

groups from different civilizations will not be close and will often be antagonistic. Yet some intercivilization relations are more conflict-prone than others. At the micro level, the most violent fault lines are between Islam and its Orthodox, Hindu, African, and Western Christian neighbors. At the macro level, the dominant division is between 'the West and the rest,' with the most intense conflicts occurring between Muslim and Asian societies on the one hand, and the West on the other. The dangerous clashes of the future are likely to arise from the interaction of Western arrogance, Islamic intolerance, and Sinic assertiveness."

Needless to say, among Huntington's goals, is to polemicize against any effort by the Clinton administration to achieve positive, viable relations with the countries along the Eurasian Land-Bridge route. At one point, he attacks that direction in U.S. policy today, which seeks to "develop close relationships with the core

states of other civilizations, in the form of . . . 'constructive engagement' with China, in the face of the natural conflicts of interest." What Huntington insists on, instead, is that the United States and Europe must impose technological apartheid on China and other countries, by acting, as he puts it, "to restrain the development of the conventional and unconventional military power of Islamic and Sinic countries," and "to maintain Western technological and military superiority over other civilizations."

Lying About the West

If Huntington's depiction of Chinese (Sinic), Islamic, and other civilizations is incompetent, his depiction of "the West" borders on the ridiculous. For all his talk of "Western civilization," Huntington displays no understanding whatsoever of those features, dating from the Fifteenth-century Golden Renaissance, which allowed "the West" to catalyze the vast increase of world population, by

developing, and then proliferating, science, technology, and human progress around the globe.

In essence, his "West" is the British imperial system and the Eighteenth-century Enlightenment. He uses terms like "Euro-American civilization" and "Western Christendom" interchangeably with "Western imperialism." Such an identification, of course, allows "the West" to be the perfect enemy-image for the other, "non-Western civilizations."

For those looking for an antidote to Samuel Huntington, it might be parenthetically noted, that the Renaissance tradition also effectively resolved the problem of clashes among cultures, religions, and civilizations, more than five hundred years ago, when Cardinal Nicolaus of Cusa wrote his dialogue *De Pace Fidei* (*On the Peace of Faith*), a philosophical manual for reconciling cultures around the highest conceptions of mankind, which are common to them all.

—Mark Burdman

The Courage To Change Axioms

At a White House reception following the signing of the Oslo peace accords between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization, Israel's Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin offered a toast to those responsible for this hard-won achievement.

Let us lift our glasses, he said, to honor "those with the courage to change axioms."

Leah Rabin has written a hard-hitting memoir about her late husband, his accomplishments, and their lives together, one which provides insights into this man who demonstrated the courage to change axioms. It is a touching story, lovingly written, of a mutual lifelong commitment to ensure security for Israel, and peace in the Middle East.

The Rabin who emerges in this intimate portrait is a private, shy man, who was fiercely devoted to his family and his nation. He is also a man whom Leah Rabin believes to have possessed the unique qualities required to "change the priorities of the nation," a warrior who had led his nation in war, and was

therefore trusted to negotiate for peace.

It is no paradox, she writes, that the man who led the armed forces to a smashing victory over the Arab forces in the Six-Day War, and in the brutal repression of youth during the Intifada, was the man who shook Arafat's hand on the White House lawn. The horrors of the Intifada, in which Israeli soldiers routinely were deployed to beat and club Palestinian youth, convinced Rabin that Israel's policies must change.

"The Intifada," she writes, "made it wholly clear to Yitzhak that Israel could not govern another people." By 1989, he "was gradually moving toward advocating Palestinian autonomy and self-determination." It was this understanding which caused Rabin to make peace with his long-term adversary in the Labor Party, Shimon Peres, and, eventually led to his grudging acceptance of Arafat as a partner.

"When he said [during the 1992 election campaign, which was won by Labor—HS] that it was time to change our priorities and make peace, the



Rabin: Our Life, His Legacy
by Leah Rabin
G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1997
320 pages, hardbound, \$24.95

nation took him at his word."

When presenting his cabinet to the Knesset on July 13, 1992, Rabin took on the axioms of the majority of Israelis. "We shall change the national order of priorities. Israel is no longer necessarily an isolated nation, nor is it correct that the entire world is against us. We must rid ourselves of the isolation that has gripped us almost for half a century."

In that same speech, Rabin made clear he believed that security is not found solely in military power. "Security is not

only a tank, an aircraft, a missile ship. Security is also a man's education, housing, schools, the street and the neighborhood, the society in which he grew up. And security is also that man's hope."

Rabin came to this view as a soldier, for whom war was always a last option. Leah Rabin writes that one of his favorite expressions was, "A destroyed house can be rebuilt. A burned-down tree can be replanted. But a young life cannot be replaced."

At a commemoration thirty days after his death, Rabin was remembered by author Meir Shalev, who described him as a man "who did not lock himself inside the fortified battlements of his opinions. Who at an advanced age, when beliefs are carved in stone and ideas freeze, and men no longer stray from well-trodden paths—suddenly, with great momentum, leapt from the furrows of his life onto a new path. And the roots of the turnaround, for those who remember, were already planted in

the young Yitzhak Rabin, who in his speech on Mount Scopus after the Six-Day War, said that we Jews are unable to rejoice as conquerors and victors."

His assassination is thus more devastating when seen in this context, through Leah Rabin's eyes. "He always felt that his second term as Prime Minister was a privilege, providing him with the chance to do what truly needed to be done, equipped as he was then with the experience of many years."

She is understandably bitter in writing of the assassination. The book opens with a description of the scene outside their apartment on the evening of his assassination, as right-wing demonstrators whom she describes as "loud-mouthed extremists with no sense of decency," chant that her husband is a traitor and a Nazi.

She believes her husband was "certainly the victim of an intellectual conspiracy" which, at its core, included extremists and rabbis who "inspired atti-

tudes that led to the murder." The murderer was led by them to believe that "he was fulfilling a holy mission sanctioned by them—that the 'holy land' of Judea and Samaria is more holy than the life of the Prime Minister who was willing to compromise on this land for peace."

Yet this book is not written in the spirit of revenge, but of hope, that her husband's sacrifice will not have been in vain. She concludes with her response to the anguished question posed by one of Rabin's comrades-in-arms, who asked, "Where, oh where, are there others like that man?"

Leah Rabin, bereaved widow, and optimistic patriot, answers: "As great a challenge as it may be, our greatest duty is to find them, to nurture them, and to support the men and women who will carry Yitzhak's vision forward and breathe life into his legacy. And we ourselves must have the courage to seek the peace of the brave."

—Harley Schlanger

From America's Best Ally, to Pariah

When Chile's Marxist President Salvador Allende was overthrown in 1973, Manuel Noriega, who was then head of Panama's intelligence services, interceded to save as many of the thousands of leftists who were detained at Santiago's soccer stadium, as possible.

Years later, Noriega had dinner with Gen. Augusto Pinochet. "Well, you Panamanians sure did save a lot of those Marxists—I'll bet it was something like two thousand of them," said Pinochet. "Tell me one thing, General Noriega: Have they ever thanked you?"

As this book documents, the left has no monopoly on ingratitude. Noriega did favors for the United States, from helping to reduce bloodshed during the Grenada invasion, to interceding with Fidel Castro for the release of C.I.A. contract agents caught carrying out sabotage in Cuba. When Jimmy Carter asked, Panama gave asylum to the Shah of Iran, and when C.I.A. directors from George Bush to William Casey asked, Noriega served as go-between, between

the U.S. and Cuba.

As everyone knows, Bush said thanks, by ordering the December 1989 invasion of Panama, to get Noriega—in the process killing thousands of Panamanians, and more than a score of American servicemen. It "marked the debut of the multi-billion-dollar Stealth bomber in combat, fighting an enemy that had no radar to be fooled . . . nor planes or rockets with which to challenge its domination of the airways." The stated reasons for the invasion—"supporting democracy, blocking drug trafficking, protecting the honor of a woman, responding to Noriega's declaration of war—were lies," writes Eisner.

So, why did Noriega have to go? For one thing, Noriega and his mentor and predecessor, Gen. Omar Torrijos, sought to transform Panama from a quasi-protectorate of the United States, into a sovereign nation-state. In 1977, in the midst of the Cold War, the U. S. had little to lose by signing a treaty pledging to turn over to Panama, twenty-three years

THE MEMOIRS OF
**MANUEL
NORIEGA**

**AMERICA'S
PRISONER**

MANUEL NORIEGA
AND PETER EISNER

**America's Prisoner:
The Memoirs of Manuel Noriega**
by Manuel Noriega and
Peter Eisner
Random House, New York, 1997
293 pages, hardbound, \$25.00

down the road, what Noriega describes as "a little canal built three-quarters of a century earlier, that was becoming obsolete and too small for the world's greater commercial fleets." In exchange, Panama was forced to agree to Wall Street's demand for banking secrecy laws easing drug-money-laundering.

But, Panama was already courting the Japanese as partners for the construc-