

OUTPOST

March 2010—Issue #230

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

Obama’s Anti-Israel Strategy

Herbert Zweibon

Supporters of Obama, unhappy with polls showing that the Israeli public overwhelmingly views him as hostile and fearing this might reduce his solid lock on the American Jewish vote, have been advancing a new thesis. According to this argument, there is a dichotomy between the political and military policies of the Obama administration. Supposedly Obama, where it “counts,” on issues of military aid, is more receptive than the Bush administration to Israel’s needs.

This is false on both counts. There is, and can be, no meaningful division between political and military support. If Obama succeeds in squeezing Israel back to the indefensible borders of 1949, no amount of military hardware will avail her. The Obama administration clearly understands the indivisible tie between political and military policy—it is using its military aid as a carrot to induce Israel to take “risks for peace,” i.e. to implement the two state dissolution of Israel. Moreover, the military aid the U.S. provides has an additional political aim. The aid is heavily weighted toward defense, with much of it intended to constrain Israel’s ability to act, above all in relation to Iran.

All indications are that the U.S. has resigned itself to a nuclear Iran and its chief effort now is to prevent Israel from attacking Iranian nuclear installations. In this issue William Mehlman analyzes Obama’s cancellation of the Raptor in this light. The Obama administration makes much of the installation of the U.S. X-Band Radar in Israel and the November Juniper Cobra joint exercises as proof of its support for Israel, yet both can be seen as ways to prevent Israeli action against Iran. Shoshana Bryen, senior director for security policy for JINSA (the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs) notes that both are defensive in nature and would come into play in case of an Iranian attack but neither goes to the real question which is how to prevent an attack on Israel in the first place.

True the U.S. army is doubling the value of emergency military equipment it stockpiles on Israeli soil, equipment the U.S. says Israel can use in event of a “military emergency.” But as Bryen points out, the

kicker is determining what constitutes “a military emergency” and how Israel obtains permission to use what is stored.

The Obama administration, in practice, is also abandoning the long-standing U.S. commitment to maintain Israel’s qualitative edge in relation to the combined Arab states. Even if Israel were permitted to buy whatever arms it wanted, it does not have the resources to match the large-scale current U.S. sales of sophisticated weapons to Egypt and Saudi Arabia. And it cannot buy what it wants. Bryen notes the problem that arose when Israel sought to buy additional Apache Longbow attack helicopters. It had used them in Gaza during Operation Cast Lead, an operation of which the Obama administration disapproved. The administration has blocked sale of the helicopters on the grounds they would threaten Palestinian civilians in Gaza—while approving their sale to Egypt.

In *Middle East Forum*, Steven Rosen, formerly foreign policy director of AIPAC, claims that the administration is more closely aligned with Israel than generally recognized. His “evidence” is ludicrous: that Obama has become tougher in his criticism of Iran and that he has changed the “pitch” if “not the words” in his demand for a complete settlement freeze. On the contrary. Even now Obama is courting Syria, openly calling for a “comprehensive peace,” i.e. feeding the Golan to Syria presumably in exchange for Assad’s reducing his support for terrorists targeting Americans.

Obama is pursuing a coordinated political and military strategy aimed at shrinking Israel and taking away the freedom of action upon which her survival depends. His motto might be summed up: Let them have whatever is needed to fight behind the stockade and nothing that can be used beyond it.

Table of Contents

The Doormat Policy by Moshe Sharon	...3
American Energy Independence by Barbara Lerner	...4
Jews With Six Arms by Pilar Rahola	...6
Raptor: Anatomy Of A Murder by William Mehlman	...8
The Biggest Scam Of All by Ruth King	...9

From the Editor

Prime Minister Wilders?

The assassination in Dubai—presumably by an Israeli hit squad—of Hamas founder Mahmoud al-Mabhouh, who began his career by killing two Israeli soldiers and went on to become Hamas's chief weapons procurer, has been portrayed as a movie-in-real-life, especially after Dubai released film of the assassins casing out their target. (Even much of the normally hostile British media celebrated this as classic derring-do, proving once again that when Israel stops acting like a doormat, a reservoir of good will can be tapped.)

But there's another real life story even more like a movie playing in Europe right now. Most movies are structured to arrive at a turning point where the fortunes of the hero hit rock bottom and he is then resurrected as a stronger person as a result of the ordeal. In the last *Outpost* we described Geert Wilders at his low point. He was standing in the dock, facing a 70 page charge sheet for insulting Moslems, likely to be slapped with a two year prison sentence and to be stripped of political office.

Now he is more likely to become Holland's next Prime Minister. The Dutch coalition cabinet has fallen, thanks to the Labor Party's insistence that Holland pull its troops out of Afghanistan immediately. New elections must be held within 83 days, first on the municipal level, then on the national level. Polls show that the Party for Freedom, which Wilders heads (and which was not in the coalition), is likely to win more votes than any other party, possibly making Wilders Prime Minister. If that happens his trial, already postponed until June, is likely to disappear like a dream that has vanished.

Funding Israel's Enemies

In 1980 AFSI published a 37 page pamphlet on the then recently established New Israel Fund (NIF). Our subtitle said it all: "A New Fund for Israel's Enemies." It has taken 30 years, in which the NIF has distributed over \$200 million to anti-Zionist organizations (most of them Arab or Jewish-led Arab support groups in Israel), for Israel to begin to wake up to the enormous role NIF has taken in the worldwide campaign to delegitimize Israel. (American Jews slumber on, pouring money into NIF's coffers).

What finally bestirred Israelis is the role NIF took in the Goldstone Report. Caroline Glick reports that the Zionist student movement *Im Tirtzu* published a detailed report showing that 16 anti-Zionist NGOs funded by the New Israel Fund worked hand in glove with the UN Human Rights Council and Richard Goldstone to establish the Goldstone committee and give credibility to its allegations of Israeli war crimes. *Im Tirtzu* documented that 92 percent of Israeli allegations that Israel committed war crimes in its campaign

against Hamas used by Goldstone came from these 16 NIF-funded outfits.

Actually, as Glick points out, the damage NIF has inflicted on Israel goes far beyond the Goldstone Report. NIF funded groups have worked steadily and successfully to intimidate political leaders, law enforcement officials and military commanders so that they do not dare to enforce the law against Arab rioters, thieves and inciters to violence. To take just one of the many examples Glick cites, NIF funded organizations have taken a key role in organizing the weekly riots at flashpoints like Ni'ilin and Bi'ilin and in the recent expansion of these riots to other places in Judea and Samaria—riots that have had a devastating impact on the morale of the IDF and its ability to defend Israeli communities.

Predictably, many of Israel's celebrities and its chattering class have signed a counter-petition expressing their "disgust with the campaign of incitement" against the New Israel Fund. Since there is nothing substantive that can be said in defense of the organizations NIF sustains, opponents of *Im Tirtzu*'s truth-telling rely on shouts of "fascist" and other kill-the-messenger imprecations.

"Rabbi" Alinsky

It's appropriate. J Street kicked off a national mobilization campaign at the University of Pennsylvania's Hillel Center by paying tribute to "our rabbi" Saul Alinsky. Alinsky, a revolutionary Marxist, was as much a rabbi as J Street is pro-Israel. J Street is merely the newest in the line of Jewish anti-Israel organizations masquerading as pro-Israel that goes back to the 1970s Breira, subject of AFSI's first pamphlet. It's also symbolically appropriate that a Hillel center should be the launch pad given that Hillel rabbis were the backbone of Breira.

To be sure, Breira did not have the financial resources of J Street, which has George Soros as a sugar daddy, funds from pro-Arab organizations and a current war chest of \$4 million.

In *National Review Online* former Israeli diplomat Lenny Ben-David sees the thumb print of J Street on the letter sent by 54 Congressmen to President (*continued on page 11*)

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>

The Doormat Policy

Moshe Sharon

If you behave like a doormat, and you regard yourself as a doormat and let others treat you as a doormat then you must be a doormat.

It is now clear that Israel is regarded by most of the world as a doormat over which political leaders, academics and the media can tread on their way to receiving the goodwill of the Islamic world.

Unfortunately, this phenomenon has been encouraged and supported by Israel's own behavior. Last year, President Barack Hussein Obama set the tone for this policy of "tread on Israel on your way to Mecca." In his sycophantic speech to the Islamic world, he treated Israel as a doormat on which he trod heavily hoping to receive the approval of the Muslims. Every time his speech denigrated Israel, he was applauded by the eager audience in Cairo.

Following the speech, official Israel was subdued and submissive. A feeble, almost frightened, reaction was voiced rejecting the impudent comparison of the Holocaust to the "suffering" of the Palestinians. No official complaint, no message to the Jews in the United States to demand a strong condemnation from American political institutions of this immoral comparison, and no effective reaction to the humiliation of Israel and the Jewish people implied by it. Israel proved yet again that it is a wet rag.

From Obama we may move to Recep Tayyip Erdogan, the Turkish premier who has put himself at the forefront of Israel's abusers. With and without his encouragement, hatred of the Jewish state, easily deteriorating to open anti-Semitism, has been appropriated by the Turkish media. The Turkish premier also walks over Israel with his heavy boots, cleaning his shoes on it and hoping in this way to receive a ticket into the club of the Islamic world, as well as the support of his Muslim subjects at home. At the same time, he offers himself as a mediator between Israel and Syria. The mere fact that Israel has accepted this offer of "mediation" from a person who clearly espouses the Arab cause and is an interested party in promoting Syrian interests, is in itself an indication to the depth which Israel reached in the process of self-degradation. Instead of rejecting outright the Turkish offer and exposing the ugly face of this Turkish policy, Israel just lies down to be yet again completely humiliated.

What happened? Why do the Turks want so much to mediate between Israel and Syria? Any professional observer of the Middle East can see through the Turkish move: It is not the interests of Israel which they are after, but their own and those of the Syrians.

These interests can be summed up in one word: water. This sudden love for peace is nothing less than an exercise to rob the Jewish state of its vital source of water. For Syria, the river Euphrates that flows into it from Turkey is its major source of water. The Turks use most of the water of the Euphrates to produce electricity, thus reducing the flow of the river and the water supplied to Syria to between 400 to 500 cubic meters a second. Syria, as a result, suffers from a severe water shortage. There is rationing of water in the capital Damascus and Syrian agriculture is almost devastated.



Bashar Assad cannot and dares not pressure the Turks for more water, but Erdogan has found an excellent solution for him. Used to the fact that Israel behaves like a doormat, the Turkish premier offers to supply the Syrians with Israeli water: the Sea of Galilee! What a wonderfully simple idea! Aren't the Israelis so eager for peace? Haven't they proved that they are ready to sacrifice their most valuable possessions for a piece of paper? Follow Sadat's precedent; convince the Israelis to give up the Golan, and all the territory to the north-east of the Sea of Galilee and comply with the Syrian demand to withdraw to the pre-1967 line. The Syrians can then settle the Golan with some quarter to half a million Syrian peasants and supply them with the water of the Sea of Galilee.

This is the only reason for the joint "peace attack" of the Syrian president and the eagerness of the Turk to "mediate." Once Bashar gets free access to the Sea of Galilee, let there be no mistake, he will pump its water and no agreement will stop him from doing so and no Israeli government would dare to "jeopardize the peace for a few litres of water." Turkey will be praised for the achievement; Israel will be left without its major source of water but with the sewage of the Syrians flowing from the Golan. Oh yes, with a bit of luck some Israelis may be able to taste the humus of Damascus!

These are well-known facts, but the Israeli doormat is still ready to be stepped on by the Turk and the Arab together.

And now we come to Egypt where the doormat policy of Israel shows itself in its most humiliating form. Whenever the president of Egypt wishes to issue an order to Israel he only has to lift a finger and the Israeli premier rushes to Cairo or Sharm el-Sheikh. Israeli ministers are only waiting to be honored with the whistle from the Egyptian pharaoh in order to lie down at his doorstep. Not once have any of Israeli leaders rebelled against the Egyptian *diktat*, not once has any of them said "if you want to see us, come to

Israel.” Not once has Egypt been challenged about not upholding a great part of the Israeli-Egyptian “peace treaty.” How embarrassing, how utterly degrading it is to see Israeli diplomats, media people, academics, ministers, artists and writers grovel in front of the Egyptian ambassador in Israel hoping to be invited to his functions whereas the Israeli ambassador in Cairo is treated like a leper. The Egyptian press frequently conducts a concerted anti-Semitic campaign, supported by most of the Egyptian intellectuals. Lies are spread about Israel and the Jews in all the media and everything passes without reaction, because Israel has long forgotten the meaning of national honor. The Middle East reads this behaviour very fast and reacts accordingly.

The same can be observed on the Palestinian side. The Hamas in Gaza kidnapped an Israeli soldier some three years ago. In a normal situation Israel should have made it impossible for any leader of the Hamas to sleep in his bed. It should have followed a policy of kidnapping each one of the Hamas leaders and putting him on

trial. Instead of doing what any country with self-respect would do, fighting to save not only Gilad Shalit but also its honour as an independent state, Israel negotiates with the kidnapers who, knowing that they face a doormat and not a proud state, keep raising their price. It started with 400 and has by now reached 1100 convicted murderers responsible for spilling the blood of hundreds of Jews.

How different is the behavior of the Egyptians who recently lost one soldier, killed by the Hamas. They are threatening to turn the life of Hanieh and his associates into hell. They issued an arrest warrant against him; they demand the handing over of the killers of the soldier—and they will achieve their goal, because Egypt is not a doormat.

Understanding Israel well, the Palestinians sign agreements which they never mean to fulfill, because they have already learned that with Israel it is very simple to follow the policy (defined by Arafat): Grab and Demand. Take! Never give and always demand more.

After Israel left Gaza completely in 2005 it is impossible to understand why Israel continued supplying its Gazan enemy with food, water, money, electricity, medical equipment and medicine whereas the Egyptians, Arabs like the Palestinians, closed their border and shun them. It is impossible to understand why Gilad Shalit has not once been visited by a representative of the Red Cross whereas the Hamas murderers in Israeli prisons live in hotel conditions, with regular visits by the Red Cross and their families, televisions in their room and food of their choice as well as pocket money. Which country would accept a situation

where in reward for its humane behavior, missiles rain down on its civilians? Only a country which has long accustomed itself to being a doormat. The so-called Palestinian Authority behaves accordingly, reacting to any offer of reconciliation with total rejection. The doormat Israel will always give more.

If Israel were to behave with self-respect, if it were to come to its neighbors with demands, not concessions, if it were to

expose their lies on a daily basis, if Israel were to follow a policy of rejecting their demands without even considering them, if it were to stop saying that “everything is negotiable” when everything is not negotiable, if it were to reject outright any demand to free convicted murderers and terrorists, if it were to stop keeping these murderers in holiday resort conditions, if it were to make clear to the Arabs and the whole world that Israel is here to look first and foremost after its own interests; if it were to make it clear that its enemies will not be rewarded for their aggression in 1967 and 1973—that the Golan Heights are not for sale and the Sea of Galilee is an Israeli lake—if it makes it clear that it will never agree to conditions which will jeopardize its existence; if it were to do all this and much more in the line of self-interest and national honor, well then it would cease to be a doormat and gain the respect of others.

Professor Moshe Sharon is Professor Emeritus of Islamic History at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem



Gilad Shalit

American Energy Independence—War-Fighting Necessity Or “Foreign Oil Alarmism”?

Barbara Lerner

Is energy a key element in the war we are fighting against the onslaught of Islamist terror and subversion? Does America need energy independence to really win this war? The American people seem to think so. The last time Rasmussen asked them if the development of new, homegrown energy sources was “an urgent national priority,” 81% said yes. Only 9% disagreed.

In National Review Online I have argued that the great American majority is right, on this fundamental policy question as on a heartening number of others. I said we need a commander-in-chief who will “insist on an all-out effort to increase our own supplies of energy as rapidly as possible,” focusing especially on the game-changing potential of the natural gas that is buried in the shale rock layers that lie beneath vast stretches of America, from Texas to New York.

After the failed Christmas Day Islamist terror bombing over Detroit, President Obama took a few belated baby steps in our direction. He reaffirmed, at long last, the fact that we are at war, and progressed from pretending that our enemies are “isolated extrem-

ists” to naming one of our Islamist enemies—Al Qaeda—though he pretended it is our only Islamist enemy. More progress: he re-endorsed energy independence as a goal, and unveiled a new program to fund solar and wind energy projects, but failed to even mention nuclear power, let alone natural gas. For Americans who see energy independence as a national security imperative—this is late, and much too little.

Kevin Williamson, a deputy managing editor at National Review Online, doesn’t see it that way. He sees us as dumb. Calling our concern “‘foreign oil’ alarmism,” he branded it “one of the dumbest themes in American politics, a yardstick of stupidity.” He offers three reasons for this cocksure assertion, which quickly collapse into two. First, he flatly asserts that American energy independence is impossible, unless we revert to the living standards of the 19th century. Second, he states that “the largest share of our ‘foreign oil’ comes from those perfidious Canadians, not those perfidious Arabs;” therefore, he argues, “Our dependence on imported oil is no more dangerous than our dependence on imported steel...or T-shirts”. A paragraph later, he acknowledges that if we stop buying so much foreign oil, the Saudis would be in “a world of hurt” because “no other player in the market is positioned to replace American demand.” Hardly a surprise, since we consume some 25% of the world’s oil, and currently produce only about a third of what we need here at home. But, third, Williamson tells us, It’s dumb to worry, even if our great and growing demand does, after all, serve to enrich Islamist states like Saudi Arabia—not to mention Iran. No harm done, he says, because “oil touches terrorism only tangentially: Box-cutters and underpants misfits are not expensive.”

Let’s treat Williamson’s reason two like the self-refuting irrelevance it is, and focus on his two main arguments, starting with his claim that there is no realistic possibility of our achieving anything close to energy independence in the near future. We can begin by acknowledging that he is right if, like our President, you pin all your hopes on solar and wind energy. Someday, American ingenuity probably will achieve the technological breakthroughs that can make these sources yield substantial amounts of energy, but counting on breakthroughs that haven’t happened yet is a dream, not a workable plan to deal with the terribly real problems facing us right now.

Natural gas, the energy source both Obama and Williamson ignore, is a different story, because two of the breakthroughs we need to fully exploit this energy source have already occurred. We’ve known for a long time that large amounts of natural gas are buried under vast swathes of American land, but, until very recently, not much of it was accessible to us in an

economically feasible way, because drilling for natural gas is a lot trickier than drilling for oil. Oil collects in deep pools below the surface of the earth, so if you drill straight down in the right place, you hit the jackpot. Natural gas is not like that. Much of it lies encased in a multitude of small fractures inside horizontal layers of shale rock that stretch out across millions of acres. As a result, simple vertical drilling in any one place produces only relatively small amounts of gas. In just the last few years, American ingenuity changed those results dramatically by achieving the two breakthroughs mentioned above. We learned to drill vertically to the necessary depth

and then turn the drill, deep in the earth, and drill horizontally to reach much larger amounts of natural gas, and we developed a technique called hydrofracking which uses water pressure to make new fractures and enlarge existing ones, creating larger spaces for the gas

to move into, making it possible to retrieve much more of it.

We already use natural gas to heat more than half of U.S. homes and to generate about 20% of our electricity, and we could use more. But, with a little help from government, we could also create the infrastructure necessary to replace gasoline and diesel fuel in the millions of trucks and buses that travel our roads every day. That would make a real dent in the amount of oil we need to import, helping to create a surplus in the world market that would greatly reduce the amount of money our Islamist enemies have to spend on their war against us.

Williamson’s claim that this would have no impact on the war is, to say the least, uninformed. Box-cutters and underpants are cheap, but to focus only on weapons is to miss the point. The real money is spent to teach Muslims throughout the Middle East to hate ‘infidels,’ and to blame us for all the obvious failures of their own governments and societies, and for every other evil in the world. Billions are spent, every year, inculcating this message of blame-shifting hate by making sure it is taught in virtually every school throughout the Middle East—from nursery school onwards. Billions more are spent reinforcing the message in Middle Eastern mosques, and in Middle Eastern newspapers and radio and television stations, and this is just the start. Billions more are spent to go far beyond Islamist hatred’s home in the Middle East, and reach into every corner of the globe to aggressively propagate the evil Islamist creed that calls for our destruction. In Africa, Asia and South America, as well as in Europe, Canada and here in America, vast sums are being spent to teach, preach and enforce compliance with this view. These vast expenditures guarantee an ever-growing supply of volunteers

Billions more are spent to go far beyond Islamist hatred’s home in the Middle East, and reach into every corner of the globe.

for *jihād* against us.

Given that abundant supply, only relatively modest additional sums are needed to fund, train, arm and transport the relatively small numbers of active Islamist terrorists, Islamist infiltrators and Islamist propagandists who use *taqqiya*—deception—as well as terror to make our defeat a reality on our home grounds. Still, most Arab states are so poor that even these relatively modest sums would be largely beyond several of them, if they did not get massive aid—for this purpose only—from the deep pockets of the few Arab states lucky enough to be sitting on huge pools of oil. Here, as all serious students of Islamist terrorist funding know, Saudi Arabia and the Gulf States lead the pack, followed by Iran.

Williamson's apparent failure to grasp any of this doesn't prove he's stupid, but it does raise questions about the depth of his knowledge in this area. Those of us who do 'get it' need to press our government to act, now, not only to make maximal use of the

new natural gas bonanza American ingenuity has opened up to us, but to drill for oil in all the American locations currently ruled off-limits, and to build at least as many nuclear power plants as the French have. If we take all these perfectly feasible steps now, energy independence is no pipe dream. It's a reality we have the power to create, not in our dreams, but in the next decade or two, and it will bring our ultimate victory in what I call the war for freedom much closer. Along the way, it offers two additional bonuses: it will create many thousands of much-needed new jobs—not make-work government jobs, but genuinely productive ones—and it will give us a cleaner environment because natural gas creates much less pollution than oil. And that is anything but dumb.

Barbara Lerner has been a free lance writer for the past 20 years. Most of her recent articles have run in National Review Online.

Jews with Six Arms

Pilar Rahola

Editors note: This is from a speech Dr. Rahola gave at a conference of the Global Forum for Combating Anti-Semitism held in Jerusalem on Dec. 16-17, 2009. Rahola is a Spanish Catalan journalist, writer and former politician and member of Parliament. In recent years she has attracted controversy for her outspoken support for Israel and Zionism—this in Spain, a country which a 2009 Pew Research poll found to be the most anti-Semitic country in the EU.

I spoke at a meeting in Barcelona of a hundred lawyers and judges a month ago.

They came together to hear my opinions on the Middle-Eastern conflict. They know that I am a heterodox vessel in the shipwreck of "uniform thinking" regarding Israel, which rules in my country. They want to listen to me, because they ask themselves why, if Pilar is a serious journalist, does she risk losing her credibility by defending the bad guys, the guilty? I answer provocatively: you all believe that you are experts in international politics when you talk about Israel, but you really know nothing.

They are jurists, their turf is not geopolitics. But against Israel they dare, as does everybody else. Why? Because Israel is permanently under the media magnifying glass and the distorted image pollutes the world's brains. And because it is part of what is politically correct, it seems part of solidarity, because talking against Israel is free. And so, cultured people when they read about Israel, are ready to believe that Jews have six arms, in the same way that during the Middle Ages people believed all sorts of outrageous things.

The first question, then, is why so many intelli-

gent people, when talking about Israel, suddenly become idiots. The problem that those of us who do not demonize Israel have, is that there exists no debate on the conflict. Intellectuals and international journalists have given up on Israel. It doesn't exist. That is why, when someone goes beyond the "uniform thought" of criticizing Israel, he becomes suspect and is immediately segregated. Why?

I've been trying to answer this question for years: Why?

Why, of all the conflicts in the world only this one interests them?

Why is a tiny country which struggles to survive criminalized?

Why does manipulated information triumph so easily?

Why are all the people of Israel reduced to a simple mass of murderous imperialists?

Why is there no Palestinian guilt?

Why is Arafat a hero and Sharon a monster?

Finally, why, when Israel is the only country in the world which is threatened with extinction, is it also the only one that nobody considers a victim?

I don't believe that there is a single answer to these questions. Just as it is impossible to completely explain the historical evil of anti-Semitism, it is also not possible to totally explain the present-day imbecility of anti-Israelism. Both drink from the fountain of intolerance and lies. Also, if we accept that anti-Israelism is the new form of anti-Semitism, we conclude that circumstances may have changed, but the deepest myths, both of the Medieval Christian anti-Semitism and of the modern political anti-Semitism, are still intact. Those myths are part of the chronicle of Israel.

For example, the Medieval Jew accused of killing Christian children to drink their blood connects directly with the Israeli Jew who kills Palestinian children to steal their land. Always they are innocent chil-

dren and dark Jews. Similarly, the Jewish bankers who wanted to dominate the world through the European banks, according to the myth of the Protocols, connect directly with the idea that the Wall Street Jews want to dominate the world through the White House. Control of the press, control of finances, the Universal Conspiracy, all that which has created the historical hatred against the Jews, is found today in hatred of the Israelis. In the subconscious, then, beats the DNA of the Western anti-Semite. But what beats in the conscious? Why does a renewed intolerance surge with such virulence, centered now, not against the Jewish people, but against the Jewish state? From my point of view, this has historical and geopolitical roots—among others, the decades long bloody Soviet role, European Anti-Americanism, the West's energy dependency and the growing Islamist phenomenon.

But it also emerges from a set of defeats which we suffer as free societies.

The moral defeat of the left.

For decades, the left raised the flag of freedom wherever there was injustice. It was the depository of the utopian hopes of society. Despite the murderous evil of Stalinism's sinking these utopias, the left still pretends to point out good and evil in the world. Even those who would never vote for leftist options, grant great prestige to leftist intellectuals, and allow them to be the ones who monopolize the concept of solidarity. Thus, those who struggled against Pinochet were freedom-fighters, but Castro's victims, are expelled from the heroes' paradise, and converted into undercover fascists.

Today, as yesterday, the left is hawking totalitarian ideologies, falls in love with dictators and, in its offensive against Israel, ignores the destruction of fundamental rights. It hates rabbis, but falls in love with imams; shouts against the Israeli Defense Forces but applauds Hamas's terrorists; weeps for the Palestinian victims, but scorns the Jewish victims.

A year ago, at the AIPAC conference in Washington I asked the following questions:

Why don't we see demonstrations in Europe against the Islamic dictatorships?

Why are there no demonstrations against the enslavement of millions of Muslim women?

Why are there no declarations against the use of bomb-carrying children in the conflicts in which Islam is involved?

Why is the left only obsessed with fighting against two of the most solid democracies of the planet, those which have suffered the bloodiest terrorist attacks, the United States and Israel?

Because the left no longer has any ideas, only slogans. It no longer defends rights, but prejudices. And the greatest prejudice of all is the one aimed against Israel. The main responsibility for the new anti-

Semitic hatred disguised as anti-Zionism lies with those who should have been there to defend freedom, solidarity and progress. Far from it, they defend despots, forget their victims, and remain silent before medieval ideologies which aim at the destruction of free societies. The treason of the left is an authentic treason against modernity.

Defeat of Journalism. We have more information in the world than ever before, but we do not have a better informed world. Today's journalists do not need maps, since they have Google Earth; they do not need to know history, since they have Wikipedia. The historical journalists, who knew the roots of a conflict, still exist, but they are an endangered species, devoured by that "fast food" journalism which offers hamburger news to readers who want fast-food information. Israel is the world's most watched place, but despite that, it is the world's least understood place. Of course one must keep in mind the pressure of the great petrodollar lobbies, whose influence upon journalism is subtle but deep. Mass media knows that if it speaks against Israel, it

will have no problems. But what would happen if it criticized an Islamic country? Without doubt, it would complicate its existence. Certainly part of the press that writes against Israel would see themselves mirrored in Mark Twain's ironical sentence: "Get your facts first, then you can distort them as you please".

Defeat of critical thinking. To all this one must add the ethical relativism which defines the present times.

I explain it with this little tale: If I were lost on an uncharted island, and wanted to found a democratic society, I would need only three written documents: The Ten Commandments ("Thou shalt not murder" founded modern civilization); the Roman Penal Code; and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. And with these three texts we would start again. These principles are relativized daily, even by those who claim to be defending them.

"Thou shalt not murder"—depending on who is the target, think those who, like the demonstrators in Europe, shout in support of Hamas.

"Hurray for Freedom of Speech!"—or not. For example, several Spanish left-wing organizations tried to take me to court, accusing me of being a negotiator, like the Nazis, because I deny the "Palestinian Holocaust". They were attempting to prohibit me from writing articles and to send me to prison. And so on.

Defeat of the United Nations. The organizations which should protect human rights have become broken puppets in the hands of despots. The United Nations is only useful to Islamofascists like Ahmadinejad or dangerous demagogues like Hugo Chavez, offering them a planetary loudspeaker where they can spit their hatred. And, of course, a platform to system-



Pilar Rahola

atically attack Israel. The UN, too, exists to fight Israel.

Finally, defeat of Islam. Tolerant and cultural Islam suffers today the violent attack of a totalitarian virus which tries to stop its ethical development. This virus uses the name of God to perpetrate the most terrible horrors: lapidate women, enslave them, use youths as human bombs. If Stalinism destroyed the left, and Nazism destroyed Europe, Islamic fundamentalism is destroying Islam. And it also has an anti-Semitic DNA. Perhaps Islamic anti-Semitism is the most serious intolerant phenomenon of our times; indeed, it contaminates more than 1,400 million people, who are educated, massively, in hatred towards the Jew.

In the crossroads of these defeats is Israel. Orphan and forgotten by a reasonable left, orphan and abandoned by serious journalism, orphan and rejected by a decent UN, Israel suffers the paradigm of the 21st Century: the lack of a solid commitment to the values of liberty. Jewish culture represents, as no other does, the metaphor of a concept of civilization which suffers today attacks on all flanks. The Jews are the thermometer of the world's health. Whenever the world

has had totalitarian fever, they have suffered. In the Spanish Middle Ages, in Christian persecutions, in Russian pogroms, in European Fascism, in Islamic fundamentalism. And, in these times of energy dependency and social uncertainty, Israel embodies, in its own flesh, the eternal Jew.

A pariah nation among nations, for a pariah people among peoples. That is why the anti-Semitism of the 21st Century has dressed itself with the efficient disguise of anti-Israelism, or its synonym, anti-Zionism. Is all criticism of Israel anti-Semitism? No. But all present-day anti-Semitism has turned into the demonization of the Jewish State. New clothes for an old hatred.

Benjamin Franklin said: "Where liberty is, there is my country." And Albert Einstein added: "The world is a dangerous place. Not because of the people who are evil; but because of the people who don't do anything about it." This is the double commitment, here and now; never remain inactive in front of evil in action and defend the countries of liberty. •

Raptor: The Anatomy of a Murder

William Mehlman

Months after the deed was done, veteran members of Congress remain at a loss to recall anything comparable to the ferocity with which the Obama White House, led by Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates, attacked and ultimately killed all further funding of the Lockheed-Martin F-22 "stealth" fighter-bomber. The supersonic, radar-evading "Raptor," described by former U.S. Air Force Chief of Staff General Merrill McPeak as "unmatched by any known or projected aircraft," has been capped at the 187 copies currently in the fleet. There will be no additions..

John Noonan, writing in the *Weekly Standard* blog, portrayed the campaign as "Napoleonic." In fact, nothing short of that would have had a chance of overcoming the combined opposition of the Congress and the military. For the Congress, scrapping the Raptor raised the prospect of short-cutting, if not terminating, the employment of 25,000 highly skilled, highly paid workers in California, Texas, Georgia and Mississippi alone. Not a pretty one in an economy with a near 10 percent unemployment and 17 percent underemployment rate.

"It was a dogfight," reported *Washington Post* staffers Ann Gerhart and Perry Bacon with "threats and promises, blunt talk and grand gestures" flying through the air like missiles, concluding with an uncommon dispensation with partisanship by enough Democrats and Republicans on the Senate Armed Services Committee to win a 13-11 vote to shift \$1.7 billion from other defense projects to keep the F-22 afloat.

Enter Rahm Emanuel. With Gates damning the Raptor as an overpriced "cold war relic," threatening Lockheed-Martin with reduced funding for its other major project, the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter," unless it reined in its F-22 lobbyists and President Obama vowing to veto any defense bill that included Raptor money, the White House Chief of Staff began working the phones. His most rewarding call was to an old Chicago pal with close ties to attorney Bill Daley, the well-connected brother of Mayor Richard Daley, asking him to convene a meeting of Chicago's prestigious Economic Club to hear Gates deliver a speech about how the F-22 had become a bad idea. Eight hundred business and political elites responded to Daley's summons. The huge national media play the speech received proved the tipping point on Capitol Hill. The Raptor was toast.

The F-22 may be dead, but its ghost continues to inspire hysteria in the White House and Defense Department. Its dimensions were rather comically illustrated in November, when White House aides demanded the removal of an F-22 prominently parked at the Elmendorf Air Force Base in Alaska, where Obama was schedule to deliver a speech. They declared, according to a source at the scene, that they would not allow the President to be photographed with the Raptor in "any way, shape or form." Ironically, the 90th and 525th Fighter Squadrons Obama came to praise proudly fly the warplane he would not been seen with. All of which leads Noonan, among others, to "find it hard to believe that the Administration's only motivation [for terminating the F-22] was to eliminate waste in the defense budget.

Expensive? At around \$180 million per copy, the Raptor surely is. But no less expensive than the F-

35 the Pentagon has been touting as an alternative to the Raptor. Aside from the fact that F-35's "stealthiness" is considered "perishable," its maneuverability limited and its air-to-air combat performance in no way comparable to the Raptor's 15 to 1 "kill ratio" in war games against the F-15s and F-16s in most Western and several Arab inventories. The most critical difference is that even the best improved F-35 Lockheed-Martin might manage to produce will not be delivered to Israel or any other potential buyer before 2015, while the Raptor is part of the here and now. And if the F-22 is anything, it is the one weapon in the Free World's arsenal capable of breaking the back of the Iranian nuclear threat – the only "game-changer" on the field.

Israel has been trying to acquire the F-22 for the last five years. The Pentagon, hunkering down behind a 12 year-old export ban on stealth aircraft to evade its commitment to maintain the Jewish State's "Qualitative Military Edge" over its Arab and Muslim adversaries, has consistently refused to allow the sale. While Congressional overtures to remove the ban have routinely been rebuffed, Iran's march toward nuclear weaponry manufacture and delivery has moved inexorably forward. Its uranium enrichment facilities have reportedly reached weapons-grade level.

An even more imposing obstacle to their elimination or degradation now looms in the form of the Russian engineered, state-of-the art "S-300" anti-aircraft, anti-missile defense platform. Bought and paid for by Iran but supposedly not yet installed around Teheran's bomb factories, the highly mobile S-300, also known as the "SA-20" (it can be operated from the back of a truck), has the ability to track up to 100 targets simultaneously, engaging up to a dozen of them at the same time. With a range of 150 miles, it can put paid to any conventional warplane flying from near ground level to 80,000 feet unfortunate enough to stray within its path. "For a non-stealth aircraft," avers General (Ret.) Richard Hawley, former Chief of the U.S. Air Force Combat Command, "the SA-20 represents a 'no-fly zone'."

Was preventing the F-22 from falling into Israel's hands one of the motivating factors behind the "Napoleonic campaign" to kill off further production of the S-300's only neutralizer? There's no evidential proof of that, but given the "book" on Robert M. Gates it isn't a question that can be airily dismissed. Begin-



ning with the 2004 study, *Iran: Time for a New Approach*, that he co-authored as then-chairman of the Task Force of the Council on Foreign Relations, that "book" is replete with warnings to Israel about military action against Iran. "Since Washington would be blamed for any military strike," a key sentence of the study reads, "the U.S. should make it clear to Israel that U.S. interests would be adversely affected by such a move." The study's co-author was Gates' long-time friend and associate at the Council on Foreign Relations Zbigniew Brzezinski, most recently famous for suggesting that American warplanes be dispatched to shoot down any Israeli combat aircraft seen venturing into Iraqi airspace en route to a bombing run in Iran.

While coupling Gates with Brzezinski's strident animosity toward Israel is unthinkable, the Defense Secretary's words and actions leave room for concern. He fired his Air Force Secretary and Chief of Staff in 2008 in part for their continued advocacy of the F-22 and in an effort to preempt Congressional opposition to his anti-Raptor campaign, he used a

July visit to Israel to pressure the IAF to tell the House and Senate Armed Services Committees that it no longer had any interest in acquiring the Raptor.

Indeed, the Defense Secretary waxed Talmudic at one critical juncture in his crusade to kill the F-22. "If we can't bring ourselves to make this tough but straightforward decision," he told an audience, "where to we draw the line...? If not now," he concluded, quoting directly from Hillel, "when?"

The Defense Secretary would do well to heed another bit of Hillelian advice: "If I have abandoned support of my own interests, to whom shall I look for support?" Secretary Gates has never denied that a nuclear weaponized Iran represents a threat not only to Israel but the West. With Ahmadinejad having repeatedly made it clear that "sanctions", even "real" sanctions, are not going to derail his nuclear ambitions, Mr. Gates and his boss in the White House have only two options for dealing with this existential threat: Either take out Iran's bomb factories with the F-22 "game-changers" under their command or put a portion of that fleet on loan to the IAF so that it can do the job, while the opportunity to do it is still available.

The rest, as Hillel would have sagely agreed, is a morally inexcusable waste of time.

William Mehlman represents AFSI in Israel.

The Biggest Scam Of All

Ruth King

A scam is defined as a fraudulent scheme, confidence game or swindle, for gain. The political

scammer sets up a crisis, creates a "victim", presents falsified data, gives the hoax a "moral" imperative, and slanders opponents, to promote a political agenda. The shill, a public figure, uses the authority and prestige of office to promote the scam and the media runs with it.

Take the recent health reform plan. The data on the number of Americans without insurance and lacking access to medical care (the victims) was "massaged" to create a "crisis." The shills negotiated a behemoth bill hiding provisions for limited access to care and nullification of choice. The trillion dollar package was defended with what George Bush Sr. once (incorrectly describing Ronald Reagan's very cogent tax policies) called "voodoo economics," claiming cost savings while adding millions of recipients. The agenda was socialized medicine. Skeptics were dismissed as right wing extremists and 'Astroturf.'

Then there is the "man-made global warming" scam. Senator Gore, a fraud of Nobel proportions, declared a crisis, the "victim" this time a starving humanity in a fevered, barren planet. Gore, along with the world's uber-scam, the UN, government-granted scientists in tow, appealed to the public conscience with "con" science. Congressional shills demanded legislation to roll back the climate by implementing a major tax increase called cap and trade. Media shills relentlessly promoted "apocalypse now." Those who dug into the data (like mining engineer Steve McIntyre and economics professor Ross McKittrick) were dubbed "deniers," as in holocaust deniers.

This is not the first time we've been warned the sky-is-falling. The late Carl Sagan warned of a "nuclear-winter" brought about by nuclear war. We may see Nuclear Winter Redux if the present administration agrees to update our existing arsenal. With all these climate scares what is a poor girl to wear? Bundle for winter or strip for the big melt?

And that brings us to the biggest scam of all. Here's the road map for the scam.

First: Call it "the Middle East conflict." Never mention that the entire Moslem/Arab world wants Israel obliterated. Ignore the fact that the "moderate" Arabs want Israel destroyed in stages while the radical "fighters" want Israel destroyed yesterday.

Second: Erase history. Pretend it all started with a land grab by the Jews in 1967.

Third: Call Israel's presence in its own country an "occupation." Sprinkle in the words oppressive, brutal, iron-fisted, apartheid--you get the picture. Always remember to get props, civilian props who wail for the cameras and then go home to a healthy supper after a job well done. Bring on the "greens" by castigating Israel for using--or not using--water aquifers. Get Christiane Amanpour and the BBC to do specials about the victims. And, whenever you can, slip in a blood libel or two. Don't forget to triple the number of Arab "refugees" every year.

Fourth: What do you call people under such an oppressive occupation? That's right. They are the "victims." Don't you dare mention who started the wars, who teaches their children to hate and kill, who considers maiming innocent civilians in pizza parlors and markets to be target practice, who cheered about 9/11, and who knows that Hamas, Fatah, Hezbollah

are just different names proposing minimally different strokes for ending Israel.

Fifth: Encourage oil rich kingdoms to fund American universities so that there will be no danger of anyone learning the true nature of the conflict. Professorial shills will gladly spread the scam and former United States legislators and Cabinet members can be paid to do the same. One dirty hand washes the other.

Sixth: Create a crisis. Present the conflict as a threat to the entire world. The failure to solve the Middle-East conflict is responsible for terrorism, 9/11, the swine flu and arthritis.

Seventh: Propose a solution. A two state solution. Insist that even the mad mullahs will become boy scouts once there's a solution. No need to be original here. Just go back to the dozens of failed initiatives which are clones of the Rogers Plan of 1969, all based on the same dumb principle that Israeli land concessions will bring peace. All those "road maps" have brought more war, more terror and more demands but you can ignore this and lumber on because you can always turn to:

Eighth: The dupes who become shills to help you promote the scam. You can count on the pacifist anti-Israel organizations (including Jewish organizations posing as supporters of Israel). You can count on the phony human rights organizations and the self righteous clergy who preen about their moral duty to support the "victims." You can count on the ignorant media, on Israel's treasonous academics and writers and filmmakers, and even on her weak Prime Ministers.

Why do the other scams eventually fail while this one is indestructible? The health scam had the redoubtable Betsy McCaughey, the tea parties and town hall meetings. The climate scam had the Heartland Institute, Senator Inhofe, Marc Morano of Climate Depot, Lord Monkton, Marc Sheppard of American Thinker and above all the hackers into the emails of the East Anglia Climatic Research Unit, the ones who really deserve the Nobel Prize.

What you have in the case of Israel (to borrow from Gabriel Garcia Marquez) is virtual total complicity based on facts in which no one believes. Look at the map. There can be no "contiguous" Arab Palestinian state in Gaza and Judea and Samaria without cutting into Israel's belly. There can be no viable state in 2200 square miles. There can be no peace when such a state is peopled by Jihadists who will control the heights of Judea and Samaria. The plan is obviously for a two state dissolution of Israel.

Yet the few (like those of us at AFSI) who speak out are still dismissed and the scam retains the status of a universal consensus.

Nonetheless we cannot give up on our efforts to expose the scam for what it is. To bond with Christian and grassroots supporters to thwart the dissolution of Israel. To do less is unthinkable. •

(Continued from page 2)

Obama asking him to press Israel to provide “immediate relief for the citizens of Gaza.” Ben-David notes that while J Street is not openly taking credit, critic of Israel Michael Rosenberg wrote: “The [54 members of Congress] deserve our thanks as does J Street and Americans for Peace Now which pushed the letter.”

Whatever its role in what amounts to a pro-Hamas petition to the President, J Street is guaranteed to provide much grief to Israel and its supporters in the years ahead.

Easing the Fund Flow to Hamas

The U.S. treasury has taken all but one member of Hamas (terror mastermind Abu Marzouk who lives in Damascus) off the international list of terrorists, thus easing the flow of funds from the European Union to Hamas. Even prior to this large sums of money from the EU, supposedly for humanitarian aid to Gaza residents, was funneled to Hamas. The flow was in danger of being stopped by an international lawsuit, but journalist Avi Tarango says the U.S. Treasury has now made this impossible—Tarango went over the 443 page updated terrorist list and says every Hamas man but Marzouk is off it. The terrorist list goes to the world banking system where the transfer of funds to anyone on the list is prohibited. EU laws define Hamas as a terror organization and therefore EU representatives need to verify that none of the people receiving salaries and support is a terrorist. With no Hamas officials in Gaza on the updated list, the European check will find nothing and funds for Gaza salaries can be transferred readily to Gaza banks.

Steyn on Foxman

In the last *Outpost* we commented on the latest lamentable performance of the ADL’s Abe Foxman in defaming good friends of Jews and Israel—in this case falsely attacking Rush Limbaugh for anti-Semitism. No one can eviscerate fools as well as Mark Steyn so we can’t resist quoting from him here.

“We are witnessing across the planet the biggest resurgence in anti-Semitism since the second World War, and this boob, this pathetic, contemptible, cowardly man thinks it’s his job as spokesperson for a major Jewish organization to attack Rush. This is beyond pathetic. It is actually self-destructive. It is going to the soft target because he doesn’t have the guts to actually confront the real sources of anti-Semitism in the world today, which is an alliance between psychotic Islamists and the college left, the polytechnic left, the educated left in the United States and in the broader Western world.

“These are physically dangerous times for Jews in almost every other part of the Western world. And this disgusting, craven little twerp thinks that the font of anti-Semitism is Rush Limbaugh. This guy’s a buffoon. The ADL should be ashamed of themselves, should be embarrassed at having this guy speaking for

them and should say to him, ‘Look whatever you did in the past, it’s gone now, and we’d just as soon appreciate it if you took early retirement.’”

President Peres on Fayyad

Competing for the stupidity award with Foxman, in this case for glorifying enemies rather than denigrating friends, is the inimitable Shimon. Peres chose the annual Herzliya Conference, bringing together Israel’s political and economic elite, to praise the Palestinian Authority’s “Prime Minister” Salam Fayyad as a man of peace, even comparing him to David Ben-Gurion, Israel’s first and longest serving Prime Minister and Peres’s mentor (Peres and Moshe Dayan were referred to as “Ben Gurion’s boys”).

In response to Peres’s servile flattery and offer of ever more concessions, Fayyad immediately launched into a series of non-negotiable demands, including a total settlement freeze (Jerusalem included), an end to Israel’s anti-terror activities even in circumstances defined as permissible in the Oslo Accords, an end to the blockade of Hamas in Gaza etc.

The previous month Fayyad had participated in a ceremony burning Israeli goods in the town square of Salfit and immediately after his Herzliya speech, he announced stepped up benefits to the families of “shahids,” those who blow themselves up murdering Israelis. All this offers a perfect illustration of Moshe Sharon’s thesis in this *Outpost*: if you act like a doormat you will be treated like a doormat.

Balfour

The name Balfour, honorably associated with the Balfour Declaration, now becomes part of the drip by drip delegitimization of Israel. Balfour is a major supplier of high school and college jewelry. AFSI member Raphael Isaac reports that he was leafing through the Balfour catalog his high school son brought home and was taken aback by the section on class rings. Purchasers are offered the opportunity to individualize rings, and can select what they would like to appear on two panels (within the large range of choices offered by Balfour). The catalog offers the Palestinian flag—but no Israeli flag.

Isaac sent us his protest note to Balfour: “I notice you offer the Palestinian flag and not the Israeli one. How come? Also where is Balfour’s tribute panel to the 9/11 hijackers, Hezbollah or Al-Qaeda? Surely you have an available side panel relief of Osama or Arafat. Or maybe my son can have an explosive vest as an activity panel on one side and a decapitated head on the other. All in the name of peace and religious tolerance, of course.”

Israel: the P.C. Punching Bag

In Canada you can be hauled up before the multi-culti high commissioners (ask Ezra Levant and Mark Steyn) for the most minor trespass of minority sensibilities (ludicrously defined as “hate speech”) but

one minority—the Jews—is fair game.

Physical assaults on Jewish students, vicious calumny, shouting down of speakers by Arab students and supportive pro-Palestinian radicals has become a familiar pattern at Canadian universities (and to a lesser extent at U.S. campuses as well) with the multi-culti police nowhere in sight.

Writing in *Human Events*, Boston University's Richard L. Cravatts (author of a forthcoming book with a title that tells it all, *Genocidal Liberalism: The University's Jihad Against Israel*), focuses on one Canadian campus, York University. On February 1, Hasbara Fellowships, a student group, with university permission, set up a table to inform students about kidnapped Israeli soldier Gilad Shalit. An angry mob of 50 surrounded the table spewing anti-Semitic and anti-Israel slurs, hitting two of the Jewish students.

A year earlier police had to be called in to take Jewish students to safety after they had been barricaded inside Hillel offices by 100 screaming pro-Palestinian brownshirts shrieking raw slurs like "Die Jew" and "Get the hell off campus." Cravatts notes that in 2008 famed hero of the Soviet gulag Natan Sharansky, invited to speak by York's Hillel, was jeered and shouted down by Students Against Israeli Apartheid and the Palestinian Students Association.

York is by no means alone. Cravatts reports that at the University of Toronto's 2009 noxious "Israeli Apartheid Week" the annual event "had so devolved into a racist, rabid rally that proceedings were closed to cameras and reporters."

In Canada's mother country, the cream of Britain's future intelligentsia come off no better. On Feb. 8 the speech of Israel's deputy foreign minister Danny

Ayalon at the Oxford Union was repeatedly disrupted, reaching its low point when one person shouted "Kill the Jews" while outside the debating chamber protesters shouted "Free Palestine from the river to the sea."

The atmosphere of intimidation is such that at England's other academic powerhouse, Cambridge University, the Israel Society canceled a talk by one-time (now repentant) revisionist historian Benny Morris after protesters accused him of "Islamophobia."

Baroness Evil-Tonge

It was only a matter of time before the unhinged haters of Israel put their own spin on Israel's huge (for its size) humanitarian effort in Haiti. The Baroness Tonge, spokesperson for the Liberal Democrat Party in the House of Lords, has called for Israel to investigate claims that members of its recent team in Haiti had been harvesting bodily organs and selling them on the black market.

The chief surprise is that Tonge's outburst (not her first) was sufficiently embarrassing for the Liberal Democrats (perhaps reluctant to become known as the Blood Libel Party) to fire her from her official post—although not from the party. •

Join AFSI's Chizuk Trip To Israel May 9-17.
Visit Jewish communities in Samaria and Judea and new communities in the Negev.
Call AFSI (212) 828-2424 or email afsi@rcn.com to make your reservation