
OUTPOST



November 2015—Issue #292 PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL 45th Year of Publication

Table of Contents		
Kitchen-Knife Intifada	William Mehlman	Page 2
From the Editor		Page 3
Mama Merkel and the Immigration Invasion	Rael Jean Isaac	Page 6
If There is a Third Intifada...	Edward Alexander	Page 8
The Two State Solution is in Stalemate – Part 2	Evelyn Gordon	Page 11
Sweden Close to Collapse	Ingrid Carlqvist	Page 15
In Praise of a Great Man	Ruth King	Page 18

Kitchen-Knife Intifada

William Mehlman

The notion across much of the political spectrum that Benjamin Netanyahu is bereft of a “strategy” for dealing with the murderous crusade being waged against Israel’s citizenry by knife-wielding Arab juveniles is entirely misinformed. In fact, the prime minister’s strategy should be clear by now to everyone. He is determined to snuff this fire out with a blanket of overwhelming police and IDF force and as few casualties as circumstances will allow while employing every economic and political lever against the perpetrators and their families. These include loss of all state welfare benefits, child allowances and ultimately citizenship for the Israeli Arabs among them. And for the Palestinians caught in the police-IDF net, a ban against any further employment in Israel. That’s known as getting their attention.

Putting it in sports jargon, an obvious second element of Netanyahu’s strategy is “playing out the clock.” The “clock” in this case is the 12 months to a November 4, 2016 U.S. national election that



should substantially limit the ability of even the most agenda-driven administration to encumber its successor with policies and positions it may not ascribe to. Hopefully, it will never ascribe to Secretary of State John Kerry’s outrageous suggestion that alleged expanded Jewish construction in Judea and Samaria helped trigger the knife and hand gun assaults that (at this writing) have killed nine Israelis and wounded more than 30 others. First of all, Israeli housing construction in Judea and Samaria is at an all-time nadir. Secondly, in trying to walk back his remarks, Mr. Kerry only underscored them by reverting to the tried and patently

untrue “both sides” moral equivalency hokum that has characterized his tenure at the State Department.

The intifada itself needs to be viewed in perspective. Savage as its depredations have been, particularly in Jerusalem, it lacks the ingredients of the Second Intifada, 2000-2005. Yasser Arafat’s last hurrah, that intifada sent 1,000 Israelis and 3,000 Arabs to their graves using a well-financed network of terror cells, supported by sophisticated communications, vehicles weapons and lookouts. With its ironclad security control from the northern Galilee to Jerusalem, along with the Arab population areas in Judea and Samaria retaken from the PA in the 2002 “Defensive Shield” operation, the Shin Bet, Israel’s premiere security service, would have been on top of such a network before it sprouted its first bud. Without fear of armed opposition, Israel’s Security Cabinet is additionally capable of sealing off the entrance to every major Arab neighborhood in Jerusalem

“If the signature weapon of this intifada is the kitchen-knife,” one observer noted, “it’s because it has been unable to lay its hands on anything more lethal.” Desperate for a role in this ongoing drama, PA President Mahmoud Abbas has opted to play both ends against the middle, crying havoc over every knife-wielding juvenile Palestinian casualty and threatening UN and ICC action against Israel, while at the same time maintaining strict cooperation between his PA internal security unit and the Israel Defense Forces, critical to the protection of his West Bank satrapy against Hamas. President Obama’s failure to devote so much as two minutes to the Palestinian cause in his UN General Assembly speech appears to have put Abbas on the skids. Indeed, Abbas’ studied non-response to the Jerusalem Grand Mufti’s recent call for the “murder of every single Jew” suggests the PA chieftain may have skidded head-first into a brick wall.

The President of the United States isn't noted for kindly suffering the politically irrelevant and if that's where Abbas stands in a White House more concerned with Afghanistan, ISIS, China's financial stability, Vladimir Putin's Syrian takeover and a national health insurance scheme whose costs are heading for the stratosphere, a Palestinian State may have become the last thing on its mind. Abbas is watching the clock, too, and it can't be making him feel like partying.

While the kitchen-knife intifada lacks mainstream Palestinian organizational direction and firepower, it has the countervailing advantage of unpredictability. A loose cannon is harder to control and liable to attract dangerous outside elements if not brought to a reasonably quick end. The economic downside for Israel is still to be reckoned with. Lone wolf street stabbings from Jerusalem to Ramallah are resulting in fewer visitors to a nation dependent on tourism for its second largest foreign currency inflow. The Bank of Israel estimates that the 50-day, 2014 Gaza war cost the country NIS 3.5 billion (roughly a billion dollars) and counting. Half that shortfall, \$500 million, represented lost tourism.

None of this has been lost on Bibi Netanyahu. In the face of a world, including many of its democracies, contesting Israel's right to defend itself, the prime minister has chosen wisely in confining this kitchen-knife intifada to something less than a media feeding frenzy, while working diligently to douse the flames. "There is a time for every purpose under the sun," King Solomon wrote. For Israel, this would appear to be a time to hang tight and play out the clock.

William Mehlman represents AFSI in Israel.

From the Editor

We Don't Run

Hats off to Jon Bon Jovi, who not only defied the boycotters to perform in Israel but dedicated a song to Israel whose title summed up his sentiments--We Don't Run. Even as terrorists were stabbing a Jewish toddler in the latest outburst of Arab violence, Bon Jovi told the audience: "This should be the fight song for Tel Aviv. It's chorus is:

We don't run
I'm standing my ground
We don't run
And we don't back down
There's fire in the sky
There's thunder on the mountains
Bless each tear and this dirt I was born in, (run)
We don't run
We don't run



Bon Jovi

There was more welcome push-back against the boycotters as 151 members of Britain's cultural and political elite, among them Harry Potter author J.K. Rowling and 14 members of Parliament, signed a letter to the editor on October 23 denouncing boycotts of Israel in the *Guardian*. (*The Guardian*, formerly *the Manchester Guardian*, whose editor was Chaim Weizmann's chief champion in furthering what would become the Balfour Declaration, has become an anti-Israel hate-sheet so it must have pained the editors to publish the letter.)

The letter said: “Cultural boycotts singling out Israel are divisive and discriminatory, and will not further peace. Open dialogue and interaction promote greater understanding and mutual acceptance, and it is through such understanding and acceptance that movement can be made towards a resolution of the conflict.”

Journalist Tom Gross, who helped organize the letter, told *The Algemeiner* : “London is in many ways at the center of global efforts to single out, demonize and boycott the state of Israel. Many persons in the worlds of arts and culture in Britain feel very uncomfortable with these efforts, and we felt it high time our voices be heard.”

Brandeis, Yet Again

The university that would have horrified its Jewish founders is in the news again—or at least it should be. The murderer of an Israeli passenger on the number 78 bus in Jerusalem was a student from Al-Quds university, with which Brandeis (and Bard) has “partnered.” Al Qud’s chief claim to fame is as the site of rallies in which students are incited to murder the Jews.

A Broken Record

It’s bad enough when the John Kerrys of this world, in best Pavlovian mode, mindlessly return to the delusionary “two state solution.” But why does Ronald Lauder, President of the World Jewish Congress, promote the fraud? Here’s Lauder at the *Jerusalem Post* annual conference in New York: “I want to be very clear, no serious discussion about peace for the Jewish people of Israel can take place without a strong agreement for a viable two-state solution.” The World Jewish Congress is so proud of this balderdash that it sends it out—complete with a photo of Lauder and Abbas together in Amman—in its November 2015 *World Jewry Digest*.

Blowing a Hole in Global Warming

A former climate modeler for the Australian government, with multiple degrees in applied mathematics, Dr. David Evans has determined that the basic climate model underpinning climate science has been wrongly applied. In fixing two errors he finds the climate’s sensitivity to carbon dioxide is much lower than has been thought and that the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has over-estimated future global warming by a factor of ten.

Evans says this explains why none of the climate models used by the IPCC match the evidence of recorded temperatures and why they have failed to predict the pause in global warming for nigh on nineteen years.

While Evans says his discovery “ought to change the world,” he admits “the political obstacles are massive.”

What he should have said is that the political obstacles are insurmountable. The global warming apocalypse is now so entrenched within the world’s elites that it would take a genuine apocalypse to unseat it. The more it is debunked the more firmly the political/academic/media establishment clings to it. A few years ago the Heartland Institute published my brief book on global warming. The Institute’s head Joseph Bast was convinced that the life-cycle of this apocalypse was coming to an end and called the book *Roosters of the Apocalypse: How the Junk Science of Global Warming Almost Bankrupted the Western World*. Past tense. I have reprinted a lengthier and updated version with a title that more adequately reflects the current situation: *Roosters of the Apocalypse: How the Junk Science of Global Warming Is Bankrupting the Western World*. Present tense.

More signs of this come as the world’s leaders (and a massive representation of NGOS) prepare to descend on Paris to reach a new climate change agreement. The so-called developing nations, repeatedly told they are the greatest victims of the West’s use of fossil fuels, in the current preparatory talks for the climate-summit have now demanded that the world cap global warming at 1.5 degrees

Celsius above the pre-industrial age. That's one half a degree Celsius lower than the previous (totally unrealistic) target of 2 degrees Celsius. The developing nation bloc was already demanding \$100 billion *a year* from developed countries to participate at all in the great climate change charade. Maybe if the developed countries cough up \$200 billion a year, the developing ones will agree to 2 degrees. The developed EU and U.S. are insane; the developing countries are smartly pulling a hold-up to get as much of the developed world's assets as possible--as long as they last.

A New World Heritage Site?

Israel's ambassador to UNESCO Carmel Shama Hacoen has come up with an excellent idea. At a conference in Bonn she suggested registering the Palestinian culture of lies as an intangible world heritage site.

Mossad Comes to Mina

IMRA (Independent Media Review and Analysis) reports that Ali Younesi, a top assistant to the Iranian President and a former Intelligence Minister, has uncovered the culprit for the recent stampede in Mina, Saudi Arabia which killed at least 2,000 Muslim pilgrims. Addressing a forum in Tabriz, Iran, Younesi declared: "I see the hand of the Zionist regime's spy agency, Mossad, in the Mina catastrophe."

BDS Funding

The Jewish Week has provided a public service in funding and publishing an investigative piece on where the BDS (boycott, divest and sanction) movement gets its funding. The report is the work of Mitchell Bard, director of the Jewish Virtual Library and formerly editor of AIPAC's *Near East Report*.

It's a slippery topic because the main campus BDS group, Students for Justice in Palestine (SJP) is not a registered charity and so does not have to report its funding to the Internal Revenue Service. Also university money flowing to BDS campus groups through student fees is, Bard says, "anything but transparent."

Still, Bard has identified such leading conduits of money to BDS as WESPAC (located in an artsy section of White Plains) and the more familiar Tides Foundation, according to its self-description dedicated "to work toward a more just, peaceful and sustainable world [progressive-speak for a world without Israel]." The whole article is worth reading and can be seen at <http://www.thejewishweek.com/news/new-york/bds-money-trail-suggests-opaque-funding-network>.

A Moral Midget

Sweden, which styles itself a moral superpower, is far better described as a moral midget. Israel's Foreign Ministry has recently labeled it the most anti-Israel country in Europe, with the consensus so strong that no one involved in politics will publicly defend Israel. In the current terror wave in Israel, the Swedish government has not condemned a single one of the attacks on Jews. Typical of the prevailing attitude was the headline with which the Swedish news agency TT reported the murder of two rabbis Nehemia Lavi and Aharon Bennett "Palestinian shot in Jerusalem." The Palestinian in question was their murderer Mohand Halabi, who shouted *allahu akbar* as he killed them.



While defamation of Israel is standard practice, criticism of favored groups is forbidden. In the criminal code "denigration of ethnic groups", that is, Muslims, is a crime punishable by imprisonment for up to four years. Ingrid Carlqvist, a Swedish one woman truth squad who writes for the Gatestone Institute, reports that Sweden is now the rape capital of Europe and ranks second in percentage of rapes in the entire world—after tiny Lesotho in southern Africa. For pointing out the strong connection between rapes in

Sweden and immigrants from the Middle East and North Africa Michael Hess, a politician in the Sweden Democratic Party, was fined and given a suspended jail sentence (as a first offender). When he presented massive evidence in court to back up his statement, the court ruled truth was no defense.

So Sweden goes down the Islamic tube as the consensus within the media and chief political parties is that questioning prevailing policies is racist and beyond the moral pale. For a further glimpse into the confusion and chaos in Sweden's governing elite see the article by Carlqvist in this *Outpost*.

Mama Merkel and the Immigration Invasion of Germany

Rael Jean Isaac

On Oct. 20, months after the "immigration invasion" of Europe began -- whose long term impact goes far beyond temporary obsessions like email servers and Benghazi -- one of the Wall Street Journal's chief pundits finally addressed the subject. Bret Stephens wrote an op-ed, "In Defense of Christendom." The reason for the long silence is not hard to guess. *The Wall Street Journal* has long been wedded to the notion of open borders. Never mind that Nobel Prize winning economist Milton Friedman admonished the paper almost twenty years ago "It's just obvious you can't have free immigration and a welfare state." The *Journal* has remained deaf to Friedman's irrefutable argument that in a redistributionist state, unlimited immigration, with its unlimited demands on the public purse, at minimum will destroy limited government.

So how should the socially conservative editorial page react to open borders in action? In theory this was fine. Yet there was something deeply troubling about millions of Muslims invading Europe's richest welfare states, with no end in sight. As the King of Siam would say, it was a puzzlement.

Stephens finally ended the embarrassing silence. He ignored the economic impact and focused on what is in truth the most important danger to which this migration contributes: the destruction of European civilization. Stephens treats the immigrant invasion as what he calls "a stiff breeze" in a civilization that has already lost its moral compass. No longer believing in the sources from which their comfortable beliefs in human rights, peace, progress, spring -- Judaism, Christianity, the Enlightenment, capitalism, etc. -- they have lost the capacity for what Pope Benedict called "self-love." Stephens is by no means the first to make this point. Nobel Prize for Literature winner Imre Kertesz more than a decade ago identified "suicidal liberalism" as Europe's dominant set of values, leaving it "wide open to Islam."

Stephens describes Angela Merkel's behavior in the crisis as "odd and disconcerting." This is



Merkel and Erdogan

because she has been seeking a small immediate favor from Turkey -- stemming the refugee flow from its shores -- in exchange for major concessions that could only aggravate the problem in the longer run: visa-free entry to Europe for 75 million Turks and forwarding Turkish membership in the E.U. Given that Turkey under Erdogan has become steadily more autocratic and contemptuous of the human rights the E.U. supposedly holds dear, and Merkel is trying to stem the Muslim tide into Europe, not pave the way for many millions more,

this makes no sense. Moreover, were Turkey to become part of the E.U., Europe would physically border on major sources of the refugee flow: Syria, Iraq and Iran. For Stephens all this sits oddly with

Merkel's leadership of a party whose purpose 'is to rally the German right to a reasonable conservatism.'

How then is one to explain Angela Merkel, whose open invitation to Syrian refugees turned a migrant flow into a deluge? She probably feels less enthusiasm for Europe's legacy in championing the values of which Stephens speaks than does Stephens. Uppermost in her mind when she thinks of her country's legacy is likely to be its role as perpetrator of the Holocaust. Clearly it is this catastrophe that underlies her reaction to the plight of Middle East refugees. In the initial euphoria over her welcome, as migrants carried signs saying "Germany" and "Mama Merkel" she openly marveled -- and rejoiced -- that migrants were so eager to come, given the country's history. Merkel is also mindful of Stalinism which she experienced growing up in East Germany. She dismisses the idea of fences (Hungary's solution): "I've lived behind a fence for long enough." In Merkel's mind then, the foremost issue is likely to be "making amends" for vile European behavior rather than preserving Enlightenment values.

To explain is not to excuse. Merkel is further evidence of the continuing validity of 17th century statesman Axel Oxenstierna's admonition to his son Johan: "Learn my son with what little wisdom the world is governed." An adept politician -- or she would not have risen to be Germany's first woman Chancellor or continued in the role for ten years -- Merkel does not think ahead, as a statesman must. So she comes up with simplistic statements like "Who are we to defend Christians around the world if we say we won't accept a Muslim or a mosque in our country?" What is at issue is not "a Muslim" or "a mosque" but the transformation of Germany into an Islamic country. An official internal report leaked to the daily paper *Bild* estimated this year alone there will be 1.5 million asylum seekers in Germany, almost double the number originally believed. And given the right of refugees to bring in family members, multiply this number by six or seven. This marks a huge demographic shift, especially since these are largely young people, while Germany's population is rapidly aging.

And while Merkel may think her policies involve learning the lessons of the Holocaust, she pays no mind to the impact on Germany's Jewish population. At a rally against anti-Semitism at the Brandenburg gate in September 2014, Merkel said: "The fact that there are again more than 100,000 Jews living in Germany [in fact there are more than double that number] is nothing short of a miracle. It's a precious gift which fills me with profound gratitude. Jewish life belongs in our country. It's a part of our identity and culture." While there is no reason to doubt the sincerity of those sentiments, does it not occur to her that her own policies are likely to achieve Hitler's aim of making Germany *judenrein*, that is, free of Jews?

Belatedly, this has crossed the mind of Jewish community leaders in Germany. Josef Schuster, the President of the Central Council of Jews in Germany (which, unbelievably, supports Merkel's open door policy!) recently met with Merkel to voice his concern that, given how many of the newcomers are from countries hostile to Israel, they might strengthen anti-Semitic views in the Arab community. Schuster told the newspaper *Welt am Sonntag* that his words created an awkward silence, after which Merkel took notes and promised: "We must address that." How on earth does she propose to do so?



Josef Schuster

Schuster's own suggestion, which he passed on to Merkel, does not pass the laugh test: "I...see a need to integrate the refugees in our community of values as soon as possible." Alas, however foreign their values may be on other matters to the prevailing mores in Germany, Muslims will find no lack of kindred spirits on both extremes of left and right to join with them in anti-Israel and anti-Semitic projects. The migrants will provide the physical savagery that will make continued Jewish life impossible to sustain.

Millions of Muslim immigrants will also before long shift the political balance. Prime Minister Netanyahu, on the eve of his trip to Berlin on October 21 declared, "Germany is a very important partner for Israel in regards to our national security." How long will that relationship withstand the pressure of millions of Muslims?

It never stops with the Jews. Merkel's policies, however high-minded, are already splitting German society down the middle, an outcome she should have anticipated and about which her advisers should have warned her. The grievances of those who were not consulted, but who will be forced to pay, both in taxes and in quality of life, are legitimate. Some of the forms in which those grievances are expressed will not be.

Even here Mama Merkel bears responsibility. A good mother knows her children's capacities and does not push them to the point where they break down.

This appeared in the American Thinker on Oct 23.

If There is a Third Intifada, We Want to Be the Ones Who Started It

Edward Alexander

"The most ghastly incident was at Hebron. There was a Jewish population there of over 700 people, an ancient community centred on a Talmudical college. Armed bands intent on slaughter reached Hebron on the 24th [August 1929]. The police were Arab and they stood passively by while their fellow Moslems moved into the town and to deeds which would have been revolting among animals. There was an inn...where some Jews had fled for safety. The Arabs killed and dismembered 23 of them with daggers and axes in an upper room, so that, according to a witness, blood ran down the stairs and soaked through the ceiling... This was not half of the crime..." (Christopher Sykes, Cross Roads to Israel: Palestine from Balfour to Bevin [Collins, 1965], pp. 118-19.)

Since one explanation of the recent "knifing intifada" is that Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas has encouraged (if not actually started) the killing — in order to extract from Secretary of State John Kerry and President Barack Obama every concession imaginable from an administration that believes "settlements" are not only "illegal" but also the sole and always justifying cause of Arab and Muslim violence against Jews — in Israel and also across Europe, it is time for a history lesson.

In 1929, there were no "occupied territories" or "illegal settlements." Indeed, there was no Jewish (or Arab) state in British Mandatory Palestine at all, and the Jewish population of Hebron was largely a non-Zionist one. Nevertheless, Arab hysteria about "the Wailing Wall" — as the British authorities called the Temple Mount area, Judaism's holiest site — had ignited Muslim fury against the Jews.

The antecedents to Arab rioting had been two-fold. First, the British had granted a small group of Jews permission to pray on the occasion of Tisha b'Av, the holiday commemorating the destruction of the Temple. Second, a Jewish boy had accidentally kicked a football into an Arab garden: seeing this as the hand of Zionism, the Arabs proceeded to murder the boy — with knives. Shortly thereafter, the Mufti and the Supreme Muslim Council brought to the city a mob of Arab peasants "armed with clubs and knives. A few of them had firearms. The mob rushed out into the streets of Jerusalem and attacked every Jew they could see."

The British authorities refused the request of Zionist groups to arm Jewish men or to deploy Jewish police. In the days following, Jewish communities from Jerusalem to Haifa, as well as the south, were laid waste, with the savagery reaching its peak in the aforementioned massacre in Hebron. Since

Obama and Kerry and their circle of advisers and sycophants are so ignorant of history that they hear no warning echoes when they celebrate the “deal” with Iran for having brought “peace in our time,” a history lesson is never superfluous with this bunch.

Speculation, bordering on hopeful anticipation, about the arrival of Intifada Three, has been rife for years in the Obama administration and among its journalist acolytes. For a very long time they alleged that “illegal settlements” are actually the cause of all the disturbances in the Middle East. As recently as October 2014, Kerry blamed Israeli “intransigence” for the emergence of ISIS. But such allegations have become embarrassing now that the entire Middle East, in large part due to the collapse of American policy there, is in flames and millions of its citizens are overrunning Europe. Rare is the person who can any longer sort out the varieties of fanaticism that have set Sunnis against Shiites, “moderate” rebels against Syria, Arabs against Persians and every man’s hand against his brother’s. So the Obama administration has been forced to reduce, somewhat, the enormity of its accusations against Israel, but hardly to abandon them: now the Jews are to blame not for all of the world’s evil, only for the fact that even its own Arab citizens and most of their cousins harbor a deep-seated desire to murder their Jewish neighbors.

In November of 2013, Kerry specifically threatened, in an interview with England’s Channel 2 television, “chaos” and a “third intifada” if Israel’s “peace talks” with the Palestinian Authority (PA) fail. “Failure of the talks will increase Israel’s isolation in the world,” Kerry warned. “The alternative to getting back to the talks is a potential of chaos. I mean, does Israel want a third intifada?”

“I believe that if we do not resolve the issues between Palestinians and Israelis; if we do not find a way to find peace, there will be an increasing isolation of Israel. There will be an increasing campaign of delegitimization of Israel that’s taking place on an international basis. That if we do not resolve the question of the settlements and who lives where and how and what rights they have; if we don’t end the presence of Israeli soldiers perpetually within the West Bank...”

Such remarks, which offered license to attack Jews in any way possible, including, or rather especially, ways that count as war crimes — the more imaginative the better — could hardly have gone unnoticed by Abbas and Hamas.

They also knew that “Intifada Three” could be sure of powerful support and nimble apologetics



at *The New York Times*. Jodi Rudoren, Jerusalem bureau chief for the *Times*, jumped the gun slightly when she suggested in 2014 that the third intifada might already have arrived as “the car intifada,” in which Arab drivers expressed their innumerable grievances by running over Jewish pedestrians with their cars or larger vehicles. Rudoren’s specialty, as everybody knows, is the licentious equation between Muslim murder and Jewish misbehavior. Best-known examples

include her likening the Arab murder of four Jews in a Jerusalem synagogue to Jewish graffiti on a mosque; or Iranian to Israeli treatment of dissident journalists. Recently she also weighed in, on October 17, with a tawdry piece of agitprop entitled “East Jerusalem Bubbling over with Despair” that linked the knifing murders to inadequate municipal services in East Jerusalem. But will her relentless apologetics for Israel’s adversaries insure her own safety now that the “real” third intifada seems to be underway, with indiscriminate stabbing at its core? Or will she find herself in the predicament of Shakespeare’s Cinna in *Julius Caesar*? (Cinna is the unlucky poet who is mistaken by the “firebrands” who come to mourn their murdered emperor for another Cinna. He insists, but to no avail, that he is not “Cinna the conspirator,” but Cinna the poet. Will Rudoren be saved from the knife-wielder by insisting that “I am Rudoren, the anti-Israel Jew; I am not Rudoren the Zionist”? Good luck to her.)

Difficult as Rudoren’s detractors may find this to credit, she has actually been less passionate in her predictive yearning for Intifada Three than have her editors at the *Times*, who must at this moment

be ululating with glee, perhaps handing out candy. On March 17, 2013, they published in their Sunday magazine section a lavishly illustrated cover story entitled: “If There Is a Third Intifada, We Want to Be the Ones Who Started It,” by Ben Ehrenreich. He qualified himself to offer this modest proposal for politicide four years earlier, by publishing an article in the *Los Angeles Times* entitled “Zionism Is the Problem.” Not only, he alleged there, did it prevent harmonious relations between Jews and Arabs — it introduced into a region well-known for its rich ethnic and religious diversity a monolithic Jewish state, which must, by definition, be “exclusive” or else practice “ethnic cleansing.”

Ehrenreich’s obsession with the potentiality for Jewish ethnic cleansing, Jewish religious fanaticism and Jewish “apartheid” contrasted sharply with his entire indifference to the actuality of what the surrounding Arab and Muslim nations had already achieved at a cost of hundreds of thousands of lives, in all those lines of endeavor. He set forth the compelling urgency of politicide (dissolution would be too weak a word) for the ill-conceived and uniquely evil country called Israel. Surely the Jews were not “entitled” to a homeland just because they had had a rather rough time of it during World War II and earlier.

The New York Times Magazine spread portrays with love, sympathy and even adoration the villagers (without exception charming “people like you and me”) of Nabi Saleh in the disputed territories who, so Ehrenreich hoped, could provide manpower for the next intifada. The Second Intifada, lest we forget, killed over a thousand Israelis and maimed ten times that number in acts which, to borrow Sykes’



words about Hebron in 1929, “would be revolting among animals.” The photos on the *Times*’s cover (itself called “depraved” by Seth Mandel in *Commentary*) included at least two children among the budding heroes and heroines of the hoped for “Third Intifada.” One of them, 11-year-old Ahed Tamimi, had already been honored by Turkey’s frenzied, Jew-hating Prime Minister Erdogan

(Barack Obama’s “favorite European leader”) for her much-photographed provocations of Israeli soldiers. Another member of the Tamimi family, Ahlan, remains “much loved in Nabi Saleh.” And why? The parents of another child, Arnold and Frimet Roth, explain:

“That’s all he [Ehrenreich] writes about Ahlan Tamimi but we can tell you more. She is a Jordanian who was 21 years old and the news-reader on official Palestinian Authority television when she signed on with Hamas to become a terrorist. She engineered, planned and helped execute a massacre in the center of Jerusalem on a hot summer afternoon in 2001. She chose the target, a restaurant filled with Jewish children. And she brought the bomb. The outcome (15 killed, a sixteenth still in a vegetative state today, 130 injured) was so uplifting to her that she has gone on camera again and again to say, smiling into the camera lens, how proud she is of what she did. She is entirely free of regret.”

This little detail about “much loved” Ahlan is missing from Ehrenreich’s saints’ tale. Also missing is a quotation of the *raison d’être* of Hamas: to kill Jews, wherever they may be found.

The question that entered my mind when reading Ehrenreich’s adoring portrait of these trainees in “resistance” to the “occupation” was the following: “Couldn’t something like this celebration of past and potential murderers of Jews have been published in the *Dearborn Independent*?” My first reply was “of course.” This hateful paper, which was financed by Henry Ford from 1919 to 1927 and reached a circulation of 900,000 in 1925, has long been considered the most antisemitic of American newspapers. But my second reply was “no, not really — the *Dearborn Independent* stopped short of explicitly inciting murder of, or violence against, Jews.” Moreover, publisher Henry Ford apologized in 1927 in an open letter to Louis Marshall of the American Jewish Committee for “the wrong done to the Jews as fellow-men and brothers” by his paper. He asked “their forgiveness for the harm that I have unintentionally committed.”

Will the Sulzberger family ever do the same? Probably not — for *New York Times* editors know no limits where the “Palestinian” issue is concerned. For them, the dividing line between moral and immoral, permitted and forbidden, is like the receding horizon; they keep moving toward it, but can never quite reach it. The knife-brandishing, blood-lusting Boanerges in their mosques, and the demagogic leaders of Hamas and the Palestinian Authority, can be as confident of apologies for Intifada Three in the editorial offices of the *Times* as in the State Department of John Kerry and the boardroom of “Team Obama” — three of the places where it was predicted and thus encouraged.

Edward Alexander’s most recent book is Jews Against Themselves (Transaction Publishers, 2015). This appeared in the Algemeiner of October 20.

The Two-State Solution Is in Stalemate. What Can Israel Do to Prevail?

Part 2

Evelyn Gordon

Editors note: This is the second part (slightly edited) of Evelyn Gordon’s article which appeared in Mosaic Magazine of September 2015.. The first part was in last month’s Outpost.

But selling yourself is only half the public-diplomacy battle; the other half is discrediting your opponent. You’ll never hear Palestinian officials talk about Israel’s peacemaking bona fides, let alone about Israeli rights; Palestinians talk only about their own rights, while consistently accusing Israel of every crime known to mankind. Once again, however, Israel frequently does the opposite. Israeli leaders speak constantly of the need to “end the occupation” and the Palestinians’ “right” to a state; they also routinely laud PA President Mahmoud Abbas as a “partner for peace.”

This habit has badly undermined the credibility of Israel’s own case and has inevitably led much if not most of the world to place blame for the lack of peace on Israel’s doorstep. After all, if both sides agree that the PA wants peace, the Palestinians must be right to point the finger of blame at Israeli malfeasance. And even when Israel does try to call out the PA’s misbehavior and repeated bad faith, its inconsistent messaging makes it hard for people to take it seriously. Why, for instance, would anyone believe the (accurate) contention that Abbas has fled every proposed deal when Israel itself has repeatedly proclaimed him sincere in his desire for peace?

Similarly, and more damagingly, most of the world now regards Israel as occupying stolen Palestinian land. And why not? For two decades, Israel has downplayed its own legal claim to the West Bank and Gaza in order to promote Palestinian statehood there. This is a critical issue, because if Israel is a thief, it has no right to retain any of its stolen land or impose conditions on the return of that land to its rightful owners. By contrast, were it to be seen, rightly, as generously offering the Palestinians some of its own territory for the sake of peace, it would be in a better position to defend its right to retain certain areas for the sake of its security or impose conditions on their transfer.

As it happens, Israel’s claim to the West Bank and Gaza is strong. The League of Nations assigned these territories to the Jewish national home in 1922, and the UN Charter preserved that decision in Article 80. The UN’s 1947 partition plan was a nonbinding recommendation that the Arabs



rejected. The UN-brokered agreement that determined the 1949 armistice line, also known (wrongly) as the “pre-1967 border,” explicitly states that this was not a final border and did not prejudice any party’s territorial claims. Israel captured both the West Bank and Gaza in a defensive war in 1967, at a time when neither was under the rule of any recognized sovereign. UN Security Council Resolution 242, which ended the 1967 war, was explicitly worded to allow Israel to retain at least part of these territories.

If, outside of Israel, few people know any of this, that is because Israel rarely talks about it. And even when it does, its contradictory message about “ending the occupation” and Palestinians’ “right” to statehood undermines its credibility. After all, people have a “right” to statehood only on their own land; if Palestinians have that right, Israel must have stolen their land.

Add to all this that whereas the Palestinians in general relentlessly accuse Israel of various crimes, Israel has failed to be equally relentless in highlighting the PA’s constant incitement to violence, let alone its internal corruption, lack of democracy, and suppression of basic human rights. Only if Israel stops acting as the Palestinians’ defense attorney and instead explains, clearly and consistently, why its own case is worthy of support, as well as why the Palestinian case is not, will it have any hope of winning the public-diplomacy battle.

One final point to keep in mind, however, is that public diplomacy is a means, not an end. The primary end isn’t winning the world’s love, but winning the war. And that means it’s sometimes necessary to disregard global public opinion. Even if Israel were vastly to improve its public diplomacy, some decisions would still bring out the anti-Israel mobs, especially in Europe. If those decisions are important to Israel’s strategic ends, then Israel cannot be deterred by their global unpopularity.

For example, Israel was right to ignore the hundreds of thousands of Europeans who protested last summer’s war in Gaza; stopping the rocket fire from Gaza was more important. By the same token, it would be wrong to capitulate to global demands for an immediate pullout from the West Bank; fleeting public approval can’t compensate for the loss of strategically vital territory. As in any other war, Israel must weigh competing strategic considerations against each other and try to pick its battles.

III. Military Strategy

One area in which Israel has been relatively successful at such a balancing act is the realm of military action. If one thing is clear about the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, it is that, militarily, the two sides are not evenly matched. Israel has the capability to destroy both the PA in the West Bank and Hamas in Gaza. But so far, it has always deemed the costs of doing so too high, despite the significant benefits it might gain. In Gaza, for instance, a long-term takeover would almost certainly enable Israel to suppress the rocket fire; not one rocket has ever been fired from the West Bank, where Israel remains in military control, although the same terrorist groups with the same motivations are present. Its reasons for holding back include reluctance to resume full responsibility for Palestinian civilian affairs, fear of damaging the peace with Egypt and Jordan, concern about international backlash, and the potential cost in Israeli lives.

Instead, Israel has opted for a series of limited engagements whose goal is to reduce anti-Israel terror without sparking a broader regional conflict or too great an international reaction. Depending on how you count, there have been at least four such engagements over the 20 years since the PA was created, and there will certainly be more. The Israeli term for these periodic operations is “mowing the grass,” which has the depressing sound of a never-ending activity. But as Doron Almog, former head of the Israel Defense Forces’ Southern Command, noted in a 2004 study, that impression is misleading.

Citing the analogy of Israel’s own early history, when Arab states launched five conventional wars in 25 years before finally concluding that the price of fighting Israel was too high, Almog argues that the goal of “mowing the grass” is ultimately to bring Palestinians to the same conclusion. After three wars in Gaza in less than a decade, one might wonder if this is wishful thinking. Yet even in Gaza,

there have recently been some signs of progress. During the year after the first Gaza war ended in 2009, Palestinians fired 217 rockets at Israel from that territory. By comparison, only nine rockets and mortars were fired from Gaza in the first eleven months after the end of the latest war a year ago.

The one real challenge to this strategy has been the so-called lawfare campaign aimed at indicting Israel for “war crimes.” But even here, Israel has begun adapting. It has successfully lobbied several European countries to amend universal-jurisdiction laws that were enabling activists to threaten Israeli officials with legal action during official visits. After last summer’s war, the IDF also granted unprecedented access to former senior officers and legal experts from various Western countries; this resulted in several blue-ribbon reports concluding that Israel’s efforts to prevent civilian casualties have regularly met or surpassed Western standards, and these documents can be used to counter the predictably biased UN report.

IV. The Home Front

Any successful foreign policy must ultimately reflect a broad internal consensus, and as I noted early on, such a consensus has already developed in Israel. The irony is that although most Israelis—as many as 80 percent in some polls—agree that a two-state solution is currently unrealistic and unattainable, that view is not yet fully reflected at the political level. Israel’s main opposition party, Labor, still publicly insists the conflict is solvable right now, and while this stance helps explain why Labor has lost the last six elections, it undeniably hinders Israel’s ability to persuade the world otherwise.

The good news is that in democracies, public sentiment often percolates upward. For instance, the centrist Yesh Atid party spent the last Knesset term demanding final-status talks with the PA; today, it candidly judges such talks a dead end. But while waiting for other politicians to catch up, the government should make sure that it preserves the existing public consensus. In particular, this would mean being careful not to push beyond what that consensus can bear. Once again, last year’s war offers a salient example: reoccupying Gaza, despite the clear benefit in countering future terrorism, would have been a mistake; too many Israelis opposed the idea. Internal unity is a major strategic asset, and sacrificing a strategic asset for tactical gain is rarely wise.

Israel also needs to be socially cohesive enough to cope with both repeated wars and relentless international opprobrium, which means ensuring that, in addition to their security concerns, its citizens’ economic, social, and political concerns are addressed. In this respect, efforts to promote its own internal development necessarily constitute a crucial element of Israel’s foreign-policy strategy.

Israel has an impressive track record in this area, but like all countries, it has domestic problems that require attention. These include the high cost of living, an underperforming education system, and two sizable communities that are insufficiently integrated: Arabs and Haredi Jews.

For much of the past two decades, successive governments prioritized the peace process over domestic issues on the theory that ending the conflict with the Palestinians would make it that much easier to address Israel’s domestic problems. But in reality, the opposite is true: addressing domestic problems will ultimately make it easier to solve the conflict. Only an Israel that can continue growing and thriving—despite all the lawfare, economic warfare, and terror that its enemies can throw at it—will in the end convince the Palestinians that their dream of defeating Israel is unachievable.

V. The Paradigm

I began this essay by suggesting that the current stalemate between Israel and the Palestinians might be thought of as a kind of cold war. The choice of terminology was deliberate: to my mind, not only are there certain clear similarities between this conflict and the decades-long cold war between the West, particularly the United States, and the Soviet Union, but I believe that the ultimately victorious

strategy adopted by the U.S. provides a template for Israel's own approach to its long struggle with the Palestinians.

Thus, the U.S. negotiated repeatedly and sometimes even productively with the USSR throughout the cold war, but there were no fantasies of a grand final-status deal resolving all of the core issues dividing them; both sides realized that was impossible. Instead, the talks focused on smaller issues, including arms-limitation or trade, where it seemed actually possible to reach agreement and thereby ease tensions.

By means of public diplomacy, the U.S. largely succeeded in maintaining the support of fractious allies under difficult circumstances, while also convincing millions of Soviet subjects that the American model was economically, politically, and morally superior to their own. It achieved this not merely by investing heavily in selling its own narrative (for instance, by establishing Voice of America and Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty to broadcast to Communist countries), but also by adhering to two important principles.

First, its narrative stressed the positive goods America really delivered on, like freedom, opportunity, human rights, and economic growth; by contrast, the Soviet Union was ultimately unable to deliver on its counter-narrative of economic development accompanied by equality and social justice, which for decades continued to attract legions of adherents and admirers worldwide until its failure became incontrovertible.

On the military front, where the nuclear threat made it imperative to avoid a direct clash, Washington instead adopted a strategy of limited engagements, often fought by proxies. In this way, it sought to further its own influence, contain Soviet expansionism, and sap Soviet resources while avoiding the unacceptable costs of all-out war.

Finally, at home, despite sometimes vehement internal disagreements over specific policies, America was able to lead the free world's resistance to Soviet aggression thanks in great measure to a bipartisan consensus on the need to do so. And it was able to sustain and ultimately to win the cold war largely because it was an economic success while the Soviet Union became an economic basket case, forcing the USSR under Mikhail Gorbachev to give up its dream of defeating the West.



Today, with the benefit of hindsight, America's victory in the cold war might seem a forgone conclusion. But it certainly didn't seem that way to anyone on either side at the time. There were many moments when Americans genuinely believed the Soviets were winning, and right up until the end, when the Soviet Union collapsed, few imagined the cold war would end during their lifetime, let alone imminently. In the mid-1980s, when I attended college, the cold war was still America's top foreign-policy issue. Two years after I graduated, the Berlin Wall was gone, and shortly thereafter the Soviet Union was no more.

It's impossible to predict how many more decades Israel's cold war will last, or what form a solution will take. Numerous possibilities present themselves. Perhaps the Palestinians will finally become willing to make peace, and a two-state solution will come into being. Perhaps the steadily rising Jewish fertility rate, the falling Palestinian one, and an unexpected influx of immigrants (hardly unprecedented in Israel's history) will change the demographic picture enough to allow Israel to absorb the territories without risking its Jewish majority. Perhaps the Hashemite regime in Amman will collapse, as other Arab regimes have done in recent years, and Jordan, which already has a Palestinian majority, will become a real Palestinian state, changing the dynamics of negotiations over the West Bank. Or

perhaps the solution will come from some development no one has yet imagined, just as few people envisioned the Soviet empire's implosion until it happened.

What matters is for Israel to ensure it can survive and thrive until some solution becomes possible. And one way to do that is to follow America's cold-war playbook. Use military force when and where necessary, but be careful to contain the conflict. Negotiate when possible, but on small deals that will reduce tensions and improve conditions rather than on big issues where agreement is unattainable. Fight the public-diplomacy war by investing the necessary resources, by advocating Israel's cause rather than the Palestinian cause, and by emphasizing Israel's successes rather than its failures—all the while remembering that public diplomacy is a means rather than an end, and strategic priorities should never be sacrificed to global public opinion. Preserve internal unity—an incalculable strategic asset—and invest heavily in Israel's own economic and social development.

All of these are doable. And by doing them, Israel can survive and thrive despite its cold war, and ultimately win it—just as America did.

Evelyn Gordon is an American born journalist who immigrated to Israel in 1987.

Sweden Close to Collapse

Ingrid Carlqvist

Sweden is fast approaching a complete collapse. More and more municipalities are raising the alarm that if the migrants keep coming at this pace, the government can no longer guarantee normal service to its citizens. In addition, ominous statements from government officials have left Swedes in fear of what tomorrow may bring. If the migrant wave keeps coming, in 10-15 years, Swedes will be a minority in their own country.

At a press conference October 9, Prime Minister Stefan Löfven said that Sweden is in a state of crisis. However, when asked to clarify what he meant by this, Löfven was unable to produce a single coherent sentence.



Stefan Löfven

"Yes, well first of all we, we are in the middle of what I mean seriously when I'm saying, when I express a, a big thank you to all the people doing such a great job, because it is a humanitarian effort, it's just as the Minister for Justice and Migration just said. What we are actually doing is that we are saving lives when people who come from bombs, from, from killing, from oppression, their lives are shattered. We, we help them and that is a, that is a great humanitarian effort,. and of course now that we can see the number of people who need it... And that we are facing a crisis situation, that is in part why I, we are outlining today that we are also preparing for a situation where we may need to house people in tents, because we stand up with the humanitarian refugee policy, right of asylum, but we can now also see that we cannot close our eyes to the fact that there are more coming than ever in such a short time, and we need to provide a roof over their heads. Then it is -- other things may be required."

The prospect of spending an ice-cold Swedish winter in a tent may make migrants choose countries other than Sweden. If not, a complete collapse of the Swedish system is imminent.

In 2014, the Danish historian and social commentator Lars Hedegaard prophetically remarked in the book *Farliga ord (Dangerous Words)*:

"If there is any lesson to be drawn from history, it is that what you do not think will happen, does. Time and again. The final consequence of the West's and, above all, Sweden's immigration policy is that the economy will collapse -- because who is going to pay for it all? And economic breakdowns, once they happen, always happen very fast."



Right now, the Swedish government is borrowing money abroad to pay for immigration. But that amount is not enough. On October 1, Minister for Home Affairs Anders Ygeman said that the current wave of immigrants will lead to "huge economic strains;" and a few days later Immigration Service Director General Anders Danielsson explained that "within the framework of the system we all know, we are now approaching the end of the road." Statements such as these have never been heard before in Sweden, especially in connection with the "sacred" issue of migration. Until now, Swedes have perpetually been told that we live in a rich country that has no problem handling all asylum seekers who want to come here.

There is now talk of 180,000 asylum seekers coming to Sweden in 2015. That number is more than twice as many as the year before. If half of them are granted asylum, and they each bring over three relatives, we are talking about 270,000 new immigrants to Sweden -- within one year. Over 8000 people arrived just last week, 1,716 of whom were so-called "unaccompanied refugee children."

Swedes who only follow the mainstream media get the impression that all the migrants arriving are war refugees from Syria, but the number of Syrians is actually less than half of the total: 2,864 people last

week claimed to be from Syria. 1,861 claimed to be from Iraq and 1,820 from Afghanistan. Clearly, many people from countries that are not at war are taking their chances and applying for asylum in Sweden; but this is something about which the mainstream media does not see fit to inform its followers.

The Swedish economist Tino Sanandaji (of Iranian-Kurdish descent, and therefore tougher than most Swedes, who, if they criticize the immigration policy, are immediately accused of racism) writes on his blog that Swedes could soon be in the minority in their own country:

"One of the municipalities that has been flooded with migrants is Trelleborg (population 43,000), located on Sweden's southernmost coast. Over 100 'unaccompanied refugee children' arrive from Germany via ferry on a typical day. During the last two weeks, more than 1000 such youths have been registered; more than half of them have now vanished and are listed as missing. No one knows why, or where they have gone. Add to this 13,000 adult asylum seekers."

Impromptu temporary lodgings have been created in sports centers, ice rinks, and at the Sturup airport hotel, to name a few.

Trelleborg has written a desperate letter of appeal for help to the government, just as, a few weeks ago, the Örkelljunga municipality did, in vain.

Malmö, about 18 miles from Trelleborg, is also in dire straits. For the last few weeks, the central train station in Sweden's third largest city has been overrun with migrants, and the volunteers that showed up for the first few days with food, water and clothes now seem to have lost interest. The daily *Sydsvenska Dagbladet* summed up the desperate situation in Malmö, where even the city's empty jail

was considered (and rejected) as possible housing for refugee children. It now looks more like a possibility for adult refugees.

While all this plays out, large portions of the Swedish people watch in horror from the sidelines and wonder when the unavoidable collapse will occur. At the same time, a surprisingly large proportion of the citizenry still overconfidently believe that "Daddy State" will make everything all right. This is a very Swedish view, like the wishes of children, that Peter Santesson, head of polling institute *Demoskop*, wrote about on the website *Dagens Opinion*. Santesson states that the Swedes have an unusually high level of trust in the social order, and that they are convinced that "somewhere higher up, there is always someone smarter and more informed; taking responsibility and making sure everything works." If the government officials turn out to be incapable of handling the refugee chaos they themselves have created, it could be disastrous.

Santesson continues: "Responsible decision makers need to ponder the trust the people have now bestowed on them, and they need to handle this trust with care in this difficult crisis. If the people's confidence is betrayed by them turning out not to be able to handle the situation – if 'Sweden' turns out to be insufficient as a miracle cure and the crisis becomes too much to handle -- the outcome could be political and social consequences reaching far beyond the issue of immigration."

The country that just 20 years ago was considered one of the safest and most affluent in the world, is now in danger of becoming a failed state.

Ingrid Carlqvist is a journalist based in Sweden, and a Fellow of the Gatestone Institute. You can read the entire article at: <http://www.gatestoneinstitute.org/6697/sweden-collapse>

Herbert Zweibon's Last Project:

A new video has gone up at Zionism101.org:



"Israel's War of Independence Part 3: Victory" depicts the period from the first truce on June 11th, 1948 to the war's end. From the moment the truce ends on July 8th, the initiative passes to Israel's hands. The ensuing battles will lead to victory but at great cost.

You can see it directly via the following link:

<http://zionism101.org/NewestVideoVimeo.aspx>

In Praise of a Great Man

Ruth King



Theodor Herzl (1860-1904), (originally Benjamin Ze'ev Herzl), was a Hungarian-born journalist who became the founding father of modern political Zionism. The narrative of his life gives the lie to the ahistorical canard that Zionism evolved from the ashes of the Holocaust.

In 1882, Herzl, a secular and cosmopolitan Jew, encountered anti-Semitism while a student in the University of Vienna and withdrew from his fraternity when it took part in an anti-Jewish demonstration.

Becoming a successful writer and playwright, he only became preoccupied with the fate of the Jews

a decade later.

It was the Dreyfus trial that would bring Herzl to the Zionist solution. In 1894, in France, in a gross miscarriage of justice, Captain Alfred Dreyfus was sentenced to life imprisonment on Devil's Island in French Guiana for allegedly communicating French military secrets to the Germans. He would remain there for five years.

Herzl covered the trial as a journalist and was initially neutral. But when he saw the trial, learned that evidence of Dreyfus's innocence had been suppressed, and heard shouts of "Death to the Jews" coming from French citizens, he understood that "egalite and fraternite", the slogans of the French Revolution, did not extend to Jews.

He also saw anti-Semitism as the centuries-old and immutable bed rock of European society. At first Herzl did not have a specific focus but thought in terms of a broad political movement of Jews. It was only after he met with Baron Moritz de Hirsch, who was not receptive, that he had an epiphany, what he described as a cataract of thought racing through his brain, that told him the only solution was Jewish sovereignty in the ancient homeland.

In 1896 Herzl published *Der Judenstaat*, (*The Jewish State*) originally conceived as a plan to be submitted to the Rothschilds (Herzl was persuaded that there was no point in doing so since the response would be negative.) Herzl was not the first to invoke the need for Jewish sovereignty. In 1862, Moses Hess wrote *Rome and Jerusalem* calling for a Jewish homeland in Palestine, which included the caveat that "even after the establishment of a Jewish state, the majority of the Jews who live at present in civilized countries of the west will undoubtedly remain where they are." In 1881, in Russia, Leo Pinsker wrote *Self Emancipation: An Appeal to His People by a Russian Jew* declaring: "the Jews are not a living nation; they are everywhere aliens; therefore they are despised. The proper and the only remedy would be the creation of a Jewish nationality, of a people living upon its own soil, the self-emancipation of the Jews; their emancipation as a nation among nations by acquisition of a home of their own."

At the time Herzl was accused of ignoring his predecessors but in fact he knew nothing about them, coming to Zionism independently. And it was Herzl who turned the Zionist idea into an international political movement. This was epitomized in the First Zionist Congress in Basle in August 1897, which adopted the so-called Basle Program, calling for "a home for the Jewish people in Eretz Israel secured under public law." The impact of Herzl's personality is apparent from the reaction of one of the delegates when Herzl rose to speak: "It is no longer the elegant Dr. Herzl of Vienna. It is a royal scion of the House of David, risen from among the dead, clothed in legend, fantasy and beauty."



Herzl tirelessly pursued his vision. The “great powers” that Herzl believed would welcome Zionism as the way to end “the Jewish problem” disappointed him. He first put his hopes in the German Kaiser whom he met through the good offices of his first important non-Jewish follower William Heckler. But while Kaiser Wilhelm was initially enthusiastic, he lost all interest when the Sultan brushed aside his proposal and he subsequently dismissed Herzl with a sneer. Herzl then sought to deal directly with the Sultan, promising financial aid in return for a charter to settle Palestine, but after a year’s negotiations led nowhere was convinced this was a dead end.

Herzl turned to the British in hopes of obtaining land around El Arish, which was in the Sinai, the stage on which the Jewish nation was forged. But this ran into the wall of Egyptian opposition. Joseph Chamberlain, the British Colonial Secretary, suggested instead territory in Uganda (actually modern Kenya) and

Herzl brought the proposal to the Zionist Congress after the Kishinev pogroms convinced him that finding some territorial sanctuary was essential—even if the goal of Palestine had to be postponed. Herzl was astonished to find that the Russian Jews, those most in need of asylum, including the Jews of Kishinev, were those who opposed most vigorously any territory but the Land of Israel. When the Zionist Congress voted to send an exploratory mission to East Africa, 170 delegates walked out in protest.

Herzl’s chief adherents came from Eastern Europe, whose poverty stricken masses experienced pogroms at worst, oppression at best. In the United States, Herzl’s ideas were staunchly opposed by the reform movement. At the Pittsburgh Conference in November 1885 Reform affirmed its opposition: “We consider ourselves no longer a nation, but a religious community; and we therefore expect neither a return to Palestine, nor a sacrificial worship under the sons of Aaron, nor the restoration of any of the laws concerning a Jewish state.” Reform leader Rabbi Isaac Mayer Wise wrote in *The American Israelite*: “The Herzl-Nordau scheme...is so fraught with the possibility of mischief . . . it becomes the duty of every true Jew to take an active part in efforts to destroy it.”

In his 1902 novel, *Altneuland* (Old New Land, 1902), Herzl laid out his vision of an egalitarian, pluralist and secular Jewish state—one that would dazzle the world by its technological and scientific achievements and “be a light unto the nations.” There is no mention of an army or hostile faith-driven Moslem Arabs.

Herzl died of heart disease in 1904. He was only 44. His death was probably hastened both by political stress and a tragic family life. Herzl never saw the Zion Mule Corps, never saw the fruition of Eliezer Ben Yehuda’s dream of the restoration of Hebrew, and of course never saw the raising of Israel’s flag with the Star of David in 1948. He never saw the mighty defense force of the New/Old Land.

Herzl’s enormous role in creating all the above is epic history. His spirit hovers over Israel, where he was reburied in 1949 on a promontory that bears his name--Mt. Herzl.

His memory is a blessing.

To learn more about Herzl (with the immediacy only video can bring) log into to Zionism 101.org and click on *Course 1: Theodor Herzl*.

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: judy@afsi.org