

OUTPOST

July/August 2006—Issue #191

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

Fruits of “Disengagement”

Herbert Zweibon

Seeking to free captured soldier Gilad Shalit and stop the missiles falling on Ashkelon and Sderot, the Israel Defense Forces moved into the northern Gaza Strip, retaking the ruins of the once flourishing Jewish settlements of Dugit, Nisanit and Elei Sinai. Left-wing politician Ephraim Sneh, a prominent supporter of “disengagement,” announced there is “no escape from prolonged ground presence at the launch sites.” As Caroline Glick points out, this is a clear admission that the government had lied when it said the IDF was in Gaza just “to protect the settlers.” If anything, the settlers provided a vital buffer and the removal of both endangered Israel’s national security.

Everything that we (and the all-too-few other critics of Sharon’s policy in this country) predicted has come true. The terrorists have been energized in the aftermath of what they rightly see as a victory for terror. The most serious consequences have not yet become obvious: the alienation of the best elements in Israeli society, above all those snidely characterized as “settlers;” rifts and decline of morale in the army; emboldening the entire Arab world in the conviction that Israel can be destroyed.

Everything the proponents of “disengagement” predicted has been proven false. Ehud Olmert’s forecast now looks absurd. He claimed the withdrawal from Gaza “will bring more security, greater safety, much more prosperity” and “a new morning of hope will emerge in our part of the world.” Clinging to the never-never land he inhabits with vice-premier Shimon Peres (of “New Middle East” infamy) Olmert nonetheless now promises to compound the disaster by destroying the much more numerous Jewish communities of Judea and Samaria. The “new morning of hope” he promises is strictly for Hamas, which gathers confidence in its campaign to exterminate Israel.

Never has Israel been in more desperate need of new leadership. In the terrible vacuum, former IDF Chief of Staff General Moshe Ya’alon is emerging as a voice for honesty and reason, declaring the emperor has no clothes and describing why he shed them.

There was no strategic plan behind the “disengagement,” he told *Haaretz* in a lengthy interview, only an effort by Sharon to escape his political and personal distress, i.e. his potential indictment for fund-raising irregularities. The Israeli public was “blinded and dazzled and drugged” by media spin. (It is a harsh comment on the sickness of Israel’s judicial and media elite that putting Israel’s security in jeopardy should have immunized Sharon.)

The Gaza Strip, says Ya’alon, “is turning into Hamastan, Hezbollahstan and Al-Qaidastan. The situation will only get worse over time. The failure of the disengagement will be more and more concrete. We will find ourselves facing a kingdom of terror that is capable of launching into Israel more rockets of greater range and greater effectiveness.” Israel’s failure to stick to its promise that it would react with all its force if Qassam rockets were fired after the disengagement “eroded our deterrence,” notes Ya’alon. “In practice we accepted the firing of the Qassams as though it were rain.”

Ya’alon enunciates truths as profoundly simple as they are unwelcome to Israel’s deluded government: “There is really no unilateralism.” “We cannot entrench ourselves behind fences and walls.” “Whoever projects weakness in the Middle East is like a weak animal in the wild; it is attacked...Therefore, if we now try to continue the failed disengagement with the convergence, the result will be grave. We will give terrorism a terrible tailwind. We will provide a tailwind for radical Islam across the region. We will create a strategic threat to Jerusalem and to Ben Gurion Airport and to the population centers of the coastal plain. The Qassams and the Katyushas will no longer be Sderot’s problem. They will reach the front door in Tel Aviv.”

In This Issue

Radical Islam by Laurent Murawiec3
Saving Darfur, Saving Face by Bill Mehlman5
Death of a Settler by Hugh Fitzgerald7
The Taxi Driver by Naomi Ragen8
An Open Letter by Steven Plaut9
Take it All, No Price Too Low by Ruth King11

From the Editor

A False Faith

A widely held misconception, in earlier years the central theme of the Anti-Defamation League's publicity campaigns, is that education promotes tolerance. This false notion accounts for the special shock when organizations of professors engage in intellectually and morally ludicrous attacks on Israel, a notable recent example being the "boycotts" (which have fizzled) by both major English associations of academics.

In fact universities in the twentieth century have been in the forefront of fomenting hatred. In *A Concise History of the Third Reich*, Wolfgang Benz reports that within mere weeks of Hitler's assumption of power (on May 10, 1933) students in every university town, with the active participation of administration and professors, held the famous "bonfire celebrations" (book burnings), assigning the works of many of Germany's chief writers to the flames. A bitter Victor Klemperer, himself a born-Jewish professor forced out of his job (but who survived the war in Germany thanks to his Protestant wife) recorded in his diary: "If one day the situation were reversed and the fate of the vanquished lay in my hands, then I would let all the ordinary folk go...but I would have all the intellectuals strung up, and the professors three feet higher than the rest; they would be left hanging from the lamp posts for as long as was compatible with hygiene."

From the National Fool

In Kazakhstan, as the Hamas government was raining rockets into Israel and reaffirming its determination to exterminate the Jewish state, vice premier Shimon Peres announced that peace with the Palestinian Arabs was closer than ever. "The distance between us is the shortest it's been for the last fifty years" he declared. He was almost equally optimistic that Iran would abandon "religion" for "development." "Their choice is to keep the country poor and their arsenal rich. The speeches are very impressive, but the reality is very depressive."

It is hard to think of anything more "depressive" than this ever more puffed-up national hot-air balloon continuing to function at the highest level of Israel's government.

By Those They Honor...

We have many times pointed out in this column that those whom a group, an institution, a government chooses to honor tells you a great deal about those bestowing the honor, their values, priorities and goals -- and many of the prizes Israel has offered in recent years speak volumes of the state's spiritual, political and intellectual decline.

A current case in point: Ben Gurion University in May awarded Andre Azoulay an honorary doctorate.

Azoulay is a Moroccan Jew who lives in Rabat and serves as adviser to King Muhammad VI, in whose palace he has an office. Azoulay claims his "fight for Palestinian causes...makes his Judaism stronger." Says Azoulay: "Until the Palestinian people recover their dignity, their freedom, I feel my Judaism is weaker and hurt."

In other words Azoulay serves his Arab master as a convenient Jewish shill for the struggle against Israel. And this makes him a suitable recipient for honor by an Israeli university?

Fighting for Al Qaeda

While the U.S. labors to provide the "Palestinians" with a state, the "Palestinians" labor on behalf of our enemies. The U.S. military has found that over the last 18 months Palestinian Arabs have become a key element in Al Qaeda groups in Iraq, heading insurgency cells and recruiting university students in Baghdad for suicide car bombings.

Unsurprisingly, the Hamas government deplored the killing of murderer-in-chief Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, faxing to Reuters a statement in which it mourned him as a "martyr of the nation." The statement said: "With hearts full of faith, Hamas commends brother-fighter Abu Musab...who was martyred at the hands of the savage crusade campaign which targets the Arab homeland, starting in Iraq."

Mao: The Unknown Story

Perhaps the most interesting revelation in Jung Chang and Jon Halliday's recent book on Mao is that it was not Communism that animated him but a variant of a Nietzschean Superman view of life. They quote his writings as a young man, where he cites the attributes of Great Heroes, among whom he counts himself. "Everything outside their nature, such as restrictions and constraints, must be swept away by the great strength of their nature...When Great Heroes give full play to their impulses, they are magnificently powerful, stormy and invincible. Their power is like a hurricane...there is no way to stop them."

This could equally describe Hitler, Stalin,
(continued on page 12)

Outpost

Editor: Rael Jean Isaac

Editorial Board: Herbert Zweibon, Ruth King

Outpost is distributed free to
Members of Americans For a Safe Israel
Annual membership: \$50.

Americans For a Safe Israel

1623 Third Ave. (at 92nd St.) - Suite 205
New York, NY 10128

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

E-mail: afsi@rcn.com web site: <http://www.afsi.org>

Radical Islam: Challenge and Response

Laurent Murawiec

Deterrence works because one is able credibly to threaten the center of gravity of the enemy: the threat of inflicting unacceptable losses upon him, whether in a bar brawl or in nuclear escalation. The calculus deterrence relies upon is: is it worth it? Deterrence works if the price to be paid by the party to be deterred hugely exceeds his expected earnings. But deterrence only works if the enemy is able and willing to enter the same calculus. If the enemy plays by other rules and calculates by other means, he will not be deterred. There was nothing the Philistines could have done to deter Samson. If the calculus is: I exchange my worthless earthly life against the triumph of Allah on earth, and an eternity of bliss for me, if the enemy wishes to be dead, if to him the Apocalypse is desirable, he will not be deterred.

When Mahmoud Ahmadi-nejad was the Mayor of Tehran, he insistently proposed that the main thoroughfares of Tehran should be widened so that, he explained, on the day of his reappearance, the Hidden Imam, Mohamed ibn Hassan, who went into the great occultation in 941 AD, could tread spacious avenues. More recently, he told the Indian Foreign Minister that “in two years, everything will be settled,” which the visiting dignitary at first mistook to mean that Iran expected to possess nuclear weapons in two years; he was later bemused to learn that Ahmadinejad had meant that the Mahdi would appear in two years, at which point all worldly problems would disappear.

This attitude, truly, is not new, nor should it surprise us: Reality is invaded by belief, and belief in turn shapes the believer’s reality. The difference between the religious and the ideologically religious is this: The religious believer accepts reality and works at improving it; the fanatic rejects reality, refuses any compromise with it and tries to destroy it and replace it with his fantasy.

Ahmadi-nejad wants to hasten the reappearance of the Hidden Imam, whose coming, in traditional Muslim, and especially Shiite apocalyptic, will be the Sign of the Hour, that the End of Days is nigh. The task of the Mahdi, when he reappears, will be to lead the great and final war which will bring about the extermination of the Unbelievers, the end of Unbelief and the complete dominion of God’s writ upon the whole of mankind. The *Umma* will inflate to absorb the rest of the world.

Contemporary *jihad* is not a matter of politics at all (of “occupation,” of “grievances,” of colonialism,

neocolonialism, imperialism and Zionism). Consequently, attempts at dealing with the problem politically will not even touch it. Aspirin is good, and so is penicillin, but they are of little avail to counter maladies of the mind. I am emphatically not saying here that the *jihadis* are “crazy.” I am saying that they are possessed of a disease of the mind, and the disease is the political religion of modern Gnosticism in its Islamic version.

Let us flash back in time to Sept. 28, 1971, in Cairo. The prime minister of Jordan Wasfi al-Tell, who had been threatened by the Palestinian movement in retaliation for the so-called Black September of 1970, walks into the lobby of the Sheraton Hotel. “Five shots, fired at point-blank range, hit [him]... He staggered... he fell dying among the shards of glass on the marble floor. As he lay dying, one of his killers bent over and lapped the blood that poured from his wounds.”

Soldiers kill. Terrorists kill. Modern *jihadis* lap the blood. Inseparable from contemporary Arab-Muslim *jihad* is the idealization of blood. Gruesome murder, gory and gleeful infliction of pain, are lionized and proffered as models and exemplary actions pleasing to Allah. I have collected, as can anybody, dozens of examples of human sacrifice inflicted by the Islamic *jihadi* of all stripes. This pornography of crime is endless, from the gratuitous killing of a Leon Klinghoffer to Mohammad Atta’s instructions, “You must make your knife sharp and you must not discomfort your animal during the slaughter,” to the *Behesht Zahra*, the ‘Paradise of Flowers’ graveyard near Tehran with its Fountain of Blood, or this report on the killing of an Algerian intellectual: “Dr. Hammed Boukhobza who was killed by a group of Islamist terrorists in the city of Telemly. (...) He was not just killed in his apartment, but his wife and children who wanted to escape were forced to watch how he was literally cut to pieces, his entrails slowly drawn out while he was just barely alive. The terrorists obviously liked to watch the suffering, and they wanted the family to share their enjoyment.”

The accumulation of such deeds shows that they are not an epiphenomenon but are central to the purpose of the *jihadi*. They are aired 24/7 on TV channels such as *al Jazeera* and many others. They are avidly watched and celebrated. Think of images and videofilms of assassinations, Daniel Pearl, Paul Johnson, ‘live’ killing for the viewing public. This is thanatology, martyro-pathology or nihilism: when an entire so-

Gruesome murder, gory and gleeful infliction of pain, are lionized and proffered as models and exemplary actions pleasing to Allah.

ciety orients itself in this direction, that society is becoming suicidal. A society that gears its young toward killing and actively seeking death is making choices that bring about its extinction. "We love death more than you love life."

The believers – here, the *jihadis* -- are the Elect: they, and only they, know God's plan for the world; they have been chosen by Him to fight and win the final, cosmic battle between God and Satan, and bring about perfection on earth, in this case, the extension of God's writ and dominion, the *dar al-Islam*, to mankind as a whole. Everybody else is wrong and evil, *jahili*, an enemy liable to be killed at will. The Perfect are "an elite of amoral supermen," to use Norman Cohn's phrase, engaged in transforming the world so that it conforms to the 'second reality' that they alone know, thank to their special knowledge, *gnôsis*. In order to get from the evil today to the perfect tomorrow, torrents of blood have to be shed, the blood of all those whose actions or very being hinder the accomplishment of the Mahdi's mission.

For five hundred years, from 1100 to 1600, Europe was wracked by Gnostic insurrections, from the Flanders to Northern Italy, from Bohemia to France: Pastoureaux, Taborites, Flagellants, Free Spirits, Anabaptists, etc. The belief-structure just described was theirs. They mobilized hundreds of thousands of people, threatened kingdoms and overthrew dukedoms; they slaughtered Jews, priests and rich people; they created their own, grotesque, bloody, totalitarian 'republics.'



Thomas Muntzer

"Soon we shall drink blood for wine," one of the leading insurgent writers stated, "those who do not accept baptism... are to be killed, then they will be baptized in their blood."

And another one: "Accursed be the man who withholds his sword from shedding the blood of the enemies of Christ. Every believer must wash his hands in that blood." Hear Thomas Müntzer: "Curse the unbelievers... don't let them live any longer, the evil-doers who turn away from God. For a godless man has no right to live if he hinders the godly. The sword is necessary to exterminate them....if they resist let them be slaughtered without mercy....the ungodly have no right to live, save what the Elect choose to allow them....Now, go at them...it is time....The scoundrels are as dispirited as dogs....Take no notice of the lamentations of the godless! They will beg you....don't be moved by pity....At them! At them! While the fire is hot! Don't let your sword get cold! Don't let it go lame!"

By and large, the same words are heard from a variety of Islamic radicals. "Die before you die!" Ali Shariati tells the Shiite believer. "He who takes up a gun, a kitchen knife or even a pebble with which to arm and kill the enemies of the faith has his place assured in Heaven..." said Ayatollah Fazlallah Mahalati,

organizer of Iranian assassination squads. "To allow the infidels to stay alive means to let them do more corrupting. To kill them is a surgical operation commanded by Allah...we have to kill...war is a blessing for the world and for every nation, it is Allah himself who commands men to wage war and kill...It is war that purifies the earth," said Ruhollah Khomeiny. Article 15 of the Hamas charter explains: "I indeed wish to go to war for the sake of Allah! I will assault and kill, assault and kill, assault and kill!"

In modern times in the West, as Eric Voegelin and Norman Cohn have shown, the ideology morphed and took on secular forms – Nazis and Bolsheviks in particular. Islam was heavily burdened by Gnostic contents and historically shaped by a tribal matrix that inherently fosters Manichean tendencies ("them" vs "us"). The jump from mere religion to religious ideology was easy. It was achieved in the 19th century by Jamal al-Din al-Afghani. It was followed by Abu Ala Mawdoodi, Hassan al-Banna, Sayyid Qutb, Ali Shariati, Ruhollah Khomeiny, Osama bin Laden. Hamas, Hezbollah, the Deobandi of South Asia, the Indonesian Jemaah Islamiyya, the Taliban, the Wahhabi, all of whom share this outlook.

Knowing this, how do we deter the modern Gnostic warriors, the *jihadis*?

Mainly, we do not. Those who are dead already, who consider themselves dead to the world and only alive to the Afterworld, those who wish to die, generally cannot be deterred. Gnosticism is belief in a fantasy that is taken to be more real than the common reality: they do not believe what they see, they see what they believe. This cannot be deterred. Deterrence might have worked before contemporary *jihad* was able to reach critical mass, sometime in the early to mid-1990s.



Hassan al-Banna

Contemporary *jihad*, like its emanation, terrorism, is an integral chain: as long as it is islamico-glamorous to be a cleric who issues *fatwas* calling for the murder of Israeli civilians or American GIs, the cleric will go on. Once dead, he will stop. So will the chairman of a charity that funnels money to *jihad*. So will the senior intelligence officer who trains or smuggles them, the preacher who incites, the *madrassa* or university professor who brainwashes, the prince who lies for terror, the ayatollah who sends out teams of killers, etc. This is deterrence after the French expression: they have been shot *pour encourager les autres*. *Jihad* is the operative ideology of a number of states; states can be pinned down and hit.

What did Europe do to crush the insurrectionary Gnostics in the Medieval and late-Medieval era? Churchill once said: "If Hitler invaded hell I would make at least a favorable reference to the devil in the

House of Commons.” Likewise I’ll have a kind word for the Inquisition (not the Spanish one, though), which did quite a job cleaning up the mess. Thomas Müntzer was defeated, captured and beheaded in 1525. The ‘King’ of the Anabaptists of Münster, John von Leyden and his aides, were executed in 1535. As a terrible warning, their bodies were suspended in iron cages from the tower of St. Lambert’s church in the town. Those who survived hid in wait for better days. What they had found is that their insurgency was hopeless, that it was useless. Their will had been broken.

One martyr will have followers, ten martyrs will be admired and emulated. One thousand dead martyrs who died unheralded die in vain. If Ahmadinejad and others die in vain and uselessly they will not die as martyrs but as slobs. For the Gnostic, for the *jihadi*, his death is the only thing that matters to him: take that away and nothing is left. It does not mean, as the jurors of the Moussaoui trial were apparently led to believe, that “you cannot make a martyr out of him, since this is what he wants.” Make his death a lonely, useless, ignored death. Unextraordinary, unromantic, trivial deaths shatter the glory of the *jihadi*’s death.

This puts to the test our own, cherished values, the rule of law, the worth of human life, sovereignty, international law. I hear: “If we behave in this way, we become like the enemy.” I think this to be a foolish view: after all, not even Dresden made the Allies into Nazis, not even Hiroshima turned America into its enemy. Instead, after using the most terrible instruments of war, we turned our enemies into friends, their ruins into blooming cities.

I am often asked about ‘Muslim moderates.’ I

invariably answer that anti-Nazi Germans existed, but were inaudible, and therefore played no role. Muslim moderates will only be a factor if they are heard, at whatever the cost to them.

The defeated European Gnostics went underground. Their sole hope resided in the clandestine conveying of their beliefs, especially to their children. Society cannot eliminate the Gnostic beliefs, but can make the strain dormant instead of virulent. *Jihad* is integral to Islam and derives from its most fundamental tenets. The severing of that link is not going to happen soon. But throughout history, when Islamic conquerors met their match, they stopped. When they met crushing defeat, they retreated, and found the *ulama* and the *faqih* to justify this, like prophets who announced the Rapture for yesterday, 8:09 am, and reschedule it for next year.

Once their leaders had been exterminated, the Medieval insurgents of Europe disbanded and scattered. Applying high-tempo attrition and nodal targeting to the *jihadi* apparatus worldwide (by which I emphatically do not mean ‘terrorists’ alone or even in the first place) seems to

me to be a modern equivalent. If I may say in homage to the chain of command that orchestrated his elimination, Sheikh Yasin was not in the habit of wielding pistols – he wielded death. It is those who deploy the undead who must be the priority targets.

Laurent Murawiec is a Senior Fellow of the Hudson Institute. This is an edited version of his essay for the BESA Center for Strategic Studies at Bar-Ilan University.

Saving Darfur, Saving Face

William Mehlman

Angst-ridden liberal American Jewry, obsessed with *tikun olam* as defined by the Anti-Defamation League’s Abe Foxman and the Dixie Chicks, is in a lather over Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir’s charge that the so-called Save Darfur Coalition (SDC), sponsor of rallies earlier this year in New York, Philadelphia and Washington, is nothing other than a platform for conspicuous consumers of Jewish guilt to strut their stuff.. “If we return to the last demonstrations in the United States and the groups that organized the demonstrations,” al-Bashir intoned, “we find that they are all Jewish organizations.”

While that might be something of an overstatement in view of the “130 diverse faith, humanitarian and human rights organizations” claimed by the SDC, the key role played by Jewish groups in organizing the demonstrations is hardly debatable. Mr. Fox-

man calls it “a badge of honor for the Jewish community.” At this writing, the bearers of that badge, sensitive to al-Bashir’s accusation, were pondering the appropriate level of Jewish presence at a second round of Save Darfur Coalition demonstrations scheduled to kick off with a September 17th rally in New York. The American Jewish World Service is believed to be leaning toward “nuancing” the Jewish imprint on the affair, leaving more room on the Big Apple stage for leaders of “other religious and ethnic communities.” Martin Raffel thinks “deep, sustained and powerful” is the only acceptable Jewish reaction to Darfur. “Jews don’t need to tone down their level of involvement,” asserts the senior associate executive director of the Jewish Council for Public Affairs. “Are we over-participating? The answer to that is no.”

One needn’t question the merits or objectives of the Save Darfur Coalition to be troubled by the glaring contrast between the buckets of concern and outrage poured out over to this issue by the American Jewish Establishment and that same Establishment’s

dry-well response to the suffering of 10,000 of its co-religionists, rendered homeless, penniless, futureless by Israeli bulldozers in Gaza and northern Samaria ten months ago. No problem with the American Jewish footprint being too visible at this scene. It would take a team of bloodhounds to find it.

For all the inexcusable brutality and irrationality of uprooting these communities, Gush Katif-northern Samaria is no longer a political issue. The awful deed having been done, to accolades from the secular Jewish left and barely a murmur from the rabbis, one might have expected some tangible expression of charity to the vanquished from the victors. In fact, their silence has been deafening. "With few exceptions, we have received almost no help from the mainstream Jewish American groups which grant billions of dollars," avers Dror Vanunu, International Coordinator, Friends of Gush Katif, himself a former Gaza resident.



Darfur Refugee

Vanunu's charge is generally confirmed by leaders of the 22 former Gush Katif communities. Despite a 51 percent unemployment rate among their residents (compared to 1 percent prior to the August 2005 dispossession), despite the lack of permanent housing for all but 2 percent of the dispossessed, despite the non-provision of compensation for 72 percent of the businesses lost as a result of the evacuation (including 95 percent of the farms), despite the cutoff since March of funding for expelled youth programs, petition after petition to Jewish philanthropic organizations in America for help in coping with a humanitarian crisis have gone unanswered. Compounding its 10-month silence -- informed and directed by the Sharon-Olmert government's vilification of Gush Katif and its inhabitants as "obstacles to peace," fully worthy of the condign punishment visited upon them -- was American mainline Jewry's eagerness to embrace the Israeli government-inspired fiction that the benighted evacuees were receiving the tenderest of loving care.

"That was a lie," Rachel Saperstein, chair of Israel/ U.S.- based Operation Dignity and former resident of Neve Dekalim, declared in a June 17th address to the World Betar Convention in Jerusalem. "Farmers with once thriving businesses sit and stare at television [Israel's Agricultural Ministry is currently offering these growers and managers of a now-vanished \$80 million a year produce and cut-flowers export business "retraining" as goat shepherds], promises of land are just that -- promises. Our small amounts of compensation are eaten up each day, mortgages on destroyed homes are still being paid to the banks. Private people come to give us handouts. Supermarkets donate food for the Sabbath meals. Donations are given so that infants can receive formula and diapers, brides receive household gifts from caring strangers. Today," Saperstein continued, "our chil-

dren cannot concentrate on their studies, our people still weep, for we are all traumatized. Many of our men have died of heart attacks. Within 24 hours our vital people were turned into the homeless and unemployed... This is what the government of Israel... did to its people. We were betrayed. You were betrayed."

While consciousness of this betrayal and their passive participation in it has yet to surface among the Darfur savers, a glimmer of belated embarrassment has begun to peep through the cracks of mainline American Jewry's organizational structure. Just a glimmer. The United Jewish Communities' "Israel Emergency Committee" has announced it is allocating \$400,000 for "trauma relief" for the dispossessed of Gush Katif and northern Samaria. If that sounds munificent, it works out to approximately \$1 per week for each of the 10,000 evacuees. Some of the Federations in UJC (the Jewish Federation network in North America) are also beginning to step up to the plate. The Jewish Federation/Jewish United Fund of Metropolitan Chicago has raised \$300,000 for "social services" for Gaza evacuees. The UJA Federation of Northern New Jersey and United Jewish Communities of Metrowest, N.J. have also kicked in with some funds. The cash register hasn't yet tingled at national UJC, but President Howard Rieger reports it is in the process of gathering some \$2 million "to make a difference for Israelis who have suffered."

Too little and a year late. As Bud Macy, who severed his Federation ties in protest against its refusal to aid the dispossessed points out, this is the same UJC/Federation conglomerate that managed to raise \$360 million in record time for Israel during the *intifada*. Moreover, one's faith in coincidence would have to be particularly strong to believe there was no connection between these belated expressions of mainline Jewish philanthropic concern for the victims of realignment and Macy's inauguration, with Friends of Gush Katif, of a grassroots fundraising campaign exclusively devoted to meeting their needs.

Nothing so stirs the juices of mainline organizational Jewry as the specter of fundraising competition. If that's what it takes to begin even these minor repairs on the vast human and national damage to which it acquiesced, so be it. Could it perhaps presage a wider awakening to the disaster inherent in Mr. Olmert's plan to create another 80,000 Jewish dispossessed in the Jewish State as he converts 95 percent of Judea and Samaria and half of Jerusalem into a Hamas playground? The *Tikunai Olam* might give that a moment's thought, if saving Darfur allows any time.

William Mehlman, a frequent contributor, is chairman of AFSI in Israel.



Gaza Jews

Death of a "settler"

Hugh Fitzgerald

Editor's Note: Eighteen year old Eliahu Asheri, pictured below, was the "settler" whom "the Palestinians" "executed." While his funeral was attended by thousands, the Israeli government did not send a single government official to his funeral.. Benzi Lieberman, head of the regional council incorporating Itamar, where Asheri lived, said of him: "He embodied love of the land."

I listened to the BBC last night. The announcer could not get enough of that word "settler." The "Palestinians" had executed "an Israeli settler." The "settler" had been kidnapped. And so on. One would have no way of knowing, unless one already knew -- and how many do? -- that this "settler" was a young boy, that he had "settled" on land that was in the original League of Nations Mandate for Palestine, even after all of Eastern Palestine (that is historic Palestine, east of the Jordan), was unilaterally closed by the British to Jewish immigration -- an act that infuriated the members of the League of Nations' Mandates Commission. That land, of course, given by way of instant consolation prize to Abdullah, now grandly promoted to Emir of the Emirate of Transjordan.

This young "settler" lived on land that still remained part of the absolute minimum territory that the British, as mandatory authority, were to hold and where they were supposed to promote, were required to promote by the terms of the Mandate, "close Jewish settlement on the land."

It is disturbing that all kinds of people, in all kinds of countries, who know nothing of the Palestine Mandate or the longer demographic and cadastral history of that area, make pronouncements without this knowledge. How many know, for example, that about 90% of the land was state and waste land -- that is, land owned by no one except, possibly, the Ottoman rulers, and that their title passed to the British as mandatory authority, to be held in trust for the intended successor government, that of the Jewish National Home?

It is intolerable that the BBC, an organ of the British government that served as the mandatory authority for Palestine, does not insist that its program speakers, or those who write their copy, demonstrate a clear understanding of, *inter alia*, the Mandate's provisions (quoting from them), and of the history of the various non-Arab and non-Muslim peoples of that area -- that area which too many have been bamboozled into thinking of as the "Arab world" (an Aramco construction that has taken on a life of its own). BBC speakers should have to show also that they know something of the demography and land-ownership

patterns.

If they did, they would never use that loaded word "settler" which they, and the European press and other media, have filled with such venomous meaning. If they did, they would never use that loaded word "occupied" (as in "occupied Arab lands" - a phrase that says the case is closed, we can all go home), or "occupation," which are terms that evoke goose-stepping Germans marching into Paris in June 1940, and clearly suggest that the "occupier" has no valid title, no claim, to the land he is occupying.

But Israel does possess such valid title, a title far superior to that of the local Arabs, many of them descendants of the Egyptians and Iraqis and others who flooded in, in greater numbers than the Jewish "settlers," during the Mandatory period -- even though the place was supposed to be the one small sliver in the entire Middle East that the Jews would have to reconstruct their commonwealth and not be treated, as they were everywhere else, as *dhimmis*. And while a few years ago one would not have known what that word means, we all do now -- not least because we can look around the world and see how non-Muslims or even non-Arab Muslims are treated everywhere that Arab Muslims rule.

The *Jihad* against Israel is relentless and endless. Yet it is still hard for Israelis to face reality. In not facing it, in not identifying what they face as a *Jihad*, they have done themselves and their own position a terrible disservice, and they have also confused the Europeans as to what it is that Europe faces. One can hardly fault them on this -- it is not Israel's business to save the Europeans from their own folly, even as the EU does everything it can to de-legitimize the very idea of Israel. Still, one wishes that the sensible scholars of Islam -- there are some in Israel, though it too has all the problems that one finds in the larger Western world, including apologists, deniers, and the simply obtuse -- would be listened to by their own government, which under Olmert is still hellbent on believing there is a "solution" to be found in giving away territory.

This appeared on Jihadwatch on June 29, 2006



Eliahu Asheri

This "settler" was a young boy, who had "settled" on land that was in the original mandate for Palestine.

The Taxi Driver

Naomi Ragen

I had a lecture to give in Haifa the other day. My usual driver wasn't available, so I called a local cab company to arrange a ride. Call it instinct, but when the cab arrived and I looked at the driver, he just didn't look the part. For one thing, he was in amazing shape: handsome, young, with an athlete's lean body. Not what I usually find in the men who sit behind the wheel all day. Something about his face, the way he spoke, too, struck me as unusual.

"It's a long ride to Haifa," I finally said. "How do you like being on the road so much?"

"Oh, it's fine. I like driving. Actually, I haven't been in the business long. Just a few months," he said smiling.

"And before this....?"

"I worked for the Ministry of Defense. I was a security guard."

We spoke a little more, and I began to realize that I was in the presence of one of the men from those elite units who protect the lives of our most elite citizens, including our former Prime Minister.

"You didn't like the work?"

"No, actually....."

This is what happened. A yeshiva graduate, he had served in the army's most elite units. He had been trained in advanced counter-terrorism techniques, and had been asked to lead men into battle in some of the most dangerous missions possible. He had spent 3.5 years in Lebanon. It was no wonder that the leaders of the country had put him on staff to protect their lives.

And then came the disengagement. They asked him to be responsible for leading soldiers to attack the residents of Gush Katif should trouble ensue. He knew Gush Katif well. He had been stationed there.

"The people there treated us so well," he said. "They made sure we had enough to eat and drink. They invited us over on Shabbat and holidays. They were the most wonderful people in the world. How could I now go into their communities and treat them like enemies? How?"

So, he walked into Sharon's office (which should give you an idea of who this person is, and what kind of job he had). I said: "I'll do anything you want. If you want me to wipe out a terrorist cell. Fine. That's what I'm trained to do. But please don't ask me to do this. Please."

Sharon didn't budge. Wasn't interested.

He also didn't budge. Despite the years he had spent risking his life to defend his country, and the people who run it, he was not only fired, he was

thrown into jail for more than a month! When he got out, he married his girlfriend. He wasn't worried about getting another job. "The security companies were lining up to hire me. But when I went to get a weapon's license, I found I'd been blackballed. It was pure revenge. So it was impossible for me to work."

He bought a taxi, and now he drives. His wife is expecting. He's not making anywhere near what he used to make.

You've paid quite a price, I told him.

"I'm not sorry for a minute. I got my medal when my father told me he was proud of me. In the end, I have to live with

myself. I have to face my little nephews. What would they think of me if I treated my own people like the enemy?" Instead, he went to visit the people of Gush Katif, in their hotel rooms and dormitories. He hugged them, and they hugged him. "I don't have a single regret," he shrugged.

He has a court case against the government for denying him a license. I wished him well. And I thought of the men in power, those complacent, gray-ing old men whose lives he had risked his young one for so many times. And I was glad he wasn't protecting them anymore. Glad that he wasn't being sent on dangerous missions anymore. Not for these men anyhow. And I thought of what he had sown, and what he had reaped. And how much we were all losing because he couldn't use his skills.

And once again, the reality of living in a country with wonderful people and terrible leadership struck me full force.

Naomi Ragen is a novelist/essayist living in Jerusalem. Her newest novel is The Covenant, about a family's encounter with terrorism.



Naomi Ragen

Save The Date

The National Conference of Americans For A Safe Israel will be held on December 3rd at the Marriott Marquis hotel, 1535 Broadway, New York City.

An Open Letter on Israeli Democracy

Steven Plaut

I am writing to ask for your help in defending free speech in Israel from the malicious assault upon it by Israel's far-Leftist extremists in league with Arab anti-Israel radicals.

Free speech in Israel is inadequately protected in law, and it is defended with increasing political selectiveness. Under selective free speech, the most seditious behavior of far leftists and Arab militants is protected speech, but any criticism of these same extremists is "libelous". Anti-Oslo dissidents are routinely investigated and prosecuted for "incitement", "racism", and other "crimes" related to their speech. There has not been a single case in which a Jewish leftist or Arab anti-Israel extremist was convicted of "incitement": not for inciting to violence, justifying terror, or anti-Jewish racism.

Moreover, after Moshe Feiglin, a Jewish anti-Oslo activist, blocked a road during a protest, he was indicted and convicted of "sedition". Blocking roads is a common protest tactic in Israel but no one else has been prosecuted for it! In part, the selective enforcement of free speech protection is consistent with the "judicial activism" ideology long promoted in Israel by its Supreme Court justices. Political biases permeate the judicial system, including the Prosecutor's Offices.

A tactic being used against freedom of speech is the filing by leftists of malicious "libel suits" as harassment. This is a clear and present threat to Israeli democracy. Because Israel has no formal constitution, it has no "First Amendment" that can be used to strike down such assaults against free expression.

Over the past few years, an Israeli extremist professor has been attempting to recruit the court system as a tool for suppressing freedom of speech. Neve Gordon of Ben Gurion University has devoted his energies to denouncing Israel as a fascist, apartheid state, one practicing "state terrorism", in every forum imaginable. His anti-Israel articles have been reprinted on Nazi web sites, including that of deported Canadian Nazi Ernst Zundel, as well as on Islamist web sites. Gordon led a campaign of defamation against his own army commander, Gen Aviv Kohavi, accusing him falsely of being a "war criminal". Gordon's actions formed the basis for an attempt in the United Kingdom to indict Kohavi, forcing Kohavi to abandon plans to study there as a private person. Gordon has also justified terrorist violence against Jews.

Gordon served as a "human shield" for Arafat and for the wanted terrorist murderers being hidden in Arafat's offices a few years back, including those who

had assassinated an Israeli cabinet minister. Gordon entered Ramallah illegally with the "international anarchists" from International Solidarity Movement and similar groups to try to prevent Israeli anti-terror operations, to interfere with attempts by the IDF at apprehending those wanted murderers, and was arrested at least once for this. He was photographed in the Israeli media embracing Arafat while Arafat was refusing to turn over the murderers of the cabinet minister. *Maariv* denounced the "human shields" groups to which Gordon belonged as "traitors" (*Maariv's* term).

Gordon also has a long track record of endorsing Norman Finkelstein (described by the ADL as a Holocaust Denier). Gordon has largely endorsed Finkelstein's political views, including Finkelstein's horrific book on the Holocaust. Finkelstein, by the way, denounces the very existence of Israel, endorses Hizbollah and other anti-

Israel terror, endorses Hamas, and at the University of California at Irvine recently declared publicly that Israel had perpetrated genocide against Arabs. In his article, Gordon compared Finkelstein ethically to the Prophets of the Bible. Gordon has also issued statements identifying with the "heroic" nuclear spy and traitor Mordecai Vanunu. He has endorsed countless anti-Israel petitions and statements, including one claiming Israel was planning to conduct Nazi-like atrocities against Arabs the moment that American troops entered Iraq to topple Saddam.

Three years ago, Gordon decided to launch a malicious legal assault against free speech and democracy in Israel. He filed a SLAPP-style "libel suit" against me because I had criticized his political behavior and opinions. SLAPP suits are malicious suits filed for purposes of suppressing free speech and are illegal in most states in the US. But, in Israel they are not.

Specifically, I had earlier harshly denounced Gordon's endorsements of Finkelstein and I had labeled the group to which Gordon belonged – the one that served as "human shields" for the terrorists - as "Judenrat wannabes". That was because – like the Judenrat – they were self-appointed "representatives" of Jews serving as "liaisons" for those seeking to murder Jews.

Gordon's suit claimed these criticisms of his political activities were "libelous". But given his own track record of libeling people (he routinely labels all Israeli politicians he does not like "murderers" and "war criminals"), including his campaign against General Kohavi, and given what he writes about Israel,

A tactic being used against freedom of speech is the filing by leftists of malicious "libel suits" as harassment.

such a complaint coming from Gordon was ludicrous.

Gordon decided to go "venue shopping." While neither he nor I live in the jurisdiction of the Nazareth court, Gordon filed his suit there, knowing full well that nearly all the judges in that court are Arabs, including judges with extremist anti-Israel political positions. The venue shopping tactic worked. The case was assigned to an Arab woman judge, one whose husband is a close sidekick and political crony of Azmi Bishara. The judge refused to recuse herself. (Bishara is the Arab Knesset Member who has called for Israel's eradication while on an illegal visit to Syria and who also endorsed Hizbollah terror attacks against Israel.)

The suit, referred to in the press as the "David Irving Trial of Israel", because of the parallels with Irving's tactics in suing Deborah Lipstadt for "libel" for calling him a Holocaust Denier, dragged on for well over three years. In the judgment, while dismissing many of Gordon's claims, the Arab woman judge nevertheless issued a ruling claiming that two or three of the statements I had published about Gordon's politics constitute "libel".



Neve Gordon

The supposedly libelous statements of mine were my use of the pejorative "Judenrat wannabe" to describe the group of extremists that were engaged in the criminally illegal entrance into Ramallah followed by their serving as "human shields" and my denunciation of Gordon's endorsements of Finkelstein's positions. Finally, I had written that at the time of the "human shield" incident, Gordon's publication record consisted largely of populist political propaganda in extremist magazines. Gordon's professional resume had been published on the Ben Gurion University web site and I simply reviewed its contents. All these statements constituted "libel" according to the judge.

While totally ignoring all of Gordon's own political extremism, anti-Israel fanaticism, ties with anti-Semites, and illegal interference with the Israeli army's anti-terror operations, the judge declared that all of Gordon's actions, writings, and behavior are protected speech, but harsh denunciation of them and criticism of his political behavior by me constitutes "libel". I was reminded of some Soviet court rulings.

The judge's political orientation was made clear in the ruling where she wrote that illegal interference with military anti-terror operations by anti-Israel protesters is "a legitimate form of protest," but denouncing such pro-terror activists as "Judenrat wannabe" is libelous. In paragraph 24 of the ruling, the judge openly endorsed "alternative" views of the Holocaust, clearly meaning Finkelstein's. That indeed was the main theme of the entire ruling. [Editor's note: Judge Nadaff wrote: "At times we are witness to the phenomenon in which some people 'dare' to reexamine the Holocaust...It is impossible and improper to

turn the Holocaust into some sort of 'taboo' subject, about which people may not comment, think beyond, investigate or analyze unless it is within the framework of the consensus and the 'permissible,' as the defendant claims."]

To grasp the enormity of this ruling, imagine that the British court had actually found for David Irving and convicted Deborah Lipstadt of "libel" for denouncing him. The Nazareth ruling is an open assault against freedom of speech in Israel for non-leftists and will serve as precedent for any anti-Israel extremist in Israel who wishes to recruit a court to suppress freedom of speech for non-leftists. All such a person now need do is run to Nazareth and file a political SLAPP "libel suit" and hope for a biased judge.

Because of the enormous implications of all this, it is crucial that the ruling be overturned on appeal. That however is expensive and not simple. A first appeal would be heard at the same Nazareth court, before an appeals panel, and politics could play a role there. If that appeal failed, the next appeal would go to Israel's Supreme Court, where my guess is that it would be summarily overturned.



Steven Plaut

The judgment against me issued by the Nazareth judge grants Gordon about \$18,000 in "damages." In the ruling, the judge agreed that Gordon never showed he suffered any material damages from what I had written about him, but assigns damages to him anyway, and also hits me with an additional \$3,000 in court costs. All that of course is above and beyond my own legal costs.

At this point, the suit is only marginally about me personally and is mainly about whether freedom of speech can be subdued in Israel using malicious prosecution and SLAPP tactics, or whether the court system will put a stop to such things once and for all.

That is why it is so important to fight this all the way through the appeals process. This however is quite expensive. I estimate that I need to raise about \$35,000 to continue this battle for freedom of speech in Israel. My own personal resources were stretched by the first trial round (bear in mind that Israeli professors make about \$2000 a month).

The stakes at play in this suit are enormous and carry important implications for the future of Israeli democracy.

Steven Plaut, a frequent contributor to Outpost, is professor of economics at Haifa University. The above article is an edited version of Plaut's lengthier account. Because AFSI agrees that it is crucial that this court challenge to free speech in Israel be overturned, we are setting up a fund for the Plaut appeal. If you wish to contribute make out your check to AFSI noting that it is earmarked for the Plaut fund.

“Take it all, no price too low”

Ruth King

In late May, before his government was even three weeks old, Prime Minister Ehud Olmert stuffed himself into his best shirt and trotted to Washington. He was flush with anticipation that his give-it-all-away-once-and-for-all plan, its title shifting dizzily from “disengagement: to “unilateralism” to “convergence” to “realignment,” would get United States blessings and big bucks.

His euphoria was short lived. While President Bush politely called the Olmert plan a bold move, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice actually said: “The Prime Minister has no program.” Instead, the State Department told Olmert to “build up” Abbas in order to weaken Hamas. Is that what they mean when they say “realpolitik”? Bismarck would pass out.

So, a deflated Olmert did what any great leader of firm convictions and principles would (not) do. He caved, issued warm praise for Abbas, and on his return to Israel promptly requested a meeting with him to renew negotiations. While he was waiting for a reply he went to see Egypt’s Mubarak and gushed “Mr. President, this was a very moving personal experience for me to sit with you now for approximately 1.5 hours, to hold talks and to listen to one of the most experienced and important leaders that I have had the opportunity of meeting with.” No matter to Olmert that Mubarak funnels arms to terrorists in Gaza and gratifies the Arab League with the most anti-Semitic media in the world.

And just in case he had not fawned enough, Olmert added an effusive apology for an incident in which two Egyptian terrorists who shot at IDF forces were killed. Mubarak, with steady icy smile, rejected the entire Olmert plan.

Next on the peripatetic (rhymes with very pathetic) Olmert’s jet stream was a decidedly unenthusiastic kingly of Jordan, who not only rejected the Olmert land auction’s terms — “take it all, no price too low” — but had the effrontery to say ““The Palestinians’ homeland and their state should be on Palestinian soil, and nowhere else.” notwithstanding the fact that Jordan is 80% of historic Palestine.

And then it was off to Londonistan and Chiracistan to try to convince those leaders that he means business. In London, responding to the Kassam rockets being fired at Sderot, Olmert warned Palestinian Authority Prime Minister Ismail Haniyeh that “no one involved in terror would have immunity,” but then sent a bouquet to Abbas, as quoted by the Jerusalem Post : “Olmert said he would start by offering 90 percent and then negotiate what to do with the remaining

10.” This is actually comedic.

Olmert finally decided he had a “crisis” when Hamas rockets were raining on Ashkelon and a 19 year old Israeli soldier was kidnapped. In greatest secrecy (as if he were President Bush visiting Baghdad) Olmert stole into Sderot explaining he feared that if his presence were known more rockets would descend on the town. The message: “I feel your pain, but I sure don’t want to be a target like you.”

Olmert sent the IDF into several of the ruined Jewish settlements in Gaza — now rocket launching pads — that had protected Israel prior to “disengagement.” For all the strutting and braggadocio — we will not free thousands of Arab prisoners, we will not submit to blackmail — who could fail to believe

that in the end he would do precisely what he said he would never do? Every leader has a line in the sand, beyond which he cannot be pushed, but not Olmert. Whatever you demand, I’ll find a way to give you more. The silver-tongued Abba Eban once said “the Arabs never miss an opportunity to miss an opportunity....” Just substitute Olmert and the old saw is a perfect fit.

For Olmert has every opportunity to disavow continuing the foolhardy Gaza surrender. Even those in the media who earlier hailed the move are skeptical.

And, most important, the Israeli public which elected Olmert shows an increasing unwillingness to go along with — what’s the most recent name for surrender?— “realignment.” Even the leftist sheet Ha’aretz disclosed a poll in which only 35% of respondents approved of Olmert’s folly.

But the accidental Prime Minister, flush with failure, just pledges more concessions, brandishes his fist in the air, bangs on the table, and “warns” Israel’s enemies that nothing they can do can stop him from giving them everything they want and more.

In the aftermath of the Gaza beach bombing of civilians for which Israel was falsely blamed, and on his way to wow Tony Blair, Olmert did say: “The IDF is the most moral army in the world and it does not and never has made a policy of targeting civilians.” However, he was silent when his own daughter Dana demonstrated against her father’s chief of staff calling for him to be tried as a “war criminal.” Nor can the uxorious Prime Minister control his Peace Now wife or radical sons. He reserves his harshness for Israel’s beleaguered settlers.

Like the old Henny Youngman joke, he tells Israel’s enemies:

“Take my land.....please.”



Olmert and Shimon Peres

Two Days In June

Ruth King

When one revisits the Israeli raids on Entebbe on June 4th, 1976 and the destruction of Iraq's nuclear reactor on June 7th, 1981, one feels great pride in the pluck and bravery of Israel. What leader today can or would inspire and send a covert mission to rescue hostages held in Entebbe, Uganda by a combination of Arab and German terrorists, abetted by Ugandan troops armed with advanced Russian weapons?



Yonatan
Netanyahu

Three Israeli Hercules planes flew 2500 miles, landed under cover of night, and their troops stormed the airport where the hostages were held.

In the ensuing 35 minute battle, the Israelis destroyed 11 Russian MIGs on the ground, killed all the terrorists and freed 100 hostages. Yonatan Netanyahu, commander of the operation was shot to death by a Ugandan sentry. He is of blessed memory.

Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin who ordered the mission said "This operation will cer-

tainly be inscribed in the annals of military history, in legend and in national tradition." And indeed it is. It was the first salvo in the war against terrorism.

In 1981, Menachem Begin, then Prime Minister of Israel, became alarmed by the rapid building of a nuclear reactor in Iraq and planned one of the most dazzling military missions of all time.

On June 7th, 1981, Israeli F-15 and F-16's roared off the runway from Etzion Air Force Base in the Sinai desert. They followed a difficult low-level navigation route to Iraq. Every detail of the missions had been planned and was executed meticulously. When the air squadron sighted the reactor, the planes climbed precipitously to unload their cargo of bombs. Enemy defenses were caught by surprise, and in one minute and twenty seconds, the Osirak reactor lay in ruins. All planes returned safely in spite of dangerously low levels of fuel.

These were breathtaking actions in the global war against terrorism. Our pride and admiration are mitigated by rue at the loss of nerve that has overcome Israel and its leaders. Fatuous apologies and concessions to barbarians have replaced national courage and resolution.

(From The Editor: continued from page 2)

or more recently Saddam. The only difference between these men is that Stalin and Mao, during their lifetime, won a free pass for the exercise of their impulses from much of the intelligentsia in the Western world on the basis of the supposed "ideals" on which their regimes rested.

While all these men were worshipped by their hypnotized followers, in no case did the level of control - or deification -- rise to the level of Mao's. For exam-

ple, Jung Chang describes a school textbook holding up as a model a youth who drowns after jumping into a flood to save an electricity pole because the pole would be used to carry the word of Mao.

And in no case did the public reap the whirlwind as it did with China's Great Hero: Mao killed 70 million of his people in fulfilling his "invincible" impulses.



Jung Chang

Americans For A Safe Israel
1623 Third Ave. (at 92nd St.) - Suite 205
New York, NY 10128

Non-Profit
Organization
U.S. Postage