

---

# OUTPOST

April 2011—Issue #242

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

41<sup>st</sup> Year of Publication

Table of Contents		
Editorial – They Kill, We Build	William Mehlman	Page 2
From The Editor	Rael Jean Isaac	Page 3
Itamar And Gilad Farm	Jerry Auerbach	Page 7
Libya: Sociology of A Revolution	Michel Gurfinkiel	Page 9
The White Papers: Then And Now	Ruth King	Page 11
Egypt’s Unholy Claim To Sinai	David Isaac	Page 15
Dangerous Peacemaking	Daniel Greenfield	Page 18

## 'They Kill, We Build'

William Mehlman

It's hard to imagine anything more dispiriting than this shiva message from Benjamin Netanyahu to the parents and surviving children of Udi and Ruth Fogel, victims, with three of their children, of the Itamar massacre.

Clumsy and, however unintended, remarkably insensitive, it should have raised warning flags throughout Israel. For the words were barely out of the prime minister's mouth, when we were informed that the government had authorized the construction of 400 housing units in Ma'ale Adumim, Ariel, Efrat and adjoining areas of Gush Etzion.

Beyond its knee-jerk grasp for political capital out of the Itamar tragedy, the government's decision laid down, for all to witness, a link between Israel's right to provide shelter for its citizens and the sacrifices it brings to the transaction. What was once a normal exercise of sovereignty has become a function of the amount of blood Israel spills. Thus did 400 formerly "tref" apartment units become "kashered" in the blood of the Fogel family. All that's missing now is a table of commensurate values. If five Jewish bodies are worth 400 apartments, how many do we get for ten?

None of the foregoing makes the prospect of a "major foreign policy initiative" the prime minister was rumored to be preparing -- possibly for an upcoming visit to Washington -- any easier to contemplate. His last such "initiative," at Bar-Ilan University, resulted in his shredding his national Zionist credential in favor of a "two-state solution" aimed at wrenching yet a third "Palestinian State" -- Jordan and Gaza being the other two -- out of the heartland of Israel.

Israel was spared the immediate consequences of that dreadful decision at the subsequent "peace talks" only by its insistence on a military presence in the Jordan Valley, refusal to repartition Jerusalem, rejection of an extension of the freeze on Jewish housing construction and its demand for recognition as the nation-state of the Jewish people. That, needless to say, was the end of the "peace talks."

How many of those "red lines" remain visible in the wake of the Palestinian Authority's attempt to criminalize 330,000 Jewish residents of Judea, Samaria and the eastern neighborhoods of Jerusalem will depend on the mindset Mr. Netanyahu brings with him to Washington or wherever he ultimately decides to deliver his latest foreign policy thrust. The people of Israel, however, must stand firm in rejecting any alteration of those red lines in "recompense" for America's derailment of a UN Security Council "putsch" engineered by the Ramallah mafia. Its ultimate refusal to join that hanging party was not an Obama "gift." It was a reflection of his nation's 235 year moral legacy. However he may have been tempted, Mr. Obama would have violated it at his political peril.

Prime Minister Netanyahu would do us all an enormous favor by putting a hold on any new Middle East "peace" initiatives -- certainly until he gets a fix on the direction of the Arab world's volcanic transition from oligarchy and dictatorship. But if speak out he must, let it be in reaffirmation of Israel's sovereignty, its people's right to a maximum level of security and the inviolability of its 4,000-year connection to its land.

*(William Mehlman represents Americans for a Safe Israel in Israel.)*

## From the Editor April 2011

### Libya: Template for Israel?

While no friend of Israel can mourn the passage from the scene of Moammar Qaddafi, the means by which his probable removal is being achieved should give Israel grave concern. Frank Gaffney of the Center for Security Policy offers a scenario in which “the Qaddafi Precedent” is used to threaten military action against Israel. It begins with the PA securing a UN Security Council Resolution recognizing its unilateral declaration of statehood with Israel confined to the cease fire lines established in 1949. Hamas and Fatah bury the hatchet temporarily and call for international intervention to “liberate” their land.

That is indeed a possible scenario but the Libyan template does not even require UN Security Council recognition of a Palestinian state. British Foreign Minister Willaim Hague, in the immediate aftermath of the Security Council vote to implement a no-fly zone over Libya (soon interpreted to include general bombing of military targets) over Libya, announced what he viewed as the three criteria for military intervention in a sovereign nation). The first was a “need” (the plea for help by the anti-Qaddafi rebels), second international legitimacy (the Security Council vote), and third the support of the other states in the region (support of the Arab League). It won’t take more than a few rubber bullets for the PA (with huge media support) to shriek genocide; in the Security Council, Israel cannot even expect the five abstentions Libya achieved (perhaps the U.S. and one or two others); and as for support of other nations in the region, the offer of airplanes would not be limited to Qatar.

### Pedant Prigs

George Canning was an English statesman (briefly Prime Minister) who lived through the French Revolution and wrote trenchantly (in verse) about that revolution—and its English defenders. He denounced what he called “French philanthropy” which professed to love all mankind while eradicating every patriotic impulse. Canning described the individual who held these values as a “pedant prig” who “disowns a Briton’s part. And plucks the name of England from his heart.” Canning continues:

“No—through th’extended globe his feelings run

As broad and general as th’unbounded sun!

No narrow bigot he;--his reason’d view

Thy interests, England, ranks with thine, Peru!

France at our doors, he sees no danger nigh,

But heaves for Turkey’s woes the impartial sigh;

A steady patriot of the world alone,

The friend of every country—but his own.”

The lines bite today as much or more than they did then—they apply to those on the American left who pride themselves on their “universalism” and disdain for the United States and most especially to Jews both in this country and Israel who identify with their enemies and blind themselves to real dangers. To paraphrase Canning (courtesy of Ruth King), they are “pedant prigs who disown their Jewish part, and pluck the name of Israel from their heart.”

## Rabbinic Pedant Prigs

Unfortunately rabbis produce more than their share of pedant prigs who “disown their Jewish part” as they “heave for Islam’s woes.” A striking example are the rabbis who rallied against the hearings held by the House Committee on Homeland Security, led by Cong. Peter King, on the radicalization of American Muslims. The “interfaith” group protesting the hearings was organized by the Islamic Society of North America (ISNA, a front for the Muslim Brotherhood, has helped direct millions of dollars to Hamas). Not surprisingly, ISNA claims the hearings constitute “anti-Muslim bigotry.” Nor is it surprising to find beside ISNA’s Imam Mohamed Hagmagid Ali, the Rev. Michael Kinnanom, general secretary of the National Council of Churches, which for the last fifty years has never missed an opportunity to attack Israel. In fulsome demagogic mode, the Rev. Kinnanom declared the “assertion that Muslims have not spoken out forcefully enough against extremism “ is not merely wrong but “slanderous.” But what is Rabbi Marc Schneier doing “Shoulder to Shoulder” (the name of the campaign) with these enthusiasts for radical Islam? He, like Rabbi Jack Moline of the Rabbinical Assembly, clearly plays the role of useful idiot.

## Candid Imams

While Rabbis Schneier and Moline and their ilk provide a cloak of legitimacy for Muslim imams who play them for fools, Egyptian cleric Miqdam al-Khadhari lauds the viciously anti-Semitic textbooks used at Cairo’s Al Azhar, the preeminent institution of Sunni Islamic learning in the world. Below are excerpts from an interview with this cleric on Al-Rahma/Al-Rawdha TV which aired on Dec. 23, 2010 (courtesy of MEMRI).

Miqdam Al-Khadhari: We’ll take 11<sup>th</sup> grade because it is the most important grade, in which the youths are at a crucial stage of their lives. Let’s see what they are being taught at Al-Azhar. This is the 2007-2008 reader for the 11<sup>th</sup> grade. After four or five chapters, the book moves to a topic with a large title, as clear as day: “The Treachery of the Jews.”

Interviewer: Let’s show it to the viewers.

Miqdam al-Khadhari: It’s the main title, not just a subhead—The Treachery of the Jews. It’s an important topic. I haven’t seen any curriculum that presents this subject so explicitly. This is the curriculum of 2008. I’m not talking about something ancient. This is now!....Right after ‘The Treachery of the Jews’ I think that the camera can show the title...I’d like you to read it, dear brothers...‘Islamic Jihad and its Various Forms,’...They teach these topics so that the student will be militarized when he graduates. After the 11<sup>th</sup> grade, he can move from Al-Azhar to a military academy. The young man graduates with this in his blood—‘Islamic Jihad and Its Various Forms.’ I hope the camera can show it clearly....Look, when people want to know what their children are studying...This is Al-Azhar...The same Al-Azhar that opposed the British, fought the French, stood against the Tatars, and opposed the Crusader wars.’

## J Street—Jews for Self-Destruction

While imams call for Israel's destruction, a substantial number of Jews in this country are rallying around J Street, an organization whose claim to be "pro-Israel" is of the "If you believe this, I've a bridge in Brooklyn to sell you" variety.

There's much that's appalling about J Street.

To begin with, there's its success, at least in the short term. The Jewish Telegraphic Agency (JTA) reports that 2,400 people showed up at the March 2011 conference of the 3 year old organization.

Then there's the hatred of Israel that permeates so many of those who showed up, especially the extraordinarily stupid Jewish college students who seek to earn "progressive" credits by slashing Israel. The JTA reporter noted that many audience members applauded when a questioner on one panel asked why the U.S. doesn't impose economic sanctions on Israel and other activists complained that both J Street and Obama were too soft on Israel. One of the invited speakers was Rebecca Vilkomerson, executive director of Jewish Voice for Peace, which calls for divestment campaigns against "apartheid" Israel—her organization is classified by ADL as one of the top ten anti-Israel groups in the United States.

In addition, there's its funding. Along with some Arab money, much of it comes from George Soros and a mysterious (front?) Asian donor, neither Jewish nor American.

Then there are the number of "progressive" rabbis, i.e. "pedant prigs" who find a congenial home in J Street.

In some respects, J Street gives one a sense of déjà vu. It is the most recent

manifestation of the persistent attitudes among a certain portion of Jews that gave birth to Breira in 1977 and (after Breira died) to the New Jewish Agenda (also defunct) and New Israel Fund (unfortunately, still very much alive). Rabbis played an especially prominent role in Breira, to the point where this writer (and Erich Isaac) published an article "The Rabbis of Breira" (*Midstream*, April 1977) focusing on its appeal to rabbis who saw Jewish sovereignty as standing in the way of the universal Jewish mission, which required the purity of powerlessness.

What has changed since Breira and is of greatest concern is the attitude of the Jewish establishment toward those who turn against Israel, whether out of self-hatred, the urge to be part of political fashions (there is no political fashion more pervasive than the irrational assault on Israel) or to "save" the Jewish soul. The Israeli government and Jewish establishment organizations overwhelmingly denounced Breira. Shamefully (suicidally), Knesset members from Israel's Kadima and Labor Parties spoke at the J Street conference (as did, in their case, appropriately, spokesmen for several Hamas-supporting Muslim organizations). And J Street is starting to be accepted—a wolf into the sheep's fold-- into the Jewish mainstream organizational world. For example, it was given membership in the Westchester Jewish Council, which is funded by the United Jewish Appeal, i.e. charity dollars collected from the broad Jewish community. J Street, with its \$4 million war chest, does not need the money but the legitimacy it derives from receiving that money it does prize. The Jews who bestow that legitimacy are lemmings heading for the cliff.

## Better than Gold

Dore Gold offers rare hopeful news from Israel with major long-term political implications. The estimates for Israel's recently discovered off-shore gas fields keep growing. Estimates are now that the Levant Basin (most of it in Israel's jurisdiction) contains 122 trillion cubic feet of gas.

Even more dramatic, says Gold, is the potentiality for oil shale. Dr. Yuval Bartov, chief geologist for Israel Energy Initiatives, recently estimated that Israel's oil shale reserves are the equivalent of 250 billion barrels (compared with Saudi Arabia's estimated 260 billion barrels of reserves). What's more, according to Gold, new technologies are being developed in Israel to separate oil from shale deep underground, no longer using vast amounts of water and energy, thus bypassing the negative side-effects of existing methods.. The spread of this technology could move the center of gravity of world oil from Iran, Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf.

As Gold notes, Saudi Arabia's status grew as its position in providing the world with oil was appreciated. Israel is uniquely situated by its geographical position to direct its energy exports either to Europe or China and India. Writes Gold: "Western policies will not change overnight." Nonetheless, he says, Israel needs to tell the fully story of its newly emerging role in the world energy sector to alter the way it has been treated internationally.

## Who Needs Jewish Studies?

The University of California at Irvine has been criticized as perhaps the most hostile campus to Jewish students in the California state system—to the point where the local Jewish community has openly encouraged Jews to enroll elsewhere. Finally someone did

something right in this ugly atmosphere. In the wake of the disruption of Israeli Ambassador Michael Oren's speech on the UC Irvine campus in Feb. 2010, the District Attorney of Orange County filed criminal (misdemeanor) charges against the Muslim students responsible-- the first action taken against Muslims who make it impossible for pro-Israel speakers to be heard that might give them pause.

Reaction of the Jewish Studies departments in the University of California system? Indignation against those seeking to maintain freedom of speech. On March 3, 2011, twenty nine of those teaching in Jewish Studies expressed "deep distress" at his effort to "police student speech." They declared: "We strongly oppose the dangerous precedent set by the use of the criminal law against non-violent protests on campus. Therefore we urge the District Attorney to dismiss all criminal charges against these students."

In short, Jewish studies teachers take on the role of enablers of campus Muslim storm troopers.

## New York City Madrasa Flops

The first public school madrasa, a middle school in Brooklyn, is such a flop the city is closing it down. More than a third of its 114 students have been suspended this year according to the Dept. of Education. Fights, weapons, intimidation of teachers and other students—you name it. According to Sean R. Grogan, a science teacher at the school, "Something is flying through the air, every class, every day. Kids bang on the partitions, yell and scream, curse and swear. It's out of control."

Not surprisingly, much of the existing student body fled and others did not want to come. As the NY City Department of Education aseptically put it, the school was having

difficulty recruiting and maintaining middle school pupils.

Such is the power of multi-culti orthodoxy with a rich dose of dhimmitude, New York's Department of Education has announced it will replace the middle school madrassa with a high school madrassa.

## Tom Paulin

We received this reminder from Edward Alexander:

"In the aftermath of the Itamar massacre of five members of the Fogel family, Bret Stephens reminded *Wall Street Journal* reader that Oxford poet Tom Paulin had, "several years earlier," declared that West Bank Jewish settlers 'should be shot dead.' Back in 2003, in the wake of Mr. Paulin's declaration, I published, in the Israeli journal *NATIV*, an essay

urging that, instead of being appointed (as he had been) to lectureships and visiting professor posts at Harvard and Columbia, he should be prosecuted as an 'accessory to murder.' Now that we have had yet another instance of the existential realization of the 'ideas' of Palestinophiles and Judeophobes in crimes of which animals would be ashamed, I take the liberty of drawing attention to this essay. It argues that 'progressives' like Paulin should not be reading poems at Harvard or tutoring English majors at Columbia or Hertford, but contemplating the fitness of things inside a prison cell. See <http://www.acpr.org.il/English-NATIV/03-ISSUE/alexander-3.htm>

---

## Itamar and Gilad Farm

Jerold S. Auerbach

No sooner had our El Al flight landed at Ben-Gurion airport, a decade ago, than the bus awaiting our AFSI group took us to the small settlement of Itamar, near Nablus. A young Israeli soldier whose family lived there was the victim of a terrorist ambush. We went to his funeral.

We arrived in time to join his friends, neighbors, and mourners from nearby settlements, lining both sides of the road to the cemetery. The procession slowly wound its way up the hill from the synagogue, passing through our silent sorrow. Several minutes later came the crack of gunfire that accompanied burial. Itamar was our sad welcome to Israel.

Several days later we visited nearby Gilad Farm, an obscure and tiny hilltop outpost built on land privately owned by Moshe Zar. It was named in memory of his son Gilad, one of the founders of Itamar, who had been murdered by Palestinian terrorists in 2001 at the beginning of the second intifada. Gilad Farm, a small cluster of temporary homes with an unimpeded view of the Samarian hills, was an unauthorized outpost of little consequence to anyone but several handfuls of determined young Israelis who endured privation on a wind-swept hill and called it home.

Recently, at the end of February, Gilad Farm suddenly became newsworthy. In a burst

of state-inflicted violence ordered by Defense Minister Ehud Barak, Israeli police launched an early morning raid, demolishing its makeshift homes and shooting Jewish residents with plastic bullets – two of them in the back and one, who was filming the assault, in both knees. The unprovoked and gratuitously violent attack clearly surely was compensation from Prime Minister Netanyahu to the Obama administration for its recent veto of a Security Council resolution condemning Israeli settlements as illegal.

In mid-March came far more devastating news. Five members of the Fogel family in Itamar – parents Uri and Ruth, their sons 11 and 4 years old, and their 3-month-old daughter - were brutally murdered in their home by Palestinian terrorists who stabbed and slashed them to death. Tamar, their 12-year-old daughter, arrived at midnight from a youth group gathering to discover the appalling carnage, which (surely inadvertently) had spared two younger brothers.

Palestinian massacres are all too familiar to Itamar residents, twenty of whom have been murdered by terrorists during the past decade. One year after Gilad Zar was killed came the deaths of three teen-age yeshiva students. The following year, Rachel Shabo and three of her children were slain in their home. The Fogel tragedy – made visible worldwide with photos of the bloodbath released by permission of the family – was beyond horrifying. To stab a 3-month-old baby to death surely reaches the depths of depravity. In Rafah (Gaza), Hamas distributed candy and sweets in celebration.

Media coverage of the slaughter – when there was any – was predictable. The Associated Press reported that Itamar was

“home to some of the West Bank’s most fervent settlers.” Were 3-month-old Hadas and her murdered brothers “fervent settlers”? Do “fervent settlers” of any age deserve to be murdered in their homes? Covering the story for *The New York Times*, Isabel Kershner carefully noted the location of Itamar, overlooking the nearby Palestinian village of Awarta. It was a reminder of “the proximity underlining the visceral nature of the contest . . . between Jewish settlers and Palestinians over the land.” The implication was clear: it was Itamar’s fault for death from proximity.

Twenty thousand mourners escorted the slain members of the Fogel family to their burial in Jerusalem. A reporter noted that “the pouch containing the infant was no larger than a potato sack.” Chief Rabbi Yona Metzger told them that “more building is the answer.” It was a theme echoed by Knesset Speaker Reuven Rivlin: “We will continue to build, and to plant.” Even Prime Minister Netanyahu, for whom settlements have become more of a Zionist problem than its solution, told the parents of the Fogels when he visited their homes: “The terrorists shoot and we build.”

Indeed, the government settlement committee quickly approved the construction of 400-500 new housing units – but only in large settlement blocs expected to remain part of Israel in any peace agreement. Interior Minister Eli Yishai suggested 1000 new homes for each murdered member of the Fogel family. No one, least of all the Prime Minister, suggested that they be built in Itamar.

World and media opinion to the contrary, Jewish settlement in the Land of Israel has always defined Zionism. Settlements should be authorized, not because Palestinian terrorists murder innocent Israelis, but because



without continued settlement the security of the Jewish state becomes even more precarious than it already is.

Postscript: After the funerals, twelve-year-old Tamar Fogel asked to deliver a message. During shiva she recounted how the government of Israel forced her family to leave their Gaza home five years ago. Her parents, refusing to fight “against our brothers,” moved to Itamar “to build, to expand our nation.” Despite her devastating family tragedy, she told her interviewer: “Nothing that happens to the Jewish nation will break us. . . . They kill us, and

we build.” During Prime Minister Netanyahu’s condolence visit she pointedly reminded him that evacuation “causes strife between brothers.” From her horrific personal tragedy, Tamar Fogel inspires the State of Israel. As Psalm 8 teaches: “Out of the mouth of babes have you found strength.”

For the interview with Tamar Fogel:  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YzAzgnSy86w>

*Jerold S. Auerbach is the author of Brothers at War: Israel and the Tragedy of the Altalena, to be published in May by Quid Pro Books.*

---

## Libya: Sociology of a Revolution

Michel Gurfinkiel

Libya is made up of a narrow coastal strip, along the Mediterranean, where 90% of the population is concentrated, and an immense desert, three times the size of France. Historically Libya has been divided into three distinct regions: Cyrenaica, in the east, oriented toward Egypt and the Levant; Tripolitana, in the west, oriented toward the Maghreb and Europe; and the Fezzan, in the south, which looks toward the Sahel and black Africa. The foundation of the population is Berber, with contributions from Phoenecians, Greeks, Romans and finally Arabs in the coastal zone. During the first century of the Christian era, Cyrenaica included likewise a very vigorous Jewish or Judaizing population: it revolted twice against the Roman empire, in 73 A.D. after the destruction of the Second Temple, and in 115 A.D., seventeen years before Bar Kochba's

rebellion. The defeat of the second rebellion, in 117 A.D., led the total destruction of Judaism in the area and consequently, to the desertification of the region. A modern Jewish community was reconstituted after the Arab conquest. It was treated relatively well by the Italians, who colonized Libya between 1911 and 1943, even after the installation of a fascist regime. The Jewish community was then expelled by the Muslims, with extreme brutality, in 1945.

Libyan society is dominated on the one hand by tribes, on the other by religious movements: the latter most often rest upon tribal structures. The most powerful, the Senussiyya movement, is rooted in Cyrenaica. Its followers—the Senussis—preach the return of Islam to its origins: nonetheless with more moderation than the Wahhabites of Arabia or

the Moslem Brotherhood of Egypt. It was a Senussi chief, Mohammed al-Mahdi, who had laid the foundation of a modern Libyan state at the end of the 19th century, rebelling against the Ottomans, who had ruled the country since the 16th century. His nephew Idris directed the resistance against the Italians. Declared emir of Cyrenaica, then of Tripolitania in 1949, Idris in 1951 became king of a federal Libya, transformed into a unitary state in 1963. He conducted a conservative but pro-Western policy and stood aside from the Arab-Israel conflict.

Moammer Qaddafi was born in Sirte, on the Mediterranean coast, on the border of Tripolitania and Cyrenaica. But his tribe, the Qaddafi, Berber Arab nomads, is chiefly lodged in the south of Tripolitania, around the oasis of Hun. And the regime that was installed in 1969, following the military coup, constituted in this respect a revolt of the non-Senussi against the Senussia, the Tripolitarians against the Cyrenaicans. Latent during the first years of the reign, this orientation became fixed from 1978 on when Qaddafi, abandoning the Nasserite model he had earlier followed, put in place a "State of the popular masses"-the Jamahiriya-modeled on the Russian and Chinese communist regimes. In the cadre of this "revolution within the revolution" followers "liberated the mosques," vandalized their holy objects, persecuted their religious leaders, beginning with those who made use of the name of Senoussism, confiscated the goods of

religious foundations and imposed a form of "progressive" Islam.

Using the present crisis, the vanquished of 1969 and the excluded of 1978 take their revenge. It is no accident that Cyrenaica was the first region to reject the Qaddafi regime and that the rebels, in their National Council, unfurl the tricolor red-black-green flag of king Idris. In fact around fifteen years ago Qaddafi started to become aware of the return of fundamentalism and, something more alarming for him, for a development of Salafism and of movements like Al Qaeda. He tried to neutralize this development by reconciliation with the Senussis. In addition, on the advice of his son Saif al Islam al Qaddafi, to draw closer to the West: Americans as well as Europeans. But these overtures were too late, and too limited, to convince and succeed.

The fall of the regime could lead to the disintegration of Libya as a state, to a Senussi restoration (not necessarily in the form of a monarchy) or the installation of a regime close to Al Qaida. Whatever the outcome, current events throw a sharp light on the fragility of most Muslim countries.

*(Michel Gurfinkiel is a French journalist and former editor of the newsmagazine Valeurs Actuelles. His most recent book is Israel: Peut Il Survivre? This article has been translated from the French by Rael J. Isaac.)*

# The White Papers Then And Now

Ruth King

The ghosts of Clement Atlee and Ernest Bevin who were so instrumental in implementing the infamous White Paper of 1939 which doomed European Jewry must be chortling in hell. Almost a century after the Balfour Declaration the government of Israel itself is issuing White Papers against Jewish settlement in the Land of Israel.

On November 2, 1917, the British government issued the Balfour Declaration, brief but momentous for Jews.

*Dear Lord Rothschild,*

*I have much pleasure in conveying to you, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations which has been submitted to, and approved by, the Cabinet:*

*"His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country".*

*I should be grateful if you would bring this declaration to the knowledge of the Zionist Federation.*

*Yours sincerely  
Arthur James Balfour*

By the time that declaration was written, there was a thriving Jewish population in Palestine. Tel-Aviv was begun in 1909; Degania, the first kibbutz was settled in 1910; and the coastal boroughs of Tel-Aviv-Bat Yam, Givat'ayim, Herzlia, Holon, Ramat Gan and Ramat HaSharon, which became independent municipalities were being developed and settled. Among the large towns of Palestine, Jerusalem was biggest and most important. In 1911 its 60,000 inhabitants included 7,000 Muslims, 9,000 Christians, and 40,000 Jews. In 1912, the cornerstone of Technion -the Israel Institute of Technology was laid in Haifa.

Cultural, social, and scientific institutions grew as the historic homeland was reborn. In 1918, Hadassah established the American Zionist Medical Unit (AZMU) which established six hospitals in Palestine, and also founded a nursing school and a Hygiene Department to give routine examinations to Jerusalem school children including Arabs.

But as the Arabs rioted in Palestine, the British began the long process of betrayal. The first White Paper on Palestine (under the aegis of then Colonial Secretary Winston Churchill) was issued in June of 1922: *'Unauthorized statements have been made to the effect that the purpose in view is to create a wholly Jewish Palestine... the terms of the Declaration referred to do not contemplate that Palestine as a whole should be converted into a Jewish National Home, but that such a home should be founded "in Palestine."* Under this White Paper Britain partitioned Palestine, deeding 76% of the original Mandate to Emir Abdullah I bin al-

Hussein of Mecca who had no historic ties to Palestine whatsoever. In 1925, the British added 60,000 sq. km. of desert to eastern Transjordan.

The document did include reassurances to the Jews: *"So far as the Jewish population of Palestine is concerned it appears that some among them are apprehensive that His Majesty's Government may depart from the policy embodied in the Declaration of 1917. It is necessary, therefore, once more to affirm that these fears are unfounded, and that that Declaration, re-affirmed by the Conference of the Principal Allied Powers at San Remo and again in the Treaty of Sevres (the formal end of the Ottoman Empire War with the Allies of World War One) is not susceptible of change."*

Significantly, it added: *'During the last two or three generations the Jews have recreated in Palestine a community, now numbering 80,000... it is essential that it should know that it is in Palestine as of right and not on the sufferance. That is the reason why it is necessary that the existence of a Jewish National Home in Palestine should be internationally guaranteed, and that it should be formally recognized to rest upon ancient historic connection.'*

But the Churchill White Paper already hinted at restrictions on Jewish immigration to even that part of Palestine still dedicated to a Jewish National Home: *"For the fulfillment of this policy it is necessary that the Jewish community in Palestine should be able to increase its numbers immigration.... This immigration cannot be so great in volume as to exceed whatever may be the economic capacity of the country at the time to absorb new arrivals. It is essential to ensure that the immigrants should not be a burden upon the*

*people of Palestine as a whole, and that they should not deprive any section of the present population of their employment."*

In spite of British appeasement, Arab violence and massacres against the Jews of Palestine escalated. But Jewish immigration also continued and in 1930, the Passfield White Paper was issued. This warned that unlimited Jewish immigration was becoming an economic and security burden for the British. Adding insult to injury, the White Paper blamed the Jews and Arabs equally for the 'violence'. In *Trial and Error* Chaim Weitzman wrote '... it [the Passfield White Paper] was considered by all Jewish friends of the National Home, Zionist and non-Zionist alike, and by a host of non-Jewish well-wishers, as rendering, and intending to render, our work in Palestine impossible.'

In a letter read in the House of Commons Prime Minister Ramsey Macdonald sought to allay Zionist fears denying that there was any intention to stop immigration. In fact, immigration increased but so did Arab violence.

Jews persevered in building a nation despite the violence. On April 1, 1925 the Hebrew University of Jerusalem (whose cornerstone was laid in 1918) was opened at a ceremony featuring Earl Balfour. The Palestine Symphony Orchestra was founded in 1936 and quickly drew top-flight persecuted Jewish musicians from Europe; the Weizmann Institute in Rehovoth was founded in 1934; two institutes which led to the founding of Tel Aviv University after statehood, the "Biological-Pedagogical Institute" and "Superior School for Law and Economy" were founded in 1931 and in 1935 respectively.

Continued Arab rioting led to new British efforts at appeasement. In July 1937 the British Peel Commission recommended further limits on Jewish immigration and proposed a new partition leaving Jews a fraction of the land left after the 1922 partition. The recommendations were rejected but the pressure on the Jews continued to grow culminating in the White Paper of 1939.

The St. James Conference of 1939, which brought Chaim Weitzman and Jewish leaders face to face with the Mufti Haj Amin al-Husseini and Arab representative from Egypt, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Transjordan and Yemen was a complete failure. The Arabs refused to meet with the Jews shutting off any prospect of bilateral negotiations. The British responded with yet another betrayal. The White Paper of 1939 effectively cut off Jewish immigration to Palestine on the eve of the Holocaust. It was a death sentence for millions of European Jews. The White Paper limited immigration to 75,000 Jews over a period of five years and made any further immigration subject to Arab acquiescence.

The irony is that this did nothing to win Arab support in the war against Hitler. On the other hand, Jewish enlistment in the British Armed Forces was high and the performance of Jewish soldiers was praised widely. In *The Forgotten Ally*, journalist Pierre van Paassen detailed the enormous contribution of the Jewish Palestine Brigades to the war effort.

Unlike present day Great Britain, where legislators from both parties vie for the title of most hostile to Israel, there were noble dissenters in Great Britain.

On 10 March 1942, in the House of Lords, Welsh peer (and former Liberal MP)

Baron Davies made a stirring speech criticizing Britain's systematic appeasement of the Arabs of Palestine. He quoted earlier words of then Prime Minister Churchill, who was now upholding the vicious provisions of the White Paper:

*"Let me recall to you the view expressed by the present Prime Minister as recently as May, 1939. This is what he said: "To whom was the pledge of the Balfour Declaration made? It was not made to the Jews in Palestine, it was not made to those who were actually living in Palestine. It was made to World Jewry and in particular to the Zionist associations. It was in consequence, and on the basis, of this pledge that we received important help in the war, and that after the war we received from the Allied and Associated Powers the Mandate for Palestine. This pledge of a home of refuge, of an asylum, was not made to the Jews in Palestine but to the Jews outside Palestine, to that vast, unhappy mass of scattered, persecuted, wandering Jews whose intense, unchanging, unconquerable desire has been for a National Home.... It is not with the Jews in Palestine that we have now or at any future time to deal, but with World Jewry, with Jews all over the world."*

In his summation, Baron Davies noted how British actions were counterproductive to the war effort: *"Now, of course, all these Jews who could have been mobilized at that time in what are now enemy-occupied countries have become, in effect, slaves of Hitler, and they are entirely lost to us."* And at the end, condemning deliberate censorship of the contribution of Jewish fighters to the Allied cause, he stated: *The whole thing has a Nazi smell about it, and I cannot help feeling that it does show the*

*extraordinary way in which our Administration carries on affairs in Palestine.*

Lord Wedgewood spoke after Lord Davies:

*"We have had twenty-two years of this policy – this attempt to appease the Arabs, this continual bias against the Jews. Now we are in the middle of a desperate war fighting for our own lives. Cannot we, even now, revise that policy and provide ourselves with friends who can fight and die --friends who dare not surrender. We might get as good an example from these people in Palestine as we are getting from the Russian morale. We are throwing it all away through a stupid prejudice carried to excess in Palestine and, believe me, my Lords, carried to excess in this country also."*

Noble men they were, but the 1939 White Paper remained the basis of British policy even after the end of World War II. Its cruel provisions kept wretched survivors of the Holocaust trapped in hostile European nations or behind barbed wire in detention camps in Cyprus. Furthermore, as jihad against Jewish citizens mounted in Arab countries, almost a million more persecuted Jews were kept out of Palestine by British fiat.

The White Paper was only abrogated by the new Israeli government in 1948.

The rest, as they say, is history. But, what can one make of a nation reborn in the

teeth of British White Papers, genocide, and a series of wars by neighbors bent on its annihilation that now declares its own White Papers on itself?

The Camp David treaty was a White Paper in which the seeds of partition were planted under the guise of "autonomy;" the Oslo Accords were a White Paper that surrendered Jewish patrimony to terrorists bent on obliterating Israel; the Wye plantation agreement was a White Paper that surrendered Jewish rights to Hebron, the cradle of the Jewish faith.

The so-called two state solution is the ultimate White Paper, that would allot Israel's religious heartland and its strategic heights to avowed enemies; it would divide Jerusalem; it would uproot hundreds of thousands of Jews from their homes; it would bring nation-building to an end; it would abrogate the mandate of Zionism to provide a safe haven for endangered Jews even as anti-Semitism boils; it will trap six million Jews in indefensible borders.

Israel triumphed in spite of the infamous British White Papers. But can it survive its own?

*(I am indebted to the Australian historian who blogs under the name of Daphne Anson, at <http://daphneanson.blogspot.com/> for the quotes from Baron Davies and Lord Wedgewood.)*

## Egypt's "Unholy" Claim to Sinai

David Isaac

"After President Mubarak steps down and a provisional government is formed, there is a need to dissolve the peace treaty with Israel," said Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood leader Rashad al-Bayoumi in an interview on Russian television. Kamal Helbawi, another leader of the Brotherhood, echoed this statement, saying "We cannot respect such agreements and won't approve of them."

Not to be outdone, Dr. Ayman Nur, leader of the liberal secular Tomorrow Party, and as Jerusalem Post columnist Caroline Glick points out, "the man heralded as the liberal democratic alternative to Mubarak by Washington neo-conservatives," announced on Egyptian radio: "The Camp David Accords are over. Egypt has to at least conduct negotiations over conditions of the agreement."

However you say chutzpah in Arabic, these Egyptian leaders have plenty of it. It takes nerve to suggest the renegotiation of a treaty their country never implemented – Egypt shelved the treaty and ignored its provisions once it had the Sinai neatly tucked into its pocket.

But if it's a renegotiation the Egyptians want, Israel ought to oblige. Renegotiation should start where negotiations began, with Israel controlling the Sinai, and specifically with an eye to Egyptian claims to that territory.

The fact of the matter is that Egypt has never had more than a tenuous historical connection to the Sinai Peninsula. This is pertinent as President Anwar Sadat based his claim to the area by cynically describing it as "holy" soil. Asked by an American journalist why

he insisted that Israel evacuate the Sinai, Sadat declared: Sinai is "part of our land," and "I cannot give up an inch of our land."

But Israel has at least as much right – indeed more right – to Sinai than Egypt. As Shmuel Katz, an advisor to Menachem Begin and author of "Battleground: Fact and Fantasy in Palestine", pointed out, Sinai was not historically part of Egyptian territory. It was a political no man's land. In an agreement between Britain and the Ottoman Empire in 1906, "Egypt was given the job of administering Sinai, but it wasn't given sovereignty over Sinai. It meant that if Egypt used this administered territory to make a war on Israel, there was certainly no historic reason for us to give back Sinai," Katz said.

Katz's claim is backed up by an in-depth 76-page report issued by the Israel Ministry of Justice in 1971. The report examined competing claims to the Sinai. Its conclusion was apparently too controversial for then-Foreign Minister Abba Eban, who had the report suppressed.

On page 70, the report states: "Upon the break-up of the Turkish Empire at the end of the First World War and its renunciation under the Treaty of Lausanne 1923 of rights and titles to certain largely undefined territories, including Sinai, a void was created because there was no formal disposition of Turkish Sovereignty either by cession or annexation or in any other formal manner as happened with other Turkish territories which were placed under a number of mandates or otherwise 'legally' disposed of. The diplomatic fiction of

Egyptian independence 'granted' by Britain in 1922 and its extensions in 1936 and 1954 did not and does not alter the formal situation. The abstract title to Sinai still remains outstanding to be acquired by one or other mode recognized under international law."

The British themselves affirm this. In the wake of the 1956 war in which Israel first took the Sinai, Richard Meinertzhagen, who was military advisor to the Middle East Department of the British Colonial Office from 1921-24, wrote in a letter to the Times of London on Feb. 9, 1957: "Sir: Mr. Ben Gurion [is quoted] as saying that he did not attack Egypt proper. That assertion is perfectly true. The Israeli army attacked and occupied No man's land. In 1926, Lord Lloyd asked the Foreign Office if the 1906 agreement was still valid and was told that it was. This was personally confirmed to me by Lloyd in 1928. Egypt's only rights in Sinai are administrative and these have been abused by using Sinai as a base for fedayeen raids and erecting coastal batteries at the mouth of the Gulf of Akaba."

C.S. Jarvis, governor of Sinai after it was attached to Egypt by the British following their conquest of the Peninsula in World War I, wrote in his book "Three Deserts" (John Murray, 1936): "(The administration of Sinai) ... was the illegitimate offspring of the British Army ... and the Egyptian Ministry of Finance was asked to accept paternity. This they never did willingly ... having been conceived and brought into the world by purely British influence, it was treated by the Egyptian Government from the first with studied neglect."

Several years after the Six Day War, Eliezer Livneh, a long-time leader in the Labor Party and a founder of the Land of Israel Movement, investigated Sadat's claims that Sinai was part of Egypt.

"The question here is fundamental," Livneh wrote. "Is the Sinai Peninsula in fact Egypt, or part of Egypt? Has Sinai ever constituted a part of Egypt throughout its long history? Have the Egyptians treated Sinai as if it were part of their homeland? Have they felt it as part of their homeland? The answer to all these is negative, unequivocally and absolutely."

"The Egyptians saw Sinai as a foreign territory, at the most a border colony, and they treated it accordingly," Livneh wrote. "[T]he Cairo government did nothing to populate and develop the Peninsula, in spite of Egypt's overabundant population and the tremendous birthrate in the Nile Valley. The sole agricultural development project was initiated during the 1920s, by the British governor, C.S. Jarvis. The oil wells of Abu Rudeis were initiated, financed and established by Italians."

"With the rise of the Nasser regime Cairo's attention turned to Sinai and Sinai was to some extent 'developed': developed as a base of aggression against Israel. This reached its peak in May 1967 when a force of some one hundred thousand Egyptian troops together with full armor, air and logistic support were concentrated in Sinai. Sinai became the 'homeland' of Egyptian imperialism," Livneh wrote.

Even the most cursory review of Egypt's recent history bears this out. In 1948, Egypt joined with four other Arab states in an attempt to crush Israel at birth. Egypt lost the war but not its desire for Israel's destruction. It trained Arab terrorists, or fedayeen, to carry out raids inside Israel, murdering women and children. It conducted this six year campaign of terror despite having signed an Armistice Agreement with Israel in 1949.

In an effort to end such incursions, Israel successfully captured the entire Peninsula in the Sinai campaign of 1956, only to be



pressured by President Eisenhower to relinquish it, a decision he later regretted. The Egyptians, with the Sinai again in their hands, upped the ante, and began preparing for the Six Day War. Losing that one in spectacular fashion, they then waged the War of Attrition, until Anwar Sadat took the reins of power and put an end to it, not because he wanted peace, but in order to prepare for his own effort to destroy Israel in what would become known as the Yom Kippur War.

Indeed, such has been Egyptian hostility toward Israel, that if the Sinai is holy soil, as Sadat claimed it was in the 1970s, it was holy first and foremost to the Jews, who consecrated the land with their blood.

Even in ancient times, one sees a surprising continuity of attitude among Egyptians towards Sinai. In the course of its long history, Egypt has conquered Sinai from time to time and indeed it also conquered Palestine and Syria, Libya and the Sudan. But such imperialist and colonialist expansion did not make these lands Egypt, not even in the consciousness of the Egyptians themselves, who continued to regard them as foreign, albeit vanquished and tributary territories to be looted, if necessary depopulated, or in the case of Sinai to be used as a source of minerals from slave-operated mines.

The crucial views of ancient Egyptian, Greek, and Biblical sources all have one thing in common – the recognition that not only the Sinai itself but the land to the west as far as the Nile is not Egypt. At the beginning of the historical period, the Egyptians placed the frontier between Egypt and “abroad” between the Damietta and Tannitic branch of the Nile. In Pyramid Texts, the god of Busiris was considered protector of the eastern frontier. Saft el Henna, located almost 35 miles due west

from Ismailia and the Suez Canal was a frontier outpost against Asian enemies.

Three Biblical texts fix the border of the Land of Israel in the eastern tributary of the Nile delta (Genesis 15:18, Joshua 13:3, Chronicles I, 13:5). One additional text explicitly includes the land of Goshen (east of the Nile delta) in the borders of Israel (Joshua 11:16).

And Herodotus (5th century B.C.), presenting the views of the Greek geographers, wrote “the Ionians say nothing is really Egypt but the delta.”

And what of Israel’s claim to Egypt? The Israeli side at the renegotiating table – in addition to dusting off that impressive 1971 Israel Ministry of Justice report – might look to Eliezer Livneh, who made a heartfelt case for the Jewish ties to the Sinai Peninsula when it was still in Israel’s hands.

“Were it not for Sinai, Israel would not have come into existence. Were it not for Israel, Sinai would be unknown. The memories and lessons of Sinai, its mountains and valleys, its oases and springs, its flora and fauna are all writ deep in the whole of Jewish experience, throughout its generations and literary expressions – in the Bible and the Talmud, the Midrashim and in modern Hebrew poetry.

“The feeling and sense of identity, the ties and devotion that have arisen in today’s generation of Israeli youth through meeting with Sinai are an expression of a deep-rooted acquaintance, a hidden yearning: we have already been here! There is no place in all the Land of Israel, with the exception of Jerusalem, which arouses such deep and clear emotions and associations as Sinai. The urge to explore and the desire to settle Sinai – from Nahal Diklah to the tip of the Peninsula – reflects something hidden within the Jewish soul, awaiting expression and fulfillment.

"Has such a thing happened with the Egyptians? Is it possible, indeed fair to demand such a love from them? For them Sinai is a desert; for Israel that desert is the very source of life."

*(David Isaac is the former executive director of Americans for A Safe Israel, and worked for*

*many years as a reporter and editorial writer for a national business newspaper. He is currently e-Editor of a Web site dedicated to Shmuel Katz, the Zionist biographer, essayist and historian. This article appeared in the Connecticut Jewish Ledger of March 2.)*

---

## How Israel's Peacemaking Endangers Itself and the Stability of the Region

Daniel Greenfield

When Israeli leaders embarked on peace negotiations with the Islamic-Marxist terrorists who called themselves representatives of the ""Palestinian people", they hoped to improve relations with the Muslim world. But not only did Israel not succeed in improving relations with the Muslim world, but its bid for peace has actually destroyed its old relationships which were built on a certain respect for Israel's staying power.

The more Israel has traded land for peace, the more its staying power has diminished. There is no better place to see that shift than in Turkey, formerly Israel's closest ally in the Muslim world. That relationship was built not on mutual friendship, but mutual respect. Today Turkish Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoglu envisions a region in which Israel ceases to exist and is replaced by a Muslim-Jewish protectorate of Turkey. In 1986 that vision would have gotten him laughed off the podium when through war after war, Israel proved that it would not be pushed into the sea. But in 2011, with two Muslim terrorist states under international protection inside its own borders, and an American administration pushing for a handover of half its capital, Davutoglu's vision of the destruction of Israel

has become the basis for Turkish policy toward Israel. And the only way that Jerusalem can improve its relations with Ankara is to change that perception of its destructibility.

The so-called Peace Process has dramatically undermined Israel's viability as a state in perception and reality. And American and European pressure on Israel to create a terrorist state within its borders has undermined regional stability and sped up the process of regional Islamization. Israel has gone from a regional power capable of guaranteeing the security of American-allied neighbors such as Jordan, to a state under siege by rockets falling on its own towns and villages. If Turkey's Islamists needed proof that Iran was the future and Israel the past, Hamas has been helpfully supplying it.

A post-Israel region is the brainchild of the same Leftist-Islamist alliance behind the overthrow of Mubarak. Their method for realizing that vision has been the constant stress on Israel's responsibility to create a Palestinian state as the only means of bringing peace and stability to the region. Arab leaders were only too happy to echo the call in order to distract attention from their own local tyrannies. Now those same leaders are falling

and the region is less stable than ever, despite two decades of misanthropic peacemaking with red-handed terrorists. Will the Saudis reconsider their campaign against Israel now that it stands as the only regional counterweight between the Iran and them. Probably not, because Israel has become too weak to be respected.

By agreeing to the peace initiatives of western powers looking to appease the Muslim world, Israel has destroyed its own relations with them for the same reason. Israel's ties with the American people might be based on religious and cultural values-- but its ties with the United States government have always been based on mutual interest.

The relations of the United States and Israeli governments did not derive from religious values-- but from growing Soviet influence in the area. The Kennedy Administration turned to Israel as a potential ally when the fall of the old colonial backed monarchies and the rise of new Soviet allied regimes endangered American influence in the region. For all the rose colored romanticism and the breathy conspiracy theories about the Jewish lobby that the US-Israel relationship has been cloaked in, it was always one of mutual interest. The JFK and Golda Meir quips or AIPAC's lobbying were frosting on the cake, but they weren't the cake. The cake was that the US needed a stable regional ally as a proxy for American interests and Israel needed to align itself with a world power.

During the Cold War when countries were being labeled in one of two colors in a global game of chess, that alliance stayed strong. But with the fall of the USSR, the Western powers decided to employ Israel in a sacrifice play to the Muslim world. Israel was still a powerful piece, but one that no longer fit in the new game. The new gameboard was no

longer a polar match between two global coalitions, but every country for itself. And by sacrificing Israel, Western governments hoped to 'capture' alliances with more valuable Muslim countries. It was a treacherous move, but one that Israel should have been prepared for over the years. Instead Israeli leaders convinced themselves that some arrangement with the terrorist gangs was in their interest. An arrangement that has gone from an autonomous territory to an independent state with its capital in Jerusalem. And even as a new Cold War began forming, with the Muslim world aligned against the free world, Western governments have kept on making the same sacrifice play over and over again. With the same results. Israel is weakened, and the Muslim world remains unappeased.

At a meeting with Jewish leaders, Barack Hussein Obama told them to "search your souls" over whether Israel really wants to make peace. But all those leaders need to search is Israeli cemeteries filled with the graves of thousands of victims of the peace process. Perhaps there they can search the souls of the thousands of men, women and children, blown up in restaurants, gunned down in schools and on roads, tortured to death in the No-Go Zones of the Palestinian Authority. They are, in the memorably gruesome words of Rabin, "Sacrifices for Peace", human sacrifices served up on the burning altar of diplomacy in an endless holocaust of appeasement. Every inch of territory that Israel has given up into the hands of terrorists, has been used as the front line of terrorism. If Israelis are less eager to be served up as human sacrifices to the Muslim Moloch, that should call for soul searching not by them, but by the Western governments who have blindly supported Muslim terrorists leaders Arafat and Abbas, and their murderous campaign against Israeli civilians.

Under Netanyahu, Israel has come to play the role of the reluctant sacrifice. Unwilling to say yes, but unwilling to say no, either. Too polite to object to its own execution. And so by way of momentum, no has become yes. As it always does when the victim is unwilling to take a firm stand and deliver a firm, "NO". The slippery slope of concessions is still sliding. Netanyahu hopes to ride it out long enough till Obama and his "enormous hostility toward Israel" is out of office, but he is more likely to end up buried underneath it. That is what happened in his first term. And even if Obama loses in 2012, it is still no solution. Obama may be going further than anyone has before him, but like Davutoglu he could not do it if the model weren't already there. Whoever succeeds him will almost certainly pick up where he left off.

The model is that Israel makes "Sacrifices for Peace" until either the region is stable or the Jewish state ceases to exist. Since the region becomes more unstable as Israel continues to weaken itself, the appeasement must go on until Israel is destroyed. Or until it finally finds a leader with the courage to say, "NO" and mean it. For two decades Israel has stood at the execution block, trying to negotiate peace by piece. "How about a finger, sir. Or my left big toe, I don't use it much anyway. My right foot then, it's far out there and populated by settlers, and my chest will be more defensible without it. Not good enough? Alright then, both my feet and half the fingers on my left hand. But that's here I draw the line!" But the line is always drawn at the neck. Sooner or later it always gets down to the head of the matter.

A terrorist state was never workable as a means of stabilizing the region. But as a way of whittling down Israel to the point of non-existence, it has performed brilliantly. And by

undermining Israel, the road was open to bringing down every marginally Westernized country in the region. The AKP took over Turkey, instituting an EU approved regime of terror against opposition politicians and journalists. The Islamists are on the rise in Tunisia. And without their victory in Gaza, the Muslim Brotherhood might never have succeeded in toppling Mubarak. The fall of Turkey and Egypt's secular governments marks an end to Western influence in the region. And Israel remains alone, a flickering candle in the growing dark. If it goes out, the hour of the Caliphate comes.

But who benefits from this scenario? Western leftists are playing the anarchist to the Muslim bolshevik, tearing down the system with no real concern for what rises in its place. Their wonderland of democracy and civil rights is as real as Utopia and Erehwon. Already the persecution of Christian Copts in Egypt has reached a fevered pitch. And International Women's Day was marked in Tahrir Square with assaults on the few hundred women that dared show up by men shouting that their call for equality was against Islam. Like Lara Logan, they had to be rescued by Egyptian soldiers, who after the removal of Mubarak, represent the only alternative to Muslim mob rule. And as goes Egypt, so goes the region.

When Western governments made their sacrifice play of Israel in the early 90's they were playing from a position of strength. Now they are the weaker players, besieged by oil money and immigrant demographics, with the pointed towers of minarets rising around them, while their own sources of strength falter and fall. The European hand-wringing over multiculturalism and America electing a wartime leader with a Muslim background so he could tour the world and reassure Muslims of our good intentions are signs of drastic

weakness. In the nineties Western governments were using Israel for their sacrifice play, now they are reduced to sacrificing their own countries and values in the hopes of appeasing the growing rage of Islam. A growing rage fed to fury by their own concessions.

American influence in the Middle East began to wane under Carter, but it has been completely destroyed in only two years of Obama. Western leaders prattle about imposing a No Fly Zone over Libya, as if that would matter in a conflict that will be decided by fast running gun battles between mercenaries and rebels on pickup trucks, and even the occasional scimitar. The left has gotten what it wanted. The West exists now only exists as a market for Muslim oil and surplus populations. And the Islamists have gotten what they wanted, a chance to seize power through populism. If Israel is going to survive that environment, it will not do so through concessions or by riding the merry go round of Western diplomacy.

The Munich Pact between Chamberlain and Hitler has been characterized as "the nadir of diplomacy-- a personal deal between two men at the expense of a third party." That aptly describes the sacrifice play in which panicked Western countries compel Israel to make sacrifices to appease the Muslim world. Chamberlain described the pact as "the last desperate snatch at the last tuft on the very verge of the precipice." That too describes the present day attitudes of Western leaders snatching at tufts of grass to avoid going down into the precipice of the Jihad. Lord Birkenhead, at the time the pusillanimous Lord Halifax's parliamentary secretary, described Chamberlain's pleading with Hitler for peace as, "effusive in the eagerness to continue the process of surrender."

The French went into the Munich Pact with a proposal for the occupation of portions of Czechoslovakia by German troops. If Hitler agreed to their proposal, they would "demand acceptance from the Czech government. If Czechoslovakia refused, conclusions could be drawn which did not need to be defined more closely." The conclusion being that either Czechoslovakia could cooperate with a French proposal for its own dismantling, or it could be dismantled without the utterly useless 'guarantees' of the French government. Two years later, German troops would be occupying France and the men who had sold out Czechoslovakia would watch German troops march through Paris.

But men have a way of learning nothing from history. Karel Schwarzenberg, the Czech Republic's foreign minister, has rejected any comparison of Israel and Czechoslovakia, saying that, "Czechoslovakia in 1938 had no friendly neighbors... but Israel has quite an important ally in the US." Much like Czechoslovakia had important allies in England and France. Schwarzenberg also rejected any analogy between the West Bank and the Sudetenland, saying that the West Bank "belongs" to the Palestinians, "They are the main inhabitants. The analogy doesn't work." But of course it does. Ethnic Germans were the main inhabitants of the Sudetenland. As an ethnic German himself, Schwarzenberg should know that. But the facts of history are ground under as the perfidy of one era melds into the next. Despicable betrayals turn respectable with time. For all of Schwarzenberg's general friendliness to Israel, he does not want Czechoslovakia to be thought of as another Israel. No country does.

That is what the so-called Peace Process has truly accomplished, to turn Israel into a pariah, not for any crimes, but for its weakness.

After WW2, no country wanted to be the next Czechoslovakia, today no country wants to be the next Israel or Yugoslavia-- carved up to pacify Muslim demands for "Lebensraum". Israel's own cooperativeness has isolated it. Each generation of compromise, each concession short of annihilation, has only brought it to the international isolation of the impatient, the world waiting for it to be thrown into the volcano of Muslim rage to calm their fury.

The Muslim world's wars against Israel succeeded in making it into an example of resistance to the Jihad. But Western pressure and the weakness of Israeli leaders has turned it into a cautionary example instead. Israel now stands internationally isolated. Its allies in the West and the Muslim world are lining up to turn

their backs on it. And in that silence, waits a desperate lesson to be learned. That paradoxically Israel can only have peace, when it refuses it. And that it can only avoid war by being ready and willing to fight it. No romantic notions about its ties to the United States or the goodwill that can come from creating a Palestinian state will save it. They will only destroy it, as they have been destroying it until now. Only by refusing to be Czechoslovakia, but rather Finland, can Israel weather the coming storm. Only by standing tall will it find the room to breathe again. Only by giving up on peace, can it have peace again.

*(Daniel Greenfield blogs as Sultan Knish. This appeared on his blog of March 9.)*