A Democratic but "Racist" Solution to the Palestinian Problem

Paul Eidelberg[1]

I. Introduction

Except in certain contexts, no distinct reference will be made to classical and contemporary democracy, since both logically negate Palestinian statehood. However, to avoid misunderstanding, the reader should bear the following distinctions in mind. Although both classical and contemporary democracy emphasize freedom and equality as basic principles, classical or normative democracy derives these principles from the Genesis account of man's creation in the image of God. As a consequence, freedom and equality in classical democracy have rational and moral constraints. This is not the case of contemporary or normless democracy, where moral relativism flourishes and prevents its victims from opposing a Palestinian nation-state on moral grounds.[1] Also, whereas freedom in classical democracy takes precedence over equality, the reverse is the case in contemporary democracy where egalitarianism reigns supreme. This egalitarianism saps Jewish national pride or honor and emasculates Jews *vis-à-vis* their scornful and brutal enemies. Finally, unlike classical democracy, which exalts *political* freedom (or "liberty"), contemporary democracy worships *personal* freedom – another reason why moral relativism flourishes in normless democracy.

Because Arab-Islamic culture, as will be seen in a moment, is diametrically opposed to democracy however understood, it is logically absurd to justify an Arab Palestinian state on democratic grounds – the illogical tendency of today's "politically correct" democrats. The present writer will demonstrate that the Arabs of Judea, Samaria, and Gaza have no right, *in this period of history*, to an independent and sovereign state, indeed, that the creation of such a state, at this time, would serve neither the good of these Arabs nor the good of Israel. The

---

[1] **Paul Eidelberg** (Ph.D. University of Chicago), a professor of political science, is president and co-founder of the Foundation for Constitutional Democracy in the Middle East. He is the author of many books including *The Philosophy of the American Constitution, A Discourse on Statesmanship*, *Beyond the Secular Mind,* and *Judaic Man.* **Professor Eidelberg**, who lives in Jerusalem, is a member of the Advisory Council of the Ariel Center for Policy Research and of the Editorial Board of *Nativ*, to which he is a frequent contributor.

unprejudiced reader will then see that (1) any claim to the contrary by Arabs is but a ploy to truncate Israel and thereby facilitate its destruction, and (2) if such a claim is made by Jewish democrats, it merely reflects either abysmal ignorance, intellectual dishonesty or moral cowardice.

II. Islam versus Democracy

That Arab-Islamic culture is diametrically opposed to the basic principles and characteristics of democracy is so obvious that I must apologize to the reader for enumerating the following well-known facts:

First, whereas, freedom, including freedom of speech, is one of the two cardinal principles of democracy, Arab-Islamic culture is strictly authoritarian, which is why its media are state-controlled.

Second, unlike democracy, whose other cardinal principle is equality, Arab-Islamic culture is strictly hierarchical. Top-down leadership is a fundamental principle of Islamic theology. Authority runs down from Allah to Muhammad, and from Muhammad to the *imam*, the ruler of the regime.

Third, democracy is based on the primacy of consent or persuasion. This adorns democratic societies with a certain easy-goingness and civility. Not only are past grievances readily swept aside, but political opponents can be friends despite their differences. Differences are resolved by mutual concessions, and agreements are usually lasting. In contrast, Arab-Islamic culture is based on the primacy of coercion. Agreements between rival factions do not really terminate animosities, which is why such agreements are so short-lived.

Fourth, because democracy is based on the primacy of consent, the pursuit of peace is the norm of democratic states. In contrast, because Arab-Islamic culture is based on the primacy of coercion, the foreign policy norm of Arab-Islamic states is intimidation and conquest. *Jihad* (holy war) is a basic Islamic principle, which is why Moslem violence will be found throughout the world.

Fifth, whereas democracy is based on the primacy of the individual, Arab-Islamic culture is based on the primacy of the group – be it the village or the extended family. The individual Moslem has no identity outside the group; it is to the group that he owes all his loyalty. This is one reason why internecine conflict has been endemic among Arabs throughout history.

Sixth, contemporary democracy is regarded as a process by which various individuals pursue their private interests and have diverse values or lifestyles. This is not the case in Arab-Islamic culture, which binds everyone to the set of substantive values prescribed in the Koran and in Islamic law (the *sharia*).

Seventh, whereas contemporary democracy is inclined toward moral relativism, Islam is based on absolutism. The former conduces to tolerance, the latter to intolerance. Admittedly, Islamic regimes tolerate non-Islamic minorities, but only as *dhimmis* or second-class citizens.

Eighth, democratic societies are preoccupied with the present (the 渡ow_). Conversely, Arab-Islamic culture exists under the aspect of eternity. What dominates Islamic mentality is the past and the future, which is why revenge for past injuries is a dominant motif of the Arab world. And given their group loyalty, Moslems are religiously bound to wreak vengeance against those who have slighted the honor of any Moslem.

Ninth, the openness or publicity found in democracy stands in striking contrast to the hiddenness, secrecy, and dissimulation characteristic of Islam. As one liberated Arab sociologist writes: "Lying is a widespread habit among the Arabs, and they have a low idea of truth."[2]

Finally, whereas contemporary democracy is rooted in secularism, Arab-Islamic culture is rooted in religion. Even Arab leaders who are not devout Moslems identify with the basic goals of Islam. The radical separation of religion and politics found in democracy is foreign to Islamic regimes.

The ten preceding considerations demonstrate that the democratic concept of national self-determination has no logical application to the Arab Palestinians. Let us examine this concept.

III. National Self-Determination

National self-determination involves the question of whether a people has the right to establish any form of government it pleases, be it a Communist, Fascist, or Islamic dictatorship. To answer this question, let us first recall these words of the American Declaration of Independence:

> 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, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. – That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Underlying these words of the Declaration of Independence is the Torah's conception of man's creation in the image of God.[3] This remarkable document portrays man as a rational possessing free will and capable of distinguishing right from wrong. Without such a conception of human nature, the 56 signatories of the Declaration would have had no rational or just grounds for rebelling against Great Britain whose laws and colonial governments violated, in their words, the "Laws of Nature and of Nature's God".

This "Higher Law" doctrine of the Declaration provides a set of norms or standards by which to determine whether the granting of national self-determination to this or that people or ethnic group can be justified. It certainly cannot be justified among people steeped in ignorance or habituated to violence and servitude. Such a people, as Thomas Jefferson understood, may justly be governed without their consent. John Stuart Mill held the same view. In his classic, *On Liberty*, Mill writes: "Despotism is a legitimate form of government in dealing with barbarians, provided the end is their improvement, and the means justified by actually effecting that end."[4]

Mill elaborates in *Representative Government*, which calls to mind certain Arab characteristics! He explains that a people may lack the moderation which representative government requires of them.

> A rude people, though in some degree alive to the benefits of civilized society, may not be able to practice the forbearance which it demands: their passions may be too violent, or their personal pride too exacting, to forego private conflict, and leave to the laws the avenging of their real or supposed wrongs. In such a case, a civilized government, to be really advantageous to them, will require to be in a considerable degree despotic: one over which they do not themselves exercise control, and which imposes a great degree of forcible restraint upon their actions. A people must be considered unfit for more than a limited and qualified freedom ... who will not co-operate actively with the law and the public authorities in the repression of evil-doers.[5]

It follows that a people's right to national self-determination is not an absolute: it is limited by rational and moral considerations. It would be irrational and unjust to permit a people, in the name of self-determination, to establish a form of government that denied its neighbor's right to self-determination. This would be the inevitable consequence of establishing an Arab Palestinian state on Israel's doorstep (the policy of contemporary democrats for whom justice is mere equality and bears no relation to a person's or a people's character or worthiness).

In view of the fact that the militant beliefs and authoritarian way of life of these Arabs renders them hostile to democracy – and I shall soon document their latent savagery – they may be governed without their consent until a humane alternative is forthcoming.

Before elaborating on this alternative, it needs to be emphasized that, contrary to almost universal opinion, the principle of government by the consent of the governed does not mean that democracy is the only just form of government. In fact, the word "democracy" does not appear in the American Declaration of Independence (nor in its Israeli counterpart). What the Declaration regards as most important is not the *form* but the *ends* of government, namely life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. In the Declaration's own words: "...whenever *any* Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or abolish it." This clearly implies that there are just forms of government other than democracy, an implication relevant to Israeli rule over the Palestinian Arabs.

Now, given the paramount importance of the ends of government, no people has a right to establish a form of government whose very nature is destructive of these ends. When the American Declaration of Independence states that men's rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are "unalienable", this means that these rights may neither be taken away *nor voted away*. If self-determination is to be continuously effective, the people must be offered, in periodic elections, alternative public policies, and not the cynical charades played by various despots.

From these considerations it follows that even if the Palestinian Arabs were to vote *unanimously* in favor of establishing an Islamic dictatorship, such an act would not only be irrational – for men cannot rationally divest themselves of the power to determine who shall be their rulers – but it would also be unjust. It would or could deprive future generations and perhaps other nations of their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. As Abraham Lincoln has written, "[One] cannot say any people has a right to do what is wrong."[6] The principle of self-determination is not self-justifying. Its justice depends on consequences, namely, whether its application will result in the establishment of a just form of government.

This understanding was still alive at the end of World War II. Neither the German nor the Japanese people were permitted to establish any form of government they desired. To the contrary, American and British statesmen in those days deemed it both reasonable and just to impose on Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan a parliamentary form of democracy in which the principle of self-determination is obviously meaningful and continually operative. By means of periodic multi-party elections and freedom of speech and press, the people of those two countries can determine who shall exercise the powers of government and thereby influence the policies and goals of their respective countries.

On the other hand, the principle of self-determination can be used to stifle democracy. Hitler called for the self-determination of the Germans in the Sudetenland, England complied at Munich, which doomed democratic Czechoslovakia. One may compare the Sudeten Germans to the "West Bank" Arabs. In the name of self-determination, the United States and Europe favor an Arab Palestinian state in the historic heartland of the Jewish people, a state which, in alliance with Egypt, Syria, and Iraq, could doom democratic Israel.

If the truth were told, the Arabs of the "West Bank" (really Judea and Samaria) exercised far more self-determination under Israel than they now do under Yasser Arafat's PLO-Palestinian Authority! Under Israel's benevolent rule they elected their own mayors and enjoyed rights and opportunities non-existent in the entire Arab-Islamic world. Israel's Government established a system of primary and secondary schools which greatly multiplied the number of girls and boys attending classes (where, they were also taught, unfortunately, to hate Jews). Thanks to Israel, Arab colleges or universities appeared for the first time in the "West Bank" (only to become centers for Arab insurrection!). The Government also established new hospitals, health centers, and nursing schools. Infant mortality was greatly reduced and the standard of health improved beyond recognition. Also, roads as well as water and electric power facilities were constructed. Modern methods of agriculture were introduced. Eventually, tens of thousands of "West Bank" Arabs were employed in Israel. The Arabs' standard of living doubled and quadrupled. (Tourists were amazed to see so many large and luxurious mansions in Arab towns and villages.)

One Arab commentator acknowledged in 1971 that "The Arabs feel, not only that they live better than before [the Six-Day War of] 1967, but say also that they will not choose to live again under a [Jordanian] dictatorship after having experienced the liberal Israeli regime."[7] In that same year the following remark appeared in a Lebanese newspaper: "We have lived a long period under the 'humiliation' of Arab nationalism, and it pains us to say that we had to wait for the Israel 'conquest' in order to become aware of human relationships..."[8]

If this candid attitude was widespread among Arabs west of the Jordan, it did not run very deep: most Arabs cheered and danced on their rooftops in 1991 when Iraqi Scud missiles fell on Israel. They are paying the price of such perversity. Having cursed the seed of Abraham, they are themselves cursed by Arafat, whom they embraced in 1993. Thanks to the Oslo or Israel-PLO Agreement of that year, they now live impoverished and intimidated by Arafat's military dictatorship. An ugly consequence of the misplaced principle of self-determination. For this the Arabs should give special thanks to Bill Clinton and Shimon Peres, two benighted champions of contemporary democracy.

With Arafat's "election", self-determination among the Palestinian Arabs ceased the moment it was exercised. Darkness has descended upon them. As we shall see in a moment, Arafat liberated their most savage instincts. Here I am reminded of a passage in Jefferson's Declaration of Independence that mentions "the merciless Indian Savages, whose known rule of warfare, is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes, and conditions."

Self-determination is a morally neutral and therefore dangerous concept. It flourishes in parliamentary democracy. Let us see why.

IV.   Parliamentary Democracy and Human Nature

Self-determination can flourish in parliamentary democracy because parliaments, by definition, are based on the primacy of speech, the distinctively human attribute. What indeed is a human self if not one that governs itself by speech? Speech lets reason in, as force does not. Reasoned speech opens the door to merit; the cleverest rhetoricians fell to Socrates. A parliamentary regime, though capable of dealing forcefully with other nation-states, prefers to deal with them by speech. But only if those nation-states share its fundamental understanding of human nature can this dialogue mean anything other than a charade.[9]

By contrast, consider a Palestinian nation-state under Yasser Arafat. (Alternatively, one might observe it as exemplified by Arafat's patron, Egypt.) We see no promise of meaningful

parliamentarism there. Arafat's PLO-Palestinian Authority is a monstrous dictatorship. In addition to absconding public funds, it summarily executes critics of the regime, indoctrinates Arab children to hate Jews, and trains them to become suicide bombers. (Incidentally, can anyone take Hosni Mubarak's parliament seriously? No more so than we can look to Egypt's media for reasoned discussions and truthful reports.) The "self-determination" so touchingly proclaimed by Arab propagandists confines itself to the will of the ruling elites. That will has little to do with reasoned speech. For them, consent is a problem resolved by force alone.

The primacy of force in Arab regimes is symptomatic of a radically different view of human nature. Not reason, not merit, but chance rules such regimes: the chance of who happens to get the power to impose his will – for the moment. Reason serves force and force serves the ruler's will, inverting the moral universe of Jeffersonian democracy. It is no accident that military, not civilian, control characterizes these regimes.

Truly, a country's form of government – its true form, not always the form it shows the world – reflects its understanding of human nature. Whereas a nationalism based on that which is distinctively human, on reasoned speech, need not destroy itself by escalating irrational, absolutist demands both in the world and within its own borders, a nationalism based on will, on force, inevitably attacks the world and convulses itself. For the passions cannot restrain themselves. Their only limit is exhaustion or destruction.

V. Arab-Islamic Barbarism

To cite a recent example of Arab-Islamic barbarism, ponder George Will's account of the suicide bombing that occurred in Jerusalem's Sbarro restaurant on August 9 of this year, where 15 Jews were killed and more than 100 were wounded, many maimed for life. Mr. Will first quotes a report by *USA Today*'s Jack Kelly, who was 30 yards away when the terrorist detonated a bomb packed with nails:

> The blast...sent flesh flying onto second-story balconies a block away. Three men were blown 30 feet; their heads, separated from their bodies by the blast, rolled down the glass-strewn street... One woman had at least six nails embedded in her neck. Another had a nail in her left eye. Two men, one with a six-inch piece of glass in his right temple...tried to walk away... A man groaned... His legs were blown off. Blood poured from his torso... A 3-year old girl, her face covered with glass, walked among the bodies calling her mother's name... The mother...was dead... One rabbi found a small hand against a white Subaru parked outside the restaurant.

Mr. Will, a gentile political scientist and perhaps America's most respected journalist, comments:

> As with the June bombing that killed 21 at a Tel Aviv disco, children were not collateral victims – they were the targets. Abdallah al-Shami, a senior official of Islamic Jihad, celebrated "this successful operation" against "pigs and monkeys". That is a familiar rhetorical trope among those whom the calamitous Oslo "peace process" cast in the role of Israel's "partners for peace". In yet another of the constant violations of the Oslo requirement to stop anti-Jewish incitements, this was a recent broadcast from the moral cesspool that is the official television station of Yasser Arafat's Palestinian Authority: "All weapons must be aimed at the Jews...whom the Koran describes as monkeys and pigs... We will enter Jerusalem as conquerors... Blessings to he who shot a bullet into the head of a Jew."[10]

Lest it be thought that Islamic Jihad is an aberration of the Arab-Islamic world, Moslems throughout that benighted world gleefully celebrated the Sbarro massacre, just as they did the destruction of the New York World Trade Center. (In fact, most Palestinian Arabs support the

suicide bombing of civilians, be they Jewish or not.) As may be learned from Rav Avraham Kook's *magnum opus*, *Orot*, the Islamic religion failed to eradicate – indeed, it can also arouse – the paganism submerged in the Arab soul. (Recall the horrifying butchery of two Jewish reserve soldiers in Ramallah.) Even in Jordan with which Israel has a "peace" treaty, Jews are regarded as sub-human. Earlier in August, Israeli businessman Yitzhak Snir was murdered outside his home in Amman. The killing was applauded by various Jordanian newspapers, one of which ran a headline that read, "A Dog that Died".[11]

Conclusion

Our analysis of Arab-Islamic culture and of self-determination on the one hand, and the evidence of Arab Palestinian savagery on the other – which evidence can be multiplied a thousand-fold – will convince any candid reader that it would be utterly irrational and inconsistent with democracy to allow these Arabs to form an independent nation-state. Such a nation-state on the "West Bank" would eat at Israel's heart: geographically, militarily and, most of all, in spirit. *By definition* that nation-state would never satisfy itself; by its nature it *could* not.

This being the case, is there a realistic and humane solution to the Arab Palestinian problem? Stated another way: Is there an alternative to "separation" or to Oslo?

VI.   How to Solve the Arab Palestinian Problem

Before addressing this issue, it needs to be pointed out that certain politicians advocate a Palestinian state only as a means of solving Israel's Arab demographic problem. For it is widely known, but hardly ever made a subject of public discussion, that such is the prolific birthrate of Israel's Arab inhabitants that, sooner or later they will outnumber Jews – some say in twenty years. The democratic principle of one adult/one vote will then enable these Arabs to control the Knesset and, by perfectly legal means, transform the Jewish state into an Arab state. Obviously such a state will not be democratic. This self-destructive logic of (contemporary) democracy can be avoided, or so some naively believe, by creating a Palestinian state in the "West Bank" to which Israel's Arab population may immigrate and there become citizens. Alternatively, these Arabs may remain in Israel, but their citizenship, hence their Israeli voting rights, will be transferred, as it were, to the new Palestinian state.

This scenario can only be spawned by those who have not transcended the Ivory Tower of academia – some have – or who lack the intellectual integrity or moral courage to acknowledge the obvious: the Arabs of Israel are committed to Israel's destruction, and they are multiplying to hasten that end. Nor is this all. Year after year these Arabs have committed hundreds of politically motivated assaults including stabbings, shootings, arson, and sabotage. They have collaborated with the PLO and other terrorist organizations and have even formed terrorist cells of their own. In 1990 no less than 62% of these "Israeli" Arabs *openly* supported Saddam Hussein. No wonder they are exempted from military service!

These Arabs have no intention of leaving Israel. Here they enjoy all the rights of Jews as well as educational opportunities unequalled in the Arab-Islamic world. In Israel, moreover, they can refrain from paying taxes, commit crimes without punishment, and receive subsidies for large families to facilitate their eventual political ascendancy. True, they complain of Israeli discrimination, but then they gain the sympathetic support of Israeli politicians anxious to win their votes, which can only be paid for at the expense of Jews and the Jewish character of the state. Hence it is futile and sheer folly to try and solve Israel's internal demographic problem by creating a Palestinian nation-state on Israel's vulnerable eastern border.

Evident here is the desperation of Jewish democrats who stubbornly refuse to take Islam seriously and unwittingly insult Moslems in the process. Unreconstructed academics are especially dangerous. Their sheltered havens are hotbeds of moral relativism, which, by denying the existence of evil, severs many of our "enlightened population" from reality. Only Ph.D.s like Yossi Beilin, Yair Hirschfeld, and Ron Pundak could dream up Oslo – could believe that offering the villainous Arafat a Palestinian state and arming his professional Jew-killers would, or could, put an end to Arab terrorism and solve not only the Palestinian problem, but defuse Israel's demographic time-bomb. The American who said Harvard is where you get your stupidity systematized must have spent a sabbatical in Israel.

In any event, Israel's internal demographic problem can be solved by vigorously addressing the more urgent Palestinian problem.

First, and as advocated by various Knesset Members, including Dr. Yuval Steinitz, chairman of the Knesset Subcommittee on Defense Planning and Policy, Israel's Government must disarm and eliminate Arafat and his PLO-Palestinian Authority. Obviously this will be a bloody undertaking, but the sooner it is accomplished the less the bloodshed. And it should be done within a few days and without media coverage. Every delay increases the likelihood that Arafat will acquire deadlier and deadlier weapons.

Second, once Judea, Samaria, and Gaza are pacified, these areas should be incorporated into the State of Israel by an explicit law – which is not to suggest that they are not, even now and *de jure*, part of the sovereign territory of the Jewish state. But even before the law is enacted, the Government should begin to move some of its ministries into eastern Jerusalem, Ramallah, Nablus (Shechem), the Galilee, and other Arab populated areas. Such moves will convince Arabs that the Jews intend to remain in these areas *permanently*.[12]

Third, the Government should pass a Homestead Act such as that enacted by the Congress of the United States in 1862. Small plots of land in Judea, Samaria, and Gaza should be sold at very low prices to Jews both in Israel and abroad with the proviso that they settle on the land, say for a period of six years. This would diminish the dangerous population density of Israel's large cities and, at the same time, encourage Jewish immigration to Israel. (Enfranchising Israelis living abroad would encourage tens of thousands of these Jews to return to their homeland.) Model cities should be built, facilitated by foreign investment on terms favorable to investors. Based on past experience, and given Israel's burgeoning Gross Domestic Product, now $106 billion, another 200,000 Jews can be settled in Judea and Samaria within a few years. Their presence will prompt more and more Arabs to leave (as tens of thousands are doing even now).[13]

Had such policies been implemented shortly after the Six-Day War, the idea of a Palestinian state would have died before it was born.

Now, once Israel seizes the initiative *vis-à-vis* the Palestinian Arabs, it will be psychologically primed to deal with the internal Arab demographic problem.

VII.   How to Solve the Arab Demographic Problem

Few people realize that the influence of the Arab vote on Israeli politicians is a basic cause of the Arab Palestinian problem and will continue to hinder the dissolution of that problem. Stated another way, Arab voting power can decisively influence who will be Israel's prime minister and thereby shape not only the character, but the *borders* of the state. Israel's political elites have long been aware of this fact. Thus, on May 6, 1976, the year after the UN

General Assembly equated Zionism with racism, then Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin said this to high school graduates about to enter the army:

> The majority of the people living in a Jewish State must be Jewish. We must prevent a situation of an *insufficient* Jewish majority and we dare not have a Jewish minority...There is room for a non-Jewish minority **on condition that it accept the destiny of the State vis-à-vis the Jewish people, culture, tradition, and belief**. The minority is entitled to equal rights as individuals with respect to their distinct religion and culture, **but not more than that**.

Rabin's last sentence obviously refers to Israel's Arab inhabitants. It clearly implies that their rights as individuals do not include equal *political* rights! In May 1976, however, Rabin's Labor Party was not dependent on the Arab vote as it was to become a year later when Labor's 29-year control of Israel's Government came to an end. Thereafter it would not be politically expedient to publicly suggest that the rights of Israel's Arab citizens do not include equal political rights. Labor had not only lost the support of the religious parties, but its electoral base was shrinking. Religious Jews, with a much higher birthrate than secular Jews, were shifting to the less secular Likud Party, a loss magnified by the tens of thousands of secularists leaving the country. To regain power, Labor had to win the burgeoning Arab vote whose kinsmen were the Palestinian Arabs and whose champion was Yasser Arafat. Enter Professor Harkabi's "Machiavellian dove", Shimon Peres. To put the Arab vote solidly in Labor's camp in the 1992 Knesset elections, it would be necessary (in violation of the law) to contact and solicit the support of Yasser Arafat in Tunis. The price was Oslo.

Of course, this betrayal of the Jewish people required their being conditioned, demoralized, and deceived. In addition to dinning the "peace process" into the minds of Jews, Israel's left-wing elites reminded the old, and thereby taught the young, that Israeli society was tired of war. (This sabotage is still going on, even by the "Right"!) Moreover, Israel's Illuminati imbued Jews with guilt by convincing them (and eventually themselves?) that "It is contrary to democracy for Israel to rule Palestinian Arabs." This falsehood was reinforced by a devious truth: "We cannot make these Arabs citizens of Israel without destroying Israel's character as a Jewish state!" But this was precisely the goal of the Labor Party once it became dependent on the Arab vote and on Arab parties to regain control of the Government.

Now we can better understand Oslo's ultimate purpose and how Israel's internal demographic problem is intimately related to the Palestinian problem.

The purpose of Oslo was not merely to create a Palestinian state in Judea and Samaria, the heartland of the Jewish people. It was not merely to withdraw Jews to Israel's pre-1967 borders, but to withdraw Jewish national *consciousness* to those borders, and then to destroy Judaism within those borders by transforming the Jewish state into a "state of its citizens"!

This was the hidden agenda of the Left (Labor and Meretz) in the 1992 national elections, which, for first time in Israel's history, witnessed a government whose formation required a political alliance between Jewish and Arab parties, proxies of the PLO. Yasser Arafat thus entered Israel's cabinet disguised as Shimon Peres!

The dejudaizing of Israel commenced with a vengeance. The notorious Shulamit Aloni was made Minister of Education and removed Jewish and Zionist content from the public school curriculum. This is not the place to detail this veritable revolution.[14] We need to focus on the fact that the voting power of Israel's Arab citizens transformed Labor into an active and obviously anti-Zionist party. Prior to its defeat in the 1977 elections, Labor spoke of "autonomy", not statehood, for the Arabs in Judea, Samaria, and Gaza. Indeed, immediately after the Six-Day War, such prominent Labor leaders as Moshe Dayan and Yigal Allon

advocated Israeli retention of Judea, Samaria, and Gaza. Even Abba Eban said in a private interview: "We shall make peace not on the basis of territorial claims but on the necessities of our security." Still more revealing, Prime Minister Levi Eshkol declared: "The threat of destruction, that hung over Israel since its establishment and which was about to be implemented, has been removed. Never again shall we permit this threat to be renewed."[15]

Oslo has renewed this threat, but primarily because of the political power of Israel's Arab voters, to which problem I now turn.

To avoid misunderstanding, let me state at the outset that no Government of Israel is going to expel the country's one million Arabs who reject Israel's existence as a Jewish state. Even if the Government were so inclined, no Arab state will accept these Arabs. So, what should be done to save the Jewish state from its burgeoning, hostile Arab population?

The *only* way to solve Israel's "Arab problem" is to make the State of Israel *increasingly Jewish and proud* on the one hand, and *classically democratic* on the other! This will result in a steady emigration of Arabs and, at the same time, erode the nationalist ambitions of their party leaders. The question is: How can this be accomplished?

Most commentators will say: "Increase the Jewish content of public education." Of course, but no less important, indeed, more urgently required, is the radical reform of Israel's political and judicial institutions.

(1) Democratize Israel's parliamentary electoral system to increase the impact of *Jewish conviction*s on those who make the laws and policies of the State. The *only* way to do this is to make legislators *individually* accountable to the voters in *multi-district* elections – the practice of 74 democracies. The existing system makes the entire country a single electoral district in which parties compete on the basis of proportional representation. This makes every vote count in apportioning Knesset seats. As a consequence, virtually every Jewish party seeks the support of Arab voters, which can only be purchased by compromising Jewish national interests.

(2) Reduce the number of parties in the Cabinet by raising the parliamentary electoral threshold to 5%. This will enable the Government to pursue more coherent and resolute national policies.

(3) Democratize the method of appointing the Supreme Court, which has become a self-perpetuating oligarchy whose decisions diminish the Jewish character of the state. Presidential nomination of judges with confirmation by the legislature would make the Court more representative of Israeli society, the bulk of whose population more or less identifies with the Jewish heritage which the Court frequently scorns. (Alternatively, it may be wise to imitate the French Constitution and transform the Supreme Court into a "Constitutional Court" with limited powers and a limited tenure of ten years.)

(4) Enforce *Basic Law: The Knesset*, which prohibits any party that negates the Jewish character of the State. (Overbearing Arabs would be humbled while unassertive Jews would be heartened if Arab parties were expelled for violating this law!)

(5) Enforce the 1952 *Citizenship Law*, which empowers the Minister of Interior to nullify the citizenship of any Israel national that commits "an act of disloyalty to the State". (The law should be amended to clarify the term "act" in such a way as to protect freedom of speech and press.)

(6) Rescind large-family allowances, with the understanding that the Jewish Agency will assume the function of providing such allowances to Jewish families, while Arab philanthropic agencies may do the same for Arab families.

(7) Rescind the "grandfather clause" of the Law of Return, which has enabled hundreds of thousands of gentiles to enter Israel.

(8) As proposed earlier, enfranchise Israelis living abroad. This will increase the power of the Jewish vote.

(9) Phase out US military assistance to Israel (now less than 2% of the country's GDP), as well as American participation in Israel-Arab affairs. Both undermine Israel's material interests as well as Jewish national pride.

(10)   Terminate Arabic as an official language of the State. This will counter the anti-Zionist idea that Israel is a bi-national state or that it should be a "state of its citizens".

The above solution to the Arab demographic problem, which I have abbreviated, avoids two simplistic and unrealistic alternatives. As already indicated, the expulsion of Israel's Arab population is politically impossible. On the other hand, no sensible policy can be based on the remote possibility that Arabs will soon forsake their 1,300-year autocratic tradition and become liberal democrats. The problem is not to change the Arabs but to change Israel, whose laws and institutions should be made more Jewish, hence more conducive to Jewish national pride.

It will be asked: Does Israel have a prime minister, or a prospective prime minister, with the courage and wisdom required for so grand a program? I answer: Nothing less is necessary for Israel's salvation.

Epilogue

If Israel were true to its heritage, it would be the best chance for democratic enlightenment in the Middle East, an enlightenment enriched by Jewish values. This chance will be lost, and Israel's own existence will be jeopardized, if a Palestinian nation-state is established in the "West Bank".

Nothing less than a "clash of civilizations" is enfolding in the Middle East. The Middle East is the place where the Occident and the Orient reveal their nature, their limitations, and their destiny. It is here that the genuinely human confronts absolutist irrationalism. This is what is at stake in the conflict between Israel and the Arab-Islamic world.

<p style="text-align:center">* * *</p>

Endnotes

[1] Although Israel is not a democracy from an *institutional* perspective, the mentality of its political and intellectual elites is thoroughly democratic. See Paul Eidelberg, *Jewish Statesmanship: Lest Israel Fall* (Ariel Center for Policy Research, 2000), pp. 89, 155, and note 2 below.

[2] Cited in Y. Harkabi, *Arab Attitudes to Israel* (Jerusalem: Keter, 1972), p. 348. It should be noted that Harkabi, Shimon Peres' mentor and a former head of Israel Military Intelligence, was a self-professed moral relativist who (illogically) advocated a Palestinian state. See my refutation of

Harkabi in *Demophrenia: Israel and the Malaise of Democracy* (Lafayette, LA: Prescott Press, 1994), pp. 128-130.

3 Although Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration, was not a religious man, the document, in his words, "was intended to be an expression of the American mind," which, as is well-known, was very much influenced by the Bible of Israel. See Paul Eidelberg, *On the Silence of the Declaration of Independence* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1976), p. 1, which develops an aristocratic interpretation of this immortal document.

4 John Stuart Mill, *Utilitarianism, Liberty, and Representative Government* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1951), p. 96.

5 Ibid., pp. 239-240.

6 *Collected Works* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1953), Vol. III, p. 315.

7 Cited in Mordechai Nisan, *Israel and the Territories* (Ramat-Gan, Israel: Turtledove Publishing, 1978), p. 119, referring to statements made in 1971.

8 Ibid.

9 Unfortunately, Israeli politicians engage in such a charade when "negotiating" with Egypt or its client, Yasser Arafat.

10 *Washington Post*, August 17, 2001, p. A23. Will quotes Al-Shami as boasting that "no border restriction will stop" suicide bombings.

11 *Jerusalem Post*, August 24, 2001, p. B3. Prime Minister Ariel Sharon's counter-terrorism adviser warned: "If you are an Israeli and you go downtown in Amman you are in danger of being lynched." But in no country does Jew-hatred thrive as in Egypt. See Arieh Stav, *Peace – The Arabian Caricature: A Study of Anti-Semitic Imagery* (Jerusalem: Gefen Publishers, 1999).

12 See Machiavelli, *The Prince*, ch. 3.

13 Having formed no distinct culture or solid infrastructure in Judea and Samaria, the Arab's attachment to the land is superficial – avowals to the contrary notwithstanding. Indeed, while Jordan ruled the area from 1949 to 1967, about 400,000 Arabs moved from Judea and Samaria to the eastern side of the Jordan River. During and immediately after the 1967 war, 200,000 more Arabs – roughly one of every five inhabitants – moved to the East Bank.

14 For details, see Yoram Hazony, et al., "The Quiet Revolution in the Teaching of Zionism" (Shalem Center, 2000).

15 Cited in Randolph S. and Winston S. Churchill, *The Six Day War* (London: Heinemann. 1967), pp. 200-201.