Fascism will not materialize without a leader. A benighted zealot without roots in the Israeli experience such as Kahane will not succeed in the role; nor will a rough-hewn soldier-farmer-carpenter like Raful [former chief-of-staff Rafael Eitan]. They are capable only of sowing the seeds of violent hatred for the Arabs, the political fruit of which will be reaped by others. A successful fascist leader requires the ability to engage in sophisticated manipulations in order to obtain power by democratic means and to maintain it by dictatorial means. His image must fulfill the expectations of those seeking a strong leader who will "impose order" and also of those who expect him to ignore legal constraints in dealing with the Arabs, "leftists", "defeatists" and "traitors". He must be capable of mobilizing mass support without weakening his ties with the elitist nationalists of Gush Emunim and Tehiya. This mantle would seem to be tailor-made for Arik Sharon. It is true that in the course of his career Sharon has been more a figure of anarchy than of order. But the paradoxical expectation that order will be imposed precisely by a leader with a reputation for excess is characteristic of situations which have spawned fascist regimes.

Will Arik Sharon don the mantle that is ready for him and transform potentiality into actuality? For the moment, we may focus on one noteworthy feature of his behaviour that gives rise to disquiet. Fascist leaders tend to equate their own good with the good of the people, to posit their private interests as national interests and to denounce their opponents as enemies of the people. Arik Sharon's behaviour fits this pattern. His suit against *Time* is, for him, "the trial of the people of Israel". (...)

There are still many people who cannot come to terms with the juxtaposition of the terms "Israeli" and "fascism". However, the notion of an Israeli terrorist underground also seemed fantastic only a year or so ago. When the underground was exposed, with the foiling of the attempted slaughter of dozens of innocent passengers—men, women and children—on public buses, and when it emerged that the underground's plans included also acts of lunacy such as the demolition of the Temple Mount mosques, many people suddenly found these phenomena quite reasonable and perfectly understandable. The murderers and pogromists were the flesh and blood of Israeli society, and a good many people knew them personally. It was thus easier to attribute their acts to the alleged failures of the government, and to accept them, forgetting that it was in this manner that the perpetrators of the worst atrocities in history were perceived in their own countries. (...)

There is no "de luxe fascism", no such thing as an undemocratic emergency regime for a limited period, no such thing as an enlightened dictatorship. Those now seeking no more than a strong leader to impose order and deal with the Arabs "with a firm hand" will soon discover that they are liable to become victims of the genie they have helped to let out of the bottle. By then it will be too late.

□ □ □

David Oren, *Ha'aretz* weekly magazine, 21 December 1984, "The Logic of a Kahanist"

(...) It is hard to write off 18-year-old Shlomi Cohen as a joke. He exists. The idea of trying to educate him differently today also seems impossible. The tall, black-haired youth is partisan of Meir Kahane's worldsview. No questions, no doubts, no reservations—everything is clearcut and understood. "I'm a Libra," he says; "we believe in what we do—and we carry it through to the end." (...)

Q: Kahane's solution is to expel the Arabs. That seems rather simplistic.

A: It sounds simplistic and it is simple. Look, today's youth are looking for clear answers. Not one of the existing parties has a clear answer. There's something nebulous about all of them, something unclear. The Alignment's idea—to return territories—I reject utterly and completely. The Likud doesn't express an unequivocal opinion on the subject. I know there are people in the Likud who think exactly as Kahane does but are afraid to say so. The same with Tehiya: they talk about annexing Judea and Samaria but they don't give an unequivocal answer to the question of what you do with the Arabs in the territories, with one-and-a-half million people. Raful [former chief-of-staff Rafael Eitan] does think the Arabs should be kicked out, he doesn't say so. He's a nothing. Afraid to speak out.

I know that Kahane's solution sounds very simplistic, but that's its attraction, especially for the young. He gives an unequivocal answer. He doesn't shirk laying things on the line. Without fear or shame. Exactly like the people on the other side of the political fence, who aren't ashamed to say that they support a Palestinian State in Judea and Samaria. And that's what the young people like. (They believe in it. (...)

Q: Is that really the solution, then—to expel a million-and-a-half Arabs? Does that seem sensible?

A: That's everyone's mistake. I didn't use the word "expel". Look, let's say that in the next elections Kahane get ten seats. He'll be a force to be reckoned with. After those elections more than a million Arabs will leave of their own accord. Especially if Kahane—with the parliamentary strength he obtains in the elections— becomes a key minister. Minister of Defence, for example. After that we'll pass laws that will make things difficult for the Arabs and they'll have no choice but to leave. Legally speaking we'll make them second-class citizens. They'll have freedom when it comes to religion, and in their private lives, but they won't have the same status as Jews. Naturally they won't be able to vote for the Knesset or be elected. If that doesn't do it, we'll pass laws so that they'll leave. That's all. (...)

Q: Do you really believe that the world will simply sit back and let this happen?

A: I don't care whether they accept it or not. That needn't concern us at all. For some reason the present Israeli leaders think about what the world will say before making a single move. We have to get rid of that attitude. I don't think we'll have a problem on that score with the Americans. The Americans know that of all the countries of the region, Israel is the most stable. It can be trusted. It's a democratic country.

Q: Do you call a country that will pass the kind of laws you're proposing a democratic State? It will be a racist society. To pass the kind of laws you're suggesting a dictatorship will have to be established here. Some people will certainly prefer to the leave the country if such legislation goes through in the Knesset.

A: So some will leave—that doesn't bother me. If you're referring to leftists such as Yossi Sarid and Shulamit Aloni I won't be upset. I think that in terms of values, we Jews are the chosen people, that's all. I have nothing specific against the Arabs. They're just a threat to me, and therefore I have to defend myself. I'd adopt the same line of thought if there were Chinese here as a minority, or Norwegians.

I still favour democracy. But democracy [for Jews] alone. I know people would like to hear me use the word "dictatorship", but I won't give them that pleasure. I expressly mean democracy—but in my version for Jews only. What's wrong with that? What could be more reasonable? (...)

□ □ □

Interview with Dr. Aviezer Ravitzky of *Netivot Shalom* (a religious peace group) by Ettie Ronel, *Al Hamishmar*, 2 January 1985, "He Who Murders Gentiles Will End Up Murdering Jews"

On the same day the Knesset voted down the Mapam-sponsored Law against Racism, with the backing of Alignment MKs who claimed that the existing law was adequate, MK Meir Kahane used his Knesset office to award a prize for the best composition on the theme: "How Mattityahu and the Maccabees would have solved the problem of Yossi Sarid and Saridism". *[Coalition note: Yossi Sarid is a Knesset member who has joined Shulamith Aloni's Citizens? Rights party.]* The competition had been organized by Kahane's Kach movement. The winner, Yonah Pressburger, a pupil of the Yemiun Orde boarding-school near Haifa, wrote: "The people of Israel are in a difficult position today. The Hellenized Jew of those days at least knew the Torah and his deeds were motivated by knowledge and intent. Today's Hellenists don't even know what tefillin or synagogues are. You cannot kill a man before you explain to him what it means to be a Jew and what Torat Yisrael is. This is a different situation from that of Mattiyahu, who for the first time killed a Jew and removed the stain of corruption from the people of Israel or that of Pinhas Ben-Eliezer Ben-Aharon Hacohen, who cleansed the people of Israel by killing the Jew and the Midianite woman. If we were to consider what the Maccabees would do today—I think their first step would be to attack the media, which are the stronghold of Yossi Sarid and Saridism. Then they would isolate Yossi Sarid and the other Hellenizing ringleaders because 'he who misleads the many cannot be allowed to repent.' We cannot allow the leaders of the Hellenists to influence the people of Israel."

Kahane himself wrote in similar vein in his regular column in the "Jewish Press": "True the Torah speaks of 'loving they neighbour as thyself'. But—it also demands that 'you shall cast the evil out from your midst', even if this means killing a Jew who merits it in a humane fashion, that is, by selecting a 'decent execution'. Judaism does not advocate tolerance and universal love. Judaism is based on the idea that there is good and evil in the world. And who are we that we should forgive when the Jewish people is in danger? Who are we to turn a blind eye when evil threatens our very existence? If Yossi Sarid and Shulamit Aloni and Mapam and Meir Wilner and the rest of those deranged Hellenists are threatening the very existence of Judaism, the Jewish people and Israel—there is nothing moral in any display of tolerance towards them."

Q: What is your comment on this?

A : Anybody who thinks that Kahane will be satisfied by the expulsion of the Arabs from Israel is mistaken. Once he has finished with the Arabs he will start on secular Jews, including those in his own movement, the people he is exploiting today. Pronouncements against Jews desecrating the Sabbath or eating "unclean" have been much harsher than any against Moslems. So I have no doubt that his indirect call for the murder of Arabs will become a call for the murder of Jews. It has already been said by our sages that "he who robs the Gentile will ultimately rob the Jew, and he who murders the Gentile will ultimately murder the Jew."

□ □ □

Shulamit Aloni, *Yediot Ahronot*, 7 January 1985, "Illegal Conversion"

The writer is a Knesset Member and head of the Citizens' Rights Movement.

The Law of Return is not a secular law. It was enacted on Herzl's birthday in 1950 and designed to bring to Israel all those people living in the Diaspora as Jews and so defined by their communities. The forced conversion of the Jews of Ethiopia is a reprehensible and degrading act, one which undermines their confidence in their traditions and heritage. Moreover, it is contrary to the law.

If they are Jews, they have the unconditional right, according the Law of Return, to become citizens of Israel. If they are not Jews, then there is no justification for bringing them here under the Law of Return, regardless of how desperate their plight. The fact of the matter is that everyone has recognized them as Jews for decades. The Ashkenazi rabbis and members of the NRP [*National Religious Party*] have cast aspersions on them precisely on account of their Judaism. They had previously meted out the same treatment to the Jews of Yemen and the Karaite Jews of Egypt. (. . .)

The Ethiopian Jews are not Europeans and they cannot assert themselves. They are black, ill, hungry and ignorant of the laws of the land, its customs and their rights as human beings. For these reasons, the government of Israel has shamelessly abandoned them to the religious establishment which is now forcing them to undergo ritualistic procedures—in the name of the State and against their will.

According to law, the rabbis are not charged with implementing the Law of Return. Nor is the registration of citizens their province—or, for that matter, the activities of the Jewish Agency. Their authority is confined to marriage and divorce. How, then, have the government and the Jewish Agency dared to treat [the Ethiopians], for whatever coalitionary considerations, like cattle? (...)

□ □ □

Editorial, *Al Hamishmar*, 16 January 1985, "Sowing Discord"

(...) At a time when the State of Israel is confronted with economic and security problems crucial to its very existence, the religious parties have decided to launch a 'Who is a Jew' crusade. All of them have fallen in with the most extreme, intransigent position. The subject is of minor significance, affecting—even in its most orthodox interpretation—a dozen or so immigrants a year at most. Yet the religious have placed it