

OUTPOST

October 2010—Issue #236

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

A Committee on the Present Danger

Herbert Zweibon

As the existential dangers to Israel mount—both from Iran and its own leaders, who are pursuing a delusional “peace process”—Israel is in urgent need of an organization that can mobilize the public: a Committee on the Present Danger.

We choose that name in honor of our Committee on the Present Danger, the non-partisan foreign policy citizen’s lobby that has formed, disbanded and re-formed to put pressure on Washington to deal with threats to this country inadequately addressed by the political leadership. In its first two incarnations, the Committee was alerting the nation to the Soviet danger. In its third and current form the Committee’s goal, in its own words, is “to stiffen American resolve to confront the challenges presented by terrorism and the ideologies that drive it.”

Over time the Committee has included prominent politicians (like Democratic Senator Henry Jackson), government officials (like former CIA director James Woolsey), labor leaders (like Lane Kirkland, head of the AFL-CIO), intellectuals (like Norman Podhoretz), businessmen (like David Packard of Hewlett Packard), think tank representatives, former army people, among others. It became a reservoir of talented and committed people for administrations to draw on: President Reagan selected thirty-three members of the Committee on the Present Danger for key posts in his administration. Democratic Senator Joseph Lieberman and Arizona Republican Senator Jon Kyl are the honorary co-chairs of the most recent Committee.

In Israel a Committee on the Present Danger would alert the nation to the danger its elites will sacrifice national rights only to obtain more terror and more Arab demands. It should include politicians from all Zionist political parties, leaders from the “settlements,” retired army officers, intellectuals and businessmen. These will be people with a record of leadership but, again following the American model, Israel is also in urgent need of a grass roots movement analogous to the tea parties that spontaneously developed here as people rose in rebellion against games their elites

played, from gigantic “stimulus” packages to Obamacare to cap and trade, at huge costs to themselves and the next generation.

The Israeli tea parties have a yet more urgent mission—survival of the state. Israeli tea parties need to mobilize the people of Israel to return to their Zionist roots, to remember and reaffirm that Israel is based on the idea of Jewish rights and the fulfillment of Jewish needs. They need to relentlessly press their weak and feckless political leaders to focus on preserving the Zionist ideal, not temporarily soothing Obama or Clinton or Mitchell. Those who suffer the most from Israel’s failed leadership are the obvious candidates to spearhead the movement. That includes the uprooted communities of Gaza, whose people have shown a remarkable ability to rebuild their lives, and people from the settlements, who at great sacrifice created vibrant communities and are at risk of losing them.

A final model: TV talk show host Glenn Beck held a huge ‘Restoring Honor’ rally in Washington, D.C. with its theme the restoration of pride in the American creed. Israel needs a similar rally that will restore pride in Zionism, Israel’s noble creed, and defy all the enemies, within and without, who vilify and defame it.

Israel suffers from a crisis in leadership. An Israeli Committee on the Present Danger along with a grass roots “tea party” movement could, between them, give birth to a new generation of leaders (to quote Shmuel Katz, who never gave up hope such a leadership would arise) “with the integrity, the prudence and the courage to cope with Israel’s problems and who will pilot it through the perilous, tempestuous, unruly seas of the contemporary world.” •

Table of Contents

The Scam Artist At The Ground Zero Mosque	
by Rael Jean Isaac	...3
Just The Facts, Imam	by Daniel Greenfield ...6
A Letter To Brooklyn College	by Edward Alexander ...8
How I Became An Unconscious Fascist	by Fiamma Nirenstein ...9
Isms And Phobias	by Ruth King ...11

From the Editor

It's a Mad, Mad ADL

The Anti-Defamation League's Abe Foxman is seeking to assuage his critics (furious at him for failing to support the planned mosque at Ground Zero) by launching an Interfaith Coalition on Mosques to aid Muslims who run into public opposition to building mosques elsewhere in the country.

The ADL is supposed to battle defamation against Jews. Anti-Semitism, after a period of dormancy following World War II, is once again a huge problem. The biggest source of defamation against Jews are militant Muslims, with U.S. mosques, the great majority funded by Saudi Arabia and promoting Wahhabi ideology, in the forefront. So why should the ADL seek to foster the creation of new fountains of anti-Semitic hatred? Foxman promises "legal support, public relations support, or whatever" wherever Muslims have "problems exercising their right to build a mosque."

Perhaps the ADL should change its name to ADIL, The Anti-Defamation of Islam League. It requires only a small change in the logo and the ADIL could then compete with J Street for OPEC money.

A Visit to Hebron

Moshe Sharon, professor emeritus of Islamic History at Hebrew University and author of some of the best essays *Outpost* has published, wrote to us recently. Following are excerpts from his letter.

"I have just come back from Hebron. I was shocked to find that Jews are not allowed to enter into the main part of the Patriarch's edifice even as tourists. When I asked why, the answer was 'Jews are not permitted.'

"Can you imagine what would happen if Jews were not permitted to enter into Notre Dame in Paris because they are Jews?

"I was further shocked when I walked through land in the site of ancient Hebron, land which is a registered Jewish property since the Ottoman period and a soldier, a Jewish soldier, stopped me, saying: 'You are not allowed to walk in this area.' He was stationed there, poor fellow, to stop Jews from walking on land which belongs to them and which is within a Jewish neighborhood!

"The Arabs can lie back and see the Jews doing their work. Driving through Hebron I saw Jewish property, tens of buildings, belonging to Jews, deserted and our Jewish army makes every effort to stop the owners of this property from coming near it.

"I am terrified of what is going to happen in the 'peace negotiations' if the Jewish government of Israel has already accepted the principle of *judenrein*.

"To say nothing that it is already possible to see that the Arabs are employing their dexterity and usual game in bazaar negotiations and the Jews are

behaving like dumb buyers in an Oriental market.

"Pressure must be put on the government of Israel to stop persecuting the Jews of Hebron and to deal firmly with the leftist anarchists who have recently acquired a house in the middle of the Jewish neighborhood in the city and from it incite the Arabs and the foreign press and their friends in Europe and America against the Jews.

"Pay attention: 'against the Jews.' It is pure undisguised anti-Semitism. Unfortunately the government of Israel and its armed forces rarely take the Jewish side.

"I am writing to you in a state of shock from this visit. Please convince as many people as you can to come and see for themselves. The Jewish community in Hebron needs backing, help and constant pressure on the government of Israel to stop shutting its eyes, and give a helping hand to these very brave Jews who are holding out in the city of our Fathers with their teeth."

Members and friends of AFSI have an extraordinary opportunity to do as Moshe Sharon urges and see for themselves. AFSI's trip to Israel (Oct. 24-Nov. 2) includes a trip to Hebron, attending Sabbath services at the Cave of Machpelah, and spending time with many of the "very brave Jews" of whom Sharon speaks.

Time Slanders Israel, Again

Time's Sept. 13 cover story, with a large star of David in which is embedded the words "Why Israel Doesn't Care About Peace," has drawn plenty of criticism. Victor Davis Hanson calls it "probably the most anti-Semitic essay I have ever read in a mainstream publication." CAMERA called it "an incitement to hatred." In *The Wall Street Journal*, Bret Stephens says the article will "someday cause a future editor of *Time* (assuming there is one) to hang her head in shame."

Unfortunately, if we judge by *Time's* record in portraying the Arab-Israel conflict, Stephens' forecast is not likely. It's because the history is missing that the criticisms have a tone of shock. Yes, Stephens recalls *Time's* infamous May 1977 guidance to pronouncing the name of Israel's new Prime Minister—rhymes with
(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 web site: <http://www.afsi.org>

The Scam Artist At The Ground Zero Mosque

Rael Jean Isaac

While there has been much emotion and argument over the proposed mosque two blocks from Ground Zero, it has largely swirled over issues that miss the nature and significance of the issues involved. Thus we hear endless variations on the theme “How can a moderate imam whose stated goal is to promote healing in the wake of 9/11 be so insensitive to the feelings of those who lost those they loved at the hands of Islamic fanatics?”

But, as the public is slowly learning, Imam Rauf is no moderate and bridge-building is not his agenda. The project with which Rauf has been most closely associated is the “Sharia Index Project” which measures how closely each country approaches the ideal of complete conformity to sharia law. The ideal is replacing Western law with Islamic law, i.e. achieving worldwide Islamic supremacy.

How did the issue of the Ground Zero mosque come to be framed so poorly? It’s because Imam Rauf is an expert at gaming the system, exploiting every economic, political and psychological vulnerability of this society. How does he scam us? Let me count the ways.

1. In a burst of investigative journalism, *The Bergen Record* has documented how, thanks to his connections with powerful politicians (including Robert Janiszewski, the county’s disgraced former county executive), Rauf managed to obtain over \$2 million in public financing for purchasing and rehabilitating low income apartments in Hudson County, New Jersey. Maintaining the buildings was another matter. Page after page of municipal health records, the *Record* reports, chronicle a barrage of tenant complaints from failure to pick up garbage to rat infestation to no heat or hot water. Union City has now brought suit, seeking receivership on two buildings, charging Rauf with ignoring orders by the city to address violations.

2. Rauf obtained church status for the American Sufi Muslim Association, giving it exemption from taxes, from filing tax returns and from revealing its sources of funding. The Association gave a one bedroom apartment on the tenth floor of a high rise at 251 West 85th street (elsewhere listed as his wife’s residence) as its place of worship. In petitioning for church status, Rauf claimed as many as 500 people prayed there daily, five times a day. Steve Emerson’s Investigative Project, which dug up this scam, points out that there is no way this small apartment could have functioned as Rauf claimed it did. (Emerson’s group has also revealed that Faiz Khan, one of the

Association’s three directors, is a “truther,” insisting at a 2006 conference of these U.S.-hating fantasists that the “most logical explanation” for 9/11 was that the hijackers were “working for corporate America.”)

3. Rauf claims his mission, in his own words, is “to strengthen relations between the Western and Muslim worlds and to help counter radical ideology.” On the strength of this persona the State Department sends him off on junkets to the Middle East, most recently this summer.

But how can the State Department possibly believe a man openly dedicated to instituting sharia worldwide will counter Islamic radicalism when implementing sharia is the central demand of Islamic radicals?

If the relation of sharia to Islamic radicalism is beyond the comprehension of our State Department,

there is the interview Rauf gave to Ed Bradley of *60 Minutes* in the immediate aftermath of 9/11. He told Bradley “U.S. policies were an accessory to the crime.” Today Rauf tries to explain this away. On CNN (September 8) Rauf says he meant to say that the U.S. had empowered Islamist militants like bin Laden while fighting the Soviet Union in Afghanistan. Only trouble is that in the original interview a startled Bradley had a follow up question. “How?” And Rauf replied “Because we have been accessory to a lot of innocent lives dying in the world. In fact, in the most direct sense, Osama bin Laden is made in the USA.” Rauf was clearly claiming that the U.S. had brought 9/11 upon itself (was “accessory to the crime”) by its brutality to Muslims. If that wasn’t clear enough, in 2005 Rauf told a Moslem audience in Australia “the U.S. has more Muslim blood on its hands than al Qaeda has on its hands of innocent non-Muslims.”

Apparently for the State Department, it’s enough to say 9/11 was a “crime” to pass muster as a Muslim moderate—it doesn’t matter to whom you attribute it.

4. Rauf exploits the ill-advised Jewish passion for interfaith dialogue (no matter how disingenuous the other side) to line up Jewish--especially rabbinic--support for the Ground Zero mosque. There are the familiar far-leftists like Arthur Waskow (formerly of the radical left-wing Institute for Policy Studies, now reincarnated as a rabbi), Rolando Matalon of the trendy B’nai Jeshurun congregation and, inevitably, the Union for Reform Judaism. But there are also the Orthodox Rabbis Schneier, father and son, and David Harris of the American Jewish Committee to whom Rauf’s position on Israel should be of some concern.



Imam Rauf

So where does Rauf stand on Israel? Challenged to condemn Hamas in a radio interview, Rauf replied "Terrorism is a very complex question." As *National Review* editor Rich Lowry has observed, that's the stock answer for anyone excusing terrorism.

But the most significant insight into Rauf's views on Israel comes from a letter from Rauf published in *The New York Times* that *The Wall Street Journal* unearthed. Elsewhere ("Taiba at Ground Zero?" *Family Security Matters*, August 20) I have compared Rauf to Tariq Ramadan, the urbane and articulate Swiss born academic, grandson of of Muslim Brotherhood founder Hassan-al-Banna, whose role as an alleged moderate has made him a fixture of the "commentariat" on Islam on European television and even secured him an invitation from the British Prime Minister to serve on the government's task force on preventing extremism. As French journalist Caroline Fourest documents extensively in her book *Brother Tariq: The Doublespeak of Tariq Ramadan*, Ramadan is adept at saying one thing to his Islamic followers, another to his Western audience. Rauf outdoes Ramadan at this game: he manages to address both audiences with opposing messages at the same time!

Let's look at Rauf's letter to *The New York Times* of Nov. 27, 1977, in which he comments on Sadat's then ground breaking trip to Jerusalem. Rauf encourages his fellow Muslims to "give peace a chance." So much for making a Western audience happy. He goes on to address specifically "my fellow Arabs." To them he says "Learn from the example of the Prophet Mohammed, your greatest historical personality. After a state of war with the Meccan unbelievers that lasted for many years, he acceded in the Treaty of Hudabiya, to demands that his closest companions considered utterly humiliating. Yet peace turned out to be a most effective weapon against the unbelievers." As *The Wall Street Journal* points out, Rauf is referring to the treaty that established a ten year truce during which Mohammed built up his forces to conquer Mecca. Rauf is telling the Arabs that Sadat is doing the same thing, offering a time-out before the ultimate conquest. In case they missed the point, he adds "In a true peace it is impossible that a purely Jewish state of Palestine can endure....In a true peace, Israel will, in our lifetimes, become one more Arab country, with a Jewish minority."

Asked by *The Wall Street Journal* if his views had changed since the 1970s (when he also celebrated the Iranian revolution as "inspired by the very principles of individual rights and freedom that Americans ardently believe in") Rauf professed himself "amused" that the *Journal* would dredge up letters he

wrote as a young man. But he stood by his original views. "As I reread those letters now, I see that they express the same concerns—a desire for peaceful solutions in Israel and for a humane understanding of Iran—that I have maintained, and worked hard on, in the years since those letters were published." "Peaceful solutions" in the case of Israel," as Rauf made crystal clear, meant Israel's extinction.

5. Rauf claims that the mosque "sends the opposite statement to what happened on 9/11." But as Amir Taheri has pointed out, the structure will be a

Abd Al-Rahman Al-Rashed: the mosque "will become an arena for the promoters of hatred and a monument to those who committed the crime."

rabat, the creation of which was ordered by Mohammed at the heart of infidel territory that had been successfully raided—and where the next raid would be prepared. As Abd Al-Rahman Al-Rashed, director general of *Al-Arabiya TV*, put it in the London daily *Al-Sharq Al-Awsat*, the mosque "will become an arena

for the promoters of hatred, and a monument to those who committed the crime."

This is more than well-informed speculation by individuals who understand the Moslem world. In August, as *Die Zeit* editor Josef Joffe wrote in *The Wall Street Journal*, the German authorities shut down the Taiba mosque and cultural center in Hamburg after it became a magnet drawing enthusiasts for *jihad*—along with actual practitioners—from around the world. It was a magnet, as Manfred Murck, deputy chief of Germany's domestic security agency, explained "because it has the aura of the 9/11 assassins." This was the mosque where Mohammed Atta and several other 9/11 hijackers had hung out, and Murck reported that "devotees of the 9/11 killers have come from all over on a tour of *jihadism* that starts in Hamburg, then proceeds to Madrid, then to London, where dozens were murdered in the tube in 2005."

If the mere "aura" of Mohammed Atta proved so powerful in Hamburg, imagine what a magnet a mosque at the site of the greatest triumph over the infidels would be? In the imagination of the *jihadists* it will be almost as good as a mosque in the actual footprint of the towers, for the Burlington Coat factory was badly damaged when landing gear from one of the planes crashed through the roof.

And this is precisely the reason why Imam Rauf and his associates are so reluctant to accept the alternative site New York Governor Patterson has offered them, on the surface an easy way to put the controversy to rest. At any other site Imam Rauf would be unlikely to raise anything like the \$100 million he can plausibly hope to obtain for a mosque in the shadow of what were once the World Trade Center towers. Moreover, it is important to note the title of Rauf's book. The abridged English version is a comforting *What's*

Right with Islam is What's Right with America. But it was published earlier in Malaysia under the very different title *A Call to Prayer from the World Trade Center Rubble: Islamic Dawa in the Heart of America Post 9-11*. Dawa means proselytizing. Rauf is set on spreading the message of Islam from the heart of Ground Zero—and the Burlington coat factory is as close as you get.

There is another backstory, not yet uncovered, as to why the Pomerantz family, owners of the site, sold it to Rauf's group for \$4.8 million, when they had turned down multiple offers, including one by developer Kevin Glodek for \$18 million. Why did Kukiko Mitani, Pomerantz's widow, claim that there were no other offers?

6. Rauf games the system by claiming he seeks reconciliation while demonizing the mosque's opponents. He claims his life's work is "peace-making" even as he issues dire warnings of worldwide violence if his Ground Zero mosque is blocked.

Speaking in a forum in Doha on his recent taxpayer funded tour, Rauf declared: "The battlefield is not between Muslims and non-Muslims. It is between moderates [and] extremists—radicals of all faith traditions." Rauf treats those who are offended by a mosque at Ground Zero as the moral equivalent of *jihadists*. Not to be outdone, on August 22 Rauf's wife Daisy Khan announced on national TV that America was a place "beyond Islamophobia."

Even more outrageous, Rauf now claims he only insists on the present mosque site out of concern for American lives! Rauf used an hour long interview on Larry King Live (conducted by Soledad O'Brien) to claim that he would not have embarked on the project had he anticipated the outcry, but it now must go forward to save American lives: "If we move from that location...the headlines in the Muslim world will be that Islam is under attack." Rauf warns that the 2006 riots in the wake of the Mohammed cartoons could pale in comparison, for anger will likely "explode in the Muslim world" leading to "something which could really become very, very, very dangerous indeed." But as Claudia Rosett points out on *Forbes.com*, it is Rauf himself who created and now stokes the "crisis."

There is a strong parallel to the Danish cartoons incident but not the one Rauf draws. Those cartoons aroused no reaction whatever in the Muslim world until, months after their publication, a group of imams toured the Middle East to incite murderous rage among ever-so-easily outraged Muslims. Abd Al-Rahman Al-Rashed of Al-Arabiya, quoted earlier, insists that most of the world's Muslims couldn't care less about Rauf's mosque and most don't want it at a place "that tomorrow may become a source of pride for the terrorists and their Muslim followers." If that

changes it's because Rauf succeeds in persuading Muslims "they are under attack."

Moreover, our naïve State Department encourages Rauf's dangerous game. State Department spokesman P.J. Crowley said that Rauf could talk about the mosque (but not raise funds for it) during his Middle East tour. Crowley said "he wouldn't be surprised" if Rauf was talking of the ongoing debate "as an example of our religious tolerance and resolving questions that come up within the rule of law." This is a good example of what Charles Jacobs calls "our ruling delusional elites" in action.

Rauf claims his life's work is "peace-making" even as he warns of worldwide violence if his Ground Zero mosque is blocked.

7. To hear Imam Rauf, his 13 story mosque plus cultural center is designed "to cultivate understanding among all religions and cultures." He promises (in his *New York Times* op-ed of September 7) "a multifaith memorial dedicated to victims of the Sept. 11

attacks," "separate prayer spaces for Muslims, Christians, Jews and men and women of other faiths" and to promote "a culture of forging personal bonds across religious traditions."

But Christine Brim of the Center for Security Policy has come closer to uncovering some of the planned activities of the center. On the basis of copious since-deleted pages on Rauf's website (which she has managed to preserve for readers on www.bigpeace.com) Brim concludes that up to six floors of the 13 floor edifice are to be devoted to the Sharia Index Project, designed to benchmark sharia compliance, to distribute sharia propaganda and to enforce sharia law in America and worldwide." The first now-hidden website reveals that the Sharia Index Project had its initial meeting, convened and chaired by Rauf, in Malaysia in August 2006 and the first four participants Rauf recruited were international leaders affiliated with the Muslim Brotherhood (the fount of today's radical Islam). The group was subsequently expanded to include "the Shi'a perspective" with one of the new recruits (identified by Anne Bayefsky on the basis of a photograph) Iran's Mohammad Javad Larijani, who has justified torture of Iranian dissidents as legal punishments under sharia.

There is of course not a hint of "recognition of the rights of others, tolerance and freedom of worship," the American values Rauf claims to pursue, in the Moslem Brotherhood or in sharia. Imposing sharia is what the Taliban is all about. On September 20 *The Wall Street Journal* described how Karzai's reaching out to the Taliban is dividing Afghans. The *Journal* quotes Khwaja Mir, head of the provincial council in the majority-Tajik provincial council in the Panjshir Valley: "If we had accepted the Taliban's ideology during Shah Masood's time [the Northern Alliance leader murdered by Taliban before the American invasion] there wouldn't have been any problem between us.

But we didn't because we wanted to live a free life."

Rauf practices a consummate con. But a con needs a mark. The mark is someone who finds the surface story so appealing he is reluctant to dig down and check out the con's claims. Rauf has found an unlimited supply of marks—our entire political and cultural elite. Perhaps stupidest of the lot is California Rabbi Haim Bialik (one of 71 religious leaders in California signing a pro-mosque petition) who declaimed: "The loneliness and isolation that Jews felt in the 1930s is palpable but now it's directed to the Moslems." Mayor Bloomberg is a close second. With the Statue of Liberty as backdrop, a gaggle of religious leaders at his side, Bloomberg declaimed: "I believe that this is an important test of the separation of

church and state, as important a test as we may see in our lifetime." Later Bloomberg said the mosque's opponents "should be ashamed of themselves."

The mosque at Ground Zero may never be built. Under the stress of all the opposition and embarrassing disclosures, Rauf and his partner, developer Sharif El-Gamal, already show signs of falling out. (El-Gamal, it turns out, has just been evicted from his SoHo offices for nonpayment of rent and has had at least seven run-ins with the law, most recently for assaulting a barber.) One or both could decide to take the money and run. Donald Trump has already offered a 25% premium on the purchase price.

But while the future of the mosque remains uncertain, one thing is for sure: because of his skill in playing our elites for fools, Imam Faisal Abdul Rauf is a dangerous, dangerous, dangerous man indeed. •

Just the Facts, Imam

Daniel Greenfield

Just the facts, Imam. A Muslim terrorist attack damaged a building, allowing Muslims to pick it up for a fraction of the price, in order to build a mosque on the spot. Some people might say that sort of thing is tacky. A little like coming by to make an offer on the house, after your cousin murdered the entire family who lived there. Sure, you might claim that you're not responsible, but it just doesn't look good. Especially once you start paling around with your cousin, and suggesting that maybe he was just misunderstood. And maybe that family brought it on themselves.

But the media still insists that Islam had nothing to do with 9/11. Or if it had anything to do with 9/11, it was those "other Muslims," not these Muslims. The media isn't really good at explaining the difference between these Muslims and those Muslims. Often the media insists that those Muslims are actually these Muslims. Sometimes they claim that those Muslims are actually not Muslims at all, but people who are upset about foreclosures and work-related stress.

When Malik Hasan opened fire at Fort Hood, the media spent thousands of pounds of ink claiming that he was suffering from some airborne form of PTSD that he picked up from the soldiers he was abusing-- all evidence to the contrary. When the Times Square Bomber tried to kill a few thousand New Yorkers, the media claimed that he was upset because his house had been foreclosed on. Inconveniently enough, he turned out to be a Muslim terrorist, complete with his very own Al Qaeda martyrdom video.

But the media has never actually said those five little words. "Sorry America, we were wrong." Because the media is never wrong. Sometimes they're just technically incorrect. Sometimes the facts just don't agree with their reality. And the reality can get pretty hazy down on the other side of the Reality

Based Community. Especially when there's enough drugs in the mix. And even when it's just the liberal Kool Aid talking.

So when it comes to Muslims, the media doesn't exactly have a great track record of telling apart "these Muslims" from "those Muslims." After 9/11 the media did multiple interviews with a kindly and friendly Imam by the name of Anwar Al-Awlaki. Anwar explained to every media outlet that would listen that Islam is opposed to terrorism and anyone who thinks otherwise misunderstood one of those 12,000 "You Shall Smite the Infidel" verses in the Koran. After doing enough interviews on NPR and PBS, Anwar Al-Awlaki is hiding from US drones somewhere in Yemen, and has been linked to both the Fort Hood Massacre and the Times Square Bomber.

You might think that Anwar Al-Awlaki snapped after enough appearances on PBS and NPR, whose soft calming music and lobotomized hosts could turn anyone into a terrorist, but Al-Awlaki was actually advising the 9/11 hijackers even before the attacks happened. So when Anwar Al-Awlaki was telling the press that Islam is opposed to terrorism, he was asking them to ignore everything the FBI and Counter-Jihadi sites had found. Which they happily did.

What that all adds up to is that the media's proven ability to handicap who is or isn't a Muslim terrorist is about as good as Crazy Blind Louie's ability to handicap horse races in China, when he doesn't speak Chinese and has been trapped in a coma for the last 3 years. At this point, if the media tells you that someone isn't a Muslim terrorist, the Vegas odds are on the side of him being Osama bin Laden's right hand man. If the media tells you that an Imam is moderate, run to within 50 feet away to avoid the shrapnel.

The media's approach to Islamic terrorism is a lot like Pat Buchanan's approach to the Holocaust. They will concede that terrorism probably does exist, and it might involve Muslims, but it's not as bad as people make it out to be, there's a lot of context, and anyway look at the history of it. It's not as if we're de-

fending them, except we're writing all these articles explaining how we shouldn't have been fighting them in the first place. And really what did we get out of the war anyway?

Finally the media plays its trump card. Religious freedom. It's in the Constitution, Man! And who has ever doubted the media's commitment to religious freedom, except when it comes to prayer in schools or in the military. Or their commitment to the Bill of Rights, which they would die for, except for the parts they don't like very much.

Certainly the media has a point, when it argues that it's wrong to claim that a house of worship shouldn't be built because it's offensive. The media has never been known to do that. Except when they actually claim that houses of worship can be destroyed, because they're offensive.

Five years ago, the good Muslims of Gaza decided to torch a bunch of synagogues. Naturally the media were outraged. Well, not exactly. The media actually enthusiastically endorsed the burning of synagogues. Why? Because synagogues in Gaza are inately offensive.

While a synagogue was being vandalized by a gleeful Muslim mob, CNN's Matthew Chance explained: "This structure behind me—very controversial because it is the Jewish synagogue in the middle of Netzarim. The Israeli cabinet, of course, voting to leave those synagogues standing, very much angering the Palestinian Authority, because they know that these buildings are seen very much by the vast majority of Palestinians as potent symbols of the Israeli occupation and could not be protected or even left standing. And so we're seeing very sensitive scenes here over the past few hours as the Palestinian security forces move the civilians out of that synagogue and move their bulldozers in to take away these structures, again, seen as hated symbols of the Israeli occupation."

A mere five years ago, CNN justified the destruction of Jewish synagogues because they're offensive. It described the destruction of a House of Worship as "take away these structures," a euphemism that Goebbels probably couldn't have improved on. A euphemism that suggests the synagogue was being taken somewhere for a walk. Or maybe to a better place. Instead of being crudely demolished, after it had been burned and ransacked by a Muslim mob.

Today CNN can't fathom that someone would find building a house of worship offensive, particularly when it's built next to a virtual cemetery of the victims of that particular brand of worship. Yet in 2005, CNN was willing to justify the actual destruction of a house of worship because it's "offensive." What a difference

five years and a different religion makes.

But perhaps CNN could extend the same "sensitivity" it displayed for the mobs of Gaza to fellow Americans, who might conceivably view a mosque near Ground Zero as "a symbol of occupation." One that would have to be taken away very sensitively. Perhaps all the way back to Mecca. Sensitively, of course.

And this wasn't some sort of bizarre CNN fluke either. This is how Reuters gleefully painted the scene: "Attacking symbols of the hated Israeli occupation, youths set ablaze several of the synagogues." And here's a lovely one from *The London Telegraph*: "The skies were yet to be lit by the rising sun when the first flames from burning synagogues could be seen, set alight by Palestinians incensed by years when the Israeli army ruthlessly defended the settlements." It's amazing how much poetry is called up from the journalistic soul at the sight of burning synagogues. If you didn't know any better, you might actually think they enjoyed seeing synagogues destroyed.

But of course that would be ridiculous. I mean just take a look at this excitable chunk of prose from Ken Ellingwood and Laurie King: "Many vented their fury over the occupation by laying waste to the synagogues that Israeli authorities chose to leave standing. At the Neve Dekalim synagogue, a hulking Star of David-shaped building visible from miles away, a club-wielding crowd had descended by early morning to smash every window and tear insulation from the walls and ceilings." You get the feeling that Ken and Laurie would have been just as excited to be up and about during Kristallnacht. And if Ken or Laurie had decided to take a club to that hateful Star of David shaped building, surely no one would have been too surprised.

But I direct your attention to more than just the purple prose. When Ken and Laurie and CNN and Reuters and the *Telegraph* don't like synagogues, then they're "hulking," destroying them becomes a matter of "sensitively" "taking them down" and the synagogues have it coming, because those damn Jews "chose to leave them standing."

It's clear that the media has no problem understanding resentment toward a "House of Worship." As long as it's Muslim resentment toward a non-Muslim house of worship.

The same blatant dishonesty and historical revisionism that was on display when Muslims destroyed 26 Jewish synagogues in Gaza, was also on display when Muslims destroyed 150 churches in Kosovo. And when Muslims destroyed 170 Hindu temples in Kashmir in the last 20 years.

If a Koran falls into a toilet somewhere, it will be on the front page of *The New York Times*. If a hundred churches or synagogues burn, look for it somewhere on page A18, under the Grey Goose ad and



just above a story about nesting pelicans in Bangalore. Three paragraphs. No photo.

Today the same people who excused and even celebrated the Muslim desecration and destruction of synagogues, churches and temples are absolutely shocked that anyone would object to building a mosque near Ground Zero. What kind of people would dare object to a house of worship. I mean besides Muslims anyway. It's Un-American. And you know what is American? Putting up a massive building dedicated to an ideology of murder, where the ashes of its victims drifted on the cold September wind.

That my friends is American. Not the "American" of George Washington or Theodore Roosevelt or the firefighters and police officers who somehow made it up a hundred stories to rescue people they had never met. No, it's the "American" of Benedict Arnold, Norman Cousins and the ACLU board of directors. And of course that great All-Time Champion of Americanism, Barack Hussein Obama. Barry, who thinks the Muslim call to prayer is the prettiest sound on earth. And the Constitution is a dim buzz in his ear.

Just the Facts, Imam. Here 3,000 Americans were murdered. For working in offices or visiting them. For being members of the NYPD or the PAPD or the FDNY. For putting on a uniform or a suit. For living their lives. And then the walls and floors and furniture around them burned. The papers in their hands burned. Their bodies burned. The ashes drifted down narrow streets. Streets where George Washington and his men once passed to visit Fraunces Tavern and toward Broadway where the Iranian hostages rode back in a ticker tape parade on their return.

Now the money that nourished their killers will

help erect a mosque. A temple of death by the ashes of the dead. And the media is outraged that we won't allow it. That we won't stand for it. The same media that stood and grinned while Muslims burned synagogues, churches and temples. That tells us that the Muslim terrorists who try to kill us are not really Muslims. Just going through a midlife crisis, picked up some PTSD from some bad coffee or was just having a bad day. Because we are not equal. On their farm, some animals are more equal than others. Some have the right to kill, others only have the right to be killed. Some have the right to build houses of worship, others have the right to burn what others labor to build. Some have the right to be offensive, others only the right to be silent.

The dead of 9/11 are silent now. Or rather they have been silenced. As countless millions before them were silenced. With flame and sword. In mass graves and at spear-point. Tortured and mutilated. Torn apart with bombs. The dead cannot speak out against their murderers, but we can. The dead cannot protest, but we can. It is our duty to stand up and speak out. This is our place. Our land and our city. These are the streets where they tried to kill us. These are the streets where they will try again. To speak out is to defy those who would kill us and claim our cities as their own. Who would build monuments to their own victory over the ashes of our dead.

First they bomb. Now they occupy. We have lived through the bombing. And now we rise to defy the occupation.

Daniel Greenfield blogs as Sultan Knish. This appeared on his blog of August 2010.

A Letter To Brooklyn College

Edward Alexander

Editors Note: Credit goes to ex-marine and journalist Bruce Kesler whose "I Just Disinherited My Alma Mater" appeared in Family Security Matters for first bringing this scandal to public attention.

Dear President Gould,

Anyone who has taught at a university during the past quarter-century and more knows that the slogan of "diversity" generally alludes to its opposite (i.e., imposed uniformity of thought camouflaged by diversity of physical appearance) and also foretells mischief. That mischief is generally hatched by people Saul Bellow called members of the GIPC (Good Intentions Paving Company), do-gooders, often in the English departments, who confuse doing good with feeling good about what they are doing.

The imposition of one uniform text on Brooklyn College's incoming freshmen seems, at first glance, an attractive idea, appealing as an instrument for overcoming the centrifugal experience of students in

the curricular bazaar, where goods of all kinds are indiscriminately heaped together for sale. But given the way in which this idea is now being exploited at Brooklyn College, I think that a return to intercollegiate football would be a far better way of bringing students together. (Perhaps, as a college president, you recall the University of Chicago president who, decades ago, predicted that, were Chicago to eliminate football, "every kook in the country will come here.")

If a single uniform text dealing with a controversial subject (inside as well as outside Kings County) is deemed desirable to introduce Brooklyn freshmen to the life of the mind, then the English faculty should have considered Milton's *Areopagitica* (1644) or J. S. Mill's *On Liberty* (1859). Obsession with the contemporary not only distorts perspective, but is a very bad preparation for a thoughtful life.

Instead, your colleagues have chosen to promote and impose upon every new student a well-written and ostensibly non-polemical yet highly partisan and contentious work by Moustafa Bayoumi called *How Does It Feel To Be A Problem?*

The title and epigraph (and therefore over-

arching metaphor) come from the well-known book by W. E. B. Du Bois, *Souls of Black Folk* (1903) and are part of an intense (if quixotic) effort by the author to enable young Arab Americans to latch on to the mournful coattails of the black experience. That experience--it is perhaps useful to recall--was one of the middle passage, of murder, of enslavement, of Jim Crow laws, of discrimination of every kind.

Moustafa's book also asserts that "The core issue [of Middle East turbulence] remains the rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination," that the post-1967 history of the entire area is essentially that of "imperialism American-style," and that the American government "limits the speech of Arab Americans in order to cement United States policy on the Israeli-

Palestinian conflict." I suppose you are aware that literate people whose mental world extends beyond the pages of *The Nation* and *London Review of Books* do not consider these to be irresistible and self-evident truths. But how are your freshmen, not only limited to this one point of view but soon to have it relentlessly hammered home by the personal presence of the author at the front of their classroom, to know this? All in all, a dismal state of affairs, which I hope you will attempt to rectify.

Sincerely yours,
Edward Alexander
Professor Emeritus, University of Washington

How I Became An Unconscious Fascist

Fiamma Nirenstein

In 1967, like most Italian youngsters, I was a young communist. Bored by my rebellious behavior my family sent me to a Kibbutz in the upper Galilee, Neot Mordechai. I was quite satisfied there, the kibbutz used to give some money every month to the Vietcong. When the Six Day War began, Moshe Dayan spoke on the radio to announce it. I asked: "What is he saying?" and the comrades of Neot answered: "Shtuyot," silly things. During the war I took children to shelters; I dug trenches, and learned some simple shooting and acts of self defense. We continued working in the orchards, but were quick to identify the incoming Mig-im and the outgoing Mirage-im, chasing one another in the sky of the Golan Heights.

When I went back to Italy, some of my fellow students stared at me as somebody new, an enemy, a wicked person who would soon become an imperialist. My life was about to change. I didn't yet know that, because I simply thought that Israel rightly won a war after having been assaulted with an incredible number of harassments. But I soon noticed that I had lost the innocence of the good Jew, of the very special Jewish friend, their Jew: I was now connected with the Jews of the State of Israel, and slowly I was put out of the dodecaphonic, psychoanalytic, Bob Dylan, Woody Allen, Isaac Bashevis Singer, Philip Roth, Freud shtetl, the coterie that sanctified my Judaism in left wing eyes.

I have tried for a long time to bring back that sanctification, and they tried to give it back to me, because we desperately needed each other, the left and the Jews. But today's anti Semitism has overwhelmed any good intention.

The Left blessed the Jews as the victim "par excellence," always a great partner in the struggle for the rights of the weak against the wicked. In return for being coddled, published, filmed, considered artists, intellectuals and moral judges, Jews, even during the

Soviet anti-Semitic persecutions, gave the Left moral support and invited it to cry with them at Holocaust memorials. Today the game is clearly over. The left has proved itself the real cradle of contemporary anti-Semitism.

The basic idea of anti-Semitism, today as always, is that Jews have a perverted soul that makes them unfit, as a morally inferior people, to be regular members of the human family. Today, this *Untermensch* ideology has shifted to the Jewish state: A separate, unequal, basically evil stranger whose national existence is slowly but surely emptied and deprived of justification. Israel, as the classic evil Jew, according to contemporary anti-Semitism, doesn't have a birthright, but exists with its "original sin" perpetrated against the Palestinians. Israel's heroic history has become a history of arrogance.

This new anti-Semitism has materialized in unprecedented physical violence towards Jewish persons and symbols coming from organizations officially devoted to human rights. Its peak occurred at the United Nations summit in Durban when anti-Semitism officially became the banner of the new secular religion of human rights, and Israel and Jews became its official enemy.

Like the mythical Medusa, this new anti-Semitism has a face that petrifies anyone who looks at it. People don't want to admit it, don't even want to name it, because doing so reveals both the identity of its perpetrators and its object. Even Jews don't want to call an anti-Semite by his name, fearing disruption of old alliances. Because the left has a precise idea of what a Jew must be, when Jews don't match its prescription, they ask: How do you dare being different from the Jew I ordered you to be? Fighting against terrorism? Electing Sharon? Are you crazy? And here the answer of Jews and Israelis is the same. We are still very shy, very concerned about your affection. So, instead of requesting that Israel become an equal nation and that Jews become equal citizens in the world, we prefer standing with you shoulder to shoulder, even when you have come out with hundreds, thousands of anti-Semitic statements. We prefer to stand with you at

Holocaust memorials cursing old anti-Semitism while you accuse Israel, and therefore the Jews, of being racist killers.

But the contradiction has become even ontologically unbearable: How can you cry with the survivors for Jews killed by Nazis when the living Jews are accused of being Nazis themselves? Somebody on a European radio program said that after the diffusion of the images of Muhammed al Dura, Europe could finally forget the famous picture of the boy in the Warsaw ghetto with his hands raised. The meaning of this statement, often repeated in other forms, is obliteration of the Holocaust through the overlapping of Israel and Nazism, namely racism, genocide, ruthless elimination of civilians, women and children, an utterly unwarranted eruption of cruelty and the most brutal instincts. It means pretending to believe blindly, without investigation, the Palestinian version of a highly disputed episode and of many, many others; it means taking for granted the "atrocities" that the Palestinian spokespersons always talk about, and ignoring every proof or fact that doesn't serve this position.



It all points in one direction: Durban.

Here, the human rights movements that we will later find on the streets demonstrating against the war in Iraq chose Israel as the primary target and enemy. This choice constitutes a great success for Palestinian propaganda, but also a very serious signal of weakness from the movements themselves.

Denouncing this new human rights anti-Semitism is psychologically a terribly arduous task for Israel and for Diaspora Jews.

Until we break the silence, we, the Jews, give them the authorization to deny us the right to a nation of our own, and to defense of its people from unprecedented anti-Semitism.

If we want to obtain something, if we decide that it is about time to fight, we must renounce "liberal" imposters. We have to know how to say that the free press is a failure when it lies, and that it does lie. We have to say that all human rights are violated when a people is denied the right of self defense, and that right is denied of Israel. Human rights are also violated when a nation is subjected to systematic defamation and made a legitimate target for terrorists. We have to stop what we have accepted since the day the State was born, namely, that Israel be viewed as a different state in the international community.

Another very important point is that of all the parameters of anti-Semitism now used, one is the confusion between "Israeli" and "Jew". Supposedly, it is wrong to insinuate that the Jews act in the interests of the state of Israel and not their own state. The more a country confuses the two terms, the more anti-Semitic it is considered, and therefore one would imagine that the Jews combat this prejudice.

This is a serious conceptual error. Since the state of Israel, and along with it Jews, have been

made the objects of the worst kind of prejudice, Jews everywhere should consider their being identified with Israel a virtue and honor.

They should assert that identification with pride.

If Israel is, and it is indeed, the focal point of anti-Semitic attacks, our attention must be concentrated there. We must measure the moral character of the person we are speaking to on that basis: if you lie about Israel, if you cover it with bias, you are an anti-Semite. If you're prejudiced against Israel, then, you're against the Jews.

This doesn't mean criticizing Israel and its policies is forbidden. However, very little of what we hear about Israel has to do with lucid criticism. The self-defined critics are not the pious interlocutors for the Jews that they pretend to be. So we must tell them: from now on you cannot use the human rights passport for free. You must demonstrate what you assert: that the army ruthlessly storms poor Arab villages that have nothing to do with terrorism; that it shoots children on purpose; that it kills journalists with pleasure. You cannot? You called Jenin a slaughter? Then you are an anti-Semite, just like the old anti-Semites you pretend to hate.

Israel is in shock over the new anti-Semitism. All the theories that claimed classic anti-Semitism would abate with the creation of the state of Israel and that, in the long run, it would be extinguished have been destroyed. Furthermore, Israel has actually become the sum of all the evil, the proof that the protocols and the blood libels were right. The Palestinians are turned into Jesus, crucified; the war in Iraq or in Afghanistan waged by the U.S. is part of the Jewish plan of domination. Jews all over the world are threatened, beaten, even killed to pay the price of Israel's existence.

Israel has the chance to prove itself for what it really is: the outpost of the fight against terrorism and the defense of democracy. That is no small thing. But, we the Jews pose as victims and hide from this chance because using it puts us in conflict with our ancient sponsors and their legitimization. We have to realize that legitimization is really in our own hands and we never used it.

The watchword of the Jews should be "Jewish pride," in the sense of pride in our history and national identity, wherever we are. Jewish pride means that we have to claim the unique identity of the Jewish people and its right to exist.

No left and no right. We won't give the Left the power to decide where we stand. We will decide our alliances by ourselves according to the actual position of our potential partners.

This is excerpted from Fiamma Nirenstein's speech at the YIVO Institute in New York. The entire speech can be seen at JewishWorldReview.com.

Isms And Phobias

Ruth King

A pastor with a tiny group of adherents in Florida threatened (before backing off) to burn the Koran on 9/11 in a poor piece of street theater. In some quarters this was hailed as proof positive that dreaded “Islamophobia”—the sin that dare not speak its name in multi-culti public—is sweeping America.

We are fortunate that sane minds prevail. Among them are Andrew McCarthy who learned to understand *jihad* when he prosecuted the blind sheik behind the first bombing of the World Trade Center in 1993, Dr. Andrew Bostom who has written two authoritative books and hundreds of articles documenting the sordid history of Islamic hatred, Robert Spencer, whose books and site *Jihadwatch* have been illuminating the depredations of Koranic driven jihad, Adrian Morgan, Editor of *Family Security Matters* , author of countless articles on Islamic extremism, and Daniel Greenfield who blogs as Sultan Knish. These men have exposed the hypocrisy and hysteria of “Islamophobia” as seen by the politically correct dhimmis.

They are the “Islamorealists” who see the world beyond utopian delusions.

For what really motivates those who cry Islamophobia is fear of offending Moslems—who respond to the most minor incidents with insensate rage, violence and killing.

Now a debate simmers among “Islamorealists”—what to call the enemy, Islam or Islamism?

For me the term “Islamism” is just dandy. This evil ideology can join those two other “isms,” Communism, and Nazism, all evil, all imperialist and all responsible for murder of millions upon millions of innocents and spurred in their genocidal quests by one of their driving “isms”—anti-Semitism.

And, for the record, even appeasers did not sink to calling Nazism a peaceful ideology hijacked by a teeny, tiny minority. There were noble souls who opposed Hitler throughout Europe and even in Germany itself but their efforts could not stop the march of death. Only overwhelming power did.

Appeasers and liars did, however, call Communism a great ideology perverted by meanies like Stalin and Brezhnev and their comrades in crimes against humanity.

But, another “ism—perhaps the noblest liberation movement of history, namely Zionism, played a great role in opposing and vanquishing Communism.

The “refuseniks” of Russia and its satellite nations, inspired by Jewish success in Israel and by its lightning victory in 1967, came together to oppose Communism and demand the right to practice their faith openly and to emigrate to Israel. Their valor in-

spired and galvanized other dissidents in bringing down what Ronald Reagan rightly called “the Evil Empire.”

Zionism reclaimed Hebrew, the language of Jewish history and Scripture, from near extinction and today it is the “first language” of almost seven million people. Its rapid adoption was due to the “ulpan” educational system which taught Hebrew reading, writing and speaking to hundreds of thousands of people who spoke ninety differ-

ent languages; it spurred the greatest rescue of people in history when it welcomed, housed, counseled and schooled hundreds of thousands of survivors of the Holocaust and of Islamism in Arab countries. Zionism brought Jews from every corner and every continent to a democratic haven. Zionism evoked valor and determination to survive and prevail in a restored ancient homeland, Zionism never stooped to the prevailing mores of its enemies in spite of unbearable provocations. Zionism defines being Jewish with dignity and pride in every corner of the Diaspora. Zionism helps us to affirm “Next Year and Every Year in Jerusalem, the Unified Capital of Israel” in all our prayers.

And that brings us back to phobias and reality.

Israel is now being pressed to dismember itself, to give up its religious and historic patrimony, to accept the escalating demands of barbarians, all in the guise of “peace.”

In short, Israel the fount and the locus of Zionism is being prodded to abandon Zionism.

“Israelophobia” which is, by default, anti-Semitism, is spreading like a virus throughout the world, in academia, in legislatures, in the media and among the public. It is no longer in remission and Israeli weakness and appeasement have encouraged it. Furthermore, this virus is spread and supported by an influx of billions upon billions of dollars from Moslem/Arab/oil producing nations that have infected all our institutions with overt anti-Jewish bias.

In my view that makes fear of Islamism a pretty realistic phobia regardless of what you call it. •



AFSI Israel (Judea/Samaria) Trip

Come with us to celebrate Shabbat Chaye Sarah In Hebron on another unique Chizuk (support) mission to Israel from Oct. 24—Nov. 2, 2010. For the full itinerary go to www.afsi.org or call AFSI: 1-800-235-3658.

(Continued from page 2)

Fagin. (Why not Reagan rather than the anti-Semitic Dickens caricature?) But *Time's* malevolence is much steadier, deeper, destructive and long-standing.

Thirty years ago, I wrote an article in *The New Republic* "'Time' Against Israel." The magazine's cover (Oct. 18, 1980) showed a mock cover of *Time* with a prettified Yasser Arafat, a flower between his teeth, surrounded by doves bearing olive branches. The article is worth a brief summary here.

Until 1970 *Time's* coverage of Israel was reasonably balanced. After Nasser's death, *Time* began to shift the blame for stalemate to Israel and after the 1973 war its tilt became pronounced. When Begin was elected in 1977, *Time* went into orbit. It sent its fact checkers home and published a series of blatant lies: Begin's men "tortured two British soldiers to death," "massacred," "mutilated" and "raped" innocent villagers and Begin himself after the sinking of the Ir-gun ship, the *Altalena*, vowed to "see to it that the state of Israel sinks with us."

From then on Israel was able to do no right. In the slow negotiations following Sadat's 1977 visit to Jerusalem, *Time* invariably put the blame on Israel. To quote one of many, many examples (this one, September 11, 1978), "Begin does seem to bear by far the greatest responsibility for the current impasse." By way of contrast Sadat (March 27, 1978) was described as having "an almost mystical commitment to the peace process." *Time's* editors were so carried away they interpreted Sadat's war on Israel on Yom Kippur 1973 as the first step in his "peace campaign." Amazingly, *Time* concluded "it was Begin who con-

ceded the least" (Oct. 2, 1978) at Camp David. Since Begin had given up the Sinai oil fields, air bases and settlements and agreed to a companion "framework" for the West Bank and Gaza, while Sadat had compromised on none of his demands, *Time's* skewed vision is obvious.

I described how *Time* did worse than subvert the facts, consistently misreporting what the PLO and other terror factions did and said: "*Time's* use of words like 'peace,' 'moderation' and 'democracy' verges on Orwellian doublethink." *Time* constantly told its readers the Arabs sought peace with Israel without ever defining what Arab leaders meant by "peace," i.e. Israel's extinction. *Time* depicted the thuggish PLO as a "democracy." I wrote that in *Time* the word "moderate" is shorn of traditional meaning as Arafat is variously portrayed as "relatively moderate," "somewhat moderate" and just plain "moderate." I noted its use of "moderate" was even more bizarre when contrasted with *Time's* use of "intransigent." *Time* very rarely used that word in relation to the Arab world but called Israel "intransigent" so frequently the word took on the character of a Homeric epithet. When *Time* wanted to castigate South Africa's then prime minister John Vorster, the Israeli prime minister was the only figure of sufficient turpitude to offer a worthy parallel: Vorster was "as intransigent as Golda Meir."

The September 13, 2010 cover story thus comes out of a long tradition of adversary journalism against Israel by *Time*. There's one welcome change. Thanks to the internet, *Time* has much less influence on the way the public perceives issues and it hangs on to survival by its teeth. •