
OUTPOST



July/August 2015—Issue #289

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

45th Year of Publication

Table of Contents

Dragon Tamer	William Mehlman	Page 2
From The Editor		Page 3
U.S. Will Teach Iran to Thwart Nuke Threats	Adam Kredo	Page 7
<i>Anonymous Soldiers</i>	Reviewed by David Isaac	Page 8
Terror Immigration Must Stop	Daniel Greenfield	Page 10
Arab Immigration to Historic Palestine	Richard Mather	Page 12
U.N. Report Calls For Arrest of Israelis	Anne Bayefsky	Page 14
Diplomacy Israeli Style	Ruth King	Page 16

Dragon Tamer

William Mehlman

If – and it’s a big “if” –the Likud governing coalition was really looking to put a dent or two in the virtually limitless power of Israel’s “High Court of Justice” (a.k.a the “Supreme Court”), it may have found its hammer in former computer engineer turned Justice Minister Ayelet Shaked, whose well-earned reputation for meaning what she says and alchemizing political intent into facts on the ground should have the High Court’s 15 justices paying fresh attention to their rear view mirrors.

Locking horns with the High Court, however, despite its two decades of tinkering with the democratic separation of powers under the rubric of everything in the affairs of state being “justiciable,” is probably the last thing this coalition with its tissue-thin 51-69 Knesset majority had any mind to do.



Ayelet Shaked

Indeed, wary of Shaked’s “agenda-driven behavior,” as TV talk-show interviewer Oded Ben-Ami recently described it, and her unshrinking Land of Israel perspective, (“settlement building will be one of the basic guidelines of this government,” she’s declared), Prime Minister Netanyahu stopped just short of the barricades in opposing her “Jewish Home” (Bayit Yehudi) party’s insistence on her appointment to head the Justice Ministry. Having lost that battle to Jewish Home and

its eight critical electoral mandates, Netanyahu made a lusty but vain effort to deny Shaked a seat on the powerful Judicial Appointments Committee and the chairmanship of the Knesset Law Committee.

It isn’t as though the prime minister and a supporting cast that includes, inter alia, Defense Minister Moshe Ya’alon, Finance Minister Moshe Kahlon and President Reuven Rivlin have any illusions about the High Court’s damaging imposition on Israel’s democratic processes, political, economic and strategic. Rather it is the right wing’s long-standing inferiority complex in the face of those 15 black robes. “It works best of all,” one observer noted, “against moderately right wing politicians eager to impress the media with their sophistication.”

The obeisance governments of Israel have continued to pay this unelected, self-empowered fabricator of unappealable decisions is reflective of the “Damoclean Sword” of legislative nullification it has hung over their heads ever since then High Court President Aharon Barak’s 1995 enunciation of the doctrine of “justiciability” without bounds. In the words of international attorney David J. Martin, former Adjunct Professor of Law at Georgetown University and currently director of International Transactions at the combined Master’s Program of Ben-Gurion and Boston Universities, it has rendered the Israeli legislature “no longer sovereign to legislate and the executive no longer empowered to execute –all in the name of democracy, while, in fact, plowing our democracy into the ground.”

Restoration of the limitations on judicial review in place over the first 48 years of Israel’s existence will call for a combination of strategic smarts and political courage and determination heretofore most notable for its absence at the Justice Ministry. Ayelet Shaked, however, doesn’t go along to get along. If calling her a “lightning rod” struck the *New York Times’* Israel correspondent Jodi Rudoren as “an understatement,” It hardly diminishes the fact that in her two years as a rookie member of the last Knesset, the 36 year-old Texas Instruments alumna, former Golani Brigade instructor, wife of an IDF fighter pilot and mother of two, was a co-architect of some of the most complex legislation that fractious body has ever passed. As for determination, the secular North Tel Aviv “poster child’ for Naftali

Bennett's effort to expand Jewish Home's reach beyond its "orthodox base," as the *Times of Israel's* Julie Wiener described her, is as "unsentimental a doer" as anyone is likely to find in Israeli politics.

She's also smart enough to avoid a frontal assault on one of the three bastions (along with the media and the academy) of the leftist, anti-Settlement glitterati into which the High Court has morphed over the last 20 years. Her initial strategy appears directed toward two objectives: Expanding the membership of the Judicial Appointments Committee from 9 to 11, thereby diluting the veto power of the three sitting justices on the committee. The latter's decisions require approval by 7 of the present 9 over any new nominee to the bench, thereby virtually eliminating any nominee whose views do not accord with the High Court's prevailing political slant. The three justices have never split their vote.

Shaked's second objective, the one that's keeping the Left awake nights, is a non-reversible bill grounded in the "Basic Law" encompassing Israel's unwritten constitution that would empower a Knesset super-majority, possibly 70 of its 120 members, to overturn High Court rulings on at least some sensitive issues, most particularly those involving strategic defense decisions. The High Court's brass in freezing an IDF advance in place during the 2002 Battle of Jenin while it heard complaints that the army was "violating the rules of war" will probably never be forgotten.

From any perspective, of course, clipping the wings of a "Supreme Court" that regards its decisions as a barrier to the baser instincts of an uncontrolled national Zionist Right isn't going to be a jog in the park. But Ayelet Shaked will be setting the pace and she's got her running shoes on.

William Mehlman represents AFSI in Israel.

From the Editor

Jews Against Themselves

The inimitable Edward Alexander has done it again—produced a book of essays, *Jews Against Themselves*, as devastating as it is witty and erudite. That Alexander writes so beautifully makes the painful nature of his subject—the large number of Jews who have turned against Israel—bearable.

Alexander notes: "There will always be readers who express astonishment that there are Jews who question the Jewish right to live as a natural right, or hate Israel and are ashamed to have a state. Surely they are as rare as singing mice or card-playing pigs. Alas, no."

Says Alexander: "I have not attempted a systematic taxonomy of all the species of Jews arrayed under the genus 'enemies of Israel,' a monumental task that would require an encyclopedia to include the following: Jewish progressives against Israel; Jewish queers against Israel; Haredim against Israel; Holocaust survivors against Israel; children of Holocaust survivors against Israel; Jewish Voice for Peace; grandchildren of Holocaust survivors against Israel; survivors of the Warsaw Ghetto against Israel; J Street; Jewish postmodernists against Israel; Jewish Berkeley professors against Israel; post-Zionists against Israel; Jewish members of MESA (Middle East Studies Association) against Israel; Jews for Boycotting Israeli Goods (JBIG, also called, seasonally, London's Jewish Christmas carolers against Israel); and so on and on, ad infinitum, ad nauseam."

Even if you have read one or more of these essays when they first appeared (in places like *The Weekly Standard*, *Commentary*, *Algemeiner*), reading them together is far more powerful. For example, this is from an essay in the book not previously published: "How many adult Jews in 1948 could have imagined that the Holocaust would cast its specter of blood and shame over the Jews well into the next century, that its lesson would be not 'Never again,' but—for the victims—'It happened once, it can happen again' and—for the perpetrators—'We did it once we can do it again.'"

The book is published by Transaction and available on Amazon.

Lunacy at *The New York Times*

The New York Times provides decisive evidence that dedication to political correctness turns the brain to mush.

The Daily Caller quotes from former Israeli ambassador to the U.S. Michael Oren's recreation of his phone conversation with *New York Times* op-ed page editor Andrew Rosenthal. Oren had given up on trying to debunk what he calls the anti-Israel "lunacy" published in the paper but an op-ed by PA Authority chairman Mahmoud Abbas in the *Times* in 2011 reversing obvious historical fact was too much. He called Rosenthal and presents the following account of their conversation:

"When I write for the *Times*, fact checkers examine every word I write," I began. "Did anybody check whether Abbas has his facts exactly backwards?"

"That's your opinion," Rosenthal replied.

"I'm an historian, Andy, and there are opinions and there are facts. That the Arabs rejected partition and the Jews accepted it is an irrefutable fact."

"In your view."

"Tell me, on June 6, 1944, did Allied forces land or did they not land on Normandy Beach?"

Rosenthal, the son of a Pulitzer Prize winning *Times* reporter and famed executive editor, replied "Some might say so."

So now you know—at the *New York Times*, the Normandy landing is up for grabs. Should it become politically correct to say the Allies didn't land, *The New York Times* op-ed page editor is ready and waiting.

An Egyptian Historian Speaks Up

With the EU gearing up for the umpteenth time to kick start Israel-Abbas negotiations, it's refreshing to hear common sense from an unexpected source—Egyptian TV. On May 26 the Mehwar TV channel aired an interview with Egyptian historian Maged Farag. Of the Palestinians Farag said bluntly "They don't want to resolve their own problem." And "For over 70 years the Palestinian cause has brought upon Egypt and the Egyptians nothing but harm, destruction and expense."

Farag, who recently visited Israel, was undaunted by the interviewer's obvious hostility to the idea of normalizing relations. Among Farag's comments: "Normal relations require, first of all, cultural exchange. We should visit there. There should be tourist exchange and economic exchange. Why can't we take advantage of their technology, of their thought, and of the results of their research? I want them as a partner in developing agriculture and industry in Egypt. The problem lies with the people who still live the old ideology and the cultural heritage on which we were raised. Our generation was raised upon hatred."

As a historian perhaps Farag is aware that the agreement Begin fashioned with Sadat called for exchanges and cooperation between Israel and Egypt in all areas—that this, from Begin's standpoint, was the key to the treaty: land for normalization of relations. But the agreements embodying those exchanges were the first thing Sadat tore up once the Sinai was restored to him.

Egyptian President Abdel Fattah Al Sisi has had the courage to ban the Brotherhood and to call for reform of Islam at Al Azhar University, the center of Islamic thought. Does he have the courage to follow the lead of Maged Farag? To take on directly "the old ideology" of hatred of Israel? If that happened, it would be the first genuine sign of spring anywhere in the Arab world.

The Jews of Turkey

There are 15,000 to 20,000 Jews in Turkey, their places of gathering and worship under tight security.

They are worried by the blatant anti-Israel rhetoric of President Recep Tayyip Erdogan and his Islamist Justice and Development Party (AKP). In response to the war with Hamas last summer Erdogan accused Israel of “Hitler-like fascism” and of perpetrating a “systemic genocide every Ramadan” against Palestinians. Ankara’s mayor, a member of Erdogan’s party, accused Israel’s Mossad of orchestrating the Charlie Hebdo and kosher supermarket attacks in Paris.

For now, Turkey’s Jews are staying put with immigration to Israel actually dropping 50% in the last two years (to only 204 individuals) from the number that went to Israel from 2009-11. The Jewish Telegraphic Agency quotes the wife of a real estate developer. “Our bags are not packed. But these days the suitcases are waiting under the bed to be filled—at a moment’s notice.”

Greek Antisemitism

Antisemitism, Rabbi Abraham Cooper and Harold Brackman of the Simon Wiesenthal Center warned in a March article, is showing signs of becoming endemic in Greek politics. On the far right is Golden Dawn, with its flag resembling the Nazi swastika and its charter limiting members to “only Aryans in blood and Greeks in descent.” One of its MPs actually read excerpts from that tired old forgery *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* into the Parliamentary record. On the far left, the now ruling Syriza Party is vehemently anti-Zionist and has promised to downgrade relations with “aggressive” Israel. (To be sure, it has been preoccupied with more urgent matters since taking power.)

And the center, to paraphrase Yeats, “does not hold.” Cooper and Brackman point out that the center-right New Democracy Party has been a favorite of Greek Jews since the early 1990s when its prime minister upgraded diplomatic relations with Israel. But now the party has admitted to its ranks former MPs who belonged to the defunct Popular Orthodox Party (LAOS) which preceded Golden Dawn as extreme right standard bearer. Among them is Thanos Plevris, son and ally of lawyer politician Konstantinos Plevris, a self-declared “Nazi, fascist, racist, anti-democrat, anti-Semite.”

Cooper and Brackman note that elements in the Greek Church are also problematic. Greek Orthodox Bishop Metropolitan Seraphim of Piraeus said on Greek television that “Adolf Hitler was an instrument of world Zionism and was financed from the renowned Rothschild family with the sole purpose of convincing the Jews to leave the shores of Europe and go to Israel to establish the new Empire.”

If this is a sample of Greek reasoning, no amount of bailout money can save the place.

A Mournful Anniversary

This is the tenth anniversary of the destruction of the flourishing Jewish settlements of Gush Katif in Gaza by Israel’s own hand. It has proved (as AFSI predicted) an unmitigated disaster. It has been a decade-long disaster for residents of southern Israel, ceaselessly bombarded by rockets, often launched from the site of those very settlements. It has been a disaster for the entire state, which has been forced to launch two wars to halt the attacks, if only temporarily. The lives of Israel’s soldiers have been sacrificed needlessly, on the altar of what was on its face an absurd notion, that retreat would bring peace. And it has been a huge disaster for the 10,000 people of Gush Katif, who were abruptly uprooted from their homes and the agricultural hothouses that were a bright light in Israel’s economy.



Helen Freedman and Dror Vanunu with Gush Katif flag

AFSI executive director Helen Freedman recently attended a luncheon in Jerusalem hosted by the Gush Katif Committee to mark the expulsion.

Yuri Edelstein, Speaker of the Knesset, who had moved to Gush Katif when the expulsion loomed, spoke of the mockery of the government's assurance that there would be "a solution for every settler." To this day, three hundred and fifty families remain in temporary housing. Among them is the family of David Hatuel who spoke at the luncheon. Hatuel's wife and four daughters were murdered by Arab terrorists in 2004 while driving on a road in Gush Katif. No one better exemplifies the resilience, tenacity and faith in the future of these people than Hatuel who has remarried and once again has four children.

A New Guinness, Anyone?

We may need a new Guinness Book of World Records, this one for politically correct idiocies. *The West Highland Free Press* surely deserves a spot. Given its current assault on free speech, the very name "Free Press" is a delicious irony.

Brian Wilson was one of the four founders of the paper in 1972. *The Daily Telegraph*, in a blistering article on the paper's behavior, notes that Wilson has written for it for 38 of its 43 years, the only gap in his contributions coming when he was a minister in Tony Blair's government. Wilson has been fired for using his weekly column to defend Free Church of Scotland theologian Prof. Donald MacLeod, a friend and fellow columnist at the paper. MacLeod's original sin? On May 22 he wrote an eminently sensible article about the growth of Islam in the United Kingdom. In it he noted that minorities prefer to keep a low profile and generations of Muslims have "done exactly that, many have made an invaluable contribution to British society, and many are perfectly prepared to listen quietly while Christians 'witness' to them." But, he noted, "when minorities become majorities, things change...in the event of Islamic dominance in Britain our friendly Muslim shopkeepers will have little option but to march behind the radicals."

The West Highland Free Press published the article and fired Prof. MacLeod. Wilson then used his own column to describe Prof. MacLeod's "Footnotes" column as the "most intellectually challenging, erudite and beautifully written column in British journalism." As for the specific offending article, Wilson said it led "to wider questions about Islamic influence within Europe, including implications for democracy and freedom." At which point, *The West Highland Free Press* fired Brian Wilson.

Wilson summed it up for *The Daily Telegraph*: "They published Donald MacLeod's column and then got rid of him, and then they published my column and get rid of me." With British understatement, MacLeod calls his dismissal "pathetic."

Perhaps *The West Highland Free Press* is simply far-thinking, already preparing for the day when the Islamic minority becomes a majority and it has to pass the censorship of new political masters.

Herbert Zweibon's last project A new video has gone up at Zionism101.org:

"The Jewish Undergrounds: Irgun" is now available. You can see it directly via the following link:

<http://zionism101.org/NewestVideoVimeo.aspx>

***The Jewish Undergrounds: Irgun* describes the most effective underground group that attacked the British in Palestine.**

We encourage you to share information about "Zionism 101" with anyone who is interested in learning about the most important development in modern Jewish history.

U.S. Will Teach Iran to Thwart Nuke Threats

Adam Kredo

Editor's note: The irony here is overwhelming. Negotiations aimed at ending Iran's nuclear threat—especially to Israel, which it repeatedly promises to annihilate—have resulted in an agreement in which the U.S. and other signatories promise to protect Iran's nuclear program against Israel. While the agreement does not specify Israel as the country from which Iran is to be protected, clearly it is Israel the agreement has in mind.

The United States and other world powers will help to teach Iran how to thwart and detect threats to its nuclear program, according to the parameters of a deal reached Tuesday to rein in Iran's contested nuclear program.

Under the terms of a deal that provides Iran billions of dollars in sanctions relief, Iran and global powers will cooperate to help teach Iran how to manage its nuclear infrastructure, which will largely remain intact under the deal.



Senior Iranian officials, including the country's president, celebrated the deal as a victory for the country. Iran's state-controlled media quoted President Hassan Rouhani as saying that the deal will “remove all sanctions while maintaining [Tehran's] nuclear program and nuclear progress.”

In what is being viewed as a new development, European countries and potentially the United States agreed to “cooperate with Iran on the implementation of nuclear security guidelines and best practices,” according to a copy of the agreement furnished by both the Russians and Iranians.

This will include “training courses and workshops to strengthen Iran's ability to prevent, protect and respond to nuclear security threats to nuclear facilities and systems as well as to enable effective and sustainable nuclear security and physical protection systems,” according to the text.

Additional “training and workshops” would work to “strengthen Iran's ability to protect against, and respond to nuclear security threats, including sabotage, as well as to enable effective and sustainable nuclear security and physical protection systems,” the text states.

The language was viewed as disturbing by analysts and experts who said such cooperation could help protect Iran against efforts by the Israelis or other countries to sabotage the Islamic Republic's nuclear program in the future.

“The United States and its partners have just become the international protectors of the Iranian nuclear program. Instead of rolling back the Iranian nuclear program, we're now legally obligated to help the Iranians build it up and protect it,” said one Western source present in Vienna and who is apprised of the details of the deal.

In addition to teaching Iran how to protect its nuclear infrastructure, world powers pledge in the agreement to help Iran construct next-generation centrifuges—the machines that enrich uranium—at its once-secret nuclear site in Fordow, where Iran has been suspected of housing a weapons program.

Fordow is an underground and fortified military site that is largely immune from air strikes by those seeking to eradicate Iran's nuclear infrastructure.

While Iran will not be permitted to enrich nuclear material with these centrifuges, the know-how gained from operating these advanced centrifuges could help it advance clandestine nuclear weapons work, experts say.

The Obama administration had once vowed that Iran would have to fully dismantle its centrifuge program. However, this demand was walked back as the Iranians demanded greater concessions over the past months.

“Now the international community will be actively sponsoring the development of Iranian nuclear technology,” Omri Ceren, an analyst from the Israel Project (TIP), wrote in an email to reporters. “And since the work will be overseen by a great power, it will be off-limits to the kind of sabotage that has kept the Iranian nuclear program in check until now.”

Meanwhile, Iranian President Rouhani celebrated the deal in a speech that detailed how the country received everything it was looking for from the United States.

This includes the full rollback on sanctions on Iran’s financial, energy, and banking sectors, as well as others, and the suspension of international resolutions banning the sale of arms to Tehran.

Iran will also move forward with work on its advanced centrifuges and also “continue its nuclear research and development,” according to Rouhani’s comments. “All our goals materialized under the deal,” Rouhani said, according to Fars.

Iran’s nuclear reactors in Arak—which could provide with a second pathway to a nuclear weapon—also will continue to operate under the deal. It will continue in conjunction with the nuclear enrichment plants located in Fordow and Natanz.

Rouhani went on to say that Iran “will scrutinize implementation of the agreement” to ensure that the United States and other world powers uphold their end of the bargain.

This appeared in the Washington Free Beacon of July 14.

The Jewish Revolt

Bruce Hoffman, *Anonymous Soldiers: The Struggle for Israel, 1917-1947*

Reviewed by: David Isaac

Bruce Hoffman’s *Anonymous Soldiers* is a deftly written account of the Jewish revolt against the British in 1940s Palestine. Despite its scholarship—it draws heavily on recently declassified British documents—and its significant bulk, it is a page-turner that leaves the reader feeling sorry once the book is finished.

Unlike most accounts of the Jewish underground, this one tells the story from the British point of view, though without taking Britain’s side. It leaves the reader with no doubt that it was the Irgun, and to a lesser extent the much smaller Lehi, that drove the British from Palestine, and not, as the longtime mythology of Israel’s Laborites would have it, David Ben-Gurion’s skillful politicking.

It was Lehi that began the terror war against the British in 1940. Its members were completely isolated at first, perceived by the Yishuv—a term for Palestine’s Jewish community—as a criminal gang. Lehi was led by Avraham (Yair) Stern, whom Hoffman describes as a man “of grandiose dreams and half-baked plans,” an outstanding classics student at Hebrew University, and a poet. The title of Hoffman’s book comes from a poem written by Stern, which would become Lehi’s anthem. Stern was killed by the British in 1941, and the group’s remaining members killed or captured. The group was revived in 1943 under the leadership of Yitzhak Shamir, decades later to become Israel’s prime minister.

In 1944, when it was clear that the Nazis would be defeated, the Irgun, too, declared a revolt. Its new leader was Menachem Begin, who had led the Jewish nationalist youth group Betar in Poland.

Hoffman considers Begin a first-class strategic thinker who recognized that he could not defeat Britain militarily and so decided “systemically [to] undermine its authority,” believing that if the Irgun could destroy the government’s prestige “the removal of its rule would follow automatically.” Through the Irgun’s violent actions, he made Palestine a center of world attention, a “glass house” as he described it, where every British misstep was broadcast to the world.



The Irgun (with Lehi’s assistance) drove up the costs for the British to the point where their presence became unsustainable. By the end of British rule, 100,000 British soldiers had been dispatched to Palestine, one-tenth of the armed forces of the entire British Empire, one soldier for every eighteen inhabitants, with a twenty-to-one numerical superiority over the approximately 5,000 terrorists in the combined ranks of the Irgun and the Lehi. Post-war Britain was in parlous financial condition and of no mind to use its limited resources in what Winston Churchill (from the opposition benches) called “a senseless squalid war with the Jews.”

Hoffman is unsparing in his criticism of Britain’s failure in dealing with a vastly inferior force, starting with, and most importantly, the failure of Palestine’s CID (Criminal Investigation Department) — guilty of everything from feckless record keeping to intelligence operatives who knew no Hebrew — “only three senior British detectives” could speak and understand it.

Anti-Semitism permeated the administration from top to bottom. Hoffman quotes repeatedly from the letters of General Evelyn Barker, the commander of British forces in Palestine, to his paramour Katy Antonius, widow of the historian of Arab nationalism, George Antonius: “I loathe the lot ... Why should we be afraid of saying we hate them — it’s time this damned race knew what we think of them— loathesome [*sic*] people.” Barker’s last act in Palestine, just before boarding the plane back to England, was to show his contempt by urinating on the ground. This scorn for their Jewish antagonists led the British to strategic blunders, such as the reliance on martial law pursued in the belief that by hurting the Yishuv’s economy, that is, its “pocketbook,” the Jews would be forced to cooperate.



Early on the mainstream Zionist leadership did cooperate, motivated by fear of the British as well as the opportunity to crush the Irgun, its main political opponent. In 1944, Ben-Gurion went so far as to use the Haganah, the largest of the three undergrounds, to kidnap and turn over Irgun members to the British in the so-called “season.” From the Zionist perspective, the season marked a grim page in its history, but Hoffman shows it inadvertently benefited the Irgun (and the Yishuv) because the British, who kept on hoping for a renewal of Jewish cooperation, pulled their punches when it came to punishing the broader Yishuv for terrorist outrages, lest the Jews become so alienated as to make a renewed “season” impossible.

In 1945, David Ben-Gurion would reverse course and order the Haganah into the fight against the British. It was a dramatic admission of how badly he had read the political map, and highlighted all the more the prescience of Menachem Begin. But after a successful British counter-terror operation, in which most of the Zionist leadership was rounded up, Ben-Gurion called off the Haganah. The Irgun and Lehi soldiered on.

One can make a couple of criticisms of this first-rate book. Hoffman swallows whole the official British version of Lehi leader Avraham Stern’s death, which states that he was shot while trying to escape. Hoffman cites the official police report and repeated victories by Detective Geoffrey Morton, the man who pulled the trigger, in libel suits brought in English courts against writers who claimed he had shot Stern in cold blood. Surprisingly, Hoffman fails to cite the subsequent late-in-life testimony of Bernard Stamp, a CID officer who was with Morton in the room when Stern was shot: “He should never have been murdered; you can call it; that’s what I’d call it. He was unarmed with no chance of escape.”

Hoffman also maintains that the 1944 assassination of Lord Moyne, the highest ranking British official in the Middle East, by Lehi in Cairo derailed a partition plan that the Churchill cabinet was entertaining when Moyne was shot. The evidence for this is thin. Churchill was positively inclined toward Zionism but in deference to the Foreign Office and Colonial Office he kept the gates of Palestine shut to Jews all through the war (in an effort to appease the Arabs). These departments would have been just as adamant as the war approached its end that partition would alienate the entire Arab world. In support of his contention, Hoffman also quotes Chaim Weizmann's autobiography. But Weizmann actually says the opposite: "The harm done our cause by the assassination of Lord Moyne ... was not in changing the intentions of the British Government, but rather in providing our enemies with a convenient excuse, and in helping to justify their course before the bar of public opinion."

Given the stakes in the Jewish revolt, the creation of the first Jewish commonwealth in 2,000 years, it is remarkable how few people were actually killed compared with what Hoffman calls "the horrific standards of terrorism today." A total of 141 British soldiers and police and 40 terrorists died between August 1945 and August 1947, he writes, "including those executed or who committed suicide awaiting execution." As for civilian fatalities, fewer than 100 Arab and Jewish noncombatants died in that period.

This appeared in the Washington Free Beacon of May 30. David Isaac is the creator of zionism101.org, a series of 6-8 minute videos on the history of Zionism. The most recent to be released is on the Irgun. It can be viewed at <http://zionism101.org/NewestVideoVimeo.aspx>.

Terror Immigration Must Stop

Daniel Greenfield

Tennessee is to Muslim refugees as New York is to Muslim hijacked planes. Chattanooga, the site of the latest Muslim terror attack against America, is a "preferred community" for resettlement along with Knoxville and Nashville.

Nashville was designated a "Gateway City" for Iraqis. Hundreds of Somali Muslims were dumped in Shelbyville and the Murfreesboro Mega-Mosque became national news because of its terror ties.

Over the last decade, middle Tennessee's Muslim population tripled. The rise of Islam in Tennessee as Muslims from terror zones like Iraq and Somalia flooded its towns and cities brought hate and violence.

In Memphis, Imam Yasir Qadhi was caught on tape calling Jews and Christians filthy and declaring that Muslims can take their lives and property. Last year the FBI warned of an ISIS threat in Memphis.

This year it was Chattanooga's turn.

Muhammad Youssef Abdulazeez, the son of a Palestinian man and a Kuwaiti woman living in the United States, killed five marines. One of his targets, a recruiting center, was a gun-free zone. Those inside had no way to defend themselves. Their government had welcomed in the enemy and left them unarmed and helpless against his Jihad.

Mosque in Tennessee



Obama refused to use the word "Terrorism." Hillary Clinton claimed that the attack was "senseless violence." But there was nothing senseless about it. It was an act of war, one of many, in a conflict that stretches back to the founding of the United States of America.

The Marines first saw action abroad against the Barbary states who informed Thomas Jefferson and John Adams that they were entitled to attack American ships and enslave American sailors because, "it was written in the Koran, that all Nations who should not have acknowledged their authority were sinners, that it was their right and duty to make war upon whoever they could find and to make Slaves of all they could take as prisoners, and that every Mussulman who should be slain in battle was sure to go to Paradise."

This is the "sense" behind Hillary's senseless violence.

The last of the Barbary Wars ended on a July, two hundred years ago, with an American victory. Two hundred years later, Marines are murdered by the barbarians we invited into our own country.

As the government began filling it with immigrants from terror zones, Tennessee, the Volunteer State, fought back because it hadn't volunteered for this. In 2008, it pulled out of the Federal refugee resettlement program. But the resettlement continued. Tennessee taxpayers suffer and bullets fly.

Three days before the latest terror attack, Muslims in Chattanooga protested in support of Islamberg, a New York outpost set up by Mubarak Ali Gilani, who has said, "We are fighting to destroy the enemy. We are dealing with evil at its roots and its roots are America."

That is what we are dealing with. Three days before a Muslim terrorist attack, supporters of Muslim terrorism were playing the victim. Their victimhood theater was aided and abetted by the media.

Every time the citizens of Tennessee attempted to stand up to terror immigration and the Murfreesboro Mega-Mosque, they were shouted down, smeared and lied about by the media. A day from now, the media will have shifted the focus of the story from the murdered Marines to local Muslims whining about the backlash. The perpetrators become the victims and the victims become the perpetrators.

It is all but certain that we will hear less about the stories of the heroes who died in Chattanooga than we did about the Muslims killed in a parking dispute in Chapel Hill. Because Muslim lives matter and Marine lives don't.

Tennessee has not been allowed to stop the dumping of Muslim settlers in its borders because Muslim immigration matters more than the families of Tennessee. Instead if we do nothing Chattanooga will go on being a "preferred community" for the transformation of the country. More Americans will die and after every terror attack, the media will dig up another Imam complaining how afraid he is of a backlash.

If we really want to stop terrorism, the place to start is at the airport. Not with TSA groping and scanners, but by ending the constant flood of terror populations into the country. The attacks of September 11 would never have happened if the United States hadn't gotten into the habit of allowing in Saudis who couldn't even be bothered to produce plausible paperwork. The World Trade Center bombing would not have happened if we hadn't gotten into the habit of setting illegal immigrants loose.

The United States of America faces a simple choice. We can fill our towns and cities with populations from terror zones and then act surprised when they kill us, or we can shut the doors on them.

Inviting in the world's terrorists to live here is not an act of kindness. Both Nidal Hasan, the Fort Hood killer, and Muhammad Youssef Abdulazeez, the Chattanooga terrorist, were born to Palestinian Arabs. Their background was in a culture where terrorism is so widely accepted that it has become a way of life. The Americans they murdered would be alive today if we had a pro-American immigration policy.

It's not just the people who send checks to terrorist groups who should be called terrorist supporters. Those who support the migration of terrorists into this country are the biggest terrorist supporters because without them most of the attacks we have experienced would not even be possible.

The terrorist attack in Chattanooga will be swiftly swiped from the media's digital pages with another story about celebrity misbehavior or a manufactured controversy. But it can become a wake-up call. The dumping of refugees in Tennessee must end. And it's time for Chattanooga to stop being a preferred community for importing the terror zones of the world to Tennessee.

Every terrorist attack has the potential to wake the sleeping giant against the terrorists and those who have infiltrated them into this country in the name of human rights, humanitarianism and diversity.

The war keeps coming home because we have filled our home with the enemy. It's time we clean house.

This appeared on frontpagemag.com on July 17.

Arab Immigration to Historic Palestine: A Survey

Richard Mather

There is a very old and rare book called *Palestina ex monumentis veteribus illustrata*, written by Hadriani Relandi, a mapmaker and scholar from Utrecht, and published in 1714. It documents Redlandi's trip to Palestine in 1695/96. On his travels he surveyed around 2,500 places that were mentioned in the Tanakh and/or Mishnah, and he carried out a census of the people who resided in such places. He made some very interesting discoveries. For a start, he discovered that not a single settlement in Palestine had a name that was of Arabic origin. Instead the names derived from Hebrew, Roman and Greek languages.

Another interesting discovery was the conspicuous absence of a sizeable Muslim population. Instead, he found that most of the inhabitants of Palestine were Jews, along with some Christians and a

few Bedouins. Nazareth was home to less than a thousand Christians, while Jerusalem held 5,000 people, mostly Jews. Gaza was home to around 250 Jews and about the same number of Christians. The only exception was Nablus where around 120 Muslims lived, along with a handful of Samaritans, whose ancestors belonged to the northern tribes of Israel.



few Bedouins. Nazareth was home to less than a thousand Christians, while Jerusalem held 5,000 people, mostly Jews. Gaza was home to around 250 Jews and about the same number of Christians. The only exception was Nablus where around 120 Muslims lived, along with a handful of Samaritans, whose ancestors belonged to the northern tribes of Israel.

Intrigued by the findings in Relandi's books, I looked at other first-hand sources, such as travelogues, governmental reports and censuses. I wasn't sure I would find anything. But there is a surprising quantity of census data, reports and

anecdotal evidence. And all the evidence suggests that the majority of non-Jewish (i.e. Arab Muslims and Christians) immigration to Palestine began in the mid or late 1800s.

Drawing on work by statistician and demographer Roberto Bachi, it is estimated that there were 151,000 non-Jewish inhabitants of Palestine in 1540. (Some sources indicate that many of these were descendants of Jews who had remained in Palestine following the failed Bar Kokhba revolt in 136 CE but had been forced to convert to Islam). By 1800, the non-Jewish population had grown to around 268,000, rising to 489,000 by 1890, 589,000 in 1922 and just over 1.3 million in 1948. The vast majority of these non-Jewish migrants were Muslims. All of which suggests that most of the Muslim (and Christian) inhabitants of Palestine were recent immigrants and had not been living there for generations as is

sometimes suggested. Moreover, the figures show that Arab immigration was a fast-growing trend, propelled by external circumstances. But what were they?

Firstly, several thousand peasant farmers had come to Palestine in the first half of the 19th century to escape Egypt's military draft, forced labour and taxes. Secondly, the Ottoman authorities transferred a great many people from Morocco, Algeria and Egypt to Palestine in the early part of the 20th century, partly in an effort to outflank Jewish immigration. Thirdly, the Zionist project was very attractive to Arabs who were drawn to Palestine by the good wages, healthcare and sanitation offered by the Jews. Indeed, the Muslim infant mortality rate in Palestine fell from 201 per 1,000 in 1925 to 94 per 1,000 in 1945. Meanwhile, life expectancy rose from 37 to 49 years.

Furthermore, the Arab population of Palestine increased the most in cities where there were large numbers of Jews, which is a strong indication that Arabs were drawn to Palestine because of the Zionists. Between 1922 and 1947, the Arab population grew by 290 per cent in Haifa, 158 per cent in Jaffa and 131 per cent in Jerusalem. Tellingly, the growth in Arab-majority towns was far less dramatic: 37 per cent in Bethlehem, 42 per cent in Nablus and 78 per cent in Jenin.

During the British civil administration in Palestine (1920 to 1948), restrictions were placed on Jewish immigration in order to appease Arab troublemakers. However, the situation regarding Arab settlement was much more lax. Historian and author Freddy Liebreich claims there was significant Arab immigration from the Hauran region of Syria during the Mandate era – and that the British authorities turned a blind eye.

However, some people were taking notice. The Hope Simpson Enquiry (1930) observed there was significant illegal Arab immigration from Egypt, Transjordan and Syria, which was negatively affecting prospective Jewish immigrants and contributing to Arab violence against Jews. The British Governor of the Sinai between 1922 and 1936 substantiated the view that unchecked Arab immigration was taking place, with most of the immigrants coming from the Sinai, Transjordan and Syria. And the Peel Commission reported in 1937 that a "shortfall of land" was "due less to the amount of land acquired by Jews than to the increase in the Arab population."

Immigration continued at a pace until the Jews declared independence in 1948. The fact that Arab (largely Muslim) immigration continued right up until Israeli independence is borne out by the United Nations stipulation that any Arab refugee who had lived in Palestine for a mere two years prior to Jewish independence was entitled to refugee status. According to the UN Relief and Works Agency, Palestine refugees are defined as "persons whose normal place of residence was Palestine during the period 1 June 1946 to 15 May 1948, and who lost both home and means of livelihood as a result of the 1948 conflict."

If there were very few non-Jewish inhabitants in Palestine in the 16th and 17th centuries, what happened to the Arab invaders who arrived in 629 CE? Well, for a start, very few of the invaders actually stayed in Palestine. Many became absentee landlords who used native tenants to cultivate their estates and to pay the *dhimmi* tax. This is why Palestine, along with Egypt and Syria, remained overwhelmingly Christian for several more centuries. It is possible, however, that following the Muslim reconquest in 1187, many Jewish and Christian inhabitants of Palestine were forced to convert to Islam, thereby pushing up the number of Muslim inhabitants. However, Palestine's population went into decline from the mid-14th century – in large part due to the Black Death, which swept in from eastern Europe and north Africa, travelling to Gaza, and making its way to Palestine, Lebanon and Syria. With no one to care for the land, many areas became malarial, especially in northern Palestine, which became largely uninhabitable. Depopulation continued as a consequence of the invasion of Palestine in 1831 by Muhammad Ali of Egypt and the ensuing Peasants' Revolt of 1834, which reduced the male population of Palestine by about twenty per cent, with large numbers of peasants either deported to Egypt or drafted into Egypt's military. Many others abandoned their farms and villages to join the Bedouin.

Clearly it would be futile to argue that there were few Arabs living in Palestine in the late 19th and the early 20th centuries, but the figures do show that the Arab population of Palestine had been in a state of flux for centuries and that the overwhelming majority were migrants from the rest of the Arab world and/or the Ottoman empire. This is important because it tells us that the postmodern notion of a deep-rooted Palestinian Arab history/culture is bogus. All the evidence points to the conspicuous absence of Arab culture in late 17th century Palestine; and even in the 18th and 19th centuries the Arab inhabitants of Palestine were not indigenous but were latecomers. This explains why, historically, Arabs never talked about Palestinian identity – because there wasn't one. They were Egyptian, Syrian, Moroccan, Iraqi and Ottoman Arabs, and many of them expressed allegiance to the concept of a Greater Syria. In fact, until the 1960s the Arabs refused to call themselves Palestinians because it was a name reserved for the Jews! It seems hilarious now, but Immanuel Kant, the 18th-century German philosopher, referred to Jews in Europe as "Palestinians living among us."

It wasn't until the mid-1960s – nearly two decades after Israel declared independence – that a semi-coherent (and very violent) Palestinian Arab identity came into being. But even as late as the 1970s, the notion of a Palestinian people was still nothing more than a terrorist construct designed to undermine Jewish claims to the land of Israel. In an interview with a Dutch newspaper in 1977, PLO executive committee member Zahir Muhsein admitted that "the Palestinian people does not exist," before adding: "The creation of a Palestinian state is only a means for continuing our struggle against the State of Israel."

Whether Arab-Palestinian identity grows into something more constructive in the 21st century remains to be seen, although it seems unlikely given the Palestinian Arabs' proclivity for violence, terror and destruction.

This appeared on May 31 at the Jewish Media Agency website which is a media hub. Richard Mather is the editor.

Shocking UN Report Calls for Arrest of Israelis Around the World

Anne Bayefsky

Arrest Benjamin Netanyahu and any other "suspected" Israeli war criminals wherever and whenever you can get your hands on them. That is the shocking bottom line of a scandalous report released from the U.N. Human Rights Council in Geneva.

The report emanates from a board of inquiry the Council created in the midst of the 2014 Gaza war. In legalese, the call to arrest Israelis either for trial before the International Criminal Court (ICC), or before any court in any country that the U.N. labels "fair," reads like this:

The board "calls upon the international community ... to support actively the work of the International Criminal Court in relation to the Occupied Palestinian Territory; to exercise universal jurisdiction to try international crimes in national courts; and to comply with extradition requests pertaining to suspects of such crimes to countries where they would face a fair trial."

To be fair, the U.N. report says this could apply to both parties. In other words, the democratic state of Israel, with a moral and legal obligation to defend its citizens, and the Palestinian attackers bent on genocide are moral equals. Throughout the 183-page tome, the U.N. council "experts" play the old "cycle of violence" trick, otherwise known as "it all started when you hit me back."

An infamous photo from the Third Reich shows eminent Jewish lawyer Michael Siegel, beaten and bloodied after going to police headquarters on behalf of a Jewish client who had been sent to

Dachau, forced to walk through the streets of Munich with a sign around his neck saying: “I am a Jew, but I will never again complain to the police.”

The similarity with today’s U.N. authorities is painfully clear. When Israel responds to Palestinian rocket fire – 750 rockets in 2014 alone prior to the war’s start – or Palestinian terrorists emerging from tunnels into Israel bent on carnage, it is Israel who is accused of war crimes. The only acceptable response, apparently, is to hang their heads or make a U.N. speech.



Israel in crosshairs of UN

In part, the war criminal charge is just one more U.N. slander. U.N. meetings routinely consist of wild allegations of Israel committing genocide, ethnic cleansing, apartheid and crimes against humanity, and frequently analogizing Israelis to Nazis. The anti-Semitic dimension of these attacks is palpable, with constant references to the offense of “Judaization” – the criminalization of the presence of Jews in what is supposed to be Judenrein Arab territory, or what is in practice apartheid Palestine.

While the point of all this hate speech is to demonize and delegitimize Israel, the war crimes label takes the campaign one step further. It deliberately ravages Israel’s right of self-defense.

Self-defense is the essence of sovereignty. In the words of the U.N. Charter: “Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of ... self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations ...” The United Nations was not intended to be a suicide pact.

But incredibly, the U.N. council report purports to address legal responsibility for casualties in Gaza without once mentioning “self-defense.”

It was exactly the outcome that the council had planned. The Council gave the board of inquiry its marching orders on July 23, 2014, just 16 days into the war. It named June 13, 2014, as the starting line because Palestinian terrorists kidnapped three Israeli teenagers on June 12. It said the Council “condemns...the violations...arising from the Israeli military operations.” Guilty before proven innocent is how it all began.

The board’s first chair, William Schabas, was forced to resign after it was revealed he had been a paid legal adviser to the Palestinian Authority. On his way out the door in February, Schabas admitted the “fact-gathering” was “largely completed,” and yet the U.N. denied the obvious conclusion that the result was irrevocably tainted. Consequently, a Palestinian legal adviser chaired the inquiry for more than half of its 10-month existence.

Impartiality was equally alien to American Mary McGowan Davis, who took over from Schabas. She had already chaired a Council committee about the 2008/09 Gaza war, and she declared in a March 2011 report that Israel’s legal system did not meet standards of independence or impartiality, or make “accountability” possible. Those criteria are both the pre-conditions for the ICC’s ability to throw Israelis in prison and the subject matter of her 2014 job.

In short, the Council gave the same person the same assignment on almost the same fact situation ... and surprise! Israel is guilty as charged.

In 2011, McGowan Davis described the misogynist, homophobic, anti-free speech, “de facto authorities in Gaza” (i.e. Hamas) – infamous for throwing political opponents off tall buildings – as “generally tolerant of local human rights organizations.”

A U.N. “human rights” expert par excellence.

Little wonder that the report is riddled with lies and libels. It claims Israel was “directing attacks against civilians,” and acted “in utter disregard of...the civilian population...” It omits that Hamas

rejected or violated a total of 11 cease-fires that would have reduced Palestinian casualties by 90 percent. It says the intent of "Palestinian armed groups" in constructing and using tunnels cannot be "conclusively determined" – photographic evidence of weapons caches and terrorists emerging from openings terrifyingly close to Israeli villages to the contrary.

It even goes so far as to lament that Palestinian "armed groups" don't have more room for their criminal enterprise: "...the obligation to avoid locating military objectives within densely populated areas is not absolute. The small size of Gaza and its population density make it difficult for armed groups to always comply with this requirement."

The U.N. has reached a new low. The United States should start by resigning from the Human Rights Council effective immediately.

This appeared at humanRightsVoices.org on June 23.

Diplomacy Israeli Style

Ruth King

Here is a short quiz ...and you may not know the answers so I will provide them.

1. What is the population of The Netherlands?

It is 16.8 Million

2. Who is the Prime Minister of the Netherlands?

Bet you did not know it is Mark "no nickname" Rutte.

3. Who is the Dutch Ambassador to the United States?

Tell the truth. Did you know that his name is Rudolf Bekiink?

Israel, in contrast, is half the size of Holland and any American who watches or reads news knows the name "Bibi" and has seen Israel's diplomats quoted and interviewed, because Israel fascinates both its admirers and its enemies. Diplomats from Israel present their credentials to the State Department but, unlike other ambassadors and consuls, their job is to serve, in large part, as emissaries to the Court of Jewish Opinion and Philanthropy.

Sometimes history creates special moments for Israeli diplomats. The late Abba Eban, who served as Israel's first Ambassador to the United Nations, and subsequently as Israel's Ambassador to the United States from 1949 until 1959 mesmerized Americans with his erudition, his wit, and his elegant, inspiring rhetoric in support of Israel. Alas, once returned to Israel he caved to the siren call of the left.

In 1974, the UN General Assembly invited Yasser Arafat to address the members and in 1975 granted the PLO an unprecedented "observer status." On November 10, 1975 the United Nations General Assembly adopted, by a vote of 72 to 35 (with 32 abstentions and the strong opposition of US Ambassador Daniel Moynihan), Resolution 3379, which states as its conclusion: "Zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination."

At the United Nations, almost immediately after the humiliating vote, Israeli Ambassador Chaim Herzog denounced both the resolution and those who voted for its adoption. He further pointed out the significance of the date, November 10th, the anniversary of Kristallnacht in 1938:

"This night, 37 years ago, has gone down in history as the Kristallnacht, or the Night of the Crystals. This was the night of 10 November 1938 when Hitler's Nazi storm troopers launched a coordinated attack on the Jewish community in Germany, burnt the synagogues in all the cities and made bonfires in the streets of the Holy Books and the Scrolls of the Holy Laws and the Bible. It was the

night when Jewish homes were attacked and heads of families were taken away, many of them never to return. It was the night when the windows of all Jewish businesses and stores were smashed, covering the streets in the cities of Germany with a film of broken glass which dissolved into millions of crystals, giving that night the name of Kristallnacht, the Night of the Crystals. It was the night which led eventually to the crematoria and the gas chambers, to Auschwitz, Birkenau, Dachau, Buchenwald, Theresienstadt, and others. It was the night which led to the most terrifying holocaust in the history of man.

“It is indeed befitting Mr. President, that this debate, conceived in the desire to deflect the Middle East from its moves towards peace and born of a deep pervading feeling of antisemitism, should take place on the anniversary of this day. It is indeed befitting, Mr. President, that the United Nations, which began its life as an anti-Nazi alliance, should thirty years later find itself on its way to becoming the world center of antisemitism. Hitler would have felt at home on a number of occasions during the past year, listening to the proceedings in this forum, and above all to the proceedings during the debate on Zionism.”

These were stirring words from a man not known for inspired rhetoric and who was generally reserved in his speeches to the grandees of the Jewish establishment in the United States.

Ambassador Ron Dermer, Israel’s present Ambassador to the United States, staunchly defends Israel and I have personally witnessed his polite but firm dismissal of complaints from anti-settlement groupies.

Ambassador Ron Prosor, Israel’s Representative to the United Nations, navigates in the world center of vehement international anti-Semitism. He is reserved, eloquent, unfailingly polite and determined to resist any endorsement of the two-state solution. Most recently, in an electrifying speech, he took on the United Nations Security Council for accepting a draft resolution implementing the disastrous Iranian nuclear deal with the West. Calling Iran “the empire of terror” he added:

"It's not only that you have not cured the symptoms, you have strengthened the source of the problem. You have given the source of the problem--Iran--money, stability at home, and the time to carry out its destructive ideology."

For AFSI the gold standard in diplomats is Ambassador (Ret.) Yoram Ettinger who served as Minister for Congressional Affairs at Israel's Embassy in Washington (with the rank of ambassador), Israel's Consul General in Houston and Director of Israel's Government Press Office. He has always pressed for Israeli sovereignty in Judea and Samaria, and implemented his claims with a demographic study which thoroughly debunked the “population” problem. He has been a guest at AFSI conferences and parlor meetings and never disappoints.



We turn now to Michael Oren, Israel’s former Ambassador to the United States. To be honest we at AFSI often found ourselves at odds with the opinions espoused by Oren while he was Ambassador to the United States. His was “green line” diplomacy. Unable to counsel annexation of Judea and Samaria, Oren endorsed the two state dissolution of Israel. Only one year ago he counseled unilateral withdrawal from the West Bank and in February of this year he wrote a column, not abandoning the two state delusion, but temporarily tabling it: “Israelis, Palestinians and the ‘Two-State Situation.’”

Now as a private Israeli citizen and member of Israel’s parliament, he has become a hero. His book *Ally: My Journey Across the American-Israeli Divide*, released in June, is a detailed, well-documented, scathing indictment of America’s State Department and White House. Michael Oren goes beyond the Administration; he scolds the American media and left wing Jews who are among the

harshest critics of Israel in America. I have read *Ally*, but even if I had not, I would have known it was good by the ADL's negative reaction and the opprobrium of many in the American Court of Jewish Opinion.

Furthermore, as Oren surely knows, his book guarantees that he will never again be envoy to any nation, something most diplomats are quite loath to accept.

Michael Oren's accusations come at an historic time when an American administration is overtly hostile to Israel and the coming Congressional and Presidential elections will determine the future of America/Israel relations.

Well done Michel Oren! Perhaps now you will show the same courage, vision and determination in abandoning the two state dissolution of the nation that you so staunchly defend and love.

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: judy@afsi.org