
OUTPOST

June 2012—Issue #255

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

42st Year of Publication

Table of Contents		
Editorial – Game Changers	William Mehlman	Page 2
From the Editor	Rael Jean Isaac	Page 3
Dreams of the Wicked Son's Father	Ruth King	Page 5
Israel's Peace Disease	Daniel Greenfield	Page 8
Our Homeland--Speech to the EU Parliament	Gershon Mesika	Page 11
Herod--The Man Who Had to be King	Mordechai Nisan	Page 14
Muslim Voters Change Europe	Soeren Kern	Page 15
Against The Grain: A Historian's Journey	AFSI Recommends	Page 17

Game Changers

William Mehlman

From: The Center for Political Disease Control
To: Barack H. Obama

The Center feels duty-bound to inform you that further bad-mouthing of Benjamin Netanyahu may prove extremely hazardous to your health. Please note:

Nicolas Sarkozy is toast

Tsipi Livni has been put out to pasture.

Shaul Mofaz is in intensive care.

WARNING: An early consultation with your campaign diagnosticians is strongly advised. You could be in critical danger.

While Mr. Obama may find all this terribly amusing as he heads for his November 6th showdown with Mitt Romney, he may also find it increasingly hard to ignore the sucking sound that permeated the Israeli political scene with the May 8th absorption of Kadima and its 28 Knesset mandates into the Likud orbit. *Mutatis mutandis*, it recast Benjamin Netanyahu as potentially the most powerful Israeli head of state in the last three decades.

Hardly less amazing is the marginal political cost of affecting this transformation. The three markers Netanyahu gave Mofaz in exchange for the key to a 94-vote Knesset super-majority -- coalition support for a Kadima-drafted "universal" military/national service conscription law that would allegedly end unlimited deferments for ultra-Orthodox yeshiva students; a change in the Israeli electoral system, and a maximum effort to "advance the peace process" in a "responsible manner" -- should all be redeemable at bargain rates. Netanyahu, who wants to keep the 15 mandates commanded by the two Haredi parties (Shas and United Torah Judaism) in reserve for a rainy day, should have little trouble persuading them to go along with a law that will not be fully implemented until 2017. Moreover, even when implemented, it will allow yeshiva students not selected for scholarly exemption to exempt themselves from military or national civilian service for one year, every year, for a maximum of eight years.

As for altering the electoral system, Likud is no less desirous of that than Kadima. The problem in trying to create a replica of the two or three-party model designed for a fairly homogenous constituency is that culturally fractionalized Israel is anything but. To impose such a system on the country without trampling on its democratic ethos is a herculean task. The new electoral deal is expected to be in place in time for the November 2013 elections. It will be a miracle if it is.

"Beware of Bibi bearing gifts" is the label that should be affixed to the third marker the prime minister gave Mofaz -- the new coalition's promise to advance the peace process in a "responsible manner." The latter being the operative phrase, it presents the national Zionist camp with a diamond-studded opportunity to expose the "two-state" paradigm for the utter delusion it has been from the outset. With moderate, make-a-deal Mofaz presumably leading the new team selected to negotiate with the Palestinian Authority, there will be no big, bad "right wing obstructionists" to blame when it transpires that no deal can be made. For in light of what such an agreement would require -- an Israeli retreat to the 1949 armistice lines, the repartition of Jerusalem, the uprooting of 400,000 Israelis, the truncation of the Negev in order to allow for a "contiguous" Palestinian state and the acceptance of anywhere from a "token" 500,000 to three million Palestinian "refugees"-- Mofaz will no more be capable of making the sale than Netanyahu was. His inevitable public failure should stamp paid to the geopolitical hoax of the century. 'Tis an opportunity not to be missed.

Clamping the cuffs on the Palestinian “peace” phantom, however enticing, pales alongside the issue that, by his own admission, keeps the prime minister awake nights—namely, the lengthening shadow of a nuclear-armed Iran. With Shaul Mofaz’s addition, the now nine-member inner “security cabinet” charged with deciding, yea or nay, on a strike at the Islamic Republic’s nuclear war-making complex includes three former IDF Chiefs of General Staff (Mofaz plus Moshe Ya’alon and Ehud Barak), a former and current defense minister (Mofaz and Barak) and a former member of “Sayeret Matkal,” the IDF’s elite strategic reconnaissance unit (Netanyahu). Surveying this lineup, the editor of the leading Palestinian daily *al-Quds al-Araby* dubbed it a “war coalition,” a view echoed across the media spectrum. “The addition of Mofaz,” Amir Oren noted in *Ha’aretz*, provides war-hawks Netanyahu and Barak with a “protective vest” against opposition to a move against Iran.

Overcoming the known reluctance of Mofaz and Ya’alon to embark on such a venture may have been considerably eased in recent days by a “Mayday” alert from Iranian opposition group Mujahadin-Khalk (MEK) that Tehran is accelerating its nuclear weapons development program at a break-neck pace behind the cover of yet another round of “talks” with the West. Passed on to *Jerusalem Post* military affairs correspondent Ya’acov Katz, by Emanuele Ottolenghi, a senior fellow at the Brussels-based “Foundation for the Defense of Democracies,” MEK lists no less than 11 companies and institutions involved in the Iranian nuclear weaponry drive, grouped around the “Center for Explosive Blast Research and Technologies,” an outfit tasked with building and testing nuclear detonators.

“This information ,” MEK asserts, “sharply contradicts the assessment by some that Iran has not yet made the decision to go forward with a weapons program...” Adds Ottolenghi: “Until now intelligence agencies and policy-makers surmised that Iran sought civil nuclear energy....These documents [the MEK disclosures] support the opposite conclusions—namely that Iran’s program was always military and its civil nuclear component was just a façade. Iran decided long ago to make nuclear weapons—the only question is when.”

The answer is irrelevant. The only “when” that counts at this juncture is the one the government of Israel must provide, the “when” on which might well hang the future of the Jewish State.

Bill Mehlman leads AFSI in Israel.

From the Editor

In Memoriam: David G. Littman

We mourn the loss of David Littman, a staunch fighter for Israel and the Jewish people. In recent years he acted tirelessly, via the Center for Information and Documentation on the Middle East in Geneva, an NGO which he founded with his wife in 1970, to address, as French writer Guy Milliere puts it, “the worst monstrosities emanating from a grotesque institution, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, since replaced by the equally grotesque United Nations Council for Human Rights.”

Littman authored significant works on Islam’s attitude toward and treatment of Jews. With Yehoshafat Harkabi, in 1971 he edited *Arab Theologians on Jews and Israel*, the fourth edition published in 2011. With Paul Fenton he published *Islam*, analyzing the status of Jews from the Middle Ages until the coming of French rule in North Africa.

Littman worked unsung, behind the scenes, to save Jewish children in the Maghreb. He led Operation Mural, the covert program that brought 530 Jewish children from Morocco to Israel in the early 1960s. In 2009 his efforts were finally acknowledged when Israel gave him the “Hero of Silence” award, the state’s highest intelligence honor. In bestowing the honor, given at the request of the

Mossad, Col. Yossi Deshal said: "Mr. Littman volunteered, at his own initiative, to aid in bringing Jewish children from Morocco. He did so at risk to his life and to his family, with courage, with much resourcefulness, and without any compensation. The story was told in the film *Operation Mural Casablanca 1961*, which premiered at the San Francisco Film Festival in 2007 (alas, not available on Netflix).

Littman's fame was overwhelmed by that of his wife, born Gisele Orebi in Cairo, better known as Bat Ye'or. A staunch supporter of her work on dhimmitude, he proudly basked in her shadow.

A Viper of Peace Studies

Another reminder why the words "peace," "peace studies" and "conflict resolution" are danger signals. Norway's Johan Galtung is famous worldwide as the "father of peace studies." He is the founder of the Peace Research Institute in Oslo and *The Journal of Peace Research*, author of a flood of articles on conflict resolution, recipient of numerous awards and honorary degrees. He is also, as Walter Russell Mead points out, "a vicious and hate-spewing anti-Semite."

Mead notes that Galtung has "hinted at links between Anders Behring Breivik's attack on civilians in Norway and Mossad, Israel's intelligence agency. He suggested there was some truth behind *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. He said that Jews share some of the blame for what happened at Auschwitz --they had provoked the poor Germans under the Weimar Republic. He suggested that Jews control the American media and academic establishments. "

Mead writes: "Even among liberal academics who specialize in the study of peace, the flame of hate sometimes burns." What Mead should have said was that the flame of hate toward Israel burns specially strong within that group. And in so far as a rational explanation is possible, a contributing factor may be that the Arab-Israel conflict illustrates better than any other that peace studies is an empty discipline and conflict resolution does not work. The Arabs don't want to "resolve" the conflict. They want to destroy Israel. The solution of peace studies mavens is to blame the intended victim for the failure of their own false premises.

Environmental Justice

And we thought the EPA overreached. Writing in *Family Security Matters*, Alan Caruba tells us the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has added to its portfolio of responsibilities enforcing environmental justice. This is how a DHS report "Environmental Justice Strategy" issued in February 2012 defines the department's new role--"a commitment of the Federal Government, through its policies, programs, and activities, to avoid placing disproportionately high and adverse effects on the human health and environment of minority or low-income population."

Writes Caruba: "This has *nothing* to do with homeland security by the wildest stretch of the imagination...this is the way government expands and expands and expands beyond what citizens expect or request."

More PEACE Insanity

Apparently the word peace destroys the brain as well as morality. Steve Peacock, writing on *World Net Daily*, reports that the Obama administration believes the violence in northern Nigeria is mistakenly viewed as a religious conflict. The U.S. Agency for International Development has therefore, at a cost of \$600 million, launched a program called Project PEACE (acronym for Programming Effectively Against Conflict and Extremism) to help the agency analyze the "true" causes of the conflict. Never mind that the Muslim jihadist group Boko Haram has openly pledged to "eradicate Christianity." Peacock says that the USAID documents contend that Boko Haram is simply angered "over the nation's poor governance." Hence, according to the USAID Conflict Assessment Framework 2.0, "the first task



of conflict management is to distinguish the symptoms of the conflict from its sources...although the symptom of conflict is intercommunal violence along sectarian lines, the source of the conflict will not be found in theology. Rather, the conflict's source [is] competition for land between a group that perceives itself as indigenous to the area and another seen as more recent settlers." In this view misconceptions about the nature of the conflict as religiously based

have interfered with efforts to heal it.

So how does the Obama administration propose to deal with Islamic jihad in Nigeria? By spending \$600 million to define it as something else.

Dreams of the Wicked Son's Father

Ruth King

In the summer of 1982 Yitzhak Ben-Ami published his memoir of the Irgun *Years of Wrath, Days of Glory*, a chronicle of the struggle, in the 1920s and 1930s, by the Zionist Revisionists and the Irgun Zvai Leumi (the movement of Jabotinsky and Begin) to get Jews from Europe to Palestine and then to fight the British and the Arabs for independence.

Ben-Ami was a founder of The American Friends for Jewish Palestine in 1939 and from 1946 to 1948 was executive Director of "The American League for a Free Palestine."



Yitzhak Ben-Ami and I were friends. Our children attended the same schools--Collegiate and Princeton University. His article, reprinted below, appeared in 1983 in *The Collegiate Review* published by the Collegiate School in New York. It was written after the Lebanon War and the killing of Arabs by Arabs in the Sabra Shatilla Camp in Lebanon occasioned a tsunami of criticism of Israel. Although Ariel Sharon ultimately cleared his name in a suit brought against *Time Magazine* for accusing him of responsibility for those attacks, the floodgates had opened and pusillanimous Jews joined the chorus in

condemning Israel even before the self-imposed investigation by Israel's highest court had studied all the evidence.

Yitzhak Ben-Ami died in 1984. His daughter Deborah Benami-Rahm chairs the Yitzhak Ben-Ami Memorial Colloquium on Rescue from the Holocaust founded by the Wyman Institute.

Although we were not close, I know three things about him: He despised fools; he reserved particular enmity for the "beautiful" Jews who attacked and harmed Israel; and he loved his son Jeremy very much and held great hopes for him. Once, when we met in Princeton, he told me how proud he was that a member of his family was studying at Princeton. As he put it "We've come a long way from Grodno."

For Yitzhak Ben Ami his son's betrayal of his hopes would have been a tragedy. For his son is not only a fool but maliciously devotes his energies to attacking Israel through the vicious organization he co-founded, J Street. Even its shabby pretense of supporting some Platonic ideal of a "beautiful Israel" has crumbled as co-founder Daniel Levy has openly declared he believes the creation of Israel "an act that was wrong." J Street's duplicity, on its funding as well as its goals, has appalled even some of the "beautiful people" whom his father despised.

Ben Ami personifies what renowned playwright and author David Mamet has called "The Wicked Son." The wicked son is filled with the self-hatred of the Jew estranged from his heritage: at some level he identifies as a Jew, but he disparages Israel with words and deeds that gratify enemies.

The "New" Israel Versus The "Beautiful" Israel By Yitzhak Ben-Ami

An intense ideological split is dividing the Jewish communities of Israel, Western Europe and the United States. On the one side are the so-called proponents of the beautiful Israel. Why "beautiful?" As adherents of Ahad Ha'am and Zionist Socialism, they maintain that the first priority of the nascent Hebrew nation is the quality of life, one that is motivated by high ethics and ideals. In pursuit of this goal, they impose upon themselves a double standard that requires them to be better than others in order that they may become "a light unto nations."

On the other side are the followers of Theodor Herzl and Ze'ev Jabotinsky. Menachem Begin, the Prime Minister of Israel, is their representative today. The standard that is good enough for the democratic world is good enough for Israel so far as they are concerned. To them, and to me, dedicated as we are to the ethics of our heritage and prophets, the survival of the nation--today or decades ago, comes first.

Following is my rebuttal to my Rabbi who, on the holiest night of the Jewish year, attacked the concept of "survival at any cost" before his congregation.

Dear Rabbi:

I cannot let your emotional Kol Nidre sermon pass without comment. Since my first confrontation with the American Rabbinate in 1939-40, the anti-Zionist Rabbi Wolsey of Philadelphia, the powerful Stephen Wise and "spiritual Zionist" Mordechai Kaplan, I have been aware of the "politicized" tradition of the Rabbinate. Actually, I have no quarrel with it, except that the captive congregation is exposed to the particular views of the Rabbis without having the option to hear a differing view. How could I, for instance, manage to assemble 3000 of our congregants to listen for half an hour to an opposing view?

Now to the point; what you did in your sermon was to indict a large, possibly the largest, segment of the people of Israel (80%) who, by and large, up to a few weeks ago, gave the policies of Menachem Begin their support. You prejudged a government and people by agonizing from the pulpit over the decline of the "beautiful Israel," thus implying that the majority is "ugly Israel." You indicted before any impartial verdict was arrived as to who is responsible for what happened in the Palestinian camps where the PLO. murderers were based, hid their weapons, and left a nucleus of active terrorists (who are still there) and from which trouble and bloodshed will still come. What happened did happen; as to who is actually responsible (regardless whether Ariel Sharon takes the blame on himself) the jury has not even convened.

What you did was to align yourself with the politically motivated Labor leadership which will live to regret identifying itself with Marxist-pro P.L.O. elements, non-Jews and Jews alike, in Israel and abroad, as it did when disseminating the Deir Yassin accusation (1948).

What you did is to introduce a century old ideological Zionist conflict into a current controversy involving a possible limited error by some army commanders that otherwise excelled under very difficult conditions in a complex operation.

The overwhelming majority of the congregation does not have the faintest notion of the difference between the Zionism of Pinsker, Herzl, Nordau and Jabotinsky, and the Zionism of Ahad Ha'am, Weizmann, Buber and Judah Magnes.

What you did is to oppose the formers' ideologies against "beautiful Israel." You did not explain why Jabotinsky's disciples defined their movement as humanitarian Zionism, the Zionism that half a century ago aimed, above all, at saving the lives of the threatened Jews of Central and Eastern Europe--the Jewish Zone of Distress--and that today cares, above all, for Israel's survival.

This basic concept has been, and still is denigrated by the "spiritual" cultural Zionists. Their ranks glitter with great names. They have dominated the Zionist movement from Theodor Herzl's death in

1904 until 1977. They are credited with a "beautiful" society in Israel, indeed, with the very creation of the State of Israel.

What they are not debited with, however, is their share in the responsibility for what could have been done for and by the Jews of Europe in 1933-45 to save so many. This historic background is, of course, unknown to the majority of your congregation.

You did not explain why a multitude of Jews, especially in Central and Eastern Europe, led by these same "beautiful" people, refused to face reality and rejected the concepts of "mass evacuation" and "non selectivity" in immigration to Palestine, urged by the school of Zionism in which today Begin is the prime living spokesman. What you did not say is that there are many, many Israelis and friends of Israel abroad who believe that the purpose of Zionism is, above all, an option for survival, not the creation of an exemplary society. It is up to a new, strong, independent nation to eventually contribute to the modern world--ethically, morally, intellectually--the more, the better! But first of all, there has to be life, and life in Jewish tradition is the essence of everything--except possibly Kiddush Hashem, and even there we have exceeded our quota!

What you told your congregation is that we Jews are different-- if not actually "chosen"-- to live and function on higher planes than the rest of mankind. You are creating an intellectual dilemma which leads nowhere, or worse, to destruction. You are creating confusion which engulfs Amos Oz on the hills of Judea, Anthony Lewis in Boston, Irving Howe in New York and Arthur Hertzberg in New Jersey. These poor souls are suspended in an intellectual and identity limbo. By the world's consent and their own admission they are Jews. As such, are they ethically superior by special covenant, different from the rest of civilized mankind? Are Jews members of a nation? Is it linked to a land? What is permitted in defending one's land? And, if the land is lost-- what then? Or don't Jews really need a land since in their dispersion, Jews suffering and facing frequent destruction are an "example" to mankind, in not compromising their unique superior ethics?

We have gone through this confusion for the last two centuries, since the early emancipation and emergence from the ghetto. Finally the world gave their recognition to our "superior" ethics by confronting us with the extermination of our people!

Out of and despite all intellectual contortions there emerged a new Israel. To some it is not beautiful. To frightened souls it is so threatening and abhorrent that they wish it would rather not be there.

But all this is abstract "pilpul."

Above all, let's admit to reality: Israel and Israelis are like all other people. They make mistakes--sometimes very bad ones like the Lavon (Ben Gurion) affair; the Yadlin/Yom Kippur affair of 1973. Some mistakes cost hundreds of Israeli lives. Others damaged Israel's image. I'm sure you don't want to confuse the congregation with all these events, and others....acts committed, precipitated and carried out by the same "beautiful" ideologues, who today flagellate themselves, atoning for Israel's "sins" in the center of Tel Aviv or on the Op-Ed pages of the beautiful *New York Times*, *Ha-aretz* and Labor's *Jerusalem Post*.

It doesn't really matter. The Jewish galut is ending. This century saw a terrible purging of the body and soul of Israel. Out of it arose the Hebrew Renaissance. It is neither "imperialist" nor "an aberration." It is a painful, excruciating process. It will continue for decades and longer. But it is the one positive event in the last two thousand years of Jewish history.

The renascent nation is emerging. It has its roots in the ancient soil and rich traditions with which our history is amply endowed. This nation lives in a State that is part of the real world, but in an unusually tragic, cruel part-- the Middle East. The nation and the State, which has some loyal non-Jewish citizens, intends to survive. To do so, it has and will and must in the future have to use all means available to it including force. It is as simple as that.

If Jews in the Diaspora disagree with the methods and ways used by the State, they can express their opposition and frustration. However, one thing those of us who believe in the philosophy of survival above all and normalized existence (unchosen) should expect from others is an equal chance to be heard. We know that we cannot expect it from *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post* or the TV networks. But, since I believe a Rabbi's duty is to expose them to all aspects of an issue, I do hope you'll find a way to circulate this message among the members of your congregation.

Sincerely,

Yitzhak Ben-Ami

P.S. My family went to Palestine 100 years ago to escape destruction. They went to Palestine to create a safe, dignified haven for themselves and their descendents. The family, hundreds of them, is well, including offspring who belong to the Peace Now movement. All of them are there because their ancestors had enough of the physical hell of the Pale of Settlement and chose life, which is today the State of Eretz Israel.

Israel's Peace Disease

Daniel Greenfield

For the last twenty years Israel has been swept into an obsession with few parallels except to the Dutch Tulip economy. Except instead of tulips, its commodity of choice is an even more insubstantial thing, the faint promise of peace.

Peace fever is the disease consuming Israel as surely as the Black Death took Europe. If the Dutch traded fortunes for flowers, the Israelis have traded away most of their territory for worthless pieces of paper that last about as long as tulips do. Mostly, like Madoff's investments, after they wither and die it turns out that they were never worth anything to begin with.

Take the Camp David Accords, greeted with insane romantic fervor in Jerusalem and European capitals, but resented and despised by Egyptians because they were a reminder of how their army had failed to destroy Israel. It was a worthless accord that gave Egypt a vast amount of territory in exchange for maintaining a status quo that it had no choice but to maintain after losing multiple wars. With the fall of Mubarak, it was revealed that the Accords were never more than moonbeams and fairy dust. A puff of Arab Spring and they are gone.

Camp David was an illusion, but the Oslo Accords are a delusion. A tulip economy where Israel doles out fortunes in money, land and power in exchange for the promise of peace and an end to the violence...tomorrow, always tomorrow. The most devastating impact of the delusion isn't on the cemeteries where children lie side by side with soldiers, on the broken homes and synagogues of Gaza, or on the tightening circle of terror around Jerusalem. As with all delusions, its most devastating impact is on the mind.

The conflict has formed into two camps. The Muslims are pro-Palestine. The Jews are pro-Peace, which means they are both pro-Palestine and pro-Israel. They are for Israel and for the terrorists trying to destroy Israel. What does being pro-Peace actually mean? It means believing above all else that peace is possible and that it will come riding in on a white donkey in our time, if we just want it badly enough.

The last twenty years have been hard on the illusion of peace. As the violence goes on year after year, it has become necessary to assign blame somewhere. There are the Dershowitzes who say that Israel wants peace, but that it lacks an amenable peace partner. There are the Friedmans who say that

both sides lack leaders who want peace. Then there are the Beinarts who blame Israel for not seizing the opportunity to make peace.

Only one of those positions is logically supportable within the context of the peace delusion. If Israel lacks a peace partner, then why not abandon the whole peace process, reclaim the territory, expel the terrorists and restore order? If both Israel and the Palestinian Authority are hopeless, then what is there to negotiate when neither party wants peace? Blaming Israel is the only internally consistent position for a peace advocate because it avoids coming to grips with the futility of negotiating with terrorists.

The only way to sustain the peace delusion is by blaming Israel. And that very act concedes the hopelessness of the Palestinian Authority and the farce of negotiating with it. Why blame Israel? Because Israel is democratic, it has a vibrant opposition, it is peace-loving, it is capable of change. Israel is everything that the people it is trying to make peace with aren't.

Blaming the terrorists opens up a hopeless catalog of violence, corruption, incitement and madness. There is no way to catalog all that and still honestly go on believing that peace is possible. To browse MEMRI or PalWatch is to confront the tragedy of life and let the illusions and delusions die as all folly does when exposed to the light. The only way to keep the lie of peace alive is by blaming Israel.

The peace disease infects its victims with self-hatred as the only way to keep the pathogen alive. And the disease has no end. There was a time when Arafat was the guest of honor among peaceniks; now it's Hamas. Peter Beinart is busy explaining that Hamas really isn't that bad once you get to know them. Forget the genocidal Hamas charter, the wunderkind of the anti-Israel peace camp says, just pay attention to a few selected excerpts from their interviews with the foreign press.

And why not? It's what the peace camp did with Arafat and that worked out great. Why not do it with Hamas? What's the worst that could happen?

The internal logic of the disease is inescapably consistent. We had to believe in Arafat in order to believe in peace. Now that our peace partners have expressed a preference for Hamas over Fatah, we have to believe in Hamas, in order to believe in peace. To believe in peace we have to believe in a peace partner to have peace. We have to believe that there is hope for peace with every terrorist, that the lack of peace is our fault—not theirs.

The one thing that sufferers of the peace disease have to believe above all else in order to remain consistent is that Israel is at fault. Any deviation from that is an inconsistency. That inconsistency is why the pro-Peace, pro-Israel side can always win on the facts, while still losing the debate. They can lay out their case against Fatah and Hamas in all its glorious detail, the incontestable facts, the quotes and the documentation, and then they finish with an absurdity that unmakes their position. Israel still wants peace. Yet, if half of what they say is true, then who is there to have peace with?

The other side is not bogged down by such contradictions. Their consistent narrative is that Israel has repeatedly avoided sincerely making peace. Whatever Israel has done, does or will do is not enough. It can never be enough, because if it were enough, there would be peace. And there is nothing that the terrorist populations can do that is too horrifying, too repugnant or too great a breach of faith. If they trade in Fatah for Hamas, then the Beinarts will dutifully pop up to introduce us to the newly peaceful Hamas and the same old intractable Israel.

Why then should the Palestinian Arabs make peace with the Jewish ogre and its checkpoints and walls, its bomb-sniffing dogs, law of return and settlements? They shouldn't is the implication. The terrorists have every right not to want peace with us; it is we who must prove our good faith and our humanity. It is we who must strive to prove ourselves worthy of even sitting across a negotiating table with them.

Sick? Demented? Twisted? All of the above, but also completely logical. If you are going to be delusional, then it is best to be consistently delusional. Why be neurotic, when you can be flat out insane? Why settle for a second rate phobia when you can go for full on schizophrenia? Hope and faith

often dance close to the level of madness. Sustaining misdirected hope in the face of reality requires a great deal of faith or delusion.

Delusional does not mean stupid. Highly intelligent people are more likely to be deluded because they have a greater capacity for imagining and then rationalizing the delusion. A stupid person would assume that being shot at marks the end of peace negotiations. It takes a highly intelligent person to rationalize the shots as not an attack on him, but on the negotiations, which are the only way to stop the cycle of violence.

Some financial observers have hypothesized that the problem with our economy is that it is run by highly intelligent people. They may have a point. Stupid people can lose money, but they can't create imaginary money. And they are always waiting for the police to show up at their door with a warrant. Highly intelligent people though can create entire tiers of imaginary value and trade them back and forth in a glorious tulip economy, which everyone believes in, until unaccountably the whole thing evaporates because it was never there.

Israel's peace economy is the work of highly intelligent people trading real world items for an imaginary currency that they have turned into their national existence. Their burning conviction is that the only reason the imaginary currency has not realized its full value is because they have greedily not given up enough real world items to make the imaginary currency appreciate in value.

It's not a mental illness unique to Israel or to Jews. It is how cons work. Once you've been conned, you either wise up and move on, or you protect your sunk cost, your self-esteem and your credibility by throwing in more good money after bad. The only way to keep justifying this destructive behavior is by believing that the con artists are legitimate, that there is a system, and that you just need to put in more money to get back ten times what you put in.



I want peace. I also want to cure all diseases, and universal happiness and immortality for all. The difference between me and virtually every Jewish communal leader is that I know that I can't have those things because they don't exist. And if they did, I couldn't get them by giving money and land to a bunch of grubby socialist and Islamist militias.

In a time of war, modern people base their goodness on wanting peace, because doing so allows them to believe that they are good people, not bloodthirsty monsters cavorting on a throne of skulls. And to go on believing that, they cannot refuse any offer of peace; otherwise, they would be choosing war over peace. Then they would be bloodthirsty monsters resting their feet on a giant pile of corpses. Instead they show themselves to be idiots with no sales resistance and no common sense.

If a war is worth fighting, then it is worth fighting until the conditions that make that war necessary no longer exist. The minimal condition of any war is the willingness of the other side to stop fighting. If this condition is not met, then nothing else matters. Not peace doves or postmodern neurosis. It is not a matter of opinion at that stage, but a matter of fact, that the war will go on. It will go on regardless of what you do because you are not in control of the conflict.

To believe that you will have something because it is an absolute good and that to strive for it is so moral that the failure to do so is immoral regardless of its feasibility, is magical thinking. It is every bit as delusional as waiting for a magic fish to swim up and grant you three wishes. And once you base your identity on a commitment to an absolute good that cannot be achieved except through your own destruction, then you have committed suicide.

That is Israel's peace disease in a nutshell. It is not unique to Israel. It can be found in America and Europe. It can be found anywhere modern enlightened people fail to come to grips with the necessity of violence in the affairs of men and escape into illusion and delusion instead. It is a fatal disease. It does not kill quickly or cleanly, it is an agonizing fevered death filled with hallucinations,

peace doves circling the ceiling, amputation after amputation, bloody limbs piled on the altar of peace that burns and burns until everything is consumed and only the ashes remain.

Daniel Greenfield blogs at sultanknish.blogspot.com.

Our Homeland

Speech delivered by Gershon Mesika to the meeting of the EU Council in Brussels May 12 2012

Heads of the European Parliament's Committee on Foreign Affairs, Members of Parliament from European countries, distinguished guests,

The prophets of Israel predicted that before the Messiah comes there will be a time of confusion, when good is turned into evil and evil is turned into good.

We see this clearly today.

The Shomron, or Samaria, which I am honored to represent in this distinguished place, the European Parliament, is a region that is in the center of international attention, since it is a sizable part of the territory that is in dispute between the Jewish nation and its neighbors in the Middle East.



But this area, which for many in the world is nothing but "disputed land," is a homeland for us, the place that characterizes and determines our national and religious identity, the scene of the great events described in the Book of Books, the Bible.

The Middle Eastern confrontation and the Islamic terror campaign against the citizens of Israel are attempts by reactionary forces to oppose the historic process of the Return to Zion: our return to our historic homeland after nearly 2,000 years, during which we were scattered all over the world – weak, humiliated, trampled, rejected, but strong in our spirit and faith.

During all those years, we did not cease for a moment to remain faithful to our homeland and to maintain a living, continuous, day-to-day connection with it. This bond was expressed in prayers and in the most important religious ceremonies, thanks to which it was only natural for us to realize the dream when opportunity came.

The connection also manifested itself in the continuous existence of Jewish settlement on the Land throughout the long years of exile. Jews always lived in the Land of Israel, throughout the years of Roman, Persian, Greek, Christian and Muslim occupation.

And indeed, even after 2,000 years of exile, the nations of the world recognized the Jewish people's right to its homeland. In the course of the First World War and immediately after it, the victorious powers made a series of decisions that culminated in the historic decision in 1922 by the League of Nations, to establish a national home for the Jewish people in the Land of Israel.

It is interesting and important to look at the words used in the mandate that was given to Britain to implement this project.

"Whereas recognition has thereby been given to the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine, and to the grounds for reconstituting their National Home in that country..."

The justification that the League of Nations gave as the grounds for establishing the Jewish national home in the Land of Israel was the historical connection between the nation and the Land. What caused this? It was the power of the Bible and the Jewish insistence on maintaining the connection to the Land of Israel.

In 1945, with the establishment of the United Nations after World War II, the organization's founding charter included the recognition of the Jewish people's legal rights to the Land of Israel as eternal ones that cannot be revoked without the consent of the Jewish people.

Article 80, known as the "Land of Israel article," determines that "nothing in the Charter shall be construed . . . to alter in any manner the rights whatsoever of any states or peoples or the terms of existing international instruments." In other words, the continued legal rights of the Jewish people to the Land of Israel are anchored in the binding UN Charter.

These include the rights of the Jewish people to Judea and Samaria, which the UN has no right to take away from it.

We hear the word "occupation" repeatedly. From whom, exactly, did the state of Israel take the land in order to occupy it?

After the establishment of the state of Israel, the Kingdom of Jordan conquered the area of Judea and Samaria. Except Britain and Pakistan, no one in the world recognized Jordanian ownership of these territories. This was an illegal occupation of the area that the occupying power called "the West Bank of the Jordan."

This occupied territory served for years as a base for launching terror attacks, and for repeated firing on and shelling of Jewish population centers on the coastal plain, which is completely controlled by the Samaria mountains.

In 1967, the surrounding countries again tried to annihilate us. To realize what danger we were facing, one needs only to look through the newspapers from that time to see the threats of murder and destruction, the sickening cries – "We will throw the Jews into the sea," "The men are for the sea and the women are for us" – and the Nazi caricatures, this time with Arabic captions.

But this time we won a decisive victory and took back our heartland.

Distinguished guests,

The three large religions – Judaism, Christianity and Islam, believe in the Bible. One of its central themes is the promise of the Land of Israel to the Jewish people and their commandment to settle in it. No other nation in the world has a deed of ownership over its land as powerful as the one the Jews possess for their land – the Land of Israel.

The Nation of Israel implements, in the very establishment of the state of Israel, and especially in the acts of settlement and construction throughout Israel, the Divine promise and commandment, and the leaders of the world must stand beside the Nation of Israel and assist it in this.

Now that we have dealt with the central matter, our natural right to our homeland, let us devote a few words to security.

All of the western Land of Israel, including Judea and Samaria or the Shomron, is a tiny strip of land. A glance at the map of the Middle East shows an Arab Muslim ocean that starts next to the Atlantic Ocean in the west and ends on the border with India. Inside this territory, Israel is so small that on maps, its name is usually written in the Mediterranean Sea.

Israel is a small David facing a large and menacing Goliath who threatens it with destruction every single day, and means it, and prepares for it.

Israeli control of the mountains prevents this. Handing over this territory to the enemy means suicide.

The state of Israel, without the Shomron, is completely indefensible. Without Judea and Samaria, Israel is left with a narrow strip just 15 kilometers wide, in which most of the centers of population, commerce, finance and transportation are concentrated in the Tel Aviv area and controlled from above by the Shomron Mountains.

Israel has withdrawn from Gaza, and southern Israel is now under ceaseless bombardment. Handing over Judea and Samaria will create a similar and even worse situation in central Israel.

Those in Europe pressing for the establishment of a Palestinian state are actually advocating cutting out the heart of the Land, and creating an existential danger to the state of Israel.

If we go, terror will replace us.

Beside us in the Land of Israel live Arabs. In the Middle East, it has been proven that an Arab has no problem living under Jewish rule, but an opposite situation in which an Israeli populace will live in peace under Arab rule is impossible, of course. The reasons are clear to all thinking people.

This is also the sad fate of Christians, who are gradually disappearing all over the Middle East because of pressure from radical Muslims, while their numbers grow under Israeli rule.

But like any country, Israel, too, has small extremist margins, tiny ultra-leftist organizations that have no real weight within Israel's population. These organizations act to undermine our state's legitimacy and attempt with all their might to incite the world against us with false accusations.

Unfortunately, these people receive large sums of money in support from European nations and from various institutions within the European Union.

In these times, as we all face a common terrorist enemy and attempts by extremist Muslims to achieve domination, it is strange that European governments see fit to pour funds into such radical hate organizations, which failed to gain influence democratically because of their small size and general insignificance.

It is odd that at a time in which some European countries are in a state of near collapse, and their stronger sisters have to dip deep into their pockets to save them, certain elements in Europe continue to spend billions of euro on this anti-Israel activity. There is no logical explanation for this behavior.

In my opinion, this is the immediate and practical conclusion we all need to reach in this honorable conference: take robust action to cut off the flow of funds to subversive groups within Israel, as well as within the Palestinian Authority. If these groups succeed in assisting our common enemies, Europe and the free world will be the next victims.

Our role is to hold on to our very existence. Israel is a forward outpost, both culturally and physically, of the free world, in the heart of an extremist Islamic ocean that is getting more and more radical and is threatening to flood Europe. The European interest is to strengthen this outpost as much as possible.

The Nazi propaganda minister, Josef Goebbels, used to say in his ugly and bestial manner, that if the Jews had a state they would sell it for money.



I, Gershon Mesika, son of Yosef and Gita, whose two older brothers were murdered by the damned Nazis in the Jado Concentration Camp in Libya, stand before you and hereby declare, for the world to hear, that the Jewish people now possess our own state, and not only are we not selling it – we are redeeming it again and again with our blood, and paying for the right to maintain it, safeguard it and settle in it.

I will conclude with the immortal words of King David in the Book of Psalms: “May G-d give courage to His nation; may G-d bless His nation with peace.” If we stand up for our rights with ferocity and strength, we will reach peace, too, by the grace of G-d. Thank you very much.

Gershon Mesika is head of the Shomron (Samaria) Regional Council. This is a slightly edited version of his speech which was delivered in Hebrew and translated simultaneously into the languages of the listeners. The English translation is by Arutz Sheva's Gil Ronen. The speech was well-received, illustrating how a forthright defense of Israel's rights by someone of strength and character will obtain more respect than the groveling characteristic of so many Israeli spokesmen.

Herod--The Man Who Had to be King by Yehuda Shulewitz

(Completed and co-edited by Malka Hillel Shulewitz, with Batsheva Pomeranz).

Reviewed by Dr. Mordechai Nisan, Hebrew University.

I remember seeing Yehuda Shulewitz frequently in the library at the Hebrew University on Mount Scopus. We would exchange greetings, and he would then plunge into his reading. I didn't know then that he was working on a labor of love: a book about Herod. The story of Herod and the era associated with him is cut from the historical cloth of three primary dates: in 167 BCE the Hasmoneans [Maccabees] fought their way to Jewish independence from Greek Hellenic rule, and the Jewish state arose again; in 63 BCE the Roman Empire quashed Jewish independence; in 47 BCE Herod, of Idumean and Nabatean parentage, became the governor of the Galilee and then King of Judea in 37 BCE until his death in the year 4.

Herod, as Yehuda's book grippingly describes, had to be king. He was driven by a passion for power and used any and all methods he deemed necessary. These included murdering his own sons, causing the death of his wife, killing rabbis of the Sanhedrin, and slaughtering Jews in order to rule Judea even under Roman authority. His regime was based on terror and cruelty, intrigue and plunder, even as it adorned the country with the rudiments of Greek culture and Roman construction. He built, or rather enlarged the Temple in Jerusalem, the port of Caesarea, roads and theatres, gymnasia and fortresses. One of them, Herodion, where he is buried, still bears his name.

Shulewitz has written a historical novel about a dazzling and vicious personality. We do not know if the conventional historical record of Herod and his times is accurate: there are questions concerning the famous work *The Wars of the Jews* by Josephus Flavius (Yosef ben Matityahu). Writers of yore doctored their manuscripts; and Josephus Flavius was heavily indebted to the Romans, actually crossing the line from being a patriotic Jew to being a Roman cultural agent. This new fictional approach attempts to plumb the depths of Herod's soul, its intense and fanatical ambitions. The truth of imagination reaches beyond the boundaries of mere chronicle, and Shulewitz's approach may remind us of Carlyle's dictum that "history is the essence of innumerable biographies."

Yehuda generally wrote about the things he loved (and Herod, of course, was not among these). He was devoted to Eretz-Israel, Judaism, the Jewish people. His delicate and detailed descriptions of the land and its seasons and scenery reverberate in the chronological development of Herod's life. We find ourselves in Emmaus [between Jerusalem and Tel Aviv], at Jericho in the Jordan Valley, and on the Temple Mount. Yehuda enlivens history and, while guarding against anachronism, views it in the light of contemporary life. His book bears the stamp of authenticity and humanity. We observe Mariamne, Herod's wife, and Queen Cleopatra his adversary, displaying the temper and vigor of women struggling to fulfill themselves and their goals. It is often a painful picture, but one riveted with life-size people and their agonies.

The book also has, especially for those of us who had the privilege of knowing its late author, an autobiographical dimension. Yehuda was an unabashed lover of Israel, the land and its people, the splendor of Torah, its law and homiletics. All resonate in this book. Yehuda, in stark contrast to Herod himself, was a man who radiated humility, serenity, and goodness. His historical novel is a genuine and lasting contribution to the literature and history of the Jewish people and the Land of Israel.

This book is available on Amazon, at Steimatsky stores in Israel and in Judaica bookstores in the U.S. Mordechai Nisan teaches Middle East Studies at Hebrew University.

Muslim Voters Change Europe

Soeren Kern

An analysis of the voting patterns that barrelled François Hollande to victory on May 6 as the first Socialist president of France since 1995 shows that this overthrow was due in large measure to Muslims, who voted for him in overwhelming numbers.



The French vote marks the first time that Muslims have determined the outcome of a presidential election in a major western European country; it is a preview of things to come.

As the politically active Muslim population in France continues to swell, and as most Muslims vote for Socialist and leftwing parties, conservative parties will find it increasingly difficult to win future elections in France.

According to a survey of 10,000 French voters conducted by the polling firm OpinionWay for the Paris-based newspaper *Le Figaro*, an extraordinary 93% of French Muslims voted for Hollande on May 6. By contrast, the poll shows that only 7% of French Muslims voted for the incumbent, Nicolas Sarkozy. An estimated 2 million Muslims participated in the 2012 election, meaning that roughly 1.7 million Muslim votes went to Hollande rather than to Sarkozy. In the election as a whole, however, Hollande won over Sarkozy by only 1.1 million votes. This figure implies that Muslims cast the deciding votes that thrust Hollande into the Élysée Palace.

France, home to between five and six million Muslims, already has the largest Muslim population in the European Union, and those numbers are expected to increase exponentially in coming years. According to conservative estimates, the Muslim population is projected to exceed 10% of the overall French population within the next decade-and-a-half.

During the campaign, Hollande offered an amnesty to all of the estimated 400,000 illegal Muslim immigrants currently in France. He also pledged to change French electoral laws so that Muslim residents without French citizenship would be allowed to vote in municipal elections as of 2014. These measures, if implemented, would enable the Socialist Party to tighten its grip on political power, both at the regional and national levels.

Muslims in France -- and across Europe as a whole -- tend to support the Socialists for a variety of demographic, socio-economic and ideological reasons.

Most Muslims in Europe live in lower-income households and experience higher levels of unemployment. As a result, Socialists and Muslims are locked into a politically advantageous power-dependence relationship, between the givers of social welfare benefits and the givers of votes. Not surprisingly, Socialists favor increased Muslim immigration, which in turn produces more voters for Socialist parties.

In the ideological sphere, Socialists and Muslims generally share a mutual antipathy for traditional Judeo-Christian values. Although many Muslims oppose the secular agenda of the Socialists, most Muslims wholeheartedly support Socialist multicultural dogma, which they are leveraging to promote the Islamization of Europe.

In foreign policymaking, Socialists and Muslims share a mutual disdain for the United States and Israel. Leftwing parties across Europe have turned anti-Zionism into a politically correct form of anti-Semitism. The increasingly hysterical anti-Israel rhetoric emanating from Socialist circles has contributed to a spike in anti-Semitic hate crimes across the continent; many of these crimes against Jews are being perpetrated by Muslims.

Although Hollande has not articulated his views on Israel--he has said he wants to visit Israel and the Palestinian territories this summer--many observers fear that Hollande will surround himself with a

coterie of leftwing advisors who will push him to distance France from the pro-Jewish, pro-Israel course established by Sarkozy.

Hollande has also said he is opposed to Israeli or American military action against Iranian nuclear facilities and many analysts believe the new French government will seek to weaken international sanctions against Iran.

The political changes in France have many Jews concerned about their future. On the day that French voters elected Hollande as their new president, more than 5,000 French Jews participated in an Aliyah (immigration of Jews to Israel) fair in Paris. The annual event, organized and run by the Jewish Agency, usually attracts about 2,000 visitors.

To be sure, France is not the only country in which Muslims are changing the political dynamic. In Denmark, Socialist Prime Minister Helle Thorning-Schmidt won the parliamentary election in September 2011 by a margin of just 8,500 votes. According to an opinion survey, 89.1% of Muslims said they would vote for Socialist or leftwing parties. There are an estimated 200,000 Muslims in Denmark, 100,000 of whom are eligible to vote.

In Britain, a new research report entitled, "Degrees of Separation: Ethnic minority voters and the Conservative Party," shows that 47% of Muslims say they have affinity for the Labour Party, while only 5% say they identify with the Conservatives. During the 2010 elections, Muslim voters were the deciding factor in 82 constituencies.



Lutfur Rahman

In the London Borough of Tower Hamlets, Muslim voters elected the Bangladeshi-born Lutfur Rahman as their mayor. He is linked to the Islamic Forum of Europe (IFE), an Islamist group dedicated to changing the "very infrastructure of society, its institutions, its culture, its political order and its creed ... from ignorance to Islam." Since taking office, Rahman has stocked the public libraries in Tower Hamlets with books and DVDs containing the extremist sermons of banned Islamist preachers.



Jim Fitzpatrick

Also in Britain, Labour Party MP Jim Fitzpatrick recently warned that his party has been infiltrated by radical Muslims who want to create an "Islamic social and political order" there. Muslims, he said, are "placing people within the political parties, recruiting members to those political parties, trying to get individuals selected and elected so they can exercise political influence and power, whether it's at local government level or national level." He added: "They are completely at odds with Labour's program, with our support for secularism."

In Belgium, Muslims now make up one-quarter of the population of Brussels. In real terms, the number of Muslims in Brussels--where half of all Muslims in Belgium currently live--has reached 300,000, meaning that the self-styled "Capital of Europe" is now the most Islamic city in Europe. In practical terms, Islam mobilizes more people in Brussels than does the Roman Catholic Church, and demographers expect that Muslims will comprise the majority of the population of Brussels by 2030. In Belgium as a whole, new research from the Itinera Institute forecasts that by 2060, 60% of the Belgian population will be foreign born, which will have clear implications for Belgian politics.

In Norway, new statistics show that immigrants will make up almost half of Oslo's population by 2040. The study, the first ever projection of immigration trends to be published in Norway, shows that the largest cities will also see the biggest upsurge in immigrant numbers. In the country as a whole, the immigrant population is expected to jump from 12% to 24%, or from 600,000 people today to 1.5 million in 2040.

In Spain, the Socialist Party recently attempted to pass a law in parliament that would have enabled more than 500,000 Moroccans residing in Spain to vote in Spanish municipal elections. If enacted, the measure would have ensured permanent Socialist control over all Spanish towns and cities

with significant Muslim minorities. The measure was derailed in November 2011, when, in the general election, the Socialists were ousted from power.

Soeren Kern is Senior Fellow for European Politics at the Madrid-based Grupo de Estudios Estratégicos / Strategic Studies Group. This appeared on May 17 on gatestoneinstitute.org

AFSI Recommends: Against The Grain: A Historian's Journey (Quid Pro Books)

Jerold S. Auerbach

Jerold S. Auerbach is Professor Emeritus of History at Wellesley College. He taught courses on modern American History, freedom of speech, American Jewish History and the History of Israel. He has written books on issues as disparate as the American legal profession (*Unequal Justice* 1976), on the Pueblo Indians (*Explorers in Eden: Pueblo Indians and the Promised Land* 2006) on Israel's biblical city Hebron (*Hebron Jews: Memory and Conflict in the Land of Israel* 2009), the history of the Altalena (*Brothers at War-Israel and the Tragedy of the Altalena* 2011).

His latest book- *Against the Grain: A Historian's Journey* is a collection of his essays on law and society; Israel's historic legitimacy; Americans and Israel and Americans in Israel; rewriting of history and plagiarism; the election of Menachem Begin and the antagonistic response from American Jewish journalists; President Woodrow Wilson's dilemma as war with Germany became inevitable; the American southwest and the Zuni Indians.

In Auerbach's words: "Regardless of the subject--law, modern American History, Pueblo Indians, American Judaism, Israel--deference to the conventional wisdom has never been my style. I always enjoyed the stimulation of writing against the grain: discovering hidden meanings, challenging historical and political pieties, and exposing the self-serving ideology that often lurked beneath self-evident truths."

Israel's vicious critics poison the minds of students throughout academia. Jerold S. Auerbach writes against this grain. One can only admire his erudition and strength of mind and envy the students who were privileged to learn from him.

Every single article is a gem.

Read it!

A great Bar Mitzvah Present:

Lone Wolf: A Two-Volume Biography of Vladimir (Ze'ev) Jabotinsky
by Shmuel Katz--\$50.00

Order from:
Americans For A Safe Israel
1751 Second Ave (at 91st Street)
New York, N.Y. 10128

Outpost

Editor: Rael Jean Isaac

Editorial Board: Ruth King, Rita Kramer

Outpost is distributed free to Members
of Americans For a Safe Israel

Annual membership: \$50.

Americans For a Safe Israel

1751 Second Ave. (at 91st Street)

New York, NY 10128

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

Email: afsi@rcn.com