

OUTPOST

September 2010—Issue #235

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

A Time To Lead

Herbert Zweibon

In the June issue we said that Obama was playing the anti-Israel fiddle while the West burned. Now we must ask if Netanyahu is fiddling while the state confronts slow burning fires on many fronts. His administration appears to be in a state of denial, engaging in make-believe activities while avoiding the hard tasks that need to be done.

There's no greater make-believe than the "peace process." Netanyahu issues a Ramadan message to Moslems around the world emphasizing his efforts to "move forward peace agreements," testifies defensively on Israel's boarding of the Turkish terror ship, and now agrees to "direct talks" under U.S. auspices, i.e. to submit to enormous pressure for major unilateral withdrawals, more "land for nothing."

Meanwhile Israel is passive, where it is not blind to mounting dangers.

1. **Turkey.** Under Erdogan, Turkey has changed from ally to enemy. This transformation is especially dangerous because Israel has sold Turkey some of its most sensitive intelligence gathering systems and weapons platforms. Israel must now assume that if Turkey is not currently sharing these technologies with Syria and Iran (with both of which it is forging alliances), it will shortly be doing so. Yet, Caroline Glick points out, "both the statements and actions of senior officials lead to the conclusion that our leaders still embrace the delusion that all is not lost with Turkey." The IDF chief of Staff Gabi Ashkenazi told lawmakers: "Relations with the Turkish army are important and they need to be preserved." Instead of breaking off all military ties with Turkey, Israel is scheduled to deliver yet more sensitive equipment.

Given Turkey's cooperation with the terror-flotilla and its outrageous attacks on Israel in the incident's aftermath, diplomatic relations should also be frozen.

2. **Lebanon.** The murder of Israeli Lt. Col. Dov Harari and the wounding of Captain Ezra Lafia by a Lebanese army sniper serves as a reminder of the looming disaster on Israel's north. Hezbollah, backed

by Iran and Syria, has become politically dominant, and according to a recent IDF briefing, has 40,000 short and medium range missiles. It's only a matter of time before the ineffective UNIFIL (which was supposed to oversee the disarming of Hezbollah but is now under armed attack by it) flees the country.

Barak promises to hold Lebanon responsible if (or rather, when) those missiles fly. He should instead be warning Syria that the road from the Golan to Damascus is wide open.

3. **Gaza.** While Israel engages in highly publicized confrontations with blockade-running ships, heavy weapons move through the tunnels between Gaza and Egyptian-controlled Sinai. Using pipes from the Mediterranean it would not be difficult for Israel to flood the deepest tunnels through which these weapons come.

4. **Egypt.** With Mubarak soon gone, the Muslim Brotherhood is likely to assume greater power within the regime and if so, the peace treaty with Israel (not that it ever was worth much) may be abrogated. But Glick notes that Netanyahu just made the "routine fawning pilgrimage to Mubarak" demonstrating Israel's leadership was "not thinking about the storm that is brewing just over the horizon in Cairo."

5. **Iran.** Netanyahu has made it clear that he recognizes the existential threat a nuclear Iran poses to Israel. What is not clear is what he intends to do about it. Since it is hard to imagine any circumstances under which Obama would take military action to prevent Iran acquiring nuclear capability, the ball is squarely in Israel's court.

If Netanyahu is to give Israel hope and direction, he must seize the initiative in confronting all the above challenges.

Table of Contents

Remembering Jabotinsky by Douglas Feith	...3
A Two State Solution: 4th Try by Daniel Greenfield	...7
Whistleblower Exposes New Israel Fund	...9
Goldstone Comes Back To Bite The Brits by Robin Shepherd	...10
Witnesses For Israel's Defense by Ruth King	...11

From the Editor

Kudos to Rachel Ehrenfeld

Rachel Ehrenfeld's multi-year battle has been won. By an overwhelming consensus Congress passed what has become known as "Rachel's Law." Readers of *Outpost* will recall that Dr. Ehrenfeld was sued in England for libel by Saudi billionaire Khalid bin Mahfouz for documenting his role in funding al-Qaeda in her 2003 book *Funding Evil*. Although Dr. Ehrenfeld does not live in England and her book was not published or marketed there, Mahfouz took advantage of the weak protections British law provides to free speech to sue her in London. Mahfouz had previously used this tactic to bully more than 40 authors and a publisher into apologies, retractions, withdrawal of publications that made similar disclosures.

But Dr. Ehrenfeld is made of sterner stuff. When the English court ruled against her by default, she countersued Mahfouz in New York on the grounds the default judgment did not meet the standard of U.S. First Amendment protections. When the court dismissed the suit for lack of jurisdiction over Mahfouz, the New York State Legislature in 2008 passed Rachel's Law, giving New York courts jurisdiction over foreign libel plaintiffs who sue New York authors abroad.

Now Congress has provided protection more broadly to American authors who are victims of "libel tourism." At the vote, Senator Leahy recognized Dr. Ehrenfeld's dogged struggle: "I would like to recognize Dr. Rachel Ehrenfeld, Director of the American Center for Democracy... [who] has been a tremendous advocate for Congressional action in this area."

Kool-Aid at Ground Zero

Kudos also to Pamela Geller for organizing the early protests against the mosque at Ground Zero and turning it into a national issue.

Thanks to the outrage she generated, Governor Patterson has offered to provide an alternative site. But he misses the point. The reason Imam Rauf can plausibly promise to raise \$100 million for this project is precisely because it is at Ground Zero. Elsewhere his Cordoba House will have much less value to his Middle East funding sources. As JINSA (the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs) aptly puts it, the mosque "will be widely understood in the Moslem world as a battlefield monument in the name of Islam."

There is no significant Moslem community in the area for the mosque to serve. Rather it will become, like the Taiba (formerly Al-Quds) mosque in Hamburg, Germany (just shut down by the authorities), a place of pilgrimage and plotting for *ihadis* around the world. The lure of the Taiba mosque, as Josef Joffe, editor of *Die Zeit*, points out was that "this is where Mohammed Atta, the mastermind of 9/11,

hung out with other co-conspirators." If "the aura of the 9/11 assassins" was enough to draw *ihadis* from around the world to gather "and then depart on a mission from God" can you imagine what a magnet and inspiration a mosque at the site of their greatest triumph over the infidels would be? Imam Rauf can imagine and so can his funders.

But of course liberal dhimmi-wits (Ruth King's apt term) refuse to see the obvious. Charles Jacobs rightly points out that the mosque has become ground zero for American liberal fanaticism. All too many prominent Jews are among those who promote the "hear no evil" posture. And so you get not only Mayor Bloomberg but a swarm of rabbis (the Schneiers, father and son, Rolando Matalon, Richard Jacobs, among them), David Harris of the American Jewish Committee, Ron Soloway of the United Jewish Appeal, J Street (no surprise there), and the Union for Reform Judaism all embracing Imam Rauf's mosque at Ground Zero.

As Jacobs says of the liberal elites (from the President on down) who would coerce us to join their fantasy-induced suicidal mission "Think Kool-Aid. Think Jonestown."

A Quarter Kudo to ADL

Remarkably, the Anti-Defamation League did something right, coming out against the mosque at Ground Zero if only on the wishy washy grounds that it "will cause some victims more pain." Even this carefully hedged opposition was enough to prompt CNN host and *Newsweek* columnist Fareed Zakaria to return the Hubert H. Humphrey First Amendment Freedoms Prize he had received from ADL in 2005. ADL head Abe Foxman should have said forthrightly that apparently the ADL had made a mistake in giving the award to Zakaria (after all, the award was for Zakaria's supposed championing the values of the First Amendment and he was returning the reward because he objected to ADL's exercise of its First Amendment rights). Instead Foxman declared himself "saddened," "stunned," "speechless" and said he hoped Zakaria would take the award back! Charles Jacobs notes that the ADL already shows signs of *(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>

Remembering Jabotinsky

Douglas J. Feith

This lecture, given under the auspices of Americans for a Safe Israel and the Nordau Circle, commemorates the 70th anniversary of Jabotinsky's death. It was given at the Park East Synagogue in New York City on August 18. It is somewhat abbreviated here but the full text can be seen at www.shmuelkatz.com.

There are few men or women who are remembered, let alone honored, 70 years after they've died. But we do remember Vladimir "Ze'ev" Jabotinsky—and for good reason. Or, I should say, for good reasons. I'll name three:

First, he played an instrumental role in the success of a great cause—the reconstitution of a Jewish state in the Land of Israel.

Second, in addition to his remarkable accomplishments, he was a man of remarkable character and ideas.

And third, Jabotinsky's thoughts on the Arab-Jewish conflict over Palestine are not merely of historical interest; they contain insights applicable today.

Shmuel Katz's superb two-volume examination of Jabotinsky's life, entitled *Lone Wolf*, catalogues the long and multifarious list of Jabotinsky's contributions to Jewish history. Reviewing that list brings to mind the Passover song "Dayenu" ["enough for us"].

Jabotinsky would occupy a place of honor in history if he'd done nothing other than pen his writings and deliver his celebrated multilingual orations on Jewish nationalism. He described the misery and vulnerability of the Jews in exile, especially in Europe. He made the case for what he called humanitarian Zionism, setting out the moral, legal, historical and practical arguments in favor of a Jewish state in Palestine. In the 1930s, he foresaw and warned over and over again of the catastrophe to which Europe's Jews were heading if they didn't move themselves by the millions to the Land of Israel. Before the Nazis invaded Poland, he famously (and, alas, vainly) told the Jews of Warsaw that they should liquidate the Diaspora or the Diaspora would surely liquidate them.

Jabotinsky would deserve grateful remembrance from the Jews even just for his role in promoting Hebrew. In the early years of the 20th century, as Zionists contended over whether Hebrew or Yiddish should be the language of the eventual Jewish state, Jabotinsky helped ensure that Zionism would bring about the miraculous revivification of the Hebrew tongue. Though he loved Yiddish, he recognized it as "sectional." He warned repeatedly that the Yiddishists risked excluding from the Zionist cause the Sephardim and the Jews of the Caucasus, Turkistan, Persia and elsewhere.

He made the work of the great Zionist poet Bialik available to the mass of Russian Jewry by translating the poems from Hebrew into Russian. Jabotinsky also translated into Hebrew the poetry of Dante

and Edgar Allen Poe. And he promoted new forms of Hebrew instruction and Jewish education. He can fairly be described as a father of what we in America call the Jewish day-school movement.

Jabotinsky would have a secure place in Jewish memory simply for his leadership of the Zionist Revisionists, the political movement based on his secular liberal philosophy of Jewish national rights. His political influence was widespread in his day and remains potent even now. Though Ben Gurion is admired by many Israelis, no political leaders in Israel anymore describe themselves as Ben Gurionites. None describe themselves as Weizmannites. But many proudly think of themselves as Jabotinskyites, followers of this rational, pragmatic, unapologetic, security-minded, non-socialist Jewish nationalist. Dayenu!



Vladimir Jabotinsky

But I haven't yet mentioned his chief contribution to Jewish history. That was his role as exponent and organizer of Jewish self-defense. He invented Jewish military organization in the modern world.

Jabotinsky understood that the physical vulnerability of a people or a nation has both physical and metaphysical effects. To protect their lives and property and for the sake of their personal dignity and aspirations for national independence, Jabotinsky instructed the Jews, scattered and unarmed, on the indispensability of resistance, military power and self-defense, with special emphasis on the word "self."

This was a paramount theme of his life. In his early manhood, he organized a Jewish group to fight violent anti-Semites in his home city of Odessa. During World War I, he was the prime mover for the creation of a Jewish Legion in the British army that would help conquer Palestine. After that war, as the Arabs in the Jerusalem area prepared their first major anti-Jewish pogrom, Jabotinsky put together a Jewish defense organization known as the Hagana, a forerunner of the underground militia of the same name. Jabotinsky created Betar, the Zionist youth organization that trained its members in military discipline and skills. Jabotinsky provided inspiration and leadership to the Irgun, one of the underground military organizations in Mandate Palestine. And when he died in New York seventy years ago, he was laboring to the point of exhaustion to create a Jewish army to fight Hitler.

The effort to create the Jewish Legion during World War I deserves a few more words. Jabotinsky

had the strategic insight that Britain might take Palestine from the Ottomans, that the Zionist cause could be made or broken by British policy and that the Jews should take an active part—politically and militarily—in effecting Palestine’s liberation. He often quarreled in later years with Chaim Weizmann, but Jabotinsky and Weizmann saw eye-to-eye that the then top officials of the World Zionist Organization were wrong to adopt a policy of neutrality in the war. Though merely a journalist at the time, Jabotinsky led an effort over several years to persuade British officials to create a Jewish fighting force for use in a Palestine campaign.

The first fruit of that effort was the Zion Mule Corps, which fought for the British not in Palestine but in the bloody battle for Gallipoli. Then, in the summer of 1917, just three months before the Balfour Declaration, the British government agreed to create a Jewish Legion for use in Palestine. Thirty-seven years old, Jabotinsky joined as an enlisted man and was eventually promoted to lieutenant.

In his book *The Story of the Jewish Legion* (New York, Bernard Ackerman, 1945) Jabotinsky describes how the first Jewish battalion, soon to be deployed abroad, marched through London behind its British commander, Colonel John Henry Patterson:

“There were tens of thousands of Jews in the streets, at the windows and on the roofs. Blue-white flags were over every shop door; women crying with joy, old Jews with fluttering beards murmuring, *shehecheyanu*; Patterson on his horse, laughing and bowing, and wearing a rose which a girl had thrown him from a balcony, and the boys, those ‘tailors,’ shoulder to shoulder, their bayonets dead level, each step like a single clap of thunder, clean, proud, drunk with the national anthem, with the noise of the crowds, and with the sense of a holy mission, unexampled since the day Bar-Kochba, in Betar, not knowing whether there would ever be others to follow and to take up the struggle, threw himself upon his sword.”

In 1981 an Israeli historian, lecturing on Jabotinsky’s place in Jewish history, said:

“[W]e see that one supreme principle guided him throughout: resistance to subjugation. Along with this he advocated a multi-faceted force, including military force, to serve as the instrument of that resistance.

“Few people today can see the novelty that all this represented. Is it not natural for any people to resist subjugation and forge the instruments of its defense? It is; but for the great majority of the Jewish people this was a dubious proposition until the turn of the [20th] century. That it has ceased to be so since that time testifies to the revolution that Jabotinsky brought about in our thinking on these matters.

“We can now appreciate the depth of the revo-

lution which Jabotinsky, by his preaching of resistance, effected in our thinking, our moral values and the way we were to conceive our problem as a nation among the nations. He taught resistance to a people who, for many generations, had lost the capacity and the will to resist.”

The Israeli historian who said that is Benzion Netanyahu, the father of the prime minister, speaking at the University of Haifa on January 13, 1981 to mark the 100th anniversary of Jabotinsky’s birth.



Douglas Feith

As interesting as Jabotinsky was for his accomplishments I find it equally fascinating to consider his character and his thoughts. He was an intellectual and a man of letters, but by no means an academic, much less a *luftmensch*. He combined erudition and action. He combined a profoundly humane liberalism with the blunt acknowledgement of the indispensability of military power. He combined unapologetic defense of the interests of the

Jewish people and generous appreciation of the interests, motives and cultures of other peoples, including those in conflict with the Jews. His political advocacy was plain-spoken and intense, but carefully reasoned and respectful in tone. He was charming and big-hearted. And he delighted in humor.

One of his most famous pronouncements was that every man is a king and every woman a queen. He traced the idea to the Bible, but stressed that it applied not only to Jews but to all human beings. He wrote:

“When I look for the kernel of that new Jewish mentality of which the Betar movement is, so far, the most advanced expression, I find it in the idea of Man’s Royalty. In so far as it applies to the Jew it is expressed in our Betar anthem:

Even in distress the Jew is a prince.
No matter if a slave or a tramp,
You were created son of kings,
Crowned with the diadem of David ...

“I who wrote it meant it apply to any man, Grecian or Bantu, Nordic or Eskimo. They were all formed in God’s image: that is what we have learnt from the Bible’s first chapter. [From *The Pen of Jabotinsky*, Capetown: Unie-Volkspers BPK, 1941, pp. 60-61]”

“[T]he first consequence of ‘every man a king’ is, obviously, universal equality,” Jabotinsky wrote, and “the second consequence [is] individual liberty.”

Some of his opponents cited Jabotinsky’s exaltation of the idea of a Jewish state as evidence of a fascist mentality. But it is clear that Jabotinsky was committed “above all” to the creation of such a state because he viewed it as a matter of life and death for millions of people. Without a state, he correctly predicted, millions of Jews in Europe would be killed. This naturally made issues of individual liberty and equality secondary to the issue of national survival.

His concept of a proper state, however, was a thorough repudiation of all totalitarian practices. He praised what he saw as the ancient Jewish tradition that “detests the very idea of state power, and only tolerates it in so far as it is indispensable and inevitable.” It undoubtedly infuriated his Marxist opponents that he identified communism as well as fascism as totalitarian poison.

Nowhere did Jabotinsky display his contrarianism more stunningly than in his discussion of Arab opposition to the Jewish state.

To understand his views we must first appreciate the context. World War I destroyed the Ottoman Empire, ending hundreds of years of the Turks’ rule over their so-called Asiatic provinces, which included Syria and Lebanon, Palestine, Mesopotamia and Arabia. The allies, as victors, had the right under international law to annex the land they conquered. Instead they recognized Arab sovereignty right away in Arabia. And they agreed to hold Mesopotamia and Syria and Lebanon in trust, under formal legal instruments called mandates, for the benefit of the inhabitants. After building the capacity for self-government, the Arab nation from the Tarsus mountains to the Indian Ocean would achieve independence within several sovereign states. Given their rights as conquerors, acquired at the cost of much blood and treasure, the victorious allies considered these arrangements to be generous to the Arabs, especially as the vast majority of the Arabs fought in the Great War on the Ottomans’ side—the enemy side, the losing side.

Palestine also would come under a mandate, but the named beneficiary was not the Arabs; it was the Jewish people. Many new states were born on the ruins of empires after World War I and the allies decided that Palestine should be held open for the return of the Jewish people to their ancient homeland. Britain’s foreign secretary described Palestine as a small notch of land in the vastness of the Middle East. If the Jews resettled in Palestine in large enough numbers to become a majority, the idea was that they would eventually be permitted to establish a Jewish state there. This could help solve the world’s long-running humanitarian disaster known as the Jewish Problem—and it would fulfill the promise of the Balfour Declaration, which the British government issued during the war to win international Jewish support for the allied war effort. Zionist leaders—Jabotinsky, Weizmann and others—had contributed valuably to that effort and key British officials at the time felt a strong sense of obligation to the Zionists. After allied officials drafted the Palestine mandate, the League of Nations endorsed it. It became the legal framework for Palestine.

Supporters of the Palestine mandate did not believe they were wronging the Arabs of Palestine, though they understood that those Arabs opposed the plan for a Jewish state. The mandate made an important distinction between the Arabs’ rights as individuals and their collective rights as a nation. Arab nationalist leaders at the time insisted that there was but one Arab nation. So supporters of the Palestine mandate argued that the postwar settlement would vindicate collective Arab rights amply in Syria, Mesopotamia, Arabia and elsewhere. As for individual rights, the Palestine mandate aimed to ensure that the Arabs of

Palestine, even when a minority, would have their personal civil and property rights respected. The Arabs would of course prefer to remain the majority in Palestine, but if the Arabs were to be the majority everywhere they lived, then the Jews could be the majority nowhere in the world.

Anyhow, soon after the Palestine mandate was drafted and Britain accepted the role of mandatory power, British officials divided Palestine east of the Jordan River from Palestine west of the Jordan River and excluded the eastern part—called Transjordan—from the Jewish national home. Britain created an Arab administration for Transjordan, which remained under the Palestine mandate until 1946. So the Arabs retained their majority status—and eventually won national independence—even in three quarters of Mandate Palestine, which was originally expected to be part of the Jewish national home.

Arab opposition to Zionism remained strong in western Palestine, which in time came commonly to be referred to simply as Palestine. In the 1930s, Arab violence against the Jews there moved the British government to create a royal commission to propose a new policy. Jabotinsky was one of the people who gave testimony.

Jabotinsky insisted on respect for Jewish rights and opposed various proposals to compromise them. What is fascinating is that he justified his position not by denying the claims of Palestine’s Arabs but by acknowledging those claims, paying respect to the Arabs’ tenacious attachment to them and warning proponents of compromise against believing that the Arabs can be bought off cheaply.

In his testimony, he said he has “the profoundest feeling for the Arab case, in so far as that Arab case is not exaggerated.” He stated that there was no “individual hardship to the Arabs of Palestine as men” deriving from Jewish settlement; indeed the economic opportunities created by the Jews had induced many Arabs in surrounding countries to immigrate to Palestine. He stressed that, in his view, “there is no question of ousting the Arabs.” He said that Palestine was big enough for the Arabs and “many millions of Jews.”

If the Arabs were to be the majority everywhere they lived, then the Jews could be the majority nowhere in the world.

“What I do not deny [Jabotinsky declared] is that in that process the Arabs of Palestine will necessarily become a minority in the country of Palestine. What I do deny is that that is a hardship. It is not a hardship on any race, any nation, possessing so many National States now and so many more National States in the future. One fraction, one branch of that race, and not a big one, will have to live in someone else’s State: well, that is the case with all the mightiest nations of the world.”

He made his point with a stunning analogy:

“So when we hear the Arab claim confronted with the Jewish claim, I fully understand that any minority would prefer to be a majority. It is quite understandable that the Arabs of Palestine would also prefer Palestine to be the Arab State No. 4, No. 5, or No. 6—that I quite understand; but when the Arab claim is confronted with our Jewish demand to be saved, it is like the claims of appetite versus the claims of starvation. [Evidence Submitted to the Palestine Royal Commission, House of Lords, February 11th, 1937, London: New Zionist Press, 1937]

Jabotinsky had a concept of the Arab-Jewish conflict in Palestine that was fundamentally at odds with that of the would-be peacemakers throughout the twentieth century down to the present day. His concept was that the Arabs were serious about their claims and their interests, opposed Zionism in principle for nationalistic and religious reasons and were as dedicated to upholding their principles as the Jews were in defending the idea and then the fact of a Jewish state.

From the earliest days of the Palestine mandate forward, peacemaking efforts were premised on the idea that the conflict was not fundamental, was not about principles. British officials thought they could persuade Arab enemies of Zionism to make peace by limiting Jewish immigration, restricting Jewish land purchases or creating Arab political bodies. Jabotinsky told the British that they were missing the Arabs’ point.

In recent decades, it has been U.S., not British officials, who have taken the lead in trying to engineer Arab-Israeli peace and they have done so in similar fashion by focusing on practical questions—the so-called “final status” issues—rather than recognize the profound nature of Palestinian Arab opposition to Israel. Hence for forty years or so, U.S. officials have repeatedly banged their heads against a wall. Time and again, they push the parties to discuss boundary lines, water rights, Jewish settlements, security arrangements, Jerusalem, etc., etc. The discussions go round and round and never achieve peace. This

would not surprise Jabotinsky.

Jabotinsky said there will be peace only if the Arabs become persuaded that Israel is truly indestructible and the Arabs realize that they cannot get their first choice, which is Arab control of all of Palestine. Only then might it be possible that Palestine’s Arabs will compromise with the Jews and conclude peace.

The current campaign to delegitimize the Jewish state—to depict Israel as a nation born in aggression against the Arabs, lawless and immoral, deserving of contempt, denunciation and isolation—shows that Israel’s enemies retain the view that Israel is vulnerable. They hope Israel will go the way of the Soviet Union or the regime of apartheid South Africa.

U.S. officials should heed the lessons of history. After so many years of fruitless diplomacy, they should recognize that Jabotinsky had a point when he argued against condescending to the Arabs and failing to take their words, principles and interests seriously.

Peace may some day come to Palestine. But it will not result from the current diplomacy conducted by officials who learn nothing and forget nothing. It may come if the Palestinian people finally get good leadership, forward-looking men and women who are persuaded that Israel is here to stay and who believe that Palestinian nationalism should be more than persistent, debilitating, hateful opposition to Zionism. But Israel’s enemies include not just Palestinians and not just Arabs. The Iranian regime is an important element in the conflict.

I’m afraid I have to end on a rather sober note. But that’s not really inappropriate in a talk about Jabotinsky. Peace is a great blessing and it is worth pursuing. But U.S. officials should become realistic about the nature of the conflict and the prospects for diplomatic progress. And Israelis cannot expect soon to be relieved of the necessity to maintain the military defenses that Jabotinsky pioneered.

Douglas J. Feith, senior fellow at the Hudson Institute, was Under Secretary of Defense for Policy during 2001-05 and is the author of War and Decision: Inside the Pentagon at the Dawn of the War on Terrorism (Harper 2008).

AFSI Israel (Judea/Samaria) Trip

Come with us to celebrate Shabbat Chaye Sarah In Hebron on another unique Chizuk (support) mission to Israel from Oct. 24 – Nov. 2, 2010. For the full itinerary see <http://www.afsi.org> or call AFSI: 1-800-235-3658.

Fourth Try At A Two State Solution

Daniel Greenfield

Editors Note: Greenfield's analysis is all the more salient now that the Obama administration is forcing Israel and Abbas (the first secretly, the second openly unwilling), beginning September 2, to negotiate for creating a "two state solution" with a year's deadline.

At a joint press conference with Obama, British Prime Minister David Cameron stated that we "desperately need a two-state solution". German Chancellor Angela Merkel is reportedly downbeat about the prospects for a Two State Solution, but insists that it is the only "reasonable solution". J-Street, the radical left wing anti-Israel group intimately tied up with the Obama Administration, has released an ad praising Congressman Joe Sestak, one of the " Hamas 54", for his support of a "Two State Solution". Alan Dershowitz responded with an Op Ed insisting that he had always been in favor of a "Two State Solution" and denouncing J-Street for daring to imply otherwise.

And with all that noise and clamor for a Two State Solution, people would be forgiven for assuming that this was something a little more feasible than flapping your wings and flying to Mars. They would be forgiven for assuming that because they are naive enough to believe that leading politicians wouldn't step forward to propose something completely insane, just because it was the same thing that had been proposed for the last 20 years, and proposing it again has become the thing to do. They would be forgiven for also assuming that the media would be able to fact check completely impossible proposals before they actually become de facto policy. And it's a sad testament to the current state of the policy debate, that they would be wrong on both points.

It is easy enough to understand why a Two State Solution not only didn't work then and won't work now, but why it makes absolutely no sense to propose.

The original Two State Solution was implemented back in the 1920's, when the British imported Abdullah, the Governor of Mecca, and gave him 76% of the territory of the Palestine Mandate, in exchange for his silence when the French invaded Syria. Yet turning over three quarters of the territory of the Mandate to Muslim rule did not bring peace. Arab pogroms of Jews continued throughout the 1920's. In a single week of August 1929 alone, 113 Jews were murdered. (That is more than the number of Arabs who died in Jenin or Deir Yassin, yet you will find that the same "historians" who constantly mention those places, couldn't be bothered to care, let alone make noises about genocide and Arab colonialism.)

But one failure proves nothing. So in the 1940's, the United Nations tackled an official Partition Plan that would have created two states, one Jewish and one Arab, within the tiny remains of the Mandate. The split would have been 43 to 56, with the Jews getting the Negev desert, and the Arabs getting the water supplies. Jerusalem would have been internationalized. The Jews said, "Yes." The Arabs said, "Jihad." The War of Independence followed, and the new borders of all sides were determined by armed force.

By the middle of the 20th century, there had already been two partitions within a single generation. Neither of them had brought anything resembling peace. So naturally the only solution was another Two State Solution.

Surely two failures didn't mean anything. Nothing worth learning from anyway.

And here we are today in the midst of the Two State Solution Number 3, and any solution that didn't work twice, isn't much of a solution, and isn't going to work a third time. And unsurprisingly it hasn't. And it won't. And none of that will stop the political zombies chanting, "Two State Solution" over and over again, as if it was a magic formula that would fulfill all their dreams.

Right now there are two Palestinian Muslim mini-states within Israel. That makes it hard to implement a Two State Solution with Three States. Every time there's trouble in Gaza, it is once again a reminder that it is ruled by Hamas, and the West Bank is ruled by Fatah, two terrorist groups that don't get along with each other. Naturally every politician who talks about the importance of a Two State Solution completely ignores this minor problem, even though they created it. Or perhaps because they created it.

Each time the assumption is that if Israel sits down at the table and negotiates with Fatah leader Abbas, and makes enough concessions, there will be a Two State Solution, and the problem will be solved. Which seems easily enough done, when you ignore the fact that Gaza is not only run by Hamas, but that the only reason Hamas isn't running the West Bank is because the U.S. is propping up Abbas with weapons, and Israel has cut off Gaza from the West Bank. Yet the same people who call for a Two State Solution

The same people who call for a Two State Solution"also demand that Israel stop blockading Gaza—when Fatah and their Two State Solution wouldn't last two weeks if Hamas militias showed up in force in Ramallah.

also demand that Israel stop blockading Gaza—when Fatah and their Two State Solution wouldn't last two weeks if Hamas militias showed up in force in Ramallah.

But even if we ignore all this, there's still one major problem—Abbas doesn't want to negotiate. Yes that's right, one more thing in the way of the Two State Solution is that the leader of Fatah, who is backed by billions of dollars in foreign aid, American diplomatic protection, and Israeli military protection, who was the recipient of Obama's first phone call to a foreign leader on taking office—refuses to actually negotiate. Instead Abbas wants Israel to just give him things without negotiating first. Like setting the borders of his state, before he agrees to sit down to negotiate the borders of his state. That isn't a negotiation, it's a hold up. It's also absurd to demand the outcome of the negotiations as a concession to just show up at the negotiations, which might be the point.

The Arab Muslim side has been willing to take land, but not to concede their claims on the rest of the land. That was why the second attempt at a Two State Solution didn't work, it's why the third attempt at a Two State Solution has gone nowhere, over and over again. Every attempt at dividing up the territory between Arabs and Jews in a way that would force both to concede the rights of the other, has been sabotaged and rejected by the Arab side over and over again. The UN found that out in the 40's. Bill Clinton found that out in the 90's. There is no way forward on this without triggering an internal civil war in the Muslim world that would be much more destructive than its current conflict with Israel.

Meanwhile Abbas is completely incapable of making a decision about anything. Especially something controversial like a Final Status Agreement that would force him into an immediate showdown with Hamas and factions within his own terrorist organization, unwilling to accept any legal concession even as part of a phased plan to destroy Israel. So he does the safest thing he can do, which is to constantly denounce Israel, while sabotaging the negotiations, and trying to avoid getting caught up in the fighting. He knows that sooner or later he will be removed by one or another faction within Fatah, when they manage to stop their internal infighting. And if that doesn't happen, sooner or later Hamas and its Iranian and Syrian backers will have a car bomb with his name on it, just as they did for so many Lebanese politicians.

As we can see then, there's only one or two or three things standing in the way of a Two State Solution.

1. The fact that it's been repeatedly tried and failed.
2. The fact that there are two Palestinian

states already in place and fighting among themselves (not counting Jordan, which was the original Palestinian state, and will join the fight if the Muslim Brotherhood succeeds in taking it over.)

3. The fact that Abbas does not want to negotiate.

Naturally none of this discourages politicians from chanting "Two State Solution" over and over again, or media pundits from suggesting that Israel needs to implement it right now—when the only conceivable way Israel could make that happen is to close the border, throw the keys across the fence, and let anyone who wants to make a Palestinian state fight for it. But advocates of the Two State Solution frown at any such ideas as "unilateral," which is slang for "It's wrong to form a state without the consent of the puppet regime currently running one Palestinian state, or the terrorist organization running the other Palestin-

ian state—which they won't consent to anyway, but that just means we must try harder to convince them."

Meanwhile Abbas and some of the loonier Israel bashing crowd are playing with the idea of a One State Solution. *Foreign Policy Journal* condemns Israel for everything, and suggests it be replaced with "a single, united, democratic state with a constitution and representative government that recognizes the equal rights of all and protects the rights of the minority." A state that the writer claims "the Arabs proposed before Israel existed." Which is rather curious considering that none of Israel's neighbors was a democratic state that protected the rights of minorities—as the million Jewish refugees from Muslim countries would tell you. Of course such quibbles are petty when it comes to the main task of damning the "Racist Zionist colonial entity," as innumerable Soviet ambassadors to the UN and left wing bloggers describe Israel.

But the prospect of turning Hamas and Fatah into part of a state with Israel is about as likely to lead to a united democratic state with protection for anyone's rights as throwing a hand grenade near a bunch of pots, one of which has a chicken in it, is likely to lead to a chicken in every pot. If the Palestinian Arab Muslims couldn't form a single united government of their own that respected the rights of even their own Christian minority, or even each other—how exactly would they form one with Israel? Rather than answer the question, proponents will instead blame Israel for that too—which is their answer for absolutely everything. And I do mean absolutely everything.

Which puts us right back where we started, with an unworkable dilemma that Israel gets all the blame for, because it can't create peace by waving a magic wand and implementing a Two State Solution, a plan that is about as workable as any decent 99 cent magic wand.

The Arab Muslim side has been willing to take land, but not to concede their claims on the rest of the land.

But politicians and pundits don't like being told that their pet projects are unworkable. Tell them that water can't run uphill or that money doesn't grow on trees, and they assume you're being deliberately obstinate or obstructionist. And they insist even more desperately that you make water run uphill, grow money on trees and implement a Two State Solution. What sort of person are you anyway, that you refuse to attempt something so reasonable with such tremendous benefits for all mankind? And it is difficult to respond to that without telling the politician that he is an idiot, and explaining to him exactly why he is an idiot, and why he would be better off trying to ride chickens, than making decisions for anyone else. And then you're naturally an extremist.

Of course some politicians actually do know better. And that's something they keep to themselves, because the safest way to be a politician is to repeat the same thing that politicians before you repeated over and over again. It doesn't matter whether it can work or not. What matters is that it's "safe," because everyone says it. Occasionally there is a call for new

ideas, which usually means brushing off a very old idea, and presenting it as brand new. Like the Two State Solution, which has been a "new idea" since before women were allowed to vote.

Today Israel is stuck in this echo chamber of stupidity, both external and internal, because its own politicians are no brighter than Cameron or Obama. And when they are bright enough, like Merkel, as Netanyahu is—they keep it to themselves. Because it's not safe to be branded an extremist for speaking common sense. It's safer to go along with what everyone else is saying. To echo, "Two State Solution" over and over again, as if it means something anymore.

But I have a suggestion for finally resolving this whole mess. The Two State Solution. This will be only the fourth time we've tried a Two State Solution and it hasn't worked until now. Which means it's bound to work this time. And if it doesn't, there's always a fifth time.

Daniel Greenfield blogs as Sultan Knish. This appeared on his blog of July 25.

New Israel Fund (NIF) Whistleblower Exposes its Role in Demonization of Israel

NGO Monitor

[Editor's Note: AFSI was the first organization to expose the New Israel Fund with its 1990 pamphlet The New Israel Fund: A New Fund for Israel's Enemies. At the time we were roundly excoriated by virtually the entire Jewish establishment which rallied to NIF's defense. The hatred for Israel which it funds and promotes has not prevented the NIF, under the false flag of "supporting democracy in Israel" from raising funds—\$35 million a year—much of it from Jews who swallow its bill of goods.]

The New Israel Fund's role in funding and promoting anti-Israel campaigns is generating increasing criticism from Israelis.

On July 16, 2010, *Ma'ariv's* Ben-Dror Yemini devoted his column to "Shlomit," a social change activist who works for an NGO providing services in the Israeli-Arab sector. In June, Shlomit attended a leadership training seminar run by *Shatil* (an NIF program), and sponsored by the Ford Israel Fund (a partnership between NIF and Ford Foundation). The twenty participants were all from NIF-funded organizations, including a "significant presence...from the Palestinian cause" represented by NGOs such as Mossawa, Sikkuy, Amnesty-Israel, and Neve Shalom.

Yemini's article describes how Shlomit reported her concerns to NIF about the radical views expressed during the seminar but received no response until after *Ma'ariv* contacted NIF officials.

Following are excerpts from the letter:

"My name is Shlomit. I am 36 years old and live in Israel...I have been a social activist in several organizations for social change throughout my entire professional life. A significant portion of our work as well as the organization's budget goes towards developing leadership and services for the Arab sectors in the Negev, Jerusalem, the triangle and the Galil... when my manager suggested I attend a leadership program run by an American institution catering for managers and leaders for social change, I did not hesitate.

"I found myselfwith Palestinian and Jewish human rights activists who negated the State of Israel's existence. With people who want to annihilate the State without ruling out violent means, who believe that the State of Israel was born out of sin and who apologize for its existence, who loathe Israel and its symbols, who justify harming Israel, its soldiers and all its institutions, who devote their lives and efforts towards turning Israel into a bi or multi-national country. In fact the above is inaccurate. These people are fighting for one nationality alone—Palestinian. These same people oppose communal or civil national service for Arabs within the State. They also equate Israel's actions with those of Nazi Germany.

"I realized that I was the only representative for the disabilities. There was another representative for the environment but the most significant presence came from the Palestinian cause: Amnesty International, Sikkuy (The Association for the Advancement of Civic Equality in Israel), AJECC (Arab-Jewish Center for Equality, Empowerment and Cooperation), Neve Shalom, Itach (Women Lawyers for Social Justice), Moussawa (Advocacy for Arab Citizens in Israel) and others. There weren't any representatives, for example, for the absorption of Ethiopian and Russian immi-

grants. Nor were there any representatives for pluralistic Judaism.

"It was also hard to hear the hatred towards a country that to me represented one of the biggest miracles and acts of justice that mankind has ever known. I could not tolerate being in an atmosphere where my Jewish identity was being paralyzed in a way that I had never felt before in my life.

"But the radical left was so present in the room that it seemed obvious that everyone was speaking in one voice. All the sentences began with "we" and not "I". It seemed like no issue was complex nor were there different views regarding the issue. The IDF was a conquering army, Israel was a colonial state, only the Palestinians suffered and this was the only real issue at heart.

"Do the supporters of the Fund have any idea that the numerous organizations benefiting from its support and counsel are putting all their effort into negating Israel as a Jewish and democratic state? Is the Fund itself openly working towards removing the 'Jewishness' from the State? Is the Fund trying to turn

Israel into a country for all her inhabitants alongside a Palestinian state?

"I cannot let what I have experienced pass by knowing that there is a possibility that the 'creature' is turning against its 'creator.' I feel that you, as manager of the Fund, would want to hear and know these things. Perhaps the Fund and all of its leaders should currently be hearing this voice not from a high perch of criticism but rather from its legitimacy in the eyes of social activists such as me. In the eyes of people who up until today, thought that they belonged to the liberal left but cannot be part of it or its activities anymore without feeling that they are harming their existence as Jews in a Jewish state.

"I as an Israeli Jew, who believes in 'Tikkun Olam' and trying to build a more just and egalitarian society and who has devoted and will continue to devote her efforts to achieve this goal, could not carry on in life without writing this letter to you with all its honesty and pain."

This appeared in the website of NGO Monitor—www.ngo-monitor.org on July 21.

Goldstone Comes Back To Bite The Brits

Robin Shepherd

The recent release of thousands of secret official files about coalition operations in Afghanistan paints a harrowing picture of the fog of war, most troubling of all the accidental killings by British soldiers of hundreds of innocent civilians—revelers at wedding parties, kids in school buses, ordinary people going about their daily business who tragically found themselves in the wrong place at the wrong time.

Given that the Taliban systematically hides behind the civilian population, this sort of thing is, of course, inevitable. Nonetheless, it is understandable that the revelations by Wikileaks have caused embarrassment to the governments of all the coalition countries.

But for those coalition countries in Europe—Britain first among them—who are currently cheerleading the passage of the Goldstone Report on Gaza through the United Nations, this is more than an embarrassment. In the light of Goldstone, it represents an outright threat to the security of their soldiers on the ground as well as to their national interests in international tribunals.

International laws, norms and procedures to a great extent operate on the basis of precedent. So when Britain and other European countries allowed the Arab dictatorships to push a report through the United Nations specifically designed to criminalize the Israeli military's attempts to deal with terrorists hiding behind a civilian population in Gaza, they simultane-

ously set a precedent for all countries, including their own.

Now that it has been revealed—via official documents—that British soldiers, for example, have been involved in exactly the same kind of operations against exactly the same kind of terror groups using exactly the same tactics and resulting in exactly the same kind of outcomes in terms of the loss of civilian lives, British soldiers and ministers could face exactly the same kind of censure and penalties as Israel.

Goldstone can be used as both a concrete precedent in its own right, but also as a proxy for the whole panoply of terror-appeasement policies and norms the British Foreign Office have allowed to develop, or have actively supported, in the international community over decades.

The Foreign Office and its equivalents are thus proved not merely to have been engaged in the vilest of discriminatory hypocrisy over Israel (Goldstone and all that it represents) but they are also shown to have been deliberately and willfully allowing a depraved anti-Israeli agenda to take precedence over their own national interests.

I didn't realize that undermining one's own military or one's own national interests was what our diplomats were being paid to do. Perhaps they would care to comment?

Robin Shepherd is director of international affairs at the Henry Jackson Society in London. He is the author of A State Beyond the Pale: Europe's Problem with Israel. This article appeared on July 26 at the blog www.robinsherpherdonline.com.



Richard Goldstone

Witnesses For The Defense Of Israel—Part 2

Ruth King

In last month's *Outpost* we paid tribute to a number of defenders of Israel. In this issue we focus on two courageous British columnists who have countered the torrent of libel and hatred elicited by the terrorist flotilla incident.

In the *Telegraph*, Charles Moore wrote: "Islamic fanatics were allowed to use the 'humanitarian flotilla' as a weapon....There was no need... for humanitarian aid to travel by these means, since the Israelis were prepared to deliver it themselves, as they regularly deliver aid of their own to Gaza. The purpose of the Gaza blockade, now roundly condemned by world leaders, was originally backed up by international agreement. Various forces, including the Royal Navy, said they would help interdict supplies of arms to Gaza: it could not be permitted to become, in effect, an Iranian port. And one could remind the world that the reason Gaza is an independent entity at all is that, in 2005, Israel withdrew from it. Finally, one might note sarcastically that world opinion's instantaneous outrage against Israel's action contrasts sharply with its marked reluctance to rush to judgment when North Korea sinks a South Korean ship, or, most notably, when Iran takes another step towards building its Bomb.

"But I shall say no more about any of these things, because what friends of Israel need to say at this point is that this mess is Israel's fault. I do not mean, as so many do, that Israel is wicked and aggressive, let alone—as is often, almost obscenely, claimed—that its actions replicate the behaviour of apartheid South Africa or even of Nazis in the Holocaust. I mean that Israel is at fault because, by failing to define the nature of the conflict, it is allowing such views to win."

Ah yes, Moore understands the failure. Israel has lost faith in its narrative, its legitimacy, its patrimony, and, above all its imperative to defend itself and Jewish people throughout the world. For it follows, as the night the day, that overt and crude anti-Semitism comes in the wake of over-the-top attacks on Israel.

Then, surprisingly, there's William Shawcross, a "progressive," a frequent critic of American policy, who wrote a column in *The Jerusalem Post* entitled "An Irrational Obscene Hatred."

"The realities of Gaza, Israel and the West Bank—where, with Israel's assistance, the Palestinian economy is booming—are deemed irrelevant. To the conventional narrative Israel is a cartoon villain, beyond sympathy, beyond even redemption. What is shocking—and frightening—is that the narrative the world accepts is always that of Israel as the evildoer.

"It was true with the so-called Jenin massacre allegedly committed by the Israelis in 2002. There was no such massacre. It was a lie that was widely and uncritically propagated by the UN, Amnesty Interna-

tional, Human Rights Watch and the BBC. It is true today. The hatred that Israel arouses is absurd, even obscene."

After describing the flotilla siege by Israel, Shawcross continues:

"Bulent Yildirim, head of the Turkish Islamist organization IHH, which organized the flotilla, exulted: 'Last night, everything in the world has changed, and everything is progressing toward Islam.'

"Consider these words from Sheikh Hussein bin Mahmud, a pseudonymous but apparently popular commentator in the global jihadist community: 'Everyone who has had contact with the Jews and lived alongside them, in the East and in the West, has spurned them, loathed them and detested them, to the point where Hitler said, 'I could kill all the Jews in the world, but I left a few alive so that the entire world will know why I killed the Jews.'

"Such raw hatred of Jews, let alone Israel, is commonplace in the Middle East, without an excuse such as last week's deadly incident.

"Israel is an imperfect society (like any other), but it has extraordinary social, scientific and scholastic achievements. Despite living under endless threats, it is far closer to the liberal ideal of a free society than any other in the Middle East. But it gets scant credit.

"Radical Muslims, on the other hand, stone women, hang homosexuals and kill to deny free speech. Do Europeans protest that? Not many, not often.

"Israel is held to a far higher standard than any other nation....No one marches and calls emergency meetings of the UN and the EU to protest the vicious Muslim brutality against other Muslims that takes place every day throughout the Islamic world – and beyond. No one demonstrates on behalf of Christians murdered in the Middle East, their churches burned. Such horrors are waved away. Only Israel merits such constant abuse.

"The Muslim world and the Western Left are in an unholy alliance; they do not want to improve the Jewish state, they want to remove it."

From Great Britain, the heart of Eurabia, William Shawcross and Charles Moore join Robin Shepherd, Bernard Harrison and Adrian Morgan, Editor of *Family Security Matters*, in defense of Israel. They are today's embodiment of that wonderful legacy of non-Jewish British writers and statesmen like liberal Richard Crossman who accused Bevin and Atlee of anti-Semitism for their opposition to the creation of a Jewish State, and Colonel Josiah Wedgwood, M.P. who told the House of Commons on May 29, 1934: "...when I see this sort of thing going on with the government unable to put any argument on the other side, it makes me bitterer that even a Jew can be against the Government of Palestine today." •

(Continued from page 2)

withdrawal from the mosque controversy under the liberal onslaught.

Unfortunately the ADL shows no sign of withdrawal from its apparent mission, "What friend of Israel can I attack today?" Recent target Joseph Farah of *World Net Daily* hits back: "Yes, anti-Semitism is alive and well in the U.S. and around the world in 2010. But the ADL continues looking in all the wrong places for the threat and ignoring the most obvious and blatant examples of this disease when it rears its ugly head."

It's a Mad, Mad, Mad Britain

The Sunday Telegraph has obtained classified papers prepared by Whitehall civil servants for the Cabinet's home affairs committee arguing a thesis so loony they make Shimon Peres look like a realist.

First, a little background. Hizb-ut-Tahrir (Islamic Party of Liberation) is an outfit among whose avowed goals is to turn Britain into an Islamic dictatorship under *sharia* law. It has been banned in nine countries, including Germany. (Incidentally Imam Rauf, who oozes interfaith tolerance as he lays the groundwork for the Ground Zero mosque, attended a conference of this outfit in 2007 in Indonesia.) Another outfit, Al-Muhajiroun praised the 9/11 terrorists as the "magnificent 19" and was itself linked to at least 19 terrorists convicted in Britain, including two serving life sentences. It also provided backing to Abu Hamza, whose Finsbury Park mosque was a fount of terrorists.

The *Telegraph* reports that according to the Whitehall studies, these hothouses of Islamism are nothing to worry about. One paper, which is classified

"Restricted" and entitled "Government Strategy toward Extremism" says: "It is sometimes argued that violent extremists have progressed to terrorism by way of a passing commitment to non-violent Islamist extremism, for example of a kind associated with al-Muhajiroun or Hizb-ut-Tahrir...We do not believe that it is accurate to regard radicalization in this country as a linear 'conveyor belt' moving from grievance, through radicalization, to violence...This thesis seems to both misread the radicalization process and to give undue weight to ideological factors."

Wait, it gets better. The papers not only provide what one senior Whitehall official calls "a clear assessment that individuals do not progress through non-violent extremist groups to violent groups" but that "extreme groups may also provide a legal 'safety valve' for extreme views." In other words, if the government is serious about fighting Islamic terror, it would do well to encourage the groups that promote Islamic terror!

If the Whitehall officials who prepared these papers are brain dead, not so the adviser who guided them. He is Mohammed Abdul Aziz, paid ministerial adviser to the Communities Department, an honorary trustee of the extremist East London Mosque, which has played host to dozens of hate-imams, including Anwar al-Awlaki. (He's the al-Qaeda fellow who was spiritual guide to the Ford Hood killer and Christmas Day bomber. The U.S. has been trying to eliminate him in Yemen with the ACLU running interference, arguing in a court challenge that as an American citizen al-Awlaki is entitled to due process protections before being attacked.)

-