
OUTPOST

July 2013—Issue #267

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

43rd Year of Publication

Table of Contents		
In Memoriam - Howard Grief (1940-2013)	William Mehlman	Page 2
From The Editor	Rael Jean Isaac	Page 3
Kerry And The Peace Idiots Ride Again	Daniel Greenfield	Page 5
Beware of Washington	David Isaac	Page 8
Changing Times	Rita Kramer	Page 9
The Elusive Goal	Noa Bursie	Page 11
France's Blood Libel Against Israel	Guy Milliere	Page 14
An Interview With Lela Gilbert	Ruth King	Page 16

In Memoriam - Howard Grief (1940-2013)

William Mehlman

Howard Grief did not suffer fools gladly, most notably those, including jurists, who in the face of documented historical evidence of Israel's sovereignty over Judea, Samaria and the Golan, as agent and assignee of the Jewish People, persist in referring to those areas as "disputed," "unallocated" and, most offensively, "occupied" territories. Irrespective of the direction of the prevailing political winds, Howard might have believed that the legal questions had been put to rest with the publication in 2008 of his *The Legal Foundation and Borders of Israel under International Law*, the 660-page product of more than two decades of ground-breaking research that should have shattered every myth, every lie, every distortion and misrepresentation of fact employed over the 65 years of Israel's reestablishment to negate the sovereign right of the Jewish People to their National Home.

Alas, five years after the book's publication and two months since Grief's tragic, untimely passing, the myths, the lies, the distortions show no sign of loosening their grip on global consciousness. If he oversold himself on the compelling power of truth in an age in which "narratives" have all but supplanted historical fact, Grief could not have envisioned the solid wall of indifference with which *The Legal Foundation* was greeted by the media. Arguably the most important book published in Israel since the 1967 war garnered not one review from a Leftist-dominated Israeli press. A review of the book by this writer did appear in *Outpost* and with the efforts of Americans For A Safe Israel, in several American-Jewish weeklies.

Howard Grief did not cast himself as the instrument for setting Israel's legal and historical record straight when he gave up a successful 23-year law practice in Montreal to make aliya in 1989. As he points out in the introduction to his book, it was thrust upon him with the amazing discovery that 41 years after the state was declared, he could find "no single book that contained an organized and systematic presentation of Israel's rights to the Land of Israel – not just the area included in the State of Israel, but to all of the land east and west of the Jordan..." Did any such "rights" exist? He was determined to find out. Two events triggered his decision to go public with what he was discovering: A 93-page position paper on the key elements of Israel's founding that he put together in 1991 for presentation to the Carnegie Foundation in New York by Yuval Ne'eman, prelude to a speech to be given by Ne'eman, then Minister of Energy and Infrastructure in the Yitzhak Shamir government. Grief served as legal advisor to the ministry from 1991-93. The second event was Ne'eman's decision to do an article for the prestigious *Global Affairs* magazine citing Grief's research as the authority for his conclusions.

As a legal historian Grief at that point had already gone where no man had gone before. Beneath the accumulated debris of 70 years of history, he had unearthed the forgotten key, the rosetta stone that spelled out the Jewish People's sovereign right to the Land of Israel in all its historic dimensions. It was the April, 1920 San Remo Resolution of the five victorious World War I Allied powers – America, Britain, France, Italy and Japan. British Foreign Minister Lord George Curzon, no defender of Jewish aspirations in Palestine, grudgingly called it the "Jewish Magna Carta." Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis, America's most passionate Zionist, remarked that the boundaries of the future Jewish state had been set and that there was no need for additional discussion. Indeed, in transforming the 1917 Balfour Declaration into a binding legal document, making it the basis of Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations and further incorporating it into the Mandate for Palestine, obligating Britain to aid and encourage Jewish immigration and settlement to the National Jewish Home, the San Remo Resolution was the ticket to Jewish sovereignty, albeit one that a Palestinian Jewish population of 60,000 at the time was not yet in a position to exercise.

“Once international law in the form of the San Remo Resolution recognized that de jure sovereignty over all regions of historical Palestine and the Land of Israel had been vested in the Jewish People,” Grief observed, “neither the Supreme Council of the Allied Powers nor the Council of the League of Nations, nor its successor, the United Nations, could thereafter revoke or alter Jewish sovereignty by a new decision...If either of these bodies really had such a right in regard to Palestine and the Land of Israel, the sovereignty of every state in the world over its own territory would be put in jeopardy.”

In ratifying the 1924 “Anglo-American Convention on Palestine,” Grief submits, the United States “became a contracting party” to the League of Nations Mandate for Palestine assigned to Britain for administration, “a document not only devoid of any provision for an Arab state within Palestine, but one that specifically prohibited the partition of the land for any purpose other than the creation of a National Jewish home.” In fact, then President Calvin Coolidge was not plowing new American legal ground with his signature to that document. He was simply reinforcing a unanimous resolution of the 67th Congress three years earlier, signed by his predecessor, President Warren G. Harding, recognizing a future Jewish state in “the whole of Palestine.” President Barak Obama’s obsession with the creation of a bogus, irredentist “Palestinian Arab State” in Judea and Samaria is nothing less than a repudiation of the signatures of two American presidents and the unanimously expressed will of the U.S. Congress.

While Howard did not live to see the wide-scale embrace of his seminal contribution to Israeli history and international law or mercifully the post-mortem assault – thus far unavailing -- by an unforgiving Israeli Far-Left on his Wikipedia biography, he did live long enough to see *The Legal Foundation and Borders of Israel under International Law* beginning to gain traction. Wherever Israel’s history and legal rights to the Land of Israel are discussed and debated these days, this is the book most often cited. Howard was too ill to accept the speaking engagements beginning to pour in from activist groups in the U.S., Canada, Scandinavia and Israel, but he went to his final rest knowing he had not labored in vain.

William Mehlman represents AFSI in Israel.

From the Editor

From Bias to Blackout

Having long grown accustomed to media bias, we have moved to the next stage--media blackout. Rather than distort the news, the media now, whenever possible, simply ignores events that disturb its political beliefs and agenda. Writing on Arutz Sheva's website, *Israel National News*, Gil Ronen offers a striking example in the Israeli media's failure to report on growing Arab terrorism within pre-1967 Israel by homegrown, independently-acting Israeli Arabs. Ronen notes that it has been left to a single journalist, Emily Amrousi, writing in *Israel Hayom*, to document this troubling development.

To quote Amrousi: "News consumers, test yourselves. Have you heard about the terror attacks against Jews in Ramla? Only this week, about ten cars had their windshield smashed in: these were family that were taking a child to an afterschool activity or returning from the supermarket, and were pummeled with rocks....What about violent attacks by Bedouin marauders against the residents of Retamim in the Negev? A sample from the past few days: rock attacks on women and children; deliberate arson; an attack on a married couple with a steel bar; violent ambushes against farmers in their field; attempted terror attacks on the roads. In the Negev. And what about firebombs thrown at residents on Har Hatzofim, not far from Hebrew University?And the large scale desecration of graves at the Mount of Olives? And the nationalist arson at Armon Hanatziv forest?"

"And another surprise newsflash: a few days ago, charges were filed against two Israeli Arabs who tried to burn a Jewish family near Nahariya. They prepared a fire bomb, waited at the side of the road in the western Galilee, and threw the fire bomb at the car, which had turned toward Tal-El. Then they rolled a burning tire onto the road. All of the news media received this information from the Ministry of Justice. All of them chose to ignore it."

The same news blackouts occur in the United States. Colin Flaherty, on the World Net Daily website, has been virtually alone in writing of the rampaging mobs of blacks who have been terrorizing malls and county fairs and subways in this country.

As Amrousi observes, news blackouts make it impossible to discuss and deal with the phenomenon. Moreover, the blackouts contrast with the wildly disproportionate coverage of "favored" subjects. Amrousi notes that relatively benign acts like graffiti allegedly scrawled by Jews is treated by Israeli news media as if it were the Twin Towers bombing. And here, of course, the shooting of Trayvon Martin--which a jury found justified under the law-- is treated as the Second Coming of the Ku Klux Klan.

U.S. Intelligence Blackouts

Government also engages in blackouts--to the immense danger of the citizenry. The Department of Homeland Security has been forced to release its list of "keywords" that are used by its agents to monitor social networking sites. As Brigitte Gabriel says on her ACT for America website, what is amazing is what is *not* included. There's militia but not jihad. In fact, there is not a single "key word" that links specifically to radical Islam. So the privacy-intrusion is engineered in advance to be all but useless.



Brigitte Gabriel

There's more. As *Investor's Business Daily (IBD)* points out, while the White House assures us that its tracking of phone calls is to stop terrorists, since October 2011 it won't do surveillance of mosques, the jihad factories where homegrown terrorists are radicalized. (Under pressure from Islamist groups, they are off limits for the FBI without high level approval from a special oversight body at the Justice Department.) Before this the FBI had launched dozens of successful sting operations and disrupted dozens of plots inside mosques--80% of which, according to recent independent surveys, preach violent jihad or distribute violent literature.

Small wonder the Boston bombers proceeded unchecked. One of them made extremist outbursts during worship but because the mosque wasn't monitored, red flags did not go off inside the FBI. IBD reports the FBI didn't so much as canvass Boston mosques until four days after the April 15 attacks and did not check out the radical mosque where the Boston bombers worshipped. It didn't even contact mosque leaders for help in identifying the images of the bombers once they were captured on closed circuit TV cameras.

IBD warns: "What other five-alarm jihadists are counterterrorism officials missing right now, thanks to restrictions on monitoring the one area they should be monitoring?"

Moderation, Iranian-style

What goes by the name of "moderate" in Iran hardly warrants the term in a more civilized polity.

The Times of Israel reports that Iranian president-elect Hasan Rowhani is named in the 2006 indictment filed in the case of the 1994 attack on the Jewish community center in Buenos Aires carried out by Hezbollah that killed 85 people and wounded hundreds. According to the indictment he was a member of the committee headed by Ayatollah Khamenei that planned the bombing.

Bibi vs Bibi

It's an open secret that the U.S. has assured Mahmoud Abbas that the United States will be at one with him in treating the 1967 borders as the framework for negotiations.

Yet this is how Benjamin Netanyahu describes the upcoming negotiations: "I view the resumption of the diplomatic process at this time as a vital strategic interest of the State of Israel."

Although always weak-kneed in practice, there was a time when Netanyahu could at least think clearly. Here is Netanyahu (in *Haaretz*, Nov. 26, 1996) on Jewish rights in Judea and Samaria and the danger of withdrawal: "If the supposed foreignness of these areas is the product of the obvious and well-known fact that a large Arab population lives in Judea and Samaria, then what about the Galilee and much of the Negev? There, too, there is a large Arab population. The idea that we are strangers in those parts of the country which are settled mainly by Arabs inevitably leads to a gradual return to the partition agreement, and from there to an abandonment of our basic right to any part of the country. Those who dream of closing ourselves off in a gilded seaside fortress, in some kind of luxury suburb on the Tel Aviv shore, are dreaming an impossible dream. The dream is reminiscent of the illusions prevalent among the Christians in Lebanon, who gave up most of the country to others in the hope that they would be left with something. In the end, they were left with nothing."

Kerry And The Peace Idiots Ride Again

Daniel Greenfield

Few figures in American political life have been as consistently wrong as often as John Kerry. The former Senator bet on every Communist leader and Middle Eastern tyrant he could find only to watch the wheels of history roll over his mistakes. And now as Secretary of State, Kerry is at it again.

In between peddling a Syrian peace process that no one but him believes in, he took a break to peddle the even more discredited peace process between Israel and the terrorists.

In a speech to the American Jewish Committee, Kerry invoked the litany of failures, "Madrid to Oslo to Wye River and Camp David and Annapolis", but urged his audience not to pay attention to history and "give in to cynicism".

"Cynicism has never solved anything," he said. But then again neither has the Peace Process. And while cynicism isn't likely to usher in an era of peace or grow money on trees, it offers you the power to extract yourself from bad situations instead of taking refuge in more of the same wishful thinking that got you into them.

If you find yourself mailing your tenth check to that Nigerian prince, cynicism won't get you a 200 percent return, but it will keep you from losing more money.

"Why should any Israeli start giving in to that cynicism now?" Kerry asked. Perhaps because it's been twenty years. Or because thousands of Israelis have been killed and wounded. Or because there isn't a single piece of supporting evidence to show that the other side is interested in any kind of final peace agreement.

The only sure things that have come out of the Peace Process in two decades are terrorist attacks and increased demands by the terrorists. There has been no final status agreement for the simple reason that the terrorists can only get the best possible deal by never coming to an agreement.

The longer they hold out, the better the offers that the likes of John Forbes Kerry extract from Israel are. And the offers keep getting better so there is never any reason to actually make a deal.

Picture a desperate rug merchant dickering with a customer. The rug merchant always lowers his prices. The customer always lowers his bids. The deal can never happen until the price of the rug reaches zero or until the rug merchant decides that the price isn't worth selling at. And that is the thing

that men like Kerry will never allow Israel to do. Israel can never stop bargaining and the Palestinian Authority never has to stop bargaining until the entire rug, all of Israel, is on the table.



Since Israel can never make that offer and since its enemies will never accept less than the whole rug, the negotiations are doomed to a descending spiral in which the Jewish State's negotiators offer more and more in the hopes of settling the negotiations faster to avoid the even higher demands that they know they will face down the road, while the exact same calculation removes any incentive from the other side to settle because they know that the deals will be better down the road.

The only way out of the spiral is for Israel to walk away from the negotiations for good, accepting that the penalty for permanently abrogating the peace process will be less than the eventual penalty for perpetuating the peace process. And that is what Obama and Kerry hedge against by talking up the benefits of peace.

"The great enemy of the truth is very often not the lie, deliberate, contrived and dishonest, but the myth, persistent, persuasive and unrealistic," John F. Kennedy said. The mythology of the peace process is the enemy of the truth. Its "reassuring repetition of stale phrases" prevents what Kennedy called, "the difficult, but essential confrontation with reality."

Kerry keeps speaking of peace negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians. But which Palestinians would those be?

Nearly half the population of the Palestinian Authority lives under Hamas rule. Hamas is arguably the legal government of the entire Palestinian Authority, having actually won elections.

Meanwhile President Abbas, the man whom Kerry would like Israel to reach a final status agreement with, was last elected in 2005. He is approaching the eighth year of his four year term.

During his heavily hyped visit to Israel, Obama gave a speech in which he said, "The days when Israel could seek peace simply with a handful of autocratic leaders, those days are over. Peace will have to be made among peoples, not just governments."

But that's exactly what Kerry is peddling. A worthless deal with a bunch of autocrats.

If Obama really meant what he said, then he would have insisted that Abbas win a current election to show that he actually speaks for the residents of the West Bank and Gaza. It would also be a matter of basic practice for the entire question of Hamas and Gaza to be settled so that there is one unified Palestinian Authority to negotiate with, rather than two Palestinian states.

And yet that's not on the table here. Anyone who proposes that a man who claims to speak for the Palestinian people should have been elected by them to higher office in this decade would be accused of cynicism and lacking in hope and faith in the mythology of peace.

Obama's failure to insist on that means that he knows the negotiations are worthless.

The bigger Arab League peace plan that Kerry is proposing is equally worthless. Not only is it worthless in detail, but it's worthless because, as Obama said in his speech, it represents a handful of autocratic leaders.

The proposal came from the Saudi King who has never run for anything, except perhaps a dessert tray. The Arab League consists of monarchies, tyrannies and a few elected governments that took a severe beating during the Arab Spring and remain unstable even after elections. Aside from the absolutely terrible terms of the agreement, there is absolutely nothing to show that the offer represents any popular will or mandate in the Arab World.

In 2010, John Kerry met with the Emir of Qatar who told him that the best way to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict would be for Israel to give up the Golan Heights to Syria because then Assad could convince Hamas, Hezbollah and Iran to come to the negotiating table.

The full phrasing of the Wikileaks cable is worth quoting here if only because it should serve to disqualify John Kerry from ever being allowed to negotiate anything, including his next yacht buy.

“Senator Kerry told the Amir he knew Qatar could help the U.S. but asked how we deal with those who advocate violence. The Amir said the short answer is to work the Syrian track, which means pushing for Israel’s return of the Golan Heights to Syria. The Amir said return of the Golan is important not just to Syria but also to Hizballah and Iran.”

Kerry said that he had “great discussions” with Assad. The Emir told Kerry that Assad was committed to “big change”. Kerry agreed that Assad wants change and peace with Israel.

A year later, the Emir of Qatar was financing a Sunni war to overthrow Assad. Everything that he had told Kerry proved to be utterly worthless. There was no peace on the horizon. The Emir had only been using Kerry and Assad to weaken Israel, before using Hillary Clinton to weaken Assad. There was no peace here. Just the puppetry of diplomatic war.

Kerry learned no lessons from this. If there is anything that Kerry has learned a lesson from in all his years of being played by everyone from the Viet Cong to the Sandinistas to Assad, it’s impossible to tell.

At the AJC, Kerry talked up the “moderate” leadership of Abbas, who had declared that he was no different than Hamas. And he doubled up on the mythology of hope. “People have spent so much time lamenting what hasn’t worked in the past that I believe we’ve actually forgotten to focus on what the future could look like if we do keep faith,” he said.

But it’s actually the other way around. The creaky process has only dragged on this long because of all the people who insist on taking hope on faith, instead of basing their decisions on the solid ground of history. Who trade Patrick Henry’s lamp of experience for rose-colored glasses.

“Mythology distracts us everywhere,” John F. Kennedy said. “In government as in business, in politics as in economics, in foreign affairs as in domestic affairs.”



The mythology of the peace process is a giant distraction. It allows for the same worthless commodity to be sold and resold, again and again. And that commodity is hope. The Israelis have been compelled to trade territory and lives for hope. Now the trade is beginning all over again, this time with a peace plan put forward by a country that is behind much of the terrorism around the world.

Saudi Arabia and Qatar insist that they are American allies even while they fund terrorists who carry out attacks against America. In 2010, they were insisting that Syria could also be America and Israel’s best friend if only it had the strategic high ground of the Golan Heights. And that once it had the Heights, then it could bring Hamas, Hezbollah and Iran to join the party. Now they’re insisting that America has to destroy Assad and pressure Israel to give up half of Jerusalem to a terrorist organization and then there will be peace.

The substance of John Kerry’s speech was that he had learned absolutely nothing from the past and that everyone else should join him in not learning anything from the past. That optimistic ignorance is not a luxury that either America or Israel can afford.

At the conclusion of his address, Kerry invoked the oath of Israeli soldiers at Masada. But the very point of the oath is the responsibility of the Israeli soldier not to allow his country to be put into a position where it is so besieged that its only choice is between the depredations of the enemy and an honorable suicide. And Masada, the final last stand in a desert fortress, is exactly where Kerry and the Qatari and Saudi devils whispering in his ear are driving the Jewish State.

This first appeared on Greenfield's blog Sultanknish.blogspot on June 4.

Beware of Washington

David Isaac

It seems John Kerry's imitation of Henry Kissinger has borne fruit. His sixth trip to jump start 'peace talks' in as many months has triggered the desired response, with Arabs and Israelis agreeing to restart negotiations.

Unfortunately, getting Israel to the negotiating table is just a first step in squeezing Israel back to the 1949 Armistice Lines. Doubly unfortunate is that trying to reduce Israel to those lines is a long State Department tradition.

Which makes it all the more disturbing that Israel's government cheers on Kerry's endeavors. On July 14, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu sent PA Chairman Mahmoud Abbas Ramadan greetings, saying "I hope that American Secretary of State John Kerry's efforts have results."

Netanyahu went even further following Kerry's announcement. "I view the resumption of the diplomatic process at this time as a vital strategic interest of the State of Israel," he said. Shortly before the announcement Israel's soon-to-be-replaced U.S. Ambassador Michael Oren promised, "If [Abbas] decides to stay in the negotiations, he will find an Israeli government that's very committed to a solution."



Shmuel Katz

Shmuel Katz said presidents and secretaries of state come and go, "but the spirit of the makers of policy in the State Department has not changed. With increased subservience to Arab demands it has only become more intense, more urgent." Kerry demonstrates he has zero intention of breaking from that mold. He wears Arabist designs like an old suit.

Notwithstanding American posturing as an "honest broker," when it comes to Arab-Israeli negotiations it is two against one – America and the Arabs vs. Israel. Kissinger described diplomacy as the art of restraining power. In this case, it has always meant restraining Israel's power.

As Shmuel wrote in "Missing Mandate" (*The Jerusalem Post*, July 19, 1985): "The U.S. government has a view of its own, firmly held and untiringly pursued for years. It accepts implicitly the essential Arab premises and their demands. The origins of its policy are in the traditional hostility to Zionism in the State Department. ...

"It ignores the history of the Arab aggression against the State of Israel since its birth, and has cooperated in Arab efforts to ensure that they should not be deprived of the fruits of their aggression. The Rogers Plan of 1969, the Reagan Plan of 1982, and all the intervening plans and planlets often accompanied by words of sympathy for Israel and concern for her security, are all expressive of these dominant themes."

Thus, Israel can hardly claim ignorance of America's stance, as it has held it with bald consistency for decades. Yet, its leaders pretend America's efforts are for the good, while denying their own understanding of the situation.

Netanyahu is not the first to act this way. His behavior duplicates that of former Prime Minister Menachem Begin. As Shmuel writes of Begin in "Return to Square One" (*The Jerusalem Post*, April 16, 1982):

"He shut his mind to the knowledge — which he himself had so often disseminated — that surrender of territory, far from advancing peace, and weakening, as it must, the power of Israeli resistance, would only strengthen Arab belief and confidence that Israel could be overrun."

And so Israel eggs the U.S. on as John Kerry, its latest personification of U.S. policy, starts still another attempt at forcing an Israeli retreat. It is an amazing scene, like watching a home team crowd

rooting for the opposing side. What Shmuel wrote in 1978 (“The Vance Team Prepares the Landmines”) could have been written today:

“Are the members of the Israeli Government the only players in the drama now unfolding who are unaware of these realities? Are they really blind to the central purpose of the Americans? Have they not learned enough from the methods of the Americans in order to realize that when their representatives appear as mediators, they direct all their advice and all their coaxing towards the central purpose of their own, which is lethal for Israel but which they regard as their national interest — and that is why they devote so much time and energy in its pursuit?”

The truth of all this is so glaringly obvious that some would say, why bother stating it? The answer is that it isn’t obvious to Israel’s leadership and its public, not when Netanyahu, the supposedly right-wing prime minister of Israel, describes the resumption of talks as in Israel’s “strategic interest.” It doesn’t take much to lead a country astray and seduce it with words.

State the obvious – loudly and often. Falsehood is a balloon filled with hot air. Obvious is the pin.

David Isaac writes a blog on Shmuel Katz at shmuelkatz.com/wordpress/ and is currently working on a set of videos on the history of Zionism, free on the internet at zionism101.org.

Changing Times

Rita Kramer

History abounds in ironies. Glimpses into the past, into what was thought and said by those who were present as events were unfolding, sometimes explain, sometimes exasperate, and sometimes mystify. For those of us dismayed by how the government and people of Israel are depicted in much of the world today, there are illuminating and often poignant accounts to be found in the reporting of earlier times--even in the columns of *The New York Times*. One example is the coverage of the role of Jewish participants in World War One.

As the Great War began to make its deadly way through Europe and parts of the Middle East, it seemed the better part of valor for the international Zionist establishment to maintain a position of strict neutrality. There were Jews living in the countries of the Triple Entente Allies, originally composed of Great Britain, France and Russia, as well as in those of the Central Powers, Germany, the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the Ottoman Empire. Uncertain as to the outcome of the devastation being visited on all sides, the representatives of Jewish interests worldwide--including the Middle East--were reluctant to take sides in a conflict that could result in reprisals against Jews who had favored whichever turned out to be the losing side.

There were, however, Zionists who disagreed with the official position. One of them was Chaim Weizmann, whose career as a chemist had led to the invention of artificial acetone, a process which enabled the British to mass produce smokeless gunpowder. This contribution to Britain’s war effort led to a friendship between the charismatic Weizmann and the Foreign Secretary Arthur Balfour, as well as other members of the British government, and would result in 1917 in the historic Balfour Declaration offering British support for a Jewish homeland in Palestine. It was not only the persuasive diplomacy of Weizmann that led to the Balfour Declaration but the belief among members of the British establishment that American Jewish leaders exerted significant influence on U.S. policy-making and might well bring that influence to bear on encouraging America’s entrance into the war on the Allied side.

Another major player in the Zionist effort was Vladimir Jabotinsky, the journalist and soldier who convinced Weizmann, despite their very different personalities and approaches to political activity, that the time was ripe for the formation of a military arm of Zionism under the British to fight against the Turks in Palestine and thus pave the way for a return of the Jewish people to the land of their ancestors as well as providing the basis of a self-defense organization when that return was realized.

The idea of a specifically Jewish army group was anathema to members of the Anglo-Jewish establishment--such as the Rothschilds and Montagus--who had achieved a degree of assimilation socially, culturally, and in the higher reaches of politics and who were reluctant to see attention called to the Jews from Eastern Europe who had found refuge in England, particularly in the East End of London. These Yiddish-speaking garment workers and shopkeepers would comprise the greater part of the membership of such a force.

The diplomacy of Weizmann and the efforts of Jabotinsky and those who joined with them succeeded in convincing the Home Office and the War Office, despite strategic misgivings and anti-Semitism among a number of members of both departments, to approve the formation of a Jewish battalion to be attached to the Royal Fusiliers.

In August of 1917, the 38th Regiment of the Royal Fusiliers, consisting of British Jews primarily originally from Russia, was formed. It was followed in April 1918 by the 39th Battalion, primarily from the U.S. and Canada and later by additional battalions made up of volunteers from Palestine. Informally known as the Jewish Legion, the Jewish battalions fought under Field Marshall Edmund Allenby's Egyptian Expeditionary Force, and acquitted themselves well in battles in the Jordan Valley that resulted in defeating the Ottomans and liberating Palestine from Turkish rule.

What was to come is a long and complicated story which is still being played out, but readers of today's *New York Times* might find it interesting to see how some of these events almost a century ago were covered by reporters of the time and speculate on how differently they would be reported and described in that newspaper today.

**ZIONISTS PLAN BIG ARMY.
ASSERT JEWISH LEGION IN PALESTINE
IS ONLY NUCLEUS OF GREAT FORCE.**

Special to *The New York Times*.

Pittsburgh, June 25 [1918].--The Jewish Legion of 8,000 men now fighting with the British in Palestine is only the nucleus of a Jewish legion ten times as great, that is to become the national standing army of the coming Jewish Republic. This became known today at the meeting of the legion committee of the Zionist convention.

Dr. A. A. Newman, Chairman of the Central Zionist Committee of Philadelphia, declared also that every Jew who had enlisted in the legion from the United States pledged himself to remain in Palestine for the rest of his life.

Major Brooman-White, chief British recruiting officer in this country, told the committee that he had learned unofficially that more than 50,000 American Jews are now in Egypt on their way to join General Allenby's forces. Plans were devised whereby the enlistment of American Jews will be increased three-fold if this country should declare war against Turkey. The Chairman of the committee said that at the end of the year there will be 50,000 Jewish boys in training in this country to beat the Germans first and then proceed to Palestine to form the standing army of the country when it becomes a nation.

Included in the \$3,000,000 appropriation which the present convention will be asked to make, for this year's development in Palestine are the building of three great harbors, the restoration of half a dozen cities, the erection of a university on the Mount of Olives, and the purchase of thousands of acres

of land. Jews in other parts of the world will be asked to make up the remainder of the \$8,000,000 necessary for the work.

**CALL TO JEWISH LEGION
ZIONISTS HAVE ONLY A SHORT TIME TO
ENLIST FOR WAR IN PALESTINE**

Special to The New York Times

Pittsburgh, Penn., June 26 [1918].--"At the end of the ninety-day period established by the agreement between the United States and England, American Jews cannot enlist in the Jewish Legion of Honor for service with the British forces in Palestine," said Major Brooman White, British recruiting agent, in an address to the American Zionists today.

"The Jews do not want Palestine as a gift from England; they want to fight for Palestine, their ancient home," said Major White as he asked the delegates to pledge themselves to assist the British Recruiting Mission....

At the executive conference held here in connection with the convention Justice Louis D. Brandeis of the United States Supreme Court, Judge Julian W. Mack of Chicago, Professor David Amram of the University of Pennsylvania, and other noted Jewish scholars, statesmen, and jurist are planning the laws and political policy of the future Jewish republic....

The dreams of the Palestine Jews of the establishment of a United States of the Near East, based largely upon the principles of the United States of America, were explained by Ittamar Ben Avis, delegate to the convention from Palestine....

Dr. H. Ami of the British Embassy in Washington said: "Great Britain, in taking Palestine from the Turk, did not take it for herself, but for the Jewish people. It is the policy of England to do everything reasonably within her power to put the Jews back in the home of their ancestors in the Holy Land, and Great Britain looks to the Jews to set up a civilization there...."

"Scholars, statesmen and jurists" a century ago indulged their naive and romantic visions of a future which in reality would see years of struggle and bloodshed before the creation of the Jewish state. "The policy of England" would turn out to be far more devious and far less friendly to the aspirations of the Zionists than these news stories from an earlier time and an earlier *Times* anticipated. As always, history has confounded predictions. And cautions us against thinking we can foresee where today's policies will find us tomorrow.

Rita Kramer is a member of Outpost's editorial board. Her books include Flames in the Field and When Morning Comes.

The Elusive Goal

Noa Bursie

(Editor's note: Noa Bursie is an African-American convert to Judaism.)

Peace. The word itself is a two-edged sword, conveying a powerful spirit of tranquility while simultaneously evoking a strange, inescapable anxiety. It is the quintessential dichotomy of humanity to so passionately crave the very thing we so effectively repel by bowing to the baser elements of our

nature. Peace eludes humanity because there are people who do not want to live in peace. Rather than talking in circles and chasing rationales around mountains of excuses and justifications, better to state the case without equivocation. Peace is possible only through mutual agreement or, if agreement fails, enforced maintenance.



Noa Bursie

An ultimate reality of war is that someone has to surrender--either surrender or be destroyed. And someone has to exert control in order to ensure the aggression that ended in surrender remains so. This is the inexorable reality politically correct arguments attempt to obscure. In war, there are those who prevail and those who must concede defeat. Negotiations merely determine the terms under which each side must proceed.

For the U.S. or any other foreign body to regard the Israeli-Islamic world conflict (for such it truly is) as a phenomenon where two aggrieved parties require conflict resolution and mutual concessions is to ignore the fact that Israel has been attacked by its neighbors repeatedly since it was established and has in turn thwarted each attempt to destroy it. The parties are erroneously regarded by the international community as equally culpable combatants, seeking redress for injustices supposedly perpetrated by both parties equally. When have we ever seen a nation victorious against its foes required by international law to "sue for peace" from the aggressor or an aggressor who not only gets to set pre-conditions, but is not required to end continued violence and engages in inciting its population against the other party? It borders on laughable to see the U.S. waxing paternalistic as it treats Israel like a naughty child who needs to be forced to make up with a sibling.

Why is the prospect for a lasting peace between Jews and the Muslim world so difficult to achieve? The answer is not complicated in the least. There can be no co-existence when one party denies the legitimacy of the other or regards the other as subservient or subhuman. Islam teaches that Jews are not equal to Muslims – plain and simple. This is the reality political correctness attempts to obscure, the Islamic practice of *taqqiyah* perpetuates, and it is the reason why negotiations to resolve this conflict by traditional means have never succeeded and never will.

The notion of the two state solution plays on our innate sense of fair-play--two states for two peoples, two cultures. But this rests on the false assumption that the Muslim world is willing to accept Jews as equals. It is not. Period. It also rests on the belief that there is no equality or self-determination for Arabs within Israeli society. Also, not true. And it must be remembered that should the tables be turned, an Islamocentric Israel would never afford equal rights to Jews, non-Muslims, or women, for such is the state of affairs in every Islamic nation, those whose laws are based on Sharia as well as the more secular societies.

Israel is the only democracy in the Middle East and not a single national entity in the entire Islamic world practices democracy or mandates equal rights for women and non-Muslims or pleads the cause of minority rights with the same furor it demands from the Jewish state.

Preserving the uniquely Jewish character of Israel, the Jewish State, is not 'racist' in the least. It is an acknowledgement of the identity, culture and history unique to its founders. A Jewish character would be impossible if the nation were to adopt the norms of a non-Jewish minority under the guise of democracy. As the only Jewish nation in a very rough neighborhood, Israel needs no justification for maintaining traditions, laws and policies that identify it as uniquely Jewish other than the fact that it is the only haven on the planet offering national self-determination for Jews, a place where one may be a Jew, proud, unafraid, and unapologetic.

On the other hand, to be a Muslim, or of Arab descent, one may live, worship, gather, eat, marry, commune, in short, engage in practices that are unique to this culture, in the Jewish State. If for whatever reason a Muslim/Arab feels imposed upon by the uniquely Jewish character of the Jewish homeland, the individual has the freedom to choose to live in a place that is uniquely Muslim/Arab in any of the surrounding Muslim/Arab nations that dominate the region. Conflict solved? Not yet. That's because the problem isn't "equality" or "justice" or "self-determination" for Palestinians at all. The true source of the conflict is the prospect that a Muslim must co-exist with people whom their doctrine and traditions teach are beneath them, dhimmi. There is no desire for co-existence with Jews on the part of the Muslim world – in Israel or elsewhere. Therefore, the quest for peace achieved through the 'active, mutual will' paradigm is ludicrous. The idea of partners engaged in negotiation for mutually agreed upon freedoms is dead at the root.

Recently, there has been discussion in the Israeli media of either changing the lyrics to the national anthem, HaTikvah, or introducing a different, more 'inclusive' and culturally sensitive national anthem. It has been suggested that the current lyrics are 'racist', undemocratic, excluding Israeli Arabs due to the focus on "the Jewish soul." Yet an anthem that is a more benign, humane expression of nationalistic pride has never been written – for any nation on earth. Acknowledging the intent behind any action is the bedrock of a good prosecutor's case. The controversy over the Israeli national anthem is relevant because it pulls back the curtain that hides the intent and sensibilities of those who hate Israel and equate Zionism with racism. To be a Jew who is proud of his history, his heritage and traditions in a world that has attempted to annihilate him is not racism. Zion is the ancestral homeland of the Jewish people and is home for men, women, and children of virtually every culture and tongue who have flocked to the Jewish State in droves precisely because of the freedoms they may enjoy within her borders.

Peace between Jews both within and outside of the State of Israel cannot exist unless there is a virtually cataclysmic reversal of the animus against Jews that is taught to Muslims from birth to the grave. How such a dramatic revision of Islamic doctrine and sensibilities could ever take place in a belief system that requires death for criticism of its tenets and in a world that bows in deference to and in fear of Islam is anybody's guess.

How then, must such a conflict be resolved? The only way forward is unilateral action that ensures the safety and prosperity of the party that is willing to at least entertain mutual co-existence. A strong Israel fueled by technology, innovation, its natural resources, and the democratic principles of the Torah will push forward into whatever the future holds. With the fortitude of the Maccabees and the tenacity of the defenders of Masada, the nation will prosper. In the Torah, G-d promises His people; "No weapon formed against you shall prosper and every tongue that rises against you in judgment you shall condemn. This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord and their righteousness is of me, saith the Lord." [Isaiah 54:17] This verse has served as the Hope in countless battles, literal and metaphorical, throughout the ages. None so relevant as the battle the Jewish people and the nation of Israel face on numerous fronts today.

Peace is a blessing, greatly to be desired, but impossible to achieve in the absence of willing partners. Where the will to peace exists on only one side, security through strength and strength of conviction is the only option.

May Israel and the Jewish people persevere as we have for thousands of years, in the words of our national anthem, "...to be a free people in our homeland...Eretz Zion, Yerushalayim."

Noa Bursie is a singer/songwriter/guitarist.

France's Blood Libel Against Israel

Guy Millière

Editor's note: Milliere was right in his prediction. On June 26 the Paris Court of Appeals convicted Philippe Karsenty of defamation of the French national television channel France 2 and fined him 7,000 euros. The case is strongly reminiscent of the second trial in the Dreyfus case when all the facts were in (including the identity of the real traitor, Major Esterhazy) and the court upheld the travesty of the first trial.

On September 30, 2000, at the beginning of the Palestinian terrorist offensive against Israel called since then the "second intifada," a particularly violent clash took place at the Netzarim junction in the Gaza Strip. As shots were exchanged between Arab militiamen and Israeli soldiers, cameramen from various television channels were nearby, filming news reports. One of these reports quickly spread around the world and became a ubiquitous tool for anti-Israeli Arab propaganda. It showed a young boy huddling against his father, the two unsuccessfully trying to protect themselves from gunfire: the son appeared to have been killed. The last words of the voice-over, uttered in a stricken tone, were: "The child is dead".

The child, Mohammed al-Dura, immediately became a "martyr" -- and a symbol. The Israeli army clearly dared to kill defenseless people, even children!

The report was considered indisputable: it had been broadcast on the main French public channel, France 2, and validated by a noted journalist, Charles Enderlin.



Charles Enderlin

Very soon, Israeli columnists and military experts thought that the report had all the appearances of a crude forgery. In the images, the "dead" child was still lifting his arm after his "death". Neither father nor son showed any trace of blood, nor was there any blood on the wall behind them. The bullet holes on the wall behind the father and son had round forms, showing that they could not come from the angled Israeli position.

A few weeks later, an Israeli website, the Metula News Agency, made a short film demonstrating in detail that the report was indeed a fake. An Israeli scientist, Nahum Shahaf, conducted a reconstruction and a scientific demonstration in support of the short film. In 2002, a German filmmaker, Esther Schapira, directed a documentary reaching the same conclusions: *Drei Kugeln und ein totes Kind* ("Three Bullets and a Dead Child").

It was soon revealed that the footage had been shot by a Palestinian Arab cameraman, Talal Abu Rahma, and sent to Charles Enderlin, who had not been present. And it became apparent that Enderlin had added a commentary without first conducting any verification.

At this point, France 2 could have admitted a mistake. But they stuck to their positions: Enderlin swore that he had "proof" that the images showed the reality and that his commentary was correct; and France 2 fully supported Enderlin. Neither the short film made by Metula News Agency, nor the documentary directed by Esther Schapira was broadcast in France. The Israeli government, for its part, remained silent.

A courageous and tireless French entrepreneur, Philippe Karsenty, head of a news media watchdog group, Media Ratings, understood the lasting harm of the fraud and saw in this deception an opportunity to expose the workings of the Palestinian propaganda machine and the complicity in it of many in the Western media. In 2004, Karsenty posted all the information available to him, including irrefutable evidence of missing footage, and wrote that the truth had to be unearthed. He was accused

by Enderlin and France 2 of defamation, and dragged to court. Undaunted, he decided to give lectures and talks on the subject around the world.

In 2012, seeing at last the sheer scope of the case, the Israeli Ministry of Strategic Affairs created a special government inquiry committee. The committee's report was officially handed to the Israeli Prime Minister a few days ago. Its findings corroborate what all those who followed the case from the beginning already know: the Enderlin and France 2 report is "baseless." The child shown in the video was not "killed" in the incident -- the incident was staged. Upon receiving the committee's report, Binyamin Netanyahu declared that the Enderlin and France 2 report is "an integral part of the ongoing campaign to delegitimize Israel."

Logic and basic human decency would have dictated that Enderlin and France 2 withdraw the charges and apologize to everyone victimized by the fraud. This is not, however, what happened. On the contrary, Enderlin and France 2 now accuse the Israeli government of wanting to harm their reputation and are threatening to "sue Israel." The French public has not, of course, been informed of the content of the committee's report. It is further very likely that no newspaper, no magazine, no radio and no TV channel in France will speak of it.

When, in fact, complaints were filed by Enderlin and France 2 against Philippe Karsenty, a petition of support for Enderlin was published in several French newspapers: all mainstream journalists had signed the petition.

In July 2009, to show his support for Enderlin, former President Nicolas Sarkozy awarded him the title of Knight of the Legion of Honor, one of France's highest honors. The current President, François Hollande, has not commented on the committee's report. He will also probably remain silent on the subject.

On May 26, the French judiciary was supposed to make a final decision on the complaints against Philippe Karsenty. The decision was postponed to June 26, undoubtedly due to the committee's report. It does not mean that the decision will be in favor of Karsenty. The French judiciary depends on the French Department of Justice, and therefore the French government. Its position will be the one adopted by the French government.

The Enderlin and France 2 report is baseless. It is a fake. But in France, it exists as an "official truth" and in France, no one can question an "official truth" without incurring huge risks -- from blacklisting by the media to arbitrary audits by the tax bureau--even death threats. The child shown in the video was not killed in the incident. But according to French "official truth," he was "killed": he will therefore be considered "killed" by French political leaders, the French media, and probably the French judiciary.

The Enderlin and France 2 report is assuredly "an integral part of the ongoing campaign to delegitimize Israel" conducted in France -- a campaign that has not stopped.

The workings of the Palestinian propaganda machine and the complicity of many in the Western media have been exposed all too often. This just makes one more time.

Charles Enderlin and France 2 should be ashamed, but they have no shame; most French political leaders, the French media and the French justice should be ashamed, but probably feel no shame.

Most French people will never even know anything at all about the affair.

Israel's Minister of International Relations, Yuval Steinitz, gave an accurate definition of the Enderlin and France 2 report: "a modern-day blood libel against the State of Israel".

This makes France's cover-up of the truth a French blood libel. The fact that almost all the members of the French elite continue to stand up for this or any blood libel is a hideous stain on the honor of France.

This article appeared on the website of the gatestoneinstitute on June 5.

An Interview with Lela Gilbert

Ruth King

In the June 2013 issue of *Outpost* I wrote about Lela Gilbert's inspiring book *Saturday People, Sunday People: Israel through the Eyes of a Christian Sojourner*, in which she describes her life in a country she came to visit but now makes her home.

Since its founding, AFSI has been front and foremost in defending the legal, religious and historic rights of Jews to live in a safe Israel from the Jordan River to the Mediterranean Sea. Equally important, we were the first Israel support group to openly embrace interaction with Evangelical Christians and, indeed all religious Christian groups who have staunchly supported Israel in America. Lela Gilbert is a Christian scholar and journalist with deep understanding and affection for Israel. It is an honor to interview her.

RSK: And now for my first question: how do you interpret your title “Saturday People, Sunday People”?

LG: The title of my book is taken from a *jihadi* slogan which appears in Middle Eastern graffiti, is chanted during demonstrations, and varies a bit in its level of threat: “First comes Saturday, then comes Sunday,” or “First the Saturday People, then the Sunday People” – these are the tame versions. But on an opening page of my book appears a photo of a Palestinian flag with Arabic writing on it, confiscated during an anti-Israel demonstration. The English translation says, “On Saturday we kill the Jews, on Sunday we kill the Christians.” This more accurately reflects the intentions and actions—past and present—of radical Islamists.

RSK: Please tell us how you came to visit and love Israel and what circumstances propelled your first visit .

LG: My believing Christian parents were very excited about the “re-gathering of the Jewish People” in the 20th century, which they knew was predicted thousands of years before in prophetic Hebrew scriptures. During their lifetimes they saw this re-gathering happen before their eyes. They were in love with the story of Israel, the courageous return of the Jews to their homeland, and their stunning military victories, all of which seemed miraculous to them, as people of faith. As a child, I too marveled at these astonishing events.

As an adult, and a writer, I was sent to several countries for work assignments. I imagined that someone would pay my way to Israel, too, so I could finally see the place for myself. But it never happened. Finally in January 2006, I was standing on a beach in Nuweiba, Egypt, and from there I could see Israel in the distance. I felt both dismay and an odd stirring of excitement. That was the moment when I knew I could and, indeed, would have to get there on my own or end up like Moses—having seen the land from afar but never setting foot on it! So I made my way to Israel in July 2006. And I still haven’t left.

RSK: Why did you decide to stay? Was there a defining moment or epiphany?

LG: I never actually decided to stay. I just kept deciding not to leave...now now, not yet. And meanwhile doors kept opening for me--new friends, new opportunities, new experiences. It’s very hard for me to imagine saying goodbye for good.

RSK: You wrote, with Nina Shea and Paul Marshall, *Persecuted: The Global Assault on Christians* in 2013. The title is almost self-explanatory, but do you see the vanguard of this assault coming from radical Islam and Arab nations?

LG: The most numerous anti-Christian incidents in the world today—and increasingly so—take place in Muslim lands. Of course there are horrific exceptions like North Korea and various other cruel parties and regimes. But Islamists are notoriously hostile to Jews and Christians, as reflected in the

“Saturday People, Sunday People” slogan. Of course this doesn’t mean all Muslims hate all Christians. In fact, moderate Muslims suffer the most under radical regimes, mobs and factions. But Christians--villages, churches and individuals--are specifically threatened, abused and murdered for their faith by *jihadis* in the Middle East and beyond.

RSK: What about Christians in Israel and their forced expulsions from Arab controlled territories in the West Bank?

LG: Quiet, no-names-please reports continue to emerge about the abuse and subsequent departure of Christians from the territories under the Palestinian Authority’s jurisdiction. This is due to intimidation and overt persecution by radical Muslims. Arab militants also sometimes label local Christians, or friends and family members of Muslim-background Christian believers, as “Zionist collaborators.” This can lead to horrific consequences.

RSK: I will not press you into a political discussion on the settlements, but can you describe a religious Christian’s emotions when walking the ancient streets of Tekoah or Shiloh, or Givot Olam?

LG: There is indisputable continuity between biblical locales and today’s modern Israeli settlements (not to mention sites within Israel’s undisputed borders) and this is not coincidental. Biblically rooted Jews have intentionally made their homes in places where their forefathers prospered and wrote about millennia ago.

As a Christian, I find it awe-inspiring to be able to look up in the Bible a place I’ve visited just hours before and to reflect on the stories and characters surrounding it. In fact, the more digging archeologists do, the more they confirm the historicity of the Bible and the ageless, shared roots of our Judeo-Christian faith.

RSK: Last: Any thoughts about the future in light of burgeoning anti-Israel sentiment and overt anti-Semitism throughout Europe and in some precincts of the left in America? Among the last lines in your book is "Dark days may well lie ahead."

LG: Yes, it’s true that for Jewish people today’s world – and particularly the Middle East – lies under darkening skies. But I end my book with a quote from the prophet Ezekiel that, in my view, offers great hope for tomorrow:

*I will now restore the fortunes of Jacob
and will have compassion on all the people of Israel...
When I have brought them back from the nations
and have gathered them from the countries of their enemies
they will know that I am the Lord their God,
for though I sent them into exile among the nations,
I will gather them to their own land, not leaving any behind.
I will no longer hide my face from them,
For I will pour out my Spirit on the people of Israel,
declares the Sovereign Lord” (Ez. 39:25-29)*

RSK: Thank you Lela Gilbert ...a thousand thanks.

LG: Thanks for doing this interview with me - it is a privilege. I hope it is an encouragement to Jews and Christians alike. 1,000 blessings.

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