the treaty did so in the face of considerable constituent opposition. Senators Mack Mattingly (R-GA), Don Nickles (R-OK), Paula Hawkins (R-FL), Jim Abdnor (R-SD), Mark Andrews (R-ND) all cast their votes in favor of ratification because of the treaty's symbolic importance as a human rights document, especially to the Jewish community.

SDI: IMPLICATIONS FOR ISRAEL'S DEFENSE

In March of 1983, President Reagan formally announced a pioneering defensive strategy predicated on the notion that it is better to save lives than avenge them. The President's plan, the Strategic Defensive Initiative (SDI), was designed to replace the doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction, a dangerously obsolete doctrine of holding civilian population centers hostage to nuclear attack.

In Israel, a nation faced with the ultimate challenge of ensuring self-survival, the U.S. invitation to participate in SDI was met with great interest. After preliminary discussions, Israeli Defense Minister Yitzhak Rabin formally responded to the American invitation agreeing "in principle" to participate in the initial research and development phases of the SDI program.

The strategic, economic and political implications of Israeli involvement in SDI are significant. The most immediate benefit to Israel will be the development of missile interception technologies. The invitation sent to the allies specifically states that the program will "examine technologies with potential against shorter-range ballistic missiles."

The use of surface-to-surface missiles against major cities in the Iran-Iraq war has alerted the Israeli defense establishment to the urgent need for such technologies. Syria, Israel's foremost adversary, has already deployed highly accurate and lethal SS-21 missiles capable of reaching Israeli population centers, air bases, storage depots and other vital facilities. General Daniel O. Graham, founder and director of High Frontier, the organization from which many of the concepts for SDI arose, has noted these implications for Israeli defense planning. Obtaining defenses against the SS-21s, he said, "would enable Israel actually to defend itself...rather than simply deter attack by threat of retaliation."

While the threat of retaliation has served Israel well in the past, this option may no longer be effective in light of the changing realities of modern warfare and the increasingly fanatical character of Israel's enemies. Such threats are unlikely to deter enemies whose scant regard for human life is reflected in suicide bomb-

ings in Lebanon and the use of poison gas in the Gulf War. To guard against the growing ballistic missile threat, Israel must move beyond deterrence to develop a defense against missile attacks.

In a recent paper presented in testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, W. Seth Carus, a military analyst for the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), called attention to Israel's growing vulnerability to missile attack. Carus pointed out that by 1990 Arab armies will possess large numbers of surface-to-surface missiles armed with sophisticated warheads. As the Arab inventory of SS-21 missiles grows, he noted, a missile attack on vital Israeli installations would leave the country dangerously vulnerable. Existing technologies alone, he added, would be insufficient to defend against such attacks, even if Israel knew of them in advance.

Dr. Robert O'Neil, director of the London-based International Institute for Strategic Studies, has also pointed out the inherent benefits of Israeli participation in SDI. O'Neil believes that Israel's involvement will allow her to remain abreast of the technologies central to a tactical missile defense.

Avram Schweitzer, a journalist with Israel's respected newspaper, *Ha'Aretz*, perhaps best describes the benefits of SDI interception technologies: "To be in on this kind of technology...could mean the purchase of peace for Israel, or more realistically, the imposition, by non-aggressive means, of a permanent state of non-belligerence along its borders."

Besides the utilization of missile interception technologies, Israel will also benefit in other ways from participation in SDI. Israel's industrial future will be

greatly enhanced by being at the forefront of the SDI technological revolution. The program will provide jobs and revenue for the Israeli defense industry, as well as research funds for the country's scientific community. Spinoffs could provide similar boosts for the country's high-technology and consumer industries.

America will also benefit from Israeli involvement. Israel's high state of technological and scientific capability can be utilized in SDI research. The Israel Defense Forces demonstrated an unforeseen mastery over command, control, and communications (C3) by downing over 80 Syrian jet fighters with no losses during the recent Lebanon conflict. Their expertise in battle-tested technologies would immensely enhance development of weapon systems. In addition, the Israelis are known for their rapid turn around times from research and development to making weaponry operational. Israeli involvement can act as a catalyst, accelerating the pace of the entire SDI program.

Israel's acceptance of President Reagan's invitation to participate in SDI should yield invaluable dividends particularly in the critical area of development of ballistic missile interception technologies. Unable to match the quantitative advantage in weaponry of her numerous adversaries, Israel's involvement in SDI should enable her to maintain a qualitative edge necessary for survival.

Israel can only be part of this strategic, technological, economic and political revolution if SDI is funded and promoted by Congress. With the help of Israel's friends in America, SDI may prove to be the most important project ever undertaken by the two allies.



A Soviet SS-21 battlefield support missile on a mobile launcher. Missiles of this type have been acquired by Syria and deployed against Israel.

Jordan Arms

continued from page 1

was strengthened by the growing realization that, with some encouragement, Republicans could become staunch allies. President Reagan's strong support, in particular, has encouraged the Jewish community to build closer ties with Republicans, based on mutual interest. The community has come to understand that the Republican Party's internationalist view of foreign policy, which favors support for America's democratic friends around the world, accommodates, quite naturally, strong support of Israel.

Under the Reagan administration, U.S.-Israel relations have never been better. The President and Republicans on Capitol Hill maintain that American passivity in foreign affairs encouraged Soviet expansionism and have seized foreign aid as an invaluable tool for combatting the Soviet threat. Thus, aid to Israel has increased from under \$2 billion to over \$4 billion, and has been converted from a combination of grants and loans to all grants. In addition, the strategic relationship between the two countries has been strengthened and a U.S.-Israel free trade area established.

With the emergence of groups such as the National Jewish Coalition which have been building strong relations with the

GOP, Republicans are now playing a leading role in supporting Israel. This development has been reinforced by the growing number of pro-Israel political action committees (PACs). These groups have recognized the importance of generating support among candidates across the country, not only those in areas with large Jewish populations. Thus, they have built ties with Republicans from all parts of the country, helping to encourage their support for Israel. As these relationships have grown, so have PAC contributions to Republicans, further reinforcing good relations. According to a *Washington Post* survey, the ten largest of these PACs gave a total of \$167,150 to Republicans as opposed to \$139,450 to Democrats in the first six months of 1985.

The fact that Congress recently overwhelmingly rejected administration efforts to push through the Jordan arms package, attests to the success of the Jewish community's efforts to recruit Republican support. Last October, Congress passed a joint resolution which called for the Jordan arms sale to be delayed until March 1 unless there was a major breakthrough in the peace process. The resolution passed on a voice vote in the House and by 97-1 in the Senate. In the Senate, 28 Republicans co-sponsored the resolution, including Jesse Helms (R-NC), Steve

Symms (R-ID), Gordon Humphrey (R-NH), Thad Cochran (R-Miss.), Don Nickles (R-OK), Charles Grassley (R-Iowa), Mack Mattingly (R-Ga.) and Frank Murkowski (R-AK)—senators who, on most matters, form a solid bloc of support for the administration.

The overwhelming coalition that the Jewish community built in opposition to the sale forced the White House to halt its efforts to push the arms package until Hussein took real steps to enter negotiations with Israel. Under the joint resolution, the administration would have been free to proceed with the sale after March 1. But in the face of solid bipartisan congressional opposition, the White House reached an agreement on January 30, promising not to go ahead with the sale if Congress would not put forward resolutions to block it.

Clearly, the recent victory testifies to a greater political sophistication on the part of the Jewish community. The lesson learned by the pro-Israel community since 1981—that it is crucially important for Jews to have a bipartisan influence on American politics—has been vindicated by the clear victory on Jordan arms. In the end, only by building relationships with Republicans as well as Democrats can Jews guarantee that their concerns are a factor in America's decision-making.

Shcharansky

continued from p. 1

gely silenced open protest in Russia. Little remains of the wide-spread movement for human rights and religious freedom that was prevalent during the 1970s. Criminal trials, exile and harassment have driven underground whatever activity has not yet been extinguished.

In the final analysis, it is Moscow's perception of Soviet interests which determines who, as well as how many, shall be allowed to emigrate. And it was such a calculated consideration of Soviet interests which prompted the decision to free Shcharansky. It is clear, however, that the Soviet Union is trying to replay its old message: "Look how nice we can be if you behave nicely toward us." And that old message is just as false as ever.

While presenting a moment of triumph, it is clear that Shcharansky's release does not signal a general relaxation of Soviet policy toward dissent and Jewish emigration. Just six days after Shcharansky was freed, seven young Jews were arrested in

Leningrad and subjected to harassment and bullying for holding an informal Jewish gathering. Leningrad activists report that the raid was part of a general process of increased pressure on religious groups.

Letters written by Andrei Sakharov and smuggled out of Russia to the West provide fresh evidence of Soviet repression. Not unexpectedly, descriptions of the torture he and his wife Yelena Bonner experienced while isolated in the closed city of Gorky contrast sharply with official Soviet pronouncements that the two have been living in "normal conditions."

While Soviet officials claim that all Jews who want to quit the Soviet Union have done so, American Jewish activists report that 400,000 of some two million Jews living in the Soviet Union have applied to get permission to leave but have been refused.

Clearly, Shcharansky's release represents only a very small gesture on the part of the Soviets who would have us believe that they have reformed. Thus, while Jews everywhere celebrate Shcha-

ransky's repatriation to Israel and his victory over repression, the Jewish community must not ease its efforts to secure the release of all those who wish to gain freedom. As the struggle is resumed, it should be remembered that the crucial factor in convincing the Soviets to release Shcharansky was American strength. Only by maintaining this strength and continuing to communicate our resolve can more substantial victories be won in the future.

NJC Bulletin is published monthly by the
National Jewish Coalition.

MAX FISHER
Hon. Chairman
RICHARD J. FOX
Nat'l Chairman

GEORGE KLEIN
Co-Chairman
GORDON ZACKS
Co-Chairman

CHRIS GERSTEN
Executive Director
ANTHONY KORENSTEIN
Editor
SUSAN HOFFINGER
Associate Editor

NJC Bulletin welcomes comments and letters to the editor. These should be sent, along with any address changes, to:

The Editor,
NJC Bulletin,
415 Second Street, NE, Suite 100,
Washington, DC 20002.

Campaign '86: Louisiana and Arizona

The pro-Israel community stands much to gain from the retirement of two Senate veterans, Barry Goldwater, Republican of Arizona and Russell Long, Democrat of Louisiana. While serving in the Senate, both Long and Goldwater have generally opposed military and economic aid packages to the State of Israel and have voted in favor of the sale of sophisticated weaponry to Saudi Arabia.

With the retirement of Long and Goldwater, GOP strategists are campaigning hard to win these two open seats as part of their national effort to retain Republican control of the Senate. The Republican candidates for the seats, both currently members of the House of Representatives, are Rep. John McCain of Arizona and Rep. W. Henson Moore of Louisiana. Both have established impressive records of support for Israel and have close and longstanding ties with the Jewish community.

John McCain: Clear Favorite in Arizona

In one of the most promising Senate races for the Republican Party, Arizona's John McCain is a highly-popular candidate with a strong lead in the polls. Well known as a decorated war hero, McCain spent five years as a prisoner of war in North Vietnam after being shot down during a mission over enemy territory. While in captivity he resisted torture and intimidation and refused to comply with his captors' demands that he denounce the United States.

McCain, who has visited Israel five times, serves on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, where he recently led the effort to block the administration's proposed arms sale to Jordan. McCain also spearheaded efforts among pro-defense conservatives for increased military aid and strategic cooperation with the State of Israel and played a critical role in assuring funding for the development of Israel's Lavi fighter aircraft.

Following the decision of the state's popular Democratic governor, Bruce Babbitt, not to seek election to the Senate, McCain's prospects have brightened.

The announced Democratic candidate, Richard Kimball, trails McCain by thirty points in the polls. Kimball has sought to gain ground by attempting to generate opposition in the state to McCain's votes for critical items in the U.S. defense build-up, such as the MX missile, the B1 bomber, and funding for the Strategic Defense Initiative.

Louisiana: Hopes for First GOP Senator

In Louisiana, Republican W. Henson Moore, a five-term congressman from Baton Rouge, is running for the Senate seat being vacated by Russell Long. Long, who was first elected in 1948, is one of the most senior members of the Senate.

Although Louisiana has consistently elected Democratic senators throughout its history, Moore's popularity has led Republicans to hope that this tradition will be broken in 1986. Moore has maintained a significant lead both in early polls and in fundraising. His opponent, Rep. John Breaux, of Crawley, Louisiana, is a six-term conservative Democrat representative from Louisiana's seventh congressional district.

Moore leads his opponent by nearly six-to-one in campaign fundraising. At the end of the January 30th filing period, Moore reported \$1.9 million "cash on hand" compared to Breaux's \$300,000. This factor is likely to be crucial: since both candidates lack high name recognition in the state, each must rely heavily on expensive paid-television exposure.

Perhaps the most difficult obstacle for Moore is the city of New Orleans, which accounts for a third of the state's electorate. The city contains a large proportion of Louisiana's black population, a group which has voted overwhelmingly for Democratic candidates in statewide races.

Moore also has to overcome the considerable power of the state's Democratic machine, an organization dominated by the personality, legacy and family of Huey Long, the most influential political figure in the state's history. However, Moore demonstrated his ability to win in the face of such opposition when he became the first Republican elected in his district since Reconstruction. Since then, he has proven himself an effective representative of the state's interests on the House Ways and Means Committee.

With the help of an increasingly effective state Republican organization, Moore has taken an early lead in the polls. New Orleans pollster, Edward Renwick, whose January, 1986 poll put Moore ahead by

nearly two-to-one, stated, "no matter how you analyze the poll, there's no way you could turn Breaux into the leader." Breaux's poor showing may be due in part to his close ties to Louisiana's governor, Edwin Edwards, who is currently under federal indictment on charges of corruption.

The Louisiana race is unusual in that the election will be decided on September



Rep. John McCain.



Rep. Henson Moore.

27 as a result of state's open-primary system. Under this system, candidates from the two parties run in a primary against each other. If any candidate wins more than 50% of the vote, he becomes the only candidate in the November general election and thus is automatically elected. The Louisiana race, therefore, will serve as an important barometer of GOP prospects for the November elections.

Henson Moore has visited Israel and has built a strong record of support for Israel. He has been a consistently opponent of sophisticated arms sales to Arab states, opposing both the 1981 AWACS sale to Saudi Arabia and the recent proposed transfer of advanced weaponry to Jordan. Moreover, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, he helped bring about the final passage and full implementation of a free trade area agreement between the United States and Israel.

U.S. Foreign Policy and American Jewry

During the 1970s, America watched with growing concern as the Soviet Union expanded its global influence unchallenged by the United States. The American people responded by calling for America to resume its leadership of the free world. American Jewry, however, continued to advocate policies that encourage Soviet expansion and today threaten the security and welfare of the State of Israel.

The evidence supporting a reassessment of American foreign policy was overwhelming. In Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam, Ethiopia, Mozambique and Angola, forces backed by the Kremlin seized power, placing their nations firmly in the Soviet orbit. In Nicaragua, the Marxist Sandinistas began the process of creating a Soviet-style dictatorship in Central America. In Poland, the independent trade union, Solidarity, was suppressed, and in Afghanistan a massive Soviet force established a brutal occupation.

Meanwhile, the Kremlin was stifling dissent at home. Even as the Helsinki Accords on human rights were signed, the Kremlin continued its policies of repression. Shortly after, the independent group set up to monitor Soviet compliance with the Accords was mercilessly crushed, its leaders arrested and imprisoned.

Throughout, America remained weak and impotent. Proponents of neo-isolationism believed that the United States was largely responsible for many of the world's conflicts. Under President Carter, this view became enshrined in government policy: as the Soviet empire engulfed nation after nation, the United States sat back and watched.

The weakness demonstrated by the Carter administration in the face of Soviet expansion led revolutionary Iran to believe that it, too, could challenge U.S. power with impunity. This resulted in the Iranian hostage crisis and 444 days of American anguish and humiliation.

The election of Ronald Reagan in 1980 was a response to the impotence that had left America bereft of credibility in the eyes of the world. Americans overwhelm-

ingly rejected neo-isolationism, and supported President Reagan's defense build-up and the U.S. intervention in Grenada. America understood how U.S. weakness had provoked Soviet aggression.

Americans came to recognize that the Soviet Union is a totalitarian state which vigorously pursues policies of repression at home and expansion abroad. These policies, it became clear, pose a threat,

Jews must recognize that support for Israel can no longer be limited to pushing for foreign aid.

not only to its own citizens, but to the entire world. The American people came to believe that only through policies that promote democracy, support U.S. allies and defend U.S. interests can Soviet designs be thwarted.

Jews, too, have become increasingly aware of the aggressive nature the Soviet Union as the Kremlin has relentlessly

persecuted Soviet Jewry and aided radical Arab nations in their conflict with Israel. But unlike the American people at large, most Jews have failed to draw the conclusion that follows from this awareness: that the motivations behind the Soviet threat to Jewish interests are the same as those behind Soviet expansionism and repression around the globe.

Led by the Jewish establishment, American Jewry has resisted the policies that would strengthen U.S. interests in the face of Soviet expansion. Enthralled by the liberal movement which they helped nurture, many Jews continue—unquestioningly—to support the liberal neo-isolationism which advocates America's abdication of her responsibilities as leader of the free world. Were they to examine the implications of such an abdication, many would understand that such neo-isolationism endangers the interest the Jewish community has in keeping Israel secure.

Unless the United States is willing to project its power in defense of its allies and its global interests, Israel's security would be jeopardized. If the Soviets perceive a United States unwilling to protect its interests in Nicaragua—in America's own back yard—why would they believe that the United States would come to the aid of an Israel faced with a concerted, Soviet-backed Arab attack?

American Jews must recognize that their support for Israel can no longer be limited to pushing for foreign aid and opposing arms sales to Arab countries. For unless the United States demonstrates its willingness to defend its allies worldwide, Israel will be vulnerable. For the sake of Israel and of America, Jews must work to create and maintain a climate in which America's commitment to freedom is both strong and credible.

C.G.

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

415 Second Street, NE., Suite 100
Washington, DC 20002

Non Profit
Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Wash., DC
Permit No. 1062

NJC Bulletin

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

INSIDE

SAUDI ARMS SALE PROPOSED

2

"THE UNCERTAIN CRUSADE":
CARTER'S HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY

3

CAMPAIGN '86

5

APRIL 1986

OPINION

Qaddafi Confronted

By authorizing the American fleet to cross Muammar Qaddafi's self-proclaimed "line of death" in the waters of the Gulf of Sidra, President Reagan took a stand for the rule of law and reason in the international arena. As the fleet engaged in peaceful maneuvers in international waters and airspace, Qaddafi's forces fired upon U.S. planes, in an attempt to test American determination as well as to assert Libya's unrecognized territorial claim to the Gulf. U.S. forces responded, destroying four Libyan naval vessels and a shore-based radar installation.

While the U.S. purpose in entering the Gulf was to assert the right of free passage through its waters, the need to do so was made all the more pressing by Qaddafi's overt sponsorship of terrorism. In returning the hostile fire, the U.S. forces demonstrated that the United States will not submit to threats of violence, be it military or terrorist, from those who seek to undermine Western interests.

The American action also had the following positive effects:

- (1) It succeeded in humiliating Qaddafi, showing the absurdity of his claim to sovereignty over the Gulf.
- (2) It succeeded in embarrassing the Soviet Union by demonstrating the inferiority of Soviet equipment and training.
- (3) It enhanced the credibility of U.S. power in the eyes of a world accustomed to an America willing to be humiliated without responding.

Despite the numerous benefits of the U.S. action, some liberals have criticized the President for unnecessarily provoking Qaddafi and for needlessly risking American lives. Nevertheless, the use of force in response to attack is not only justifiable, but necessary for the preservation of U.S. interests.

The President's action in this instance represents an important step, following, as it does, the invasion of Grenada and the forcing down of the EgyptAir jet carrying the murderers of Leon Klinghoffer. In each case, the United States has shown that it will respond to attacks against U.S. interests, with force if necessary. By continuing to respond to such attacks, the security of the entire West will be enhanced.

Senate Passes, House Rejects, Contra Aid

On March 27, the Senate approved President Reagan's modified request for \$100 million in aid to the anti-Sandinista resistance by a vote of 53-47. That request would provide for immediate disbursement of \$25-30 million in non-lethal aid and defensive weaponry—chiefly anti-helicopter equipment to resist attacks from the Soviet Hind helicopters recently acquired by the Sandinistas. The remainder of the aid would be distributed after ninety days unless the Sandinista government enters into negotiations with the rebel forces during the interim.

The President's compromise request was offered to the House on March 19 in an effort to close the voting gap in favor of aiding the "contras". Despite that effort, on March 20 the House rejected the President's request by 222-210. Sixteen Republicans broke ranks and sided with 206 Democrats to oppose aid to the embattled rebel forces.

The House Democratic leadership has agreed that on April 15 it will vote on the resolution passed by the Senate. The House is also likely to be considering amendments constructed by the Democrats which would further dilute the President's request. Most political analysts believe, however, that the legislative process will eventually result in some aid being disbursed to the freedom fighters. But the amount finally delivered may be less than what was called for in the original package.

The Sandinistas' recent invasion of Honduras has reinforced the case that timely aid is crucial. However, with the original defeat of the President's request in the House, and alternative packages being considered, it is clear that a conclusive outcome for aid to the rebels will be delayed by at least four weeks.

COMMENTS?

The NJC Bulletin welcomes comments and letters from its readers. These should be sent to:

The Editor
NJC Bulletin
415 Second St., N.E., Suite 100
Washington, D.C. 20002

The nations of the free world should applaud this display of American determination to defend freedom. For friends of Israel, in particular, the action will be a welcome sign that the Jewish state is no longer alone in its war against terror and intimidation.

C.G.

CAPITAL Wire

SAUDI MISSILE SALE PROPOSED

On March 8, 1986, the administration sent to Congress a proposal for a \$350 million missile package to be sold to Saudi Arabia—a scaled down version of the \$1 billion package originally proposed in January of 1986. The larger package was to include thousands of missiles as well as upgrades for F-15 fighters, helicopters and electronic warfare systems. The scaled-down package would supply Saudi Arabia with Stinger, Sidewinder and Harpoon missiles for protection of that nation's shipping lanes in the Persian Gulf.

When the required twenty-day informal notification period ends on Friday March 28, the White House may proceed with formal notification, announcing the precise nature and delivery date of the package. Presently, however, it is carefully watching developments in Congress. To date, 58 senators and 147 representatives have joined efforts opposing the sale.

The pro-Israel community has indicated that it wishes to avoid a battle with the administration over the package. While maintaining its long-standing objection in principle to the sale of U.S. arms to Israel's avowed enemies, the Israeli government is eager to avoid open confrontation with what it regards as the most sympathetic U.S. administration ever. The American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) recently announced that it will not be opposing the sale. According to one Senate proponent of the sale, AIPAC "does not think this one is worth fighting."

TERRORISM TASK FORCE REPORTS

"Terrorism is a fundamental challenge to the security and strategic interests of the United States." This was the overwhelming view of the Vice President's Task Force on Combatting Terrorism. Released after six months' study by fourteen senior White House officials, the

Task Force report states that "terrorism permits small nations and organizations to attack U.S. interests...in a manner which, if done openly, would constitute acts of war.

The attacks at the Rome and Vienna airports, and the hijackings of TWA flight 847 and the cruise ship Achille Lauro are "representative of what has become a growing trend toward international terrorism" over the past decade. Since the early 1970s, American citizens and installations have been attacked approximately once every 17 days. The report concludes that American efforts to "promote democratic societies with guaranteed personal freedoms" are being undermined.

"United States policy," the report maintains, "is based upon the conviction that to give in to terrorist demands places even more Americans at risk. This no-concession policy is the best way of ensuring the safety of the greatest number of people." The U.S. Government is prepared to act in concert with other nations or, when necessary, unilaterally in response to terrorist acts. According to the Task Force, military action could deter future terrorist attacks and encourage other nations to take a harder line in the future.

The report also offers several legislative recommendations, including making the murder of U.S. citizens abroad a federal crime. "The Departments of State and Justice should continue urging Congress to adopt legislation, such as the Terrorist Prosecution Act of 1985," introduced into the Senate by Arlen Specter (R-PA).

REPORT REVEALS SANDINISTA ABUSES

A recently published report provides a wealth of important information about the Sandinista government's human rights violations. *Inside the Sandinista Regime: A Special Investigator's Perspective*, issued by the State Department last month, testifies to the Sandinistas' deliberate attempts to conceal evidence of their stained human rights record.

The report details testimony of Alvaro Jose Baldizon Aviles, formerly Chief Investigator of the Special Investigations Commission of the Nicaraguan Ministry of the Interior. That commission was created by the Nicaraguan government in late 1982 to conduct internal investigations of reported governmental abuses, in response to accusations made by the Inter-American Human Rights Commission and others. As an official of the commission, Baldizon was given considerable authority to investigate allegations of malfeasance.

Mr. Baldizon defected from Nicaragua's Sandinista government last July. He claims that he discovered that the Sandinistas had carried out a systematic reign of terror and had concealed all evidence of their actions. They had assassinated political opponents, massacred large groups held to be subversive, and had beaten and tortured those accused of being enemies of the regime. Baldizon reports that his findings were suppressed and rarely led to official action against the criminals.

A TRIBUTE TO JACOB JAVITS

If ever a man represented the strength and determination of America, it was Jacob Javits. A victim of poverty and prejudice in his youth, he sold lithograph supplies by day and attended Columbia University Law School at night.

Jacob Javits will be remembered as one of the brightest and most devoted legislators in this nation's history. Eight years as a congressman, 24 years as a senator, he plunged into almost every policy debate of the postwar era. In the area of foreign affairs, he was a vigorous defender of world-wide freedom and staunch supporter of the State of Israel. Despite suffering from a debilitating nerve disorder in recent years, Javits maintained an impressive load of speeches and correspondence until his death on March 7.

As we strive to fulfill America's great potential, we would do well to heed the words of Jacob Javits: "Love your country and don't be afraid to stick your neck out." The National Jewish Coalition, along with the rest of America, mourns the loss of this special American.

Joshua Muravchik's

"The Uncertain Crusade"

A Book Review by David Cahn

The translation of concern for human rights into a coherent and effective foreign policy is a complex and difficult endeavor. The problems encountered by the administration of Jimmy Carter in developing and implementing such a policy are explored in *The Uncertain Crusade* (Hamilton Press, New York, 1986), a first book by Joshua Muravchik. Muravchik, a former aide to the late Senator Henry M. (Scoop) Jackson (D-Wash.) and Senator Daniel P. Moynihan, is presently a senior fellow at the Washington Center for Near East Policy.

The Carter human rights policy, Muravchik writes, originally emerged as a compromise between the Scoop Jackson and George McGovern factions of the Democratic Party. The Jackson Democrats focused on the large scale abuses of totalitarian communist regimes, while the McGovernites were more concerned with the repression of opponents by rightist dictatorships. The two factions found common ground by agreeing that Carter's human rights policy would seek to combat abuses in both leftist and rightist countries with equal vigor.

Although in the first days of the Carter presidency, the State Department spoke out strongly against Soviet violations of human rights, within a month, these statements ceased. Faced with Kremlin protests which threatened to jeopardize the arms control agreement so desired by Carter, U.S. criticism of Soviet human rights abuse was muted for three years until the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

This U.S. response to Soviet protestations reflected the administration's willingness to overlook human rights abuses in those East-bloc and Third World countries with which Carter hoped to cultivate better relations. In order to avoid the tension and embarrassment that would result from U.S. protests against human rights violations in these countries, the administration preferred to ignore, or at least to down-play, the abuses. Thus, instead of focusing on the systematic and pervasive denial of human rights in the Eastern Bloc, the Carter policy concen-

trated on specific cases of abuse, usually by rightist dictatorships in weak countries which were friendly towards the United States.

Muravchik points out, however, that no effective human rights policy can ig-

Overall, the Carter policy must be judged a failure.

nore the connection between a nation's political system and its attitude towards human rights. Democracy is rooted in individual rights and self-government. Dictatorships, on the other hand, may deny these rights, and totalitarian dictatorships, such as those in the communist

world, take this abuse to an ideological extreme in which the individual exists only to serve the state.

This inconsistency in the Carter policy was defended on grounds that U.S. expectations and interests differed from country to country and that U.S. influence with rightist dictatorships, such as Guatemala and Uruguay, was greater than those of the left, such as Romania and Hungary. The result, however, was that U.S. human rights policy was least rigorous in precisely those countries—especially those ruled by radical-left regimes—where rights are most severely abused.

But even in rightist-ruled countries where the Carter administration did seek to improve human rights, its policies achieved only limited success. The administration used foreign aid sanctions against violators including Pinochet's Chile and Bokassa's Central African Empire in an effort to reduce abuses. This was ineffective and often counter-productive. All such punitive measures accomplished was to distance the Carter administration from the regimes it considered oppressive, thereby reducing any influence the United States might have had in convincing them to moderate their policies.

Nevertheless, Muravchik does credit

Continued, page 4

Exercise in Accountability

(The following article appeared in the 'Wall Street Journal' on March 11, 1986).

The Reagan administration has thrown down the gauntlet to House Democrats: Either aid the contras in Nicaragua or take the heat for what happens in Central America. Faced with accepting responsibility, the House Democrats and the liberal community generally are whining about "McCarthyism."

The Democrats have nothing to fear, of course, if they're right that there is no harm in allowing the consolidation of a communist government in Nicaragua. They can go ahead and defeat contra aid in the March 19 vote, and nothing bad will happen. Indeed, if the Sandinistas turned to literacy campaigns, left their neighbors alone and negotiated a settle-

ment with the Contadora group, the Democrats could claim much credit. They could go to the voters saying they blocked a reckless adventure; why are they so affronted at being given this opportunity?

They are affronted, of course, because they know their policy is wrong. Despite the words he feels he needs to mouth, Rep. Richard Gephardt is not such a fool as to believe the Sandinistas are respecters of a free press and private property. When Sen. Jim Sasser complains that the contras "are not an effective military force," he understands full well that this is because Congress cut off military aid when the contras were making rapid progress in 1984, and because the Soviets have been stuffing the Sandinistas with tanks and attack helicopters. Speaker Tip O'Neill does not for a minute believe that "smart diplomacy" could make Nicaragua turn out like the Philippines.

The Democrats understand that if the

Continued, page 4

Accountability, *cont'd.*

Sandinistas remain in power, they will grow increasingly totalitarian and increasingly a threat to their neighbors. The Democrats understand that there will be no negotiated settlement, that Central America will remain in turmoil. They understand that with the contras fading from lack of supplies, this vote will give the Sandinistas a free ride. They smart when White House aide Pat Buchanan writes that in the contra vote they are either with the president or with the communists. Their complaint is that Mr. Buchanan's division is wrong; their real fear is that it is right.

How many more elections do the Democrats want to lose, after all, by running on a platform of American weakness? A glance at the op-ed page of the *Washington Post* shows that Mr. Buchanan's rhetorical onslaught succeeded in no less than resurrecting George McGovern himself as the spokesman for the Democratic position. Jimmy Carter, Walter Mondale and the San Francisco convention cannot be far behind. If Nicaragua does keep Central America in turmoil, a generation of Republicans will be able to point to March 19 as the day the Democrats gave it away.

This predicament has the Democrats

writhing. They recognize that whatever the polls say about the contras, on national-security issues their party is fundamentally out of step with the electorate. (Indeed, they probably would have no chance of defeating contra aid if their House majority were not swelled by gerrymandering.) They can no longer support the Sandinistas; the last time they did, Danny Ortega slapped them in the face with his Moscow junket. They can no longer rail against American imperialism; they have just applauded a great imperial venture in the Philippines. So they are reduced to arguments about good manners. They assert that they are being ill-treated. They protest that to point out the likely outcome of their policies is to question their patriotism.

And, of course, they importune the administration to compromise—which is to say, let the Democrats have the policy and the administration have the blame. Vote some aid, but on the condition the contras be starved another six months. Giving the contras just enough aid to stumble on with no prospect of success is cynical, but it is also a brilliant solution to the Democrats' political predicament. They can say that it was the administration's policy that failed. This ploy has in fact worked repeatedly in the past, but so far talk of the administration compro-

mising seems to be mostly the Democrats grasping at straws.

What is different this time is precisely that Mr. Reagan has decided not to fuzz the issue but to sharpen it, not to compromise but to insist on an up-or-down division. The vote-counters say he faces an uphill battle, and it is no surprise that he should lose in the House's packed committees. From outside the Beltway the impressive thing is that he won even one. House Armed Services Chairman Les Aspin pushed the aid through in a thirty-second voice vote, not even letting Rep. Pat Schroeder speechify. It is a sign that some Democrats learn from painful experience.

The president has warned House Democrats that if they grab the reins "history will hold them accountable." It will be fascinating to watch the House Democrats come March 19; sometimes making the opposition responsible produces a responsible opposition.

Reprinted by permission of the 'Wall Street Journal', © Dow Jones & Company, Inc., 1986. All Rights Reserved.

Editor's Note: On March 20, House Democrats voted against the President's aid request by 206 to 46 and on March 27, Democratic Senators opposed it by 36 to 11.

Muravchik, *cont'd.*

the Carter policy with "some small overall beneficial impact" on human rights around the world. In Indonesia, for example, the Carter policy helped ensure that democratic elections were held despite the Jakarta government's desire to cancel them. Moreover, in Argentina, Muravchik writes, "pressures brought by the Carter administration helped bring about an end to 'disappearances'."

But overall, the Carter policy must be judged a failure. While the administration did achieve certain limited benefits raising the level of respect for human rights in some countries, it "achieved little in the realm of its indirect goals—restoring American pride, winning the admiration of the Third World, capturing the ideological initiative..." Muravchik also reminds the reader that any benefits that were achieved also brought with them losses, such as those in Nicaragua and Iran.

Muravchik offers a solution to the dilemmas involved in the development

and implementation of a coherent and effective human rights policy. Such a policy, he says, is essential to combatting communism which today is the greatest enemy of human rights. But "to resist communism effectively, the United States must oppose it both in the realm of arms and in the realm of ideas."

To ignore the former, he says, would be calamitous. To do so would strengthen the enemies of democracy and human rights until only in America would these values survive intact. In pursuing the latter, though, consistency is essential, consistency tempered with common sense concerning how extensively a country's human rights situation can in fact be improved over a limited period. However, Muravchik writes, "U.S. human rights policy should give high priority to providing moral support to persecuted democrats and dissidents wherever they are found," be they in the Soviet Union, mainland China, Saudi Arabia, the Philippines or South Korea.

In *The Uncertain Crusade*, Joshua

Muravchik has made a valuable contribution to an understanding of the U.S. role in human rights during the Carter administration. More importantly, he has given us much to think about for the future improvement of the dignity of man.

David L. Cahn is a public policy consultant with extensive experience in government and foreign affairs.

NJC Bulletin is published monthly by the National Jewish Coalition

MAX FISHER RICHARD J. FOX
Honorary Chairman National Chairman

GEORGE KLEIN IVAN BOESKY GORDON ZACKS
Co-Chairman Finance Chairman Co-Chairman

CHRIS GERSTEN
Executive Director

The NJC Bulletin welcomes comments and letters to the editor. These, along with any address changes, should be sent to:

NJC Bulletin
415 Second Street, N.E.
Suite 100
Washington, D.C. 20002

ANTONY KORENSTEIN
Editor

SUSAN HOFFINGER
Associate Editor

Campaign '86: Georgia and North Dakota

GEORGIA

Georgia Republican Mack Mattingly was elected to the Senate in one of the major upsets of 1980. Relatively unknown at the time, he narrowly beat four-term Democratic senator Herman Talmadge, who was charged with financial improprieties. Now, as Mattingly faces reelection, he does so with broad support throughout this heavily Democratic state.

Mattingly is a moderate Republican who has built close ties with Georgia's senior senator, the powerful and well-respected Democrat, Sam Nunn. Mattingly has made a name for himself as a proponent of the line-item veto, giving the President authority to veto specific budget items.

Mattingly was elected with little Jewish support. Since taking office, however, he has reached out to the Jewish community, both in Georgia and elsewhere. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, he has supported high levels of aid to Israel and an amendment providing funds for Israel's Lavi aircraft project.

Senator Mattingly has become increasingly sensitive to the need to oppose U.S. arms sales to Arab nations hostile to Israel. In 1985, he was involved in the effort to stop Saudi Arabia from acquiring American arms. Mattingly signed the joint resolution opposing the administration's proposed arms sale to Jordan, and is a co-sponsor of the resolution oppos-

ing the sale of missiles to Saudi Arabia.

Mattingly has also been active on other issues of Jewish concern. In 1985, he joined the effort to ensure the resumption of the airlift to Israel of thousands of Ethiopian Jews. Mattingly is also active on behalf of Soviet Jewry, as is his wife, Carolyn.

Mattingly's key opponents are former Carter White House chief of staff Hamilton Jordan, and Rep. Wyche Fowler. As a prominent official in the Carter administration, Jordan played a significant role in support of the 1978 arms sale to Saudi Arabia. According to a *New York Times* report, several senators complained about remarks Jordan made during the Saudi arms battle. His statement, "We are going to break the Jews on this one," was corroborated by National Public Radio.

Wyche Fowler, a liberal Democrat, holds the congressional seat formerly held by Atlanta mayor Andrew Young. Fowler is relatively unknown outside his district and may have trouble gaining support in the rural and conservative parts of the state. A bitter primary is expected.

At present, Senator Mattingly is favored for reelection. According to a Democratic poll taken for Fowler in June 1985, Mattingly had a 68% approval rating. As of January, he had \$1.3 million on hand. And as an added bonus, Georgia's Democratic senator, Sam Nunn, is not expected to oppose Mattingly in his bid for reelection.

NORTH DAKOTA

Although a Senate freshman elected in the Reagan landslide of 1980, North Dakota's Mark Andrews is no newcomer to Congress, having served a seventeen-year apprenticeship in the House of Represen-



Senator Mark Andrews

tatives. Andrews was first elected to the House in 1963, and was reelected through the 1970s with huge margins.

North Dakota is wheat country. No other state has such a large rural population. With farm policy naturally a major issue for Andrews, he was careful to secure seats on the Agriculture Committee and the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture.

With growing economic problems in the farm belt, there has been a growing element of opposition to foreign aid, and of anti-Semitism among desperate farmers. Despite pressure from some constituents, Andrews has been a strong supporter of aid to Israel.

North Dakota has a very small, fragmented Jewish community of 1,080, representing only 0.2% of the state's total population. Even without Jewish backing, Andrews has compiled an outstanding record on Israel during his five years in the Senate. In addition to consistent support of aid to Israel, he recently opposed the Jordan arms package. Last year he signed a letter sent to President Reagan urging him to cancel his visit to Bitburg. As a result of his firm stand on these issues, Andrews has received Jewish support from outside the state.

Andrews had expected to face a tough challenge from Democratic representative, Byron Dorgan. As a result of Andrews' strong showing in the polls, however, Dorgan dropped out of the race. Kent Conrad, the state's tax commissioner, is now Andrews' sole opponent and at present, Andrews is heavily favored to retain his seat.



Senator Mack Mattingly (r.) with Israeli prime minister, Shimon Peres.

The Kirkpatrick Doctrine Revisited

In recent weeks, the world has witnessed the fall of two dictators who, a year ago, had seemed firmly in control of their respective countries. The changes of government came quickly to the Philippines and Haiti as the peoples of those nations demanded an end to the corruption and repression under which they had lived. In place of the dictatorships of Ferdinand Marcos and Jean-Claude "Baby Doc" Duvalier, there is new hope for greater freedom.

The Reagan administration has been justifiably praised by politicians of both parties for its role in facilitating the non-violent transitions of power in Haiti and the Philippines. In these two countries, the will of man to be free has overcome adversity, achieving victories that are also a triumph for the interests of the United States.

These events contain an important lesson about the nature of dictatorship in today's world. Authoritarian dictatorships, of the kind typified by Marcos and Duvalier, are often brutal, corrupt and repressive. They may be governed by single-party dictators, military juntas or by ruling dynasties.

While they take differing forms, authoritarian dictatorships share several important characteristics. Although they are designed to perpetuate the power of the ruling elite, they do not seek to promote a particular ideology. Moreover, while repression is a feature common to all such regimes, the degree of repression varies not only from country to country but also from one period of time to another within each country. During periods of lessened repression, the potential for popular dissent and for overt opposition to the regime may be realized. And this opposition itself has the potential to cause the regime's downfall.

The totalitarian dictatorships of communist countries, on the other hand, possess markedly different characteristics. The dictatorship seeks to reshape the state in the image of the communist party, making the interests of the two entities indistinguishable from each other.

In order to create a society that conforms to strict ideological tenets, totalit-

arian dictatorships must control every element of that society. Thus, these regimes exert total control over the political system, total control over education and communications, and total control over the police and military apparatus.

As a result of the complete control that communist dictatorships impose on the societies they rule, internal opposition is seldom allowed to develop. Moreover, on the rare occasions when limited

The communist world cannot allow the development of political alternatives to its ruling parties.

dissent has developed, it has been ruthlessly suppressed. In Hungary and in Czechoslovakia, Soviet tanks enforced total loyalty to the state communist party

and to Moscow. In Poland, the imposition of martial law and the massing of 900,000 Soviet troops on Poland's borders ensured that the free trade union, Solidarity, was crushed. Enjoying both total state control and the protection of Soviet troops, no communist government has ever been overthrown from within.

Herein lies the difference between the authoritarian and the totalitarian. Although repressive and undemocratic, the potential for democratic opposition to develop is always present in authoritarian-ruled countries. Such dictatorships can and do give way to change, as they have in countries from El Salvador and Argentina, to Uganda and the Central African Republic.

But the communist world has not allowed and cannot allow the development of political alternatives to its ruling parties. Communist ideology opposes it, the communist system suppresses it, and the leader of the communist world, the Soviet Union, employs military might to ensure that it does not come about. This results in a steady stream of political exiles and defectors from such regimes, a stream of such great proportions that emigration from communist countries is banned.

In the Philippines and Haiti, the Reagan administration has shown that US influence, used judiciously, can help bring about change in authoritarian countries. Whether or not democracy will now follow the downfall of Duvalier and Marcos, the potential for the development of democratic institutions has now been established.

C.G.

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

415 Second Street, NE., Suite 100
Washington, DC 20002

Non Profit
Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Wash., DC
Permit No. 1062

NJC Bulletin

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

INSIDE

SAUDI ARMS STALLED

4

CAMPAIGN '86

5

JEWISH APOLOGISTS FOR
ANTI-SEMITISM

6

MAY 1986

Striking A Blow for U.S. Power

After the defeat of Hitler's forces in the battle of El Alemein, British prime minister, Winston S. Churchill, reflected on the implications of the allied victory. "This is not the end," he said of the war against Nazi Germany, "it is not even the beginning of the end. But it is, perhaps, the end of the beginning."

President Reagan's election in 1980 marked "the end of the beginning" of the debilitating effects of the Vietnam syndrome, the paralysis that overcame U.S. defense and foreign policy after the Vietnam War. The American people had elected in President Reagan a man whom they believed would restore American pride, American strength and the primacy of America among the world's democracies.

But Ronald Reagan's election did not bring with it the reckless use of military force anticipated by his opponents on the left. For five years, his administration went to great lengths to avoid using force when U.S. interests could be protected by other means. The President tried numerous peaceful means to combat the increasingly frequent terrorist attacks against American citizens, fearing perhaps that military action might provoke a public outcry that would undermine his support in the nation.

But these approaches repeatedly failed to bear fruit, as our allies refused to join the effort to curtail the growing scourge of state-sponsored terror. As Colonel Qaddafi continued to call America's bluff over the President's threats of a military response, and continued to direct terrorist attacks against Americans, Mr. Reagan recognized that the United States had to respond, and had to respond with force.

For years, the fear of public opposition restrained the use of military force even in the most testing of circumstances. When attacked, the Marines withdrew from Lebanon; when the TWA 847 and

the Achille Lauro were hijacked, America's response was limited. By ordering a carefully-planned and -executed strike against terrorist training and support facilities in Libya, President Reagan has helped change the perception of America from that of a power whose hands are tied to that of one willing and able to use force when provoked.

However, President Reagan's measured and skillful use of force against Libya did more than show that the U.S. government is willing to exercise power.

Continued, page 4



Libyan leader, Muammar Qaddafi, and Nicaraguan president, Daniel Ortega, watch military maneuvers in the Gulf of Sidra.

Bringing Change to South Africa

Max Green

Editor's note: Max Green is associate director of the White House Office of Public Liaison. He has recently returned from a fact-finding trip to South Africa which he organized for a number of non-governmental public-policy experts.

The features of apartheid are so well known that they do not need repeating.

Suffice it to say that the racial segregation and discrimination that define apartheid are politically and morally indefensible.

About that, the Reagan administration and its critics agree. About the rest—both means and ends—we disagree profoundly. For those committed to the democratic reform of South Africa, only a policy of "constructive engagement" makes sense. But those who despair of reform (or for whom reform is anathema) want us to sever our ties to South Africa.

Continued, page 3

CAPITAL *Wire*

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Contra Aid Setback

President Reagan's policy in Central America suffered another setback on April 31 when supporters of the the policy failed to gather enough support to force a new House vote on military aid to the contras. Supporters of the aid package needed to gather 218 signatures on a "discharge petition" to force the contra aid issue back to the House floor on May 12—but failed to do so. The House will not now have an opportunity to vote on the issue until June.

The House first rejected the President's request on March 20. The Senate then passed a modified version of the aid package which was returned to the House floor on April 16, where it was considered as an amendment to an appropriations bill that President Reagan had threatened to veto. Supporters of the package also feared that opponents such as Reps. Dave McCurdy (D-OK) and Michael Barnes (D-MD) would succeed in passing amendments that would dilute the aid request or even bar any aid from reaching the anti-Sandinista resistance. Supporters, wishing to avoid such amendments and seeking to vote on the aid package as a separate piece of legislation, attempted to secure a discharge petition. This would have by-passed efforts by the Democratic leadership of the House to block the package and bring the issue to the House floor. With the failure of that petition, some advocates of the proposal now acknowledge that the prospects for passage of the aid request appear increasingly poor.

Defense Funds, Foreign Aid, Cut

House Budget Committee Democrats are proposing deep cuts in the administration's defense and foreign aid requests as part of a strategy to achieve a budget deficit of \$144 billion for 1987, the target specified by the Gramm-Rudman deficit-reduction legislation.

The Democrats' plan would set defense appropriations for 1987 at an estimated \$282 billion—\$38 billion less than President Reagan's request. This means that by 1989, new defense budget authority would be \$303.4 billion, or just \$2.5 bil-

lion more than the Senate-proposed level for 1987.

The cuts made in foreign-aid requests, though smaller in dollar terms, are still significant. Budget Committee Democrats reportedly rejected an amendment backed by the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) to restore \$400 million included in the Senate budget resolution. Currently, the House Democratic proposal would provide an estimated \$13.8 billion in foreign aid during 1987—\$2.7 billion less than the President's request and \$1.3 billion less than current spending as estimated by the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION CONTROVERSY

On April 23rd, U.S. Civil Rights Commission vice chairman, Morris B. Abram, criticized a General Accounting Office (GAO) audit of the Commission which he called "part of a larger effort to discredit the Commission because our ideas are unacceptable".

The GAO's audit, requested by Rep. Don Edwards (D-CA), chairman of the House Judiciary subcommittee on civil and constitutional rights, charged the Commission with mismanagement and improper political hiring.

Supported by Commission Chairman, Clarence M. Pendleton, Jr., Abram responded that the GAO had relied on "innuendo" in its report. Abram said that the real reason for the audit and the harassment was the Commission's opposition to racial quotas. "The real subject of this dispute is over equality of opportunity versus equality of results. The real issue here . . . is the struggle between the fair shakers, who started the civil rights movement, and the social engineers who presume to speak for it." The GAO reports were triggered, he maintained, because "the social engineers have lost their ideological monopoly of the Commission."

Citing accusations that Pendleton had made inflammatory remarks, Abram asked why these accusations were not raised when Commissioner Mary Berry characterized Chairman Pendleton, At-

torney General Edwin Meese, and Assistant Attorney General William Bradford Reynolds as having "bigotry dripping from their lips." "Where are these sanctimonious guardians of public discourse when Congressman Parren Mitchell or others call Chairman Pendleton 'a low-level kind of houseboy' or 'Uncle Tom?'" Abram asked.

They look the other way, he suggested, because these speakers, no matter how inflammatory their rhetoric, have "the correct social engineering ideas." The GAO report, he claimed, was simply another example "of heavy-handed attempts at legislative interference with an independent commission because of its ideas."

ANTI-TERRORISM BILL PROPOSED

On April 17th, Reps. Joe Barton (R-TX), Bob Livingston (R-LA), and Duncan Hunter (R-CA) introduced a bill which clarifies presidential authority and strengthens the President's hand in dealing with terrorism. Identical legislation is being introduced in the Senate by Senators Robert Dole (R-KS) and Jeremiah Denton (R-AL).

The sponsors of the bill state that terrorism is the number-one threat to the safety and well-being of American citizens. While diplomatic efforts and economic sanctions must be part of an overall anti-terrorism policy, the sponsors assert that these avenues are not sufficient in themselves. "Terrorism can be discouraged" they say, "only if terrorists believe that the President has a full range of anti-terrorism options and the ability to act promptly with the backing of Congress."

Although the legislation gives the President no new authority, it seeks to clarify—particularly to terrorists—that he has the power to act "with all appropriate means, including deadly force." The resolution defines as terrorists not only those who pull the trigger or detonate the bomb, but also those who "organize, lead, fund and support terrorists." In other words, all those involved in the terrorist network, including governments that openly and actively promote and support terrorism as an instrument of policy, will be held accountable.

South Africa

continued from page 1

The record of the past ten years shows that South Africa is changing. So far, that change has been due in large part to the capitalist development of its economy. As South Africa's private sector has grown, it has required the labor of more and more blacks, at first for unskilled jobs only, but later for skilled jobs too. As a result, one of the mainstays of apartheid—the "job bar"—fell.

Influx control another of apartheid's distinguishing characteristics, has also given way for similar reasons. The apartheid ideology of 1976 dictated that the flow of blacks into urban areas be slowed and ultimately reversed. Instead, in response to new economic opportunities in the cities, it increased. As it did, enforcement of the hated pass laws began to break down and the laws ceased serving a purpose. Their recent repeal was thus a radical, but nonetheless logical, next step.

With blacks required to fill many skilled and professional jobs, the government has been forced to increase the quantity and improve the quality of education provided to blacks. Spending for black education is on the rise—up 300% since 1980. Black college students are no longer a rare breed. In 1960, there were only 2200 black college graduates in all of South Africa. This year more than ten times that number will attend college, many of them at formerly "white-only" colleges that are now integrated.

Although reforms are underway, the process is far from complete. Public schools, hospitals, and other institutions remain segregated and grossly unequal. The Group Areas Act still prohibits blacks from living in white neighborhoods. And most importantly, blacks, 70% of the population, are still denied participation in the governance of their country.

Continued progress is essential if chaos and tyranny are not to prevail. For most purposes, the government has already lost control of black townships to "street committees" of kids armed with gasoline-drenched tires with which they "necklace" black "collaborators."

This is a far cry, though, from a truly revolutionary situation. Gangs of wild teenagers wielding tires are no match for South Africa's well-disciplined and well-armed security forces. Neither is the African National Congress (ANC), South Africa's underground revolutionary organization. By all accounts, it is woefully short of everything an army needs. This is not a fact to bemoan. Whatever its

past, the ANC of 1986 is not fighting for democracy. Armed primarily by the Soviet Union and its allies, the ANC has come increasingly under the sway of the South African Communist Party, which holds between 12 and 18 out of 30 seats on its executive committee.

Revolution being both unattainable (at least in the short term), and undesirable (at least to the West), what can the United States do to promote faster

or of "The Bill Cosby Show", or their presence more likely to affect the way South Africans think about race?

American corporations can pull up their stakes in South Africa. But won't they do far more to undermine the social foundations of apartheid by hiring according to the non-discriminatory Sullivan principles? The United States can refuse to have anything further to do with South Africa unless and until apartheid is com-



Black demonstrators at a recent funeral in South Africa.

change? Disinvestment would slow down the economy, the most powerful engine of reform in South Africa. A serious recession caused by disinvestment would move affected blacks to the left, affected whites to the right, and bring to power white hardliners who would first stop the process of reform and then reverse it. A blood bath would soon follow.

~~This is not to suggest that economic~~ growth is sufficient in and of itself. Protest against the outrages of apartheid from both within and outside of South Africa has always been and will continue to be important. But not all protest is effective. The South African government, for example, does not care about the condemnations of the Communist world which is its enemy. But, because it considers itself part of the West, it does care very much about American attitudes. Thus the following paradox: while advocates claim that Western disinvestment from and isolation of South Africa would provide incentive for further reform, in fact, either would be a disincentive.

Consider. The owners of the television series "Dallas" recently announced that, to protest apartheid, they would not allow the program to be shown on South African television. Is the absence of "Dallas"

pletely dismantled and replaced by one man, one vote. But in so doing, the United States would lose all its leverage, and no longer be able to fund training for black entrepreneurs and black trade unionists, black community-based self-help projects, or numerous other such programs.

We could hardly pick a worse time than now to give up on South Africa. At long last, black trade unions and black political parties are being allowed to organize freely. The ANC is still prohibited, but the United Democratic Front, which by all accounts is an ANC front, is legal and active in black communities throughout the country. Also, Chief Gatsho Buthelezi's Inkatha party which has more than a million members, has begun negotiating an agreement for a unitary legislature and executive in Natal province.

Blacks finally have a political voice: the question is whether they will be granted political power. If they are not, other reforms will have limited effect. But if they are, additional reforms will necessarily follow. For America to abandon the South African people at this, the most critical juncture of their history, would be an unforgivable act of political cowardice and moral irresponsibility.

Saudi Arms Stalled

On May 6th and 7th, Congress defeated the administration's proposal to sell \$354 million worth of Stinger, Sidewinder and Harpoon missiles to Saudi Arabia. The Senate voted 73-22 and the House 356-62 to block the sale, more than the two-thirds needed to over-ride a presidential veto. The administration is seeking the sale in an effort to demonstrate American commitment to Saudi security and deter Iranian aggression against Saudi Arabia.

This effort to defeat the arms sale included some of the strongest supporters of the administration. Republican senators James Abdnor (SD), William Armstrong (CO), Jesse Helms (NC), Mack Mattingly (GA), Don Nickles (OK) and Steve Symms (ID), and 28 of 32 House Republican freshmen voted to defeat the package.

This unprecedented defeat of an arms sale to an Arab government came even though the Israeli government, American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) and the Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations were not actively opposing the sale. Having suc-

ceeded in convincing the administration to remove more threatening elements of the package, such as sophisticated fighter aircraft and tanks, the principal pro-Israel groups dropped further active involvement.

However, substantial opposition had already developed among pro-Israel members of Congress, and continued to gather strength under its own momentum. Those leading the effort against the sale, most notably Senators Alfonse D'Amato (R-NY), Bob Packwood (R-OR) and Alan Cranston (D-CA) continued to work for the sale's defeat even after Israel and the major pro-Israel organizations ceased their efforts to block congressional approval of the package.

A further reason for the strength of congressional opposition to a sale at this time is the recent increase in Arab terrorist attacks against the United States and its allies. With Saudi Arabia maintaining close ties with both Libya and the PLO, sentiment on Capitol Hill was not favorable to the Saudis' request for U.S. arms.

Despite the Israeli government's view that the Saudi package "was not worth fighting," a number of pro-Israel political action committees (PACs), organizations such as the Zionist Organization of America, Hadassah, and the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, and some leading members of the Jewish community, lobbied against the sale.

Their efforts created a perception among legislators that, despite the lack of opposition on the part of the organized Jewish leadership, opposition to the sale was strong among American Jews. Concerned that they not alienate their Jewish constituents in an election year, 23 of 29 senators facing re-election in November voted against the sale.

While congressional opposition was growing, however, the administration did not mount a high-level effort to gain passage for the sale during the 30-day period leading up to the congressional vote. With the Tokyo economic summit, the battle for "contra" aid, and efforts to deal with Libya and international terrorism underway, the Saudi missile sale was, understandably, not at the top of the administration's agenda.

Nevertheless, President Reagan is now expected to veto the resolution disapproving the sale. The resolution will then be returned to Congress where a two-thirds majority in each house will be required to over-ride the presidential veto.

In an effort to ensure that his veto is sustained, the President has begun work to persuade some of the senators who voted against the sale that the package should, indeed, proceed. The administration needs to persuade only seven of the 73 senators who opposed the sale to change their votes for the veto to be sustained and the sale approved.

U.S. Power, *continued from page 1*

It also demonstrated that the American people will strongly support military action when their patience has been exhausted and alternatives yield no result.

Opinion polls taken since the strike show that an overwhelming majority of Americans—79 percent—approve of the President's action, 76 percent approve of the President's handling of foreign policy overall, while on Capitol Hill, leaders of both parties have hurried to support the strike. Such popular backing serves further to reinforce the perception that the U.S. armed forces are a credible tool of American foreign policy that can and will be used when necessary.

The air strike may not bring an immediate end to Qaddafi's sponsorship of terrorism. But by acting when talking no longer proved a reasonable alternative, the Reagan administration has put Qaddafi and his allies in Damascus, Teheran and even in Moscow, on notice that the United States will defend itself when attacked.

The Kremlin has recognized the implications of the American action. Unwilling to risk a confrontation with a U.S. administration committed to the defense of its citizens, the Soviet Union withdrew its ships from Libyan ports, and allowed the American strike to proceed unhindered by Soviet forces. In the face of American determination to fight the terrorism that the Kremlin had encouraged, the Soviet Union pulled back. The price of confrontation was simply too high.

It is instructive that Israel, the nation with the greatest experience in combating terrorism, was among the few U.S. allies to give unequivocal support the President. The Israelis recognize that appeasement and weakness serve only to embolden one's adversary.

Despite the reticence of most of our other allies, the strike against a declared enemy of "America, Great Britain and NATO," will engender the recognition by friend and foe alike, that America will not engage in appeasement, but can and will use her power in defense of freedom. This recognition will be particularly reas-

suring to friends of Israel. The demonstration of American willingness to use force in the Middle East will send a strong message to any adversary of Israel, that the Israeli people can look for, and receive, U.S. support in the event of a conflict in the region.

America has now reached, if not the end of the post-Vietnam era of paralysis, then at least the beginning of the end. April 14th, 1986, will be remembered as a glad day for democracy.

NJC Bulletin is published monthly by the National Jewish Coalition

MAX FISHER <i>Honorary Chairman</i>	RICHARD J. FOX <i>National Chairman</i>
GEORGE KLEIN <i>Co-Chairman</i>	IVAN BOESKY <i>Finance Chairman</i>
	GORDON ZACKS <i>Co-Chairman</i>
CHRIS GERSTEN <i>Executive Director</i>	

The NJC Bulletin welcomes comments and letters to the editor. These, along with any address changes, should be sent to:

NJC Bulletin
415 Second Street, N.E.
Suite 100
Washington, D.C. 20002

ANTONY KORENSTEIN
Editor

SUSAN HOFFINGER
Associate Editor

Campaign '86: Missouri and Nevada

With eighteen Republican senators facing re-election in 1986, and another four retiring, the GOP is working hard to win open seats in order to retain their Senate majority, now 53 to 47, over the Democrats. In particular, Republican strategists are focusing on seats being vacated in Missouri and Nevada, which they believe offer their best chances for success. In both cases, the Republican candidate—former governor Kit Bond in Missouri and former congressman Jim Santini in Nevada—is well known in his state.

Missouri

In the race to fill the seat being vacated by retiring Democratic senator Thomas Eagleton, former Republican governor Kit Bond is running against Lieutenant-Governor Harriet Woods, leader of the liberal-wing of the state's Democratic party.

Bond is credited with improving Missouri's fiscal policy during his two terms as governor. Facing a budget deficit of \$270 million when he entered office, Bond claims to have instituted programs which produced a balanced budget each year, leaving the state with a \$300 million surplus when he stepped down in 1984.

Bond has maintained close ties with the Jewish community, and last summer travelled to Israel to learn more about Mideast foreign policy issues and to assess first hand the state of U.S.-Israeli relations. Bond has stated publicly that as a member of the Senate, he will sup-

port military and economic aid to Israel and will oppose sales of weapons to Israel's adversaries. It is imperative, he maintains, that the United States "continue to provide Israel with the military and economic aid it needs to maintain a qualitative military advantage over its neighbors."

Recent polls show Bond maintaining a lead over Woods, who was unsuccessful in a prior attempt to unseat GOP senator, John Danforth, in 1982. According to a May poll conducted by the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, Bond is carrying 43% of the voters' support, to Woods' 39%. Bond received an added boost to his candidacy recently when he was endorsed by the Missouri Farm Bureau.

Nevada

For nearly a decade, Jim Santini represented the entire state of Nevada in the U.S. Congress. Re-elected four times as Nevada's sole representative, Santini now faces a battle against Harry Reid, Democratic congressman representing the Las Vegas area.

As a U.S. representative, Jim Santini was a moderate-conservative Democrat who strongly supported President Reagan's tax and budget policies. Last August, Santini changed parties because, he maintains, to remain a Democrat would have "forced me to change my principles and abandon my convictions." Unlike Reid, who is a staunch critic of the administration's defense and foreign policies, Santini is known to agree with

most of the President's positions. As such, he is the candidate that Nevada's powerful senior senator, Paul Laxalt, has hand picked to take his place upon retirement this year.

As a member of the House, Jim Santini opposed arms sales to Arab states hostile to Israel—including the sale of F-15s and AWACs to Saudi Arabia—while supporting aid packages to Israel. He has



Nevada Republican, Jim Santini.

promised that as a senator, he will continue to oppose arms sales to Arab countries that refuse to enter peace talks with Israel, and he will consistently support adequate levels of U.S. aid to Israel as a cornerstone of effective U.S. foreign policy. "Strong U.S.-Israel relations are not only a moral imperative, they serve long-range U.S. strategic interests as well," he asserts.

Santini has also promised to keep the issue of Soviet Jewry prominently on the agenda of U.S.-Soviet relations. He has stated that he does not believe the U.S. can ease its demand for progress on this issue as a precondition for discussions concerning most-favored-nation status in the provision of trade credit.

Santini has been out of public life for four years (his term as representative ended in 1982), yet indications are that he is still widely remembered and respected. Currently, polls show Santini running dead even with Rep. Reid, who lost a former bid for the Senate to Laxalt in 1974.



Former Missouri governor, Kit Bond of Missouri, with President Reagan.

Jewish Apologists for Anti-Semitism

Nicaraguan Jews who fled their country when the Sandinistas came to power assert that the Sandinista regime is anti-Semitic and anti-Israel. Jewish leaders representing organizations such as the Anti-Defamation League, the American Jewish Committee and the National Jewish Coalition, have accepted their testimony. However, the New Jewish Agenda and New York rabbi, Balfour Brickner, deny accounts of these eyewitnesses, adopting the Sandinista line that Jews fled not because they were persecuted as Jews, but because they were supporters of ousted dictator Anastasio Somoza.

Nicaraguan Jews deny that they supported Somoza. Most were either neutral or supportive of efforts to move Nicaragua toward democracy. Sarita Kellerman, a native Nicaraguan, says that she felt safe returning to her country after the revolution because the Sandinista government had promised the people "true democracy, human rights, social justice.

Brickner, who visited Nicaragua after almost all of the small Jewish community had left, said of assertions that the community was non-political, "That's just a damn lie." His information is based on discussions with Sandinistas.

Fred Luft, former secretary of the Nicaraguan Jewish community, reports that most Jews fled out of fear for their personal safety—fear stimulated by the 1978 firebombing of the Managua synagogue, telephone threats, carbombings and anti-Semitic graffiti on homes and businesses.

Oscar Kellerman was worshipping inside the synagogue when it was firebombed. When he and others tried to escape the burning building, they were met by gunmen who identified themselves as Sandinistas. "If you don't go back we will kill you. What Hitler started, we will finish," he quoted one as saying.

According to Brickner, this incident represents, at worst, the actions "of a small gang of excited supporters of the revolution . . . "When questioned about the event, Brickner snapped: "I don't

want to argue about that . . . nobody really knows what happened. I suggest to you that what happened is different than what they report."

Brickner is not concerned that the Sandinista-approved newspaper, *Nuevo Diario*, has referred to "synagogues of Satan" and denounced Jews "who . . . massacre the Palestinian people without

Brickner is dedicated to the radical left, not Judaism and the Jewish people.

mercy." He is not concerned that the PLO maintains an "embassy" in Managua, that the Sandinistas provide PLO members with Nicaraguan passports to facilitate terrorism, nor that Sandinistas participated in PLO attacks against Jews in Israel and Europe during the 1970s.

Brickner continues to believe Nicaraguan Foreign Minister Miguel D'Escoto, who claims that the regime is "neither anti-Semitic nor anti-Israel."

Sarita Kellerman is surprised that Nicaraguan Jews have not received more support from American Jews. "We are one people, and therefore we have one destiny . . . What happens to a Jew in any place in the world is bound to happen to every Jew any place in the world if you let it happen."

Unfortunately, Rabbi Brickner does not accept this view. He has cast off his Jewish mantle, donning that of an apologist for the overt anti-Semitism of a regime which he admires. Brickner has chosen to take the word of Sandinista officials, who understandably deny allegations of anti-Semitism, rather than that of the many Jewish victims of Sandinista persecution.

Brickner's willingness to ignore the human rights abuses of the Sandinistas is consistent with his world view. While he apologizes for Sandinista anti-Semitism, he also sympathizes with those who accuse Israel of persecuting the Palestinian people. According to a 1985 *New York Times* article, Brickner's synagogue invited Mohammed Milhem, a member of the PLO Executive Committee, to speak to its congregation.

Rabbi Brickner has dedicated himself to the causes of the radical left rather than to Judaism and the Jewish people. It is time that the Jewish community repudiate those, like Brickner, who are prepared to sacrifice Jewish security and welfare to advance their own political agendas.

C.G.

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

415 Second Street, NE., Suite 100
Washington, DC 20002

Non Profit
Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Wash., DC
Permit No. 1062

SENATORS SEEK ACTION AGAINST PLO	2
CAMPAIGN '86	3
RE-ELECTING THE CLASS OF '84	4

JUNE 1986

Affirmative Action Without Discrimination

Mark R. Disler

The continuing, vigorous debate over the proper form of affirmative action in the workplace has, once again, been fueled by a Supreme Court decision in which the Justices produced multiple opinions. In the administration's view, the decision in *Wygant v. Jackson Board of Education* is a vindication of the Reagan administration's civil rights policies and a victory for the principle of equal justice under law.

Since 1981, the administration's civil rights program in employment has consisted of three components: 1. a cessation of the employer's discriminatory practices; 2. compensation and relief for all victims of the employer's discrimination that include back-pay, the provision of an appropriate job at the next available opening and retroactive seniority to the date of the discrimination, and; 3. affirmative action in what Morris Abram, vice-chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, called its "original, undefined meaning," i.e., affirmative efforts to attract qualified women and members of minority groups into the applicant pool who may then compete for a position on a nondiscriminatory basis. The administration has refused to use numerical objectives, be they called quotas or goals, or any other preferential technique, to help those who have not personally experienced discrimination by employers at the expense of innocent third parties.

In *Wygant*, the Court reviewed a racially-preferential layoff policy. The Jackson, Michigan, School Board and the Jackson Education Association had negotiated a labor agreement which provided that when teachers are laid-off,

Mark R. Disler is Deputy Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights.

those with the most seniority would be retained except when the percentage of minority teachers laid off exceeded the percentage of minorities employed at the time of the lay-off. As a result of this provision, the school board laid-off non-minority teachers while more junior, minority teachers were retained solely because of their race, in order to maintain a particular racial proportion among Jackson teachers.

In striking down this odious, racially-preferential lay-off provision, the Court established important principles.

1. Governmental racial classifications are subject to strict judicial scrutiny regardless of the race of the party advantaged or disadvantaged by such classifications. This is a highly significant result: before *Wygant*, many lower courts erroneously believed that a racial classification that imposed disadvantages on non-minorities was subject to a lesser standard of review than a classification that imposed disadvantages on minorities. This double standard is no longer viable after *Wygant*: every American is entitled to have any racial classification which penalizes him or her reviewed under the same rigorous test for legality.

2. "Societal" discrimination is no justification for a racial classification. Nor may the value of minority employees as role models (in this case, for their students) serve as a basis for racial classification.

3. In order for any racial classification to be valid it must meet a two-part test:

Continued, page 5

Exploding Myths About Evangelicals

Rabbi Joshua O. Haberman

In view of the huge number of Americans who are Evangelical Christians—estimated as high as sixty million—would any rational Jew question the importance of developing dialogue with them? As one who has done so for more than ten years, I confess that, at least to begin with, the Jewish public and its recognized leadership have been far from supportive of such efforts. In my own experience, most of the difficulties I encountered stemmed not from Christian bias, but from Jewish suspicion and reluctance to have any dealings whatever with Evangelicals. What makes this cold-shouldering

Rabbi Joshua Haberman is rabbi emeritus of the Washington Hebrew Congregation in Washington, D.C.

of potential friends even more mystifying is the fact that Evangelicals are, by far, the most ardent Christians in expressions of friendship for Jews and support for the State of Israel.

I am happy to detect signs that the ice between Jews and Evangelicals is finally breaking and that the Jewish community is becoming more responsive to Evangelical initiatives. Major credit for this turn of events must go to a few interfaith relations leaders of great wisdom and courage, such as Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum, Rabbi James Rudin of the American Jewish Committee and Nathan Perlmutter, National Director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

Continued, page 5

CAPITALWire

SAUDI ARMS UPDATE

Missile Package Passes

On June 5, the U.S. Senate failed in an effort to over-ride President Reagan's veto of a congressional resolution banning the sale of \$354 million worth of advanced weaponry to Saudi Arabia. The vote of 66 to 34 was only one vote short of the two-thirds majority required to over-ride a presidential veto. The sale of the Harpoon and Sidewinder missiles contained in the weapons package can now proceed as requested by the administration.

Congress had earlier passed the resolution banning the sale by large majorities of 73-22 in the Senate and 356-62 in the House, marking the first time that Congress has voted to block an arms sale. Following passage of the resolution, the administration removed the most controversial item—the shoulder-held Stinger anti-aircraft missile—from the package, before the President vetoed the congressional action. During the weeks that followed, the administration mounted a major lobbying campaign which succeeded in persuading 34 senators to support the President and to allow the sale to proceed.

AWACS To Be Delivered

President Reagan certified on June 18 that Saudi Arabia had met congressional conditions for the \$8.5 billion sale of five Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) aircraft. The certification, demanded by Congress in 1981 before it would approve the AWACS sale, triggers the delivery of the first aircraft, which is expected to occur on June 28. Subsequently, one plane will be delivered every two months until the Saudis have taken possession of all five.

SENATORS SEEK ACTION AGAINST PLO

Although the Department of Justice has decided not to seek the indictment of PLO chairman Yasir Arafat for the 1973 murder of two U.S. diplomats, alternative efforts to combat international terrorism are underway. Senators Jeremiah Denton (R-AL) and Frank Lautenberg (D-NJ) are working to shut down the PLO infor-

mation office in Washington and have circulated a resolution in Congress which would bar Arafat from visiting the United Nations by denying him a visa to enter the United States.

According to the resolution, evidence has accumulated in recent years testifying to Arafat's involvement in international terrorism, including attacks aimed at U.S. government officials and citizens. Arafat's al-Fatah has been responsible for the murder of 32, the wounding of at least 38, and the kidnapping of at least 6 Americans. The PLO general command has claimed responsibility for approximately 150 terrorist attacks since February 11, 1985. Moreover, in a statement on November 13, 1985, that bolstered the belief that Arafat presents a threat to U.S. interests, the PLO leader announced that: "We are on the threshold of a fierce battle—not an Israeli-Palestinian battle but a Palestinian-U.S. battle."

Under current immigration laws, the United States has the right to expel or deny visas to aliens who "seek to enter the U.S. solely, principally, or incidentally to engage in activities which would be prejudicial to the public interest or endanger the welfare, safety, or security of the U.S." The U.S. government also has the power to "control the entrance of aliens" to the district of the U.N. headquarters in such a manner as to "safeguard its own security."

The resolution has been signed by 45 Senators. Democratic presidential front-runner, Gary Hart (D-CO), however, reportedly refused to add his name to the list of co-signers because the resolution "would interfere with the business of the U.N."

ANTI-APARTHEID BILL PASSED

In a surprise vote on June 18, the House of Representatives adopted, for the first time, sweeping anti-apartheid legislation requiring U.S. firms to divest themselves of all holdings in South Africa. The divestment bill, proposed by liberal California Democrat, Rep. Ronald Dellums, would also impose a trade embargo on South Africa, although it permits the United States to continue importing strategic minerals from the country if

the President certifies that such minerals cannot be obtained elsewhere. The House bill will now be taken up by the Senate, which is expected to reject or to radically amend the sweeping nature of the bill.

The imposition of sanctions of any kind against South Africa is strongly opposed by the Reagan administration and by many congressional Republicans. The administration believes that sanctions would be counterproductive in the effort to bring an end to apartheid in South Africa.

The House action came as speculation was growing that President Reagan is considering naming a special envoy to Africa to assess the effects that current sanctions are having on the region. The House vote also coincided with the veto by the United States and Great Britain of a U.N. Security Council resolution calling for mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria government.

CHEMICAL-WEAPONS CONTROLS FOR SYRIA

In response to reports that Iraq had used chemical weapons in its war with Iran, Congress enacted the Chemical Weapons Export Act in 1984 to prevent the sale of industrial chemicals that could be used in the manufacturing of chemical weapons to Iraq and Iran. Analysts now believe that Iran is seeking to stockpile its own chemical weapons arsenal, and that it may approach Syria for help in doing so. In an effort to prevent an escalation in the use of chemical weapons in the Gulf War, the State Department announced on June 6 that the provisions of the Act would be extended to Syria.

The Act does not impose a complete ban on the sale of chemicals to Iran, Iraq or Syria. It does, however, require that the companies submit for Commerce Department approval, details of which chemicals they wish to sell to the listed countries.

Since 1980, chemical weapons have taken more than 10,000 lives, the State Department estimates. Most of these deaths have resulted from the use of chemical weapons by the Soviets in Afghanistan, and by the Iraqis in the Gulf War. Both the Soviet Union and Iraq have denied that they have used chemical weapons.

Campaign '86: Pennsylvania, New Hampshire and Colorado

Three Jewish Republicans—incumbent senators Arlen Specter (PA) and Warren Rudman (NH), and Representative Ken Kramer (CO)—have won their party's nomination for the U.S. Senate and will be running in the forthcoming general elections.

Pennsylvania

A former Philadelphia district attorney, Arlen Specter was elected to the Senate in 1980. Since taking office, Specter has been careful not to stray too far from Reagan economic policies, although his record reflects the views of a state which is dependent on federal aid. Specter holds a strategic place on the Judiciary Committee and is credited with sponsoring laws requiring mandatory 15-year-to-life sentences for some career criminals, and that help combat child pornography.

As a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, Specter has been a



Sen. Arlen Specter

strong advocate of increasing levels of military and economic aid to Israel. He also led efforts to block the last three proposed sales of weapons to Jordan and Saudi Arabia, and fought hard for the Jerusalem Bill, which would have moved the American embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.

Specter's campaign received a boost when Pennsylvania's popular governor, Richard Thornburg, decided not to challenge, leaving Specter a clear shot at his Democratic opponent, Philadelphia con-

gressman Bob Edgar. A Methodist minister and leader of the anti-Vietnam war movement, Edgar is aligned with the most liberal faction in the House.

Specter may have a tough race, though, because Democrats out-register Republicans in Pennsylvania, and Edgar represents the Republican suburbs of Philadelphia where Specter gleaned much of the support he needed to win his seat in 1980. Nevertheless, the state has not elected a Democrat to the Senate since 1962, and Specter is able to appeal to a broad range of constituents, including several of the state's major unions.

New Hampshire

A former state attorney general, New Hampshire's junior senator, Warren Rudman, faces re-election at a time when his stature is higher than any time since he came to Washington. From his seat on the Senate Appropriations Committee, Rudman gained national recognition as a major sponsor of the landmark 1985 Balanced Budget Act, the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law.

Rudman has supported the Reagan administration on major economic policies, taking the lead on a number of anti-trust issues. Consumer groups were pleased with his strong and successful opposition to a plan to bar Federal Trade Commission review of the medical profession.

Nevertheless, because of his independ-



Sen. Warren Rudman

ence on many issues, Rudman is one of a number of 1980 Senate freshmen whom the Conservative Caucus has targeted for defeat in 1986. Yet, by general consent, he is one of the strongest Republican incumbents to be running in 1986, and in a state considered one of the most Republican in the nation. Having pledged not to accept any PAC contributions, Rudman is currently running a low-key campaign in the face of only token opposition from the Democrats, who have failed to put up a serious opponent so far.

Colorado

In the race to fill the seat being vacated by Gary Hart, Colorado Springs' Jewish Republican congressman, Ken Kramer, is running against Tim Wirth, a leading liberal Democratic congressman from Boulder.

Kramer was first elected to the House in 1978 and has had no trouble winning



Rep. Ken Kramer

re-election since. He served on the Education and Labor Committee and now sits on the Armed Services Committee, where he has been a strong proponent of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI).

In the last two years, members of the House have had four opportunities to vote for critical economic and military assistance to Israel. On each occasion, Kramer voted in favor of the aid, while Wirth opposed it. Kramer has also consistently voted against arms sales to Arab nations hostile to Israel.

The most recent *Denver Post* poll shows Wirth leading Kramer by 9%, while the *Washington Post* reports that Wirth has \$265,786 and Kramer \$109,896 on hand. Kramer, though, saved two months of hard campaigning and hundreds of thousands of dollars when both his primary opponents dropped out of the race after narrowly failing to draw the required 20 percent of the vote at the state's GOP convention.

Campaign '86: House Freshmen

With this issue, the *NJC Bulletin* begins to track the re-election races of the thirty-one first-term House Republicans. Elected in 1984, these freshmen must now face re-election for the first time. The outstanding feature of the class of 1984 is that it includes a large proportion of young, aggressive members who have proven to be strong supporters of traditional Republican positions and leadership.

This freshman class is also the first to be actively courted by members of the pro-Israel community. The National Jewish Coalition, recognizing these members as future congressional leaders, has engaged in a major effort to make them aware of Israel's strategic value to the United States. The results have been remarkable.

Recently, 88 percent of the freshmen Republicans voted to block the sale of sophisticated arms to Saudi Arabia. On June 30, 1985, in a vote on a supplemental appropriations bill providing \$1.5 billion in emergency aid to Israel, over 85 percent of the GOP freshmen supported the aid, as compared to 75 percent of freshman Democrats. Similarly, the 1986 Foreign Aid Bill, which provided \$4.5 billion in economic and military aid to the State of Israel, was backed by 88 percent of the freshmen Republicans but by only 66 percent of their Democratic counterparts.

Voting records such as these are indicative of growing support among conservatives and Republicans for foreign aid. For example, all four freshmen from North Carolina and five of the six from Texas gave their support for the Foreign Aid Bill, even though they represent states which have traditionally elected GOP legislators who strongly oppose any foreign aid.

While some of the freshmen are expected to be re-elected by relatively safe margins, others are expected to face particularly tough challenges. Democratic leaders, hoping to recoup some of the losses incurred in 1984, consider the GOP freshmen to be vulnerable targets.

Both parties, for example, are closely watching the races in Texas and North

Carolina, which together elected ten freshmen Republicans in 1984. Other freshmen to be targeted, such as Rep. Mike Strang of Colorado and Rep. Joe DioGuardi of New York, represent districts which are traditionally Democratic.

Traditionally, off-year elections during the second term of a presidency have meant trouble for the party in control of the White House. In 1958, 1966 and 1974, when the economy was weak and

presidential popularity waning, the president's party sustained devastating losses in congressional elections.

This year, however, with Ronald Reagan enjoying greater popularity than ever before, many GOP strategists are dismissing concerns about the "six-year itch". The ingredients of the "six-year itch" simply do not exist in 1986, which should be good news for the freshmen.

Rep. Vin Weber— A Profile

Representing the farmland of Minnesota's second district, is Rep. Vin Weber, a former aide to Senator Rudy Boschwitz (R-MN). First elected to the House in 1980 at the age of 28, Weber quickly earned a reputation as a skilled legislator destined for a future leadership role. Along with Newt Gingrich (R-GA) he leads the Conservative Opportunity Society, the group of young conservatives known for their strong support of Reagan administration policies.



Rep. Vin Weber

Weber, recognized for the strength of his anti-Soviet views, has also become known as one of Israel's most staunch supporters in the House. He has led the opposition against such arms sales to

Arab states as the 1981 AWACS sale to Saudi Arabia, the 1985 Jordan arms sale and the recent attempt to sell a missile package to Saudi Arabia. He is an outspoken and consistent advocate of foreign aid, helping to promote support for aid to Israel among his Republican colleagues.

Despite the depression in the farm belt, Weber easily won re-election in both 1982 and 1984. This year, however, Weber has been targeted by the Democrats as an important incumbent to beat, and faces a tough battle to retain his seat.

The challenge to Weber is expected to come from millionaire farmer David Johnson, a former Reagan delegate to the 1984 Republican National Convention, who has since switched parties. Johnson is using the crisis in America's farms as the key issue on which to attack Weber. But Weber has taken an independent stand on the Midwest's farm problems and was one of only two Republicans to support a farm bill amendment that would have placed mandatory supply controls on the production of grain for domestic sale.

The race is an important test-case for the Republicans and will also be closely watched by the pro-Israel community. If Weber can overcome the farm issue as he did in 1982 and again in 1984, his presence will continue to be felt as a major force in Congress.

Affirmative Action,
continued from page 1

(a) it must be predicated on concrete evidence of actual discrimination and; (b) even when such evidence exists, the racial classification must be narrowly tailored and not unnecessarily burden innocent third parties.

The application of these principles to the Jackson School Board's racially-preferential lay-off provision revealed a double legal flaw in that plan: 1. there were no findings of discrimination upon which the Jackson School Board based the provision and; 2. even had there been such findings, the layoff provision was

not narrowly tailored and fell too harshly on innocent third parties, in this case, the more senior non-minority teachers.

In his plurality opinion, Justice Powell noted that a hiring preference would be less burdensome in comparison to a lay-off preference. Some commentators have asserted that the Court, therefore, has embraced hiring preferences as constitutionally sound if properly based on evidence of actual discrimination. There is another, and more plausible reading, however. Justice Powell's reference to hiring goals was made while discussing the school board's lay-off preference. As the plurality opinion makes clear, the lay-off preference was more burdensome on third-party rights than another alternative

(i.e., hiring goals), and thus it was constitutionally unacceptable. By the same reasoning, however, the hiring goal can only survive judicial scrutiny if there is no other less burdensome alternative—an inquiry not undertaken in *Wygant*. As the courts examine the implications of the *Wygant* decision, we are confident that the choice compelled by the Constitution will be the affirmative action program which requires rigorous outreach and recruitment (such as those utilized so effectively by the Department of Justice over the past few years) together with a policy of nondiscrimination. Such a program can effectively increase the number of minority and women employees and is far less intrusive on innocent third parties.

Evangelicals,
continued from page 1

I wish to share with you part of Nathan Perlmutter's enlightening article which explodes various myths about Evangelicals and Fundamentalist Christians.

Questioning Assumptions

It is curious that so much angst over so long a time has occasioned so very little investigation into the assumptions upon which the angst is grounded. In the hope that it may do some good, I'll try to deal here with some of them.

Fundamentalism and Evangelicism are intrusive newcomers on the American scene. Actually, they've been around in various forms at least since colonial times. The name "Fundamentalist," however, seems to have been culled from a series of 1909 pamphlets known as *The Fundamentals*, which carried contributions by such eminent theologians of the time as James N. Gray, W.J. Erdman, and H.C.G. Moule. Their pieces constituted: 1. a defense of Christian classical doctrine against the high-powered assault of German secular scholarship and; 2. an effort to hold back a trend toward secularism by Christian denominations.

Fundamentalism is inextricably interwoven into the fabric of the American Right and thinks, feels, and votes the same ultra-conservative way about all social and political issues. I might as well start with the conclusion to *The Evangelical Voter*, by sociologists Stuart Rothenberg and Frank Newport: "The Evangelical voter is in many ways not so very different from the American voter."

But how like the American voter is he?

Rothenberg and Newport asked a sampling of 1,000 Evangelicals about certain controversial issues. They found the group split almost evenly on nuclear freeze and on direct military intervention in Central America, but favoring by a slight margin increased spending for defense.

Among their other findings: two-to-one support for the proposed Equal Rights Amendment; the dissemination of birth control information in public schools; the right to abortion and; the massive use of government funds to find a cure for AIDS.

There were more registered Democrats than Republicans among Fundamentalists, and some 60 percent of these Democrats crossed over and voted for Reagan in 1980; two years later, though, during the congressional races, a small plurality voted Democrat.

Fundamentalist views and Fundamentalist voting patterns clearly parallel Gallup Poll findings about all Americans.

The religious Right marks for defeat political candidates whose voting records or platforms run counter to its stand on selected issues. I might be somewhat more worried if Jews, blacks, Catholics, liberals, farmers, and corporations hadn't been doing the very same thing for generations. To put it another way: any candidate who fails to appeal to my interests—my special interests—is unlikely to get my vote. It is said that the Reverends Falwell, Baker, and Robertson and the long right flank of Christian political activists have sought, in Jesus' name, to infiltrate Caesar's territory. But so did the Reverend Martin Luther King. So do the Fathers Berrigan. So does the Reverend Andrew Young,

the Reverend William Sloane Coffin, the reverend leaders of the National Council of Churches. And so does the long list of rabbis concerned with social issues and with Israel. So what else is new?

Are we to reject Fundamentalist friendship for Israel because its scriptural foundation unnerves us? Is our bias perhaps showing? Do we await the day when these fire-and-brimstone preachers will issue a blast of old-fashioned anti-Semitism and we can issue in turn an exultant, "See, we told you so?"

I would suggest that it is high time for American Jews to start, as the human relations pastor put it, "a meaningful dialogue" with Fundamentalists. When the millenium—and the messiah—comes, then there will be time in which to consider our options. Meanwhile, let us remain steadfast in our devotion to the separation of Church and State; and steadfast too, in our suspicion of smug assumptions—about ourselves as well as about Fundamentalists.

NJC Bulletin is published monthly by
the National Jewish Coalition

MAX FISHER <i>Honorary Chairman</i>	RICHARD J. FOX <i>National Chairman</i>
GEORGE KLEIN <i>Co-Chairman</i>	IVAN BOESKY <i>Finance Chairman</i>
	GORDON ZACKS <i>Co-Chairman</i>
CHRIS GERSTEN <i>Executive Director</i>	

The NJC Bulletin welcomes comments and letters to the editor. These, along with any address changes, should be sent to:

NJC Bulletin
415 Second Street, N.E.
Suite 100
Washington, D.C. 20002

ANTONY KORENSTEIN <i>Editor</i>	SUSAN HOFFINGER <i>Associate Editor</i>
------------------------------------	--

Pollard and the Press

In recent weeks, one of the nation's leading newspapers—and those who follow its lead—has mounted a vigorous campaign to discredit Israel. Never known for its pro-Israel sentiment, the *Washington Post* has exploited the Pollard spy case as a means of driving a wedge between the United States and one of its most loyal and valuable allies.

In an effort to discredit Israel in the eyes of the American public, however, the *Post* has distorted reality. Those who recognize Israel's value to American security must point out these distortions, and help to preserve the special relationship that is now being threatened.

The *Post's* attack has been unrelenting. Its daily "revelations" of Israeli intelligence operations in the United States are often based on the questionable citing of anonymous "administration officials" or "top intelligence sources." Israeli intelligence agencies, we learn, are "more active than the KGB . . ." engaged in "the collection of information on secret U.S. policy or decisions, if any, concerning Israel." According to the paper's reports, Israel has built a massive intelligence network in the United States which, the *Post* would have us believe, is slowly but surely undermining U.S. security.

Day after day, the *Post* prints allegations, many based solely on the suspect statements made by Pollard himself as part of a plea bargain he made with federal prosecutors. The paper examines every conceivable angle in order to uncover "fresh evidence." And when no new evidence is available, the *Post* resorts to recycling old material, lest its readers forget about the supposed Israeli perfidy.

Former Carter administration officials are quoted to add substance where none exists. For example, Stansfield Turner, Carter's CIA director, helped bolster a recent article by suggesting that Israel was of little or no intelligence value to the United States. "Ninety percent of declarations about the supposed Israeli contribution to the security of the United States is public relations," Turner said. Turner's credibility in this area crumbles, however, when it is recalled that he is

widely recognized for having gutted the intelligence-gathering capabilities of the CIA during his tenure as the Agency's director.

In fact, Israel has proven, time and again, its value as a U.S. ally. For over thirty years, Israel has provided the United States with intelligence and tech-

In an effort to discredit Israel . . . the press has distorted reality.

nical information of incalculable worth. Israel's intelligence services, noted for their quality and thoroughness, are said to have provided the United States with the text of Nikita Krushchev's secret speech denouncing Josef Stalin in 1956, and are reported to have contributed to the demise of the notorious British spy ring of Kim Philby.

More recently, Israel has provided the United States with invaluable information about Soviet-made weaponry. From providing the West with its first Soviet MiG-21 in 1966, to learning how to overcome Syria's sophisticated Soviet-made SAM-6 anti-aircraft missiles during the 1982 war in Lebanon, Israel has played a major role in ensuring that the United States is well prepared to meet any potential Soviet challenge.

Finally, as the United States attempts to combat the growing scourge of world terrorism, Israeli intelligence sources have provided a wealth of information about terrorists. By identifying sponsors and perpetrators of terrorism and the methods they employ, Israel has contributed greatly to the U.S. effort to forestall terrorist attacks, and to judge how and against whom to respond when an attack actually takes place.

The media, by their very nature, must be selective in what they publish or broadcast. Frequently, though, incidents are amplified and magnified by the press, creating a scandal that is out of all proportion to their importance.

Such is the case with the Pollard affair. Troubling though it was, the affair should not be permitted to damage a relationship of such great mutual value to both the United States and Israel. Measures must be taken to ensure that, in the future, these allies have no call to lay charges of espionage against each other. Both have too much to lose to allow the relationship to be undermined by such a needless controversy stirred up by sensationalist journalism.

C.G.

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

415 Second Street, NE., Suite 100
Washington, DC 20002

Non Profit
Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Wash., DC
Permit No. 1062

NJC Bulletin

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

INSIDE

TERRORISM: HOW THE WEST CAN WIN **3**

BEHIND THE SANCTUARY MOVEMENT **4**

CAMPAIGN '86 **5**

JULY 1986

Paying the Price for Cheap Oil

Milton Copulos

After more than a decade of periodic oil-price shocks, the American consumer is finally enjoying a brief respite from high energy costs. As a consequence of Saudi Arabia's decision last October to discount its oil products in an attempt to regain its lost market share, prices on world oil markets have collapsed in a manner unmatched since the discovery of the West Texas oil field in the 1930s.

Natural gas prices, too, have experienced a sharp, (albeit smaller) decline, largely due to the fall in the price of its main competitor, fuel oil. As the two primary fuels used in the U.S. economy have become cheaper and cheaper, inflation, interest rates, and manufacturing costs have all fallen, leading economists both at home and abroad to hail OPEC's changing fortunes as a much-needed shot in the arm for the world economy.

Yet, bright though the economic skies may seem, a dark cloud looms on the horizon. While the consumer understandably finds some small measure of satisfaction in OPEC's current discomfiture, the long-term implications of the short-term economic benefits are cause for grave concern. For along with the decline in oil prices has come a renewed reliance on Middle Eastern imports, a reliance that will increase U.S. vulnerability to a sudden cut-back in the supply of crude oil from the region.

In just a few months, for example, Saudi shipments of crude oil to the

Milton Copulos is a senior policy analyst at the Heritage Foundation in Washington, D.C.

United States have increased by 2500 percent. Worse, since the demand for petroleum products remained relatively level during that period, the bulk of the increase came at the expense of more stable sources of supply such as the Latin American exporting nations, and the large number of small domestic producers.

As far as the domestic producers are concerned, the case of "stripper wells" is

particularly important. These wells, which produce 10 barrels a day or less, currently account for some 15 percent of U.S. production. If prices remain at their current levels, however, stripper wells could become an endangered species. It costs anywhere from \$8 to \$15 to produce a barrel of stripper oil. With oil prices today ranging between \$12 and \$15 a barrel, many of these wells are losing money. Increasingly, their operators are finding that they cannot weather the losses brought on by the price slump, and, as a result, are shutting down their wells.

When a stripper well's production is halted, most state's regulations require that it be reclaimed, i.e. that the pipe running to the deposit be removed and

Continued, page 7

RNC Chairman Looks to Future of GOP

In a speech to leaders of the National Jewish Coalition, the chairman of the Republican National Committee, Frank Fahrenkopf, Jr., addressed Jewish concerns over the growing influence of evangelical Christians in the Republican Party. He said that, in the past, reports of evangelical influence hurt the GOP, not only among Jews but also among young voters, many of whom are more liberal on social issues than some evangelical leaders. The interests of evangelical and young voters, as well as those of Jews, he said, will have to be balanced. If this is not achieved, GOP efforts to attract additional support from some of these groups could jeopardize its efforts to win the support of others.

Nevertheless, he said, Pat Robertson,

the evangelical minister who is thinking of seeking the GOP presidential nomination,



RNC Chairman, Frank Fahrenkopf, Jr. tion, would not do to the Republican Party what Jesse Jackson did for the

Continued, page 7

CAPITAL Wire

BILL SEEKS TO LOCATE U.S. EMBASSY IN JERUSALEM

An amendment to the Diplomatic Security and Anti-Terrorism Bill recently passed by the Senate lays out conditions for the construction of a new U.S. embassy in Israel. The bill authorizes over \$850 million for increases in security at U.S. diplomatic facilities around the world.

While approving \$83 million for the construction of the new embassy, the amendment prohibits the embassy's construction unless it is located within five miles of the Knesset in Jerusalem. The amendment was sponsored by Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC), and cosponsored by Senators Paula Hawkins (R-FL), Rudy Boschwitz (R-MN) and Chic Hecht (R-NV).

The State Department had requested that the funds be spent on construction of a new embassy in Tel Aviv and a new consulate in Jerusalem, which would service the West Bank. Such a plan, the State Department claimed, would "demonstrate that the United States is neutral as to the outcome of peace negotiations." But in introducing the amendment, Sen. Helms argued that permitting the construction of a new embassy in Tel Aviv would end all hope that "the United States might one day recognize Jerusalem as the Israeli capital."

Before it can become law, the amended bill must be reconciled with the House version, which does not require that the embassy be constructed in Jerusalem, and be signed by President Reagan.

SHAMIR BACKS U.S. ACTIONS IN LIBYA, NICARAGUA

The Israeli foreign minister and vice-premier, Yitchak Shamir, said on June 17 that "a war against international terrorism—a war in which the United States plays a leading role—is absolutely vital." Shamir added that "International terrorism is an international monster that ex-

ceeds all bounds. "We see this terrorism... from Libya to Nicaragua."

Shamir applauded U.S. actions against Libya and the Sandinista regime in Nicaragua, two nations known to have close ties to terrorist organizations. Noting that the Sandinistas have long supported and been supported by the PLO, Shamir said: "We welcome American activities aimed at struggling with the danger of terrorism in [Nicaragua] as much as we welcome the U.S. activities in Libya."

Shamir's remarks came shortly before the House of Representatives began debate on President Reagan's request for aid to Nicaragua's anti-Sandinista resistance. The House approved the aid request on June 25th by a vote of 221 to 209, and must now be considered by the Senate before it can become law. Senate opponents, however, are expected to try to block its package by using the filibuster to prevent a vote. When the Senate last voted on the question in March, 53 senators favored the package—seven fewer than the 60 needed to cut off a filibuster and force a vote.

SENATE RATIFIES EXTRADITION TREATY

An extradition treaty signed a year ago by the United States and Britain has been ratified by the Senate. The new treaty's tougher provisions are intended to help Britain prosecute members of the Irish Republican Army (IRA), a terrorist group that seeks to make the British province of Northern Ireland part of the Irish Republic. During recent years, numerous suspected IRA terrorists have fled to the United States and escaped extradition by claiming that their crimes were politically motivated. Under the new treaty, those wanted for violent crimes, such as murder, hijacking and hostage-taking, will no longer have recourse to the political exception as a means of avoiding extradition.

The treaty enjoyed the strong backing of the State Department, whose legal advisor, Abraham Sofaer, had urged its ratification, and of the Senate leadership. The vote approving the treaty reflected the success of the chairman of the Senate

Foreign Relations committee, Richard Lugar (R-Ind.), in overcoming strong opposition from dissenting senators. Senate opponents on both sides of the aisle were concerned that the treaty would come to bar political violence of all kinds, even that justifiably covered by the political exception.

The treaty is expected to provide a model for similar agreements between the United States and other countries, including Israel. By limiting the political exception in terrorist cases, Israel's efforts to combat the terrorism of the PLO would be considerably strengthened.

REPORT CALLS FOR CLOSE U.S.-ISRAEL TIES

A report issued by the Heritage Foundation, a Washington-based think-tank considered to be among the capital's most influential, has called for a more extensive strategic cooperation between the United States and Israel. In an examination of increasingly-close U.S.-Israel ties, the report finds that Israel has made a valuable contribution to U.S. interests in a variety of areas, ranging from the political to the strategic. The report, entitled "America's Security Stake in Israel," was prepared by James A. Phillips, a senior policy analyst for the Foundation.

In an important expression of support for the expansion of Israel's strategic relationship with the United States, the report recommends that "Washington should integrate Israel discreetly into the global anti-Soviet defense system..." In particular, the report urges that Israel's defense capabilities should be utilized by the United States to bolster NATO security in the eastern Mediterranean.

The report calls for joint U.S.-Israeli naval and air exercises, as well as the secret pre-positioning of U.S. supplies in Israel as a means of enhancing American capacity to respond to threats both in the eastern Mediterranean and in the Persian Gulf. "In the Gramm-Rudman era," the report concludes, "Increased co-operation with Israel offers a cost-effective way to enhance the effectiveness of the American military establishment."

Benjamin Netanyahu's

"Terrorism: How the West Can Win"

A Book Review By Michael Lewis

In 1981, Secretary of State Alexander Haig pledged that terrorism would become for the Reagan administration what human rights had been for the Carter administration. What in fact followed were five years of stirring speeches, but of only languid actions. Only recently has the administration responded to the growing problem of international terrorism in a manner commensurate with its forceful rhetoric.

When the Jonathan Institute convened its second international conference in Washington D.C., in June 1984, its primary intent was to advocate a unified international policy against terrorism. For those who are searching for serious solutions rather than facile palliatives, the edited conference proceedings, *Terrorism: How the West Can Win*, (Farrar, Straus, Giroux, New York, 1986, edited by Benjamin Netanyahu), will prove enlightening. The book lays out the parameters of the task confronting the West. The message is a sanguine one: If the West is prepared to adopt the appropriate steps, terrorism can be defeated.

Netanyahu, the book's editor, is currently Israeli ambassador to the United Nations and brother of Jonathan Netanyahu, the hero of the Israeli rescue mission at Entebbe in whose memory the Institute was founded. Netanyahu's book brings together articles by a wide range of experts, from Jeane Kirkpatrick and George Will, to Yitzhak Rabin and Moshe Arens. The sum is a collection that covers the subject thoroughly, dealing with the historic roots of terror, its methods and the particular threat it poses to the world's democracies.

The book attacks the growing tolerance of terrorism and its perpetrators within democratic societies. Aphorisms such as "one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter", have hitherto succeeded in obfuscating the inherent evil of terrorism, the conference held. For they ignore the particularly pernicious nature of the terrorist's tactics and take

no account of the complete absence of such tactics among the resistance movements of Nazi-occupied Europe.

In an effort to disabuse people of such misconceptions, the conference defined terrorism as "the deliberate and systematic murder, maiming and menacing of the innocent to inspire fear for political ends." It is a crime for which there is no justification, no excuse, no "root cause." Indeed, it differs from ordinary crime only in its desire for publicity.

Terrorism is a crime for which there is no excuse, no root cause.

The media were criticized at the conference for the even-handed attitude they have adopted towards terrorism. Since media coverage of terrorism is indispensable for the dissemination of terrorists' statements, such coverage has the effect of promoting violence and increasing public tensions. Although no call is made for censorship, the authors urge greater self-restraint on the part of the media as a means of reducing drastically terrorism's impact.

In the fight against terrorism a number of steps sanctioned by international law can be taken. States can be condemned, relations broken and embassies serving as bastions of terror, closed. Boycotts and embargoes can be imposed, economic aid refused and landing rights denied. Countries with lax airport security can have their airports quarantined.



Ambassador Benjamin Netanyahu

Moreover, terrorists, and states sponsoring terrorism, should learn to expect Western military retaliation or even pre-emption.

Were all—or even many—of these measures to be consistently implemented, the defeat of terrorism could be accomplished fairly rapidly. However, because the defeat demands a series of blows and counter-blows which are neither easy nor cost-free, victory will require leaders to make politically-difficult decisions, and a public agreed to a policy of non-surrender to terrorism. For, in the face of sustained Western resistance, terrorism will collapse and terrorists be deterred. In the long run, there is no alternative way to deal with terrorism.

The principal lesson of this insightful book is that the sooner we acknowledge that a war is being waged against us, the sooner will we take the steps necessary to fight it. With the will to resist, we can cease to be the passive victims of terrorism and can, instead, actively confront and thereby vanquish this scourge. To cite Netanyahu: "Confusion and vacillation facilitated the rise of terrorism; clarity and courage will ensure its defeat."

One unsettling issue is left unresolved by this book. Success in the war against terrorism would seem to require bipartisan support. However the consensus forged at this conference appears primarily to be one of conservatives. That many liberals may hold views diametrically opposed to this consensus, especially on the issue of the requisite use of force, is clearly a matter of some concern. What remains open to question is the degree to which a future liberal administration would be prepared to pursue the war against terror.

Michael Lewis is a Research Fellow at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, specializing in U.S. foreign policy. His article, "An Analysis of Foreign Affairs' Coverage of the Middle East" will appear in the Fall issue of Middle East Review.

Behind the Sanctuary Movement

Max Green

Amidst extensive coverage in the Jewish press, rabbis belonging to the Sanctuary Movement have been touring the country's synagogues. Already, members of Reform Jewry's Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the Central Conference of American Rabbis, as well as the Conservative Rabbinical Assembly of America, have passed resolutions in support of the Movement. Now, the rabbis are hoping to persuade the nation's synagogues to declare themselves "sanctuaries" for illegal aliens from Central America.

Leaders of the Sanctuary Movement, both Jewish and non-Jewish, carry a seemingly-powerful message. Their speeches to synagogues and churches are replete with references to the Holocaust, including comparisons between Nazis and right-wing death-squads, and between Jews and Salvadoran refugees. Indeed, speakers often define the Movement's purpose as saving Central American refugees from the fate of the Six Million Jews.

But, away from the houses of worship, these leaders reveal a more far-reaching goal: the defeat of what they refer to as the "fascist" or "imperialist" U.S. intervention in Central America. By this they mean American support for the region's democratically-elected governments, particularly that of El Salvador.

To the naïfs attracted to the Movement by its declared humanitarian goal, the Chicago Religious Task Force, the coordinating body for the Movement as a whole, has this to say: "Some churches have declared themselves sanctuaries and have done almost nothing to oppose U.S. military aid to Central America. We wonder whether this is adequate. What is the value of a sanctuary church that continues its support (by *silence*, by vote or whatever) for U.S. policies in Central America." (*emphasis added*)

The Movement's radical objective explains its leaders' blindness to both the decline in human-rights abuses in the

Central American democracies, and the increased brutality of Nicaragua's Sandinista government and the anti-government rebel group in El Salvador. It also explains why it refuses to help refugees from Nicaragua, or even those from El Salvador, unless they first agree to denounce U.S. policy in Central America.

The Sanctuary Movement arose at a time when right-wing death-squads roamed almost at will in El Salvador. But the political landscape of the country has changed since Jose Napoleon Duarte's election to the presidency. In 1981, there were 9000 violent civilian deaths, many attributable to far-right para-military units. But in 1984, the year of Duarte's

The Movement's radical goals blind it to the decline in human-rights abuses in El Salvador.

election, the number declined to 774, and to half that in 1985.

Acknowledging the progress made by the Salvadoran government in the area of human rights would put the Sanctuary Movement out of business. So, instead, it continues to behave as if 1986 were 1980 and Napoleon Duarte were Roberto D'Aubisson, the right-wing politician often closely linked to the death-squads.

The Movement also focuses increasingly on the fate that awaits Salvadorans who are deported from the United States. Such deportations, one leader alleges, is just like putting "Jews on boxcars bound for Dachau." Numerous studies, however, indicate that such hyperbole is all but

baseless. The Intergovernmental Commission on Migration, which monitors such matters, has not reported a single case of a deportee coming to harm. Even in the much-worse days of 1983, the American Civil Liberties Union failed to identify conclusively a single deportee who had suffered a human-rights violation.

The Movement also charges the United States government with mercilessly violating the rights of Salvadoran illegals. The facts belie this allegation as well. There are a total of 500,000 Salvadoran illegals in the United States of whom fewer than 3,000 will be returned to their home country this year. Of the relatively few that immigration authorities catch up with, many request political asylum, which is granted if they can demonstrate a "well-founded fear of persecution if forced to return home." But, as Assistant Secretary of State, Elliott Abrams, has explained, "under our laws, generalized conditions of poverty and civil unrest do not entitle people to leave their homeland and settle here. If this were our test, one half of the one hundred million people living between the Rio Grand and the Panama Canal would meet it..." As it is, the United States takes in more legal immigrants and refugees (of whom the fourth-largest group is Salvadoran) than the rest of the world combined.

As the threat of persecution in El Salvador recedes, fewer Salvadorans are meeting the political-asylum test. As a result, fully 70 percent of Salvadorans caught by the INS return voluntarily, rather than under "deportation orders," while the majority of the remaining 30 percent do not list fear of political persecution as a reason for being allowed to stay. Moreover, those who are deported have had every opportunity to appeal to administrative panels and the federal courts, guaranteeing due process of law.

The facts relating to the situation in El Salvador and to illegal Salvadoran immigrants to the United States appear to have passed the Sanctuary Movement by. Nevertheless, the Movement's leaders continue to raise the specter of the Holocaust as they speak of "horrors" being committed with U.S. acquiescence.

This parallel between the Holocaust and the rapidly-improving human-rights situation in El Salvador does more than merely insult the memory of the six million Jews who perished under Hitler's tyranny. It reveals a lack of concern for the truth, both past and present, that deserves our strongest rebuke.

Max Green is associate director of the White House Office of Public Liaison.

Campaign '86: House Freshmen

Texas: Joe Barton

When Phil Gramm, then a Democratic congressman, resigned his seat in 1983 and won re-election as a Republican, he broke a tradition in the sixth district of Texas. As recently as 1982, when the voters of this rural area supported Democrat Mark White for governor, the district had been a Democratic stronghold.

Gramm's victory after switching parties marked a turning point. When he relinquished his seat to run for the Senate, his place was taken by former Washington lobbyist, Joe Barton. Benefiting from re-districting, which brought some of Fort Worth's more affluent voters onto the district's rolls, Barton in 1984 became the first Republican ever to be elected by the district to a full House term.

A conservative on most social and foreign-policy issues, Barton has proven a strong friend of Israel. A supporter of the measures that provided the Jewish state with \$4.5 billion in foreign aid in 1986, Barton also opposed administration efforts to sell arms to Jordan and Saudi Arabia.

Barton's Democratic challenger is Pete Geren. A veteran of Texas politics, Geren has gathered both experience and con-



Rep. Joe Barton

tacts in his position as director of Senator Lloyd Bentsen's offices in Texas.

Barton, benefiting from his incumbency, is the initial front-runner. But, Geren hails from one of Fort Worth's wealthiest families, and his campaign is benefiting from contributions from Democrats nationwide.

North Carolina: William W. Cobey

For North Carolina's GOP strategists, the Research Triangle of the state's fourth congressional district, represented a promising but elusive prize. Despite targeting the district for over a decade, it was not until 1984 that the GOP captured the seat when William Cobey, defeated the Democratic incumbent, Ike Andrews, by a margin of two percent.

Cobey's narrow victory has set the stage for one of the most hotly-contested congressional races this year. With a Senate seat at stake and four GOP freshmen facing re-election, Cobey himself



Rep. Bill Cobey

describes North Carolina as one the country's premier political front lines.

In the absence of major economic problems in the district, the campaign between Cobey and the Democratic nominee, former state Democratic Party chairman, David Price, has centered around Cobey's campaign financing.

Price has attacked Cobey for the extraordinary support the Republican has received from pro-Israel political-action committees (PACs). Friendly towards Israel, Cobey attracted \$11,000 in PAC support as part of the effort to defeat Andrews, whose record on Israel was poor. Since winning election, Cobey paid his own way on a trip to Israel and supported foreign aid to Israel, while opposing arms sales to Arab states hostile to the Jewish state.

Cobey has responded to his critics by claiming that the PAC contributions he received did not detract from his ability to serve his constituents. He cites his

efforts to promote responsible federal spending, and his work on the House Committee on Science and Technology to serve the interests of the research-and-development industries located in his district.

Democratic Party strategists targeted Cobey's seat as one to regain in 1986. The national effort to defeat Cobey is likely to combine with the Democrats' marginal advantage in registration in the district to make the race close.

Michigan: William Schuette

Originally a GOP stronghold, an influx of Democratic migrants during the 1970s helped turn the rural area at the center of Michigan's lower peninsula into a marginal district. The tenth district was captured by the Democrats in 1978, when Don Albosta unseated a 26-year Republican incumbent. Then, in 1984, as Albosta was beginning to feel secure, he was defeated by Republican, Bill Schuette.

Schuette is a seasoned political campaigner. He sharpened his campaign skills as the orchestrator of George Bush's 1980 presidential primary victory in Michigan. This experience, combined with the support of his step-father, the former chairman of the district's main employer, Dow Chemical, helped ensure that his congressional campaign was both well-organized and well-financed.

Since taking office, Schuette has been a strong advocate of close U.S.-Israel relations. A supporter of aid to Israel, Schuette opposed the proposed sale of weapons to Jordan, and the recent sale of missiles to Saudi Arabia.

As Albosta attempts to regain his seat this November, the race in this swing dis-



Rep. Bill Schuette

trict is expected to be close. However, Schuette sits on the Agriculture Committee and has sought to further the interests of his constituents and, as the incumbent, he is the early favorite.

Campaign '86: Oregon, Washington and Idaho

Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, originally far-west pioneer outposts carved out of the Oregon Territory, are noted for their independence and their suspicion of Washington D.C. politics. While the fiscal conservatism and free-market orientation of the states' three GOP incumbents appear to be well supported, all three face serious challenges.

Oregon

First elected in 1968, Oregon's junior senator, Bob Packwood, has steadily worked his way up in the ranks of the Republican Senate leadership. In 1984, Packwood became chairman of the Finance Committee, where he has established himself as a national figure by playing a pivotal role in the effort to achieve tax reform.

Although Packwood supports the Rea-



Sen. Robert Packwood

gan administration on economic policy questions, he tends to be liberal on social issues. As chairman of the National Republican Senatorial Committee, Packwood pursued a broader base of support for the GOP by seeking the recruitment of more Jews, blacks, and women.

Packwood is considered one of the "inner circle" essential to U.S.-Israel diplomatic, economic, and military relations. In 1981, he led the fight against the AWACS sale to Saudi Arabia and more recently, opposed arms sales to Jordan and Saudi Arabia. He has also been a strong and influential advocate of economic and military assistance to Israel.

The Democratic challenge to Packwood comes from James Weaver, a U.S. representative from Eugene who is considered one of the most liberal Democrats in

Congress. A staunch opponent of foreign aid, Weaver has openly criticized Packwood for sending U.S. aid abroad.

While Weaver claimed to be "broke" at the beginning of this year, Packwood has set a record by raising over \$7 million for his campaign. Despite this advantage, however, Packwood faces a tough challenge, but is expected to be returned to office by a narrow margin.

Washington

First elected in 1980 when he defeated veteran Democrat, Warren G. Magnuson, Senator Slade Gorton has an image as a moderate Republican. While the fiscally conservative and market-oriented freshman Senator has backed the Reagan administration on economic issues, he has tended to be moderate-to-liberal on cultural and social matters.

Although he supported the 1981 AWACS sale to Saudi Arabia, Gorton's visit to Israel has helped make him more sensitive to Israel's needs. He has since become an increasingly steadfast suppor-



Sen. Slade Gorton

ter of close U.S.-Israel ties, promoting Israel as a strategic asset throughout the 1982 Lebanon War, while many of his colleagues were critical of Israel. He has also been a consistent supporter of U.S. aid to Israel, and opposed efforts to sell arms to Saudi Arabia and Jordan.

Gorton faces a challenge from Brock Adams, former congressman and former transportation secretary under Jimmy Carter. Adams' sluggish campaign regained some momentum recently after Gorton was criticized for allegedly trading his support for the administration's controversial judicial nominee, Daniel

Manion, for pledges of support for a nominee from Washington. Gorton claims that the press has overreacted and that his action represented an effort to depoliticize the appointment.

While Gorton is one of six Republicans targeted by the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, a July 15 poll shows him leading 57 to 34 percent.

Idaho

Former Idaho congressman, Steven Symms, was first elected to the Senate in 1980. A conservative Republican in an agricultural state, Symms social conservatism is consistent with the views of his constituency.

In 1981 Symms supported the sale of AWACS surveillance aircraft to Saudi Arabia and, until recently, had voted against foreign aid on every occasion. However, as a result of efforts by the NJC and other Jewish groups, Symms has visited Israel for the first time and become more supportive of Israel. Despite intense White House pressure,



Sen. Steve Symms

Symms opposed both the sale of arms to Jordan and Saudi Arabia. Furthermore in 1985, Symms cast his first vote for a foreign aid bill when he supported \$1.5 billion in emergency aid to Israel.

The race between Symms and his Democratic opponent, Governor John Evans, has been marked by heated controversy over a 1977 trip that Symms made to Libya as part of an Idaho trade delegation. Evans' campaign has exploited the visit to accuse Symms of collaborating with a known terrorist. However, Evans' attempt to discredit Symms' record on Israel has backfired in Idaho, as details of Evans' own involvement in the matter—including his meeting with members of Qaddafi's political party in the Idaho statehouse—have emerged.

In what is an extremely close race, June Democratic polls show Evans holding a two-point lead.

Oil, Cont'd from page 1

then the hole sealed with cement to prevent contamination of nearby water tables. As a result, when most stripper wells are shut down, their production capacity is lost forever. This means that if prices remain at current levels for as long as a year, the United States could stand to lose as much as 15 percent (about 1.3 million barrels per day) of its production capability—permanently.

Nor is that all. Because stripper production is one of the primary sources of income for independent oil companies, many are on the verge of bankruptcy. As more and more go under, the nation is slowly losing the infrastructure of oil and gas exploration. Put simply, new sources of oil and gas cannot be located or developed if the companies which specialize in assuming the particular risks of oil exploration no longer exist, or if the trained personnel able to carry out the task have moved on to other occupations. The loss of this capability may be as serious a blow to the nation's energy security as any OPEC embargo.

It is not just the United States however, that is adversely affected by the

Saudi price-discount policy. Our neighbor, Mexico, has experienced a sharp drop in its export income as a result of both the decline of world oil prices, and the loss of market share (including significant sales volume to the United States) to the Saudis. Because primary deposits of Mexican oil lie offshore, Mexican production costs can run as high as \$10 per barrel. Thus, Mexican oil would not again become competitive until world prices recovered to between \$20 and \$22 per barrel. In the interim, the already-shaky Mexican economy is facing collapse, creating yet another fertile area for mischief for those who wish the United States ill.

What could the long-term effects of the price collapse be? If we consider what the loss of 15 percent of U.S. production means in terms of increased import requirements, the answer is self-evident. Our imports would quickly be catapulted to the levels that prevailed at the height of the energy crisis. Moreover, the primary source of those imports would be the Persian Gulf, since other, more reliable exporting nations would have been forced by the price collapse to close down production. As a result, OPEC would soon regain control over the West's

oil supply with all the foreign policy and security implications of such a circumstance. Certainly, the prospect of yet another round of escalating prices, shortages and gasoline lines would not be outside the realm of possibility.

What, then, can the United States do? First and foremost, Washington has to "wake up"! Seemingly oblivious to the long-term implications of low oil prices, too many politicians continue to view the current price conditions as nothing but good news.

Secondly, there should be a conscious decision to implement policies that would at once allow the nation to take advantage of the short-term benefits, while still protecting the long-term national interest. Such policies would include: decontrolling natural gas; continuing to fill the strategic petroleum reserve; providing relief for operators of marginal domestic wells, such as strippers; and possibly creating a national ready-reserve of oil and gas as a means of protecting the nation against a future embargo. But, most importantly, our leaders must take their heads out of the sand and recognize that a potential problem exists, before we all pay the price once again.

RNC Chairman, Cont'd from page 1

Democratic. This, he said, is because "there is no monolithic evangelical population" comparable to the black community, which voted en masse for Jackson in 1984 Democratic primaries. The evangelical movement is a splintered one. As a result, candidates other than Robertson, including Vice-President George Bush and Rep. Jack Kemp (R-NY), have all received—and will continue to receive—support from various evangelical groups.

Fahrenkopf also spoke optimistically of the GOP's hopes of becoming America's majority party. He recognized, though, that the broad coalition that could constitute this majority must be built with care in order to avoid including certain elements to the exclusion of others. To succeed, he said, "the Republican Party must be broad enough to embrace both a Jesse Helms and a Lowell Weicker."

Many of the GOP's hopes, he said, have been raised by the growing strength of the GOP among young Americans.

He pointed to the fact that 68 per cent of voters aged 18 to 21 supported Ronald Reagan in 1984, and that, among young voters, Republicans are out-registering Democrats by almost two-to-one. "No longer does the Republican Party just relate to young Americans" he said, "The Republican Party has become young Americans." It is this strength, he said, that has helped bring "the two major political parties to parity for the first time in fifty years."

Support for the GOP among the young, he continued, would become an increasingly important factor in helping the Republican Party achieve majority status in the country, and particularly in the House of Representatives. With the help of young voters, Fahrenkopf believes, the GOP will be able to win the state legislatures and state houses which draw up the boundaries of congressional districts. Fahrenkopf told the group of how Democrats hold 40 per cent of the California's House seats even though Republicans won 60 per cent of the state's popular

vote in 1984. This discrepancy, he said, was due to gerrymandering of district boundaries by the state's Democratic legislature. By winning Democratically-controlled legislatures such as California's, the GOP could re-draw those boundaries to make the elections reflect the popular vote more closely.

NJC Bulletin is published monthly by
the National Jewish Coalition

MAX FISHER Honorary Chairman	RICHARD J. FOX National Chairman
GEORGE KLEIN Co-Chairman	IVAN BOESKY Finance Chairman
GORDON ZACKS Co-Chairman	
CHRIS GERSTEN Executive Director	

The NJC Bulletin welcomes comments and letters to the editor. These, along with any address changes, should be sent to:

NJC Bulletin
415 Second Street, N.E.
Suite 100
Washington, D.C. 20002

ANTHONY KORENSTEIN
Editor

Wanted: Fairness in Pro-Israel Politics

Concern of American Jews for Israel—and a political candidate's position on U.S.-Israel relations—features prominently in the decisions of individual Jews to make political contributions. Their choice of whom to support is often greatly influenced by information on candidates provided by pro-Israel groups and individuals around the country.

Along with the more-than eighty political-action committees (PACs), these pro-Israel institutions and individuals play a pivotal role in political fund-raising. Before endorsing candidates, though, these institutions and individuals must first determine whether a candidate is sufficiently pro-Israel to merit support. This determination is made primarily by considering a candidate's voting record on two key items: foreign aid to Israel, and arms sales to Arab states hostile to Israel.

The by-laws of most pro-Israel PACs commit them to dealing solely on the basis of U.S.-Israel relations, regardless of party labels. Indeed, GOP senators Al D'Amato (R-NY), Paula Hawkins (R-Fla.), Arlen Specter (R-Pa.), Bob Kasten (R-Wisc.) and Bob Packwood (R-Ore.), have all received support consistent with their strong pro-Israel records.

But when the differences between the records of competing candidates are less clear-cut, the rule of even-handedness that binds these organizations is often breached in favor of Democratic candidates. This has occurred even when a Democrat's recent record on Israel is inferior to that of the Republican against whom he is running, or when a Democrat with no record at all challenges an increasingly sympathetic Republican.

The Senate races in Colorado and Idaho provide examples of this phenomenon. In the former, Democratic congressman, Tim Wirth, is campaigning against the GOP nominee, Rep. Ken Kramer. On the question of Arab arms sales, both Kramer and Wirth have consistently voted to block sales to Arab states at war with Israel. But on foreign aid, a different picture emerges. Prior to 1984, Wirth was a supporter of foreign aid, Kramer an opponent. Since then, however, their positions have been reversed:

while Kramer has supported aid, Wirth has not only worked to cut \$75 million in assistance to Israel, but has also voted against the entire foreign aid package on four occasions. Despite this dramatic reversal, Wirth continues to be promoted as a paragon of pro-Israel support while Kramer is shunned.

Failure to be fair can only result in a weakening of U.S.-Israel ties.

In the Idaho race, pro-Israel activists have engaged in an effort to help the state's Democratic governor, John Evans, unseat the incumbent senator, Steve Symms, a Republican whose early record on Israel was poor. Capitalizing on a visit Symms made to Libya in 1977 as part of a trade delegation, some in the pro-Israel community have written to pro-Israel contributors describing Symms as "Qaddafi's favorite senator," and accusing him of "promoting a chief sponsor of international terrorism."

The facts appear simple: Symms visited Libya, met Qaddafi and, initially at least, had a poor voting record on Israel. But

on closer examination the story takes on a different complexion. Symms was not alone in promoting trade links with Libya: Evans, too, was involved in the effort. Evans sent a representative to Libya, met with members of Qaddafi's political party, and welcomed a Libyan trade delegation to the Idaho statehouse.

Furthermore, Symms has shown himself to be a far better friend of Israel than his detractors claim. During the past two years, he has visited Israel for the first time and, in spite of intense White House pressure, opposed arms sales to Jordan and Saudi Arabia. He also voted to provide Israel with \$1.5 billion in aid, even though he had long opposed all such assistance.

Many of Symms' former detractors now believe that his turn-around on Israel is genuine. In spite of this, and in spite of Evans' own Libyan connection, pro-Israel institutions and individuals have ensured that Evans has received all of the substantial pro-Israel contributions devoted to the Idaho race.

By allowing bias to influence activities, the pro-Israel community endangering the very support for Israel that is its *raison d'être*. If elected, Wirth will have no incentive to support aid to Israel, safe in the knowledge that he will receive Jewish support whatever he does. Moreover, Symms, whose record speaks of growing support for Israel, may be unseated by a challenger who has no record on the issue, save one created by partisan promoters in the pro-Israel community.

For those who work to strengthen support for Israel to be effective, they must be honest, consistent and, above all, fair. Their failure to do so can only result in disenchantment among shunned Republicans, complacency among Democrats, and a weakening of U.S.-Israel ties.

C.G.

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

415 Second Street, NE., Suite 100
Washington, DC 20002

Non Profit
Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Wash., DC
Permit No. 1062

NJC Bulletin

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

INSIDE

JACK KEMP ON THE LAVI 2

SDI FUNDS THREATENED 2

CAMPAIGN '86 3

AUGUST 1986

Why SDI Is Non-negotiable

Daniel O. Graham

Most of today's talk about arms control negotiations with the Soviet Union simply doesn't make sense. Ten years ago it made a little more sense, but not much. The arguments on the subject can be reduced to this sort of simple formula: "They have 1400 missiles and we have 1000 missiles. They have nearly 10,000 strategic nuclear weapons and we have over 10,000 strategic nuclear weapons. Let's cut these inventories by half. We'd both be better off."

This approach, however, is simple-minded, reflecting a lack of appreciation of the differences between the nuclear strategies of the superpowers. It presumes not only that the U.S. and Soviet nuclear systems are of equal capability but also that the nuclear strike forces of both sides are designed to serve the identical purpose of retaliating against an attack from the other.

The fact is that U.S. and Soviet nuclear forces are so drastically different in composition and mission that total numbers have little to do with relative capabilities. The U.S. nuclear force is, indeed, designed to ride out a Soviet attack and then retaliate, which is to say that we have a "second-strike" force. Most of our nuclear weapons are carried by bombers and submarines which are either too slow or

too inaccurate to use in a first strike against Soviet nuclear forces.

The Soviet nuclear force, on the other hand, has been designed and postured to launch a preemptive attack against U.S. nuclear forces with some weapons and to retain a large reserve of others in order to deter or respond to a U.S. second strike; that is, the Soviets have a first-strike and a third-strike force. Their force consists primarily of quick-reaction missiles, a quarter of which (the SS-18 first-strike force) are highly-accurate weapons

capable of launching an effective attack on the U.S. retaliatory force within 30 minutes of a decision to fire. Three-quarters of their nuclear forces would be left either to reinforce this attack or to deter a U.S. president from launching a retaliatory attack with what nuclear forces he had left after absorbing the damage caused by a Soviet first strike. The target for this Soviet third-strike force are the towns and cities of the United States.

It was the realization of this situation which gave rise to the Carter administration's warnings about a "window of vulnerability." And it is this fundamental asymmetry between U.S. and Soviet nuclear attack forces which makes the simple arithmetic approach to arms control not only foolish, but dangerous.

Continued, page 5

Vice President Visits Israel

Accompanied by eight American Jewish leaders, all members of the National Jewish Coalition, Vice President George Bush spent four days in Israel as part of his ten-day tour of the Middle East. During his stay, Bush visited the Holocaust memorial at Yad Vashem, and became the highest-ranking U.S. official ever to visit the Old City of Jerusalem, where he offered a prayer at the Western Wall. A major focus of the Vice President's visit to Israel was the plight of Jews in the Soviet Union. Mr. Bush visited a Soviet Jewish family now resident in Israel, and met with the recently-freed Soviet Jewish dissident, Anatoly Shcharansky. He also addressed the issue of Soviet Jewry in his

speech to the Knesset, Israel's parliament, in which he reaffirmed the United States' commitment to winning the release of Soviet Jews.

Bush said he was "delighted" that the eight leaders accompanied him, as they "enriched [his] understanding" of Israel and of the many talks he held there. The eight leaders were Gordon Zacks, the NJC's co-chairman, Jacob Stein, President Reagan's first liaison to the Jewish community, Joseph Gildenhorn of Washington, D.C., Paul Borman of Detroit, Ivan Novick of Pittsburgh, Barbara Gold of Chicago, Richard Goldman of San Francisco and Jay Kislak of Miami.

Continued, page 5

Lt. Gen. Daniel O. Graham, USA (Ret.) is the founder and director of High Frontier. An advisor to President Reagan during the 1976 and 1980 campaigns, he has also served as director of the Defense Intelligence Agency and as deputy director of the CIA.

CAPITAL Wire

KEMP ATTENDS LAVI "ROLL-OUT"

As the only American speaking at the July 21 "roll-out" ceremony for the new Lavi aircraft in Tel Aviv, Rep. Jack Kemp (R-NY), praised close U.S.-Israel relations as "a union of spirit and purpose." Kemp, a principal sponsor of the legislation which provided much of the U.S. funding for the new plane, proclaimed the Lavi a product of "Israeli excellence in partnership with U.S. industry and financial support."

The plane, which utilizes the most sophisticated computer, radar and guidance systems available, was custom-designed to meet Israel's special military needs. It is designed to be fast, agile and—most important to Israel—able to withstand attack from the next generation of the Syrian army's Soviet-supplied surface-to-air missiles (SAMs).

The Israeli Air Force is expected to purchase some 300 of the planes by the early 21st century, with much of the development and construction costs being paid for with U.S. aid. In his address at the "roll-out" Kemp referred to U.S. aid to Israel, stressing that the U.S. is "investing our faith and precious resources in a key ally... a friend... not a client." He added that "Israel is a vital outpost for the West," effectively checking Soviet aggression in the Middle East.

Kemp, a long-standing friend of the State of Israel, also voiced his commitment to Israeli participation in President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). He claimed that SDI also has "immediate consequences for near-term Israeli defense needs. Israeli firms and research centers," he said, "have much to contribute" to this venture.

ARMSTRONG REJECTS MIX OF RELIGION AND POLITICS

Senator William Armstrong (R-Colo.), a born-again Christian and potential Republican presidential candidate, has warned the evangelical-Christian community that they "will make a horrible

mistake if they claim to speak on political issues with the authority of the Church."

Armstrong has not openly criticized Robertson, but cautioned the minister about his comments. "Any time a group, particularly a church group, begins to think in terms of taking over [a party]", Armstrong said, "they are going off the rails."

Armstrong was reacting, in part, to remarks made by television evangelist, Pat Robertson, who is examining the possibility of seeking the GOP presidential nomination for 1988. Robertson had recently commented that "Christians feel more strongly than others do about love of God, country, and the traditional family."

Robertson, who has set up a presidential exploratory committee, will decide by September 17 whether to seek the nomination. The decision will be based, he says, on what he determines is the "will of God." Armstrong will not reach a decision about his own candidacy until the end of the year.

GLENN SEEKS TO BLOCK SDI LINKS WITH ISRAEL

The Senate has adopted an amendment offered by Senator John Glenn, (D-Ohio), that would make it harder for foreign companies to win research contracts as part of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). The amendment to the Defense Authorization Bill would prohibit the awarding of contracts to foreign firms for research projects "that could be reasonably performed by a U.S. firm."

Glenn, who supports SDI only as a "research-oriented program," argues that U.S. allies have not lived up to their responsibilities in sharing international defense burdens, and, therefore, should not benefit from U.S. research funds.

The United States has already signed agreements with Israel, Britain and West Germany, aimed at promoting cooperation on SDI projects. Israel hopes to win a number of SDI contracts, and is particularly interested in those leading to development of anti-missile systems that will help counter the threat posed by

Syria's Soviet-made missiles.

Rep. Les AuCoin (D-Ore.) had planned to introduce a similar amendment in the House. However, pro-Israel members of Congress, and groups such as the National Jewish Coalition, succeeded in persuading him to withdraw the measure before it reached the House floor.

The entire bill is due to be considered by a House-Senate conference in September, at which time pro-Israel members, led by Rep. Jim Courter (R-NJ), will endeavor to delete the Glenn amendment from the final version.

"YARMULKE BILL" FAILS

The U.S. Senate has narrowly failed to approve an amendment that would have allowed military personnel to wear religious apparel, such as a yarmulke, while in uniform. The vote was 51-49 to table, or defer, consideration of the bill.

The bill, introduced by Sen. Frank Lautenberg (D-NJ), would have permitted personnel to wear headgear required by religion if such "apparel is neat and conservative or until such time as it is determined that it would interfere with the performance of military duties."

Had it passed, the bill would have reversed a 5-4 Supreme Court decision giving the Defense Department authority to prohibit Captain Simcha Goldman, an orthodox Jew, from wearing his yarmulke while in uniform.

The Anti-Defamation League, in a statement released on August 11, had called on Congress "to pass the legislation which would guarantee American military personnel greater accommodation to religious practices." The National Jewish Coalition, in cooperation with the ADL, was one of the few Jewish groups to support the bill.

Although defeated in the Senate, a similar measure was passed by the House as an amendment to the Defense Authorization Bill. It is unlikely, however, that the measure will be included in the final version of the bill once discrepancies between the House and Senate versions have been ironed out.

Campaign '86: California

As November's elections approach, perhaps no race anywhere in the country is being watched more closely by the American Jewish community as that for the Senate in California. Indeed, with a pro-Israel incumbent facing a challenger whose record on matters relating to Israel has not been as strong, the community has made the race its top priority for 1986.

Seeking re-election to a fourth term in the Senate, the state's Democratic senior senator, Alan Cranston, has an excellent record on the issues traditionally considered to be of greatest importance to Israel. From supporting foreign aid to opposing arms sales to Arab states hostile to Israel, Cranston has helped spearhead pro-Israel efforts in the Senate.

As one of the most liberal members of the Senate, however, Cranston has opposed the administration policies aimed at strengthening America's defense posture. The American Security Council, a pro-defense group that rates the positions of representatives and senators on security-related matters, gave Cranston a zero percent rating for 1986, indicating that his record is the most anti-defense possible.

In strenuously opposing the administration's defense and foreign policies, however, Cranston has adopted positions that could indirectly harm Israel. He has consistently opposed the development of new weapons systems that Israel subsequently buys from the United States, and is a vocal opponent of the Strategic Defense Initiative, in which Israel is participating and which promises to produce a defense against the Soviet-made missiles recently acquired by Syria.

The GOP challenge to Cranston comes from Ed Zschau, a two-term U.S. representative from the Silicon Valley area in northern California. A former professor at Stanford University's graduate business school, Zschau won the nomination after defeating thirteen other candidates. With the conservative vote split between several candidates—including Rep. Bobbi Fiedler and Los Angeles television commentator, Bruce Herschenson—Zschau,

a moderate, was able to win the primary by seven points.

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee Zschau has supported the sale of U.S. arms to Jordan and Saudi Arabia, and endorsed across-the-board cuts in a spending bill which would have reduced economic assistance to Israel among others. Nevertheless, although this cut was defeated, he has consistently voted for foreign aid packages. Zschau was also one of only a handful of House members to oppose the initial passage of the Free Trade Area Agreement between the United States and Israel. However, he did support the revised version of the agreement, worked out at a conference between the House and Senate, when it returned to the House for final passage.

Since winning the GOP nomination Zschau has appeared to become more sensitive to concerns that he is anti-Israel. He recently made his second trip to Israel and, on his return, issued a "white paper" in which he expressed a belief that "Israel must possess a defense superior to any combination of foes." He said that U.S. aid to Israel "should not be seen as a gift or loan, but rather as a legitimate share of the cost of America's own defense commitment." The "white paper" also endorsed the development of the Lavi,

Israel's domestically-produced fighter jet, opposed the establishment of a Palestinian state on the West Bank and supported "the unity of Jerusalem under Israeli sovereignty."

Although earlier a proponent of the nuclear freeze and an opponent of aiding Nicaragua's anti-Sandinista resistance—the "contras"—Zschau has recently become more supportive of Reagan administration foreign and defense policies. He voted to provide aid to the contras, and is a backer of SDI.

Zschau is also a supporter of liberal abortion laws and an opponent of school prayer. As a result of this social liberalism, Zschau will be able to deny the Democrats the opportunity to attack him on the social issues which are of importance to the high proportion of Californians under forty.

The race between Cranston and Zschau is expected to be fiercely contested. Both candidates have raised more than \$3 million in campaign contributions, but Zschau's primary race has left him with only \$444,000 on hand, while Cranston still has \$1.5 million.

Cranston won re-election in 1980 with more votes than any other senator in history. His popularity was seriously damaged, however, by his abortive bid for the 1984 Democratic presidential nomination, and GOP strategists consider him the most vulnerable Democratic incumbent to be seeking re-election this year. Thus, despite Cranston's incumbency—a factor that might be expected to help him in the early stages of the race—recent polls show him leading Zschau by only six points.



Rep. Ed Zschau

Campaign '86: House Freshmen

Texas: Mac Sweeney

First elected in 1984, Mac Sweeney was the first Republican ever to represent his rural southeast Texas district. Elected with the support of the district's urban areas, Sweeney unseated Bill Patman, a Democrat with one of the five worst voting records on Israel in the House.

Serving on the Armed Services Committee, Sweeney has a thorough understanding of the strategic aspects of U.S.-Israel relations. Regarded as the most effective advocate of close U.S.-Israel ties among freshman members of either party, he is a strong supporter of U.S. aid to Israel. He also opposed the sale of arms to Jordan and Saudi Arabia, writing to the President on behalf of House GOP freshmen that "we will oppose arms sales to Arab countries hostile to Israel with all the energy and determination in our power."

Sweeney's campaign encountered difficulties this summer when he was accused



Rep. Mac Sweeney

of illegally requiring his staff to aid in political fund-raising. Although some of the allegations have since been found to be based on false evidence, Sweeney has invited an investigation "to clear the air."

Sweeney has also suffered from the recession in the farming and oil industries. As the former director of operations for the Reagan White House, he is being blamed in part for the recession that has caused an unemployment rate of 14 percent in Texas.

The Democrats have sought to capitalize on Sweeney's campaign difficulties by making the race one of the state's target-

aces. Greg Laughlin, the relatively-unknown Democratic challenger, has already benefited from Sweeney's vulnerability by raising \$100,000. Sweeney is now concentrating on raising funds for an expensive media campaign.

California: Robert Dornan

Robert K. Dornan was first elected to Congress in 1976, representing California's 27th district. When redistricting caused Dornan to lose his seat in 1982, however, he made an unsuccessful bid for election to the Senate. In 1984, he again ran for the House, this time from the 38th district in Orange County, and beat five-term incumbent, Jerry Paterson, by eight percent.

Known as "the President's candidate," Dornan is a strong supporter of the Reagan administration and an outspoken critic of House liberal Democrats.



Rep. Robert Dornan

Recently, his outspoken manner got him into trouble when, in a speech on the House floor, he called Soviet propagandist, Vladimir Posner, "a betraying little Jew." In an effort to quell the controversy raised by the remark, leading members of the Jewish community, including Democratic representatives, Tom Lantos (CA) and Steve Solarz (NY), came to Dornan's defense. Dornan later explained that he had intended the remark to mean that Posner had betrayed the Jewish people.

In fact, Dornan is one of the Jewish community's fastest friends in the House. A leading advocate of freedom for Soviet Jewry, he is also a strong supporter of

Israel. As the only freshman to serve on the Foreign Affairs Committee, Dornan is a leading proponent of aid to Israel and a key opponent of U.S. arms sales to Arab states. A former Air Force pilot, he is also the only member ever to have flown with the Israeli Air Force—a distinction in which he takes great pride.

Dornan's antagonistic relationship with Democrats has made him a target in what will be one of the top three political contests in California. His opponent, Rich Robinson, is a political veteran who once raised more than \$900,000 running for the state legislature. But with his district prospering, Dornan is strongly favored to win.

Maryland: Helen Bentley

Helen Bentley was unsuccessful in two attempts to unseat the aging House veteran, Clarence "Doc" Long. Although his strong support for Israel earned Long the backing of the pro-Israel community, he was unable to retain his seat when Bentley challenged him again in 1984.



Rep. Helen Bentley

Still considered as "Long's opponent," Bentley receives no support from the pro-Israel community. In fact, even though she has proven an unexpected friend of Israel—supporting aid and opposing the recent proposed arms sales to Jordan and Saudi Arabia—pro-Israel PACs have made sizable contributions to her opponent, Kathleen Kennedy Townsend.

Townsend, the eldest child of the late Robert Kennedy, is a liberal Democrat whose campaign is focusing on her "tradition of public service." A newcomer to Baltimore, though, Townsend has been labelled by some critics a "carpetbagger."

Townsend will face an uphill battle against Bentley. Bentley enjoys strong support for having turned Baltimore into a more productive maritime center and in bringing federal jobs and dollars into the district. She currently holds a comfortable lead over her opponent.

SDI, continued from page 1

Bearing this in mind, how should we look at the Gorbachev proposal to reduce nuclear strike weapons by 50 percent, a prospect now being dangled before U.S. negotiators in Geneva? First of all, the Soviets would probably take any negotiated numerical cut from their third-strike force, which even they must see as grossly excessive for Soviet requirements. But for the sake of argument, assume that they would cut instead 50 percent of their first-strike force in return for a similar cut in our retaliatory force. This would mean that half the Soviet first-strike force would need to destroy only half as many targets. The strategic asymmetry between U.S. and Soviet forces would remain the same. Even if the 50 percent reduction were applied to warheads rather than to missiles, the results would be similar.

Thus, even if one assumes solution of all the hitherto-intractable arms-control problems, such as verification or cheating, the numbers game in arms control is a losing proposition for the United States. The only real answer to this dilemma lies in the Strategic Defense Initiative—not just the research into, but also the deployment of defenses.

Even a modestly effective strategic-defense system would restore symmetry to the nuclear balance. Consider the case of a U.S. strategic defense that was 80 percent effective. With such a system in place, only one in five of the missiles the Soviets might use in a first strike against the U.S. second-strike force could be expected to reach its mark. The United States' ability to retaliate effectively would, therefore, be substantially preserved, raising the risk that a first strike would pose for the Soviets and reducing the possibility that the Kremlin would, in fact, strike first.

Under such conditions, the Soviets would be forced to place greater emphasis on their own retaliatory capability, reducing the present Soviet first and third-strike forces into a second-strike force similar to that of the United States. With the forces of both superpowers thus postured for retaliation, numerical reductions would become a reasonable, even achievable, goal which would weaken neither side.

The Soviets have already made it abundantly clear that they do not relish the thought of being forced to abandon their thus-far successful pursuit of first-strike capabilities. They have scrambled back to the bargaining table and used every

carrot or stick at the disposal to dissuade the United States from pursuing SDI. They have even preferred reductions, knowing full-well that their winning strategy will remain intact if SDI is defeated. The Soviets know that they are better off with half the current number of missiles still enjoying a free ride to their targets than they would be with four times as many missiles whose chances of reaching their targets are severely reduced by an American strategic defense.

It makes good sense to defend ourselves from nuclear missiles, particularly when we can do so by non-nuclear means. What makes no sense is the plethora of arguments in favor of dooming SDI to mere research by striking a deal with the Soviets to adhere to the ABM Treaty for 15 years in return for a mutual reduction in nuclear weapons. At best, such a deal promises only that a dangerous, fundamental, nuclear asymmetry will persist at a lower level. When developed, strategic defenses will force the Soviets to give up their first-/third-strike force in favor of a second-strike force. Then we will be dealing on equal terms, and we just might agree that that the time for real cuts has arrived.

Bush, continued from page 1

Bush was warmly welcomed in Israel, both by the media and by government officials. Israeli leaders, including the prime minister, Shimon Peres, and the defense minister, Yitzhak Rabin, welcomed the opportunity to discuss substantive issues affecting the two countries.

According to the administration, the Bush trip was meant to prod peace initiatives in the region. Bush refused to meet with the PLO, but met instead with prominent Palestinians from the Israeli settlements on the West Bank and Gaza. He also urged direct talks between Peres and Jordan's King Hussein as the next step toward peace in the Middle East. The Vice President also expressed his commitment "to maintaining Israel's quality military edge," and assured his hosts that the United States "will not impose a peace, but will serve only as a friendly supporter" in seeking a peace settlement.

Though some found it disappointing

that Bush's presence in the region could not be used as a impetus to prepare for a long-awaited summit between Peres and Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak, Bush did succeed in expediting a solution of the Taba issue. Taba, a small strip of land on the Israeli-Egyptian border in Sinai, has been a major source of tension between the two countries and an impediment to the normalization of relations between them.

In keeping with the Reagan administration's position that an economically healthy Israel is important to America's national security interests, Bush also signed a tourism pact with Peres, which is expected to boost bilateral tourism ties. Israeli officials have expressed hope that the high-profile of the Bush trip will help restore tourism to its pre-1986 level.

On the military front, Bush praised Israel for having joined the United States in the development of the Strategic Defense Initiative. He also indicated that there is interest in Washington in grant-

ing Israel the same favored treatment for U.S. arms purchases as that afforded NATO allies. At the urging of Yitzhak Rabin, Bush said he would set up a commission to study the trade benefits of such an arrangement.

NJC Bulletin is published monthly by
the National Jewish Coalition

MAX FISHER <i>Honorary Chairman</i>	RICHARD J. FOX <i>National Chairman</i>
GEORGE KLEIN <i>Co-Chairman</i>	IVAN BOESKY <i>Finance Chairman</i>
GORDON ZACKS <i>Co-Chairman</i>	
CHRIS GERSTEN <i>Executive Director</i>	

The NJC Bulletin welcomes comments and letters to the editor. These, along with any address changes, should be sent to:

NJC Bulletin
 415 Second Street, N.E.
 Suite 100
 Washington, D.C. 20002
ANTONY KORENSTEIN
Editor

The ABA and Soviet Lawyers

Throughout the American legal and academic communities, preparations are now under way for next year's bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution. But as America prepares to celebrate the freedoms enshrined in this document, the nation's pre-eminent legal organization, the American Bar Association (ABA), has taken an action that is at odds with the group's reputation as a defender of liberty and justice.

On July 24, the president of the ABA informed the organization's governing body, the House of Delegates, of a cooperation agreement signed between the ABA and the Association of Soviet Lawyers (ASL). The agreement "pledged to advance the rule of law," and to promote respect for human rights. Superficially, it appears to be a worthy document between two organizations equally committed to the values of freedom and liberty that Americans hold dear.

Unlike the ABA, however, the ASL is as far from being committed to liberty and justice as the Kremlin is from promoting free-enterprise and democracy. Like all professional, cultural and political organizations in the Soviet Union, the ASL is controlled by the government, and membership is limited to those who are considered "politically reliable."

Although the ASL committed itself in its agreement with the ABA to uphold human rights, the group has, in fact, been in the forefront of Soviet efforts to deny those same rights. The Kremlin craves legitimacy, among both the Soviet people and the international community. It has, therefore, created the ASL to provide legal rationalizations and spurious legitimacy to such policies of repression as the persecution of Hebrew teachers and the imprisonment of dissidents in "psychiatric hospitals."

Some of the ASL's most virulent attacks have, in fact, been reserved for Soviet Jews, particularly those "refuseniks" whose requests for permission to emigrate to Israel have been denied. In 1979, for example, the ASL published the *White Book* dealing with the subject of Soviet Jewry, in which Jews who wish to emigrate were said to be inspired by

Western "intelligence services." Last May, a second edition of the *White Book* appeared. Among the attacks on Soviet Jews to appear in this edition, was one that called the teaching of Hebrew and the Jewish religion "a blatant attempt to affect the psyche of minors in a religious and nationalistic way."

The teaching of Hebrew is "a blatant attempt to affect the psyche of minors . . ."

The Association of Soviet Lawyers

The second edition, in fact, was produced by the ASL in cooperation with the Soviet Anti-Zionist Committee, an organization whose anti-Semitic rhetoric and publications are among the most virulent to appear since the defeat of Nazi Germany. In fact, the deputy president of the ASL, Samuel Zivs, is also the vice-chairman of the Anti-Zionist Committee. Zivs, himself a Jew, is an outspoken defender of Soviet policy towards dissidents, having written that the Soviet Jewish dissident, Anatoly Shcharansky, was a paid CIA spy, and described the

harsh treatment of physicist, Andrei Sakharov, as "lenient."

Many Americans may legitimately ask why the ABA should accord an organization such as the ASL recognition and respectability by signing an agreement of mutual cooperation. Certainly, given the ASL's record of opposing all that the ABA stands for, there would appear to be little on which the two groups could possibly agree to cooperate. Indeed, it is the recognition of the fact that the Kremlin creates such groups as the ASL to serve its own political ends that has led the AFL-CIO to refuse for three decades to recognize or legitimate Soviet trade unions.

Some might believe that the ABA entered the agreement out of naivete. The current agreement, however, supercedes an earlier one signed just as the second edition of the ASL's *White Book* was published, an event that must surely have dispelled any illusions the American lawyers may have had about the purpose and aims of their Soviet counterparts.

Advocates of the agreement within the ABA have argued that dialogue between American and Soviet lawyers will, indeed, help to promote the goals proclaimed in the agreement. Their arguments succeeded in persuading the ABA's House of Delegates to approve the agreement.

Now that the agreement is in place, its opponents within the ABA should work to provide the organization with evidence of the ASL's contempt for human rights in the hope that such evidence will lead to the accord's abrogation. For, as America celebrates two centuries of constitutionally-guaranteed liberties, there can be no greater affirmation of our own dedication to freedom than the forceful and complete repudiation of the repression that the Soviet legal system seeks to uphold.

C.G.

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

415 Second Street, NE., Suite 100
Washington, DC 20002

Non Profit
Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Wash., DC
Permit No. 1062

September 10, 1986

The Honorable ^F1^
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Rep. ^F2^:

On behalf of the National Jewish Coalition, I would like to express my concern over the measure to bar U.S. support to the forces fighting Angola's Cuban-backed regime which is included in the Intelligence Authorization bill.

Passage of the measure would reinstate the 1976 Clark amendment, which was repealed last year. By prohibiting U.S. support for democratic guerrilla groups in Angola, the Clark amendment provided the Soviet Union with a free hand to install its ally, the MPLA in power in Luanda. Since then, the Angolan government, with the help of some 35,000 Cuban troops, have made Angola a bridgehead for Soviet expansion throughout the region.

We at the NJC are concerned at the oppression that the Angolan people must endure. We are also concerned at the overt and extensive relationship between the MPLA and the terrorists of the PLO. The PLO maintains a training camp for Angolan troops near the northern city of Caxito, and during a "state visit" in May, PLO leader, Yasir Arafat, pledged support to the Angolan government. Shortly after his departure, a reinforced battallion of PLO guerrillas were reported to have landed in Luanda and been deployed in a major offensive against the democratic forces of UNITA.

American Jews are concerned about the anti-Israel and anti-American partnership between the PLO and the MPLA, and so oppose action that inhibits U.S. aid to Angola's anti-Marxist resistance. We also believe that the United States has a moral obligation to the people of Angola to help ensure that their country becomes free and democratic.

I, therefore, respectfully urge that you vote to defeat any measure that would prevent the United States from aiding those fighting for freedom against the Luanda regime.

Sincerely,

Richard J. Fox
National Chairman

September 10, 1986

The Honorable ^F1^
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator ^F2^:

On behalf of the National Jewish Coalition, I would like to express our opposition to the proposal currently pending before the Senate that would reduce drastically the threshold for underground nuclear tests. It is my sincere hope that the Senate will recognize the considerable weakening of U.S. security that will inevitably result if the Aspin-Gephardt-Schroeder amendment passed by the House were to become law.

The question of nuclear testing is one which has received considerable attention in recent months. The Kremlin, having completed its testing requirements for the present, has adopted and extended a unilateral nuclear-test moratorium in an effort to put pressure on the United States to follow suit.

For Congress to succumb to this Soviet pressure would be to reward Mr. Gorbachev for what is widely-regarded as a publicity stunt: the Soviet Union still refuses to permit the kind of on-site verification of a test ban which the United States has insisted must be included in any comprehensive test-ban treaty. Given the Soviet's history of violating every arms control agreement it has ever signed with the United States, such verification measures are indispensable if the United States is to be certain of Soviet compliance.

In the absence of an agreement on verification, however, restrictions on U.S. testing such as those proposed by Reps. Aspin, Gephardt and Schroeder, would permit the Soviet Union to retain and even increase the testing advantage it gained during the months preceding its moratorium. Unable to test the reliability of existing weapons, the United States would lose confidence in its existing nuclear arsenal--a condition which would severely weaken the nuclear deterrent that constitutes the mainstay of the West's defenses.

Moreover, such a ban would prevent the development of new weapons, including the small, mobile ICBM known as "Midgetman," thereby permitting the Soviets to retain the advantage they have gained by the deployment of their own mobile missile, the SS-25. This, in turn, would result in a destabilization of the nuclear balance, and a situation in which the U.S. deterrent is seriously

undermined.

Throughout its history, the Jewish people have learned of the importance of vigilance in the face of its enemies. We have also learned that weakness and appeasement serve only to embolden those who wish us ill.

I, therefore, respectfully urge that you adopt a position against the imposition by Congress of unilateral restraints on nuclear testing by the United States. For, instead of forcing disarmament and reducing the likelihood of a nuclear war, such restraints would render the West increasingly impotent in the face of the Soviet Union's massive conventional and nuclear forces--a condition that vastly increases the likelihood of war.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Richard J. Fox
National Chairman

November 4, 1986

HIGH DIVIDENDS FROM A U.S.-ISRAELI PARTNERSHIP ON STRATEGIC DEFENSE

INTRODUCTION

The Israeli decision to participate in research on the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) promises to be the most important project ever formally undertaken between the two nations. Never before has a joint U.S.-Israeli military project offered so many strategic, technological, economic, and political benefits for both countries. The U.S. stands to gain not only a stronger ally in the Middle East, but a much improved technology base for the SDI program. Israel stands to gain a stronger defense capability and access to the technical and economic benefits of participating in the world's most advanced technology research program.

Specifically, building an Israeli defense against Soviet-supplied SCUD-B, SS-12, SS-21, and SS-22 surface-to-surface missiles deployed in Syria would serve U.S. interests by strengthening Israel's defenses, which should help stabilize the Middle East's military balance. It would benefit SDI by calling on Israeli expertise in laser technology, aero-mechanics, computer software, microelectronics, and propulsion systems. It would accelerate the SDI program by taking advantage of the rapid weapons acquisition process in Israel. It would create technological spinoffs for conventional armaments that would improve Israel's ability to coordinate its military forces and stop attacks by enemy tanks and heavy armored vehicles. And it would stimulate the Israeli economy by imparting to Israel some of the estimated \$5 trillion to \$15 trillion commercial value of SDI high technology spinoffs.

To reap these benefits, it is vital that the U.S.-Israeli cooperation on SDI be allowed to develop fully. Thus the Reagan Administration should:

1) vigorously oppose congressional efforts to reduce allied participation in the SDI research program;

2) establish a U.S.-Israeli working group as soon as possible to accelerate research and development on an anti-tactical ballistic missile (ATBM) system for Israel; and

3) begin working with Israel to upgrade the Israeli air defense system around air bases, mobilization centers, and cities as a first step toward a more comprehensive defense system against tactical ballistic missiles.

THE TACTICAL BALLISTIC MISSILE THREAT TO ISRAEL

When Ronald Reagan unveiled his Strategic Defense Initiative in March 1983, he offered U.S. allies the opportunity to participate in the project. Three years later, in May 1986, with the unanimous support of the Israeli Cabinet, Israeli Defense Minister Yitzhak Rabin signed a Memorandum of Understanding with U.S. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger signaling a go ahead for Israeli involvement in the program. This prompt Israeli response derives in large part from the growing threat to Israel from ballistic missiles armed with conventional, chemical, and nuclear warheads.

Arab states confronting Israel have accumulated weaponry that totals well over \$100 billion. Israel's chief adversary is Syria, which boasts Soviet-supplied SCUD-B, SS-12, SS-21, and SS-22 surface-to-surface missiles. These missiles--even when carrying non-nuclear warheads--can destroy Israeli military control centers, storage depots, and airfields almost without warning. Virtually all of Israel's airbases north of Jerusalem would be vulnerable to attack and could be neutralized for up to 24 hours. This would allow Syria to overrun Israeli forces on the Golan Heights.

Israel currently has ten airbases potentially vulnerable to Syrian short-range missiles.¹ Ten direct hits by either a chemically armed or conventionally armed SS-21 could completely incapacitate a base. The Syrians now possess about two dozen SS-21s. In the near future, the Soviets could supply Syria with enough missiles to knock out all of Israel's bases with a first strike.

1. For a detailed analysis of the Syrian missile threat to Israel airbases and major cities, see Seth W. Carus, "The Threat to Israel From Tactical Ballistic Missiles," testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Strategic Nuclear Forces, January 30, 1986.

The Syrian SS-21 short-range ballistic missiles have a range of 75 miles and an accuracy reported to be within 100 yards. They can strike major Israeli population centers. A surprise attack by these missiles would seriously disrupt the call-up of reserves, the lifeline of the Israel Defense Forces. Israel believes, moreover, that Syria will soon receive the SS-23 with greater accuracy and more than four times the range of the SS-21. It could hit almost any point within Israel.

The use of surface-to-surface missiles in the Iran-Iraq war has revealed to Israeli officials the vulnerability of population centers. One of Israel's most pressing needs thus has become to develop technologies to counter this threat. That SDI offers a promise to remedy this vulnerability is understood by the Israelis.

THE ADVANTAGES OF ISRAELI PARTICIPATION IN SDI

The U.S. invitation to its allies to participate in SDI stated that the program will "examine technologies with potential against shorter-range ballistic missiles." One of the first technologies likely to emerge from SDI research will be for anti-tactical ballistic missiles. SDI technologies thus could enable Israel to defend itself rather than rely upon the risky strategies of deterrence by threat of retaliation or preemptive attack. The development of an Anti-Tactical Ballistic Missile System (ATBM) or a theater defense system offers a near-term deployment option for Israel. Interceptor weapons such as kinetic energy kill systems, ground-launched hypervelocity interceptor missiles, Rail guns, laser beams, particle beams, and various other intercept technologies are already being tested.² Defense against SS-21, SS-22, and SS-23 missiles could employ a wide range of current technologies since the trajectories of the missiles are lower, and the speeds are slower than those for ICBMs.

What Kind of System

Upgrading existing air defense systems to meet the short-term ballistic missile threat would be the first step in creating a theater defense system. Newer technologies, however, offer great promise. An ideal candidate for an Israeli defense against the Syrians' SS-21 is the U.S. Navy's "Aegis" acquisition radar deployed with a two-stage

2. Israel is reported to be able to deploy a ground-based free electron laser weapon system capable of intercepting ballistic missiles as part of an ATBM system during the 1990s. The system could use a single system to defend the entire country and would rely upon ground-based relay/fighting mirrors instead of space-based systems. Aviation Week and Space Technology, October 20, 1986, p. 27.

hypervelocity missile being developed by Rafael Corporation in Israel. Many of the major components for the missile have already been flight tested. Also promising are a modified version of the U.S. Army's "Patriot" air defense missile and the French "Aster" anti-ballistic missile, which could engage warheads inside the atmosphere.

A point defense at a lower altitude could be composed of proved "off the shelf" anti-ballistic missile technologies, which might also include Patriot surface-to-air missiles. Newly devised "Swarm Jets," hypervelocity Rail guns, lasers, and various other ground-based interceptors could serve as a second layer to catch missiles in the terminal phase of their trajectories that permeate the higher altitude defense.

Each layer when utilized alone would have an 80 percent reliability rate, and when combined, could produce a 96 percent reliability rate. Syria, therefore, would need to target 500 missiles per base, instead of ten missiles, to guarantee destruction of each base. To wipe out all Israeli bases then would require 5,000 SS-21s. Logistics, costs, and political and strategic constraints make this an almost impossible number for Syria to deploy. Without SDI, the Syrians now require only 200 SS-21s to achieve the same results.

Enhancing Israeli Conventional Warfare Capability

SDI technologies should spill over considerably on Israel's conventional capabilities. Weapon designs and battlefield management systems, for instance, could be upgraded via cooperation with the U.S. in developing and sharing such state-of-the-art technologies as electronics, optics, computers, and energy. Domestic defense production enhanced by SDI contracts and shared expertise will contribute to Israeli self-sufficiency and the development of advanced weapons systems necessary for Israel's survival. Writes Avram Schweitzer, an Israeli journalist for the widely respected Ha'Aretz newspaper: "A system that can make out, identify, hone-in-on, and destroy an object less than 100 feet long, moving at near Mach 1 speed at a distance of 10,000 miles, is essentially a [ballistic missiles defense] system, the application of which could do to the foot soldier, the artillery piece, the tank, or the helicopter, what its space-progenitor is supposed to do to strategic missiles. To be in on this kind of technology...could mean the purchase of peace for Israel, or more realistically, the imposition, by non-aggressive means, of a permanent state of non-belligerence along its borders."³

The Israelis are already researching the possibilities of converting offshoots of SDI hypervelocity Rail guns into weapons capable of being mounted on tanks and armored vehicles. Because of

3. Midstream, June/July 1985, pp. 6, 7.

SDI, Israel will be in a better position to update aviation electronics and keep combat command and control systems close to state-of-the-art. The 1982 Lebanese conflict demonstrated the importance of these components for military success during Israel's confrontation with Syria.

Reducing the Likelihood of a Future Arab/Israeli Conflict

Unable to match the numbers of men and weapons fielded by its adversaries, Israel has had to rely on its qualitative advantage. But because of economic restraints, and the influx of Soviet, British, French, and even American weaponry to its adversaries, Israel's qualitative deterrent has eroded seriously. Syrian short-range missiles, for example, soon may be able to destroy Israel's fighter aircraft on the tarmac in a surprise attack. Israel's only way to counter such an imminent attack from surface-to-surface missiles would be by a preemptive strike against the missiles before they can be fired. Such a preemptive strike, of course, could ignite a new war in the Middle East. SDI, however, could enable Israel to regain its qualitative edge and thus be able to counter an impending missile strike without having to take preemptive action. Such a capability to deter Syrian aggression would not only enhance Israeli security immeasurably, but stabilize the entire region as well.

Insurance for Israel's Reserve System

The bulk of the Israeli Defense Forces consists of reserves. Israel's standing armed forces number 174,000. The reserves bring IDF to around 500,000--and most of this can be done within 72 hours. Israel's strained economy, however, cannot bear the cost of a constant reserves mobilization.

An ATBM system for Israel would help protect such Israeli mobilization capabilities as storage depots, roads, and supply lines which could seriously disrupt the call of the reserves. Moreover, by providing Israel defensive cover for calling up the reserves, an ATBM system would give the Israelis more time to decide and prepare for mobilization.

Strengthening the U.S.-Israeli Relationship

The U.S.-Israeli relationship will grow as the SDI program expands. Shared research and development between industries and applications of weaponry in the conventional arena will build a new array of relationships. This could lead to heightened strategic cooperation beyond anything envisioned at present.

Israel also will benefit from SDI relationships with those other U.S. allies that have accepted the President's offer. Great Britain and West Germany already have begun discussions on hybrid technological ventures for theater defenses. With an SDI role, Israel

could assume a de facto allied membership by helping to guard the southern flank of NATO.

Economic Benefits

U.S. federal budget constraints could restrict future U.S. aid to Israel. Possible aid drops, however, could be offset by SDI contracts awarded to Israeli defense industries. The Pentagon already has signed three contracts with Israel. Israeli research facilities and firms already have submitted some 150 science and technology proposals (including a project for the study of the basic features of regional anti-tactical ballistic missiles systems) to the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative Organization. Since high-tech products now account for 40 percent of Israel's industrial exports, the rapid development of SDI-related industries will boost economic growth.

Technological spinoffs could include new computer systems, energy sources, communication devices, medicines, and thousands of consumer products. SDI also will channel research funds to Israeli universities and will help revitalize the Israeli scientific community.

Israeli defense-related industries will receive contracts, strengthening strategic and economic cooperation between Israel and the United States. Major General David Ivry (Ret.), former Chairman of Israel Aircraft Industries, confirmed that Israeli industry is committed to playing a significant role in the SDI program. Such high-tech firms and organizations as Ivry's, Technion, Tadiran, Rafael, Elbit, El Op, Elisra, and the Sofek Nuclear Research Centre will be the likely recipients of the initial SDI subcontracts.

New opportunities in high-tech jobs surely could prevent Israeli scientists from leaving the country to seek opportunities in the West. In fact, an expanded high-tech industrial base in Israel may serve to be an attractive incentive for Jewish scientists abroad to move to Israel. In a sense, the economic importance of SDI to Israel is equally as important as the strategic benefits toward ensuring Israel's survival.

ISRAELI CONTRIBUTIONS TO SDI

Israel can contribute substantially to the SDI effort.

Technological Innovations and Battlefield Experience

Israel leads the world in the share of its population employed in research and development. There are approximately 300 engineers and scientists per every 10,000 people in Israel. Israel excels in the development of lasers, aero-mechanics, computer software, and

propulsion systems. Israel's vast battlefield experience, meanwhile, can be of great value to SDI. Example: the development of such U.S. weaponry as the F-16 Fighting Falcon interceptor aircraft was enhanced by lessons Israel learned during the Lebanon war.

The Israeli Defense Forces' battle experience ranges from remotely piloted vehicles (drones) to command, control, and communications (C³). This could enhance development of SDI.

A Catalyst for the SDI Program

Because of the precarious nature of the Middle East, the Israelis cannot afford long research and development time spans to move weaponry from the drawing board to the field. The Israelis team the military with scientists to conceive new technologies quickly. The Israeli Weapons Acquisition Cycle, therefore, provides a quick reaction capability and an emergency "surge" production capability. This could catalyze the entire SDI program by accelerating its pace.

The Israeli military/industrial partnership has advantages over the American. Since the Israeli military is small, it has a more fluid organizational structure, and there is more room for individual initiative in weapons proposals. Israel, moreover, need not contend with a strong anti-national security political network. Israel's historical experience dictates that military strength is the best insurance for survival.

CONCLUSION

Deployment of a ballistic missile defense system in Israel is feasible and necessary. An SDI system in Israel should prevent its adversaries from contemplating attack. Such a system also could guard against a conflict arising from an accidental launch or conventionally armed shorter-range missiles. A joint U.S.-Israeli project, moreover, will not only improve the SDI program with Israeli technical expertise but produce important technical spinoffs for conventional armaments, and it could stimulate economic growth in Israel by encouraging the development of marketable high-technology spinoffs. Finally, U.S.-Israeli cooperation on SDI will set a good example in participation for Western Europe.

For both Israel and the United States, the Strategic Defense Initiative is an opportunity and insurance policy for survival. Recent congressional efforts to restrict SDI contracts to allies was vigorously and successfully opposed by SDI supporters in Congress and by the Reagan Administration. The Administration must continue to

oppose amendments designed at reducing allied support for SDI by undermining competitive bidding on projects.

To facilitate research on a tactical ballistic missile defense system for Israel, the U.S. should form a working group with Israel and NATO allies to accelerate research and expedite cooperative development not only of an ATBM system but improved air defense systems as well. Establishing ATBM defenses in Israel and in Western Europe would greatly reduce the chances of a successful preemptive attack against Israeli and NATO forces. This would, in turn, deter aggression and thereby help preserve the peace in two regions of vital interest to the U.S.

SDI cooperation serves the interests of both the U.S. and Israel. It strengthens U.S. and Israeli ties as well as the SDI program itself. But clearly cooperation is most important for Israel. For the ability to defend itself against a growing Syrian short-range ballistic missile threat may some day be necessary for Israel's very survival.

Prepared for The Heritage Foundation
by Charles Brooks,
an official of the Washington-based
National Jewish Coalition

NJC Bulletin

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

INSIDE

MEESE BARS WALDHEIM	2
CONGRESS ACTS TO CLOSE PLO OFFICES	2
GLASNOST: A FORMER SOVIET JEW SPEAKS OUT	3

APRIL 1987

Administration Striving for Soviet Jewry

In an unprecedented gesture of support for Soviet Jewry, the Secretary of State, George P. Shultz, hosted a Passover *seder* at the residence of the U.S. ambassador to Moscow. Some 40 prominent Jewish refuseniks, including Josef Begun, Vladimir Slepak, Ida Nudel and Aleksandr Lerner were among those participating in the *seder*.

Accompanying Mr. Shultz was Ambassador Richard Schifter, the Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs. Ambassador Schifter has been in the forefront of efforts to obtain freedom for Soviet Jews.

The Secretary of State, who was in Moscow for talks on a wide range of issues with his Soviet counterpart, Eduard Shevardnadze, took the opportunity to reassure Soviet Jews of the Reagan administration's strong support for their cause. Shortly before he left the *seder*, Shultz addressed the refuseniks saying: "We think of you, we pray for you, and we are with you. On every occasion we meet the Soviets, we will always bring this subject [of Jewish emigration] up and they know it. Whether this seems to be a time of hope or a time of disappointment, our effort is always there. But we never give up, we never stop trying..."

There has been speculation recently that the policy of *glasnost* or "openness" being pursued by the Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, will result in a sizable increase in the rate of Soviet Jewish emigration. Since the beginning of 1987, there has been a slight rise in the number of Jews permitted to leave to 400 per month. However, the Reagan administration does

not believe that a return to the high rates that prevailed in the late '70s—50,000 were permitted to leave in 1979—is likely. Indeed, one senior official said that the Soviets appear willing to consider the emigration only of the 11,000 Jewish refuseniks who have already applied to leave but whose applications have been rejected. The Soviets are not willing to permit to leave the remaining 400,000 Soviet Jews who have taken the first steps in the long and cumbersome emigration process.

In fact, the Soviets have taken a number of steps in recent months to discourage

new applications. Among these is the new emigration law, which took effect on January 1st, 1987. This law requires that those wishing to leave do so only for reasons of family reunification. But while in the past "family" was broadly defined, under the new law anyone wishing to emigrate must have a first-degree relative—parent, child or sibling—living abroad.

The Soviets have also used the "security-sensitive status" as a means of complicating emigration procedure. Such status is applied to anyone whom the

Continued, page 2



Photo: Wide World Photos

Secretary of State, George Shultz, speaks to Jewish refusenik, Vladimir Slepak, at the Passover *seder* held at the residence of the U.S. ambassador to Moscow (see interview, page 3).

CAPITAL *Wire*

POLLS SUGGEST JEWISH VOTING PATTERNS CHANGING

Two recent opinion polls indicate a weakening in the once-solid support given by Jews to the Democratic Party. One poll, conducted in early April by the *New York Times* and CBS News, showed that 54 percent of Jews registered to vote expected to vote Democrat in next year's presidential election, while 12 percent expected to vote Republican. A poll conducted earlier in the year by Richard Wirthlin for the Republican National Committee revealed similar results from Jews who were asked to identify the party they support. In that poll, 53 percent identified as Democrats, and 18 percent as Republicans.

The results from the Wirthlin and *New York Times*/CBS polls suggest a continuation of the trend demonstrated in which Jews are increasingly willing to consider alternatives to the Democratic Party and its candidates. According to polling data published in the National Survey of American Jewry (NSAJ), 65 percent of Jews identified as Democrats in 1981, 59 percent in 1983, and 57 percent in 1984. The NSAJ found that Jewish support for the GOP remained fairly constant at around 12 percent during the years in question.

The polling data are encouraging to GOP strategists who have sought to expand their party's support within the Jewish community. Although the *New York Times*/CBS poll shows Jewish support for Republicans remaining at 12 percent, the rise to 18 percent in such support indicated by the Wirthlin poll and the weakening in Jewish support for the Democrats suggest expanded opportunities for the GOP to attract Jewish support.

MEESE BARS WALDHEIM

The Reagan administration announced on April 27th that it has barred the Austrian president, Kurt Waldheim, from entering the United States. The decision was taken in light of evidence indicating that Waldheim was involved in war crimes dur-

ing his service as a German officer in the Balkans during World War II. Dr. Waldheim, who served two terms as the Secretary General of the United Nations, had concealed his involvement in Nazi organizations and his service in the Balkans until they were uncovered last year.

The decision was taken after the attorney general, Edwin Meese, III, found that a prima facie case exists against Waldheim. As a result, Waldheim's name will be placed on a "watch list" of people prohibited from entering the country. Should Waldheim request permission to do so, a hearing would be held to determine whether or not he is guilty of the crimes of which he is suspected.

The prohibition against Dr. Waldheim applies only to private visits. Should he come to the United States on official business, his diplomatic immunity would permit him to enter the country unhindered. It is thought unlikely, however, that he will attempt to do so.

CONGRESS ACTS TO CLOSE PLO OFFICES

An effort is under way in Congress to close the offices maintained by the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) in the United States. The offices are the PLO's observer mission to the United Nations in New York, and the Palestine Information Office in Washington, D.C.

The effort is being led in the House of Representatives by Rep. Jack Kemp (R-NY), who introduced a bill on April 29 which would make it illegal to aid, abet or provide services to the PLO. The bill is intended to bring about the closure of the PLO's offices in this country. A similar bill is expected to be introduced shortly in the Senate by Senators Charles Grassley (R-Iowa) and Robert Dole (R-KS).

The Congressional action came a few days after the Egyptian government closed the PLO's offices in Cairo and Alexandria in response to harsh PLO criticism of Egypt for her adherence to the Camp David Accords. The criticism was levelled during the recent meeting in Algiers of the Palestine National Council. Jordan and Morocco had previously acted to close the PLO's offices in their capitals.

Shultz, cont'd from page 1

Soviets claim has had access to classified material whose disclosure would damage the interests of the Soviet Union. Those falling into this category are denied permission to emigrate although, according to published reports, the Soviets have established a new procedure by which the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet would consider appeals made in "special cases".

The wide publicity that the problem of Soviet Jewry has received has hindered Mr. Gorbachev's efforts to improve his country's image in the West. By removing this embarrassing issue as a point of contention between the Soviets and the West, the Kremlin hopes to reduce opposition among Western public opinion Soviet policies.

In part, this reduction would help the Soviets secure hard-currency loans from the West. The decline in the price of oil has drastically reduced the Soviets' earnings of the hard currencies which are needed to purchase the Western technology needed to modernize the Soviet economy.

The Soviets hope that enhancing their image abroad will also help soften opposition in the West for Soviet foreign policy in general. Such softening could, for example, help put pressure on the Reagan administration and other NATO governments to accept less-than-favorable Soviet terms for an arms-control agreement.

It is within this context that recent Soviet hints at higher emigration levels and the news of more relaxed domestic restrictions on religious practice by Jews and others are viewed. Under the new domestic Soviet policy towards religious practice, the import of religious books and other materials not deemed "anti-Soviet" will be permitted, and religious instruction will be allowed within synagogues. The Soviets have also stated that new synagogues will be built "where there is a demonstrated need."

Despite these changes, severe restrictions on the practice of Judaism will remain. The teaching of Hebrew and the holding of prayer-groups other than in synagogues will continue to be prohibited. Moreover, according to a senior administration official, the Soviets have made clear that they have "no intention of making special rules for Jews," adding to fears that emigration will be cut off once the issue of the 11,000 refuseniks has been dealt with.

Glasnost: A Soviet Jew Speaks Out

On March 27, Alexander Slepak, a Jewish emigrant from the Soviet Union, began a seventeen-day hunger-strike in Washington, D.C., to protest the continued refusal of Soviet authorities to permit his parents, Vladimir and Maria Slepak, to emigrate to Israel.

In the late 1960s, Vladimir Slepak became a pioneer of the Soviet Jewry movement in the Soviet Union, and was a leading member of the Helsinki Group which monitored Soviet compliance with the Helsinki human-rights accords. In 1970, he requested permission to emigrate, an action which resulted in his dismissal from his job at a Moscow radio-television laboratory, harassment at the hands of the KGB, imprisonment and five years' internal exile in Siberia.

In an interview with the NJC Bulletin, Slepak's younger son, Leonid, addressed the plight of his father and other Soviet Jews under the glasnost policies of the Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev.

NJC: In light of recent speculation concerning improvements in the Kremlin's policies towards Soviet Jews, what effect do you think Mr. Gorbachev's glasnost policies will have on Soviet Jews?

Leonid Slepak: I consider glasnost to be mostly a political stunt, a wide-ranging public-relations campaign. Gorbachev wants to change the image of the Soviet Union, and so we see a lot of propaganda. But in reality there have not been that many changes: we have heard a lot of words, but we haven't seen much in the way of action.

Let's consider the recent talk about increased Jewish emigration, about how they are going to raise the number of exit visas to 400 per month. Of course we welcome the increase, but in reality, it is insignificant. Look at the numbers. In 1979, the Soviets allowed over 50,000 people a year to leave—that is over 4000 visas per month. So when they speak about an increase from 100 to up to 400, it is mostly words, not much action.

NJC: Given your views on the matter, then, could you address the results of the recent trip to Moscow taken by Mr. Morris Abram [chairman of the Conference of

Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, and of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry] and Mr. Edgar Bronfman [President of the World Jewish Congress]. After their trip, they announced that the Soviet officials they had met had indicated that there would be considerable easing of restrictions, both on Jewish emigration and on religious practice by those Jews who remain in the Soviet Union.

Slepak: First of all, there were no promises made. Mr. Abram and Mr. Bronfman met Soviet officials, they raised the question of Soviet Jewry and that's as far as it went. There were no definite answers, there were no promises and no agreements. The discussions seemed to deal more with concerns over the religious and ethnic freedom of Jews in the Soviet

In large part, glasnost is a P.R. campaign, rather than strong political change.

Union than with the main questions of free emigration of Jews.

Also, the discussions of emigration dealt with the release of 10-13,000 Jewish refuseniks, and that's as far as it went. But we know there are up to 400,000 Jews who would like to leave the country but who have been afraid to seek permission because of the fate suffered by the refuseniks. I'm sure everybody in the West would welcome the release of the refuseniks, although I doubt that they will, in fact, be allowed to leave. But even if they are, I think that's as far as it will go—the remainder of the 400,000 will still be prevented from leaving.

The Soviet Jewish community was very disappointed about the stress on religious freedom within the Soviet Union. This is because, while there might be some easing,

which will contribute to the image of glasnost, if it does occur, it will only be very temporary. Conditions can be eased for a moment—until the Jackson-Vanik restrictions [tying Soviet trade benefits to emigration levels] are dropped—and then tightened again. For this reason, the main concern is to get the people out, not to let them stay even under promises that allow them to practice their religion. That's why I said that the visit was disappointing, because the main issue was not really discussed.

NJC: What approach would you recommend that the West in general, and Jewish communities in the West in particular, take towards glasnost and the problem of Soviet Jewish emigration in the coming years?

Slepak: First of all, they have to be extremely cautious and not be misled by this PR campaign that I mentioned before. Because, in large part, glasnost is just a PR campaign, and not the strong political change it is presented as being. Simply speaking, it is quite impossible to expect a real democratization of the country because its one-party system is a dictatorship. Even if there is some melting and softening of the inside policy, it is only superficial. People in the West think a revolution is occurring in the Soviet Union, but this is a wrong assumption.

Judging from their deeds in the past, we cannot trust the Soviets. A lot of promises have been made, but in reality, not much was done. So if we just take their word that they are going to change, and we soften the Jackson-Vanik amendment and similar sanctions against the oppression in the Soviet Union, we will be making concessions—by giving them trade favors, cultural exchanges and so on—while they are giving nothing in return except promises. So in good faith, they have to show that they are willing to do, if not everything, then at least something.

Look at the widely-publicized new emigration law that went into effect on January 1st: in reality, this law made the situation even worse. It's not that the new law did not change the situation, it made it even worse. This law says that everybody may leave, but when you look at the fine print, you see that yes, you may leave, but if and only if you have first-degree relatives—parent, child, brother or sister—living abroad. This is ridiculous. In other words, if you do not have your siblings, if you do not have your parents abroad, you're stuck.

Continued, page 4

Slepak, cont'd from page 3

But this new law does help the Russians. For instance, now there are 10-13,000 refuseniks. But many of these refuseniks don't have first-degree relatives abroad, and so they drop out of that category. Because under the new law, they cannot reapply for permission to leave without immediate family abroad, the number of the refuseniks will diminish. Gorbachev's administration will then be able to say: "Listen, we have fewer and fewer refuseniks; nobody wants to go."

But even those who do have first-degree relatives abroad—as my parents do—still will be refused because their leaving is "not in the interest of the state". That's how they write the law.

Our father had access, they say, to classified information, but that was over eighteen years ago. Then they said, the secrets will prevent him from leaving for five years. But when the five years were over, they said: "No, it's not five years, it's ten." Since they couldn't extend the time indefinitely after ten years, they just said that his departure "is not in the interest of the state". How can you fight that? What are the interests of the state? It is eighteen years since my father worked in his profession. Even when he did work, almost two decades ago, whatever he worked on was already ten years out of date, because the Soviet Union is so far behind the West. So that's the reality of the new emigration law.

NJC: Could you address the apparent enthusiasm that Dr. Sakharov, the Nobel Peace-Price winner, has shown towards the *glasnost* reforms? How have Soviet Jews reacted to that?

Slepak: Dr. Sakharov was mainly known by as "a democrat". In other words, he is someone who is fighting for reforms, changes, inside the country. That is the difference between "democratic dissidents" and the Jewish-activist dissidents.

My father and his colleagues always stressed this difference between them and the "democratic dissidents". The Jewish activists are not trying to change anything inside the country. After all, Soviet law already gives everyone the right to leave. So they're not trying to change anything, they want to leave the country.

But because Sakharov and his colleagues are mainly fighting for changes *inside* the country, he is supportive of the changes and that's why he's been supportive of Gorbachev since returning from internal exile. Gorbachev uses Sakharov because they're sort of singing the same tune.

But, so far, Sakharov has not really made any statements regarding the emi-

gration and the fate of the Jews. That has been slightly disappointing for the Jewish community, because in the past they worked together. For example, my father and Shcharansky were members, along with Sakharov, of the Helsinki Group. They were fighting together for human rights in the Soviet Union. But now, their cooperation has fallen apart. As much as the Jewish activists welcomed Sakharov's return from Gorky, they have been disappointed that he has been silent on the topic of Soviet Jewry and on emigration in general.

NJC: Do you think the West should be imposing stricter measures against the Soviet Union such as the ban on the import of goods made with slave labor recently proposed by Senator William Armstrong (R-Colo.)?

Slepak: Speaking in particular about Armstrong's ban, as a political move it's great. It shows one more time the concern about the political prisoners. But in reality, I'm slightly skeptical, because it is so easy for the Russians to overcome: all they have to do is change the labels so that the goods cannot be traced. But as a gesture, it's a wonderful way to show that we are concerned about the labor camps and their inmates.

NJC: What other measures would you suggest be taken?

Slepak: On the one hand, new bans or prohibitions against the Soviets can be counterproductive, because they get stubborn and they refuse to cooperate at all.

Then you start just banging your head against a brick wall—or iron curtain for that matter. As we have seen in the past, we can achieve much more by speaking to them rather than just confronting them.

Nevertheless, as I said before, *we have to be extremely cautious*. There is quite a difference between the words and deeds. Yes we do have to try to work out something with the Soviets; we should try to negotiate, to speak with them rather than fight with them. But, as I mentioned before, we cannot be misled just by promises. So I don't think that additional bans will have any effect right now. Rather we should speak to them, but be careful not just to take their word that they will change.

NJC: Under what conditions would you suggest that measures such as the Jackson-Vanik Amendment be repealed or waived on a yearly basis?

Slepak: I think it's simply up to the Russians. What the Jackson-Vanik amendment says is that if there are restrictions on emigration, the amendment goes into effect. If there are no restrictions, it doesn't. It's not even up to the American public. What the Russians try to do is say "you drop the amendment and we'll start doing something." But if they will start doing something, the amendment will be dropped by itself. They're just trying to throw the ball in our court rather than do something themselves. As I said, it shows one more time that they try to get concessions from the West based on words rather than on deeds.



NJC co-chairman, George Klein (left) with White House aide, Chris Bowman, at a recent Coalition meeting in New York.

The Pollard Affair in Perspective

Richard J. Fox

As the flood of damaging reports and revelations about the Pollard spy affair begins, finally, to recede, the time has come for all concerned with U.S.-Israel relations to consider what mistakes were made and what lessons may be learned. In order to prevent a recurrence of so serious a dispute, we must identify and openly discuss these mistakes to ensure that they are not repeated in the future.

To anyone who believes that strong and close U.S.-Israel ties are in the best interest of both countries, the Pollard affair can only be viewed as a fiasco. Who but our enemies has benefitted from the divisions that have recently arisen between two allies who have so much in common?

The first mistake, therefore, was that which allowed this truly special relationship to be placed at risk. Who made that mistake? A month ago, the answer seemed clear: Israel had done so by recruiting an American citizen to spy on its closest ally. Today, the absolute culpability ascribed to Israel has, in the eyes of some, been mitigated by news that the United States had engaged a dissident Israeli soldier to spy on Israel during the Lebanon War. The statement by Senator Dave Durenberger (R-Minn.) to this effect was echoed in a memorandum by the secretary of defense, Caspar Weinberger, which reportedly states that the United States routinely spies on several of its allies, including Israel.

An old axiom holds true in this case: two wrongs do not make a right. If the United States did, indeed, spy on Israel, Israel's response should not have been to recruit an American to do likewise against the United States. Instead, Israel should have ensured merely that the American spying ceased, protesting strongly to prevent its recurrence. Certainly, the Israelis may have had other motives for staging the operation, specifically the concern that the United States denied Israel intelligence data important to Israel's security. But no

amount of data—and no degree of umbrage taken from the U.S. operation—could possibly justify the risks Israel took in recruiting Pollard. As the scandal produced by Pollard's spying attests, the operation threatened to undermine a relationship whose importance to both Israel and the United States is unequalled. Israel simply cannot afford to offend her major friend and ally in such a manner.

Whatever the rights and wrongs of Pollard's spying, Israel's handling of the affair served to perpetuate, rather than to defuse, the crisis that ensued. Just as it seemed that the damage from the affair was beginning to be corrected, Israel compounded the problem by adding insult to injury.

The Israeli government has taken steps intended to defuse the dispute.

Instead of allowing Pollard's sentencing hearing to pass as quietly as possible, Israel announced on the eve of the hearing that the man believed to have "operated" Pollard—Aviem Sella—had been promoted and given the command of Israel's second-largest air-force base.

It is hard to understand what motivated the Israelis to take this action. That Sella would be assigned to a new post following his departure from the United States should not have been a surprise: he is, after all, a military officer on active service. But by promoting him and giving him one of the most prestigious and highly-visible postings in the Israeli armed forces, Israel gave

the appearance—intended or not—of rewarding Sella for his role in the Pollard affair. At best this was a grossly insensitive action, incomprehensible in the context of the strains in Israel's relations with the United States.

Sella has since resigned this post and been appointed instead as lecturer at a military college. Had he not resigned, his presence in so important a position would have served as a constant reminder in the United States of the mistrust that the Pollard case had created.

In addition, the Israeli government has taken steps intended to defuse the dispute completely. First the Knesset, and then the government, recently established commissions of enquiry into the affair. Had Israel taken this step immediately following Pollard's arrest—instead of waiting until U.S. pressure to do so became too strong to resist—much of the damage that has since occurred could have been avoided.

If the Pollard case was a fiasco, it was one largely of Israel's own making, not only because Pollard was recruited in the first place, but because the insensitive manner in which it was handled by Israel ensured that the controversy persisted far longer than was necessary.

Now, finally, the affair is behind us—U.S.-Israel relations proved strong enough to bear the strain. This is due to the efforts of the Reagan administration to institutionalize the alliance, broadening the areas of mutual cooperation and recognizing Israel as the invaluable ally she is.

Were it not for these changes, the damage that the Pollard case caused would have been far more difficult to repair. Nevertheless, in order that the special and close relationship continue to prosper, the commitment and goodwill on which it is founded must continue to be demonstrated by both sides. There is simply too much at stake to do otherwise.

NJC Bulletin is published monthly by
the National Jewish Coalition

MAX FISHER **RICHARD J. FOX**
Honorary Chairman *National Chairman*

GEORGE KLEIN **GORDON ZACKS**
Co-Chairman *Co-Chairman*

CHRIS GERSTEN
Executive Director

Please send comments and address changes to:

NJC Bulletin
415 Second Street, N.E.,
Suite 100
Washington, D.C. 20002

ANTONY KORENSTEIN
Editor

Mr. Fox is the NJC's national chairman.

Reagan's Return

Max M. Fisher

For a while, all seemed to be precisely as Ronald Reagan's opponents said. The President, reeling from the disclosures of the Iran affair, weakened by the loss of the U.S. Senate to the Democrats, and battered by the criticisms of the Tower Commission, appeared to have relinquished his role as our nation's leader. All around, his Democratic adversaries relished the prospect of spending the last two years of the Reagan administration undoing six years of the Reagan revolution.

The nadir of President Reagan's political fortunes came with the release of the Tower Report on February 26th. Having been urged by the President to "tell all" about the national-security council's role in the Iranian affair, the Commission did so, sparing Mr. Reagan no criticism.

But, in Washington, political fortunes often change as quickly as the winds. Having read the report, and digested its findings, Ronald Reagan quickly acted to restore his presidency to its former status. Donald Regan, the much-maligned White House chief of staff, departed from his post, to be replaced by former Tennessee Republican senator, Howard Baker.

The appointment of Baker was an act of political genius. As a man who served for four years as the Senate's majority leader, Baker is a man trusted and popular among his former colleagues. He is also remembered by the public for his role in the Watergate hearings, a role which stamped him as a man of integrity. At once, therefore, Baker was a man who could rebuild relations between the White House and the Congress, as well as help restore public confidence in the institution of the Presidency.

This was noted by the President's opponents as an important first step in overcoming the crisis. It was soon followed by another "first step": the President's press conference on March 19th. Despite hostile—and often grossly disrespectful—questioning by representatives of the media, the President was adjudged to have acquitted himself well during the conference. His success confirmed what many already

believed: that the worst of the Iran crisis was far behind, and that Ronald Reagan had resumed the role of leader.

Indeed, since the release of the Tower Commission report, Mr. Reagan's actions have left little doubt that he refuses to be the lame-duck President the Democrats hoped he would be. The first confirmation of the fact was the thoroughness of the change in White House staff that accompanied Mr. Baker's appointment as chief of staff. It quickly became clear that the appointment represented far more than

Mr. Reagan has shown that he refuses to be the lame-duck president that many would like him to be.

window-dressing, and that the President was determined to make a fresh start.

But more importantly, Mr. Reagan has demonstrated that, in policy matters, too, he is determined to regain the upper hand. The first test was the Democratic attempt

in mid-March to use the Iran affair to derail the President's Central America policy. In votes in the House and the Senate, the Democrats sought to block—or at least to postpone—the transfer of U.S. aid to Nicaragua's anti-Sandinista forces, the "contrast". Although the House approved a measure to do so, the Democrats' majority was not as resounding as they had hoped. When the Senate voted on whether to block the aid, the measure was defeated—with the help of several southern Democratic freshmen. The Democrats were also forced, by a Republican filibuster, to abandon an attempt to force a vote on an aid moratorium.

But if in the "contra" aid vote President Reagan succeeded in turning back a Democratic assault on his policies, his veto of the Highway Bill showed that he was once again on the offensive. Passed overwhelmingly by Congress, the bill was enormously popular with members of both parties, not least because it permitted the states to raise the speed limit on rural inter-state highways.

For this reason, many believed that the President should not have vetoed the bill, even though he considered it as "budget-buster". But, against the odds, the President fought the bill, and was defeated. However, the ferocity of the fight over his veto, the fact that the Senate voted for passage of this popular bill only on the second attempt—and even then by only one vote—indicate that Mr. Reagan is back.

While some partisans may rue the President's return to vigor, those who recognize his contributions to the health and strength of the nation will welcome it unreservedly. As the pressing issues of our day—the Strategic-Defense Initiative, arms control, Central America and trade—are dealt with, only a president both strong and determined will be capable of preserving America's interests.

NATIONAL JEWISH COALITION

415 Second Street, NE., Suite 100
Washington, DC 20002

Non Profit
Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Wash., DC
Permit No. 1062

Mr. Fisher, one of the nation's most distinguished Jewish leaders, is the NJC's honorary chairman.