

to function in the Fifth Century of the Common Era. The Small Sanhedrin is the initiative of some 30 people from Shocharey HaMikdash, who wish to establish an halachic state in Israel and establish the Third Temple.

Public consciousness about the Temple has been increasing in recent years, with encouragement by the state. The state regularly finances the activity of institutes and institutions acting to reinstitute the Temple rituals and conventions of Shocharey HaMikdash. The Jerusalem municipality also assists the organizations in their activities, and Jerusalem's mayor recently placed himself at the head of the Temple Mount campaign.

This policy is irresponsible and dangerous. These bodies are not solely involved in history, culture, and education, but are actively endeavoring to establish the Temple. Their goal is to establish the Temple on the Temple Mount in the place where the mosques are presently situated. This goal dictates destruction of the mosques.

The concern that a political agreement will be signed, the urgings of rabbis that are liable to be construed as permission to harm the mosques on the Temple Mount, and the explicit calls recently made by Shocharey HaMikdash to "destroy the mosques," as well as the desire to revenge the death of Rabbi Binyamin Kahane make the mosques on the Temple Mount a principal target of attack by Jews.

If the Muslim holy sites are attacked, all the responsibility will be placed on Israel, and it is likely that destructive forces of apocalyptic power will be unleashed. Therefore, whatever the nature of the political arrangement regarding the Temple Mount, it is in Israel's vital interest to bring in international bodies to share responsibility over the holy sites. This should be done even if a peace agreement cannot be signed at this time. Keshev therefore urges the Israeli government to move without delay to invite international bodies (the UN or a multi-lateral force) to share responsibility for the security of the holy sites on the Temple Mount.

Simultaneously, Israel's government must take measures to safeguard the Temple Mount and its surrounding areas and to obtain the relevant intelligence to enable effective protection of the area. Security forces must closely monitor the activists from groups primarily and secondarily involved. The immediate danger of an attack on the Temple Mount is likely to occur, in Keshev's view, primarily from the fringe elements—from an isolated individual from groups of repentant Jews (such as Shuvu Banim), who will be willing to sacrifice themselves in the manner of Yigal Amir and Baruch Goldstein.

Keshev also urges the authorities to cease providing support and funding to organizations and institutions of Shocharey HaMikdash.

In addition, the government must demand rabbis in Judea and Samaria and the leaders of the national-religious and the Ultra-Orthodox communities to publicly decry the calls to "destroy the mosques." Our lives depend on it.

Conference Report

Bush Team Wants To Be 'Master of the World'

by Rainer Apel

On Feb. 2-4, Munich was the site of the annual Conference on International Security Policy, more commonly known as the "Wehrkunde Meeting." The 37th gathering of the Western world's leading experts on defense, plus select spokesmen for Russia, China, India, Japan, and the potential future members of NATO in Europe's East, provided the first occasion for the Bush Administration to present its views on global affairs to an international audience.

The fact that the conference was held only two weeks after the inauguration of the new U.S. President, predetermined that it would occur in a somewhat eerie atmosphere: Non-American participants were mostly on "different wavelengths" than the Bush team. Europeans and Russians in particular, who are known to be skeptical of the views of the new U.S. Administration, were very hesitant to voice clear and firm positions. Europe and Russia are agitated, but leading politicians tend not to sound "undiplomatic" toward the Americans. The Bush team is trying to exploit this vacuum, making aggressive advances.

Rumsfeld: NMD Is Inevitable

In his first foreign appearance, U.S. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld stated in no uncertain terms on Feb. 3, that the Bush Administration will push ahead with its National Missile Defense (NMD) program—no matter what European NATO allies think or do. There may be talks about missile defense, said Rumsfeld, but the U.S. decision for it is definite. With an aura of arrogance, Rumsfeld did not address Russia directly in his remarks; he simply ignored the presence of Russian Security Council head Sergei Ivanov, while greeting the delegations from Japan, China, India, and Singapore.

More brutally than Rumsfeld, Henry Kissinger, also speaking on Feb. 3, warned Europeans, Russians, and Asians not to provoke the wrath of the United States, and risk (unspecified) American retaliation. Kissinger attacked, though not by name, "European leaders" for criticizing American policies during their recent visits to Moscow (such as the German Defense Minister, who criticized the NMD project). Dropping the usual rhetoric, Kissinger said that the U.S. missile defense program is not directed primarily against "rogue states," such as North Korea and Iran, with their limited capabilities, but rather against the bigger nuclear powers Russia,

China, or India. Other American participants, notably former Democratic Vice Presidential candidate Sen. Joseph Lieberman (Conn.), illustrated with their remarks—along the line that “NMD will happen anyway, but we’ll also talk”—that America’s defense policy has bipartisan support.

When Ivanov spoke the next day, he attacked the U.S. missile defense program, as violating the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (described by Rumsfeld as “ancient history”) and disrupting the past decades’ arms control regime. But there was no broader strategic design presented by Ivanov, who, instead, went through a lengthy *tour d’horizon* on Russia’s achievements, problems, and complaints. This may indicate that Russia is still testing whether or not a bilateral political deal over ballistic missile defense and related issues is possible with the Bush Administration. A trial balloon in this direction was launched by Kissinger, when he described in his speech how the ABM Treaty (which, as he said, he and his friends in the Nixon Administration helped to bring about) enabled the Americans to freeze the Soviet project for a missile defense of its own.

On the European side, serious worries over U.S. missile defense and its impact on Russia and China were voiced, particularly by the Germans, though cautiously. Christian Democratic foreign policy spokesman Karl Lamers, an “old hand” from the pre-1998 Helmut Kohl era, provoked Rumsfeld with the remark that if the Americans believed the “dream of invulnerability” would make them the “master of the world,” they were being misled by the same “Siegfried myth” of invulnerability that had misled the Germans in the past. Rumsfeld conceded that, indeed, Bush’s election campaign promise of big tax cuts for the American people would pose budget constraints to future funding of efficient NMD systems.

In fact, as acknowledged by Senator Lieberman in Munich, the proposed NMD system is not yet technologically feasible, and requires much more research and development. Moreover, the Bush Administration will soon be hit with a massive economic collapse and financial crisis, centered around the California energy crisis, which is likely to derail all of their best-laid plans.

India, Russia Have ‘Complementary Interests’

Worth special note was the presentation by India’s National Security Adviser, Brajeesh Mishra, who rejected hopes harbored among some geopolitical circles in Washington for a strategic alignment with India, against Russia and China. Indirectly, Mishra also spoke up for Russia’s genuine interest in drawing a line against the new would-be “master of the world.” In his Feb. 4 speech, Mishra said that “India-Russia relations have several remarkable characteristics. They have demonstrated a robust strength, withstanding major structural changes in both countries. Indo-Soviet relations moved almost seamlessly into Indo-Russian relations, in spite of the post-Cold War political and military realignments, and the



Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, who said at the Wehrkunde conference, that the United States is proceeding with a national missile defense program, no matter what.

upheavals caused by the breakdown of our economic arrangements with the Soviet Union.” Mishra referenced the Asian financial crisis of 1997 and the Russian one of 1998, in this context.

“There was, and remains, a national consensus in both countries on the fundamentals of our bilateral relations,” Mishra said. “The two countries have a common interest in the development of a multipolar world, based on a cooperative security order. In fact, even in the bipolar construct of the Cold War, the development of India’s relations with the Soviet Union was perhaps one of the first expressions of multipolarity.

“Russia’s ‘National Security Concept’ of January 2000, and its ‘Foreign Policy Concept’ of June 2000 enunciate a worldview similar to that of India. We share disquiet at insidious attempts to undermine sovereignty and to justify intervention in the name of human rights, to encourage protectionism in the guise of labor and environmental standards, and to impose alien socio-cultural conditions in the name of globalization.

“The increasing political and economic importance of Asia has created a new security matrix in which both India and Russia have crucial and complementary interests.”

Thus, the military and economic conflict with the rest of the world which the Bush team is heading for, was most directly addressed by the Indians. But the first concrete actions by the Bush Administration toward realization of its projects will polarize the situation in most other countries, including the NATO allies, and frictions between the United States and the rest of the world will intensify. The ugly reality may then force those who still hope for special deals with Bush to realize, that such arrangements with people who consider themselves “master of the world,” are impossible. If the prevailing U.S. attitude is to pose the alternative, “either talk on our terms, or don’t talk at all,” the opposition to the Bush team will grow—it simply has to, if there is to be any dignity left in foreign relations.