

# OUTPOST

May 2009—Issue #222

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

## British Christian Zionism

Ruth King

The Jews of England were exiled in 1292. After almost 400 years, Oliver Cromwell invited them to return in 1665. So much is well known. What is little known is the background of Cromwell's action. He was prompted by sermons and petitions from Puritan missionaries, theologians and legislators. These had their roots in the publication of the King James version of the Bible which inspired a movement called "restorationism," promoting the restoration of Jews to their biblical homeland.

Puritan theologians and legislators such as Thomas Brightman (1562-1607) and Sir Henry Finch (1558-1625) published sermons and what were called "documents": In 1615 Brightman wrote: "Shall they return to Jerusalem again? There is nothing more certain: the prophets do everywhere confirm it and beat upon it." In 1621 Finch, who spoke Hebrew, wrote *The World's Great Restoration* urging Jews in the Diaspora to claim their homeland. "Out of all the places of thy dispersion, East, West, North and South, His purpose is to bring thee home again and to marry thee to Himself by faith for evermore." In 1649, Ebenezer and Joanna Cartwright petitioned parliament to welcome Jews and help "...transport Israel's sons and daughters to the land promised to their forefathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, for an everlasting inheritance."

The movement, albeit small scale, continued after the return of Jews to England. Dr. Joseph Priestley (1733-1804), a clergyman, teacher and scientist who discovered oxygen, was a member of the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews, but his prestige encouraged others to support non-millennial (Messianic conversion) Zionism."

The influential Lord Shaftesbury (1801-1885), whose ring bore the inscription "Pray for the Peace of Jerusalem," presented a declaration to Lord Palmerston (1747-1865) the deeply religious British Foreign Secretary for the "restoration of the Jews to the soil of Palestine to establish the principles of European civilization" and in March of 1841 several hundred Christians issued a plea to parliament: "The land

of Palestine was bestowed by the Sovereign of the Universe upon the descendants of Abraham as a permanent and inalienable possession nearly 4,000 years ago, and ... neither conquests nor treaties among men can possibly affect their Title to it."

There were many others. The Reverend William Bradshaw in 1844 proposed a church budget for resettlement of Jews. William Hechler (1845-1931) was a clergyman who encouraged Theodore Herzl. James Finn (1806-1872), the British Consul in Jerusalem from 1845 to 1862, and his wife Elizabeth trained Jews in farming and in the building trades. Pastor T. Tully Crybace called for Jewish sovereignty in "the entire territory of Palestine from the Euphrates to the Nile, and from the Mediterranean to the Desert."

Colonel George Gawler, commander at Waterloo and Governor of Australia, travelled to Palestine to encourage settlement. In 1860 he wrote: "I should be truly rejoiced to see in Palestine a strong guard of Jews established in flourishing agricultural settlements and ready to hold their own upon the mountains of Israel against all aggressors. I can wish for nothing more glorious in this life than to have my share in helping them do so."

Christian Zionists inspired "freethinkers" such as George Eliot and her companion, the critic and philosopher Henry Lewes. Lord Byron lamented: "The wild dove hath her nest, the fox his cave, Mankind their country - Israel but the grave."

Early Christian Zionists would be horrified to see how trade, media and mainline religious institutions in England have descended into an orgy of anti-Semitism masquerading as opposition to Israel.

The sun has set on the British Empire but it casts its glow on Jerusalem, and it would gladden the hearts of Christian Zionists to know that there will always be an Israel. •

### Table of Contents

<b>The Company He Keeps</b> by William Mehlman	...3
<b>Hebron's Jews</b> by Jerold Auerbach	...6
<b>Stopping The Advance Of Islam</b> by Hans Jansen	...9

## From the Editor

### Groveling To Islam

We are treated to increasing displays of self-abnegation in relation to Islam by our President, symbolized by his deep bow to Saudi Arabia's King Abdullah. Obama endlessly exudes his "respect" for Islam (reiterating that "respect" seven times in a single interview with *Al-Arabiya*). He courts the Iranian mullahs with obeisance to the "Islamic Republic of Iran" taking "its rightful place in the community of nations." He invokes a mythical "partnership with the Muslim world" to roll back a "fringe ideology" (never mind this "fringe ideology" is currently swallowing up parts of nuclear-armed Pakistan, maybe all of it in short order). As Victor Davis Hanson points out, Obama will apologize for almost anything on behalf of the United States, but never refer to the pathologies of Islam that foster *al Qaeda* (the religious intolerance, the gender apartheid, to name just two). Before the Turkish Parliament Obama outdid himself: "We will convey our deep appreciation for the Islamic faith, which has done so much over the centuries to shape the world—including in my own country."

Shaped this country? Thank goodness, not so. As Robert Spencer notes in *Frontpage*: "One would be hard-pressed to find any significant way in which the Islamic faith had shaped the United States in terms of its governing principles and the nature of American society. Meanwhile, there are numerous ways in which, if there had been a significant Muslim presence in the country at the time, some of the most cherished and important principles of American society and law may have met fierce resistance, and may never have seen the light of day." As Spencer notes, the most significant impact upon the United States of an event connected to Islam was the attack on the World Trade Center and Pentagon on September 11, 2001. The Islamic faith has shaped the U.S. since 9/11 in highly unwelcome ways, forcing billions to be spent on anti-terror measures and the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, to name only the most painful.

### Demoting the Jews

While Obama's sycophancy to Islam has at least been oft-noted (indeed, it's been impossible to escape), his more subtle downgrading of Judaism has been overlooked. Edward Alexander (on *Commentary's* website *Contentions*) points out that in his inaugural address Obama "jettisoned the long-established locution that embodies the generally accepted notion of 'the Judeo-Christian tradition.' That tradition, in America, mandates the phrase 'Christians and Jews,' with Christians in first place for the good reason that the roots of this country and most of those who founded it are Christian. Obama, however, said on January 20 that 'We are a nation of Christians and Muslims,' and then, after a slight pause, 'Jews and

Hindus,' and another slight pause, 'and unbelievers.' Later, in his *Al-Arabiya* interview, he demoted the Jews still further, calling America a country of Muslims, Christians, Jews.'

Alexander observes that Obama's actions (and inactions) with respect to Jewish concerns suggest that this demotion is real and not merely verbal.

### Shrugging Off Allies

As Obama makes overtures to Iran, Venezuela, North Korea and Cuba, he turns his back on our allies, making clear that he is not interested in maintaining the U.S. role as protector of the free world. Caroline Glick writes: "Tokyo was distraught by the administration's reaction to North Korea's three-stage ballistic missile test...India, for its part, is concerned by Obama's repeated assertions that its refusal to transfer control over the disputed Jammu and Kashmir provinces to Pakistan inspires Pakistani terror against India [and] the Obama administration's refusal to make ending Pakistan's support for *jihadist* terror groups attacking India a central component of its strategy for contending with Pakistan and Afghanistan... Then there is Iraq...The most supportive statement he could muster came during his conversation with Turkish students in Istanbul...There he said, 'I have a responsibility to make sure that as we bring troops out, that we do so in a careful enough way that we don't see a complete collapse into violence.'"

Nor, Glick notes, can Obama's promise to aim for a nuclear free world, to drastically scale back the missile defense program and forge a new alliance with Russia have been music to the ears of the leaders of former Soviet satellites threatened by Russia. As for Israel, Obama's declaration of support for the so-called Saudi "peace plan" (and warning to Israel that it not strike to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear power) is simply a demand to Israel that it commit national suicide.

As Glick sums up "America's betrayal of its democratic allies makes each of them more vulnerable to aggression at the hands of their enemies—enemies the Obama administration is now actively attempting to appease."

(Continued on page 12)

#### Outpost

Editor: Rael Jean Isaac

Editorial Board: Herbert Zweibon, Ruth King

Outpost is distributed free to  
Members of Americans For a Safe Israel  
Annual membership: \$50.

**Americans For a Safe Israel**

1751 Second Ave. (at 91st St.)

New York, NY 10128

tel (212) 828-2424 / fax (212) 828-1717

E-mail: [afsi@rcn.com](mailto:afsi@rcn.com) web site: <http://www.afsi.org>

# The Company He Keeps

William Mehlman

The opacity of the Obama administration's professed dedication to the safety and security of Israel becomes more pronounced with each passing week.

Former U.S. ambassador Charles Freeman's aborted appointment to the chairmanship of the president's National Intelligence Council is history, but its reverberations refuse to subside. By now we all know why this appointment was aborted. The question that won't go away is why it was ever made.

Given Freeman's stellar performances riding shotgun for the Saudis and the Communist Chinese, even as the "goddess of democracy" was being systematically assaulted by their regimes, by what stretch of whose imagination was the ambassador deemed fit to be sifting national intelligence data, much less presiding over the process? "Don't ask us," could serve as a summation of the response of the President and his inner circle, their collective arms extended full length.

It was Freeman himself who let the cat out of the bag. Withdrawing his name from further consideration for the National Intelligence Council chairmanship, he issued what the *Washington Post* described as a "two-page screed" in which he cast himself as the victim of an "Israeli lobby" whose "tactics plumb the depths of dishonor and indecency" and which is "intent on forcing adherence to the policies of a foreign government. The aim of this lobby," he continued, "is control of the policy process through the exercise of a veto over the appointment of people who dispute the wisdom of their views...and the exclusion of any and all options for decisions by Americans and our government, other than those that it favors."

While never having been mistaken for a member of Israel's "amen" corner, even the *Washington Post* found all this a bit much to bear. "Yes, Mr. Freeman was referring to Americans who support Israel," it declared in a March 12th editorial entitled "Peddling a Conspiracy Theory," "and his statement was a gross libel." That the former ambassador feels the way he does about Israel is hardly news. He's declared on more than one occasion that he thinks all of America's problems with the Islamic world can be traced to its supposed open-ended support of the Jewish state. That Freeman thought he could predicate his withdrawal from the NIC nomination on an Israeli "conspiracy", totally ignoring the furor he raised in Congress over his links to Saudi Arabia and China, says as much about the new atmosphere the Obama administration has brought to Washington as it

does about himself.

Speaking to that subject in a recent *Jerusalem Post* column, Caroline Glick observed that "In the past, while anti-Israel politicians, policy makers and opinion shapers were accepted in Washington, they would not have felt comfortable brandishing their anti-Israel positions as qualifying credentials for high position. Freeman's appointment showed that is no longer the case. Today in Washington there are powerful circles of political players for whom a person's anti-Israel bona fides are his strongest suit." Indeed, she goes on to note, Freeman's defenders underscored his ambivalence toward Israel as their reason for defending him, even to the point of ignoring his assertion in one instance that America deserved the attacks launched upon it on September 11, 2001. "They felt the fact that he raised the hackles of Americans who support Israel," she said, "was reason enough to support him. Whether his views on other issues are reasonable or not was of no interest to them."

That they also seemed to be of little or no interest to the Obama people is clearly a cause for concern. Political toilet training being an incremental process, if the Freeman fiasco was an isolated matter, it might be passed off as one of those "accidents" that inevitably mark the crawling stages of every new administration in Washington. But there was nothing isolated about the Freeman appointment. It was illustrative of a pattern of highly questionable foreign policy appointments by this White House, bound by a common thread of antipathy toward Israel. Like that involving Freeman, some of the most controversial among them were not subject to Senate review and confirmation.

A Democratic controlled Senate might not have nixed the nominations of Samantha Power and Robert Malley to the National Security Council, but it would not have let them pass without some serious debate. Power, a Harvard genocide expert who served as one of Obama's campaign advisors, is a product of the International Crisis Group, a think tank heavily funded by billionaire George Soros. Not surprisingly, it has made a specialty of bashing Israel. Power was part of the ICG directorate that voted to bestow its 2008 "Founders Award" on Soros, in acceptance of which the renowned arch-critic of Israel and all things Israeli praised it for its exemplary work on the "Palestine Question." Power, who is heading up the National Security Council's "Multilateral Institutions" section, stopped just short of accusing Israel of genocide for its 2002 Defensive Shield opera-



Charles Freeman



Samantha Power



Robert Malley

tion against Tanzim terrorists in Jenin, settling for a charge of “major human rights abuses.” But she has not been shy of suggesting the injection of U.S. military forces into Judea and Samaria to safeguard the “human rights” of the Palestinians.

Power doesn't blanch at *force majeure* as an answer to the Israeli-Palestinian impasse. With a heavy dollop of moral equivalence, she mused in a recent interview that “imposition of a solution on unwilling partners is dreadful. I mean it's a terrible thing to do...but it's essential that some set of principles becomes the benchmark, rather than a deterrence to people who are fundamentally politically destined to destroy the lives of their own people.”

**R**obert Malley, another horse out of the International Crisis Group stable, has been holding hands with Syrian dictator Bashir Assad since 2006. A former Clinton administration National Security Council honcho and key member of ICG's Middle East policy team, he succeeded in winning for ICG a rare prize among American think tanks—an office in Damascus. Malley is believed to have been the mover behind Senator John Kerry's February trip to Syria, highlighted by the senator's effusive commendation of Assad, Hezbollah's co-sponsor, for his valiant efforts on behalf of what turned out to be a still-born rapprochement between Fatah and Hamas. It was Malley who reportedly persuaded Obama to suspend further enforcement of U.S. sanctions against Syria and Malley who fired up the President's enthusiasm for reopening the U.S. Embassy in Damascus, closed in February 2005 in response to Syria's involvement in the assassination of Lebanese prime minister Rafik Hariri.

Frederic Hof, Obama's choice for the Damascus ambassadorial post, is a consummate Arabist (he once referred to the Jewish communities in Judea and Samaria as “a cancer killing the Oslo Process”) and a protégé of George Mitchell, the President's “Special Envoy” to the Middle East. Mitchell billed his initial pre-election visit to Israel as a “listening tour.” He was back in Jerusalem following the election and by all indications the “listening” is over. Still basking in the afterglow of the “Good Friday” peace agreement he cobbled together in Northern Ireland, one that has begun to fray around the edges, the former Maine Senator is convinced that there are no differences—political or territorial—that cannot be split. Among the first things he's given notice he wants to split away from Israel are its communities in the strategic hilltops of Judea and Samaria. He's already made it known that the dismantling of those communities was promised to former president, George Bush by former prime minister Ehud Olmert. That promise, as Mitchell defines it, was not Olmert's alone, but Israel's and he fully expects the Netanyahu government to make good. Of course, a victory on this front will be seen as

setting the stage for an even bigger split—the division of Jerusalem.

The celebrants of such an event would be almost certain to include Zbigniew Brzezinski and Brent Scowcroft. As mere “unofficial” advisors to the President, they fall well under the Senatorial confirmation radar but their animus toward the Jewish state, burnished to a fine polish over the years, is only too recognizable. Brzezinski, Jimmy Carter's National Security Chief, shares a place with Samantha Power on the board of the International Crisis Group, a testament in itself to his feelings about Israel. They were on full display in his recent testimony on Iran before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in which he ridiculed Israel's contention of an existential threat raised by Iran's quest for an atomic bomb. America's “nuclear umbrella,” he averred, furnished all the protection Israel needed, adding, in a transparent jab at the Jewish state, that “we should be very careful not to become susceptible to interested parties.”



Z. Brzezinski



Brent Scowcroft

Scowcroft, the most impassioned advocate of a hard line against Israel during his tenure as advisor to George H.W. Bush, is currently beating the drums for direct U.S. “engagement” with Hamas from his post as chairman of the international board of the U.S. Middle East Project. Co-created with one-time American Jewish Congress chairman Henry Siegman, the board, including seven Arab members, is a loud voice in favor of imposing a Fatah/Hamas regime on Israel in Judea, Samaria and Jerusalem. In a *Washington Post* op-ed last fall, Scowcroft opined that resolving the “Palestinian issue” would “liberate Arab governments to support U.S. leadership in dealing with regional problems” as well as “dissipate much of the appeal of Hezbollah and Hamas, dependent as it is, on the Palestinians' plight.”

While his language is more elegant and his views marginally less radical, Scowcroft's rumored possible replacement of Freeman as chairman of the National Intelligence Council amounts to a distinction without a great deal of difference. In his February testimony, he implored the Senate Foreign Relations Committee not to take its eyes off the Palestinian ball. “The main gist,” he told the Senators, “is that you need to push hard on the Palestinian peace process. Don't move it to the end of your agenda and say you have too much to do. And the United States needs to have a position, not just to hold their coats.” Vis-a-vis the Iranian threat, Scowcroft said he was primarily concerned with the prospect of a nuclear-armed Iran precipitating a nuclear arms race throughout the Middle East. As far as Israel was concerned, he saw no reason to dissent from Brzezinski's view that its fears were overblown.

You won't catch Obama's National Security Director, General James Jones (USMC, Ret.), taking large exception to that sentiment. That much was ob-

vious in the embarrassing wake of IDF Chief of Staff Gabi Ashkenazi's March 17th trip to Washington to review fresh intelligence related to Iran's threat to his nation's existence. The sound of doors slamming in his face could have been heard all the way back to the *Hakiriyah* in Tel Aviv. Though appointments were scheduled well in advance, Defense Secretary Gates, Vice President Biden, National Intelligence Chief Blair and Joint Chiefs of Staff chairman Mullen, Ashkenazi's military counterpart, all found they had more important things to do. Jones, the former Marine commandant, was the only administration policy maker who had any time for him and he made it clear from the get-go that Iran was not a subject he cared to discuss. Sources in Washington report that virtually the entire session was taken up with American demands that Israel lift further security restrictions on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. In the words of one diplomat, "the [Obama] administration was sending a very clear message to Israel, and that is 'we want to talk about Palestine and not Iran.'"

Finally, there is Susan Rice, the administration's ambassador to the United Nations. A Brookings Institution Senior Fellow, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs during Bill Clinton's second term, Oxford Rhodes Scholar, Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Stanford, daughter of a Cornell University economics professor and Federal Reserve System governor, Rice was ticketed for the political stratosphere from the day she was elected president of the student council at Washington's exclusive National Cathedral High School. As chief torch bearer for "engagenomics," Barack Obama's chosen foreign policy wand, she could not have made landfall in a more suitable venue than Turtle Bay.

Rice does not intend to disappoint. Her first act, barely a month after Senate confirmation, was to announce that the U.S. would contend for a seat on the UN's "Human Rights Council," the same "ragtag" retailer of anti-Israel snake oil from which John Bolton, George Bush's UN representative, disengaged the U.S. in 2006, deeming any further association with an organization responsible for 26 condemnations of Israel over the previous three-years as "legitimizing something that doesn't deserve legitimacy."

Ambassador Rice and her boss think otherwise. While describing the Human Rights Council's record as "disturbing" ("Yes, of course we mean Israel," she responded to a reporter's request for clarification), she apparently didn't find it disturbing enough to preclude America's bid for reentry. "We do not see any inherent benefit, as demonstrated by recent history, in being outside the tent and simply being critical," she told reporters at a news conference following the announcement. She coldly dismissed the argument put forth by the Republican Jewish Coalition and

Florida Congresswoman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, the ranking member of the House International Affairs Committee, that in failing to condition America's return to the UN body on substantive structural reforms, including the barring from its deliberations of human rights violators like Libya and Zimbabwe, the United States was throwing its diplomatic leverage to the four winds. "We don't view engagement or diplomacy as a reward," she replied. "It's a tool to advance our interests."

In the kind of mortifying post script to the affair that occasionally causes even its most fervent supporters to wonder why they stick their necks out for the Jewish state, the Republican Jewish Coalition and Congresswoman Ros-Lehtinen wound up with egg on their faces when Aharon Leshno Yaar, Israel's Geneva-based UN representative, joined with UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon and a host of leftist and notably anti-Israel "human rights" floggers in welcoming America's projected return to the Council as a "concrete embodiment of the U.S. commitment to a new era of engagement." One hopes that the Netanyahu government's replacement of Mr. Leshno Yaar in Geneva becomes an early order of business.



Susan Rice



Gen. James Jones

In a sobering assessment of the new Obama era of U.S-Israel relations, British author and journalist Melanie Phillips commented that the "Israel bashers and Jew-haters with whom [Obama] has surrounded himself, aided and abetted by new realist appeasers and (often Jewish) useful idiots..." have only succeeded in "pursuing with far greater ferocity the change in strategy that was already apparent when George W. Bush became fatally weakened—forcing Israel to sacrifice its security, all for the illusory goal of a Palestinian state that would almost certainly become yet another proxy for Iran and which, far from helping defang the Middle East, would result instead in regional instability and yet more terrible war."

That the West, as she predicts, "will be next if Obama succeeds in throwing Israel under the bus," has notably failed to cut any ice with Scowcroft and the other "realists," who have been driving this agenda, "including," Phillips adds, "those who wish Israel would just vanish off the face of the earth." That puts the ball squarely in the court of Benjamin Netanyahu and his Likud-led coalition. It is a collection of ill-fitting parts, but somehow the new prime minister will have to find the key to making it work, if Israel is to have any chance of prevailing over the terrible hand it's been dealt.

*\*The author represents AFSI in Israel and is co-editor of the Jerusalem-based internet magazine ZionNet ([www.zionnet.net](http://www.zionnet.net)).*

# Hebron Jews: A Community of Memory

Jerold S. Auerbach

Israel recently marked two momentous events in its brief history: two years ago it observed the fortieth anniversary of the Six-Day war, followed last year by the sixtieth anniversary of independence. Although each offered an appropriate occasion for celebration of a stunning historic achievement, both provoked prolonged lamentation by many Israelis, first over Israel's shameful responsibility for "Naqba," the Palestinian dispersion in 1948 that accompanied the rebirth of a Jewish state; and then over the "Pyrrhic" victory and "occupation" of "Palestinian" land since 1967.

Two anniversaries this year, if noticed at all, are likely to attract even sharper criticism. Hebron Jews will commemorate the eightieth anniversary of the horrific 1929 massacre, which led to the expulsion of a 400

year-old Jewish community from the City of the Patriarchs. But they also celebrate the thirtieth anniversary of their return to inhabit abandoned Jewish property after five decades of forced exclusion from Hebron. Together, these commemorative occasions will demonstrate the power of Jewish memory in a community of Jews committed to preserving the historical links between biblical antiquity and modern Israel, between Judaism and Zionism.

Yet no Jews are as reviled as the Jews of Hebron. Vilified as "zealots," "fanatics" and "fundamentalists" who illegally "occupy" someone else's land, they are the Jewish settlers whom legions of critics love to hate. It is seldom noticed that their most serious transgression, settlement in the Land of Israel—the return of Jews to their historic homeland—defines Zionism.

Living in the ancient biblical city south of Jerusalem, Hebron Jews are clustered near *Me'arat HaMachpelah*, the Cave of Machpelah, the oldest Jewish holy site in the world. There, according to Jewish tradition, Abraham purchased the first parcel of land owned by the Jewish people in their promised land to bury Sarah. There, too, the other patriarchs and matriarchs were entombed. Since biblical antiquity Jews have lived and prayed in Hebron and made pilgrimages to the Machpelah shrine. Conquered, massacred, expelled and exiled over the centuries, they have always remembered Hebron and they have always returned.

One of the four ancient holy cities, Hebron was honored with designation as a city of refuge and a priestly city. It became King David's first capital, an important administrative center for King Hezekiah in his eighth-century war against the Assyrians, and a crucial battleground during the Maccabean and Bar Kokhba uprisings. There, at the beginning of the Common Era, King Herod built the massive stone en-

closure around the burial tombs that remains the oldest intact structure in the entire Land of Israel.

But Jews were not alone in finding sacred meaning and inspiration in Hebron. Over the centuries, Christians and Muslims attempted to make Hebron exclusively theirs. Beginning in the mid-thirteenth century, Muslim rulers prohibited Jews (and other "infidels") from entering Machpelah to pray at the tombs, permitting them to ascend no higher than the seventh step outside the enclosure. But itinerant Jewish travelers persisted in making pilgrimages to the

ancient burial site and some elderly Jews moved to Hebron to be buried near their biblical ancestors.

Following the expulsions from Spain at the end of the fifteenth century, a small group of

pious Jews built a community of study and prayer in Hebron on land purchased for them by a wealthy benefactor. Sephardic Jews trickled in from villages and cities in the Middle East, subsequently joined by Hasidim from Eastern Europe. Gathered around the Avraham Avinu ("Our Father Abraham") synagogue, in a dark and cramped quarter adjacent to the market in the center of town, they clung tenaciously to their precarious foothold, dependent for economic survival largely on emissaries dispatched to benefactors scattered throughout the Jewish world.

During much of the nineteenth century, a time of impressive community expansion, Hebron Jews maintained relatively harmonious, if largely subservient, relations with their Muslim neighbors, who treated them as *dhimmi*s. Hebron became widely known for its Talmudic scholarship and learning. Yeshivas sprouted, a medical clinic opened, and the first paved road from Jerusalem linked Hebron to other Jewish communities in Ottoman Palestine.

But there was little connection between Hebron Jews and the nascent Zionist movement. The secular Jews who rode the swift currents of nineteenth-century nationalism largely abandoned the religious Judaism that had framed Jewish life during 2,000 years of statelessness and exile. At the founding Zionist convention in Basel in 1896, Max Nordau insisted "Zionism has nothing to do with religion." Like other emancipated modern Jews, these iconoclastic Jewish nationalists were prepared to cast off a religion that looked backward to the past and inward to divine revelation and sacred texts. Only Zionism, stripped of religious content, could provide an answer to the Jewish Question—the place of Jews in modern society—by relocating them within the boundaries of their own homeland.

---

## No Jews are as reviled as the Jews of Hebron.

---

In 1929, after nearly a decade of British rule in Palestine following World War I, Hebron Jews suffered another of the horrific pogroms that had long punctuated Jewish history. Incited by Haj Amin al-Husseini, the mufti of Jerusalem, Arab rioting swept through Palestine. The venerable Hebron Jewish community was suddenly attacked. Sixty-seven Jews were murdered; scores were assaulted, severely wounded, even mutilated. After British soldiers removed traumatized survivors from their homes and evacuated them to Jerusalem, Hebron became *Judenrein*. Two years later an attempt to rebuild the community failed. During Israel's War of Independence in 1948, Hebron was conquered and absorbed within the Kingdom of Jordan. In the old Jewish Quarter remnants of its past—synagogues, yeshivas, even the ancient cemetery—were desecrated and virtually obliterated.

Nineteen years later, when the Israel Defense Forces swept into biblical Judea and Samaria near the end of the Six-Day War, Hebron—along with Jerusalem—was restored to Jewish control after 2000 years. For the first time since 1267, Jews could pray inside the Machpelah enclosure. Israelis visited Hebron by the thousands, and then tens of thousands. On a single June day, 70,000 Jewish visitors flooded the city. Inside the venerable shrine a Yemenite man blew repeated blasts on his shofar while a Moroccan woman, wailing *Ima, Ima* ("Mother, Mother"), kissed the cenotaph marking Sarah's tomb.

The return to biblical Judea and Samaria was the unanticipated consequence of an unwanted war. Determined to erase the lingering humiliation of 1948 and annihilate the Jewish state, Israel's Arab neighbors—Egypt, Syria, and Jordan—had inadvertently compelled secular Zionists to confront their Jewish past and future. The sudden presence of Israeli soldiers and tourists in Hebron provoked vigorous debate in government circles over the fruits of victory, the rights of conquest, the claims of history and possibilities for peaceful co-existence—a debate that continues to divide Israeli society.

The Labor government acted with alacrity in Jerusalem. It bulldozed the Arab neighborhood abutting the Western Wall and annexed the Old City and east Jerusalem. In the Old City, where the Jewish Quarter had been abandoned since 1948, ancient Jewish history and modern Zionism converged in an outpouring of nationalist and religious enthusiasm. There was virtually no question, either in government circles or in an exultant nation, but that the Western Wall would remain under Israeli sovereignty and the historic Jewish Quarter would be rebuilt.

But the government remained ambivalent, at best, about Hebron. A symbol of the old religious *yishuv* that secular Zionists spurned, Hebron was problematic in ways that Jerusalem was not. Yet for-

mer Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion, meeting with Israeli Cabinet members, insisted: "On Jerusalem we must not budge. We have to quickly establish a large Jewish settlement there. The same with Hebron." And in a ceremony at the ancient Jewish cemetery on the Mount of Olives two months after the war, Defense Minister Moshe Dayan boldly proclaimed, "We have returned to all that is holy in our land....We have returned to the cradle of our people, to the inheritance of the Patriarchs....We have returned to the Mountain [the Temple Mount], to Hebron and to Nablus. We will not be parted from the holy places."

Not all Israelis appreciated the encounter with their ancient heritage. A promising young writer, Amos Oz, confessed: "I don't have any feeling that Hebron's part of my homeland. But I do feel this about Holon," the dreary town outside Tel Aviv where he first fell in love. Archaeologist Yigal Yadin sharply denounced the embrace of national and religious relics as "idolatrous." As passionately (and publicly) as he had previously celebrated his own discovery of the bones of nine hundred suicidal Jewish Zealots at Masada, he now ridiculed Jews for praying inside Machpelah, which he dismissed as the likely site of tombs of Arab sheikhs.



Beit Hadassah: Center of Jewish Hebron

In the spring following the Six Day War, a group of predominantly religious Zionists, led by Rabbi Moshe Levinger, came to Hebron to celebrate Passover. Levinger, born in Jerusalem in 1935, had attended a Bnei Akiva yeshiva, served in the army, and studied at the Mercaz HaRav in Jerusalem. Then he joined Kibbutz Lavi, near the Golan Heights, where he combined rabbinical duties with shepherding.

Shortly after the 1967 war, Levinger visited Hebron to explore the possibility of rebuilding the community. In the desecrated Jewish cemetery, he experienced "an awakening of tempestuous spirits." The visit, he recalled, created "an internal turmoil that left me restless for days and weeks." He decided to return to Hebron and restore a Jewish community there. Early in the spring of 1968, he contacted the military governor of Hebron to request permission to hold a Passover Seder and spend the night there.

In recognition of the historic Jewish presence in Hebron, Labor Minister Yigal Allon had already floated a proposal for a Jewish neighborhood nearby, perhaps an "upper" Hebron on a hill overlooking the Arab city (modeled on Upper Nazareth in the Galilee). But the government did not respond to Levinger's inquiries. Meeting with Hanan Porat, who had led the return to Gush Etzion after the war, and Elyakim Haetzni, a maverick lawyer, the decision was reached to go to Hebron without government permission.

Rabbi Levinger negotiated a rental arrangement with the owner of the Park Hotel for Passover

week in April 1968. The hotel, a nondescript two-story stone building, had fallen on hard times, losing nearly its entire clientele now that prosperous Jordanians no longer vacationed there. Posing as Swiss tourists, the Levinger group negotiated a rental agreement for one dollar nightly for each guest. Levinger left a substantial deposit for “an unlimited amount of people for an unspecified period of time.” The hotel owner assured Levinger that they could extend their stay if they wished. Some Israeli government authorities learned of the plan, but they did not interfere. Central Command General Uzi Narkiss told Levinger, “What do you want? To settle in Hebron? I don’t care. I know nothing. Rent a hotel, put up tents....I know nothing.”

A sizable group of Israelis—estimates range between sixty and eighty—arrived in Hebron to celebrate Passover and restore a Jewish presence in the city. The Levingers, clearly intending to stay, brought their four children, a refrigerator, and a washing machine. The kitchen was made kosher, and mezzuzas were attached to doorframes. “We never told anyone that we were going only to celebrate Passover,” Rabbi Levinger recalled. “The government authorities knew that we wanted to settle.”



Rabbi Levinger

Rabbi Chaim Druckman, another graduate of the Mercaz HaRav yeshiva, led the Seder. Hanan Porat attended. Rabbi Shlomo Aviner, a recent immigrant from France who would lead Ateret Cohanim, the movement to restore a Jewish presence throughout Jerusalem’s Old City, joined the celebration. So did veteran Irgun fighter Shmuel Katz and *Maariv* journalist Yisrael Harel. Elyakim Haetzni, accompanied by his wife, mother, and four children, described the Seder nearly forty years later as “a once in a lifetime experience.” Miriam Levinger sensed “an historical breakthrough, and we all felt deeply moved and excited.” After the festive meal, exulting participants, joined by a Druze soldier who was guarding the hotel, danced and sang *v’shavu banim l’gvulam* (“your children shall return to their borders”).

The next morning the celebrants, singing and dancing through the streets of Hebron, carried Torah scrolls to *Me’arat HaMachpelah*. That evening, after the end of the Jewish Sabbath, some of the older participants left the hotel to return to their homes, but younger Israelis and yeshiva students remained behind, soon to be joined by newcomers. The next day, in their exuberance, they sent a telegram to Labor Minister Allon: **Blessings for festival of our freedom to you from Hebron City of Patriarchs from first of those returning to it to settle in it in the name of 30 families Rabbi Moshe Levinger.**

The new settlers remained in the Park Hotel for six weeks while the government debated what to do about them. In a compromise solution, they agreed to be relocated to the former British and Jordanian

police building, now under Israeli military control, on a hill overlooking the city. There they remained, in miserably cramped quarters, while the government debated their future. After two years of hesitation that ended only after a terrorist attack wounded dozens of Jews awaiting entry to *Me’arat HaMachpelah* during Sukkoth, government ministers finally decided to decide. The new settlement of Kiryat Arba was built on a twenty-two-acre tract overlooking Hebron on an empty hill that had been seized after the war by Israeli military authorities.

But Kiryat Arba was not Hebron. Despite Levinger’s fiery insistence that “no government has the authority or right to say that a Jew cannot live in all parts of the Land of Israel,” the time was not right, the issue was too sensitive, or there were security problems, budgetary constraints, or American pressures to consider. The Likud government of Menachem Begin, in principle at least, seemed to favor the expansion of Kiryat Arba until it reached the size of Hebron, thereby creating separate Jewish and Arab cities. But exploratory discussions went nowhere. Then, in 1978, the government stunned settlers when it signed the Camp David accords with Egypt, committing it to return the entire Sinai Peninsula and grant “autonomy” to West Bank Palestinians. Settlers sensed that opportunities were slipping from their grasp.

Fifty years after the 1929 massacre, Kiryat Arba residents decided that the time had come to return to Hebron. By community consensus, the issue would be forced by women and children, who were least likely to provoke a harsh response from the government or military. One week after Passover, at 4:00 A.M., ten women led by Miriam Levinger and Sarah Nachshon, joined by thirty-five children, eight of whom were Nachshons, arrived by truck at the rear of Beit Hadassah, the former medical clinic in the heart of Hebron. Assisted by teenage boys from Kiryat Arba, they quietly climbed ladders, cut wires to the windows, and unloaded mattresses, cooking burners, gas canisters, water, a refrigerator, laundry lines, and a chemical toilet.

Safely inside the dilapidated building, the excited children sang *v’shavu banim l’gvulam*, God’s promise that children would return to Zion. Hearing their voices, an astonished Israeli soldier came down from his observation post on a nearby roof to investigate. When he inquired how they had entered the building, a four-year-old girl responded, “Jacob, our forefather, built us a ladder and we came in.”

In their first message from Beit Hadassah the women declared, “When we went to live eight years ago in Kiryat-Arba . . . it was because of compromise



Miriam Levinger

and going towards the government. Our wish was and still is Jewish settlement within Hebron.” At the end of their first *Shabbat* in Beit Hadassah, yeshiva students from Kiryat Arba came to dance and sing outside. Miriam Levinger described that moment: “We felt as if the souls of the murdered of this place had come and gathered with us at the window...to rejoice with us at the sight of Jews dancing on Saturday evening in the streets of Hebron. I wanted to calm them and say to them, ‘You can rest, you have waited for many years, now we have returned. What was in the past in Hebron is what will happen in the future.’”



Sarah Nachshon

“With the sword in one hand and the Bible in the other,” wrote journalist Amos Elon disapprovingly, Hebron settlers had the temerity to insist that “deeds contracted in the late Bronze Age are the legal and moral basis for present claims”—as though biblical roots in the Land of Israel were not the deepest source of Zionism itself. Hebron became the ideological vanguard of the Jewish settlement movement that has embedded nearly 300,000 Israelis in Judea and Samaria.

Seven hundred Jews, joined by 200 yeshiva students, now live in Hebron, surrounded by 160,000 Palestinian Arabs. For thirty years, the government of Israel has stifled growth in the Jewish Quarter, obstructed property purchases by Jews, and constricted population enlargement. With their impassioned blend

of Zionist nationalism and religious Judaism blamed for undermining Israeli democracy and jeopardizing Middle Eastern peace efforts, Hebron Jews may be the only Jews in the world whose critics can viciously malign them without incurring the taint of anti-Semitism. Their determination to remember, in the very place where Jewish memory may be said to have originated, places them at the epicenter of a polarizing conflict within contemporary Israel—as acrimonious as the struggle between Israelis and Palestinian Arabs—over the identity and future boundaries, both external and internal, of the Jewish state.

A year ago, the sole surviving member of a Jewish family that had owned property in Hebron since the 15<sup>th</sup> century Spanish expulsion, appeared before the High Court of Justice with registration records to document his claim. Yosef Ezra was the seventy-five-year-old son of Yaacov ben Shalom Ezra. Father and son had been the only Jews to remain behind in Hebron between 1936 and 1947. Yosef praised Hebron Jews as “true pioneers, among the last who are putting Zionism into practice.”

*Jerold S. Auerbach is professor of history at Wellesley College. This essay is drawn from his forthcoming book, Hebron Jews: Memory and Conflict in the Land of Israel, to be published in July by Roman & Littlefield.*

## Stopping The Advance of Islam

Hans Jansen

In less than four centuries Christianity was able to win the Roman Empire over to itself. This happened from the bottom up, without force or violence, without government intervention or support. On the contrary, the government of the Roman Empire, by persecuting Christians from time to time, hindered Christianization with force and violence.

During the period the Roman Empire was being Christianized, the process occurred more or less in what is now known as the Middle East, plus in Europe up to the Danube and the Rhine. That doesn't mean that there were no Christians outside that area. By about 300-350, to the east of the Roman Empire in Persia, a fair number of Christians could be found (later known as the Nestorians). Also just outside the borders of the Roman Empire there lived the Armenians and Georgians, who by about 300 had adopted Christianity as a state religion. In the Roman Empire that happened shortly thereafter.

The Muslims managed to conquer roughly the same area as that of the ancient Roman Empire in about a century, with the exception of Western Europe, where they were stopped in France by Charles Martel (732), and Turkey and the current Balkans, where the Muslims were stopped by the Eastern

Roman Empire, the Byzantines, until the middle of the fifteenth century.

Nevertheless it was a tremendous military achievement for the Muslims to conquer in such a short time a territory that stretched from Toledo to Gibraltar, Tunis, Cairo, Damascus, Baghdad, Mecca, and beyond.

There is not a single Muslim who is unaware of this century of conquests. The military successes of that time are generally perceived by Islamic theologians as proof of the truth of Islam and the correctness of the statements made by Muhammad about himself and his mission. If Islam were not God's own religion, Muslims reason, and if Muhammad were not the messenger of God, they think, then these conquests would not have taken place and would not have been so successful. These conquests can be considered as *akbar dalaala alla Sidq muhammad*, “the best proof of the sincerity of Muhammad,” as a comment in the Qur'an at one point expresses it.

Europeans who are not used to employing this kind of reasoning are sometimes left mute when they are for the first time confronted with this assertion. But it is a ridiculous Islamic fallacy. When Christianity was able to win the Middle East and Europe over, it was without using violence. Should the Christians then be impressed that others, namely the Muslims, have managed to conquer such an area using brute military violence?

We should not enter into silly contests of miracles, but may establish that a religion like this needed to make use of the force of arms to achieve approximately the same thing that Christianity managed to achieve without violence. In their propaganda Muslims are eager to point to the later violent nature of churches and Christianity. That of course is true. Man is inclined towards all kinds of evil. Once the power of the state during the fourth century AD came into Christian hands, it was obviously made use of in a way that was considered normal in those days. But that was only after the triumph of Christianity.

Those who wish to may apologize for the later Christian violence. Because of the “confession” that is part of the Christian liturgy, Christians are perhaps trained too well in the confession of guilt, and that contrasts with the views of most Muslims, who are in fact proud of the warfare of Islam against the Christians. But we need to understand fully that the Muslims could have stayed at home in Medina. They did not do so; they marched out to battle. Time and again, the Muslims declared war on their neighbors at the borders of their ever growing empire.

Once the Muslims were the masters of the Middle East, they started—and it can not be said otherwise—to harass and bully powerless Christians who were in the majority in their captive nations. For the Christians of Egypt, for example, this has been defined in the *History of the Patriarchs of the Egyptian Church*, a book in many parts, attributed to Bishop Severus ibn al-Mukaffa. How unfortunate, sad, and incomprehensible that no one at the top of the Christian Democratic parties is prepared to read this book (which is translated into English). Did not the Romans state that the gods first blind those they want to destroy?

For the Jews in Egypt this bullying is demonstrated beyond any doubt by the Genizah documents, a vast collection of correspondence, fragments of accounts, receipts, etc., from the medieval Jewish community in Cairo.

The Muslims themselves write very openly about this harassment in the manuals of the *sharia* and in *fatwas*. Historically therefore, there is no doubt whatsoever. The literary tradition in chronicles of the victims (Severus), archeology (Genizah), and the administration and reporting (Sharia) of the perpetrators totally agree. That is not often so, and therefore you might think that a crowd of scientists would have focused on this episode in history. But that seems not to be the case. Research that might anger the Muslim elite is usually ignored by Western scholars.

What does the harassment consist of according to the Muslims themselves? The core of it is

summed up on a list that is known as “the Pact of Omar.” There were two Caliph Omars; the first from 634 to 644, the second from 717 to 720. Both are mentioned as the monarch under whom these rules were issued. In Arabic, this list has a bit clearer name: the “conditions”, *shurut* of Omar. These are the conditions under which Christians, Samaritans, and Jews within the areas that are conquered by Islam may hold on to their religion. They must distinguish themselves by the color of their clothing or headgear as non-Muslim. This is where the yellow star for the Jews derives from. They are not allowed to carry arms or own them (and are therefore completely helpless). Riding horses is prohibited. In combination with the prohibition on possession of weapons this made a trip of any magnitude impossible in the early days.



Turks at Gates of Vienna

Annually every non-Muslim person had to pay a personal tax. When it was handed over, the tax collector had to strike a blow on the neck of the non-Muslim, which was meant as a symbolic beheading. The purpose of this was to remind the non-Muslim that he had been overcome by the superior Muslim armies, and even though he was spared from being a prisoner of war, enslaved or decapitated, this would only be as long as the Muslim rulers were pleased to do so. Whoever could not

pay the tax had the choice between becoming Muslim or death.

The *Sharia*, the Islamic law, as revealed in the manuals written by Muslims for Muslims, adds a few nice things to this. Major maintenance to church buildings is no longer needed and therefore forbidden, because Islam is coming to replace Christianity. It is not permitted to build new churches and synagogues. When a Muslim accuses a Christian or Jew of “insulting the prophet,” the Christian or Jew in question usually can only be saved by becoming a Muslim.

Christians are not allowed to marry Muslim women, although Muslims are allowed to marry Christian women. This has led to many hormone-driven conversions of young Christian men. Christians cannot be a witness for the prosecution in court cases against Muslims. This has had enormous consequences for criminal law in *Sharia*. The Muslim prohibition of music and wine also affects church music and the Eucharistic wine.

It is almost unbelievable, but Christians and Jews who grew up under Islamic supremacy have usually fully internalized these rules. The Dutch also internalize these rules more and more and find it self-evident that Muslim demands in this area must be met, and according to good Dutch custom, they sometimes are even ahead of the requirements that Islam demands.

What is nice about the game is that Islam does not even explicitly make some of these de-

mands. That forces Christians who live under the authority of Islam to constantly ask themselves what is allowed and what is not allowed. The inhabitants of the Middle East have developed a good feel for that, but nevertheless sometimes get it wrong. Think of the British teacher in Sudan who gave a teddy bear the name Muhammad, and then only with the greatest difficulty managed to save her life. The wonderful Roman rule *nulla poena sine lege*, “no punishment without [clear] law” is obviously not the case under Islamic law.

This vagueness of the rules is highly praised by the friends of Islam as the “flexibility” of the *Sharia*. From the Islamic perspective this flexibility is very effective, because it forces Christians to constantly ask themselves what their Muslim masters desire of them. And it’s bizarre to see to how much trouble the Dutch also go to prevent their Muslim neighbors from feeling displeased. Islam, unlike most other religions, is capable of having a decisive influence on the lives of those who do not adhere to that religion. Just grab a newspaper and see the examples.

---

**It will not take more than a few years before the last Arabic, Turkish or Syrian Christians will have left Nazareth, Bethlehem, Greater Syria, Turkey and Iraq.**

---

With so many juridical rules that favor the Muslims and Islam, it is a miracle that about the year 1000 AD Muslims and Christians were still equal in number in the Middle East. Later, only in remote areas did Christianity managed to survive, as with the Maronites in the mountains of Lebanon. After the Crusades the percentage of Christians in the Muslim world dropped to about ten to fifteen percent; it remained roughly the same until the eighties of the last century.

After 9-11 and the millennium a lot quickly changed in this respect. In Lebanon, Iraq, Syria and Turkey, the last of the remaining native Christians are trying to get out. The hurricane of *Sharia* fanaticism—mostly called Islamic fundamentalism or radicalism by us—was noted by many of them much earlier than by us in the West. It will not take more than a few years before the last Arabic, Turkish or Syrian Christians will have left Nazareth, Bethlehem, Greater Syria, Turkey and Iraq. In Muslim eyes this is a historically important development, which coincides with the peaceful conquest of Europe by Islam. To us here in Europe this doesn’t matter at all; on the contrary, with boundless naïveté we are building mosques for our immigrants from the Islamic world. While the elite plays the fiddle of multiculturalism, the suburbs are already burning.

Mosques play a central role in the rise of Islam. The mosque is not only the prayer house, it is the command center of *jihad*. The stoning for adultery and beheading of apostates takes place in front of the mosque. The army that marches out on *jihad* departs from the mosque. Since the relief of Vienna in 1683,

*jihad* against unbelief and unbelievers is no longer practiced by states, but by private organizations like the elusive *Al-Qaeda*, because a state that wages *jihad* would be destroyed by the Western military.

The shame about their own cowardice has disappeared; to come out in the open to fight is characterized as simply stupid. The hiding of the heroes of the *jihad* among defenseless citizens is a routine maneuver. Intense complaints if the enemy also happens to hurt those citizens belong to the daily game with the ignorantly stupid Western news agencies. Kamikaze-artists who in addition to themselves bring death to dozens of others receive from the hands of Islamic clergyemen like Al-Qaradawi the crown of martyrdom.

This Al-Qaradawi also preaches that God’s last punishment of the Jews was carried out “by Hitler against the Jews, but the next punishment must be at the hands of the Muslims (January 30, 2009).” This Al-Qaradawi is brought to Amsterdam by influential PvdA politicians [Socialists, Labour] and seen as their mentor. Deeper than this the Netherlands cannot fall, you may think. But you are mistaken.

The advance of Islam can still go much further and can only be stopped when we ensure that future victims of the *jihad* (i.e., the population of the Netherlands and the rest of Europe) retain their freedom of expression. Muhammad, the founder of Islam, always took special care to silence his possible critics first, usually by assassination, just like his namesake Mohammed Bouyeri who carried out the assassination of Theo van Gogh. The Islamic tradition itself teaches that only after Muhammad had silenced his opponents with violence could the process of Islamization begin. It is therefore of the utmost importance that we in the Netherlands (and anywhere else in the Free World) do not go any further towards the prohibition of criticism of Islam, because Islamic ideology is not resistant to the free word.

Christianity, on the contrary, is. Christianity is the religion of the word, reason, love, and freedom. Islam is the religion of violence, coercion, fear, and obedience. The nature of man is such that it will be a close contest as to which of the two religions will win.

*Hans Jansen is a specialist in political Islam. He was Houtsuma professor for Contemporary Islamic Thought in the Department of Arabic, Persian and Turkish at the University of Utrecht until his retirement in 2008.*

*This is an edited version of an essay published in: Profetisch Perspectief, Volume 14, Spring 2009, Number 62, pp. 45-50; and on the Dutch website HoeiBoei, March 20, 2009.*

(Continued from page 2)

## No to Energy Development

Two million more acres of energy-rich land are being put off-limits to development. As *Investor's Business Daily* (which offers the best editorial pages in the country now that the *Wall Street Journal* muddies the water with the likes of columnist Thomas Frank and genuflecting to global warming) points out:

The bill (a Senate-passed omnibus bill that the House has now approved) takes 8.8 trillion cubic feet of natural gas and 300 million barrels of oil out of production in California—while providing \$1 billion for a water project to save 500 California salmon. The energy resources walled off by this bill (more than half the acreage is in Wyoming) nearly match the annual production levels of our two natural gas producing states—Texas and Alaska.

IBD reports that earlier this year Interior Secretary Ken Salazar canceled 77 Utah oil and gas leases that had gone through seven years of studies, negotiations and land-use planning because temporary drilling operations might be visible from national parks more than a mile away. Some of those parcels are in or near the Green River Formation, called the "Persia of the West" which contains the largest known oil shale deposits in the world. According to a 2008 Utah Mining Association report, the West's oil shale provides America with the "potential to be completely energy self-sufficient with no demands on external sources."

The IBD editorial notes that technology for shale-oil extraction is certainly further along than getting energy from switch grass or producing cellulosic ethanol. If we're going to stimulate anything, we

should be stimulating shale oil production.

Don Quixote tilted at windmills—this was harmless, nay intelligent, compared to our President who actually believes he'll fill our energy needs with them.

## The Word Game

The Obama administration is on a bury-reality-with-words kick that leaves Orwell's *1984* in the shade. Long War is out. Global War on Terror is out. War is out, period. In place of any of these, say the government guidelines, it's "Overseas Contingency Operations." Enemies are out. So of course are "enemy combatants." In their place are "individuals currently detained at Guantanamo Bay" or "individuals captured or apprehended in connection with armed conflicts and counterterrorism operations." There are no more individual acts of terror. In their place are "man-caused disasters."

Alas, we don't have Orwell to satirize these "man-caused absurdities," but we do have Joe Queenan. In the *Wall Street Journal* he informs us that the Taliban will no longer refer to its favorite kind of murder as "beheadings" but as "cephalic attrition;" flaying is now "unsolicited epidermal reconfigurations;" and public floggings of teenage girls is "metajudicial interfacing." *Jihad* is "booka-bonga-bippo" to give it a more zesty feel that will reassure teenagers that going on *jihad* will leave plenty of time for youthful hijinks.

In the meantime our military in Iraq and Afghanistan will surely be energized to learn they have no enemies and are not fighting a war (at worst may encounter "man-caused disasters" produced by followers of Islam whom we deeply respect). •

---

Americans For A Safe Israel  
1751 Second Ave. (at 91st St.)  
New York, NY 10128

Non-Profit  
U.S. Postage  
PAID  
Permit No. 60  
Farmingdale, N.Y.