

OUTPOST

Twenty Questions

Herbert Zweibon

Twenty Questions was a popular television panel show from 1949 to 1955. A person chose a subject, not known to the panel, which then had twenty questions, answered yes or no, to reach the correct answer. We offer our own adapted 20 Questions, directed to Prime Minister Netanyahu, asking how he plans to deal with the ramifications of the (Demilitarized) Two State Solution.

1. In the year prior to signing the Oslo agreements, Israeli intelligence experts did a study for the Labor government of 200 agreements that Arafat's PLO had signed over the years and found that he had honored none of them. What makes you believe "this time" will be any different?

2. How are you going to prevent an influx of sophisticated weapons into the "demilitarized" state? And please don't insult our intelligence by saying foreign "monitors" are going to stop it.

3. How are you going to prevent the firing of missiles at airplanes going in and out of Ben Gurion airport? One downed plane will mean the end of international carriers flying to Israel.

4. How do you prevent the training and equipping of a Palestinian army in another Arab state?

5. How do you propose to deal with demands by Israeli Arabs in the Galilee, where they are a majority, to join the Palestinian state?

6. How will you respond to Hamas or Hezbollah taking over "demilitarized" Palestine?

7. How do you deal with the loss of political support from Bible-believing Christians in the United States, your last important source of support in a world filled with irrational hatred of Israel?

8. How will you cope with the depletion and destruction of the mountain aquifer on which Israel depends for water?

9. How do you restore the morale of Israelis after the shock of forfeiting Jerusalem and all claims to the heartland of the Jewish people?

10. How do you envisage expelling 500,000 Jews from their homes on the "wrong" side of the Green Line (including East Jerusalem)?

11. How do you pay for their resettlement, given that Israel has still not managed to recompense and resettle the 10,000 Jews it expelled from their homes in Gaza?

12. How do you stem the flood of Israelis leaving the country in the wake of this demoralization?

13. How do you defend a country whose width is the distance between New York's JFK and LaGuardia airports?

14. How do you defend the coastal plain when a Palestinian state controls the mountain ranges that dominate it?

15. Are you now preparing to give the Golan Heights to Syria and destroy its Jewish communities?

16. How do you deal with the loss of ability to engage in "hot pursuit" in a sovereign Palestine?

17. How do you prevent foreign armies entering Palestine when you don't control the entry points?

18. How do you propose to recoup the loss in business investment and tourism?

19. Do you plan to recognize two Palestinian states, Hamastan and Fatahland?

20. The PA, like Hamas, has made clear it insists on the Right to Return. How will you deal with these demands for a "one state solution" after you have forfeited your claims to the historic Land of Israel and given up so many of your strategic advantages?

We will be astounded if you can come up with a rational answer to any of these questions. And under those circumstances, it is, to quote Edgar Allen Poe, "much of Madness, and more of Sin" to embark—or pretend to embark—on a "two state solution."

Table of Contents

Character is Fate by Rael Jean Isaac	...3
Menachem Begin To Ronald Reagan	...5
After The Fall by William Mehlman	...6
Its Official! Guinness World Record by David Isaac	...8
Déjà vu All Over Again by Melanie Phillips	...9
Paved With Good Intentions by Ruth King	...10

From the Editor

Truth In Fairy Tales

In July, when the G8 voted to stop global warming by cutting greenhouse gases 80%, *Investors Business Daily* and *The Wall Street Journal* came up with the same analogy: King Canute. King Canute was the king of England, Denmark and Norway who, legend goes, was flattered by his courtiers into believing he was so powerful the tides would recede at his command.

We falsely pride ourselves on having left behind such absurd beliefs as a result of our allegiance to the scientific method. On the contrary, the current Western politicians who decree “the temperature shall not rise” are as chock full of cockamamie hubris as those around King Canute. Moreover, at least according to some versions of the tale, the King (if he ever believed his courtiers) was a fast learner. When the tide came in anyway and he nearly drowned, the king is supposed to have told his assembled followers: “Let all men know how empty and worthless is the power of kings, for there is none worthy of the name, but He whom heaven, earth and sea obey by eternal laws.”

Our politicians never learn. As the temperature cools while carbon dioxide levels go up, they substitute “climate change” for global warming, and by magical abracadabra (known as computer projections) continue on their wacky economy-destroying project of controlling the climate.

Hans Christian Andersen’s “The Emperor’s New Clothes” underscores the power of a similar perennial human failing—self-delusion. No empirical evidence, no history of failure, no honest statements by Arab spokesmen can shake the faith of the political herd in the “two state solution” dogma. No sooner had Netanyahu toed the Obama line than a Fatah leader appeared on PA TV to say: “It has been said that we are negotiating for peace, but our goal has never been peace. Peace is a means; and the goal is Palestine.” Needless to say, that’s Palestine as it appears on PA maps, without Israel.

If we do not find better ways to monitor and check these human propensities, our future is bleak.

A Double Apology

The administration of inveterate apologizer Obama has apologized twice(!) for one of the few appropriate actions it has taken—staying away from Durban II. One of the apologies to the UN Human Rights Council went like this: “It was with regret that we did not join the recent Durban Review Conference. We are deeply grateful to the many country delegations and senior UN officials who worked steadfastly to improve the outcome document and to refocus the Durban Review Conference squarely on the global fight to eliminate racism and racial discrimination.”

What world are these Obama-apologizers

living in? The opening speaker at Durban II was Ahmadinejad and the conference unsurprisingly again singled out Israel for condemnation as “racist.” As *Eye on the UN’s* Anne Bayefsky notes: “Obama officials bent over backwards to issue an obsequious unprincipled statement about [UN officials] working to improve a meeting and its result while fully aware that those improvements never came.” Embarrassing for those touting Obama’s human rights credentials.

Europe Against Israel

Nothing better illustrates the hatred sweeping “progressive” Europe than the wave of count ‘em, 936 lawsuits against Israeli IDF officers and politicians in Spain, Britain, Holland, Norway—there are even some in New Zealand. In Norway six attorneys have been seeking a European-wide warrant to arrest senior Israeli officials, including former Prime Minister Ehud Olmert, for war crimes. In London, attorneys are waiting for one of their targets to travel to a country where it is legally possible to file charges, so a local attorney can petition for his arrest. Prominent Israelis fear to travel: former head of the IDF Southern Command Doron Almog only narrowly escaped arrest when, warned at the last minute, he refused to leave his plane at Heathrow Airport and flew back to Israel.

Needless to say, there’s nary a lawyer in these places expressing the slightest interest in arresting the terror chieftains of Hamas or Fatah.

Nor is it just avant garde “progressives.” See the Melanie Phillips article in this issue on Britain’s arms embargo against Israel for its “crime” of finally taking up arms against Hamas bombardments. Can one imagine the reaction were Israel to react against assaults from a “demilitarized” sovereign state of Palestine?

Jews Donate the Rope

If you give to Jewish communal federations including the Jewish Federation of New York, the Durham-Chapel Hill Federation and the Jewish Federation of Grand Rapids, be aware that you are contributing to Arab outfits dedicated to Israel’s destruction. That’s (*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

1751 Second Ave. (at 91st St.)

New York, NY 10128

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

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

Character is Fate

Rael Jean Isaac

The many plaudits it received to the contrary, Netanyahu's June 14 speech at Bar Ilan University was appalling from beginning to end. The normally astute Caroline Glick called it "an eloquent, rational and at times impassioned defense of Israel...a breath of fresh air." The usually perspicacious Daniel Pipes called it "a fine speech, making many needed points" which failed "on the critical point of prematurely accepting a Palestinian state."

But the speech failed on many more counts than that. Netanyahu stood before not just Israel, but a world audience, an emperor who has no clothes, elaborating the details of his finely wrought costume. For although he emphasizes the need to "be firmly connected to reality, to the truth," the speech is built upon a lie—the lie that peace with Palestinian Arabs and the broader Arab world is achievable and potentially at hand. Sounding like Israel's chief-fantasizer Shimon Peres, Netanyahu spins his vision of peace ("in my vision of peace, in this small land of ours, two peoples live freely, side by side, in amity and mutual respect") and waxes lyrical over the potential glories of regional economic cooperation. In doing this, in buying into the never-never land of the peace-processors, Netanyahu undercut the ground upon which he needed to stand firm if he were to face down Obama's existential threat to the state.

What should Netanyahu have said? He could have kept his first sentence "Peace has always been our people's most ardent desire." But instead of burbling on about our prophets who gave the world the vision of peace, the need to advance peace and "a new era of reconciliation in our region," he should have said bluntly that despite this desire, the people of Israel must listen to the prophet who warned of those who say peace, peace, when there is no peace. An unreformed Islam, he should have said, will simply not tolerate a non-Islamic state in what it considers its heartland. We have pretended too long that our territorial concessions could produce peace, with devastating results to our security and internal morale, our retreat from Gaza being only the last such disastrous experiment, and we are not going to pursue policies that have consistently led and can only lead to failure.

If Netanyahu had been what he pretended to be, "firmly connected to reality, to the truth," instead of lauding the treaties with Egypt and Jordan, he would have said that almost all their provisions had been violated from the outset by the other side. To take only one example, he could have pointed out that one of the provisions of the treaty with Egypt was that it would proscribe anti-Jewish incitement yet its govern-

ment controlled media spew hatred to the extent that Egypt vies with Iran for the unenviable title of world center of anti-Semitism. Even now, he should have continued, President Mubarak says our demand that the Palestinians recognize Israel as the state of the Jewish people "scuttles the chances for peace." If that is the case, what is the nature of the peace Mubarak has in mind? A peace without a Jewish state? That is not a "peace" this Prime Minister of Israel has any interest in negotiating.



Netanyahu at Bar Ilan

The much-applauded history lesson Netanyahu was clearly addressing to Obama in response to the latter's speech in Cairo—that Israel was not a response to the Holocaust and Arab hostility did not begin with post 1967 "settlements" nor did it lessen with Israeli concessions—was totally vitiated by the speech's conclusion which contradicted all that went before. Abruptly he argues that another massive Israeli territorial concession, in the form of a Palestinian state (with vastly more Israeli communities in Judea and Samaria implicitly uprooted) is the "solution" by universal consensus. Netanyahu should have concluded by declaring flatly that the two state solution was no solution: the phrase merely masked Arab determination to achieve a one state solution.

He could have ended by throwing the ball into Obama's court. Obama believed that the Arab world was prepared to make peace with Israel. All right then, Obama should put pressure on the Arabs to live up to the commitments already made. He should demand that Egypt dust off the 50 detailed agreements on cultural and economic cooperation it made with Israel in 1979 (which were buried no sooner than signed) and abide by them. He should demand that both the governments of Gaza and the so-called "West Bank" eliminate all incitement from their schools and media, end all terror and acts of war, and embrace in all the forums under their control the idea of living at peace with the Jewish state. He should insist all the Arab states lift their various boycotts and show by word and deed they accepted Israel into the region.

Yes, Netanyahu could have said, the Prime Minister of Israel did not believe that the Arabs were capable of making these changes. Since Obama did, let him try. And if he, Netanyahu turned out to be right, there was no peace to process. The United States would have to join with Israel in accepting that another way to manage the conflict had to be found.

Instead the speech showed that it had taken only one browbeating by Obama in their meeting a month earlier to whip Netanyahu into shape on the key issue. As Knesset member for the National Union

Party Arieh Eldad noted caustically: "He was elected to prevent the establishment of a Palestinian state and now he declares that there is a consensus on two states for two peoples. But Netanyahu knows that the only consensus now is that he is a weak leader who crumbles under pressure."

Yet if his supporters were taken aback, Netanyahu's behavior was all too predictable. The online *Frontpage Magazine* conducted a symposium over two years ago, in March 2007, exploring the threats Israel then faced. Since all the participants--myself, Caroline Glick, terrorism specialist David Keyes, psychiatrist Kenneth Levin and free lance writer P. David Hornik--agreed that the Olmert government was incompetent and delusional, we wound up debating the changes that could be expected once it was replaced, with Netanyahu, as we all presumed, the new Prime Minister. I found myself alone in predicting what has in fact happened. I based my prediction on Netanyahu's previous performance as Prime Minister, when he was elected in 1996. Netanyahu, I pointed out, "admittedly understands the Middle East and world politics far better than Mr. Olmert, but nonetheless, as Prime Minister, held out the same delusional promise of 'peace' and furthered the Oslo process (through more concessions at the Wye conference)."

The other symposium participants all believed that Netanyahu had learned from previous experience and "this time would be different." I countered that "character is fate, and Netanyahu simply lacks the character necessary for the role of Prime Minister; he lacks political courage and resolve, the willingness to abide by bedrock principles and commitments, even when the going is tough." I observed that as Prime Minister Netanyahu had sought to return the Golan Heights to Syria (the only dispute is whether he was prepared to go back to the pre-1967 war line or held out for a few kilometers beyond it). I noted that subsequently, as a member of the Sharon cabinet, he had backed the morally and strategically culpable destruction of Gaza's Jewish communities, cynically resigning just before the actual pullout so that "on the model of John Kerry he could then say 'I actually voted against the Gaza withdrawal after I voted for it.'" I insisted that to expect anything different from Netanyahu now was folly, that "he has always talked the talk, but never been able to walk the walk."

One of the most disconcerting aspects of Netanyahu's character, I observed, was the split between his understanding and his practice. And indeed this was dramatized in his recent speech by his insistence on demilitarization of the new Palestinian state "with ironclad security provisions" lest it "become another terrorist base against the Jewish state." In his

speech Netanyahu elaborated what he meant by demilitarization: no army, no control of its airspace, security measures to prevent weapons smuggling, no ability to forge military pacts.

No one knows better than Netanyahu how idiotic this is. He clearly explained why in a May 12, 2002 speech to the Likud Central Committee, arguing against then Prime Minister Sharon's implied support for a demilitarized Palestinian state. Said Netanyahu: "[I]t [the Palestinian state] will demand all the powers of a state, such as controlling borders, bringing in weapons, control of airspace and the ability to knock down any Israeli plane that enters its area, the ability

to sign peace treaties and military alliances with other countries. Once you give them a state, you give them all these things, even if there is an agreement to the contrary, for within a short time they will demand all these things, and they will assume these powers, and the world will stand by and do nothing but it *will* stop us from trying to stop them...We will thus

have created with our own hands a threat to our very existence. What will happen if the Palestinians do what the Germans did after World War I, when they nullified the demilitarized zone? The world did nothing then, and the world will do nothing now as well."

The absurdity is compounded in that U.S. Lt. General Keith Dayton is already training a PA army and the Netanyahu government this July approved the transfer of 1,000 AK-47 rifles to them. Defending these soldiers, whom Hamas mockingly calls "Dayton Forces" former PA Minister of Prisoners Ashraf al-Ajrami counters that they constituted the backbone of Palestinian operations [i.e. terror attacks on Israel] during the five year intifada. (As they would doubtless be the backbone of future attacks from any Palestinian state.) All that Netanyahu has achieved with his "demilitarization" gimmick is to open Pandora's box. Ten days after Netanyahu's speech *Haaretz* reported that the Obama administration was examining an Israeli-Syrian peace plan based on demilitarizing a returned-to-Syria Golan Heights and transforming it into a nature preserve or "peace park."

It is the task of a leader to withstand pressures deeply harmful to his country's welfare. As Israeli journalist Israel Harel has aptly pointed out, Israel is treated like a doormat because it acts like a doormat. Who would have thought that small, impoverished Honduras would put Israel to shame? Yet, after ousting its President Zelaya, who had defied the Constitution and the Honduran Supreme Court in illegally seeking to extend his stay in office, it has thus far stood firm against pressures to reinstate him. Those pressures include the vote of all 192 members of the UN General Assembly, the Organization of American States, such champions of democracy as Hugo

Character is fate, and Netanyahu simply lacks the character necessary for the role of Prime Minister.

Chavez (who demands an OAS-led military invasion), Daniel Ortega and Raul Castro, and shameful addition to the list, Barack Obama, who promptly suspended military assistance and development projects.

In 1940, shortly before his death, the great Zionist leader Zeev Jabotinsky penned what he called his *kaddish*, his final testament. The Jewish people was at its lowest ebb, with the Holocaust looming and the British White Paper of the year before cutting off Palestine as a refuge for the Jews of Europe. Since he had long been forbidden entry into Palestine, Jabotinsky cast the *kaddish* as the demand of his young followers in Palestine.

"A Jew comes to us, particularly a young one, and announces before the entire world 'I demand right and justice for myself—if I will not get it, may the entire world turn into a desert. In a place where I am a king among other kings—there progress will flourish. But if my fate is to be ejected from the structure of peoples, it will not bother me if all of you are consumed by fire. I shall add oil to the flame. There will be no redemption for the world if I have no part in it.' This is a position...for which it is worthwhile to fight, to suffer and to devote your life."

An Israeli leader must be imbued with faith in Israel's legitimate rights to her ancient land, a bedrock conviction that not everything is negotiable, and those convictions must be so strong they inure him to pressures, both internal and external. Were Netanyahu to have the uncompromising underlying attitude expressed by Jabotinsky's *kaddish*--I will be treated as an equal, with my national and legal rights and core principles respected—he would immeasurably strengthen Israel. The more Israel appeases its enemies, the more Israel's deterrence erodes. The more

Netanyahu crumbles before Obama's unreasonable demands, the more those demands accelerate. It is only by standing up to pressure that a leader has the chance to develop countervailing pressures. If Netanyahu were to refuse the role of doormat, he would find Israel has allies, among Democrats in Congress as well as Republicans and among evangelicals.

It even has potential allies in Europe—look at staunch supporter of Israel Geert Wilders, who may yet be the next Prime Minister of Holland.

If Netanyahu were a genuine leader, he would force debate on the real issues including, among others, Iran's development of nuclear bombs under an apocalyptic leadership, the dangers posed by resurgent Islam to the West, with Israel only the initial target, the steady transformation of Gaza into a Taliban statelet and international terror base at the very time when the U.S. is pouring resources into preventing the reemergence of such a base in Afghanistan.

Instead, by caving in to Obama's outrageous and unethical demands (who is Obama to decide what houses may be built and how many children Jews may have?), he allows Obama to set the framework for negotiation, which now focuses on such absurd trivialities as whether a "settlement freeze" includes kindergartens and toilets in Jewish communities beyond the 1949 Green Line.

What is most painful of all is that the folly, the betrayals and the debasement of Israel comes from a political party and leadership that claims spiritual descent from Zeev Jabotinsky, the man who above all sought to instill pride, honor and determination in the Jewish people. •



Zeev Jabotinsky

The following letter was sent by Menachem Begin to Ronald Reagan in September 1982:

What some call the 'West Bank,' Mr. President, is Judea and Samaria, and this simple historic truth will never change. There are cynics who deride history. They may continue their derision as they wish, but I will stand by the truth. And the truth is that millennia ago there was a Jewish Kingdom of Judea and Samaria where our kings knelt to God, where our prophets brought forth the vision of eternal peace, where we developed a rather rich civilization which we took with us in our hearts and in our minds, on our long global trek for over 18 centuries; and, with it, we came back home. By aggressive war, by invasion, King Abdullah conquered parts of Judea and Samaria in 1948; and in a war of most legitimate self-defense in 1967, after being attacked by King Hussein, we liberated, with God's help, that portion of our homeland.

Geography and history have ordained that Judea and Samaria be mountainous country and that two-thirds of our population dwell in the coastal plain dominated by those mountains. From them you can hit every city, every town, each township and village and, last but not least, our principal airport in the plain below.

Mr. President, you and I chose for the last two years to call our countries 'friends and allies.' Such being the case, a friend does not weaken a friend, an ally does not put his ally in jeopardy. This would be the inevitable consequence were the 'positions' [Begin refers here to the Reagan Plan which called on Israel to withdraw to the 1967 lines] transmitted to me on August 31, 1982, to become reality. I believe they won't. 'For Zion's sake will I not hold my peace, and for Jerusalem's sake I will not rest.' (Isaiah 62).

After The Fall

William Mehlman

Nothing was more glaringly exposed in the Iranian people's heroic response to the theft of their national election than the mendacity of Barack Obama's Middle East policy.

Indeed, the most tellingly absent ingredient in the mass protests and marches the world witnessed on the streets of Teheran in June, was the slightest evidence of passion for the creation of a 23rd Arab state in Judea and Samaria. The Iranian people had more important things on their minds, like the right to a legitimate count of their ballots and to raise hell over its denial without having their skulls caved in by Ayatollah Ali Khamenei's Basij thugs.

Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, on whose behalf those skulls were being cracked, the perpetually grinning punk with whom the President of the United States was planning to play peekaboo for the rest of the year while he enriched enough uranium to make an atomic bomb, is in almost universal bad odor. The White House's portrait of an Arab world waiting only for Israel's acquiescence to a Palestinian state between Kfar Saba and the Jordan to join it in defanging the Iranian viper has never looked more like a forgery. "Peace Now" to the contrary notwithstanding, it turns out the "Arab World" was always a lot more concerned about Iranian territorial ambitions in the Middle East than the number of *mirpesets* [balconies] in Karnei Shomron. It is the mul-lahs, moreover, not Ahmadinejad, who call the shots in Iran, and the "Arab World's" influence over them—even if one could imagine it being exerted on Israel's behalf—is roughly zero. Unless and until that mul-lahcracy is replaced by a sane, civilized government, Israel will remain on the nuclear griddle. And last anybody checked, the centrifuges at Natanz were going full blast.

Back in Israel meanwhile, continued fallout over Benjamin Netanyahu's June 14th speech appears to have at least temporarily nudged concern over Iran's nukes to the sidelines. Was the prime minister's finger-dip in the "Two-for-Two" baptismal font the act of a genuine converso or a survivalist looking to buy time after being shown the instruments of the Inquisition? And how does one define a "demilitarized" Palestinian state populated by the Al-Aksa Martyrs Brigades as other than an oxymoron?

What is beyond question is the ideological upheaval caused by the speech. Nothing since Ariel Sharon's decision to unilaterally disengage Israel from Gaza has so fractured the "national Zionist camp" or created stranger misalliances. Martin Sherman, direc-

tor of the Jerusalem Summit and lecturer on security policy at Tel Aviv University, accuses Netanyahu of having chosen "surrender over resistance" and in so doing, having "put in grave danger not only his country and his people, but the very rationale of Zionism itself." To the no less Zionistically-committed Michael Freund, founder and chairman of Shavei Zion, which scours the globe for "lost" Israelite tribal remnants, Sherman's indictment of Netanyahu puts him in league with a "knuckleheaded" Right incapable of esteeming the tactical brilliance with which the prime minister, in the course of 29 minutes, "succeeded in outwitting U.S. President Barack Obama at his own game, using his considerable rhetorical skills to marshal an unprecedented consensus among the public."

Putting fervent right-wingers Daniella Weiss and Aryeh Eldad at loggerheads in the national Zionist kitchen would seem a challenge too far for even the most skilled rhetorician, but what the fiery former mayor of Kedumim considered *chulent*—she heard Netanyahu say "no" to a Palestinian state, "yes" to continued building in Judea and Samaria—the National Union party's No.2 declared to be pork stew. "In saying a 'demilitarized' Palestinian state, Netanyahu is trying to eat a pig that has been slaughtered according to Jewish dietary laws," Eldad declaimed. "[He] has crossed not only the red lines of his election promises, but also converted."

The enthusiasm with which the Left and Center-Left greeted Netanyahu's mouthing of the "Two-for-Two" mantra ("a large step for Israel, a giant leap for Netanyahu," glowed Labor Member of Knesset Daniel Simon; "responsible and serious," chimed in Kadima's Otniel Schneller), could not have been music to the ears of the Knesset's Likud contingent. Yet, even its most disquieted members stopped well short of a break with their leader. The normally uninhibited Danny Danon confined himself to labeling Bibi's accession to Palestinian sovereignty "one unnecessary sentence in a brilliant speech." The more outspoken Druz MK Ayoub Kara accused the prime minister of "going against the decision of the party's institutions in agreeing to a Palestinian state, demilitarized or not." He joined with Danon in a pledge to "work in the Knesset faction and Central Committee to make sure it doesn't get implemented."

More circumspect was Minister-without-Portfolio Benny Begin, regarded in some circles as the "conscience" of the Likud. "Although I have reservations about some components of the speech," he said,



Benny Begin



Daniella Weiss



Aryeh Eldad

"[Netanyahu] presented facts that sometimes disappear from the political discourse in Israel and abroad." In what he termed "a hint to Obama," Yoel Marcus, writing in *Ha'aretz*, cautioned the president to keep a sharp eye on Benny Begin. "He's not really a politician," Marcus observed of the geologist professor son of Menachem Begin, "but you can't question his integrity and zealotry for his cause...If the government signs an agreement obligating it to make territorial concessions, Begin will go home quietly... Conclusion: As long as Begin remains there, Bibi will only talk."

Convinced that is about all Netanyahu ever means to do, Daniel Levy, a senior fellow at the liberal-leaning New America and Century Foundations, opines that "the words 'Palestinian State' were intended primarily for [Obama's] ears. Next, were Netanyahu's supporters in the United States, desperate for ammunition to depict their Israeli champion as reasonable and to push the blame for an impasse back onto Arab and Palestinian

shoulders." Third, and no less important, Levy added, "was the premier's domestic constituency. That his speech did not spark even the slightest coalition crisis reveals more about the stinginess of his words than it does about the sturdiness of his coalition."

Netanyahu certainly wasn't stingy with the markers he laid down in his Bar-Ilan address. They included demands for the unequivocal recognition of Israel as the "nation-state of the Jewish people;" resolution of the Palestinian "refugee problem" outside the borders of Israel; the continued status of Jerusalem as the "united capital of Israel;" obligatory Palestinian Authority responsibility for establishing "the rule of law in Gaza and overcoming Hamas;" recognition of Israel's "need to enable the residents [of the Jewish communities beyond the Green Line] to lead normal lives ...[as] an integral part of our people," and the demilitarization of any territory passing under the control of a future Palestine.

It took Saab Erekat, the ubiquitous voice of the PA, less than five minutes to declare before an Al-Jazeera TV camera that "in a thousand years, no Palestinian leader will accept" the humiliating demands of the Israeli prime minister. PA Executive Committee secretary Abed Rabbo nearly had apoplexy waiting his turn. Calling Netanyahu "a swindler, a fraud and a liar" and his speech "a zero," he accused the prime minister of trying to inveigle the Palestinians into joining the Zionist movement by offering them a state under Israel's protectorate. There was more restraint from PA Chairman Mahmoud Abbas but the bottom line was the same. "The speech has destroyed all initiatives and expectations," read the memo from his headquar-

ters in Ramallah. "It has placed restrictions on efforts to achieve peace and constitutes a clear challenge to the Palestinian, Arab and American positions."

Significantly, neither the PA, in damning the speech, nor the Obama administration, in cautiously applauding it, paid nearly as much attention to the Netanyahu marker the media most prominently featured in its account of the prime minister's acceptance of a Palestinian State—namely, its demilitarization. Perhaps that's because, as Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak presciently noted, "the concept of a demilitarized Palestinian state is baseless."

Purdue University International law professor Louis Rene Beres agrees: "Any new agreement for demilitarization will be a non-starter...a non-treaty agreement" with no legal authority behind it. Within the bounds of international law, Beres explains, a future Palestinian state could choose from among a number of pretexts to extricate itself from a pre-state demilitarization pact, including a real or imagined "material

breach" of the agreement by Israel, or a "fundamental change of circumstances" in which the future Palestine declares itself "vulnerable to previously unforeseen dangers, perhaps even from the forces of other Arab armies." Moreover, he points out, no demilitarization agreement ever devised would stand a chance against the "peremptory rule" of national sovereignty. "Because the right of sovereign states to maintain military forces for self-defense is such a rule," he adds, "Palestine could be within its lawful right to abrogate any agreement that had previously compelled its demilitarization."

The one marker Netanyahu laid down in his June 14th speech that has galvanized the attention of the White House and its Palestinian client is the one related to the allowance for "natural growth" of the Jewish communities of Judea and Samaria. The milk Netanyahu spilled at Bar-Ilan can't be put back in the bottle, but a *Jihadist* entity between the Mediterranean and the Jordan River can still be foreclosed by the facts Israel creates on the ground. It is little wonder that the White House and the State Department have honed in with laser intensity on the demand for a dead halt to all Jewish construction in Judea, Samaria and "east" Jerusalem.

The prime minister's insistence on the right to "normal lives" for the 300,000 Jews of Judea and Samaria raised "new and unnecessary obstacles to negotiations" for even "friendly" Italy's foreign minister Franco Frattinni. The Obama administration was notably less diplomatic. "Netanyahu needs to know that one speech, a large part of which was in any case meant to reassure us, will not buy us," was the way

"Progress" in the Arab-Israeli diplomatic theatre has long been a code word for Israeli retreat and retreat is precisely what settlement leaders fear Netanyahu may do.

one unidentified White House official put it to an Israeli source. "If anyone is under any illusions, we do not intend to reduce the pressure to achieve progress."

"Progress" in the Arab-Israeli diplomatic theatre of operations has long been a code word for Israeli retreat, and retreat is precisely what settlement leaders fear Netanyahu may do. Dani Dayan, who heads the Council of Jewish Communities of Judea and Samaria says he is "very worried." Well he might be. Netanyahu's initial "I will not freeze [natural growth]" has morphed into "I will not completely freeze." There are other warning flags. Defense Minister Ehud Barak's increasing presence in the "natural growth" negotiations is far from comforting. He made two trips to Washington in late June to "consolidate all the construction data" relative to the "natural growth" question and "define the parameters of a settlement freeze."

In a cogent analysis, *Jerusalem Post* diplomatic correspondent Herb Keinon contends that Obama's "hard line on the Settlements has effectively made Israeli-Palestinian negotiations dependent on a complete Settlement freeze, something the Netanyahu government—because of its political makeup and Netanyahu's desire for political longevity—is simply not going to do." And since the Palestinians insist they will not begin talking until a freeze is in place, the bottom line is there will be no negotiations. Mahmoud Abbas, Keinon asserts, finds that much to his liking. "He is not interested in negotiating with Netanyahu and Obama has now given him an excuse not to." If the Obama's game plan is to ignite a revolt against the Likud government and bring on a more pliant Tzippi Livni, he is playing to lose, Keinon believes. The prime minister is riding a 61 percent popularity wave in favor of "natural" settlement expansion. He has no intention of going "gently into the good political night."

"At the end of the day and after all the speeches," Nadav Shragai recently wrote in *Ha'aretz*. "the Palestinian State – and with it the State of Israel – will rise or fall on Jerusalem, the most legitimate and greatest Israeli settlement ever...When it comes to

Jerusalem, there is no need to mention either 'natural growth' or natural development. What is at stake is nature itself, the nature of our connection to this city and the realization of the right that is rooted in our religion, our history and 2,000 years of memory and longing, during which the Jewish presence in Israel never ceased to exist."

The challenge to that history penetrates beyond political considerations into the heart of a zero sum culture incapable of recognizing any right, any truth alien to its fevered illusions. It has spawned a Palestinian television network that daily warns its viewers that the Al-Aksa mosque is under imminent threat of a man-made Israeli earthquake and a Jerusalem mufti, Sheikh Mohammed Hussein, who believes that if the earthquake doesn't come off, Israel will do the job with "bombs" dropped from the air or detonated from a distance. The stirring of Arab blood lust isn't confined to religious leaders or alleged threats to the Al-Aksa. The mere Jewish presence in Jerusalem was sufficient to have prompted Dr. Marwan Abu Khalaf, director of Al-Quds University's "Institute of Islamic Archeology" to declare that "under every stone and in every corner, on every street and at every bend in Jerusalem, there are remains that say: 'We are Arab, we are Muslim.'" Given such a narrative, Shragai avers, "it is no wonder that the Palestinian Authority—and not just Hamas—is defining Jerusalem as *ribat* land, meaning that Muslims are religiously mandated to fight for it and hold on to it...for the sake of Islam."

That Israel after 61 years stands virtually alone in the face of this barbaric revisionist onslaught is about the most damning commentary that can be made about the "civilized" West. That the most powerful and enlightened democracy in the history of the world appears to be shifting to the side of the barbarians is the stuff of which our worst dreams are made. One can only hope that the awakening that ends this nightmare is not much longer delayed.

William Mehlman represents AFSI in Israel and co-edits the Jerusalem-based internet magazine ZionNet

It's Official! Guinness Book Declares Palestine Demilitarized Zone, Most Militarized Region On The Planet

David Isaac

"The second principle is demilitarization. Any area in Palestinian hands has to be demilitarized, with ironclad security measures. Without this condition, there is a real fear that there will be an armed Palestinian state which will become a terrorist base against Israel, as happened in Gaza." -- Benjamin Netanyahu, Bar-Ilan University speech, June, 14, 2009.

East Jerusalem - It was a festive atmosphere today in the Palestine State's new capital. A large crowd gathered along Nablus street singing "Death to Israel!" as a parade passed by in commemoration of Land Day. The local holiday, celebrated yearly on March 30, features incursions across the border into Israel to have picnics and set forest fires.

What makes this year's Land Day special, however, is the parade's unusual Grand Marshal. Instead of the run-of-the-mill mother of a suicide bomber, it's Jim McNicholls, editor-in-chief of the Guinness Book of World Records. The unassuming 5'3" Glasgow native has been invited to verify what Palestinian State officials have been saying for a long time; that Palestine is the most militarized region in the

world.

"We thought we'd be counting weapons per square mile," said Guinness editor McNicholls, explaining why it's taken over two years to make the announcement. "It was more like per square inch."

McNicholls was the center of attention as he waved to the crowd from his float, a fantastically large piece of dynamite. "We thought of putting him on a giant spinning top filled with nitroglycerin, but it looked too much like a Jewish dreidel. Plus it exploded," said Parade Organizer Walid Schmalid. "You can still see where we assembled it over where Mt. Scopus used to be."

The story behind how Guinness counted the weapons is itself one for the record books. At first, the company assigned a single representative to tally the armaments of the newly minted 23rd Arab state. When the official collapsed from a brain spasm after checking off his 380,000th Qassam rocket, the people at Guinness recognized their resources were woefully inadequate to the task.

To count the weapons, Guinness realized it would need an army. Luckily, there was one nearby. Some 50,000 blue-helmeted UN soldiers, police and civilian personnel were on hand as part of a long-term mission to ensure that Palestine remain demilitarized, as stipulated in the final status agreement signed between Israel and the Palestinian Authority three years earlier.

The task of putting the UN peacekeepers to work on a new mission, one which some said was at odds with their original one, was not a simple matter. Negotiations went on until McNicholls hit on the idea of putting the UN peacekeepers themselves in the record book.

"It was the largest UN peacekeeping operation in history. I don't know why I didn't think of it sooner," McNicholls said. "Most people melt like butter when you dangle a Guinness record in front of them. The UN was no different."

The UN General Assembly ratified the changed mission in Resolution 2450. French General

Louis de Funes expressed relief once he received his new orders. "Before, it was embarrassing. There were weapons everywhere. You couldn't take a step without tripping over an artillery piece," de Funes said. "But what could I do with 50,000 troops? Stop them?"

The French general beamed with pride as he stood on the podium with various Arab dignitaries as McNicholls presented them with a plaque certifying the Palestinian State as the most heavily armed zone on the planet.

The parade ended with the usual barrage of missiles, tank rounds and artillery shells launched against Israel, one of which accidentally dropped into Ricky Rukab's ice cream parlor, wiping out the Arab girls inside who were enjoying Ricky's famous Rocket Pops.

There was an additional note of sadness in the proceedings. Their mission accomplished, General de Funes and his troops would be leaving Palestine to go across the

border into Israel. The UN troops will now oversee Israel's demilitarization. According to recently passed UN Resolution 2544, it was decided that in order to make the two-state solution work, one of the sides should be demilitarized. If the Arabs wouldn't do it, it would have to be the Jews.

"This time our mission will succeed," declared General de Funes. "We have learned many lessons from our efforts here. The first of which is that the people must want to be demilitarized. The Arabs didn't want it. But from everything I hear, the Jews do. They are tired of war. They are tired of fighting. That gives us reason to hope."

McNicholls hitched a ride with the peacekeeping convoy as it made its way to the border. He was on his way to present still another plaque, this one for Israel's new Peace Park, once the site of Tel Aviv University. The buildings were destroyed in a recent rocket attack. Trees, grass and birds were trucked in before the flames had even died down. It's the fastest built park in the world, McNicholls says.

David Isaac is a free-lance writer living in California.



French Troops Leave Rhineland in 1936

It's Déjà Vu All Over Again

Melanie Phillips

So now the veil is well and truly ripped off. All the warning signs have been there for months: Foreign Secretary David Miliband's boilerplate leftist agitprop about Operation Cast Lead in Gaza; Britain's pressure on the EU to renege on the agreements it made with Israel and boycott produce from the settlements; Miliband's statement that Jerusalem should be the capital of 'Palestine' as well as of Israel. Now there has been a step-change. *Haaretz* reports that the British gov-

ernment has revoked a number of arms export licenses to Israel following the Gaza war. Five export licences have been revoked over spare parts for ships' guns. The decision apparently resulted from heavy pressure by both members of Parliament and human rights organizations.

The unhinged malevolence over Cast Lead can no longer be brushed off as the foamings of the far-left and its acolytes in the media, NGOs and fashionable society. This is the British government now acting to punish Israel for defending itself against relentless rocket attack by an enemy bent on its destruction.

It says Israel's actions were 'disproportionate'. What is it talking about? The actual evidence showed that the proportion of civilians killed in Gaza was very small—far smaller than might have been expected given the tactics Hamas was using of embedding itself within the population. The claims of large numbers of civilians and children killed were fabricated by Hamas and recycled by the Israel-bashers of the UN and media. Far from being 'disproportionate', Cast Lead was a carefully targeted operation which, given the circumstances, was astonishingly successful in its aim of confining its attack to terrorist operatives. The only people claiming 'disproportionate' are enemies of Israel. Now the British government has openly joined them.

Even now, however, the Foreign Office is in weaselly fashion attempting to deny that this is what it is. This partial arms embargo, it says, is not a partial arms embargo—because all export licenses will continue to be considered individually:

"Future decisions will take into account what has happened in the recent conflict. We do not grant export licenses where there is a clear risk that arms will be used for external aggression or internal repression. We do not believe that the current situation in the Middle East would be improved by imposing an arms embargo on Israel. Israel has the right to defend itself and faces real security threats. This said, we consistently urge Israel to act with restraint and supported the EU Presidency statement that called the Israeli actions during operation Cast Lead 'disproportionate.'"

Sorry, but an embargo is an embargo. An act of ideological spite is still an act of ideological spite. The false flag of 'disproportionality' is hoisted only by those who find it 'disproportionate' that Israel should ever defend itself against the Palestinians by military means at all. Israelis are expected instead passively to die under rocket and bomb attack—or perhaps live in shelters for ever. That's proportionate.

It is time now for all decent people of goodwill everywhere to boycott NGOs like Amnesty, War on Want and all the others who are pushing these ob-

scene lies and libels about Israel. No decent person should have anything to do with these organizations. No-one should give money to these inciters of hatred and purveyors of lies. They have sided with the forces of genocide and Islamic fascism against the Jewish people, truth and conscience. They have become a force for evil in the world.

As for the current British Labour government, it can no longer be counted a friend or ally of Israel. The odious Miliband made this as plain as could be when he called two months ago for a 'new coalition of consent' between the West and the Islamic world. He went on: "Decisions taken many years ago in [the Foreign Office] are still felt on the landscape of the Middle East...Ruined Crusader castles remain as poignant monuments to the religious violence of the Middle Ages. Lines drawn on maps by colonial powers were succeeded, among other things, by the failure to establish two states in Palestine."

There was only one reason why a Palestine state did not arise, and that was because the Arabs refused precisely such a proposal—offered not just by the 'colonial' power, Britain, but again in 1947 by fiat of the United Nations. As Miliband did not recall, the Arab response was a rejection of a state of Palestine and a war of extermination against Israel instead. This in turn followed decades in which Arab rejectionism of 'two states' and of the Jews' right to be in their historic homeland at all was directly related to the systematic British appeasement of Arab terror. Britain's history in Palestine was in fact one of repeated betrayal of its pledges to the Jewish people made under international law and its appeasement of Arab tyranny.

Let us not hear any more sickening cant from Gordon Brown about how he learned to love Israel at his father's knee. In this latest act of malice, Britain has merely reverted to shameful colonial type, courtesy this time of the post-modern left.

It's déjà vu all over again.

This appeared in the Spectator (UK) on July 13. Melanie Phillips is the author of Londonistan.

Paved With Good Intentions

Ruth King

I am not a Torah scholar, but having consulted with experts and scoured the Decalogue and the 613 additional commandments codified in the eighth century, I can report with confidence that among the hundreds of "shalts" and "shalt nots" there are none that command Jews to be Democrats or liberals or to love their enemies better than themselves. You could be excused for not knowing this, given the number of political groupies who cloak themselves in "religious" palaver when their politically correct doctrines are challenged.

The most misused and overused cliché is

Tikkun Olam, translated as "repairing the world." The phrase originated in classical rabbinic literature and is found in *kabbalah*, a major strand of Jewish mysticism whose famous exponent was the 16th-century Rabbi Isaac Luria. It is now used to promote the cult of global warming, universal health care and assorted other "progressive" policies, especially those inimical to Israel's survival. Incidentally, one of the directors of the seditious group "J" Street which acts as shill for President Obama's anti-Israel policies is named Isaac Luria. Well what's in a name? The director is called "Ben-Ami" which means son of my people.

Groups like "J" Street were founded on anti-Israel premises. More alarming are the formerly

mainstream organizations which have veered precipitously to the left. For example, Hadassah is the world's largest volunteer women's organization with a sterling record of hands-on support for Israel. Hadassah sent the first group of public health nurses to Palestine in 1913. It established nurseries, schools, health centers and major hospitals. Its members were active in the rescue movement which saved thousands of children from the Nazis. With Israel's independence Hadassah played an outsize role in the ingathering which brought the wretched survivors of Europe and the Arab states to Israel, providing housing, medical care, counseling and language and vocational training.

However, as younger women active in the 1970s anti-war movement took over, the focus changed to trendy domestic issues such as abortion, gay and lesbian rights, embryonic stem cell research, a "green" planet, and "social justice and civil rights" as seen through the prism of the far left of the Democratic party. It is not only that this has nothing to do with specifically Jewish concerns. "Social justice" issues, thus defined, are the mainstay of Israel-hating groups—to take Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International as well known examples.

The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith is another former powerhouse that fell to the left. Founded in 1843, the B'nai B'rith is the oldest Jewish service and communal organization in the world. It founded the ADL in 1913 "to stop, by appeals to reason and conscience and, if necessary, by appeals to law, the defamation of the Jewish people." The great influx of refugees from Eastern Europe had intensified latent anti-Semitism. Libels of Jews as "money lenders" and criminals were widespread; clubs were formed to exclude them; even boycotts of businesses gained traction; and financial and academic institutions established quotas to limit Jewish participation.

Through education, public relations and the courts, the ADL rose to the challenge of taking on defamers of Jews. The ADL was also strongly supportive of Israel and after 1967 closely monitored anti-Vietnam and other leftist protests which degenerated into stealth-bashing of Israel. The ADL maintained the most thorough archives of United Nations depredations, anti-Semitic cartoons and editorials in the Arab press, media assaults and libels against Israel. Within the President's Conference, the ADL was foremost in resisting the pressures of left-wing anti Israel groups.

What happened? Why did the ADL turn from opposing anti-Israel and anti-Semitic propaganda to insulting people like Dennis Prager as "intolerant, misinformed and downright un-American" for insisting that Moslem Congressman Keith Ellison take the oath of office on a Bible, not the Koran? (The worst the

ADL could find to say about Ahmadinejad's speech at Columbia University was that it was "a charade of half-answers and obfuscation.") Why does the ADL slam the heroic Geert Wilders, who has put his life on the line for the West, for "Islamophobia," while remaining silent on the genocidal intentions toward Jews of "the religion of peace"? Why have they defamed the Evangelicals who are Israel's most stalwart supporters while schmoozing with and empathizing with the "hurt feelings" of those who want to behead all infidels? In its zeal to empty the public square of any and all religious content, the ADL has gone so far as to criticize the placement of the Ten Commandments on public property and Bibles in public schools.

In a hard-hitting column Ann Coulter skewered the ADL: "The survival of Israel is inextricably linked to the survival of the Republican Party and its evangelical base. And yet the ADL viciously attacks conservatives,

implying that there is some genetic anti-Semitism among right-wingers in order to hide the fact that anti-Semites are the ADL's best friends—the defeatists in Congress, the people who tried to drive Joe Lieberman from office, the hoodlums on college campuses who riot at any criticism of Muslim terrorists and identify Israel as an imperialist aggressor, and liberal college faculties calling for 'anti-apartheid' boycotts of Israel. The Democratic Party sleeps with anti-Semites every night, but groups like the ADL love to play-act their bravery at battling ghosts, as if it's the 1920s and they are still fighting quotas at Harvard."

The ADL's poster boy is Alan Dershowitz, once a defender of Jews and Israel at Harvard and the *bête noir* of Jhimmi Carter, who feared debating him. His obsession with abortions, climate-warming hysteria, and other multi-culty trash has rendered him a pathetic hero worshipper of Obama and the Democratic party and a loud and articulate defamer of Christian friends of Israel.

What is going on? People like Dershowitz, along with the leaders of most of the mainstream Jewish organizations, somehow got the idea that blending with the left and dabbling in "progressive" politics was good for the Jewish future. They bought into the idea that they were furthering Jewish interests but now the idea has them in its grip. To the left, which increasingly flirts with outright anti-Semitism, they are irrelevant. As defenders of Israel they are useless. Indeed, by their support of the left they wind up in the same place as Israel's most malevolent detractors, the J Streets, Tikvuns and New Israel Funds, driving away friends and gratifying enemies.

As the old saw has it, the road to hell is paved with good intentions. •

The Anti-Defamation League is another former powerhouse that fell to the left.

(Continued from page 2)

because many Jewish federations contribute to the New Israel Fund, which provides hundreds of thousands of dollars to anti-Israel groups. For example, NIF is the core funder for Adalah, a legal center for Israeli Arabs, Mossawa, an advocacy center and I'lam, a media center. They all reject the right of Jews to a Jewish state.

Samuel Sokol and David Bedein point out that I'lam's first director was Hanin Zoabi, recently elected as a member of the hostile Israeli Arab Balad Party. In her maiden interview with the *Jerusalem Post* as a Knesset member, Zoabi declared her support for a nuclear Iran. As director of I'lam, Zoabi helped draft the Haifa Declaration, which called for the negation of Israel's Jewish identity. The current director of I'lam was a senior adviser for the Palestinian Authority, while its international relations coordinator has issued numerous statements in support of Hamas.

As for Adalah, writer and researcher Arlene Kushner notes that its position is that Jewish immigration should be banned and that the Israeli government is a "junta which proves each day that it is the most fascist and racist in history."

Sokol and Bedein report that Mossawa, along with New Israel Fund grantee Coalition of Women for Peace, recently wrote to the Norwegian government asking "the Norwegian people to join us in our efforts and to stop investing in the Israeli occupation of Palestinian territory."

Breaking the Silence is the most recent New Israel Fund project (along with the British Embassy, it was the chief funder) to create international waves by slandering Israel, in this case the Israel Defense Forces, through anonymous charges of "war crimes" in

the operation to halt the multi-year rocket attacks from Gaza.

Almost twenty years ago AFSI published a pamphlet on the New Israel Fund, calling it "A New Fund for Israel's Enemies." All that has changed is that mainstream Jewish organizations that claim to support Israel now fund it.

Macabre Humor

Human Rights Watch, which ranks with Amnesty International in deserving a Nobel Prize in hypocrisy, has sent a delegation to raise money from that bastion of human rights Saudi Arabia. Its pitch is that it has earned the support of Saudi royals by its battles with "pro-Israel pressure groups in the U.S., the European Union and the United Nations." (Even the Saudis must wonder how Human Rights Watch could find such groups to battle in the latter two.)

Law Professor David Bernstein says the point "is not that Human Rights Watch is pro-Saudi, but that it is maniacally anti-Israel. The most recent manifestation [of that hostility] is that its officers see nothing unseemly about raising funds among the elite of one of the most totalitarian nations on earth...without the felt need to discuss any of the Saudis' manifold human rights violations, and without apparent concern that becoming dependent on funds emanating from a brutal dictatorship leaves you vulnerable to that brutal dictatorship later cutting off the flow of funds, if you don't 'behave.'"

What Bernstein overlooks is that when it comes to off-the-wall attacks on Israel, Human Rights Watch can feel sure there is no danger the organization will fail to live up to donor expectations. •