

---

# OUTPOST

February 2013—Issue #262

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL 43<sup>rd</sup> Year of Publication

<b>Table of Contents</b>		
A Post Election Perspective	William Mehlman	Page 2
From the Editor	Ruth King	Page 3
Rabbis Rush To Judgment	Roger Gerber	Page 6
Will They Give Oscars For Bashing Israel?	Lori Lowenthal Marcus	Page 9
The Rasha	David Krakow	Page 10
Watch Out When Someone Says He Knows What's Best For You	Gerald Honigman	Page 12
Evolution of Hatred	Ruth King	Page 14

## A Post Election Perspective

William Mehlman

“On the plains of hesitation,” the English poet George Cecil Ives observed, “bleach the bones of countless millions who at the dawn of victory sat down to wait...and in waiting, died.”

Benjamin Netanyahu was at the dawn of victory six months ago when he set September 4<sup>th</sup> as the date for Israeli national elections and his own third run for the premiership of the Jewish state. Smith Research, the most respected of Israel’s polling organizations, was predicting 37-40 Knesset mandates for his Likud party, on its own, up from 27 in 2008. Netanyahu could have coasted to victory against a Left and Center-Left divided, demoralized and in disarray. Instead of moving in for the kill, he “sat down to wait,” fomenting an ill-conceived Likud electoral list partnership with the Yisrael Beyteinu party of soon to be indicted former Foreign Minister Avigdor Lieberman and a 71-day mock marriage with Shaul Mofaz and a virtually comatose Kadima . Finally getting to elections in late January, he instigated a costly campaign feud with Naftali Bennett and his Ha’Bayit Ha’Yehudi (“The Jewish Home”) party.

It speaks to the anomaly of the Israeli political system that despite a 30 percent haircut to 31 mandates from the 42 they received as independent entities four years earlier, Netanyahu and Likud-Beyteinu are neither dead nor on life-support. Rather, in some critical respects, including his further dealings with Barak Obama, the prime minister may have emerged from the ordeal strengthened. Assuming he can clear his mind of “governments of national unity” and other oxymoronic notions, the prime minister’s future could still be a work in progress. That will depend on his ability to get Bennett, the 40 year- old former software tycoon who propelled Bayit Yehudi from 3 to 12 mandates, and ex-TV journalist Yair Lapid, who at 49 created Yesh Atid (“There is a future”) and turned it into Israel’s second largest political entity (19 mandates) around the same table. If he can manage it, his dream of creating a governing coalition uncluttered with factional splinters and their extortionist demands may finally be realized.



Yair Lapid

The math certainly works. Likud-Beyteinu, Yesh Atid and Bayit Yehudi command a 62-seat majority in the 120-seat Knesset. They could without much risk raise it to 64 by accessing Shaul Mofaz and his two-seat Kadima faction. The politics work too. “Nonsense,” is Michael Widlanski’s response to the characterization of Yesh Atid as a “Left- leaning” party. “Lapid is not on the Left,” asserts the author of *Battle for Our Minds: Western Elites and the Terror Threat* (Simon & Schuster), “neither politically nor economically.” Markedly uninterested in associating Yesh Atid

with Meretz’s and the Tzipi Livni Party’s regurgitated pleas for unrequited concessions to Mahmoud Abbas in the pursuit of “peace,” Lapid’s election campaign focused on the equalization of the burden of national military service within the larger context of integrating Israel’s 800,000 ultra-Orthodox population into the Israeli economic and educational mainstream. Though not a Right-wing party, approximately half the votes that rocketed Yesh Atid to second place in the Knesset count came from people who describe themselves as rightist, according to pollster Mina Tsemah.

In his total rejection of the “two-state” paradigm as the solution to the Arab-Israeli impasse, Naftali Bennett and Bayit Yehudi are clearly to the right of Lapid and Yesh Atid, who regard it as unrealistic under present conditions. They are pretty much on the same page, however, in respect to the

equalization of the burden of military service, the haredi integration into the economy and the conviction that it has to be an “evolutionary” process . Both are staunch promoters of a strengthened middle class as the cornerstone of sustained economic health.

Bringing Yesh Atid, a secular party headed by a mainstream TV news personality with a large national following into the coalition, should, if nothing else, blunt the Obama administration’s charge that Netanyahu- led Israel’s sole support for an end to further concessions to the Palestinian Authority stems from the “far- Right.” Yesh Atid’s input in Israel’s decision-making process should also temper to some degree the European Union’s warped conception of Netanyahu as the leader of a war-obsessed garrison state.



By the same token, the inclusion of religiously-oriented, but Zionistically fervent Bayit Yehudi in the new ruling coalition would preclude the further need to express sensitivity to Orthodox Jewish values by yielding to the demands of a haredi sector fiercely opposed to any alteration of a status quo that enables 60,000 Yeshiva students to avoid both military and national service . Though Shas, many of whose constituents do serve in the IDF, might be responsive to a compromise on that issue in exchange for participation in the coalition, the

good old days of political favor by extortion should be at an end. Mr. Netanyahu’s presumptive new partners would surely have something to say on that subject.

---

### From The Editor

(Rael Jean Isaac is on vacation. these entries are from Ruth King)

### WHY THE SURPRISE AND OUTRAGE NOW?

Why is anyone surprised by President Obama’s choices of Chuck Hagel and John Kerry and John Brennan? Where have they been during the past four years? President Obama, in his first speech to the United Nations in 2009 made his sentiments very clear.

He ignored, as he always has, the terrorism and barbaric human rights violation in the Moslem world, stating that “Extremists sowing terror in pockets of the world....protracted conflicts that grind on and on; genocide, mass atrocities, more nations with nuclear weapons; melting ice caps and ravaged populations; persistent poverty and pandemic disease.”

Well, some of those very deep pockets of the world are in Saudi Arabia where the President of the United Nations bowed to the tyrant who promotes and funds and enables genocide and terror. And, let’s face it there are no “melting ice caps” in Saudi Arabia or those Moslem nations he is so eager to avoid dissing.

Then after platitudes upon platitudes he segued into the Middle East and mentioned his “special Czar for Middle East Peace- George Mitchell, a Chuck Hagel In John Kerry clothing.

And what did he promise his Czar would do to end the Israel/Arab conflict? He evoked a Mitchell engineered settlement based on “....security for Israelis and Palestinians....two states living side by side in peace and security- a Jewish State of Israel.....**and a viable, independent Palestinian state with contiguous territory that ends the occupation that began in 1967, and realizes the potential of the Palestinian people.** “

Contiguous territory? I hereby offer a free lifetime subscription to OUTPOST to anyone who can figure out how to make Gaza and the West Bank contiguous without strangling Israel.

Then the man who has Israel's back added "The United States does Israel no favors when we fail to couple an unwavering commitment to its security with an insistence that Israel respect the legitimate claims and rights of the Palestinians."

There are four people who share those thoughts....Hillary Clinton, John Kerry, John Brennan and Chuck Hagel.

Where was the outrage in 2009? 2010? 2011? And 2012?

**AFSI NOTES WITH GREAT SADNESS THAT RON NACHMAN THE MAYOR OF ARIEL DIED ON JANUARY 18TH, OF THIS YEAR. RON WAS OUR FRIEND AND INSPIRATION. THIS COLUMN BY DR. MOSHE DANN SUMS UP THE LIFE OF A GREAT ZIONIST**

<http://www.israelnationalnews.com/Articles/Article.aspx/12792>

Ron Nachman, mayor of Ariel, had a vision. "I want to build a city here that will be the center of a regional area, not a satellite of some larger place, an independent city of thirty or sixty thousand Jews, that will offer services to everyone – Jews and Arabs from the Jordan Valley to Petach Tikvah. And I want peace, real peace; coexistence, not separation."

Nachman, a fourth generation Israeli, came from a long tradition of builders and public figures. His grandfather helped establish Nes Ziyona, near Rehovolt, in the early 1880's; his father was the deputy mayor of the town. In 1977, Nachman came to an isolated hilltop 30 kilometers east of Tel Aviv with a handful of friends and envisioned a city. Today, that dream is an impressive reality.

Unlike his neighbors in Gush Emunim who took over sites that were, at first, in dispute, Nachman played strictly by the rules. He received government permission every step of the way, and the funds to build. At the time he was the deputy director-general of Israel Military Industries, and later became a director at IBA. In 1985, shortly after Ariel received its municipal council status, Nachman became its first elected mayor and served in that position ever since.

The dynamic mayor was simply undaunted by obstacles. Told that he could not receive thirty caravans to house new immigrants from the FSU, during a massive wave of aliyah, he fought with the Housing Ministry and eventually arranged for six hundred. He literally ran from one project to another, from classrooms where young children play with computers to libraries and planning meetings with the satisfaction of a proud father. Ariel was his child and his soul.

Boycotted by the Jewish Agency and visiting Federations from North America because Ariel is "over the green line," Nachman found private funding from prominent philanthropists like the Milken Family Foundation and the Arison Foundation, as well as many church groups. These organizations have an ongoing and close relationship with Ariel, providing substantial financial and emotional support.

Involving Christian groups financially, however, was controversial for some Jews who fear missionary activity and mistrust their intentions. Other rabbinic authorities believe that this is permissible when there is no intent or desire to carry out missionary activity in any way.

Ariel officials insist that not only are the groups carefully screened, but also they bring an enthusiasm that is quite inspiring. Christians who follow the Bible are excited by what they see as the fulfillment of prophetic writings. With Nachman, they agree that "this is the land that was given by God to the Jewish People. If you want tangible proof that God keeps his promises, it's Israel's existence."

Christian Zionism is certainly not new. The International Christian Embassy actively promotes Israel and Israeli causes — much appreciated especially at a time when Israel is castigated throughout the world. For the most part, the churches that are involved with settlements are non-denominational evangelicals, the fastest-growing churches in America. Perhaps the main reason for their interest is theological. They accept the validity of "the Old Testament" along with (rather than replaced by) the

New Testament. They believe that the Bible openly and clearly commands Christians to bless Israel materially, as well as spiritually.

It is ironic that these Christian groups bring an element of faith to Nachman, a devout non-observant Jew. Although wary of religious ties, his visits with the Lubavitcher Rebbe made a deep and lasting impression on him. "The Rebbe gave me a bracha and told me that the work I was doing – building Eretz Yisrael – was very important. That's my religion." Nachman had a picture of the Rebbe in his office and treasured a collection of dollar bills he received from him.

Nachman's political Zionism centers on The Land of Israel and The Jewish People. Asked about "Torat Yisrael," he responded. "I'm a pluralist, and a liberal. I care less about what someone believes, than what he does." Although religion did not play a great role in Nachman's daily life, he was deeply concerned about "yiddishkeit," the lack of Jewish values in Israeli public schools, and the future of Israel. More distressing, for him, was the lack of unity in the country. "Look what happens in the United States. The country is under attack and goes to war. Does anyone dare attack the government? Everyone supports each other. Here it's just the opposite. The newspapers and media are against government. The Left shouts that we are the problem. Jews fight other Jews who live in Yesha and are being attacked and killed every day. What difference does it make where someone lives? A life is a life. A Jew is a Jew." Despite its location well beyond the "green line" Ariel is one of the few places that even Yossi Beilin was reluctant to relinquish to the Palestinians. "There is consensus," Nachman emphasized. "We have reached a critical population mass and now very few speak about removing Ariel."

One group that does is Peace Now. According to their spokesman, Didi Remez, "Israel's future as a Jewish and democratic state depends on its ability to achieve a viable peace with the Palestinians. Any viable future peace agreement will be based on the 1967 borders, with minor territorial exchanges. Because Ariel lies deep within the West Bank, it will probably have to be dismantled. This will be a tragedy for the vast majority of its residents who were lured in with lucrative economic incentives and had no idea what a terrible price they would have to pay for the sake of a nationalistic ideology, which they do not necessarily share."

Nachman dismissed such statements as nonsense. Is there a solution? "Tolerance," Nachman believed. "We have to find a way to live together. I've always worked for that, and it will take time and patience. We have to be strong and determined. If the Palestinians want a state, let them have it in Jordan, with connections to their cities and towns in the West Bank. I am against transfer – of Jews, or Arabs. That won't bring peace."

"Before Oslo we had peace. Maybe it wasn't the best, but it worked. Now, everything has changed. Arafat and his gang want to destroy us ... And some Israelis helped him," he added

"That's what bothers me about (Yitzhak) Rabin, (Shimon) Peres, and (Yossi) Beilin. They divided the country. They took in 50,000 terrorists from all over the Arab world and gave them weapons. We tried to warn them, but they wouldn't listen. They were blind. So instead of fighting them in Lebanon, or Tunis, we fight them in Kalkiliya and Kfar Saba."

"We gave them control over 95% of the Palestinian people – we are not 'occupying' them – but it's not enough for them. And it will never be. Arafat wants it all. When they see us fighting among ourselves, it only encourages them to kill more."

"Oslo was a dream; it became a nightmare. We were supposed to get security; instead we got bloodshed. Instead of peace, we have war. And the world blames us. Well, I understand that. But our friends in America and Europe? And the Reform Movement? They won't even invite me to speak in their congregations. Project Renewal? Partnership 2000? Not in Judea and Samaria. We have no 'sister city.' No one 'adopted' us. Why? What have we done?"

"We absorbed 8,000 Russian immigrants (from the FSU). That's almost half the population of Ariel. Why should the Russians in Karmiel get help from the Federations, and not here?"

But Nachman remained undaunted. “I was brought up with a deep love for this country and for the Jewish people, all of them. Maybe it’s not enough, but I believe in God and I hope He believes in me.”

May his memory be for a blessing.

### **WHO IS THE PRESIDENT’S NEW CHIEF OF STAFF?**

<http://frontpagemag.com/2013/dgreenfield/new-white-house-chief-of-staff-blamed-mo-video-called-for-a-world-where-islam-is-not-disrespected/print/>

Denis McDonough’s appointment as Chief of Staff is probably the biggest win for the Soros Lobby since the Obama victory. Denis McDonough was a Senior Fellow at the George Soros funded Center for American Progress, which is the criminal brain behind the Frankenbody of Obama Inc. Delivering a speech after the Benghazi terrorist attack, McDonough profaned the very concept of religious freedom, at a conference on US policy and international religious freedom, where he eulogized the dead and blasted the Mohammed video, a worldview that eventually led Obama Inc. to see to the imprisonment of the filmmaker.

A top White House official has blasted as “truly abhorrent” the anti-Islam film which appears to have triggered an outpouring of violence against U.S. diplomatic posts in Egypt and Libya.

Speaking to an international religious freedom conference in Washington Wednesday, Deputy National Security Adviser Denis McDonough endorsed efforts to create “a world where the dignity of all people—and all faiths—is respected.”

According to his prepared remarks released by the White House, he then added: “This work takes on added urgency given the truly abhorrent video that has offended so many people—Muslims, and non-Muslims alike—in our country and around the world.”

McDonough also praised Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood thug Mohammed Morsi in this same speech.

Denis McDonough also appeared at the ADAMS Islamist center which is linked to Hamas and the Muslim Brotherhood to promote Obama’s outsourcing of “violent extremism prevention” to mosques. ADAMS (All Dulles Area Muslim Society) is led by its Executive Director, Mohammad Majid. Majid is also the President of the largest Muslim Brotherhood / Hamas support entity in North America – the Islamic Society of North America (ISNA).

At ADAMS, Denis McDonough delivered a speech dedicated to whitewashing Islam and promoting Obama’s appeasement of Islamism

---

---

## **Rabbis Rush To Judgment**

Roger Gerber

On November 29, 2012 the UN General Assembly voted, by a margin of 138-9 with 41 abstentions, to confer non-member state observer status on the Palestinian Authority. IN a NY Times article describing the vote, Ethan Bronner characterized it as “a sharp rebuke to the United States and Israel’ in view of the efforts by both countries to abort the vote.

Israel’s Ambassador to the U.N., Ron Prosor, stated that the adoption of the resolution “will make a negotiated peace settlement less likely, as Palestinians continue to harden their positions and place further obstacles and preconditions to negotiations and peace.” Ambassador Alan Baker, former legal adviser and deputy director-general of Israel’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs stated: “The UN does not have the legal and political power to establish states. It merely upgraded the observer status of the

PLO's UN representation to that of a non-member observer state for internal purposes within the UN and its constituent organs and agencies."

However, the Rabbis of B'nai Jeshurun ("BJ") saw things differently; to them the passage of the General Assembly resolution was "an opportunity to celebrate the process that allows a nation to come forward and ask for recognition". They could not wait to bring the celebratory news to their congregants, distributing an email the very next day in the name of all three BJ Rabbis, the Hazzan, the synagogue's board president and other synagogue officials. The email proudly proclaimed that the UN vote on the preceding day was "a great moment for us as citizens of the world". Perhaps from their unique Olympian vantage point "as citizens of the world" the BJ Rabbis spy great moments that the rest of us who are merely citizens of the United States, Israel or another state cannot perceive.

However, in their haste to forward their celebratory email the rabbis apparently failed to obtain the consent of the non-rabbinical signatories and they were compelled to issue a second email stating that "while we affirm the essence of our message" the email "should not have included the names" of the non-rabbinical signatories, and expressing "regret" regarding "the feelings of alienation that resulted from our letter." The New York Times took note of the first email in a front page article, which also referenced a similar email sent by six rabbis in White Plains, New York. The Times subsequently published a second article reporting the "correction" issued by the BJ rabbis.

The three B'nai Jeshurun rabbis have a well deserved reputation for advocacy of "progressive" causes; for example, their activities include service by one or more of the rabbis on the boards of the Jews for Racial and Economic Justice, Human Rights Watch/Americas, the Progressive Jewish Alliance and the Jewish Funds for Justice, all of which are identified with the "progressive" left of the Jewish political spectrum. Interestingly, BJ's two senior Rabbis, Matalon and Bronstein, as well as Hazzan Priven, are natives of Buenos Aires..

Alan Dershowitz, a sometime attendee of services at BJ, calls the BJ Rabbis "extraordinarily naïve." He observed that "Naïveté and ignorance are not an excuse for supporting immoral actions, especially when this support comes from rabbis and congregational leaders who ought to do their homework before spouting out support for resolutions whose implications they do not understand." [\[http://forward.com/articles/167286/bnai-jeshurun-should-rethink-rash-statehood-suppor/\]](http://forward.com/articles/167286/bnai-jeshurun-should-rethink-rash-statehood-suppor/)

The six White Plains rabbis, referenced in the front page NY Times article, represent Reform, Conservative and Reconstructionist congregations in that city (no orthodox rabbis signed the email statement). The most egregious factual error in their collective statement was the unqualified assertion that "Both sides have now indicated that they are prepared for negotiations without preconditions". On the contrary, the Palestinian Arab leadership has emphasized it will not enter into negotiations until various preconditions have been met.

In addition to the false assertion, the statement contains not even a hint of the impediments to negotiations over which Israel has no control, such as the split between Gaza, ruled by Hamas, and the West Bank, ostensibly ruled by Abbas and Fatah. Which Palestinian Arab parties do the signatories think have "now indicated that they are prepared for negotiations without preconditions"? Hamas has emphatically ruled out any peace negotiations with Israel, as distinguished from short term truces, or hudnas, ["There is no solution to the Palestinian problem except by Jihad. The initiatives, proposals and International Conferences are but a waste of time, an exercise in futility." Article 13 of Hamas Charter].

Perhaps the rabbis intended the assertion about willingness to negotiate without preconditions to apply only to Abbas and Fatah but, as Dore Gold wrote on December 7th, " "It should have come as no surprise that after the vote on Nov. 29, Abbas did not budge on his famous pre-conditions. He even used the U.N. resolution as future terms of reference that Israel must agree to if negotiations are ever to be resumed." Gold concluded that "while formal Israeli positions over the last decade and a half moved significantly, the Palestinians did not move one inch." Dore Gold is not alone in his assessment; NBC News reported that "The U.K. had committed to voting for the [UN] resolution if Abbas had shown

commitment to resuming peace negotiations without preconditions. Lacking that assurance, Britain abstained from the vote.”

After Abbas made an ambiguous remark that he would not wish to return to Safed many seized on that as a hint that he was bending on the “right of return” issue; Abbas emphatically proclaimed the opposite to be the case, “The right of return is holy and no one can deny it,” Abbas more recently told an Egyptian interviewer that he had only meant that he personally would not return to Safed. “What I said about Safed was my own personal position, and it did not mean giving up the right of return. *No one can give up the right of return,*” Abbas said. (my emphasis)”

Some among the rabbis have indicated that the U.N. Resolution itself urged an immediate resumption of negotiations, which implied Palestinian Arab consent to do so. However, the operative paragraph relating to negotiations in the UN Resolution is a formulaic bit of diplomat-speak which incorporates the usual Palestinian Arab references to “the relevant U.N. resolutions” and “the Arab Peace Initiative” which includes, among other things, the specious “right of return” which the Arabs have never in all these years relinquished. In fact, Mahmoud Abbas has asserted that the Palestinian Arabs will continue to demand the so- called “right of return” even after recognition of statehood. Reliance on the text of the UN resolution as a basis for the pronouncement that “both sides” are now prepared for unconditional negotiations is feckless indeed.

It is clear that the General Assembly lacks the power to confer recognition of the putative nation and that pursuant to the provisions of the Oslo documents the P.A. is committed to negotiations that they have refused to pursue. It is the considered opinion of a broad spectrum of knowledgeable observers that seeking non-member observer state status by the Palestinian Arabs was an attempt to utilize yet another weapon in its campaign to isolate Israel diplomatically and seek to delegitimize it

The statements of the three B’nai Jeshuran Rabbis, and the six White Plains Rabbis, raise the issue of whether, and under what circumstances, rabbis should opine, especially in a collective statement, on political and geo-strategic matters that are not within the scope of their professional expertise. Of course each of us has the unqualified right to speak as individuals on matters of public policy; however, when Rabbis speak in their capacity as Rabbis, particularly when they speak collectively as in this case, they are speaking *ex cathedra* as it were and have a special duty to scrupulously adhere to factual accuracy. This is all the more important in matters pertaining to the Middle East since many congregants assume that Rabbis possess special expertise in this area, which is not necessarily the case.

The question, therefore, is whether it is appropriate for rabbis to base a collective email to congregants containing assertions of fact that mislead the congregants, thus disfiguring the discourse. In my view, in these increasingly parlous times for Israel, and in the face of a torrent of media misinformation and even hostility, it is of vital importance for identified Jews to have a factual grounding so that their opinions can at least rest on a solid basis. In the future, one hopes that those in positions of leadership in the Jewish community will prudently adhere to the facts, especially when speaking as Rabbis to their congregants, and will be at least as generous in interpreting Israeli actions as they are in evaluating the actions of the Palestinian Arabs. After almost twenty years of experience with the “peace process” is it unreasonable to expect that leaders of the Jewish community would favor caution in asserting as factual a proposition based purely on hope, particularly when the statement is a collective rabbinical statement to congregants?



## Will They Give Oscars For Bashing Israel?

Lori Lowenthal Marcus

Two of the five films nominated for Best Documentary by the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences this year are Israeli films. Let's hope one of the other films wins.

Why? Because the two films portray Israel and Israelis in the classic two-dimensional role of evil occupier and brutal interrogator.

The first of the two movies, "5 Broken Cameras," has a plot as thin as pita bread. You already know the plot, even if you've never heard of the movie: Israelis are very bad, they violently wrest away the land and the dignity from the angelic Arab Palestinians. That's the story, in a nutshell.

If you want more specifics, "5 Broken Cameras," chronicles the experience of the Arabs who live in the village of Bil'in, next to which, in 2005, part of Israel's security fence was erected. The five cameras refer to ones owned by the amateur filmmaker and Bil'in villager Emad Burnat, who purchased them in order to document the "horrors" of the Israeli encroachment (although some accounts claim the cameras were purchased for the birth of Burnat's first and then subsequent children). Burnat records the weekly "nonviolent" activities held by the villagers and international agitators who join them to protest the fence. He claims that all five cameras were broken by the evil Israelis responding to the weekly nonviolent protests against what they call the "Apartheid Wall."

The sole objective of "5 Broken Cameras," like so many Pallywood videos, is to portray Arabs as the innocent victims of the evil "Zionist Occupation Government." Astoundingly enough, however, this movie actually started as video clips of the protests that were submitted as "evidence" to Israeli courts and handed over to be used by mainstream media to show the sad plight of the Arabs.

For those who maintain a vigilant watch on news reports about the Arab-Israeli conflict, Bil'in is famous for a very different kind of revelation – it is one of the few times the pro-Israel side was able to capture – dead to rights – the Arab Palestinians in a flat out lie.

Jawaher abu Rahma was an Arab woman who lived in Bil'in. In late December, 2010, spilling on into 2011, news reports from dozen of mainstream media outlets claimed that abu Rahma was killed by the Israelis who threw tear gas at the "nonviolent" protesters near the fence. How awful. Except that it turned out abu Rahma, who died in a Ramallah Hospital on December 31, 2010, died as the result of medical malpractice at the hospital, completely unrelated to any tear gas. In fact, abu Rahma wasn't even at the protest that day. A film about how Jawaher abu Rahma actually died, who exploited her death, and why the lies about it weren't considered news is a film I'd be happy to recommend.

"5 Broken Cameras" is 90 minutes long, and is in Hebrew and Arabic.

The second Israeli film nominated for Best Documentary is an odd film to be nominated for any kind of artistic award; it really is mostly the piecing together of six long interviews with six former heads of the Israeli Agency in charge of preventing terrorism, the Shin Bet, interspersed with what looks like stock footage of the Arab Israeli conflict from the six o'clock news.

While it is fascinating to hear what the leaders of one of the world's most vaunted spy agencies think, it's hard to believe that, were it not for the opportunity to hear firsthand bashing of Israel, anyone would sit still for more than an hour and a half watching aging men with strong accents talk into the camera.

In the film the last Shin Bet retiree, Yuval Diskin – who looks like the American actor Wallace Shawn – says, not realizing it has long been a tired and tiresome cliché, "one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter." He also points out: "to the enemy, by the way, I was also a terrorist." While it's true that Israel's enemies probably thought that, the difference is that it isn't true. Diskin was tasked with killing terrorists, terrorists, by definition, kill innocent civilians.

A small slice of A.O. Scott's review of "The Gatekeepers" in the New York Times makes clear why this film was chosen by Hollywood to represent Israel, and why we can only hope it doesn't get a boost in viewership that winning the Academy Award would provide.

What is most astonishing about the interviews is how critical these six spymasters are, inflicting stories with pointed, sometimes devastating assessments of the failings of successive governments... And their shared professional ethos of ruthless, unsentimental pragmatism is precisely what gives such force to their worries about the current state of Israeli politics.

The remaining three films nominated for Best Documentary include two American entries, one about the AIDS epidemic, "How to Survive a Plague," and the other, "The Invisible War" is about sexual abuse in the U.S. military. The fifth film nominated in this category, "Searching for Sugar Man," is a joint Swedish/British documentary about the search by two South African fans to find out if their favorite American musician is dead.

There is good news however, for pro-Israel cinephiles. There are currently two films in pre-production that are about two of modern history's most fascinating Israelis. One, "The Revolt," based on the book by Menachem Begin about the Irgun, is being produced by Eric Goldbrener.

The other film in pre-production, "The Accomplices," is about Peter Bergson, who, as leader of what came to be known as the "Bergson Group," along with playwright and screenwriter Ben Hecht, tried to awaken American Jews to what was happening to Jews in Europe during World War II. Edward James Olmos, who was nominated for an Oscar in 1998 for "Stand and Deliver" and starred in many television series, will be producing the movie. It is based on the play of the same name, written by former New York Times reporter Bernard Weinraub.

---

---

## The Rasha

David Krakow

As we witness radical Jewish leftists assume a prominent role in an international assault on the Jewish State, we are reminded that their counterparts in the past not only fought Zionism tooth and nail, but also demonstrably opposed American involvement in the "imperialist" war against Hitler.

In the Spring of 1929, when the followers of the British-appointed Grand Mufti of Jerusalem attacked unarmed Jewish men, women, and children in such religious centers as Hebron and Safed, killing and maiming more than four hundred, the Communist Yiddish Daily "Freiheit," which was published in New York and had a paid readership of 65,000 at that time, blamed the "Zionists" for the pogroms and hailed the bloody events as "the beginning of the Arab revolution."

Norman Thomas, the Socialist candidate for Mayor of New York City and a gentile beloved by many Jews, denounced the Balfour Declaration in a message to a Conference of the United Hebrew Trades even as he sent a check to help the survivors.

In a rally at Union Square, Jewish Communists proclaimed support for the "revolutionary uprising of the Arab masses" to whom they forwarded "brotherly greetings."

Many years later, Lionel Trilling said: "We were inclined to be skeptical about Zionism and even opposed it and during the violence that flared up in 1929, some of us were, on principle, pro-Arab." One cannot help remembering the enthusiastic involvement of many young Jews in the "Peace Movement" prior to the German invasion of the USSR.

Indeed, in a pamphlet dated May 11, 1940, entitled "The Jewish People and the War," Earl Browder, then the leader of the American Communists, wrote:

“This war is an imperialist war, and the Jewish people...have nothing to gain from taking sides, they have nothing to gain from an Allied victory just as they have nothing to gain from a victory by Hitler.”

Lest we think it was only the Young Jewish Communists at CCNY and other colleges who demonstrated against the “imperialist” war, we were reminded by Bernard Bellush, an alumnus of City College, in a letter to the English language Forward published on June 11, 1993, that they had company: “..Shortly before I graduated in January, 1941, all of us in Alcove 1 – Democratic Socialists Trotskyists, Labor Zionists and Anarchists – planned and convened an anti-war anti-ROTC rally on Convent Avenue, in front of General Webb’s statue.”

It would be an understatement to point out that the unfolding Jewish catastrophe in Europe was simply not on the radar screen of the “progressive” Jewish students who were drowning in Marxist claptrap. If they hadn’t fallen victim to anti-Semitism, themselves, how else is one to explain the widespread reluctance to identify as Jews, the indifference to the Jewish fate, and the hostility to Zionism which was providing an imperative lifeline to the endangered Jewish people?

It is not surprising that many “enlightened” Jews subliminally soaked up and internalized anti-Semitic attitudes deeply entrenched in the, basically, Christian culture surrounding them.

Neither was the common reaction to their unrequited devotion to the peoples and cultures that they had embraced, namely, a principled rejection of parochialism and nationalism, Jewish as well as others.

Thus, Irving Howe, writing about “New York Intellectuals” some thirty years after the Holocaust put it in a nutshell:

“.. even though most of the New York intellectuals were Jewish, statements beginning ‘I am a Jew’ were hard for them to make. They resisted identifications or assertions of Jewishness just as the Yiddish-speaking Socialists — had quailed before the heresy of ‘Jewish nationalism.’ To speak openly of Jewish sentiments or interests seemed too ‘parochial’ for (youngsters) ..from immigrant neighborhoods in Brooklyn and the Bronx (who) liked to think of themselves as ... ‘internationalists’ ... transcending ‘mere ethnic loyalties.’ ”

Even in the postwar years, Howe added, “the most terrible event of modern, perhaps all history, had not yet deeply registered in our minds.” Nearly a decade after that, he wrote, in his “intellectual autobiography,” “Our failure .... Had made us into ‘inauthentic Jews’ (to use Sartre’s term) who gave the Jewish situation neither serious thought nor unblocked emotion. In a review of that book, Professor Sanford Pinsker, of Franklin and Marsall College, put it thus: “..only an accident of history allowed the New York Jewish intellectuals the luxury of their alienated imperial stance.”

For several decades prior to World War II, the newly minted Jewish universalists (or cosmopolitans as Stalin referred to them), contrary to objective reality, directed their reverence to those they deemed to be or, more accurately, they intended to be, members of universalist categories such as peasants or workers. To say that their zealous and persistent enthusiasm for these unsuspecting icons was unrequited would be a gross understatement.

Eventually, it came to what surely qualifies as “redacto ad absurdum”:

All cultures are OK, if not Jewish.  
Self-determination is right, if not Jewish.  
Conquests confer legitimacy, if not Jewish.  
Pre-emptive defense is justified, if not Jewish.  
Reprisals are understandable, if not Jewish.  
Ethnic pride is praiseworthy, if not Jewish.  
Religious practices are acceptable, if not Jewish, etc.

Turning morality upside down, these misguided souls will not distinguish between avarice and existential need: between those with territory in excess of five million square miles and those whose very existence depends upon a smidgen of less than ten thousand; between those whose defeat in war has no existential implications and those who would face another Holocaust; between those who so neglected the land that it turned into a desolation and those who restored and rejuvenated it, providing amazing benefits to mankind.

What then should our reaction be to those among us who suffer such lamentable confusion?

The Passover Haggadah provides one answer in the section pertaining to the four archetypical sons, specifically, the Rasha (the wicked one), who doesn't want to be part of us: "Set his teeth on the edge" is the advice given by the Haggadah.

Jabotinsky, for one, did not agree. Let his teeth alone, he urged (in a Betar booklet entitled "Blueprint for Israel"), the poor unfortunate will be beaten and spat at by those whom he would serve. Then he will tear his hair and bite the earth with his teeth.

Perhaps the best answer of all was given by Hess, Pinsker, and Herzl who, though initially confused, saw the light and helped to save their people.

Moses Hess, no less exalted than Marx in the Communist pantheon, returned to the Jewish people (at the age of 50) prompted in part by the anti-Semitism of "comrades." His book, Rome and Jerusalem, influenced both Pinsker and Herzl.

Leon Pinsker, a physician, who served as an officer in the Crimean War, was a staunch advocate of Russification until (at the age of 60) shocked by the pogroms in 1881 and the ensuing silence of Russia "liberals," he became a leader of *Haveve Zion* (Lovers of Zion).

Theodore Herzl, an assimilationist until (at the age of 36), as Paris correspondent for the *Vienna Neue Freie Presse*, he witnessed the mass outburst of Jew-hatred following the conviction of Alfred Dreyfus and not only wrote the "Jewish State," but founded and led the World Zionist Organization.

---

---

## Watch Out When Someone Says He Knows What's Best For You

Gerald Honigman

When someone says he knows what's best for you. Or, that you don't know what's best for yourself. Too often it really means that they know what's best for themselves, and that they want you to play ball in order to make it happen.

I've learned a few other things also over the years—like to often be wary when someone says that they have your back. Best to then ask how long the blade is that you'll be stuck with.

I'm sorry to have to say what comes next, but for some reason—after close observation of both events and deep personal associations over the decades—the name Barack Hussein Obama comes to mind followed by "Israel." Yes, many will have a fit over my saying this—but will pathetically stumble when hit between the eyes with overwhelming solid documentation and other evidence.

The Atlantic's Jeffrey Goldberg—rival to Thomas Friedman of *The New York Times* for the Arabs' dhimmi *kelbi yahudi* (Jew dog) man of the year award—recently wrote a widely-reported piece for the Bloomberg View (<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-01-14/what-obama-thinks-israelis-don-t-understand-.html>). Among other things, he seems to have quoted President Obama stating that Israel simply doesn't know what its own best interests are.

Understand that, like his powerful good friend in High Places, Goldberg also sees Jews—wishing to live in a state larger than the nine to fifteen-mile wide virtual sardine can that Israel was left as as a

result of the U.N.-imposed armistice lines in 1949—as expecting too much and behaving like provocative, expansionist, right wing zealots.

The problem of the relationship between the current two American and Israel leaders is well known. There is no need to rehash all of the fine details yet again. The open microphone conversation between Obama and his French counterpart was revealing enough, not to mention the episode at the White House where Netanyahu was left stewing for hours by himself while Obama took off to dine with his family.

It's one thing for an American president to claim, after Israel's destructive and deadly experience in the wake of its unilateral withdrawal from Gaza years ago, that he has that nation's best interests in mind when he demands that it forsake the promise of the final draft of UNSC Resolution 242 in the wake of the Arabs' renewed attempt on its life in 1967. American-supplied F-16s (the same ones given to Israel's assorted Arab enemies) won't stop Arabs from allegedly "moderate" Fatahland (let alone from Jihadi Islamist Hamastan) from once again slitting the throats of Jewish families and decapitating their infants if more sane borders are not created. But for Jews to parrot such claims is worthy of the Nazi Kapo experience.

*Best interests?*

There is no way, regardless of anything else, that you can claim that you are concerned about Israel's security and next demand that it return to those '49 Auschwitz/armistice lines. No way. Michelle Obama likely travels farther to shop at Target than the width of Israel by that travesty.

While much has been made of the animosity Obama feels towards Netanyahu, despite the real or imagined flaws in the latter's personality, the fault really does not lie in that leader's person.

If Arafat's supreme Hebrew derriere-kisser, Shimon Peres, or runner-up, Ehud Olmert, did not cave into Obama's demand that Israel abandon 242's promise of more secure, defensible, and real borders to replace the suicidal '49 armistice lines, they too would have become persona non grata.

At least since the days that he was still Senator Obama, the President has repeatedly stated that Israel would be crazy—exact words—to not accept the alleged Saudi Peace Plan, which remains the basis for the non-negotiation negotiations he envisions.

One of the key provisions of that plan demands a total withdrawal of Israel back to the Auschwitz lines. The latter were never meant to be final political borders and merely marked the points where the combined invasion by a half dozen Arab countries of a re-born Israel in 1948 was stopped. They did nothing but invite subsequent Arab attempts on Israel's life long before Israel changed that reality in the aftermath of its being blockaded (*a casus belli*) in 1967—one of the main origins of the Six Day War.

As some of us have constantly stressed, the major heat generated over the settlement issue and things like Jews building in the environs of Jerusalem or in the rest of Judea (as in *Jew*) and Samaria (*aka*, only since the 20th century, as the "West Bank")—where Jews have been committing that same alleged crime long before most other peoples ever became known in history—is all about whether Israel gets the territorial compromise promised to it by 242 or not.

Despite Obama's claims to the contrary, his demands do not mesh with what all other important folks (with the main exceptions being President Clinton and the forever hostile State Department) have stated over the years. The follow examples cannot be cited too often in light of the hostility Israel now faces over this crucial issue.

Here are excerpts from Great Britain's Lord Caradon, the chief architect of the final, accepted draft of 242:

*It would have been wrong to demand Israel return to positions of June 4, 1967. Those positions were artificial, just places where soldiers of each side happened to be on the day fighting stopped in 1948, just armistice lines. That's why we didn't demand Israelis return to them.*

Furthermore, earlier American leaders supported Lord Caradon's position and the need for Israel to get a meaningful territorial compromise—not a mere return to the *status quo ante*—as an end result of any peacemaking deals with Arabs who repeatedly sought its destruction.

Note President Lyndon Johnson on June 19, 1967, soon after the war ended:

*A return to the situation on June 4 (the day before the actual shooting began) was not a prescription for peace but for renewed hostilities.*

Johnson next called for “new recognized boundaries that would provide security against terror, destruction, and war.”

President Ronald Reagan stated the following on Sept. 1, 1982:

*In the pre-1967 borders (sic), Israel was barely 10-miles wide—the bulk of Israel's population within artillery range of hostile armies. I'm not about to ask Israel to live that way again.*

And even much more recently, the man Hebrews like Jeffrey Goldberg love to despise, President George W. Bush, gave Israel an official letter upon its withdrawal from Gaza which also promised that it would not be expected to return to the 1949 armistice lines—and he called them just that, not borders. Unlike the current occupant of the White House, the gentlemen above truly had both America's and Israel's best interests in mind—and had the latter's “back” as well. At the same time, they were seeking justice for *all* parties involved. Opposing the Arab demand for Israel's destruction or suicide did not make them anti-Arab.

Please keep all of this in mind as the increasing nastiness of the next four years gets underway.

Gerald Honigman blogs at <http://q4j-middle-east.com>

---

---

## Evolution of Hatred

Ruth King

Here is a small quiz for OUTPOST readers:

Question: Who said that Jews are descended from apes and pigs?

1. Bashar Al Assad of Syria
2. The Moslem Brotherhood
3. President Morsi of Egypt
4. Charles Mohammed Darwin
5. Al-Azhar Sheikh Muhammad Sayyid Tantawi, the highest-ranking cleric in the Sunni Muslim world
6. Saudi sheikh Abd Al-Rahman Al-Sudayyis, imam and preacher at the Al-Haraam mosque – the most important mosque in Mecca
7. Sheikh Ibrahim Madhi, PA official and imam of the Sheikh Ijlin mosque in Gaza City.
8. Hezbollah Secretary-General Hassan Nasrallah
9. Salim 'Azzouz, columnist for the Al-Ahrar Egyptian opposition daily, affiliated with the religious Liberal Party
10. British-Palestinian Muslim cleric Haitham al-Haddad
11. The Koran

Answer: All of the above except for D. My apologies to Charles Darwin, the naturalist and father of the theory of evolution.

The radicals in the 1960s anti-war movement called policemen “pigs” to deprive them of respect and mercy. Fortunately, that movement dissipated but its participants became leftist activists,

journalists and tenured academics, many of whom who now support the promulgators of these anti-Semitic slurs.

Associating Jews with apes, pigs, and other animals, is widespread in the Arab and Muslim world among both Shi'ites and Sunnis, and firmly grounded in Islamic religious sources since the advent of Mohammed. It dehumanizes the Jewish people and justifies Jihad.

When it was disclosed that Morsi had used that vile language, the Obama administration tut-tutted capped by the hapless Jay Carney who said "We completely reject these statements." but clearly did not reject their man in Cairo who made it. In fact they just rewarded him with the pending delivery of American made F-16 fighter jets.

Even the New York Times called the comments "scurrilous" but then added :

*"The problem goes deeper than just Mr. Morsi, however. The remarks were made at a time when anti-Israel sentiment was running high in Egypt and the region after the three-week Gaza conflict in 2009 between Israel and Hamas. The sad truth is that defaming Jews is an all too standard feature of Egyptian, and Arab, discourse; Israelis are not immune to responding in kind either."*

Got that? It was the Gaza "conflict" of 2009 and Jews can be meanies also. Okay, well what was the provocation on November 21, 2004 when Morsi stated the following: (Andrew Bostom : *Morsi's Islamic Jew-Hatred and Jihadism in Context* <http://pjmedia.com/blog/in-context-muhammad-morsis-islamically-correct-jew-hatred/>)

*"...it is confirmed by the Quran that Jews are the most hostile of men to Muslims. The Almighty says: "Certainly you will find the most hostile to those who believe are the Jews and those who are polytheists." [Koran 5: 82] The verse confirms that Jews are the most hostile enemies of the Muslims, as the Almighty says "and prepare for them all you can of power, including steeds" [Koran 8: 60], [Note: The beginning of the verse is on the Brotherhood logo] a verse which urges preparation for this enemy with all our energy to prepare us to confront him at any time; because Zionists are traitors to every covenant and convention... there is no peace with the descendants of apes and pigs, [Koran 5:60]"*

Or how about 2007 when Morsi "... stressed that the Palestinian issue for the Brotherhood is pivotal and essential, and that the Brotherhood offered and still offers full support for the Palestinian resistance to liberate the Holy Land... resistance is the right and only way to liberate the land from the defilement of the Jews" (Ibid)

Well the New York Times did get one thing right...the problem does go deeper than just Mr. Morsi. The crude and jihadist anti-Semitism has its roots in hadiths and surahs of the Koran and its evidence in the uninterrupted Moslem persecution and oppression of Jews.

As Dr. Bostom reminds us: *"Promoters of modern jihad genocide have repeatedly invoked Islam's Jew-exterminating eschatology. Hajj Amin el Husseini ex-Mufti of Jerusalem and Muslim jihadist who became, additionally, a full-fledged Nazi collaborator and ideologue in his endeavors to abort a Jewish homeland and destroy world Jewry, composed a 1943 recruitment pamphlet for Balkan Muslims entitled, "Islam and the Jews." This incendiary document was rife with the anti-Semitic Koranic verses cited herein, as well as Jew-hating motifs from the hadith, and concluded with the apocalyptic canonical hadith describing the Jews' annihilation."*

*"Forty-five years later, the same hadith was incorporated into the 1988 Hamas Covenant making clear its own aspirations for Jew annihilation."*

*"Presently, according to polling data<sup>1</sup> in July, 2011, 73% of Palestinian Muslims surveyed agree with the annihilationist dictates of this canonical hadith."*

Morsi speaks for and to this ancient, faith driven hatred. I have no doubt that there are countless observant Muslims who, like the faithful of other religions, pray for a better life, good health and world peace. Where are they?

Furthermore, why don't the moderate Muslims like Zuhdi Jasser or Tawfik Hamid or Stephen Suleiman Schwartz demand a purging of the vile edicts? The Catholic Church removed references to

collective Jewish guilt in the deicide from its teaching, its sermons and its religious doctrine. Why do only Muslim apostates confront the incitement in the Koran?

How much evidence will open the willfully shut eyes of Israel's leaders and their international supporters?

Instead the Western democracies and Israel avoid the truth, and Jihad, like an opportunistic virus rears its ugly head when it perceives weakness among the "infidel" nations.

There is a very fitting zoological metaphor for them...namely, the ostrich which hides its head in the sand.

I am deeply indebted to my dear friends Dr. Andrew Bostom in America and Professor Moshe Sharon in Israel and Gisele Bat Ye'or in Switzerland for their insight and great knowledge of Islam.

---

### **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 91<sup>st</sup> Street)

New York, NY 10128

Tel (212) 828-2424 / fax (212) 828-1717

**Email:** [afsi@rcn.com](mailto:afsi@rcn.com)