

November 2012—Issue #259

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

42st Year of Publication

| Table of Contents | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| Editorial – 'Daylight' and Shadow | William Mehlman | Page 2 |
| From the Editor | Rael Jean Isaac | Page 3 |
| Jews in Denial | Rael Jean Isaac | Page 5 |
| My Mentor, Ze'ev Jabotinsky | Menachem Begin | Page 8 |
| Jewish-Arab Demography | Yoram Ettinger | Page 9 |
| Raising Children in Netivot | Danielle Schreiber Rubin | Page 10 |
| If Only We Were Turks | Sarah Honig | Page 11 |
| The Camp David Accords | Ruth King | Page 13 |

'Daylight' and Shadow

William Mehlman

Four years of the "daylight" President Obama vowed to put between Washington and Jerusalem have left in deep shadow the prospects for a bold joint response to the Iranian nuclear weapons threat and the Jihadist plague spreading across the Middle East. Disaffection in both substance and tone is rampant. America's UN Ambassador Susan Rice may not have intended to consign "fair and balanced" to the twilight zone in electing to absent herself from both Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's rant and Prime Minister Netanyahu's address to the UN General Assembly, but it played beautifully to Barack Obama's rejection of Netanyahu's plea for a New York meeting on the advancing Iranian nuclear weapons threat. In a subsequent television interview, the president appeared to include Netanyahu's push for the imposition of "red lines" on Tehran's race for an atomic bomb as part of the "noise" he said he needed to "block out" in order "to do what's right for the American people."

At this juncture, no amount of diplomatic pancake makeup is going to hide the bruises on the face of what is still being portrayed as the "special relationship" between the United States and Israel. This is not to discount such positives as America's support and partial funding of Israel's "Iron Dome" missile defensive system, its ongoing military intelligence cooperation with Israel and its opposition (albeit in defense of the "peace process") to Mahmoud Abbas's grab for international recognition of a sovereign "Palestine" by getting the UN to upgrade its position to "non-member state" status." But what kind of "special relationship" is it with an administration that on the one hand attempts to walk back a deletion of Jerusalem as Israel's capital in its party's platform with a farcical voice vote "correction," while on the other it zealously pursues the same aim by digitally erasing every caption datelined "Jerusalem, Israel" from the vast photo file on the White House website, as reported by Commentary Magazine blogger Omri Ceren? This digital assault on history, moreover, has been augmented by instructions to the agencies involved not to list Israel as the birthplace of U.S. citizens born in Jerusalem.

Was It the "special relationship" – or just Turkish pressure – that dictated the denial of a State Department invitation to Israel to participate in last summer's U.S.-supported Global Counter-Terrorism



Salam Al-Maryati

Forum's "Conference on Victims of Terror" in Madrid and the exclusion of Israeli witness testimony from a film recounting the experiences of terror victims from 11 other countries? One might have thought the "special relationship" had reached its nadir with the appointment of Muslim Public Affairs Council President Salam Al-Maryati, who has charged Israel with being a "suspect" in the 9/11 destruction of the World Trade Center, as America's emissary to the Organization for Security & Cooperation's recent "Human Rights Forum" in Poland. But then along came Serge Duss, a J Street-created pastoral celebrity who under the canopy of something called

the "New Century Evangelicals" has been flogging the old "Replacement Theology" canard about today's Jews being the descendants of a bunch of 9th Century Khuzari castoffs, with no relation to the Biblical Israelites and no claim to Israel. His two J Street appearances were followed by no fewer than four reported visits to the White House.

Forty five months since her confirmation, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has yet to engage in a single serious conversation with her Israeli counterpart, Foreign Minister Avigdor Liberman. With the foreign ministers of how many other countries, outside of America's most important Middle Eastern ally, has Mrs. Clinton presumed to invoke that privilege? On a more serious level, the "special relationship" could ultimately be stretched beyond the limit by the Obama administration's ardent pursuit of the Moslem Brotherhood, an outfit committed to the Jewish state's disappearance from the map of the

Middle East. Steven Emerson, founder of the Investigative Project on Terrorism has recounted the details and depth of that pursuit in IPT's new film "Jihad in America – The Grand Deception."

What Fouad Ajami in the *Wall Street Journal* called President Obama's "too little recognition of the [Middle East's] malignant trilogy — anti-Americanism, anti-Semitism and anti-modernism" has contributed to making the world's most dangerous and unstable region even more dangerous and unstable. It was most recently exemplified, observes Isi Leibler, writing in *The Jerusalem Post*, by "Obama's failure to adequately condemn [the Tehran-staged] 'Non-Alignment Summit,' which endorsed Iran's nuclear policy, appointed a Holocaust denier as its new head and whose representatives from 120 countries listened to the genocidal ravings of their Iranian hosts." If that isn't alarming enough, how about the continued irrational U.S. funding of a Lebanese government almost wholly in thrall to Hezbollah, a huge terrorist network and key Iranian proxy in possession of 21 of Lebanon's 30 ministries. With an estimated 60,000 rockets poised to strike Israel at a nod from Tehran, Hezbollah, according the *Washington Post*, has now assumed an "operational (read 'combat') role" on the Assad side of the Syrian bloodbath.



Quite apart from the overriding Iranian nuclear issue, Professor Efraim Inbar, who heads the Begin-Sadat (BESA) Center for Strategic Studies at Bar-Illan University, additionally faults the Obama administration on its failure to halt Iraq's accelerating slide into Iranian satellitedom, its *no lo contendere* position on Syria, even its virtual silence in the face of Iran's establishment of a presence in Venezuela, an American backyard. As for Iran, he notes that economic sanctions to the contrary notwithstanding, the only time the mullahs were motivated to push the "pause" button on their centrifuges was in 2003, when America decided to terminate Saddam Hussein's lease on Iraq.

"I do not have a policy of containment; I have a policy to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon," President Obama has declared. He believes he can do it without a military strike. But the only way he can possibly head off a nuclear Iran without resorting to a military strike, avers Charles Krauthammer, paraphrasing defense analyst Anthony Cordesman, "is to establish a credible military threat to make Iran recalculate and reconsider. That means U.S. red lines: deadlines beyond which Washington will not allow itself to be strung." These the president remains opposed to institute.

Bill Mehlman leads AFSI in Israel.

From the Editor

The Islamic Republic of Catalonia?

Catalonia, historically one of Spain's wealthiest and most industrialized regions, blaming the central government in Madrid for the region's economic woes, is considering independence. If its politicians push forward on this, writes Soeren Kern, Catalonia would become a country with the third-largest percentage of Muslims in Western Europe (just behind France and Belgium). It would also be home to the largest concentration of radical Islamists in Europe, become ground-zero for Salafi-Jihadism on the continent and one of the top incubators for Islamist terrorism in the West. Kern quotes Abdelwahab Houzi, a Salafi jihadist preacher in Catalonia: "Muslims should vote for pro-independence parties, as they need our votes. But what they do not know is that, when they allow us to vote, we will all vote for Islamic parties because we do not believe in left and right. This will make us win local councils and as we begin to accumulate power in the Catalan autonomous region, Islam will begin to be implemented."

Israel's Left Wing Press Careens toward Oblivion

Sheldon Adelson has become famous in the U.S. for his campaign contributions to Republican Presidential contenders. While the result will be at best mixed (the investment in Gingrich's campaign did not pan out), an article in McClatchy newspapers by Sheera Frenkel reveals that Adelson has already had a decisive (if perhaps unforeseen) impact with a very different investment--in *Israel Hayom*, a free-distribution newspaper he established five years ago. Publishers and reporters of Israel's long established newspapers, now folding like cards, are blaming Adelson for their financial woes. While they admit competition with the internet is partially responsible, they put the lion's share of the blame on *Israel Hayom*.

If so, Adelson has made an important contribution to Israel's welfare. Naturally, those fearful for their jobs try to inflate the stakes. Israeli columnist Ben Caspit declared in *Maariv* that this was a "campaign to make democracy extinct." Sharon Avishay, a former *Maariv* journalist, announced: "We are watching a death blow to the free press in Israel." But Israel's daily press has become a monolithic mouthpiece for the far left. Moreover the standards of reporting are execrable. With a few count-themon-one-hand exceptions, Israeli reporters are lazy, careless of facts, far more apt to spout leftist orthodoxies than engage in investigative reporting. Israel's press is less contentious than uniform--its net effect is to destroy morale and the public belief in the state's very legitimacy.

The end result may be to enhance the debate desirable in a democratic society. *Yediot Ahronot*, the most popular of the left-wing papers, is likely to survive. *Maariv* may also survive. Instead of serving as a left-wing echo of *Yediot*, it is likely to have an alternative ideological perspective, for Shlomo Ben-Zvi, the publisher of the right leaning weekly Makor Rishon, has put in a bid for the paper. If the incorrigible *Haaretz* disappears or becomes a web-only paper, no one should waste a tear.

National Defense University vs. Free Speech

Col. Matthew Dooley has been removed "for cause" from his position teaching at the joint Forces Staff College within the National Defense University. The "cause," as the *Washington Times* reports, is teaching a course "Perspectives on Islam and Islamic Radicals," which offended an assortment of American Islamic groups, at least two of which were unindicted co-conspirators in the Justice Department's prosecution of a Texas charity for funding Hamas. These groups demanded Pentagon employees who promote "based" training materials be "effectively disciplined." Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Martin Dempsey jumped to attention, publicly calling Col. Dooley's training materials unfair to Islam and "academically irresponsible." Although the course and materials in it had been approved by the National Defense University and Col. Dooley's evaluation report last year was outstanding, the fact that a general on Dempsey's staff ordered him to be removed "for cause" meant that the National Defense University had to produce a negative officer evaluation report--a career ender for Colonel Dooley.

Richard Thompson, president of the Thomas More Law Center, who is representing Col. Dooley in an appeal against the negative report, rightly said: "What happened here was this whole idea of political correctness deterred the ability of our military to speak frankly about the identity of the enemy."

The Obama administration's long-standing method of dealing with Islamic radicalism is to redefine it. In the May "From the Editor" we remarked on the \$600 million the US Agency for International Development (USAID) had dedicated to finding the "true" causes of the violence against Christians in northern Nigeria. Never mind that the Muslim jihadist group Boko Haram had openly pledged to "eradicate Christianity." USAID airily declared the true problem was "competition for land" between older and more recent settlers. So the Obama administration's "solution" to Islamic jihad in Nigeria was to spend \$600 million to define it as something else.

Jews in Denial

Rael Jean Isaac



The National Council Of Churches building in New York

"The hostility of liberal Protestantism toward Israel has been something liberal Jews have found difficult to accept. As a result they have largely ignored it." These words were not written within the last few weeks, when, as Jonathan Tobin pointed out, a good part of the liberal Protestant establishment issued "nothing less than a declaration of war on the Jewish state" as the leaders of the National Council of Churches, the Presbyterian Church U.S.A., the Evangelical Lutheran Church, the United Methodist Church, the United Church of Christ, the Disciples of Christ, among others, demanded a congressional investigation into their charges that Israel is involved in crimes that violate U.S law and should therefore be sent neither aid nor arms. Far from being a current observation, the words at the beginning of this paragraph opened an article by this writer entitled "Liberal Protestants vs. Israel" published in Midstream in October 1981. The paragraph concluded: "[T]he National Council of Churches, including the major denominations that set its policy--the United Methodists, the United Presbyterians, the Disciples of

Christ, the Episcopalians, the United Church of Christ--have become centers of activity directed toward eliminating the Jewish state."

Despite this, and the steady escalating drumbeat of attacks by mainline churches in the thirty years since then, the ardor of Jewish organizations for engaging in "interfaith dialogue" with these people has not dimmed. The Anti-Defamation League (ADL) announced--and won plaudits from both Tobin and veteran international Jewish leader Isi Leibler as a result--that it is withdrawing from the annual Christian-Jewish Roundtable, a national Jewish-Christian dialogue event on Oct. 22. It was belatedly followed by seven other groups, among them the American Jewish Committee, the Conference of American Rabbis, the Rabbinical Assembly, the Union for Reform Judaism and the United Synagogue of Conservative Judaism. So what? When the publicity spotlight shifts, their interfaith-addicted staffers will be back in full force for the next meaningless confab. That's clear from their joint letter bowing out of the Oct. 22 event; the signatories declared "[W]e remain committed to continuing our dialogue and our collaboration on the many issues of common concern." Nor is the ADL's presence and that of other Jewish outfits in these endless "dialogues" as meaningless as one would like, for it gives cover to these churches in their ongoing effort to delegitimize the Jewish state.

So when should Jewish organizations and religious bodies have known what their interfaith partners were up to and called a halt to these extensive phony "dialogues"? The answer is clear--forty five years ago, in June 1967. As the noose slowly tightened around Israel, as the Straits of Tiran were closed, the UN forces withdrawn from the Sinai, the Egyptian forces massed there, and threats of destruction poured from Arab capitals, American Jewish organizations and rabbis who had been active in interfaith programs turned to the churches for expressions of support for Israel. It seemed that Israel was facing extinction as the world once more passively looked on.

Liberal Protestant churches shrugged off the pleas. And in the aftermath of the war, when Israel's triumphant escape was met with joy by a Western public that had been reluctant to see her destroyed even if unwilling to act to prevent it, the most equivocal reactions came from liberal Protestant churches. Although ready to condone by silence the threat to Israel's existence in the tense weeks preceding June 4, 1967, the Executive Committee of the National Council of Churches was quick

to find its voice following Israel's victory and on July 7, 1967 announced that it "cannot condone by silence territorial expansion by armed force."

By the time of the 1973 war, the hostility of the liberal Protestant church bureaucracy was undisguised. Although the circumstances of the Yom Kippur War, where the Arab states attacked Israel on the holiest day of the Jewish year, while most of the population was at prayer, might have been expected to provoke special indignation in a religious body, the response of the National Council of Churches was to call for an arms embargo against Israel and to vote down an amendment that affirmed Israel's right to defend itself against the Arab onslaught.

In November 1975, when the UN passed a resolution equating Zionism with racism, the National Council, as an organization representing, as its leaders were fond of saying, 41 million Christians, was silent. If anything its actions could be construed as indirect support for the resolution, for only a few months later, in March, 1976, at its first meeting after the UN had proclaimed Zionism was racism, the Governing Board passed a resolution to "strongly reaffirm" support for the United Nations.

While uniformly silent after PLO raids on Israeli civilians, in May, 1978, when Israel retaliated after a particularly gruesome PLO incursion which began with the murder of a young American photographer upon an Israeli beach and culminated with the massacre of 36 other civilians, many of them in a bus traveling the coastal road, the National Council sharply attacked Israel. Averring that "we as Christians affirm the sanctity of human life," the Governing Board passed a resolution calling upon the United States to cease furnishing anti-personnel bombs to Israel because Israel had used them "wantonly" to kill "thousands of men, women and children." There was no mention of the wanton murder of Israeli civilians. Indeed, the Council rejected an amendment referring to persons "wantonly killed or maimed" in terrorist acts that occasioned the reprisal.

Nor, despite that phrase "we as Christians," did the National Council seem disturbed by challenges to the sanctity of Christian life. When a delegation of Copts showed up at the 1979 Governing Board meeting, and pleaded for a hearing on draconian legislation against Copts in Egypt, the Council refused to let them speak.

In November 1980, the National Council passed a new policy statement on the Middle East, superseding its first, 1969 policy statement on the region. For a number of years, the National Council had been unhappy with that statement, which had called for "direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab states concerned" and had not mentioned Palestinian statehood. This time the Governing Board had no difficulty in deciding that it was morally imperative to give the PLO a state. But there was heated discussion as to whether the policy statement should approve the continued existence of Israel. The 250 man board voted in favor of retaining Israel as a Jewish state by only nine votes. And while one excuse for replacing the 1969 statement was that it dealt only with the Arab-Israel conflict and not the Middle East as a whole, the policy statement had nothing to say about the Maronite Christians in Lebanon (then in a critical plight), Copts or Christians of the Sudan, being massacred by the hundreds of thousands by the Muslims of the north.

In 1981, after the Israeli raid that destroyed Saddam Hussein's nuclear reactor, the Reverend William Howard, then President of the National Council, seized the occasion not merely to condemn the raid but to seek to eliminate Israel's capacity for self-defense. In a letter to President Reagan he claimed the raid on the reactor would "weaken any hope of creating a system of international or regional security guarantees" and asserted that the "moral credibility" of the United States would be forfeited if it did not impose a unilateral arms embargo on Israel. The United Presbyterian Church and the United Methodist Church, among others, sent similar letters to reinforce the message.

Resolutions, letters and policy statements tell only part of the story. Seminars, conferences, films, radio and publications poured out pro-Arab propaganda and National Council bureaucrats and those of member churches often took roles in, established cooperative relationships with, and distributed material of the most virulently anti-Israel groups.

Occasionally there were complaints from Jewish organizations. In a letter to the National Council in 1979 the ADL complained a 20 item packet entitled "American Churches in the Arab-Israel Conflict" which the National Council had distributed was unmistakably designed "to undermine and reverse Christian support of Israel." Not long after, in a rare show of Jewish solidarity, 14 Jewish organizations rejected an invitation by the National Council to participate in "hearings," i.e. a rigged trial of Israel, preparatory to its passage of its 1980 policy statement on the Middle East. In a joint letter they objected that the "Issues for Consideration" which the Council had drawn up placed Israel on trial on the basis of "slanderous charges" and constituted "a gross and deliberate misrepresentation of fact and history." But nothing the National Council or its member churches did interfered with the Jewish thirst for "dialogue." The interfaith bus chugged merrily onward. And you can bet that despite the Rabbinical Assembly's current declaration that the National Council's latest performance "warrants a review" of the Assembly's interfaith activities--or the statement by Ethan Felson of the Jewish Council for Public Affairs, that "something is deeply broken, badly broken"-- it won't come to a halt now.

The undignified sycophancy of Jewish organizations toward liberal Protestants is bad enough. But their behavior is far worse than that. While turning their slapped cheeks with the regularity of a wound-up doll, Jewish leaders lash out at those churches whose leaders have been in the forefront supporting Israel. In *A Match Made in Heaven*, Zev Chafets tells the sordid and painful story of deepest Jewish ingratitude toward those evangelical Christian leaders who have made every effort to be their friend and Israel's friend. Chafetz writes that on Nov. 3, 2005, Abe Foxman (the same Foxman now reaping unwarranted praise from Tobin and Leibler) "declared war on evangelical Christianity" at an ADL National Commission meeting. Actually that declaration of war was made more than a year earlier, in June 1944, when the ADL issued a report *The Religious Right: The Assault on Tolerance and Pluralism in America* accusing evangelical and fundamentalist leaders of using "a rhetoric of fear, suspicion and even hatred" in quest of political power.

But if Chafetz is off on the date, he is absolutely right that Jewish leaders are both arrogant and stupid to turn down the hand extended to them in fellowship, to reject what Chafetz calls "the Judeo-Christian bargain the evangelicals had placed on the table." When Israel's fate is on the line, evangelicals, to use the title of Rabbi Yechiel Eckstein's organization Stand Up for Israel, have been standing up for her. In Israel's most recent Lebanon war against Hezbollah it was Pastor John Hagee's group Christians United for Israel which organized the first major pro-Israel rally in Washington, sending thousands to the street and then to Congress to deliver their message of support. As the bombs were falling Pat Robertson was broadcasting his 700 Club from the town of Metulla in northern Israel and touring shelters in the Galilee. Meanwhile the bureaucrats of the National Council of Churches, for whose company Jewish leaders quiver, was hard at work to figure out how best to bring Israel to its knees.

Can Israel and Jews count on the continued support of evangelical and fundamentalist Christians no matter how badly Jewish leaders in this country behave toward them? Chafetz says, don't count on it. If Jewish leaders, unable or unwilling to distinguish friends from enemies, continue to repudiate their friends they may be left solely with enemies. As they self-importantly cavort with their "progressive" anti-Israel counterparts in the liberal churches, one is reminded of Thomas Gray's lines:

Alas! regardless of their doom, The little victims play; No sense have they of ills to come, Nor care beyond today.

Much of this article is taken from Rael Jean Isaac, "Liberal Protestants vs. Israel," Midstream, October 1981.

My Mentor Ze'ev Jabotinsky: Ze'ev Jabotinsky's Centennial Birthday, 1980

Prime Minister Menachem Begin

(Editor's Note: Ze'ev Jabotinsky was born in October so in reprinting this tribute to him we commemorate him on the one hundred and thirty second anniversary of his birth. Jabotinsky remains AFSI's inspiration as he was the inspiration for his one-time secretary Shmuel Katz, who had a more direct role in AFSI's birth. For those who would like to see a five part video on his life--25 minutes in all--we strongly recommend David Isaac's new project, Zionism 101, The Founding Fathers, at http://www.zionism101.org).



One hundred years ago, at the port city of Odessa, a son was born in the house of Jabotinsky. Today, as we gather to memorialize and rejoice marking the 100th anniversary of his birth, we must say his life and work had changed the history of the Jewish people.

From his youth and up until his passing, Jabotinsky devoted his life to the salvation of our people, to free its land, Eretz Yisrael, to renew its Jewish forces, to educate a generation of warriors, to preach for social justice and its implementation, to create a sense of pride in every Jew for being born as such, and above all — to renew Zionism and fight the continuous battle for the establishment of an independent Jewish state.

Ze'ev Jabotinsky was a man of many talents in various fields, but his efforts and thoughts were concentrated on achieving his goal of educating the new Jewish character: The quiet, proud, devoted, faithful one who loves his people and is willing to make any sacrifice for their salvation, national freedom and honor. In both of these fields he achieved complete success and his victory met his aspirations. Indeed, he

acknowledged the heroic fighters, and he was the one to provide them and the people as well with the flag raised by Herzl, the flag of renewed Jewish nationalism.

There are a few who claim that Jabotinsky was a tragic figure, for he dreamed, made sacrifices and suffered greatly, but yet he did not live to see his work come to fruition, for he had collapsed while working to achieve his goal and his life ended while on foreign land. This is far from the case. It is true — as of many others in history — that Jabotinsky's victory was achieved after his passing. However, he was a winning figure; his goal was accomplished, a generation of fighters had come to life and the State of Israel was renewed from the pit of decay and dust. A Jewish force had come to life - a kind not seen since the time of the Maccabees.



Menachem Begin

Few are the men in history that have such powerful, clear triumphs. For us, Ze'ev Jabotinsky was a tutor, the carrier of hopes. Our souls were bound. We never, G-d forbid, anticipated his death and I can therefore say, 40 years after his passing, that he continues to live in our hearts. Throughout troubling times of rebellion and revival, we continue to stop and ponder: Under these conditions, what would Ze'ev Jabotinsky have done, how would he conduct himself and what would have been his decision.

But it is not only incumbent on us, the Jewish people in our land and in the Diaspora, to make this day marking the 100th anniversary of his birth one of high spirits and a renewal of faith. It is a day to pledge that we

continue to follow in his footsteps and to work toward accomplishing his social and political beliefs until our final living days. Indeed – Ze'ev Jabotinsky is among us, he is eternal!

Jewish-Arab Demography Defies Conventional "Wisdom"

Yoram Ettinger

A Jewish majority west of the Jordan River is secure, benefiting from a tailwind in defiance of conventional "wisdom," which once again is detached from reality.

In 2012, Israel's Jewish demography continues the robust surge of the last 17 years, while Muslim demography, west of the Jordan River and throughout the Middle East, increasingly embraces Western standards.

According to a June, 2012 study by the Washington-based Population Reference Bureau (PRB), 72% of 15-49 year old Palestinian married women prefer to avoid pregnancy, as do 78% in Morocco, 71% in Jordan, 69% in Egypt and Libya, 68% in Syria, 63% in Iraq and 61% in Yemen. The PRB study states that "a growing number of women are using contraception, as family planning services have expanded in the Arab region."

The unprecedented fertility decline in the Muslim world was documented in June, 2012 by Dr. Nicholas Eberstadt, a leading demographer at the American Enterprise Institute, and Apoorva Shah of the Hoover Institute. According to Eberstadt and Shah, "Throughout the worldwide Muslim community, fertility levels are falling dramatically.... According to the UN Population Division estimates and projections, all 48 Muslim-majority countries and territories witnessed fertility decline over the last three decades.... The proportional decline in fertility for Muslim-majority areas was greater than for the world as a whole over that same period, or for the less-developed regions as a whole.... Six of the ten largest absolute declines in fertility for a two-decade period yet recorded in the postwar era (and by extension, we may suppose, ever to take place under orderly conditions in human history) have occurred in Muslim-majority countries.... Four of the ten greatest fertility declines ever recorded in a 20-year period took place in the Arab world.... No other region of the world — not highly dynamic Southeast Asia, or even rapidly modernizing East Asia — comes close to this showing.... The remarkable fertility decline now unfolding throughout the Muslim world is one of the most important demographic developments in our era."

The key developments yielding a drastic decline in Arab fertility, in the Middle East including west of the Jordan River, have been modernity and its derivatives. For instance, urbanization (70% rural Arab population in Judea and Samaria in 1967 and 75% urban in 2012), expanded women's education and employment, led to a record high divorce rate and wedding age, all time high family planning, rapidly declining teen-pregnancy, youthful male net-emigration, etc.

The Palestinian Authority (PA) has inflated the actual number of Arabs in Judea and Samaria (1.65 million) by one million, since the arrival of one million immigrants from the USSR. Thus, contrary to internationally accepted demographic standards, the PA counts some 400,000 overseas residents, who have been overseas for over a year, as de-facto residents. Some 300,000 Israeli I.D. card-bearing Jerusalem Arabs are doubly-counted as Israelis (by Israel) and as Palestinians (by the PA). The number of births is over-reported, the number of death is under-reported, emigration is ignored, etc.

In 2012, Israel's Jewish fertility rate (three births per woman) is trending upward, boding well for Israel's economy and national security, exceeding any Middle Eastern Muslim country, other than Yemen, Iraq and Jordan, which are trending downward. Iran's fertility rate is 1.8 births per woman, Saudi Arabia and the Gulf States 2.5, Syria and Egypt 2.9 and North Africa 1.8. The average fertility rate of an Israeli-born Jewish mother has already surpassed three births. In 2012, the Israeli Arab-Jewish fertility gap is half a birth per woman, compared with a six birth gap in 1969.

Moreover, young Jewish and Arab Israeli women have converged at three births, with Arab women trending below – and Jewish women trending above – three births.

In 2012, Jewish births have expanded to 77% of total Israeli births, compared with 69% in 1969. While the ultra-orthodox Jewish fertility rate has declined, due to growing integration into the workforce and the military, the secular Jewish fertility rate has risen significantly.

Since 2001, the number of Jewish emigrants has decreased and the number of returning Jewish expatriates has increased. Aliya has been sustained annually since 1882, while Arab net-emigration – especially from Judea and Samaria – has been a fixture, at least, since 1950.

The current 66% Jewish majority in the combined area of the pre-1967 Israel, Judea and Samaria would catapult to an 80% majority in 2035, if Israel realizes the clear and present dramatic Aliyah (Jewish immigration) window of opportunity. At least 500,000 Olim from the former USSR, France, Britain, Argentina and the USA could reach Israel during the next five years, in light of Israel's economic indicators, the intensification of European anti-Semitism, the Islamic penetration of Europe and the growth of Jewish-Zionist education.

The suggestion that Jews are doomed to become a minority between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean is either dramatically mistaken or outrageously misleading.

Yoram Ettinger is a former Israeli Consul-General to the United States and currently a lecturer, writer and consultant on the Middle East. This appeared in Israel Hayom, on October 19. Website: http://bit.ly/RcqV6L

Raising Children in Netivot

Danielle Schreiber Rubin

(Editor's note: Netivot is not a "settlement." It is squarely in Israel in the old green line, south of Beersheba. It became target practice for Hamas after Israel, to its eternal discredit, destroyed the Jewish communities of Gush Khatif. We publish this to give readers an idea of what "normal life" has become in parts of Israel--and what it could become elsewhere if more such territorial surrenders follow.)



So it's 10:20. Night. Husband's on the way home from a meeting in Tel Aviv (yes, the other part of the country). I have successfully maneuvered all three children, ages four, two and three months, into bed.

Going over e-mails is getting boring... and suddenly there's that sound. It takes a split second to recognize it, since I've heard it over and over again in my head for the past four years, ever since my oldest son was born (a few months before Operation Cast Lead, December 2008), so I need to

confirm that I'm not just humming that old tune. But, alas, it's that same siren. Yup, and it's definitely coming from our town, not from one of the regional councils a few miles away. And now comes the tricky part.

Which child do I pick up first? It's a first for me because this time I'm alone, with three children at home, all asleep, none in a protected area (i.e., clear of windows and external walls). Do I go for the baby? Last time I grabbed him out of his crib, waking him, and decided that this is how traumas begin, so I told myself that next time I'd just wheel him in with his carriage, so as not to interrupt his peaceful baby sleep.

But what about my two-year-old daughter? She's the one who's really having a hard time, stopping short every time an ambulances passes, mistaking it for a siren.

After sitting up with her for an hour and a half after the last midnight siren, I told myself that next time I'd carry her in gently, so as not to wake her at all. But what about my oldest son, the one who has been living for four years under the missile threat, who is most aware of the situation and reminds



me every time we visit our parents that there, up north, we are safe.

Forget the emotional consequences, he's on top of a bunk-bed I can't climb up! This all takes a split second. I don't have much more than that; a little more than half a minute before the rocket lands. I run for my oldest, hoping to wake him to get him to climb down the ladder. Yeah, right.

I climb up the ladder, pull him toward me by the leg, hold him carefully as I run toward a safe area, and lay him gently on the carpet.

Back to kids' room. Have no idea how I got number two out of the tractor-turned-bunk- bed trenches below. Bring her into safe area. On my way to my room to get the baby I note that the siren has stopped.

Grab stroller and wheel into safe room just as loud explosion is heard.

We're safe. For now.

Two oldest are still sleeping. Baby stirring.

He'll need to wait a minute or two since I can't really stop this thumping in my chest, and I'm not sure how that tastes.

Then I'll calm him down, put him back to sleep and remind myself that next time I should try to be a little more gentle with him.

Back to those boring e-mails. Boring is good.

The author lives in Netivot, Israel.

If Only We Were Turks

Sarah Honig

When it's properly motivated, the UN can react with lightning speed. It just has to want to, as in the case of the errant mortar shells from the Syrian civil war that inadvertently overfly the border and come down with an occasional thud on the Turkish side.

No lucid pundit can envisage any stratagem that would remotely tempt embattled Damascus despot Bashar Assad to arouse Turkish ire. Assad presumably has his hands more than full at home. He is the least likely to launch deliberate aggression against his big neighbor and thereby ostracize and endanger himself even further in an already hostile world environment.

Whatever else we have to say about Assad, and there's plenty to rightfully badmouth him for, he certainly didn't seek confrontation with Turkey. This isn't his doing.

Nevertheless, it's no less than instructive to witness the stern censure against Syria after each mortar shell that explodes in Turkish jurisdiction. One would think that this constitutes the most heinous belligerence in recent memory. And so UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon was rattled out of his habitual inclination for keeping lethargically mum (such as when Hamas rockets explode deep inside Israel). In an official statement, he informed all the peace-loving denizens of this planet that he was "alarmed by escalating tensions" between Syria and Turkey.

Gazan missiles fired for many years – and very intentionally so – at Israel's entire South don't upset him. Ban only expresses concern on those occasions in which Israel rises to defend its incessantly terrorized civilians.

But in the case of Islamist-led Turkey, Ban's concern took on a resolute proactive expression. With unprecedented swiftness and solemnity, he warned against "the risk of the 18-month-long Syrian conflict embroiling the entire region."

The manifest implication is that the Mideast is in trouble because a Turkish response is to be naturally expected, contingent on Turkey's inalienable right to exact vengeance. Again, needless to stress, this is quite unlike what is perceived as natural and inherently justified for Israel.

But as this wasn't about Israel, Ban's official spokesman, Martin Nesirky, lost no time to let us all know that "the risks of regional conflict and the threat to international peace and security are increasing."

This is never the case when Hamas, Islamic Jihad and associate proxies (boasting mutating monikers) fire rockets at Israeli kindergartens, schools, medical facilities, family homes, apartment houses, grocery stores and even the Ashkelon Power Plant that inter alia supplies Gaza with electricity.

The UN Security Council also reacted with uncharacteristic alacrity when Ankara asked it to take the "necessary action to stop Syrian aggression and ensure that Turkish territorial integrity is respected." No sooner did Turkey squawk then the Security Council condemned what was called "the Syrian attack." This starkly contrasts with the undisguised disdain with which numerous Israeli complaints are dismissed.

The Security Council was unequivocal in the compassion it copiously showered upon the Turks. "The attack," we were told, "highlighted the grave impact the crisis in Syria has on the security of its neighbors and on regional peace and stability."

Syria might have fared even worse in the Security Council were it not for the obliging Russian and Chinese Assad-boosters who objected to a more severe admonition against the "grave impact to international peace and security," as distinct from mere regional repercussions.

The Council went on to sanctimoniously demand that "such violations of international law stop immediately and are not repeated."

Ever hear anything of the like out of the same Council regarding Gaza? There's as much chance of that as of tasting the green cheese from the dark side of the moon.

Syria's UN envoy Bashar Ja'afari repeated his patrons' frightened apology to Ankara and assured the Council that his government isn't out to trigger combat with Turkey. But no one was listening.

No outcries of dismayed denunciation greeted Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan's reiterated bluster that "The Turkish Republic is a state capable of defending its citizens and borders. Nobody should try and test our determination on this subject." On yet another oratorical opportunity Erdogan counseled Damascus not to attempt to assess Turkey's "limits and fortitude." He declared that Ankara "was not bluffing" when promising payback for each instance of "Syrian aggression."

If Erdogan's counterpart in Jerusalem had repetitively resorted to similar rhetoric, the global commotion would be deafening and damning. Israeli leaders need utter nothing to traumatize the international community. Mere hype about hypothetical bullying by ogre Jews suffices.

The world purports to know what we think and despises us for it. On the other hand, there is profuse sympathy for unfortunate Turkey's unspeakable ordeal, as there is a tacit understanding for the counter-shelling with which Turkey is, alas, compelled to retaliate. On Turkey's part, answering fire with fire is the unchallenged and self-evident course to take.

Get the take of US Defense Secretary Leon Panetta on Erdogan's cautions that his country "isn't far from war with Syria." Panetta was quite cool and collected about it and with studied composure informed all and sundry that "the US is using its diplomatic channels to relay worries about the fighting in the hopes that it won't broaden."

Such soft vocabulary choices are never used for Israel. Panetta, undoubtedly echoing his boss's sentiments, serially and acerbically scorns our survival strategies. Put in a nutshell, he blames all regional ills on Israel. The inescapable corollary is that justice can only be achieved by righting wayward Israel's wrongs and winning concessions from it.

Less than 10 months ago, pontificating at the Brookings Institute's Saban Center, Panetta unambiguously placed all onus upon Israel, and urged Israel to take risks and "lean forward" to achieve peace with the Palestinians. Never mind that Israel had already taken risks aplenty – time after disastrous time – gaining nothing but more bloodshed and abuse for its sacrifices, while whetting appetites for yet more sacrifices.

What if our goodwill blows up in our faces yet again? "If the gestures are rebuked, the world will see those rebukes for what they are. And that is exactly why Israel should pursue them," Panetta proclaimed.

Subtext: Israel needs to bare its throat to genocidal enemies, so that the watching world will admire its virtue. One would think Panetta, a former CIA director, had just surfaced from a sealed bunker, oblivious of successive displays of Israeli virtue that only intensified Israel's vilification.

In other words, Panetta preached that we'd be better liked for being weaker and that getting weaker will improve our self-preservation prospects.

Likewise, Panetta pompously prods Israel to "reach out and mend fences with those who share an interest in regional stability – countries like Turkey and Egypt." We might question how much stability has been furthered by either Egypt or Turkey, but Panetta left no doubt regarding who's liable for the busted fences.

Panetta plainly expanded on this motif when he suggested that Israel undermines the Palestinian Authority and is at fault for not restarting moribund negotiations with it. That was why he hectored: "Just get to the damn table!"

Can anyone imagine such callous language and contemptuous tones used to browbeat Turkey? Obviously one set of rules applies to Turkey and quite another to Israel – without even configuring the incomparably more prolonged, frequent and menacing provocations against Israel.

That goes for the media too. One Syrian mortar shell that hit just inside Turkish territory last Sunday made headlines worldwide. Over 55 shells and rockets that barraged Israel that same night went largely unmentioned. Israeli pain is clearly not worth wasting airtime for.

To paraphrase Tevye's plaintive exclamation in Fiddler on the Roof: "If only we were Turks!"

Sarah Honig is an Israeli writer and opinion columnist. This is a slightly shortened version of her blog of October 12 on sarahhonig.com.

The Camp David Accords Then And Now

Ruth King

Pundits and commentators who were giddy with delight at the onset of the Arab "Spring" uprisings, are now recanting their naïve assumptions that democracy and freedom were sweeping into the Arab/Moslem Middle East.

Those who were more realistic from the onset are now gloating "we told you so."

However, both groups bemoan the abrogation of the so-called "peace treaty" between Israel and Egypt. Well we at AFSI told you so. We were the only, repeat, only group that opposed the so-called peace treaty with Egypt. We were not fooled by Sadat, who had the gall to insist on the total return of the Sinai-- 92% of the territories won in 1967 and held in 1973 despite a sneak attack by Egypt and Syria.

We were not lulled by his demands for "autonomy" for the Palestinian Arabs of Judea and Samaria. We recognized that the word "autonomy" was code for independence and that the total withdrawal from Sinai would become the template for complete territorial surrender by Israel on all fronts.

We were not convinced that Israel's acquiescence would buy it much in international approval. Only a few years later the war in Lebanon elicited an outpouring of libel and hatred for Israel unseen and unheard since its very creation in 1948.

Before the ink was dry on the accords, Egypt violated all significant paragraphs of the agreement: there was no trade, no exchange of tourists, no cooperative ventures and no halt in anti-Semitic incitement. While Jimmy Carter and his consigliere were demanding more concessions from Israel, the Egyptian media, imams and school books redoubled their venom.

There was no real gain for Israel. What self-respecting nation would exchange security, territory, air bases and settlements for "recognition of its right to exist?" And of course even that was an illusion since Egypt continued to treat Israel as a cancer in the Arab/Moslem world.

Most important of all, the Camp David Accords vitiated the moral and strategic principles Israel's first Prime Minister David Ben Gurion invoked after the 1949 cease fire agreement. Israel had declared its statehood within the framework of the 1947 lines drawn by the United Nations (Resolution 141). The entire Arab world then declared war on Israel. In that war Israel won land in the Galilee, the Negev, Lod, Ramle and Jerusalem (although it did not succeed in liberating the Old City). Despite intense international pressure, Ben Gurion stood firm in refusing to relinquish Israel's territorial gains, asserting Israel would not reward genocidal aggressors. This should have been the precedent guiding Israel at Camp David.

Defenders of the so-called treaty will claim that the subsequent forty years brought peace, enabling the growth of Israel's economy, research and technology.

Not so fast!

Israel did develop state of the art centers for science and a local "Silicon Valley." Just look at a map. Where are they located and why did they thrive? Because, although they are located in that narrow strip of land of the pre-1967 borders, the retention of the Golan Heights and the depth and elevations of Judea and Samaria afforded that strip significant strategic depth and security.

That, and that alone, and not a specious "peace" treaty accounts for Israel's impressive achievements in technology, research and economy.

Camp David's premise of territorial concessions for "peace" gave way to the Oslo Agreements, an abject failure followed by the longest and most bloody string of terrorism and continual escalation of terms and demands by Abbas and the Palestinian Arabs. Having learned nothing from Oslo, Israel then acceded to the surrender of the Gaza Strip, followed by what has become an almost daily barrage of lethal rockets fired from Gaza into civilian towns in southern Israel.

And, having learned nothing from the foregoing, nor from the anti-Semitic hysteria of resurgent Islam throughout the Arab world, ostensible supporters of Israel here and in Jerusalem still flog the two state dissolution based on surrender of Israel's biblical heartland and the depth and elevation which defend and sustain Israel's security. Although their intent may be innocent, they align themselves with those who wish to see an end to the Jewish State.

If one went to a doctor with a strep infection and he suggested leeches and cupping, that would be considered malpractice to say the least and another opinion would be sought immediately.

To continue to promote territorial concessions by Israel is political malpractice.

There are sane voices in Israel who inspire our opposition to any form of territorial concessions by Israel.

First, the brave patriots who live in Judea and Samaria and Golan...may they prosper and be fruitful and increase their presence and their offspring.

Second, William Mehlman, P.David Hornik, Martin Sherman, Caroline Glick, Ruthie Blum, Sarah Honig, Michael Freund, Moshe Sharon, Marc Prowisor, Yisrael Medad, Joel Fishman-- I mention them without intent to offend any I have omitted.

I owe special gratitude to former Ambassador Yoram Ettinger, whose columns and demographic studies of Judea and Samaria and his almost daily notes of encouragement help—keep us at AFSI strong and determined.

An ideal bar-mitzvah gift:

Shmuel Katz's **Lone Wolf, A Biography of Vladimir (Ze'ev) Jabotinsky**This two volume biography is available to members of AFSI for only \$25.

For non-members \$50.00.

Outpost

Editor: Rael Jean Isaac Editorial Board: Ruth King, Rita Kramer Outpost is distributed free to Members of Americans For a Safe Israel

Annual membership: \$50.

Americans For a Safe Israel

1751 Second Ave. (at 91st Street) New York, NY 10128 Tel (212) 828-2424 / fax (212) 828-1717

Email: afsi@rcn.com