

OUTPOST

September 2009—Issue #224

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

Principles Over Politics

Herbert Zweibon

On his recent trip to Israel former Arkansas governor (and Republican Presidential contender against McCain) Mike Huckabee put to shame not only the Congressional delegations that preceded him but Israel's own Prime Minister.

Huckabee is no fair weather friend of Israel. While he, like Clinton, was born in Hope, Arkansas, unlike the Clintons, who tack with the wind, Huckabee over many years has consistently and staunchly supported Israel despite the fact that the state he governed had an insignificant Jewish population. On this trip Huckabee dared to up-end international political dogma and say simply that there is no room for a Palestinian state "in the middle of the Jewish homeland." If the international community wanted to give the Palestinians a homeland, it would have to be somewhere else. Instead of the conventional pleading for Moslem acceptance of Jews near their holy places, Huckabee neatly turned tables and praised Israel for giving Moslems access to the Dome of the Rock, the site of the ancient Jewish temple, even though, he noted, the presence of a mosque there "could be considered an affront."

The vilified "settlements" Obama is intent on "freezing"? Said Huckabee: "It concerns me when there are some in the United States who would want to tell Israel that it cannot allow people to live in their own country, wherever they want." No restrictions, of the sort Netanyahu pleads for, about limiting Jewish communities to "natural growth" or fulfilling preexisting building contracts. Huckabee is straightforward: Jews have the right to build as they choose in their own country.

Huckabee also spoke with his feet. He traveled through Samaria, to Beit El, Har Gerizim, Har Beracha and Givat Olam and to Jewish neighborhoods in East Jerusalem Obama wants to destroy. Metaphorically he put his finger squarely in Obama's eye by going to a dinner, attended by a hundred people, including several members of the Knesset, on the grounds of the Shepherd Hotel in East Jerusalem.

Obama has specifically demanded that Israel stop the hotel's Jewish owner from renovating the property, treating it as a symbolic key to re-dividing the city. The Shepherd Hotel is indeed heavy with symbolism. It was built by Haj Amin al-Husseini, the Jerusalem mufti who mobilized Moslem forces for Hitler in World War II. When Israel reunited Jerusalem in the Six Day War, it took control of the empty structure and eventually sold it to its current owner, Zionist philanthropist Dr. Irving Moskowitz.

Contrast Huckabee's forthright support for Israel's rights with the 25 member Republican delegation led by Eric Cantor and the 29 member Democratic delegation that followed on its heels led by Steny Hoyer. Yes, they criticized Obama's obsessive focus on a settlement freeze, but nary a one said that "the two state solution," cutting off Judea and Samaria from Israel was illegitimate, and a recipe for Israel's destruction. Contrast Huckabee's stance with that of Netanyahu, who campaigned on the promise "no Palestinian state," and collapsed on this central issue after one browbeating by Obama and who insisted publicly there would be no settlement freeze only, duplicitously, to institute one.

Perhaps the most important contribution of Huckabee's visit is in giving heart to those Israeli leaders like Deputy Prime Minister Moshe Ya'alon (who met with Huckabee on his visit) who say it is not necessary to capitulate to every dangerous and insulting American demand. *The Jerusalem Post's* Caroline Glick writes: "Huckabee's trip showed that the administration is not operating in a policy vacuum. There is plenty of strong American support for an Israeli government that would stand up to the administration on the Palestinian issue and Iran alike."

Table of Contents

Solving The Arab Refugee Problem	...
by Rael Jean Isaac and Ruth King	...3
Hebron's Jews by Jerold Auerbach	...7
Lux et Dhimmitude by Diana West	...8
Swedish Hypocrisy by Fjordman	...9
Hanna Senesh: A Flame That Still Burns	
by Rita Kramer	...10

From the Editor

Archaeology as Farce

The World Archaeological Congress chose Ramallah—of all places—for its recent international conference. The Israel Antiquities Authority's deputy director Dr. Uzi Dahari accused the organization of excluding Israelis, not informing the IAA of the event and turning the proceedings into "little more than a political demonstration [against Israel]."

Further, Dahari noted that although it was unethical and unprofessional to visit active archaeological sites without informing the archaeologists charged with the excavation, the Congress had visited the Temple Mount and City of David Archaeological Park in Jerusalem without any such coordination, indeed with a politico-archaeological tour guide who, in the words of City of David spokesman Doron Spielman, engaged in "a political diatribe" designed to "use archaeology as a guise to enforce an extreme political agenda to weaken Israel's sovereignty in Jerusalem."

Spielman observes that it is particularly ironic to hold an archaeological conference in Ramallah, seat of the Palestinian Authority, when the Palestinian Authority-controlled Wakf carried out in 1999 what is likely the largest archaeological devastation in recent history, when they bulldozed and dumped 13,000 tons of archaeological earth from the Temple Mount.

J Street Meets S Street

It turns out the self-styled "pro-Israel" organization J Street receives substantial funding from Arabs and Palestinian Arab and Iran advocacy groups. We are confident they earn every dinar. But while it's no surprise that Moslems find the virulently anti-Israel J Street worthy of support, it did come as a shock to learn from Anti-Defamation League head Abe Foxman that ADL "occasionally" receives money from Arabs. Foxman stated that the key issue in his mind was whether J Street's contributors were individuals or organizations. That strikes us as a tad silly. Then Foxman asks: "Why are these Arab or Muslim organizations supporting a Jewish or pro-Israel group?" Precisely! And one has to ask the question of ADL as well.

As for J Street, it intersects with S Street. That's S for Strumpet, for this outfit operates in the political red light district.

The Paper of Record

The New York Times merits its famous title as the paper of record—only now it's the record for obfuscation. Reporting on the Fatah Party elections on August 12, it spun the event as "ushering in a younger generation," "more pragmatic" than its elders, in a better position to negotiate with Israel.

Nary a mention that this "more pragmatic" leadership endorsed the terrorist-gangster Aksa Mar-

tyrs Brigades as Fatah's official armed wing and proclaimed that the "right to return" was sacred. Nary a mention that the Fatah General Assembly decreed that Palestinian control over the entire city of Jerusalem, East and West, was a non-negotiable "red line."

The U.S. Consulate in Jerusalem does not seem to differ from Fatah on the last score. Melanie Phillips notes that its website never mentions Israel. Writes Phillips: "As far as the U.S. Consulate is concerned, Israel's capital city is Arab. It's as if Israel and its Jewish identity have been airbrushed from history altogether."

Honduras Wins

In the last *Outpost* we noted that small, impoverished Honduras put Israel to shame. We further noted that "it is only by standing up to pressure that a leader has the chance to develop countervailing pressures." Honduras is already proving the validity of this observation. A month ago the entire world was arrayed against its courageous leadership, which had refused to back down after blocking President Zelaya's attempt to remain in office through a Chavez-style coup. Now it is the State Department which has backed down, informing the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's Richard Lugar that the U.S. would no longer threaten sanctions on Honduras nor would it insist on Zelaya's return to power. Since U.S. sanctions were the worst threat (Honduras depends on the U.S. for 80% of its trade) this is a clear win for the new Honduras.

Iran's Bomb

Iran is going into its familiar routine of playing the West like a fiddle (it's opening up one of its reactors to IAEA inspection in an effort to obtain yet more time to get its nuclear weapons program up and running). Just prior to this phony "breakthrough" the Konrad Adenauer foundation had organized a conference of Iran experts (including diplomats who had served in Teheran, former senior Iranian military officers and defense and intelligence officials). British journalist Con Coughlin (no friend of Israel) reports that the

(Continued on page 11)

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 web site: <http://www.afsi.org>

Putting First Things First—Solving The Arab Refugee Problem

Rael Jean Isaac and Ruth King

Editors Note: In the September 2003 Outpost we published the first version of this article entitled "Putting First Things Last: The 55 Year Failure to Address the Arab Refugee Problem." The failure is now 61 years old and we felt it was time to say it again: the integration of the refugees into Arab countries is a prerequisite for any meaningful agreement. We published an updated version of our 2003 article on the Family Security Matters website on August 12, 2009. We reprint that article—slightly expanded—because this issue has been neglected by Jewish organizations almost as badly as by diplomats, Middle East experts and the media. If Jewish organizations, each time the issue of settlements was raised, would say "No, the core issue is refugees, with their claimed 'right of return,' What are you doing to resettle them in Arab countries?" they could force a shift in the terms of the debate.

The Rogers Plan of 1969, like all subsequent and ill-fated efforts to resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict, tabled the issue of the Palestinian "refugees," leaving it for "final status" negotiations. "It is our hope," said the Rogers Plan, "that agreement on the key issues of peace, security, withdrawal and territory will create a climate in which these questions of refugees...can be resolved as part of the overall settlement."

But this is to put first things last. As the passage of time has made abundantly clear, the issue of "refugees" remains the defining obstacle to any reconciliation in the region. Pretending to negotiate, without addressing this issue at the outset, is like operating on a patient and leaving a growing cancer intact. Had it been confronted in 1949, the prospects for finding a subsequent *modus vivendi* between Israel and the Arabs would have been vastly improved.

President Obama has promised a fresh perspective on issues, to bring "change" in the old ways of doing things. There is no better place to start than by confronting the core issue of the Arab refugees head on—and putting responsibility for solving it on the only ones who can do so, the Arab states.

When the problem of the Arab refugees was at last put on the table at Camp David in the year 2000, the issue blew up the tattered remnant of the Oslo "peace process." Then-Prime Minister Ehud Barak thought he had a winning formula. Israel would make a virtually total territorial withdrawal to the 1949 armistice lines. In return, all that would be asked of the Palestinian Authority was to abandon the "right to return," i.e. to eliminate, via demography, the Jewish state. If the Arab-Israeli conflict was susceptible to solution via "land for peace," Barak should have had a deal. But Arafat refused to give up the "right to return" and launched outright war, including the most deadly series of terrorist attacks in Israel's history.

When the present "peace processing" runs into the same impasse (and the "moderate" Abbas, never mind Hamas, repeatedly reiterates that the Pal-

estinians will never give up the refugees' right to return) the resulting explosion is likely to make the old *intifada* look like pale beer.



There is a widespread impression that the Arab refugee problem is immutable. But is it? Before we offer our answer, it's time to examine more closely the question: Who are the Palestinian Arab refugees?

Initially, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA), which administers the refugee camps, defined Palestine refugees as persons whose normal place of residence was Palestine between June 1946 and May 1948, who lost both their homes and means of livelihood as a result of the 1948 Arab-Israeli conflict. The camps opened in 1950, in the wake of the first Arab war to destroy the state of Israel. The precise number of Arab refugees as a result of that war is uncertain, estimates ranging from 450,000 to 700,000. Even experts who lean to the higher side believe that no more than 550,000 wound up in refugee camps, since some fled to families settled in other Arab countries and fleeing Bedouin resumed their nomadic life in Jordan.

UNRWA would set up 59 camps in what is now Judea and Samaria, Gaza (then part of Egypt), Jordan, Syria and Lebanon. Certainly no one, including UNRWA and its donors, imagined that refugee status would become a heritable trust to be bestowed on the refugees' cousins, sisters and their aunts, their children, grandchildren, by now their great grandchildren. Yet now the world (including the world's Jews) accept without protest UNRWA's assertion (on its 2009 homepage) that it provides education, health-care, social services and emergency aid to over 4.6 million Palestinian refugees. UNRWA, which has relocated headquarters from Amman to Gaza, the better to serve Hamas, has a staff of over 29,000 persons and its General Assembly-approved budget for 2008 was \$541 million (www.un.org/unrwa/finances/index.htm). As of May 31, 2008, the Agency's largest contributors are the United States, the European Un-

ion, Sweden, the United Kingdom, Norway and the Netherlands. The Arab states contribute almost nothing in hard cash but millions in lip service.

Although long forgotten by the media and general public, the number of Jewish refugees from Arab countries was substantially greater. On May 16, 1948, the day following Israel's declaration of independence, *The New York Times* headlined an article: "Jews in Grave Danger in All Moslem Lands: Nine Hundred Thousand in Africa and Asia Face Wrath of Their Foes." And indeed within 15 years (the last great wave was from Algeria, after it gained independence from France in 1962), Jews had fled the Arab world en masse (until the Shah's ouster, in 1979, there remained one viable Jewish community in the Moslem world, in non-Arab Iran). Today there are barely 5,000, chiefly elderly Jews in the entire Arab world.

One reason the expulsion and flight of these Jews even then attracted little attention was that Israel never referred to them as refugees—they were welcomed as an "ingathering of the exiles," given citizenship on the spot. Yet these Jews had lived in the countries from which they were forced to flee far longer than the vast majority of Arabs who left the small territory that became Israel. Indeed Jews had lived in these countries longer than their Arab conquerors. In Iraq, for example, the Jewish community dated back to the Babylonian exile. In contrast, most of the Arabs leaving Israel in 1948 were recent arrivals, attracted by the economic opportunities opened up by Zionist colonization of Palestine in the 20th century.

What happened in Israel was a replay, on a far smaller scale, of the vast population exchange that took place on the Indian subcontinent when England gave up rule of its last great colony. In that case, 8,500,000 Hindus fled Pakistan to India and 6,500,000 Muslims fled to Pakistan.

In the 1950s, in the wake of World War II, Elfan Rees, leader of World Refugee Year, reported the existence of 36 million refugees in Africa, Asia and Europe, with Arabs only one in 72 refugees. All but the Arabs have been forgotten because the others were integrated into the lands in which they sought refuge. No one today seeks the "right to return" of the ethnic Germans, probably 12 million in all, expelled after WWII from nations of Eastern Europe, or the Japanese expelled from Manchuria and Korea or the 3 million North Koreans who fled to South Korea. More recently, in the aftermath of the Vietnam War, 1.6 million refugees from Vietnam, including the "boat people" who escaped so perilously to freedom, have been resettled. This is what the official website of the boat people concluded in 2003: "Yes, we suffered in the past and we lost everything. But we've managed to overcome the difficult times, settle, rebuild our lives

and bring up our children. And that's something to celebrate."

Only the Arab refugees, at the insistence of Arab host countries, and by now with full UN American and European Union support, have been denied integration, their plight perpetuated as an Arab "ultimate" weapon to destroy Israel by demographic means.

It should be noted that UNWRA only gradually became transformed from an agency seeking to settle Arab refugees into one dedicated to perpetuating their refugee status. In a report he submitted in November 1951, UNRWA director John Blandford Jr. said he expected the Arab governments to assume responsibility for relief operations by July 1952.

The international community assumed the refugees should be resettled as soon as possible, said Blandford, because, as he put it, "sustained relief operations inevitably contain the germ of human deterioration."

By the late 1950s, the early UNRWA leaders were disillusioned and voiced their disgust.

Ralph Garroway, who also served as an UNRWA director, said in August 1958: "The Arab states do not want to solve the refugee problem. They want to keep it as an open sore, as an affront to the United Nations and as a weapon against Israel. Arab leaders don't give a damn whether the refugees live or die." Elfan Rees, who worked closely with UNRWA, noted in 1959 that the Arab refugee problem should be the easiest in the world to solve, for there was, in countries like Syria and Iraq, "a developing demand for the manpower they represent and their new settlements would be distinct economic assets." Unfortunately, said Dr. Rees, "the organized intransigence of the refugees and the calculated indifference of the Arab states concerned have brought all its [UNRWA's] plans to naught." Even in 1959, Dr. Rees noted that UNRWA, because of Arab "chicanery" was "feeding the dead" and "by political pressure it is feeding non-refugees." (Interview in *New York Post*, June 11, 1959)

Nothing better illustrates UNRWA's transformation than its response to an Israeli effort, in the mid-1980s, to improve the lives of Arab refugees in the Gaza Strip by constructing new housing for them. UNRWA protested to the UN and on December 3, 1986, the General Assembly passed a resolution demanding Israel "desist from the removal and resettlement of Palestinian refugees in the Gaza Strip and from the destruction of their shelters." It declared that "measures to resettle Palestinian refugees in the Gaza Strip away from the homes and property from which they were displaced constitute a violation of their inalienable right of return." Similarly, when Israel built new homes for residents of a camp near Nablus, UNRWA forbade anyone to move into them and posted a guard at the empty houses to make sure no one moved in.

When Israel built new homes for residents of a camp near Nablus, UNRWA forbade anyone to move into them.

The Shuafat camp is within the municipal boundaries of Jerusalem and the city offered to give it full services in street paving, sewers and other urban amenities; UNRWA forbade it.

The camps have become centers of recruitment, training and storage of weapons for terrorists. Camp ambulances are used for transportation of men and armaments; their schools teach hatred and *Jihad*; they glorify suicide bombers; some of their "honor students" have become notorious terrorists; corruption and profiteering with aid is endemic. In September 2008 a bipartisan group headed by Representative Steve Rothman (D.NJ) submitted a report documenting those abuses and citing specific examples of UNRWA ambulances, schools and hospitals used to shield terrorists and build bombs and rockets.

Nonetheless, the Obama administration (which hectors Israel about the "natural growth" of settlements while ignoring the "unnatural growth" of the Arab refugee population) has pledged an additional \$900 million for Gaza and the Palestinian Authority, including an extra \$160 million for UNRWA. Thus the United States, struggling with a severe economic crisis, is involved in a morally and strategically indefensible contradiction to its avowed goals: it funds and enables suicide bombing, rocket launching and other forms of Middle East terrorism.

There have been noble protests, specifically from senior Republican on the House Foreign Affairs Committee Ileana Ros-Lehtinen of Florida, House Republican leader John A. Boehner of Ohio, House Republican whip Rep. Eric Cantor of Virginia, chairman of the House Republican Conference Mike Pence of Indiana, and chairman of the House Republican Policy Committee Thaddeus McCotter of Michigan, who in March excoriated the administration.

However, more is required.

Leaving the camps and their populations where they are permanently entrenches what the media calls "the cycle of violence." They must be resettled elsewhere in the Arab world. If the United States were to announce, "Millions for permanent resettlement in Arab states, not a penny more for perpetuating victimhood," the dynamic would be transformed overnight. Here would be a demand for a tangible concession by the Arabs instead of minor gestures that can easily be withdrawn.

Does this sound like a surprising, even shocking suggestion? Consider the absurdity of the alternatives. The "right to return" of over four million Arabs to a Jewish state that comprises a mere 8,000 square miles is in itself an insane demand. Nor is there any way a resourceless miniscule West Bank area – com-

binated with Gaza comprising only 2,400 square miles, a fourth of the size of tiny Israel – can economically support the millions of UNRWA-defined refugees.

The fairest, most equitable, way to end the problem of the refugees is to base their resettlement on the population exchange that followed the 1948 Arab-Israeli war. If 1948 is the starting point for the Arabs, it must also be the starting point for the Jews. Because so many Arab states had a substantial Jewish population, this also has the advantage of forcing a number of Arab states to take some share of responsibility for the refugees, without singling out or overwhelming any one of them. Wealthy countries like Saudi Arabia or the United Arab Emirates that did not have a Jewish population, could shoulder a disproportionate share of the cost.

Returning to the population exchange also has the merit of throwing out reparations claims. The Jews left far more property behind in Arab lands than Arabs in what became Israel; generously, Israel can offer to declare a washout. Making the Arab states face up to the task of resettlement will also have the merit of encouraging them to evaluate honestly claims to refugee status. While the international community footed the bill and the larger the number of refugees, the greater the pressure on Israel, the attitude of the Arab states was "the more the better." Once the burden is on them, phony claims are no longer welcome and it is safe to assume it will rapidly be discovered that there are far fewer refugees than UNRWA now claims.

What, then, would refugee resettlement look like? Iraq, Morocco and Algeria between them had almost half the population of expelled Jews; they should proportionately take responsibility for half the number of Arab refugees. Tunisia, Egypt, Yemen, Libya, and Syria, in that order, also had substantial Jewish populations; they would also take in substantial number of refugees. (Since Syria already hosts 409,000 refugees, it would need to permanently absorb them, not take in any more.) The burden on these states would not be as great as it sounds because Jordan has 1,718,767 registered refugees, only 304,000 of whom are in camps. Jordan has behaved better than any other Arab state toward the refugees, making them full citizens, in effect absorbing them (indeed they form a majority of Jordan's population). Of course, those so-called refugees in Jordan are, strictly and historically speaking, in Palestine, bearing in mind the 1922 partition of Mandatory Palestine which gave the Hashemites 80 percent of the land. Thus almost half the refugees are off the table.

Lebanon, with close to 400,000 refugees, over half in camps, is a special case. It did not expel its



Iraqi Jews en route to Israel 1951

small Jewish population in 1948 and is desperate to rid itself of the Palestinian Arab refugee population, who have served as persistent troublemakers and would totally destroy the balance between Muslims and Christians, should they become citizens. The other overwhelmingly Muslim Arab states should resettle the refugees now in Lebanon. (If any of the Arab states had insuperable difficulties with absorbing their "fair share" of refugees, they could, if need be with the help of international funds, find Muslim states which would absorb a portion of their "quota.")

Were the refugees to be resettled away from Judea, Samaria and Gaza—and the entire refugee issue dissolved—the Arab-Israel conflict would become manageable (precisely the reason the Arab states refuse to contemplate dissolving the issue). An agreement between Israel and Jordan, perhaps on the lines of that proposed by Minister of Tourism Benny Elon, dividing responsibilities in the territory now under the failed rule of the PA, should be possible to find. Jordan and Israel, which share Mandatory Palestine, are the only states that can negotiate a settlement, and this can only occur when the "refugee problem" is solved.

One can hear the State Department. One can hear the President's advisers. "Impossible. The Arabs will never agree." True, they will not willingly accept any such plan. But this does not mean the United States is helpless to act. The United States can refuse to reauthorize UNRWA. It can say, as noted earlier, "We will no longer pay to perpetuate refugee victimhood. We have seen the catastrophe of destroyed lives, hatred and terrorism that we have unwittingly funded and we will do this no longer. Only if you agree to our plan of resettling the refugees will we contribute – and then, we will contribute generously. Otherwise you can take over the task of funding the refugees: not only are you on your own, but we will do our best to take our European allies with us."

The United States can do more. Each Arab ruler lets no opportunity go by to tell President Obama the hostility of the Arab world toward the U.S. will only end when the Arab-Israel conflict is solved. The President can take them up on this statement. If that is so, he should say, it is incumbent upon each of you to contribute now toward solving the crucial stumbling block of the Arab refugees. If they are unwilling to do so, the President should tell them the Road Map has nowhere to go and they are on their own when it comes to the "peace process" as well.

No money for UNRWA. No U.S. promotion of any "Road Map" in the absence of guaranteed Arab absorption of the refugees. It would be a paradigm shift that would get the attention of the Arab states.

There are finally rare voices within the Arab

world daring to speak up about the need to shut down the camps. MEMRI (the Middle East Media Research Institute) reports that Daoud Al-Shiryian, *Al-Hayat* columnist and deputy secretary-general of *Al-Arabiya* TV (and no friend of Israel), recently published a series of four articles criticizing how the Palestinian refugees have been treated and calling on the Arab countries to "tear down the refugee camps' fences." In Lebanon, says Al-Shiryian scornfully, Palestinians are barred from 72 types of work "despite the fact that you wouldn't find such a long list of professions even on Mars."

In one article Al-Shiryian contrasted the fate of two Lebanese friends, a Jewish woman who left Lebanon after the 1958 civil war and a Palestinian woman living in the camps. The Jewish woman, Hannah, goes to the U.S., is assisted by Jewish organizations, obtains citizenship, earns a good salary. Her son Avraham becomes director-general of a bank. Over 35 years after leaving, Hannah returns to Lebanon for a visit and seeks out her old friend Umm Bilal, still in the camps, living in a hut, her son working for a pittance in a local bicycle repair shop. "The resettlement for which I call," writes Al-Shiryian, means "that the 'rope' countries that serve as a gallows for the Palestinians, will allow them to live as they live in Great Britain, the U.S., Saudi Arabia and the Gulf states where they have dreams and jobs..."

It is quite true that there is little evidence that Arab states will heed Al-Shiryian (who was promptly accused of advancing "Zionist proposals") and much evidence that they are determined to preserve the refugees as a battering ram against Israel. The Arab goal is to destroy Israel, not to solve the Arab-Israel conflict. But if this is the reality, surely it is better for the United States to confront the harsh facts squarely now. For what is the alternative? As long as the U.S. is unwilling to exert pressure for real change on the Arabs, it winds up inevitably—as it is doing now—exerting pressure only on Israel.

There are two possible outcomes. One is a repeat of the debacle in 2000. Israel offers radical territorial concessions but balks at the suicidal right of return, again precipitating an explosion, this time on a greater, more dangerous scale. Or, relentless U.S. and European pressure brings Israel to its knees. Israel agrees both to return to the vulnerable 1949 lines and to accept an Arab "right to return." The result can only be more refugees, this time 5 million Jewish refugees with no neighboring states to take them in.

Is this the legacy any U.S. President—even Obama—wishes to be his? If not, the time for the U.S. to reevaluate its warped Middle East policies is now.

The President has signaled his intention to sell his policy directly to the Israeli public. What he should be doing is formulating a new policy and selling it to the Arabs.

In Lebanon, says Al-Shiryian scornfully, Palestinians are barred from 72 types of work.

Hebron's Jews

Jerold Auerbach

(Editors Note: In the May 2009 Outpost we ran an excerpt from Auerbach's fine new book Hebron's Jews—Memory and Conflict in the Land of Israel. Here we run an excerpt from the Epilogue.)

To secular liberal Israelis, as daily newspaper reports incessantly revealed, the Hebron Jewish community symbolized everything they despised about the settler movement: its religious zeal and arrogant assertion that it was the rightful inheritor of Zionist tradition. Headlines suggested that the intense debate over the future of the settlements might determine whether Israel was truly a Jewish state—or merely a state of Jews.

Some months later, during another sabbatical year in Israel, I once again set out to visit Hebron. By then, the West Bank had become a virtual war zone, with frequent Palestinian attacks on Israeli vehicles and their occupants. Driving south from Jerusalem, my guide Dov maintained close radio contact with settler security headquarters. His car had protective plastic windows, and his pistol was in the glove compartment. Perhaps to ease the tension, Dov told the apocryphal story about Henry Kissinger after his term as secretary of state had ended. In his new job as manager of a zoo, he had finally discovered how to get the Arab lion to lie peacefully with the Israeli lamb. An astonished visiting diplomat asked Kissinger to explain this remarkable achievement. "Don't tell anyone," the former secretary of state whispered, "but I change lambs every morning." Nearing Hebron, I tried to appreciate Dov's gal-lows humor.

Accompanied by Mischa, our gruff but friendly escort from Kiryat Arba, we drove into Hebron, past the looming Machpelah enclosure, along narrow streets bordering on the casbah, to the restored Avraham Avinu quarter. The synagogue had only recently been rebuilt after decades of desecration, neglect, and, finally, destruction. Soldiers guarded the entrance; others were stationed on a nearby roof....

I was relieved to finally enter the synagogue, where Mischa recounted the horrors of the 1929 massacre, the compulsory evacuation of survivors by the British, and the more recent murders of yeshiva students. But he also reminded us of the Arab sheikh who took Jews into his home to protect them and, nearly forty years later, led Jews back to the ruins of Avraham Avinu, its floor covered with excrement. Mischa opened the *aron* to display Torah scrolls enclosed in the beautiful wooden cases that are customary in Sephardic synagogues.

On our way to Beit Hadassah, which I had last

glimpsed from a bus window nearly fifteen years earlier, Mischa updated me on its recent history. By now, it had become home for a dozen Jewish families whose young children darted playfully through the spacious entrance hall. As we walked along the narrow balcony that surrounds the building, Mischa pointed to adjacent houses, now vacant, where Jews once had lived but now were excluded by the Israeli government. The message was evident: just as the Avraham Avinu synagogue had been restored for Jewish worship and the old Beit Hadassah medical clinic had been reclaimed for Jewish occupancy, so other property would be returned to Jewish habitation. I was beginning to learn about the fierce tenacity of Hebron Jews, still attached by an umbilical cord of memory to biblical antiquity and to their own history

in this beleaguered city.

Leaving Beit Hadassah, we wound our way up the hill to Tel Rumeida, the likely site of biblical Hebron. On the hilltop, in the newest cluster of Jewish homes, half a dozen small caravans housed Jewish families. As we arrived, a young Orthodox man stepped outside. After brief introductions, Chaim invited us for conversation and refreshment. It was a pleasure, he assured us: it is, after all, in the tradition of Abraham to welcome strangers in Hebron. I asked him why he lived here, in such a dangerous place, surrounded by so many hostile Arabs. Because, he responded, Jewish history began here. "The tree with the deepest roots," he explained, "is the strongest tree...."

Did it matter that Jewish history, as Hebron Jews invariably remind visitors, began here? If not, why did it matter that the Jewish state be built in the Land of Israel rather than in Africa or South America? Can a people ever relinquish the attachments formed by its deepest memories?

We returned to Machpelah for the morning service, with the reading of Chaye Sarah that 20,000 people had come to Hebron to hear. Recounting a simple real estate transaction, Chaye Sarah irrevocably connects Jews to their promised land—and to Hebron. Inside the densely packed Isaac Hall, there was a surge of anticipatory excitement. When the Torah scroll was removed from the *aron* and carried through the room to be reverently touched and kissed, it pulled everyone forward like a magnet. A cluster of rabbis

Did it matter that Jewish history, as Hebron Jews invariably remind visitors, began here? If not, why did it matter that the Jewish state be built in the Land of Israel rather than in Africa or South America?

and community elders gathered on the *bima*. I edged as close as I could get to the reader, whose strong voice began to chant the opening words: "Sarah died in Kiryat Arba—now Hebron—in the land of Canaan. (Gen. 23:2)"

With his purchase of a grave site, Abraham became a landholder, with legal rights of inheritance that his descendants would claim, in perpetuity: "So Ephron's land in Machpelah, near Mamre—the field with its cave and all the trees anywhere within the confines of that field—passed to Abraham as his possession....And then Abraham buried his wife Sarah in the cave of the field of Machpelah, facing Mamre—now Hebron—in the land of Canaan (Gen. 23:17-20)."

Chaye Sarah recounts the precise moment when the attachment of the Jewish people to the Land of Israel and to Hebron was forever sealed. Its annual reading affirms the unbroken link of identification between present and past. That morning in Hebron, the power of the deepest historical memory of the Jewish people was palpable. I was standing on the bedrock of Jewish history, directly above the burial cave in the field of Machpelah, in Hebron, in the Land of Israel, as it is described in the biblical text. At this most venerable yet vulnerable Jewish holy site in the world, I felt enclosed, for that moment, within a community of Jew-

ish memory.

If the Hebrew Bible is the ultimate source for Zionism, as David Ben-Gurion affirmed to British royal commissioners some seventy years ago, then Zion surely includes Hebron. Once Jews relinquish their right to live in Hebron, they implicitly undermine their claim to live anywhere in their biblical homeland. To abandon Hebron is to surrender the claims of memory that bind Jews to each other, to their ancient homeland, and to their shared past and future.

Jewish prayer resonates with pleas from the prophet Jeremiah for the return of his people "within our borders." Immediately preceding the affirmation of the *Shma*, Jews recite, "Bring us in peacefulness from the four corners of the earth and lead us with upright pride to our land." During the concluding *Musaf* service, Jews implore God to "bring us up in gladness to our land and plant us within our boundaries." These ancient religious pleas, as it happens, also define the essence of Zionism. For the Jews of Hebron, Judaism and Zionism are inseparable. In Hebron, in Me'arat Hamachpelah, on Shabbat Chaye Sarah, an exuberant community of religious Zionists revealed the enduring power of Jewish memory."

Jerold Auerbach is Professor of History at Wellesley.

Lux et Dhimmitude

Diana West

Behold the guardian of Yale Dhimmi-versity Press: John Donatich, dressed for a hard day's work in the Ivory Tower snipping out what he calls "gratuitous" images of Mohammed through the centuries. Mohammed by Old Masters and Mohammed by sketch artists; Mohammed in a 19th-century woodcut by Dore and Mohammed in a 21st-century caricature by Westergaard. I refer, of course, to Yale University Press's decision to delete all imagery of Mohammed in a book about imagery of Mohammed, which, as Roger Kimball reports in a fine bit of detective work, appears to have emanated from Yale University's highest offices. The book's title is *The Cartoons That Shook the World*. Sans pics, the book also should be re-titled:*That Shook the World*. It makes as much sense.

Not that "sense" is the goal. Yale's motto, *Lux et Veritas* has been obliterated in this shameful effort to pursue not light and truth, but Islamic approval. And Yale University Press will get that approval because it has proven that it operates under Islamic law (*sharia*), which prohibits both images of Mohammed and criticism of Mohammed. And woe to anyone who draws or publishes a critical image of Mohammed.

Of course, there is irony in the fact that the book itself is unlikely to be a resounding smack-down of Islamic dictates on speech and artistic expression in the Western world. As Thomas Landen of *Brussels Journal* points out, the book's author, Jytte Klausen,

a leftist Danish-born professor at Brandeis, was one of the "experts" cited in *Newsweek's* cover-story last month downplaying the Islamization of Europe, along with anyone fighting it. Landen writes: "Mr. Underhill, writing from his ivory tower at *Newsweek*, cites Jytte Klausen, "an authority on Islam in Europe at Boston's Brandeis University," and Grace Davie, "an expert on Europe and Islam at the University of Exeter in Britain," to prove that those who warn for a Muslim takeover in Europe are "scaremongering." Ms. Klausen gained some notoriety when, in a March 2006 article in *Prospect Magazine*, she said the Danish cartoon affair was the result of "a provincial newspaper's prank."

The rationale for publishing the cartoons was anything but a "prank." It was a serious exercise to prove that Denmark is not under Islamic *sharia* prohibitions against depicting images of Mohammed. The exercise was undertaken by *Jyllands-Posten* features editor Fleming Rose on discovering that a Danish publisher of a children's book on Mohammed was unable to procure illustrations for his childishly positive little book because Danish illustrators were afraid to draw Big Mo. *Jyllands-Posten's* response was a laudable effort unequalled anywhere in the West, to assert that Western law, not Islamic law, operates in Denmark. The craven reaction throughout the West, tragically, shows the fragility of Westerners' attachment to their own freedoms. Landen goes on:

"As a result of this 'prank,' Kurt Westergaard, the cartoonist of the newspaper *Jyllands Posten*, based in the European provincial backwater of Aarhus, Denmark, lives in a house which, as I could wit-

ness when I visited him there last month, the Danish authorities have had to transform into a fortress, with surveillance cameras, bullet-proof windows and a panic room. Every day, the Aarhus police drives Mr. Westergaard to work. Such is the situation facing a simple cartoonist of a European provincial newspaper and his wife, four years after he drew a cartoon depicting Mohammed with a bomb in his turban. One wonders why Mr. Underhill did not consult Mr. and Mrs. Westergaard for their views on the effects of Islam in early 21st century Europe. Surely, he is as much an expert on the issue as Ms. Klausen in her cosy office at Brandeis University, another of America's ivory towers.

Last night, I picked up a 1967 book called *The Battle of Silence* by Vercors, the alias of J. Bruller. It

is the wartime memoir by the publisher of a secret anti-Nazi press run in the midst of Nazi-occupied Paris. The first sentence is unforgettable: "When the Nazis occupied France after the defeat of 1940, French writers had two alternatives: collaboration or silence."

The parallels are distinct if incomplete. The Nazis imposed the censorship by force; The Muslims are imposing censorship by threat of force backed up by occasional bloodlettings. Yale has many, many alternatives -- publish the pictures, for Chrissake -- but it has seized on the two natural reactions of the already-enslaved: collaboration and silence.

Syndicated columnist Diana West is author of The Death of The Grown-Up. This appeared on her blog.

Swedish Hypocrisy

Fjordman

Sweden's foreign minister Carl Bildt has rejected calls from Israel for the government to distance itself from the newspaper article [in *Aftonbladet* which details allegations of the systematic harvesting by Israeli soldiers of the organs of Palestinian men]. Writing on his blog, Bildt argues that Sweden's free press and tradition of free speech are the best defense against "breaches of judgment, bad taste and transgressions of core societal values."

The fact that the anti-Israeli and anti-American writer Helle Klein, for many years the political editor of *Aftonbladet*, at her blog also speaks warmly of "free speech" is such an extreme case of hypocrisy that it simply cannot go unanswered. Free speech does not exist in Sweden. I would personally rate Sweden as being probably the most totalitarian and politically repressive country in the entire Western world as of 2009, and *Aftonbladet* has made substantial contributions to this repressive climate. Sweden has huge problems caused by mass immigration, and Muslim immigration in particular, but speaking honestly about this is absolutely taboo. According to journalist Karen Jespersen, Helle Klein has stated that "If the debate is [about] that there are problems caused by refugees and immigrants, we don't want it."

As I have stated in "Why Europeans Should Support Israel," the demonization of Israel should be rejected not just because of Israel, but because of Europe. The very same people who are demonizing Israelis are also demonizing native Europeans who resist the Islamization of their lands. The truth is that Israelis defend themselves so that their daughters do not have to suffer rape at the hands of Muslim *Jihadists*, the way the authorities in Western European countries, and in Sweden in particular, allow to happen every single day. Here are a few relevant quotes from the chapter "The Case of Sweden," taken from my book *Defeating Eurabia*.

Leading newspaper *Aftonbladet* has close

ideological ties to the Social Democrats, the country's dominant party for most of the past century. Helle Klein, its political editor-in-chief from 2001 to 2007, during a demonstration organized by Islamic and anti-racist organizations in December 2006 stood in front of a banner which read "A Sweden for all--Stop the Nazi violence" and warned against Islamophobia in the media. Klein has voiced sympathy for terrorist organization Hamas in her editorials while warning against the threat posed to world peace by Israeli aggression and the Christian Right in the USA. The irony of warning against "Nazi violence" while showing sympathy for an organization that wants to finish what the Nazis started apparently doesn't strike Ms. Klein.

Before the elections in 2006, the established parties cooperated in boycotting the Sweden Democrats and other "xenophobic" parties. In one of many similar incidents, which extreme Leftists bragged about on the Internet, around 30 members of the SD were attacked during a peaceful, private party outside the town of Växjö. The brave "anti-Fascists" threw tear gas into the building, forcing people outside where they were beaten with iron bars and axes.

According to Jonathan Friedman, an American Jew working in Sweden for years, "no debate about immigration policies is possible, the subject is simply avoided. The elites are worried to see their power slip away and therefore want to silence critics, for instance the Sweden Democrats, a small party opposed to immigration: "It is a completely legal party, they just aren't allowed to speak....In reality, the basis of democracy has been completely turned on its head. It is said: 'Democracy is a certain way of thinking, a specific set of opinions, and if you do not share them, then you aren't democratic, and then we condemn you and you ought to be eliminated. The People? That is not democratic. We the Elite, we are democracy.' It is grotesque and it certainly has nothing to do with democracy, more like a kind of moral dictatorship."

This is excerpted from Fjordman's essay which appeared on the website Atlas Shrugs on August 22.

Hannah Senesh: A Flame That Still Burns

Rita Kramer

In the early days of World War II, when Britain stood alone against Nazi-occupied Fortress Europe, Winston Churchill created a secret organization and gave it the mandate “now set Europe ablaze.”

The organization, Special Operations Executive, would drop agents into the countries of occupied Europe to organize and train resistance groups to be ready to rise up in support of an eventual cross-Channel invasion.

The organization’s existence and activities remained secret all through the war and for years afterward for two reasons. The military establishment did not approve of irregular or “ungentlemanly” warfare, not yet having learned that such tactics would be necessary in order to defeat an enemy that did not play by the rules. The other reason was that SOE was recruiting and training women to be sent into the dark and dangerous Continent.

Women who were fluent in the language of an occupied country could more easily pass as natives than men of military age. Where men would be challenged to show their papers, women could move about freely among the crowds of housewives going about the business of looking for food, soap, and other necessities of domestic life, carrying messages or hidden radio sets on which to communicate with London. The women who volunteered for this mission were told of the dangers, the risks of capture, and what would follow if they were caught.

Among those who accepted those risks was a 23-year-old Jewish woman born in Hungary.

Hannah Senesh (Szenes in Hungarian) was the child of assimilated Budapest Jews; her father was a well-known writer. Her daily experience of anti-Semitism at school and on the streets led her to join a student Zionist group called Maccabea and then in 1939 to emigrate with her brother to Palestine. Hannah studied agriculture at the training school for girls at Nahalal and in 1941 joined Kibbutz Sdot Yam. She continued the writing she had been doing since childhood—a diary, poetry, songs and plays. And she joined the Haganah, determined to fight for Eretz Yisrael.

As it became clear what kind of war they would have to fight and what kind of enemy they faced, the British Army, if not the Foreign Office, relaxed its traditional attitude of suspicion and distaste toward Jews. Many of them were proving useful in unanticipated ways. Those who had escaped from Europe knew the languages of the countries in which they had grown up and many of them were young and strong and eager to enlist in the fight to defeat the Nazi horrors, which by 1943 were clear to those who did not choose to close their eyes.

Enzo Sereni, an Italian Zionist who during the 1930s had worked tirelessly to bring Jews to the Yishuv, both legally and in secret, succeeded in convincing the British to make use of Jewish volunteers as SOE agents. Of 250 who volunteered, fewer than half were selected for training by SOE in Egypt, where they practiced parachuting and were taught other skills they would need in evading capture once dropped into the occupied countries. Hannah Senesh was one of the volunteers who made the cut, and it seemed to her she was destined for the task. She had written in her diary: “Suddenly the idea grabbed me that I must go to Hungary, and be there during these days, to lend a hand to *Aliyat Hanoar* [an organization to bring out Jewish children] ...” And a month later, “A member of the Palmach visited here...and told me that a unit is being organized to do...exactly what I felt ought to be done...”



In March 1944 Hannah was one of three Jewish paratroopers dropped by SOE into Yugoslavia with the plan of eventually crossing the border into Hungary to help the threatened Jews—as well as downed Allied pilots and escaped prisoners of war—to reach safety on one of the evasion lines being run out of occupied Europe. The three joined Tito’s partisans in the Balkan mountains and waited for the right time to continue on.

By now the Germans had taken over in Hungary and disaster awaited the agents. Her two male companions decided to abort the mission, but Hannah was determined to chance it and in early June she made her way to the border, carrying her British wireless transmitter. She was captured on arrival by Hungarian authorities, before she had any chance to carry out her mission. She was imprisoned in the Horthy Miklos Prison in Budapest and tortured—clubbed, whipped, and threatened with the torture of her mother, who had remained in Hungary and been arrested.

She never broke. She never revealed her wireless codes or any information about her comrades, her mission, or the organization that had trained and sent them. Remarkably, she kept her spirits up during the months of her brutal imprisonment, finding ways to communicate with other prisoners and singing in the hopes of helping to keep up their spirits.

When it became clear that nothing would be gotten from her, she was accused of treason and tried as a spy. SOE had secured British Army commissions for the agents in the belief, naïve as it turned out, that they would be protected by the uniform and treated as prisoners of war. But Hannah was condemned to death, before the court had even declared a verdict.

As she stood before a German firing squad,

she refused to be blindfolded, so she could look her killers in the eyes. It was November 7, 1944. She had kept writing in her diary until the last, when an entry found in her cell after her death read, "I played a number in a game/I gambled on what mattered most/the dice have rolled/ I lost." Hannah Senesh did not live to her twenty-fourth birthday.

Among the things she left behind were poems and songs still sung in Israel today. The best known is *Eli, Eli*, which concludes "The voice called, and I went/I went because the voice called." These lines are from the last song she wrote from the partisan camp in Yugoslavia:

***Blessed is the match consumed in kindling flame.
Blessed is the flame that burns in the secret fastness of the heart.***

Blessed is the heart with strength to stop its beating for honor's sake.

Blessed is the match consumed in kindling flame.

The flame in Hannah Senesh's heart answered Churchill's urging to "set Europe ablaze."

Hannah Senesh's diary appeared in Hebrew in 1946. In 1950 her remains were brought to Israel for burial on Mount Herzl in Jerusalem and in 2007 her tombstone was brought to Sdot Yam. Her story has been told in histories, novels and films. She is a particular hero of Israeli children, who know her story and her songs. In 1993 a Hungarian Military Court saw fit to inform her family in Israel that she had been officially exonerated.

Rita Kramer's most recent non-fiction book is *Flames in the Field: The Story of Four SOE Agents in Occupied France*. Her latest book, *When Morning Comes*, her first novel, draws on her skills as a biographer, a historian, a social critic, and a lover of fiction.



Hungary Memorial (in Israel)

(Continued from page 2)

consensus at the conference was that unless Iran could be prevailed on to rein in its nuclear ambitions (which they considered highly unlikely, especially given Obama's appeasement of the mullahs) the world is heading toward calamity. With the political will to stop Iran diminishing in the West, conference participants concluded the most likely outcome was for leading Arab states, such as Saudi Arabia, Syria and Egypt, to seek to acquire their own nuclear arsenals. And alas, as Coughlin writes "the doctrine of mutually assured destruction, which could be relied upon during the Cold War to prevent a nuclear holocaust, cannot be applied to a region in which national pride and personal honour often take precedence over the more basic human instinct for self-preservation."

De Mortuis, Veritas

In "Bob Novak, Truth Seeker," (*Wall Street Journal*, August 20) Jeffrey Bell, a visiting fellow at the Ethics and Public Policy Center, adds to the praise gushing from the right for the conservative columnist. The focus in Bell's op-ed is on Novak's ability to change his mind, his openness to argument, his ever-readiness "to open a new door."

But there was one issue on which Novak shut the door—Israel. Born a Jew (he finally converted to Catholicism in 1998), Novak was so consistently, obsessively and irrationally hostile to Israel (Jewish self-hatred, anyone?) that he even embraced Hamas.

Debbie Schluskel and Diana West have been among the very few to zero in on Novak as hater of Israel. Both quote from a November 24, 2001 CNN Capital Gang just after Israeli forces had killed Hamas mastermind Abu Hanoud (he was behind the Sbarro pizza parlor murders and those at the Dolphinarium disco in Tel Aviv, among others). Novak was livid, his reaction

so outrageous that the Capital Gang, left (Margaret Carlson, Al Hunt) and right (Kate O'Beirne), ganged up on him. When O'Beirne argued the killing was self-defense, Novak retorted that he was "always amazed how American conservatives can get involved in this absolutely mindless support of the intransigent Israeli policy." When Carlson referred to Hanoud as a terrorist Novak retorted: "Why do you call him a terrorist? I mean, one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter." Carlson shot back: "Bob, you're the only person who would call Hamas freedom fighters." Sticking to his pro-terrorist guns, Novak replied: "Oh, no; people all over the world do." (For Novak clearly it was no bar that Hamas, as Ken Levin puts it "explicitly declares in its charter, in its media, in its mosques, in its schools, its dedication not only to the annihilation of Israel but to the murder of all Jews, and daily seeks to translate its words into acts.")

Schluskel reports on Novak's reaction when, in 1989, attending the conservative National Journalism Center school at which he was a speaker, she challenged him. "I asked him, since he was such an anti-Communist, why he would openly support Yasser Arafat and the PLO—who were sponsored and funded by the Soviets and had trained with other Communists around the world that he [Novak] hated....And I asked him to name a single other communist group he supported in the world. He sputtered to give a response, because he and I both knew the truth: he simply hated Jews."

Diana West puts her finger on what is really disturbing: "The question is, how does this significant aspect of Novak's political makeup—repeated over time—get lost in all the lionizing. At least in the early reactions I have seen, it is as if it has been erased from the record. As far as many conservatives go, to-the-hilt support for a *jihād* group dedicated to the eradication of Israel just doesn't count for anything at all in the end."

(Continued on page 12)

(Continued from page 11)

The Peres Center Boondoggle

Haaretz on August 21 ran an article by Uri Blau detailing how the Peres Center for Peace had become a vanity project spending most of its millions on a trophy building in Jaffa and elaborate parties drawing billionaires around the globe jockeying to sit close to the Great Man of Peace.

Actually, this is good news. By spilling its money on a high design building with huge cost overruns and over-the-top social events, the Center is prevented from funding “peace projects” that would do real damage. (One of the projects staff laments having to cut was a joint Israeli-Palestinian theater group—*My Name is Rachel Corrie* is feeble fare compared to the anti-Israel propaganda that would flood out of this operation.)

Still, the story is amusing. According to the Center’s director general Ron Pundak “the architect is very, let’s say, original” and his design posed a large number of engineering problems. As costs mounted, the Center sought vainly to take out a mortgage. The building, consisting of layers of green-tinged cement on bands of glass, is in the heart of a poor Arab neighborhood adjacent to a Moslem cemetery. The banks, Pundak notes ruefully, “claim it would be impossible to sell the building.”

As for its tenth anniversary party in October 2008, Blau writes that it drew tycoons, artists and actors from the ends of the earth. “We filled the airport with private planes,” a former Center employee tells Blau. Every tycoon and celebrity wanted to be seated next to Peres, posing a big problem. A worse problem was that fund-raising fell so short that the celebration

cost far more than it brought in.

Pundak notes the building is all donors want to fund—out of “love for Peres” and a feeling it’s necessary to create something to remember him by. The building is a fitting memorial to Simple Shimon—an unsalable cement box adjoining a Moslem cemetery.

Watching Joe Stork

Writing on the *Commentary* blog, Noah Pollak praises “a block buster article” by Ben-Dror Yemini in *Maariv* for exposing the anti-Israel background of Human Rights Watch’s Joe Stork. Please. Much of it was obviously drawn, probably second or third hand, from AFSI’s 1977 pamphlet *Breira: Counsel for Judaism* available on www.afsi.org, see esp. pp. 12-14. (To his credit, Yemini wrote a splendid riposte to Stork who was stung into attacking the article.)

An interesting fact that no one has mentioned is that Barry Rubin, like Joe Stork, started his career in MERIP (the Middle East Research and Information Project), a radical outfit dedicated to the proposition that Zionism had to be destroyed to create a “socialist” Middle East. Both Stork and Rubin have maintained their focus on Israel but the paths they took could not be more different. The difference is typified by the most recent actions of each. Stork called a press conference where, absent evidence, he accused the IDF of killing twelve Palestinians in Gaza who waved white flags. At the same time Barry Rubin, now a political analyst and long time resident of Israel, was exposing the indecent allegations of a Swedish newspaper that the IDF stole organs of dead Palestinians.

The title of Rubin’s piece, equally applicable to Joe Stork, was “How Low Can They Go?” •