

---

# OUTPOST



October 2011—Issue #247

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

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

## Table of Contents

Editorial – Anarchy At Turtle Bay	William Mehlman	Page 2
From The Editor	Rael Jean Isaac	Page 3
Administrative Detention vs Jewish Nationalists	Adina Kutnicki	Page 5
Baron Maurice De Hirsch	David Isaac	Page 8
That Beilinesque Set Of Mind	Sarah Honig	Page 9
A Vote For Independence?	Steven Plaut	Page 11
A Museum At Atlit	Nurit Greenger	Page 13
By What Right?	Ruth King	Page 14

## Anarchy at Turtle Bay

William Mehlman

Barring a zero-hour capitulation by Israel to Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas' insistence on the 1949 Arab-Israeli armistice lines and a renewed halt to Jewish construction in Judea and Samaria as starting points for revived "peace" negotiations, the UN General Assembly may have overwhelmingly approved the PA's bid for recognition of Palestine as the world body's 194th member by the time you read these words.

The spectacle of a rump entity, dependent on Western charity and Israeli protection from its terrorist partner, demanding the status of a sovereign nation might have furnished the plot-line for a comic opera, were it not for its potential for further inflaming a Middle East plagued by an Islamist-bent "Arab Spring" and a growing Turkish appetite for a fight with Israel. As things stand, we'll have to settle for another fun-filled episode of "Barack Obama's Chickens Coming Home to Roost." Lest we may have forgotten as we watched the President's surrogates scurrying between Ramallah and Jerusalem in a last-ditch effort to head off a General Assembly decision he will be forced to veto in deference to his reelection chances, it was Mr. Obama who put the cat among the pigeons last year when he gave voice to the thrill he anticipated in greeting Palestine as a "proud new member of the United Nations" on his next visit to Turtle Bay. It was a fitting sequel to Mr. Obama's earlier venture into chicken diplomacy, his Jewish construction freeze, whose perpetuation became the PA's *sine qua non* for any further discussions with Israel.

All of this is by way of prelude to the main attraction: the UN's complicity in a diplomatic illegality not witnessed since the 1922 League of Nations decision to look the other way as its Covenant, its Mandate and the Balfour Declaration were shredded with the British handover of 78 percent of Palestine to the Hashemite kingdom. The PA's unilateral statehood petition is illegal on several major counts. It obliterates the Oslo Accords, which condition any disposition of the territories comprising the "West Bank" on a negotiated peace settlement. The UN was witness to and a vocal advocate of the Oslo Accords. They bear the signature of Yitzhak Rabin. The hundreds of thousands in Israel and abroad who annually gather to commemorate the slain prime minister ought to be troubled by this debasement of his "legacy." The UN's staging of this diplomatic "breaking and entering," moreover, makes confetti of its own Resolutions 242 and 338, both of which stress negotiation as the bedrock of any final agreement.

The greatest damage the UN will have inflicted on itself in sanctioning a unilateral Palestinian statehood bid is to its own charter. The General Assembly action violates Article 80 of that document, which preserves intact all of the rights granted the Jewish people under the League of Nations Mandate for Palestine. As pointed out by international attorney and author\* Howard Grief and confirmed by former Israeli UN ambassador Dr. Dore Gold, Article 80 is a guarantor against any alteration of Jewish rights to Palestine and the Land of Israel enumerated in the Mandate, absent an intervening agreement converting the Mandate into a Trusteeship. "The only time that could have occurred," Grief submits in a recent paper on the subject, "was during the three-year period between the October 24th 1945 inception of the UN Charter and the May 14th-15th expiration of the Mandate. That did not happen and so those rights, including the right of Jews to immigrate freely to the Land of Israel and establish settlements, as stipulated in Article 6 of the Mandate, remain in full force and effect." "The United Nations," he adds, "has no power to transfer those rights to any non-Jewish entity such as the Palestinian Authority."

The Palestinian Authority, in assigning to the rubbish heap the Oslo Accords, which awarded it full control over Area A of Judea and Samaria and practical control of Area B, has lifted the yoke on

Israel's right of independent action in Area C, in which the Jewish state enjoys full military and civilian control. Area C has a 94 percent Jewish demographic. It is home to virtually all of the 300,000-plus Jews living beyond the Green Line and it constitutes 59 percent of the Jewish patrimony beyond that meaningless boundary. There may never be a better time for bringing this 5 percent of Israel's population and their land in from the cold and putting paid to any lingering Arab delusions of displacing them. The gauntlet has been laid down. It's your move, Mr. Netanyahu.

*\*The Legal Foundation and Borders of Israel Under International Law (Mazo Publishers, Jerusalem)*

---

## **From the Editor**

### **A Policy from Chelm**

Will the Israeli government make the Palestinian Authority pay a price for contravening all its signed agreements with Israel by going to the UN to be declared a state? The answer seems to be no. The government's reaction, rather, is to pretend nothing has happened.

According to *Jerusalem Post* columnist Caroline Glick, the official Israeli government position transmitted to the UN conference of donors to the Palestinian Authority is that it wants ongoing support for the PA budget and "development projects that will contribute to the growth of a vibrant private sector, which will provide the PA an expanded base for generating internal revenue." The Defense Ministry and senior IDF brass even want continued aid to the U.S. trained and financed Palestinian army. The reasoning? Without paying off the PA and its militias, there could be an escalation of violence.

Writes Glick: "By supporting continued foreign aid to the Palestinians in the aftermath of their UN bid the government has adopted a classic appeasement policy. It has told the Palestinians that they will pay no price for their act of aggression. Worse, Israel just told them they will be rewarded. Israel has gone on record saying it cannot manage without the Palestinian governing body that exists to destroy it.

"As for Israel's friends, the government just pulled the rug out from under their feet. Cong. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, is a true friend of Israel. Her bill calling for a cutoff of US aid to the PA and a massive decrease of US aid to the UN in the event the UN upgrades the Palestinians' diplomatic status is one of the most important pieces of pro-Israel legislation to be introduced in the UN Congress in a generation.

"By announcing it opposes an aid cutoff, Israel undermined Ros-Lehtinen's position. It betrayed its good friend.

"The only way to fix what just happened is for the government to issue a new policy supporting the cutting off of foreign aid to the Palestinians and announcing that Israel will stop transferring tax revenues to them if their status at the UN is upgraded in any way. And Netanyahu should pick up the phone and personally apologize to Ros-Lehtinen for his government's disgraceful behavior."

### **The Good Hitchens**

Unlike his better-known brother Christopher, Peter Hitchens is a straight-talking, clear-thinking friend of Israel. Here are some of his comments on the Libyan uprising:

"We're cheering on a football crowd with A-47s, who could be worse than Qaddafi....Why am I expected to like it? For we are all supposed to approve of it. Every media outlet, every politician, every church pulpit, treats it as an unmixed Good Thing. Not me. I look at these wild characters in baseball caps and tracksuit bottoms blasting ammunition into the sky (often killing or injuring innocents far away, but they don't care) and I am mainly thankful that they are a long way off....And I think it very wrong that this aspect is played down so much--their victory would never have happened without NATO

providing them with an air force, as it did for the equally suspect Kosovo Liberation Army in the early days of Blair."

The self-congratulation by the Obama administration is premature. Brazilian journalist Pepe Escobar foresees chaos as wildly disparate factions consolidate their fiefdoms, preparatory to turning on each other-- with Al Qaeda linked groups a prominent part of the mix. Writes Escobar: "Everyone in Libya is now virtually armed to its teeth....All over Tripoli, there are graphic echoes of militia hell in Iraq. Former US Central Intelligence Agency asset and former 'war on terror' detainee, General Abdelhakim Belhaj--issued from the Derna circle, the ground zero of Islamic fundamentalism in Libya--is the leader of the brand new Tripoli Military Council. In Tripoli, rebels from Zintan, in the western mountains, control the airport. The central bank, Tripoli's port and the Prime Minister's office are being controlled by rebels from Misrata. Berbers from the mountain town of Yafran control Tripoli's central square, now spray-painted 'Yafran Revolutionaries'....At least 600 Salafis who fought in the Sunni Iraqi resistance against the US were liberated from Abu Salim prison by the rebels. It's easy to picture them profiting from the widespread looting of kalashnikovs and shoulder-launched Soviet Sam-7 anti-aircraft missiles to bolster their own hardcore Islamist militia--following their own agenda, and their own guerrilla war."

The Libyan revolution, like the Arab spring, is apt to turn out quite differently from the way our media and politicians anticipated.

## **Not a Parody**

When Aaron Lerner of IMRA (Independent Media Review and Analysis) prefaces an email with "This is not a parody" he is all but certain to be sending more jewels from the lunatic lips of Israel's President (and the most respected public figure in the land according to polls.) Sure enough, these gems were actually distributed proudly by the Communications Department of the Office of the President on September 14, 2011. "The shutters of extremism have closed on many windows in our region. The shutter of peace with the Palestinians is still open. We have to approach it before the clouds of extremism cover it. We must do everything in order to quickly begin direct negotiations with the Palestinians. I know from experience that things that seem impossible can become possible." He then praises (the disintegrated) peace with Egypt, concluding "Do not let fleeting events disrupt the future. We will respect the past, and let our youth respect the future."

Through the verbal fog, as Lerner notes, this illustrates three Peres principles: what happened in the past doesn't matter, what the Arabs say doesn't matter, what happens now doesn't matter.

In a *Frontpage* article on September 6, Cuban-born writer Humberto Fontova reminds us of the smarmy letter Peres wrote to Castro a year ago (September 24, 2010). Castro, seeking to influence a vote in Congress on legislation helpful to Cuba, gave an interview to *The Atlantic* in which he said "Israel has a definite right to exist" and no one had been slandered more than Jews. (Never mind that only a year earlier Castro had declared "The Fuhrer's swastika is today Israel's banner.") Wrote Peres to Castro: "I must confess that your remarks were, in my opinion unexpected and rife with unique intellectual depth. Your words presented a surprising bridge between a harsh reality and a new horizon. You tried to sail to bigger seas, to show that a small geographical size doesn't have to reflect human smallness."

It's hard to know what is more embarrassing, the groveling tone or the verbal swill.

## **From Cold Peace to Cold (Hot?) War**

Netanyahu is reportedly anxious to return the Israeli ambassador to Egypt. Presumably some of Peres' blindness to reality has rubbed off on the Prime Minister. One would have thought the Egyptian government's response to the attack on the embassy would have opened Netanyahu's eyes. After all, as the embassy workers came in peril of their lives, Field Marshal Mohamed Tantawi, who heads Egypt's

Supreme Military Council, refused to accept Netanyahu and Barak's increasingly desperate calls. It was only Obama's intervention (apparently Egypt has not yet reached the stage where its military leaders refuse an American President's calls) that saved the lives of the last six Israelis trapped in the embassy.

As David Hornick writes in *Frontpage*, "Israelis have recently debated amending the 1979 Israeli-Egyptian peace treaty to allow Egyptian forces into Sinai to fight global-jihad terrorists there....allowing [Egypt] to remilitarize Sinai now looks to be the worst step Israel can take, even worse than having it be terror-infested." Hornick observes that a main plank of the Israeli-Egyptian "peace" has been the annual \$2 billion in U.S. aid to Egypt, most of it going to the military. "Today--when the only good thing that can be said about the Tantawi regime is that Islamist and/or ultra-nationalist forces that could soon replace it are even worse--it no longer makes sense to be rewarding Egypt with top-of-the-line tanks, fighter jets, attack helicopters, anti-ship missiles, antitank missiles, and so on. A rethink of this policy is urgent."

## **All History is Islamic History**

At a recent conference in Jerusalem, scholar of Islam Moshe Sharon pointed out that the basic attitude of Islam is that all history is Islamic history. According to Muslims, since the creation of the world there has been only one religion and that is Islam. "So, if anybody says, for example, that there is a place connected with Solomon and that's the place where Solomon's Temple stood, a true Muslim would tell you: 'Yes, you're absolutely right, but don't forget that Solomon was a Muslim.'"

Through Islamization of history you've got Islamization of geography. Anywhere that was connected with these prophets, who were all Muslims [according to Islamic imagination], becomes Muslim territory. There is no Islamic occupation, there's only Islamic liberation.

---

---

## **Administrative Detention Orders Against Jewish Nationalists**

Adina Kutnicki

*(Editor's Note: The author variously uses the terms GSS [General Security Services], Shin Bet, Shabak, ISA [Israel Security Agency]. They are all names for Israel's internal security service.)*

In western democracies, a person's home is considered his castle. Therefore, if a government banishes a citizen from his home, the act must be based on a judicious interpretation of the law. The detainee must present a clear and present danger.

Chief Justice Aharon Barak, previous president of the Supreme Court, underscored his belief in this principle, albeit not from a perspective which protects the rights of Jewish nationalists. On July 15, 2002, Justice Barak ruled in the Ajuri case: "Our point of departure is that in principle removing a person from his dwelling place and forcibly moving him someplace else causes serious harm to his self respect, his freedom, and his possessions. A person's home is not only a roof over his head, it is the means for establishing his physical and social relationships. A number of a person's basic human rights are harmed when he is forcibly removed to another place, even if such a move does not involve an international crossing." Tragically, his legal opinion was rendered in relation to the protection of the civil and human rights of terrorists! The security services recommended their expulsion from Nablus to Gaza, and the Supreme Court ruled in favor of the terrorists.

Even the pro-Arab B'tselem human rights organization is unhappy about administrative detention/expulsion orders, stating: "Undoubtedly the state should act determinedly against 'settlers' who harm Palestinians and their property, but the way to achieve this is via criminal proceedings and not administrative orders that are based on confidential information."

Few outside Israel's nationalist sector recognize that these orders, which obviate due process and were held over from the British Mandate era, have been quietly resurrected and expanded in recent years. Currently, administrative detention is pursued under Order Number 1591, updated in 2007. It empowers military commanders in Judea and Samaria to detain a person for a maximum of six months when there is a "reasonable basis for believing that the security of the region or public security necessitates." The order may be extended for an additional six months, with no maximum cumulative period specified. Within eight days a detainee must be brought before a military judge. Hearings in both the lower and appellate court are held in camera. The judge is not bound by the regular rules of evidence. A judge may admit evidence without revealing that evidence to the detainee's representative.

When dealing with Arabs residing in Judea and Samaria--many overtly belligerent to Israel--orders of administrative detention become a powerful weapon in the arsenal of the security forces. But they are abused when they are used as a political tool to silence Jewish nationalists. Political science professor and expert on international law Louis Rene Beres writes: "The point of these orders, of course, has been to quash anti-government dissent in various West Bank (Judea/Samaria) Jewish communities. In issuing these orders, the IDF generally works together with ISS [Israel Security Services] or the Shin Bet. Designated recipients are not informed as to the precise reason for the orders, nor have they any formal right of appeal." A nation which takes pride in its adherence to basic democratic principles--the protection of its citizens' civil/human rights-- can ill afford to enact orders which are in direct contravention of these rights.

Administrative detention/expulsion orders aim to achieve political results under the guise of national security interests. Right wing nationalists are opposed to the leadership's policy of "land for peace." Living in Judea and Samaria, they literally stand guard over Israel's heartland. Their presence is an obstacle to creating a Palestinian controlled (terror) state. Detention/expulsion orders are used to intimidate, frustrate and hamper Jewish patriots. The orders are specifically referred to as *Harchakah Minhalit* (administrative removal).

Once they set their sights on a Jewish nationalist target, the Israel Security Agency utilizes a variety of methods. It may move the process forward quickly by citing 'information' which requires immediate detention or expulsion. Gleaned mostly through unsubstantiated intel in the first place, (which is often fabricated) the cases rarely lead to formal indictments, with many charges quietly dropped. Sometimes, they dangle incentives before those identified as more likely to succumb to pressure. For instance, they may offer to pay for everyday necessities to ease a family's financial burdens. Lately the security services have employed a new tool of harassment--arresting those who come home after midnight!

The deleterious and human costs of banishment from one's family cannot be underestimated. Many families lose their sole support and struggle financially and emotionally for months on end. These orders are designed to break the internal fortitude of the detainees and their families.

Following are just a few examples of cases (there were many more) from the first two weeks of August 2011 that lawyers from the organization Honenu have been called upon to defend. (Honenu is the go-to address for those ensnared by these orders, cherry picked from the dustbin of pre-state history.)

On August 2, hundreds of police and GSS agents raided Yitzhar and other local communities in Judea and Samaria. They distributed Administrative Detention orders, barring residents from either entering or staying in Judea and Samaria. Five days later, Calev Blanc, one of those exiled, was arrested while driving on Highway 4. Detectives took him away without detailing the reason and without showing him an arrest warrant. On the same day, a yeshiva student in Yitzhar, without warning, was arrested at the gate of his school by special police forces, again with no reason given. Later on that same day, Honenu attorney Adi Kedar reported that two detainees were being held at the GSS interrogating

facilities in Petah Tikvah, subject to humiliating conditions, on a par with those reserved for hardened terrorists. They were separated from each other and held in tiny cells with no bed or toilet.

Three days later, at 6:30 a.m., a policeman from the Ariel station arrived at the home of Itamar resident Daniel Ben-Avraham and delivered a summons for "a discussion at the GSS facility in Petah Tikvah". When he arrived at GSS headquarters his interrogator hinted that if Ben-Avraham incriminated Calev Blanc, then the interrogators would help him enlist in the IDF, as well as 'assist' him with other matters. Ben-Avraham refused to cooperate. Obviously, Calev Blanc was identified as a higher value target, whereas Ben-Avraham, just as clearly, was singled out as a more pliable subject.

Twenty-six year old Akiva HaCohen and his wife Ayelet, the parents of four and expecting another child, cannot escape the grip of the security services. The security services have targeted Akiva since his mid-teens. He entered their radar for the 'crime' of placing nationalist posters within Judea and Samaria and has been harassed ever since. Over the last decade he has been given administrative detention orders numerous times and banished from Judea and Samaria for months on end. He has never been brought before a court of law, given specific reasons for his expulsion, nor charged with any crimes. In August the security services came to his home in Yitzhar--at 4:30 a.m.-- to advise him of another administrative detention decree again without specific reason or charge. As a result, Akiva has to deal with the disruption in his life, find another apartment for himself and his family, and find a way to absorb the additional costs since he must continue to pay the mortgage on his newly built home in Yitzhar. Furthermore, he now has to pay an unexpected salary to a manager to tend his wheat farm and vineyard.

One administrative order upon another, the Shin Bet hopes to break the spirits of those believing in Jewish rights to Judea and Samaria. Supreme Court Judge, Ayala Procaccia, a vociferous advocate for government crackdown on nationalist dissenters, coined the term an 'ideologically motivated criminal.' In this anti-democratic perspective, to have nationalist beliefs is to be a criminal. Until the harassment and persecution for 'thought crimes' itself becomes illegal, nationalist Jews will be unable to live freely as Jews in the Jewish homeland.

While the mistreatment of Jewish residents of Judea and Samaria, more often than not, stems from administrative detention arrests, this is not exclusively so, as the case of Chaim Perlman illustrates. Perlman, age 30, was arrested on July 14, 2010. He later charged that he was handcuffed for 18 hours a day during his 31 day interrogation. Finally the court accepted Honenu's arguments and forced Perlman's release to house arrest. Judge Nachum Sternlicht stated, "I haven't seen any evidence that could serve to convict Perlman." Undeterred, agents brought Perlman to an identification line up where his Honenu appointed lawyer was not allowed to be present. Incredibly, twelve years after the alleged crime, an Arab was suddenly found to pick Perlman out of a line up. Mercifully, the authorities nonetheless lost their case and Perlman was released. The Shin Bet wanted revenge on Perlman because one of their most unsavory techniques had backfired. Perlman, who had been hired by the Shabak to provoke conflict with the Arabs, had ideas of his own. He taped over 20 hours of discussion with his handlers as they pressured him to commit crimes against Arabs. Presumably, their intention was to incite the general public against the supposedly out-of-control settler community.

These are just a tiny sampling of the trials and tribulations suffered by countless Jewish residents of Judea and Samaria because of their vocal efforts to save the Jewish heartland. One cannot help but wonder what their fate would be without the immediate capable assistance and intervention of Honenu's legal defense association. For further information about Honenu go to its website, [www.honenu.org](http://www.honenu.org). For those who would like to hear more about the association, spokesman Shalom Pollack is currently scheduling his next series of programs for the US in November.

*Adina Kutnicki, a life-long Zionist, made aliyah in the summer of 2008. Her articles can be found at [www.israelnationalnews.com/Articles/Author.aspx/451](http://www.israelnationalnews.com/Articles/Author.aspx/451)*

## Baron Maurice de Hirsch: A Man To Remember

David Isaac

You may have encountered the name Baron Maurice de Hirsch. His name pops up in unusual places. There are cemeteries named for him as far afield as Halifax, Nova Scotia and Staten Island in New York City. There's a Baron de Hirsch synagogue in Seattle, a Baron de Hirsch library on the pampas of Argentina. Sometimes it's not even clear why his name is there, such as Baron de Hirsch Road in Crompond, New York. But the Baron deserves to be remembered, even if the reason he is remembered at a particular place may be forgotten. One of the richest men of his time, his name was synonymous with Jewish philanthropy.

Baron de Hirsch was born in 1831, the scion of a wealthy German-Jewish banking family. His grandfather, the first Jewish landowner in Bavaria, was ennobled in 1818. His father, a banker to the King of Bavaria, was made a Baron in 1869. But Maurice de Hirsch didn't rely on his family fortune. He made his own, building a railroad from Europe to Turkey and investing in the sugar and copper industries.

Hirsch felt an intense drive to help his co-religionists. This was fairly unusual for the wealthy Jews of his time. As Hirsch said to Theodor Herzl during their June 2, 1895 meeting, "The rich Jews will give you nothing. The rich Jews are bad, they display no interest in the sufferings of the poor."

Some of the credit for Baron de Hirsch's feeling of responsibility toward his fellow Jews goes to his mother, Caroline Wertheimer von de Hirsch, who insisted that her son learn Hebrew and have a Jewish upbringing. Hirsch was also affected by his experiences building the Vienna-Constantinople railroad, during which time he witnessed firsthand the impoverished state of Jews in Eastern Europe.

In 1874, Hirsch gifted one million French francs to the Alliance Israélite Universelle, a Paris-based Jewish aid society founded in 1860 with which his father-in-law was involved. The organization's motto was *Kol yisrael arevim zeh bazeh*, meaning "All Israel is responsible for one another." Baron de Hirsch took this rabbinic injunction seriously, as evidenced by his response to the pogroms and anti-Semitic edicts of Imperial Russia in the 1880s. He began to contribute on a scale never before seen.

Some five million Jews were trapped in the Pale of Settlement, the only area where Jews were permitted to settle in any numbers in Russia. Hirsch offered 50 million francs to the Russian government to set up a separate school system. The offer was rejected when Hirsch insisted on some control over the money so it wouldn't disappear into the pockets of Russian civil servants. Hirsch then decided to set up his own organization, the Jewish Colonization Association (ICA), in 1891.

The Baron poured huge resources into establishing Jewish colonies in Woodbine, New Jersey, near Bismarck, North Dakota, in the Northwest territories, in Cyprus, in Canada, in Brazil, and on and on. But the area with which Baron de Hirsch is most closely associated is Argentina. The country was brought to the Baron's attention by Dr. Wilhelm Lowenthal in 1890. Dr. Lowenthal, a Romanian Jew, was hired by the Argentine government to conduct a survey. In the course of his work, he passed through a railroad station in Santa Fe province and was shocked to find 120 Jewish families, refugees from Russia, living in severe distress, without food or shelter, scavenging for scraps from passing dining cars. Once Dr. Lowenthal helped relieve their plight, he thought about the possibility of Argentina as a refuge for thousands of Russian Jews. Argentina had not been on Hirsch's radar, but he was taken by the idea, partly because the Jews would be put to farming, which Hirsch thought could remake the Jews to be more like their neighbors, thus reducing anti-Semitism.

Hirsch disliked Jewish intellectuals. He said to Theodor Herzl, "All our misfortunes come from the fact that the Jews aim too high. We have too many intellectuals. My aim is to discourage this



pushfulness among the Jews. They mustn't make such great progress. All the hatred of us comes from this."

Hirsch would not succeed in preventing the Jews from aiming high, even those he settled in Argentina. In his book, *An Outstretched Arm: A History of the Jewish Colonization Association*, Theodore Norman writes: "A disproportionate number of the professional class in Argentina came to be children of ICA settlers who attended lower schools in the colonies and then went on to university. One Argentine colonist pithily summed up this tendency by saying, 'We have sown wheat and harvested doctors.'"

Somewhat unfairly the Baron has also gone down in Jewish history as the man who lacked vision. That's because he refused to help Theodor Herzl, who had turned to him first in his effort to launch a campaign of massive Jewish immigration to Palestine. But the Baron was a visionary in business, embarking on enterprises, like the railway through the Balkans to Constantinople, that others deemed foolhardy if not crazy. And the Baron's objections to Herzl's proposals would have seemed far more justified at the time than they do in hindsight. The objective of the Jewish Colonization Society, specifically set forth in its founding document, was to take Jews from Russia, where they suffered persecution and special laws directed against them, to countries with large open territories, governments willing to receive them, and, very important, where they would not be subject to any special taxes or political or other disabilities. The Baron would have seen Palestine as a Turkish backwater, its government hostile to Jewish immigration, and where Jews were subject to the arbitrary mistreatment from which it was the Baron's goal to rescue them. Moreover, Norman points out in *An Outstretched Arm* Hirsch expressed his fear that Palestine was in an area that might be seized by Russia and there was no point in moving Jews from the Czar's repressive control only to have the Czar come after them, as it were. In addition, Hirsch had objected that settlement in Palestine required dealing with the Turkish government and he knew well from his own experience (constructing that railroad) would be difficult, expensive and fraught with uncertainty. It would only be after the Baron's death in 1896 that the Jewish Colonization Association began supporting Jewish settlement in Palestine.

The Baron was a pragmatist in Jewish affairs and the visionary turned out to be right. Ironically, even when it came to farming, in which Hirsch placed such stock, it turned out the place where Jews became successful farmers on a large scale was Israel.

Still, like his wife who actively supported his activities and carried on his legacy after he died, Hirsch deserves an honored place in the pantheon of Jews who did what they could to relieve the sufferings of oppressed Jewry. Upon learning of the Baron's death, Herzl, despite his disappointment in having been unable to change the Baron's views, wrote: "His cooperation could have hastened our success tremendously. ... [H]is death is a loss to the Jewish cause. Among the rich Jews he was the only one prepared to do something big for the poor ones."

*David Isaac edits the Web site shmuelkatz.com. He is currently developing an educational Web project on Zionist history.*

---

---

## **That Beilinesque Set Of Mind**

Sarah Honig

Back in 1916 Ze'ev Jabotinsky described the Jews as "very strange with their pangs of conscience and sentimentality. They sincerely lament the misfortune of arch-haters.... What compassion they feel for the poor Poles whom Providence afflicted with the inconvenient Jewish problem."

Jewish guilt for burdening oppressors and assailants is entrenched and with it, apparently, the compulsion to make amends. Its derivation may be traceable to the penchant of every local medieval tyrant to oblige Jewish communities to pay exorbitantly for the privilege of not being slaughtered.

Our homegrown self-appointed guardians of collective conscience also inevitably – by their own testimony – corner the market on all available good sense. They persistently analyze our assorted predicaments and without fail arrive at the same judgment – Israel is to blame.

Specific circumstances and incidental details notwithstanding, it's always our moral lapse and/or misguided conceptions that make us mess up massively. We need only be more virtuous or more sagacious (obviously as per their flawless recommendations).

The other day Yossi Beilin – ex-minister, pivotal Oslo protagonist, Labor Party headliner and later Meretz hotshot – published an op-ed in *Yisrael Hayom* omnisciently instructing us all on where we erred vis-à-vis Turkey. And thus he sermonized: “There comes a moment when a state must weigh what's dearer to its heart – diplomatic, military and economic ties with a very large Muslim country whose influence in the region grows, or insistence on the truth, as it perceives it, and on what it interprets as national honor.”

Beilin's preferences are unequivocal – we should have opted for the bounty clearly accruing from chumminess with Turkey and apologized abjectly for our legitimate self-defense in the Mavi Marmara incident. Considerations of national honor, he more than implies, are irrational, if not outrightly insane. As he puts it, it was a showdown between “pursuers of national honor” and “those who sought to sustain the national interest.” He despairs that the former won.

Let's leave the issue of national honor on the side for a bit and assume that it's quite natural, indeed sometimes altogether desirable, for nations to humble and even defame themselves. Let's just ponder the pragmatic perks contingent upon bowing down to Turkish diktats.

Of all the world's Muslim powers, Turkey undeniably appears the most accessible. A negligible corner of it even protrudes into what's arbitrarily defined as Europe. Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, founder of its post-World War I republic, seemed to transform the abolished Ottoman Sultanate with political, cultural, social, economic and legal reforms. Despite the occasional resort to military coups to protect its threatened secular quasi-democracy, Turkey became a NATO stalwart and for decades held radical Islam at bay.

Bigger players in the international arena had realpolitik reasons to suck up to Turkey. For us the attraction was overpowering. An outcast in its neighborhood, Israel yearned for Muslim friends. It fell headlong for the vision of the region's non-Arabs banding together in a comradeship of self-preservation.

This made particular sense in the heyday of nationalist pan-Arabism. It was bound to erode as jihadist fervor supplanted nationalist zeal and Arabs could hypothetically welcome Iran and Turkey into their club rather than shun their co-religionists as rank outsiders.

We know the way Iran went. We lost what we trusted was a bosom ally in Teheran. But Turkey, it was long obstinately maintained here, is a whole other story because its eyes are set westward and it covets EU membership.

Therefrom sprang the sugar-coated “strategic alliance” with Ankara, in the framework of which Israel supplied Turkey with sophisticated weaponry, among other security-oriented and less-publicized services. The wishful thinking was that even 2002's electoral victory of a religious Muslim party wouldn't impel Turkey to follow in Iran's footsteps.

But this was delusionary already many years before the Mavi Marmara. Some among us, like Beilin, refuse to admit that things have moved on and that their hype has been rendered obsolete.

The Mavi Marmara wasn't unforeseeable. It was preceded by a Turkish veto on Israeli participation in a joint NATO drill within its borders. That slap in the face evidently stunned our powers-

that-be, who professed “sudden shock” at the “bolt from the blue” turn of events. Nevertheless chatty know-it-alls continued to pooh-pooh the affront.

But – still significantly pre-Mavi Marmara – Turkey lost no opportunity to hector and routinely unleash virulent anti-Israel invective. Turkish state-run TV broadcast libelous anti-Israeli melodramas, like *Ayrilik*, which portrayed IDF soldiers callously shooting Arab children, among other bogus homicidal atrocities.

Nevertheless, given our attachments to cloud-cuckoo-land and our insatiable hunger for syrupy companionship in a hostile environment, we made a predictably worsening situation a whole lot worse by submissive fawning.

Turkey’s Islamic leadership played us for suckers while spurning our incongruous affections.

The most egregious miscalculations were made by former prime minister Ehud Olmert and his foreign minister Tzipi Livni. It boggles the mind, but this duo single-handedly promoted Turkish premier Recep Tayyip Erdogan to the role of a regional super-statesman when initially choosing him, of all unlikely facilitators, to mediate between Israel and Syria. Olmert-Livni should have realized that Turkey is hardly a neutral bystander. They blundered spectacularly.

The fat was already irretrievably in the fire before Erdogan insolently scolded the dumbstruck Shimon Peres at Davos in January 2009, before the effusively chummy Turkish and Syrian foreign ministers signed military and nonmilitary cooperation treaties in Aleppo, before Erdogan hobnobbed with Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmedinejad and lauded him as “doubtlessly our friend,” before Erdogan outrageously charged that Avigdor Lieberman schemes to nuke Gaza.

The bitterest travesty is that Turkey, of all nations, tongue-lashed Israel for mass-murdering innocents in Operation Cast Lead. Ironically, while we never did the evil deed, Turkey’s record is horrific. We could of course answer Erdogan in his own idiom and elaborate on Turkey’s first Armenian massacre of 1890 (between 100,000 and 200,000 dead); Turkey’s subsequent mega-massacres of 1915 in which hundreds of thousands of Armenians perished in a series of bloodbaths and forced marches of uprooted civilians in Syria’s direction; the WWI slaughter of tens of thousands of Assyrians in Turkey’s southeast; and the 1974 invasion and continued occupation of northern Cyprus (which incredibly fails to preoccupy the international community).

Last but hardly least is the ethnic cleansing, ongoing aerial bombardments and other operations that cost Kurds untold thousands of lives throughout the 20th century and beyond and still deny them the self-determination they deserve (eminently more than Palestinians).

On the night of August 17, Turkish military jets bombed the Qandil Mountains in Northern Iraq, in yet another anti-Kurd aggression.

The Iraqi Kurdistan Regional Government protested the cross-border incursion and the infliction of civilian casualties, but the world appears remarkably unperturbed. No Goldstone-like commission was empowered to probe and do-gooders didn’t organize flotilla-equivalents in support of the Kurds.

Most of all, Israel didn’t pay Turkey back with its own coin, which brings us back to the pesky business of national honor.

*Israeli journalist Sarah Honig blogs at SarahHonig.com.*

---

---

## **A Vote For Independence?**

Steven Plaut

As you know, much of the world is getting ready to recognize a “state” for “Palestinians.” The US may veto the vote in the Security Council to set up “Palestine” in Israeli lands, and then again maybe

it will not veto it. Other countries are going ahead with plans to vote for “Palestine” in the General Assembly, to grant “Palestine” embassy space, to grant it formal recognition, and so on. After years of paying lip service to the righteous need for granting “Palestinians” a state, Netanyahu and his cowardly crew are scratching their heads about what to do and how to stop all this. The best Bibi has come up with is a plan to give a speech in that building on the East River near 42nd street. I have a better idea. My suggestion is this.

The “Palestinian” movement is nothing more than a local separatist movement, composed of Arabs seeking to gain separatist independence. Arabs already have 22 states. Since almost all countries in the world have their own domestic separatist movements, the only reasonable response by Israel to votes by other countries in favor of the “Palestinian” separatist movement is a decision by Israel to recognize the separatist movements in those countries, to grant them embassy space and official diplomatic recognition.

Here are some examples:

If France votes for a “Palestinian state,” as it is expected to do, Israel must immediately grant diplomatic status and recognition to the National Front for the Liberation of Corsica, to the separatist Savoyard League and the Nissa Rebela, to the separatist Armée Révolutionnaire Bretonne and Front de Libération de la Bretagne, and to the French Basque separatists.

If Spain votes for a “Palestinian state,” as it is expected to do, Israel must immediately grant diplomatic status and recognition to the ETA and other Basque separatists, to the Catalan separatists, as well as to the separatist movements in Castille, Leon, Andalusia, Cantabria, Galicia, Aragon, and Asturias.

If Belgium votes for a “Palestinian state,” as it is expected to do, Israel must immediately grant diplomatic status and recognition to both the Flemish and Walloon separatist movements.

If Holland votes for a “Palestinian state,” as it is expected to do, Israel must immediately grant diplomatic status and recognition to the Frisian separatist movement.

Turkey of course is leading the campaign for “Palestine,” which is why Israel should recognize the Armenian, Kurdish, Arab, and other ethnic nationalist movements inside Turkey. And let’s hear nothing about Armenians already having their own state outside the Turkish borders.

The UK will probably vote against it, but just in case it votes in favor, Israel should then recognize the separatist movements of Cornwall, Guernsey, Gibraltar, the Isle of Man, the Isle of Wight, Northumberland, Wessex, Yorkshire, and of course also the independence of Wales, Scotland and Ulster.

Russia plans to vote for “Palestinian independence.” Israel should respond by recognizing all of the separatist movements within Russia, a full list of which is much too long to reproduce here.

If Italy votes for “Palestine,” there are so many regional independence and separatist movements inside Italy that could be recognized that space does not allow their complete listing.

The Sami independence movements in Norway, Sweden and Finland should be recognized at once. Ditto for the Faroes Islands independence movement in Denmark. If Switzerland votes in favor, Israel should recognize the Jura regional separatist movement.

The above list is just for European countries. Most of South America has already recognized “Palestine,” even before any UN vote. If Argentina and or Chile votes in favor, Israel needs to recognize the Mapuche separatists in those countries. If Bolivia votes in favor, the Santa Cruz separatists should be recognized. If Brazil votes in favor, Israel should recognize the separatist movements in Rio Grande do Sul. Venezuela will certainly vote in favor, which is why Israel must recognize the independence of Zulia and Maracaibo. Mexico is certain to vote in favor, which is why the Zapatista movement in Chiapas needs a nice embassy in Israel.

Moslem states have their own domestic separatist movements and these are deserving of special support and recognition by Israel. In Iran, aside from the obvious Kurdish separatists, there are

Assyrian, Baluchi, Azeri, and Arab regional separatist movements, all in need of an Embassy. (And let's hear no nonsense about how Iranian Arabs have no right to independence because Arabs already have 22 states! Azeris already have a state, you say? Since when does that matter??) Syria of course also has Kurdish and Assyrian separatists. Pakistan has Balochistan, Gilgit Baltistan, and Singh separatist movements. Indonesia has oodles of separatists.

The number of separatist movements in other parts of the world is so large that Israel will have to build an entire new diplomatic city east of Ariel just to house all the embassies it needs to establish for the separatist movements in countries voting for "Palestinian statehood."

*Haifa Economics Professor Steven Plaut blogs at: <http://stevenplaut.blogspot.com/>*

---

## A Museum at Atlit

Nurit Greenger

Atlit is a town on the Mediterranean twelve miles south of Haifa. Due to its natural large bay--second only to Haifa--the site was inhabited as early as the Canaanite and Israelite period. Later it was a Phoenician port and functioned as a port during the Persian, Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine periods.

The Crusaders built a large castle at Atlit to protect the pilgrims' road along the coast from Acre to Jerusalem. Atlit was the last remaining Crusader outpost in the Holy Land and after the Crusaders retreated in 1291 A.D., it was partially destroyed. The fortress was repaired and held by the Mamlukes. During Napoleon's failed expedition to conquer Acre in 1799, Atlit served as a French navy port. During the 19th century, the fort was heavily damaged by an earthquake, and many of its stones were looted and reused by the Turks in other cities.

The modern town of Atlit was founded in 1903, under the auspices of Baron Edmond de Rothschild.

As the 1930s drew to a close, the British, seeking to enforce the provisions of the various White Papers which severely limited Jewish immigration, built a detainment camp in Atlit to house refugees from Europe who attempted to violate their blockade of Palestine. The Atlit camp was surrounded by barbed wire and watchtowers. When they entered the camp, the detainees were sprayed with DDT, then told to undress and enter the showers. Men were sent to one side, women to the other. Some of those interned remained as long as 23 months. From 1939 until 1948, the jailed immigrants were housed in eighty rectangular wooden huts, each containing 40 bunks.

When World War II came to an end, the Jews who survived the Holocaust had few options. The Zionists among them, as well as thousands of European Jews who were rendered stateless, headed to Palestine defying the British blockade. These Jews were called *Ma'apilim* and their movement *Ha'apala*, meaning "ascending." Many of the *Ma'apilim* came to Palestine on barely navigable ships that were often rammed, run aground and chased into stormy seas by the British. While the Haganah, Israel's fledgling military force, was able to rescue many passengers, others were caught by the British and sent to Atlit.

There were horrific similarities between the Nazi concentration camps and Atlit Detention camp. For Holocaust survivors the showers, the disinfection process, the long barracks lined with cots, and the barbed wire were appalling reminders of what they had so recently experienced. Still, for the *Ma'apilim* even a detention camp in the land of Israel was a symbol of life and future in a Jewish state.

On October 10, 1945, the Haganah special forces unit Palmach broke into the camp and freed 200 detainees. Yitzchak Rabin planned the raid and Nachum Sarig commanded it. After this, the British

began deporting Jewish illegal immigrants to internment camps in Cyprus which operated from 1946 until the establishment of the State of Israel.

My mother Rachel Katz was a member of the Hashomer Ha'tzair's Zionist youth movement in Europe. From the age of 19 to 23 she worked in Nazi labor camps. At her release by the Russian army, she weighed 40 kilograms (85 Lbs) and was alone in the world. Fluent in Polish, Russian, Yiddish and Hebrew, she obtained a job with one of the rescue and information centers in Poland established by the Jewish Agency. At the Center she met her future husband, my father, who had lived in Israel since 1942 and was a soldier in the British Army's Jewish Brigade stationed in Belgium. He came to Poland seeking family survivors. He found none. But my dad found my mother.

In June 1946, my mother embarked on the ship "Biria" from Marseilles, heading for Palestine. The conditions aboard the ship were atrocious. The vessel began to keel over and transmitted S.O.S signals. The British answered the call and accompanied the vessel but would not give the *Ma'apilim* water or food, nor would they tow the ship into Haifa port. On July 1st Biria finally arrived at Haifa, where her passengers were arrested by the British. The Jewish Agency negotiated with the British who agreed to move the *Ma'apilim* to Atlit (rather than Cyprus). There my mother was detained until she was released to join her future husband, my dad. I was born in 1947, Israel was born in 1948 and the rest is part and parcel of modern Israel history, being written as I write.

After independence, Atlit became a transit center for immigrants, but stopped functioning within two years. It was eventually dismantled leaving only two of the original buildings. In 1987 Atlit was declared a National Heritage Site. Today the town's population is 5,300 and the Atlit Detainee Camp is now a museum of the history of *Ha'apala* and a base for Israel's Naval Command.

*Nurit Greenger is a freelance writer in California.*

---

---

## By What Right?

Ruth King

On September 15th 2011, Americans for Safe Israel observed our annual memorial for Zeev Jabotinsky (October 18, 1880 – August 4, 1940).

The annual event honors the memory of the great Zionist leader, soldier (founder of the Jewish Legion), author, orator, prophet and head of the New Zionist Organization. He is the inspiration for our organization, which remains true to the guiding principle of Zionism--namely, Jewish historic, legal, religious and moral rights to the land of Israel.

Jabotinsky warned the Jews of Eastern Europe of the impending cataclysm that killed one of every three Jews in the world. He died in 1940, fortunately unaware of the accuracy of his predictions.

Frank Gaffney Jr., the director of the Washington based Center for Security Policy, invoked this warning as he spoke forcefully of the implacable enemies surrounding Israel. He described how the so-called "Arab Spring" has evolved into a Moslem Brotherhood/Hamas/ Hezbollah springboard for faith driven fury aimed first at Israel and then at America. Behind Gaffney were two large maps in relief, created by Mark Langfan, illustrating precisely how vulnerable Israel's pre-1967 borders were to these murderous forces.

As I listened, it struck me how little Israel's early leaders spoke--or even knew--of the centuries of Islamic anti-Semitism and the brutal repression of Jews as *dhimmi* under Sharia law. Was it their secularism? Was it that they came from Europe where the Moslems had been hurled back centuries earlier at the Gates of Vienna? Was it the seduction of Orientalist fantasies spun by those who claimed, falsely, that some golden age of comity existed between Moslems and Jews? Did they feel that as a

religious group constantly traumatized by violence and hatred it did not behoove them to speak ill of any religion? Or, finally, did they really think that their own desire for peace and friendship would sedate centuries of hatred?

Although Jabotinsky never spoke directly of Islam he certainly harbored no illusions. This is what he wrote in 1923:

“There can be no voluntary agreement between ourselves and the Palestine Arabs..... Not now, nor in the prospective future. I say this with such conviction, not because I want to hurt the moderate Zionists.... Except for those who were born blind, they realized long ago that it is utterly impossible to obtain the voluntary consent of the Palestine Arabs for converting" Palestine" from an Arab country into a country with a Jewish majority. But it is quite another question whether it is always possible to realize a peaceful aim by peaceful means. For the answer to this question does not depend on our attitude to the Arabs; but entirely on the attitude of the Arabs to us and to Zionism.”

Frank Gaffney called AFSI his “favorite organization in the world” and we are grateful for his support, friendship and the important contributions he has made to the debate on the Middle East.

Member of the Knesset Dr. Aryeh Eldad was the second speaker. Like Gaffney he harbors no illusions. He too spoke of the centrality of jihad as the motivation for the assault on Israel. He invoked the spirit of Jabotinsky when he denounced the notion of “defensible borders” as another of those moveable goal posts which are used to deny Israel’s rights to the Land of Israel from the Jordan River to the Mediterranean. Eldad explained that all countries, especially those threatened by enemies, must have defensible borders, but it is the right to the land that is inviolable and must be asserted. Negotiations based on Arab “recognition” or “renunciation of terror” or abrogation of their so-called “right of return” or “defensible borders” at best produce agreements that can be overturned at Arab whim. They involve an unpardonable concession of the guiding principle of Zionism. Dr. Eldad argued that demands for Arab independence should be countered with demands for immediate annexation of Judea and Samaria, not with pathetic pleas for more talks and negotiations.

There has been a woeful failure by Israel to assert that it is in Israel by right, that its land is not a bargaining counter, and this failure has seriously undermined its position. In 1977 Erich and Rael Jean Isaac published in *Judaism* a prescient article “By What Right?” (I have borrowed their title) warning of the dangers of an Israeli policy based on any principle but Israel’s right to the Land of Israel. They wrote of the “territories for peace” program the Israeli government adopted after the Six Day War: “Without belief in the legitimacy of her title to the territories that she had taken, although these included the core area of the historic Land of Israel and had been won in a war of survival, and psychologically intensely vulnerable to charges of ‘imperialism’ and ‘oppression,’ Israel’s solution was to treat the territories as commodities exchangeable for peace.”

The Isaacs noted that although the Arabs showed no interest in the exchange, Israeli leaders felt that the policy would amaze the world by its generosity and could certainly do no harm. On the contrary, wrote the Isaacs, the position produced a great deal of harm as Israel’s position became incomprehensible internationally; internally a guilt culture was fostered; and worst of all, “new credibility was given to the Arab propaganda which asserted that Israel had no title to any part of Palestine....The implicit Israeli admission that the area of greatest historical significance within Palestine did not belong to the Jews lent credence to Arab anti-Zionist propaganda. For the Arabs, the presence of the Jews in part of Palestine had not negated their own claim to all of it, whereas for the Jews, the Arab presence, even though the Jews had physical control of the land, made Jews act as if they had no title. Since the Zionist claim was ultimately a historical-religious one...the implicit confession by the Jews that their claim did not hold for Judea and Samaria, the area that was religiously central, was bound to cast doubt upon the entire claim. Somehow, it now appeared, the intrinsic connection between Jews and the ancient homeland had been severed.”

Even Winston Churchill emphasized the issue of "rights." He wrote in 1922: "When it is asked what is meant by the development of the Jewish National Home in Palestine, it may be answered that it is not the imposition of a Jewish nationality upon the inhabitants of Palestine as a whole, but the further development of the existing Jewish community, with the assistance of Jews in other parts of the world, in order that it may become a centre in which the Jewish people as a whole may take, on grounds of religion and race, an interest and a pride. *But in order that this community should have the best prospect of free development and provide a full opportunity for the Jewish people to display its capacities, it is essential that it should know that it is in Palestine as of right and not on sufferance.* [italics mine]"

Dr. Eldad affirmed that only a resolute response by Israel will deter the Arabs and invoked Zeev Jabotinsky's description in 1923 of the "Iron Wall" upon which Israel must depend:

".... Settlement can thus develop under the protection of a force that is not dependent on the local population, behind an iron wall which they will be powerless to break down...a voluntary agreement is just not possible. As long as the Arabs preserve a gleam of hope that they will succeed in getting rid of us, nothing in the world can cause them to relinquish this hope, precisely because they are not a rabble but a living people. And a living people will be ready to yield on such fateful issues only when they give up all hope of getting rid of the Alien Settlers. Only then will extremist groups with their slogan 'No, never' lose their influence, and only then their influence be transferred to more moderate groups. And only then will the moderates offer suggestions for compromise. Then only will they begin bargaining with us on practical matters, such as guarantees against pushing them out, and equality of civil, and national rights."

Dr. Eldad's strong words, and the response of the large audience, made me proud to be a member of Americans for A Safe Israel. As Dr. Eldad reminded us, Zionists everywhere are the supports and pillars of Zeev Jabotinsky's metaphoric "Iron Wall."

AFSI's Executive Director Helen Freedman did an excellent job in organizing the event, coordinated with Manny Zweibon and the Nordau Circle.

Zeev Jabotinsky and our beloved Herbert Zweibon, rest in eternal peace. AFSI remembers.