

Welcome to Palestine

By Caroline Glick *The Jerusalem Post* January 29, 2007

In the world of international diplomacy few issues receive more wall-to-wall support than the notion that it is essential to establish a Palestinian state. Leaders worldwide are so busy speaking of how essential it is for a State of Palestine to be founded that none of them seems to have noticed that it already exists.

This state was officially founded in the summer of 2005, when Israel removed its military forces and civilian population from the Gaza Strip and so established the first wholly independent Palestinian state in history. Israel's destruction of four Israeli communities in Northern Samaria and curtailment of its military operations in the area set the conditions for statehood in that area as well.

And so it is that as statesmen and activists worldwide loudly proclaim their commitment to establishing the sovereign State of Palestine, they miss the fact that Palestine exists. And it is a nightmare.

In the State of Palestine 88 percent of the public feels insecure. Perhaps the other 12 percent are members of the multitude of regular and irregular militias. For in the State of Palestine the ratio of police/militiamen/men-under-arms to civilians is higher than in any other country on earth.

In the State of Palestine, two-year-olds are killed and no one cares. Children are woken up in the middle of the night and murdered in front of their parents. Worshipers in mosques are gunned down by terrorists who attend competing mosques. And no one cares. No international human rights groups publish reports calling for an end to the slaughter. No UN body condemns anyone or sends a fact-finding mission to investigate the murders.

In the State of Palestine, women are stripped naked and forced to march in the streets to humiliate their husbands. Ambulances are stopped on the way to hospitals and wounded are shot in cold blood. Terrorists enter operating rooms in hospitals and unplug patients from life-support machines.

In the State of Palestine, people are kidnapped from their homes in broad daylight and in front of the television cameras. This is the case because the kidnappers themselves are cameramen. Indeed, their commanders often run television stations. And because terror commanders run television stations in the State of Palestine, it should not be surprising that they bomb the competition's television stations.

So it was that last week, terrorists from this group or that group bombed Al Arabiya television station in Gaza. And so it is that Hamas attacks Fatah radio announcers and closes down their radio station claiming that they use their microphones to incite murder. Because indeed, they are inciting murder. What would one expect for terrorists to do when placed in charge of a radio station?

And so it is that in the State of Palestine, journalists - whether members of terror groups or not - are part of the 88 percent of their public who are afraid. Sunday they protested outside the offices of one terror faction or another that controls the Palestinian Authority.

Speaking to *The Jerusalem Post*, reporter Ala Masharawi explained, "No one goes outside, no one moves without thinking twice. Gaza's streets have become terrible streets, especially at night. Gaza is a ghost town."

As the *Post's* Khaled Abu Toameh reported last week, in the State of Palestine, Christians are persecuted, robbed and beaten in what can only be viewed as a systematic campaign to end the Christian presence in places like Bethlehem. As Samir Qumsiyeh, owner of the Beit Sahur-based private Al-Mahd (Nativity) TV station lamented, "I believe that 15 years from now there will be no Christians left in Bethlehem. Then you will need a torch to find a Christian here."

Many Government ministers and commentators seek strategic meaning in the strife in the State of Palestine. Foreign Minister Tzipi Livni, for instance, goes on and on about the need to strengthen the "moderates" - that is, the Fatah terror group - over the "extremists" - that is, the Hamas terror group.

Helping her to propound this nonsense is PA Chairman and Fatah chief Mahmoud Abbas. Abbas and his men tell Westerners how pro-Western they are at the same time as they name streets and schools financed by US aid after Saddam Hussein and build sports facilities on the American taxpayers' tab in memory of terrorists who killed American soldiers in Iraq.

For the umpteenth time, on Sunday Fatah spokesmen in PA Chairman Mahmoud Abbas's office blamed Iran and Syria for the escalating violence in Gaza and Judea and Samaria that has killed 29 people, including two children, in four days. "Iran and Syria are encouraging Hamas to continue fighting against Fatah," they alleged.

Damra and his partner and fellow Fatah terrorist Mahamad Ramaha, who was arrested a month ago, were working under the instruction of Hizbullah - that is, under the direction of Iran. According to the Shin Bet, Hizbullah - that is, Iran - has taken over Fatah operations in Nablus. Since Israel's withdrawal from northern Samaria in August 2005, the Shin Bet has noted that, like Gaza, the Nablus area has become a mini-Afghanistan.

So not only are Hamas terrorists operating under Iranian and Syrian direction today, Fatah terrorists are as well. Yet this doesn't stop the US and Israel from pouring guns and money into the hands of Fatah terror chiefs. They fail to recognize that what you see is what you get.

These guns are not used to encourage moderation. These guns are used against Israelis and Palestinians alike in a turf battle between terror groups over money, guns and power that will never end. And it will never end because fighting and killing for money, guns and power is what terrorists do.

For the past 13 years, since the Palestinian Authority was established in 1994, the contours of the State of Palestine have taken form in front of our eyes. Starting with Yasser Arafat's abrogation of the rule of law and murderous campaign against land dealers and journalists, with each passing year and with each move to further empower the PA, the situation has only grown worse. And yet, international pressure on Israel from Arabs, Europeans and the US to surrender more territory, curtail its authority, abrogate its claims to the areas set for Palestine, and finance the Fatah terror group have only grown in intensity.

And with each passing year, as the reality of Palestine has become clearer, the Israeli leadership's will to resist this pressure is increasingly eroded.

So it is that last week Defense Minister Amir Peretz announced that he supports negotiating with Hamas. Peretz laid out his "vision" for the reinstatement of the so-called peace process with the

Palestinians, and stated that, to "empower" the Palestinians, he supports extending the ban on IDF operations from Gaza to Judea and Samaria. It should go without saying that such IDF operations are aimed at preventing massacres of Israeli civilians like the one that happened in Eilat Monday morning.

Livni, for her part, has become the international champion of Fatah. Gushing to an audience of international peace processors in Davos, Switzerland, last week, Livni said, "In order to achieve peace and in order to promote a process, we must stick to this vision of a two-state solution and examine what the best steps to take are."

Of course, neither Livni nor Peretz, who insist that Israel's most urgent priority is to establish Palestine, is willing to recognize that Palestine exists already. They refuse to acknowledge what we already know: Palestine is a terror state and an economic basket case fully funded by the international community. Indeed, over the past year since Hamas won the Palestinian elections, international assistance to the Palestinians has increased dramatically.

As Ibrahim Gambari, the UN under-secretary-general for political affairs, noted last Thursday, official Western aid to the Palestinians, not including Arab and Iranian support for Hamas and Fatah, increased by 10 percent in 2006 over 2005, and stood at \$1.2 billion.

The Palestinians, who receive more aid per capita than any people on earth, are needy not because they lack funds. They are poor because they prefer poverty, violence and war to prosperity, peace and moderation. So it is that 57 percent of Palestinians support terror attacks against Israel.

The multitude of protesters worldwide who demand an end to the so-called "occupation" and the establishment of Palestine should be made aware of the fact that Palestine already exists. The hordes of political leaders mindlessly squawking about "visions" and "two-state solutions" should know: This is Palestine. Enter at your own risk.

Two lectures from the prestigious Herzliya Security conference (1) By Professor Robert Aumann, Nobel Prize Laureate January 25, 2007

First of all, I would like to thank the conference organizers for inviting me to speak at this important and central event. I was asked to speak about the existential dangers threatening the State of Israel. One danger known to all of us stems from Iran's nuclear armament program, which threatens to erase the State of Israel from the map. We cannot underestimate the importance of this danger. However, in my humble opinion, it is less threatening than it appears at first glance. Iran is a nation like all nations; it has an address-we know who it is and where it is. If the rumors are true-that the State of Israel has according deterrence capability, and no less importantly, means of

delivering weapons, then there is indeed a danger, but it is a limited one. The rulers of Iran are often called lunatics, but there is no evidence that this is the case. Iran's rulers act very rationally. They have goals that indeed oppose our goals, but these are their goals, and they advance them very effectively. The destruction of central Iranian cities is not one of their goals. We certainly need to stand guard, but the fear of Iran's direct use of nuclear weapons against Israel seems minimal. I allow myself to speak freely because I don't know anything that's happening in the field-perhaps less than anyone in this hall.

However, unfortunately, there is a different danger in Iran's nuclear armament-more tangible and

more threatening, although more indirect. This danger is hidden in the possibility that nuclear technology will be transferred from Iran to terrorist groups such as Al Qa'ida or others-groups whose identities are indistinct, who have no address. Even these groups are not insane; they act consistently, rationally, and sophisticated in order to achieve their goals. But because they have no address, direct deterrence policy is not effective in their case. Thus, if they succeed in obtaining nuclear weapons, it is unclear how we will be able to deter them from using it against us.

These groups, or some of them, are very close in their goals and ideology to Iran. Therefore, this is a great danger in the transfer of nuclear technology and the necessary materials from Iran to these groups. One possibility is that such a transfer would be intended and approved by the Iranian authorities. Another possibility, which is more likely, is that the transfer will not be intended or planned; this is a case of infiltration of radical terrorist elements into the Iranian nuclear system or of a lack of sufficient caution of the Iranian authorities or of a leak or of deliberate smuggling in the lower echelons of the Iranian system-leaks and smuggling that are unauthorized and even unknown to the higher echelons. If such a transfer occurs in one of these two ways, then we will in fact be in substantial trouble. We will not be able to directly prevent these groups to execute their schemes. Therefore, we must act indirectly by offering appropriate incentives. In my opinion, there are two ways to do this. One is to create strong and tangible motivation for the government of Iran to prevent at all costs the transfer of nuclear technology and materials to groups that do not function under its auspices. The second and less effective way is to give strong and tangible motivation to these terrorist groups we have mentioned not to use nuclear weapons against Israel, even if they have obtained such weapons. As we have said, this type of deterrence is not easy because these groups have no address, but they have goals and they have an ideological identity, and it is possible to create adequate incentives on this backdrop. We mentioned two existential threats facing the State of Israel-the direct nuclear threat and the indirect nuclear threat. As we have said, the second danger is greater, and now a few words about a third threat, which is perhaps the greatest of all. It does not come from Iran, nor from terrorist groups, nor from any external source. It comes from within us. "We have met the enemy, and it is us." Esteemed ladies and gentlemen, your humble servant makes his living from game theory-among other things, very serious games: games of life and death and of existence and annihilation. The name of the game in game theory is motivation, incentives. Earlier, we discussed the motivations of those standing on the opposite side. Motivating ourselves is the most

important thing, and the thing we are losing the most. Without motivation, we will not endure. What are we doing here? Why are we here? What are we aspiring to here? We are here because we are Jewish, we are Zionist, because of our ancient bond to this land; we aspire to realize our 2000-year-old hope of becoming a free nation in our land, the Land of Zion and Jerusalem. Without this profound understanding, we will not endure. We will simply no longer be here; Post-Zionism will finish us off. About half a year ago in Petra, Jordan, the prime minister said that we are tired. He was right. He was elected by the nation, and he expresses the sentiments of the nation. We are like a mountain-climber that gets caught in a snowstorm; the night falls, he is cold and tired, and he wants to sleep. If he falls asleep, he will freeze to death. We are in terminal danger because we are tired. I will allow myself to say a few unpopular, unfashionable words: our panicked lunging for peace is working against us. It brings us farther away from peace, and endangers our very existence. I think it was Churchill who said, "If you want peace, prepare for war." The preparation includes material preparation, a fantastic army, effective tools of war, but above all, we are talking about spiritual preparation, about spiritual readiness to go to war.

Roadmaps, capitulation, gestures, disengagements, convergences, deportations, and so forth do not bring peace. On the contrary, they bring war, just as we saw last summer. These things send a clear signal to our "cousins" that we are tired, that we no longer have spiritual strength, that we have no time, that we are calling for a time-out. They only whet their appetites. It only encourages them to pressure us more, to demand more, and not to give up on anything. These things stem from simple theoretical considerations and also from straight thinking. But it's not just theory: it has been proven and reproven in the field over thousands of years. I returned today from a trip to India, where we heard about historical stories that illustrate the same. Capitulations bring about war; determination and readiness bring about peace. Ladies and gentlemen, we must tell our cousins that we are staying here. We are not moving. We have time; we have patience; we have stamina. Understand this and internalize it. And we must not simply say it to our cousins but feel it within ourselves. This and only this will bring peace. We can really live in peace and unity and cooperation with our cousins. But only after they understand and internalize that the Zionist state will be here forever. Thank you very much.

Professor Aumann teaches at the Center for the Study of Rationality at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. He won the Nobel prize in Economics in 2005.

(2) By Dr. Salam Fayyad, former PA Finance Minister January 24, 2007

I would like to extend my thanks to the conference organizers for inviting me to speak before you. I recognize the importance of this conference – it is the very platform where major Israeli policies have been laid out including, most recently, unilateralism in the form of the Israeli "disengagement" from the Gaza Strip. As a Palestinian, who has felt the effects of these policies, it is my hope that today I will be able to shed some light on this issue, and on how together we can chart a new, brighter, more promising future for the Middle East – not just for our two peoples.

It would have been very easy for me to focus my talk today on economics and finance. But owing to the very important role that politics play in the success or failure of any economy and indeed the future of any state, I decided instead to focus my comments on matters of politics, leaving matters of economics and finance aside for the moment.

Examining the past 6 years of this conflict, I would characterize the Israeli-Palestinian relations over this period as having been too intimate – too intimate for the Palestinians and too intimate for the Israelis. You may be stunned by this characterization, for many have characterized it as the opposite. But the nature of relations today between Israelis and Palestinians has reached levels of micromanagement, where Israel is involved in the minute details of the lives of Palestinians. It is important to remember that the entirety of the West Bank and Gaza Strip is ruled by military orders – not by politics, logic, or reason – but by military orders with "security" dictating the rules of the game. Whether through the erection of hundreds of checkpoints and roadblocks throughout the West Bank – most of which have no real security rationale, the requirement that Palestinians obtain permits to travel even within the West Bank or some of the absurd rules which are largely unknown to Israelis, the occupation has seeped into almost every aspect of Palestinian life. Take, for example, the recently announced prohibition on Palestinians riding in Israeli yellow-plated cars. While to many there is a clear security rationale, what is ignored are the ramifications of such policies. I know many Jerusalemites for whom this new policy means that they cannot transport their own relatives who happen, by the fate of war, to be characterized as "West Bankers." I also know many Palestinians – whether in Jerusalem or elsewhere – whose land has been taken away and whose families have been divided for the construction of the wall. These are the details to which few Israelis are exposed but the very reality that Palestinians continue to live and suffer from daily.

And, while I understand that in the design of these and other measures there may be a "security"

rationale involved, the effect is not to create more security for Israel, but rather to create more conditions for future instability. Why? Because at its core, this conflict is NOT a security conflict with political ramifications but instead a POLITICAL conflict with security ramifications. Unfortunately, for the past six years, and arguably longer, the focus has been solely on security, ignoring the inherent link between Israel's lack of security and the Palestinians' lack of freedom. This is not a humanitarian conflict needing a humanitarian response, nor is this a security conflict requiring a security response. What we are both suffering from is a political conflict requiring a political solution.

There was once, arguably, a focus on the larger picture – beyond checkpoints, dirt mounds and permits – to major political issues: Jerusalem, borders, refugees, the settlements, etc. Unfortunately, the process took center stage and not the actual need for peace. While meetings between the two sides and with the international community abounded, what was ignored was whether progress was actually being made to end the conflict – the occupation – and give both peoples what they want: peace. Today, meetings have been reduced to discussions on small, practical (and sometimes not so practical) issues that are peripheral to the conflict. By focusing on the peripheral, we are no closer to solving our problems and hence no closer to peace. We need to broaden our view and look to politics – not only to the small issues that are not germane to the fundamental nature of this conflict.

It is easy for Israel to shrug away and do nothing. Israel – as the stronger party to this conflict – has the luxury to do nothing. But in doing nothing, Israel is doing something: it is not contributing to solving this conflict; it is making it fester. Many believe that we are stuck between doing nothing and between unilateral approaches. Yet from our experience we should now know that neither approach works: both doing nothing and acting unilaterally only serve to make matters worse.

What then should be done? We need bifocals. Yes, bifocals. By that, I mean we need clear vision to address the short term and the long term. While it is important to address the immediate concerns that preoccupy Palestinians and Israelis on a daily basis, we need to do so within a framework that provides a clear and agreed definition of where we are going and how we are going to get there. Ever so skeptical of transitional solutions, the need for a concrete definition of the "final status" was, for a long time, perceived to be a predominantly Palestinian need. But, I would argue that the adverse developments of the past few years, including the misgivings of unilateralism, have made working toward transitional arrangements in the absence of an agreed final status

equally unattractive from the point of view of Israelis as well.

A peaceful solution is inevitable. It is. It is impossible to maintain the status quo because the status quo is not static; it is fluid and, unfortunately only gets worse, not better. There is no question that there will be stability when the Palestinians are given their freedom. The vision that has been laid out by President Bush and embraced by President Abbas is that of peaceful coexistence. For Israelis, this means feeling safe and secure; for Palestinians this means being free of Israeli interference and also living in safety and security. But these are just statements. What I really want to lay out for you is a vision for positive relations; not just coexistence.

Palestinians have a vision of peace. We want our state to be a qualitative addition to the region and model of democratic values and good governance. When I speak of good governance I mean it concretely – not as a lofty and unattainable goal but one in which the rule of law and not the rule of the gun will prevail. Palestinians have the highest rate of PhD holders per capita in the Arab world (I am one of those statistics), and our focus will be on creating a generation of smart, educated Palestinians who will demand no less than a credible system of laws and respect for rights. Many might ask why this has not happened already? The answer lies mainly in the occupation and the lack of freedom for the Palestinians. When you live in a context where there is no respect for laws under a suffocating and oppressive occupation, it is very difficult to demand and enforce civility.

That said, I will never use occupation as an excuse to allow ourselves to be sloppy or lax in the building of our state. As a Palestinian nationalist and someone who is committed to working to end the occupation, I will demand certain things from our independent Palestinian state on behalf of all Palestinians. I want to see a state that is free, where respect for rights is guaranteed (not simply sloganized), where education is at the fore, and where democracy is guiding principle.

These are matters that are of concern to Israel. But more importantly, I want to spell out a vision of peace with Israel. I seek a warm peace with Israel. I don't want it so warm that you are in our backyard as you are now, but I seek a warm peace. I seek strong political ties with Israel; I seek strong economic ties between the independent states of Israel and Palestine. I seek warm relations with Israelis. Yes, we

seek warm relations with you. We do not want to simply get to a point where we just accept each other – we want to have warm relations where we both recognize the mutual economic, political, intellectual and spiritual benefits of living and working together. We do not want to erect walls; we want to see bridges. We do not want to close you out of our lives – we want to live with you – as your neighbors and as your equals.

At heart, I am an optimist. Why? How? After so much effort from all parties and after such spectacular failure, many question how I can persist in my optimism. The answer lies in the fact that I know that there is a great deal of depth of goodwill on both sides, and on the part of the international community.

This does not mean that the solution will be easy. It won't. If it were, obviously we would have been there. Political and other sacrifices are required and we will need to be bold and explain to our respective publics what we want and how to achieve it.

Time is running out for us. Time is not on our side. I am part of the last generation of Palestinians who see Israelis in normal settings, who meets with Israelis and who can call Israelis "friends." The cold separation coupled with the micromanagement of affairs must disappear soon, for if it does not, we will never be able to live together as equals with mutual respect. In Arabic, there is a saying which is, ironically, the opposite of its English language counterpart – "absence makes the heart grow colder". As a father and husband, I fear that our hearts are growing colder the more that we are separated. I want a future for my children and I am certain that you do too. The future that I seek is a warm, bright one for them. And I know that you share this vision too. Too much time has been wasted. It is time for us to get back on track and work to end this conflict so that our children's future can be marked by Palestinian-Israeli friendships; not Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

Mr. Fayyad is the US trained former Finance Minister of the Palestinian National Authority, who is considered one of the few Palestinian politicians who is not corrupt. He ran as founder and leader of the new Third Way political party, and sits in the Palestinian Authority Legislative Council.

Judgment Day By Yossi Klein HaLevi The Wall Street Journal January 26, 2007

The Israeli presidency is largely a ceremonial position and has only one real purpose: to uphold the honor of the Jewish state. Yet over the last six

months, as accusations of sexual crimes accumulated against him, President Moshe Katsav resisted demands to resign, insisting on his right to remain in

office until being formally charged -- even though, by tainting the presidency with scandal, he has betrayed the job's core requirement. Now, with impending charges that include rape, sexual harassment, obstruction of justice and fraud, he is being dragged out of office: Yesterday, the Knesset approved the president's temporary suspension. But not before Mr. Katsav called a hysterical press conference in which he blamed the media, the police and the attorney general for hounding him.

For Israelis, this is a time of near-despair. A former justice minister is on trial for sexual harassment, leading tax authority officials have been arrested for fraud, the finance minister is under investigation, and any of a half-dozen alleged financial scandals could topple Prime Minister Ehud Olmert. "There is no judgment and no judge," Israelis tell each other, quoting a Talmudic phrase. With the looming threat of a nuclear Iran, and jihadist Hamas and Hezbollah pressing against its borders, Israel faces an internal challenge that is no less daunting than the external ones: to recreate a society that is worth fighting for. Never before has Israel faced greater dangers, and never before has it been so bereft of trustworthy leaders.

The roots of Israel's ethical crisis go back, ironically, to the heroic founders of the state. Personally stoic, the leaders of Mapai, the socialist party that led the state in its formative years, created a culture of cronyism. Possession of a "red card," marking Mapai membership, was often a precondition for securing scarce employment. Cronyism was coupled with frontier recklessness: Under constant siege, and overwhelmed with impoverished refugees, Israel created a culture of improvisation, a bending of the rules. With the country's survival constantly in the balance, Israelis indulged the sexual improprieties of their military heroes; Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion defended the philandering general, Moshe Dayan, by noting that King David was also an adulterer. But they knew their leaders were devoted to the nation. The same can hardly be said about today's politicians, who absorbed the wiles of the founders but not their self-sacrifice.

Perhaps the greatest threat to the political system today is a corruption of the spirit of leadership. In refusing to accept responsibility for sullyng the presidency, Mr. Katsav represents a new class of Israeli leaders who reject accountability for failure. Though last summer's war didn't achieve any of its objectives, none of the architects of Israel's first military defeat admitted responsibility. Mr. Olmert continues to insist that Israel won, even though Hezbollah has rearmed and Israeli deterrence has been weakened by the very war that was intended to restore it. True, the army chief of staff, Dan Halutz, did resign last week -- but only to pre-

empt a call for his dismissal from a commission of inquiry investigating the war, and without any admission of failure on his part.

It used to be different. When Avraham Ofer, housing minister in the first government of Yitzhak Rabin during the mid-1970s, was accused of corruption, he shot himself, leaving behind a note that insisted on his innocence while adding that he couldn't bear the shame. And when the wife of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin was found to have kept a bank account in Washington, in violation of the law at the time forbidding Israelis to hold foreign currency, Rabin took personal responsibility and resigned -- incomprehensible by today's standards.

Corruption among Israel's leadership is arguably no worse than anywhere else. But a nation facing immediate existential threats needs leaders who can inspire. No citizen in the West makes the kind of sacrifices, from compulsory military reserve duty to punishingly high taxes, that Israelis routinely endure. To a large extent, they endure those hardships willingly: Teenagers vie for every slot in elite combat units; at times of national emergency, even reservists who haven't been called up volunteer for service. Israelis deserve a leadership worthy of their sacrifices. The founders of Zionism hoped to turn the Jews into a "normal" people, a nation like all other nations. They envisioned a country maintaining normal international relations while creating an admirable society -- externally normalized, internally exceptional. Given Israel's precarious status and the current state of its political culture, that vision seems to have been reversed.

But the good news is that change is coming. Mr. Katsav, after all, is being brought to trial. The plethora of sex-related accusations against prominent Israelis is an indication of a maturing society no longer indulging the excesses of its leaders. With Lt. Gen. Halutz gone, Mr. Peretz will almost certainly soon have to follow: He will be forced to resign either by the commission of inquiry into the Lebanon war or by a rebellion within the Labor Party, which he currently heads. Finally, Mr. Olmert's own day before the commission of inquiry is approaching, and so is a decision by the attorney general about whether to pursue criminal charges against him for financial improprieties. There is judgment and judge, after all.

Mr. Klein Halevi is a senior fellow at the Shalem Center and a contributing editor to the New Republic.

For those interested in receiving the newsletter by e-mail, please send a note to sheldonb@rsfchart.com. Current edition and Archives are available at www.suburbanorthodox.org/iasn.php

Holocaust deniers and their allies

By Ariel Cohen *The Washington Times* January 30, 2007

Jan. 27 was the anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz (1945). It was also U.N.-sponsored International Holocaust Commemoration Day.

Poland, as well as other European countries joined in support of a U.N. resolution, initiated by the United States, which "condemns without reservation any denial of the Holocaust" and urges U.N. member states "unreservedly to reject any denial of the Holocaust as an historical event."

The U.S. Acting Ambassador to the United Nations Alejandro D. Wolff said "those who would deny the Holocaust -- and, sadly, there are some who do -- reveal not only their ignorance, but their moral failure as well."

In a recent lecture, the newly elected U.N. Secretary General Ban Ki-moon said, in a veiled reference to Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, "Denying historical facts, especially on such an important subject as the Holocaust, is just not acceptable. Nor is it acceptable to call for the elimination of any State or people. ... We must apply the lessons of the Holocaust to today's world."

Heeding his call, 103 countries co-sponsored the resolution, which passed by consensus and without a vote. The Holocaust was one of the defining events of the last century. It should be one of its most important lessons.

But who is refusing to learn from the mass slaughter? Who voiced objections to the U.N. resolution and who opposed it? Those who do not wish to learn from history are doomed to repeat it. Unsurprisingly, Iran made a strong statement against the resolution, focusing instead on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and the treatment of the Palestinians. None of the Arab nations, and most Muslim countries refused to co-sponsor.

This is a chilling fact. It says a great deal not just about the Iranian state of mind, but of its intentions. By supporting Holocaust denial Tehran is legitimizing it -- and paving the way to a new Holocaust.

The deafening silence of the Arab states, even though some, like Egypt and Jordan, are formally at peace with Israel, as well as the stance of nuclear-armed Pakistan, makes one wonder how deep both denial of history and hatred of the Jews go.

Even Kofi Annan, hardly a friend of Israel, stated at the end of his tenure that "the [Iranian] rhetoric implies a refusal to concede the very legitimacy of Israel's existence, let alone the validity of its security concerns. ... Today Israelis are often confronted with words and action that seem to confirm their fear that the goal of their adversaries is to extinguish their existence as a state and as a people."

The United States and Israel have warned that Iran's stance on the Holocaust-- and its president's assertions that Israel should be wiped off the map -- are in direct violation of the U.N. Charter and should be viewed with extreme concern in light of its defiant development of nuclear capabilities.

"While the nations of the world gather here... with the intent of never again allowing genocide, a member of this assembly is acquiring the capabilities of carrying out its own," said Israeli ambassador to the United Nations, Dan Gillerman.

Mr. Ahmadinejad's nuclear arms race and calls to destroy Israel are connected by an umbilical cord to hatred. The nexus between the Holocaust and anti-Western and anti-Semitic Islamist ideology are well-known and well-documented. Twentieth century Muslim radicals were Adolf Hitler's willing accomplices. Leading among them was the Mufti of Jerusalem Hajj Amin Al Housseini, Yasser Arafat's relative and mentor.

At the Nuremberg trials of the Nazi leadership, Adolf Eichmann's deputy Dieter Wisliceny testified that "The Mufti was one of the initiators of the systematic extermination of European Jewry and had been a collaborator and adviser of Eichmann and [SS Chief Heinrich] Himmler in the execution of this plan. ... He was one of Eichmann's best friends and had constantly incited him to accelerate the extermination measures. I heard him to say, accompanied by Eichmann, he had visited incognito the gas chambers of Auschwitz."

After the war, the Mufti was the guest of the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, the founder of which, Hassan al-Banna, was an admirer of Hitler. Egypt gave refuge to Nazi propaganda experts and missile scientists, while Syria harbored SS brass.

The chief ideologist of the Muslim Brotherhood, Sayyid Qutb, though an exchange student in Colorado, came to passionately hate the United States, primarily because of the freedoms American women enjoy. He refined the anti-Western and anti-American trajectory of the Brotherhood, which later spawned even more extremist offshoots, such as Ayman al-Zawahri's Egyptian Islamic Jihad, the constituent part of al Qaeda. Hamas, which is bent on destroying Israel, is also an offshoot of the Muslim Brotherhood. Qutb is still a guiding light among Islamist radicals.

In Iran, Nazi sympathies ran deep even before World War II, fuelled by hatred of the British Empire. Reza Pahlavi, the father of the last shah, renamed Persia Iran (meaning "Aryan" in Farsi) to signal his political sympathy with the Nazi "Aryan" ideology.

Today Iran is a worldwide center of Holocaust denial. This did not start with Mr. Ahmadinejad's December 2006 conference for Holocaust deniers, nor did it begin with Iran's macabre Holocaust cartoon competition, which has now been declared an annual event. Since 2000, Iran has embraced Holocaust deniers Juergen Graf, Wolfgang Froehlich, David Duke and Roger Garaudy, who claim the Holocaust was a myth.

The refusal of Iran and Arab countries to co-sponsor the U.N. Holocaust commemoration resolution, their rejection of Holocaust education, and the Iranian nuclear arms and ballistic missile program are signs of an approaching danger.

Block Iran, Don't Redivide Jerusalem

By Dore Gold HumanEvents.com January 29, 2007

Much of the present critique of the Bush administration's Iraq policy focuses on the need to ratchet up U.S. diplomacy in the Middle East. Diplomats, politicians, and commentators have been proposing a new policy of increasing U.S. "engagement" based on the assumption that America's chief rival in the region -- Iran -- can act as a force for stability.

At the same time, there is growing pressure on Bush to immediately revive Israeli-Palestinian peace negotiations, despite the Hamas' control of the Palestinian Authority, with full Iranian backing. In addition to the Iraq Study Group report, articles and speeches by John Kerry, Brent Scowcroft, and Richard Haas have all argued that a new momentum for the peace process -- which could include Israel's transfer of more lands to the Hamas-led Palestinian Authority -- would greatly contribute to regional stability. Such a "land-for-peace" swap, including the division of Jerusalem, undoubtedly forms the centerpiece of the final vision for peace that Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice feels compelled at this stage to get the two sides to agree upon.

By offering concessions like these, Western diplomats are making a colossal error that could have devastating consequences. As I explain in my new book, *The Fight for Jerusalem*, proposals to "engage" radical Islam and appease it with territorial concessions in Jerusalem and elsewhere will not lower the flames of militant Islamic rage, but will much more likely result in an explosion of new violence throughout the entire Middle East.

New apocalyptic trends have captured the imaginations of both Sunni and Shiite Muslims in recent years. For adherents of this worldview, like Iranian President Ahmadinejad, the capture of Jerusalem is a vital stepping stone to a renewed global jihad. The city's division -- envisioned in every current international peace plan -- will serve to confirm Islamic prophecy and energize Islamic

The implied embrace of the ideology and politics of hatred that brought about the Holocaust does not threaten Israel alone. Radical Islamism, which embraces Holocaust denial, Jew hatred and denial of Israel's right to exist, also vehemently denies Western civilization its right to exist. It is a clear and present danger to world peace. It is laudable that the Holocaust is commemorated at the U.N. But to preserve peace, U.N. members need to do much more than adopt nonbinding resolutions.

Ariel Cohen is senior research fellow at the Heritage Foundation

apocalyptic speculation about the coming "end of days."

The Iranian President is religiously driven to achieve regional hegemony across the Middle East for Iran -- starting with the domination of Iraq, the Arab oil-producing states, and then Israel. By striking Israel and especially by threatening Jerusalem, Ahmadinejad sees himself accelerating the arrival of the Mahdi -- the Shiite Messianic figure. Monday's suicide attack in Eilat, Israel, conducted by Islamic Jihad, which is directly controlled by Iranian intelligence, is just the latest example of Iran's plans for Israel's "security."

What is absolutely clear is that talks at this stage about a final peace settlement will put Jerusalem squarely on the current diplomatic agenda. Rather than feed Iran's Messianic sense of mission, the U.S. and its Western allies must be careful to avoid proposals that put Jerusalem back on the negotiating agenda, especially if they call for its re-division, as President Clinton suggested back in 2000.

While pressure to resume Israeli-Palestinian negotiations has led some foreign policy experts to whitewash Hamas, *The Fight for Jerusalem* supplies rare photographic evidence linking Hamas to al Qaeda. This has both security and religious implications. For what is clear from recent events across the Middle East, where churches and mosques are regularly attacked by Sunni radicals identifying with al Qaeda affiliates, is that only a free and democratic Israel will protect the freedom of Jerusalem for all the world's faiths.

Dr. Gold is President of the Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, former Israeli Ambassador to the United Nations, and author of the New York Times Bestseller "Hatred's Kingdom: How Saudi Arabia Supports the New Global Terrorism" and "Tower of Babble"(Regnery).

Israelis aren't racist – they're worried

By Isi Leibler *The Jerusalem Post* January 25, 2007

When Defense Minister Amir Peretz designated MK Ghaleb Majadle for a ministerial post, in order to garner Arab support for his position in Labor, Israel Beiteinu faction chairwoman Estherina Tartman branded the appointment "shameful and pitiful," "a huge ax poised over the neck of Zionism," and damaging to "Israel's character as a Jewish state."

Granted Tartman's outburst was contemptible. But that does not detract from the reality that increasingly hostile, even treasonable outbursts by Israeli Arabs against the state have created enormous resentment among Jewish Israelis. Some are beginning to regard their Arab neighbors as fifth columnists. In large measure it is the radical Israeli-Arab politicians who compete against each other to undermine the legitimacy of the Jewish state who must shoulder the blame for this.

For example, it was treason, pure and simple, when MK Azmi Bishara and two other Balad MKs last year traveled illegally to Beirut and Damascus and proclaimed their solidarity with Hizbullah. "Hizbullah won, and for the first time since 1967, we tasted the taste of victory," Bishara stated, adding that demonstrating "solidarity with these heroes is the least we can do." Bishara also supported Syria's struggle to free "occupied Arab land" and praised Syrian support for "resistance."

Balad MK Wasal Taha described the abduction of IDF soldiers as legitimate and said that "resistance is not terror but a moral value." MK Taleb a-Sanaa was forced to resign from the Knesset Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee after conducting illegal meetings with Hamas leaders.

During the Lebanon war an Arab survey found that 78% of Israeli Arabs believed that Israeli leaders should be tried for war crimes. At funerals of Arab children killed by Hizbullah missiles, some parents went so far as to blame Israel, praise Hizbullah, and refer to Hassan Nasrallah as their "brother." At a rally of his followers, Sheikh Raed Salah, an Islamic Movement leader, urged Hizbullah and Hamas not to release kidnapped Israeli soldiers.

More recently, in greetings extended to Fatah supporters in Gaza, MK Ahmed Tibi praised them for having nurtured "the first martyrs who fell and the first prisoners arrested." He urged them to "continue the struggle" until a Palestinian state is established.

In the religious arena, the mufti of Jerusalem and other Islamic leaders openly support Hamas, and call for the establishment of a caliphate on Israeli territory. MK Ibrahim Sarsour warned that any attempt to build a synagogue on the Temple Mount would plunge Israel into a bloodbath. "Muslims and Arabs would not stand by idly while representatives of Satan on earth try to launch their insane plots." Arab schoolchildren are taught about

the Nakba, the "catastrophe" of Israel's creation and encouraged to despise the Jewish state.

Another disconcerting development was a report from the National Committee of the Heads of Arab Local Councils titled "The Future Vision of Palestinian Arabs in Israel." Backed by Arab leaders and intellectuals, the report effectively calls for the dismantling of the Jewish state and its replacement by a binational entity. It demands the abrogation of the Law of Return unless a Law of Return for Arabs is promulgated, replacement of the current Israeli flag and national anthem, and total autonomy in Arab education. It also requires that Israel acknowledge responsibility for the 1948 Nakba and take steps to "rectify the damage inflicted on the Palestinians."

Clearly the radicalization of Israeli Arabs already poses a genuine threat to the security of the nation. In fact, some Arab citizens of Israel have been arrested for spying on behalf of Hizbullah and the Iranians, and others for direct involvement in suicide bombings and terrorist attacks. As of now such incidents are not widespread, but with Israeli Arab MKs calling on their followers to identify with shaheeds, it is inevitable that more youngsters will move in this direction.

To offset these trends the government must introduce a twin-track approach. Israeli Arabs enjoy a higher standard of living than Arabs in any Arab country. One merely has to enter hospitals or universities in Jerusalem or Haifa to appreciate this. But despite this, they are among the lowest-income earners in the country, and still experience discrimination at various levels. The government must commit itself to granting Israeli Arab citizens genuine social and economic equality. Decent Israelis must publicly support this goal.

But in turn, Arab-Israelis must accept the fact that Israel will remain a Jewish state. Those unwilling or unable to do so should join their Muslim kinsmen a few kilometers across the border and live in a future Palestinian state. Of course most would undoubtedly choose to remain in a Jewish state rather than become citizens of Hamasland.

The government is now belatedly reviewing the situation and the Knesset has even begun drafting legislation which will invariably impose limits on freedom of expression. But we are a nation at war and must defend ourselves. The Knesset was able to outlaw Meir Kahane's party, which posed no threat to the security of the state but was allegedly promoting racism. It should therefore not be difficult to take similar steps against actions which undermine our security.

As a nation surrounded by enemies pledged to our destruction, we must become far more vigilant. This is not a lapse into McCarthyism. It is common sense and self-defense. If British-born Muslims can

be transformed into suicide bombers in London mosques and schools, similar situations will inevitably ensue here unless we take firm action in advance.

This should in no way detract from our determination to ensure that Israel remain a Jewish democratic state. Most of us always dreamt of having an Arab minority that would live with us in peace and friendship and possibly even act as a bridge for reconciliation with the Arab world. Alas, at least in the short term that is not on the horizon.

But is it good for the Jews?

By Suzanne Fields *The Washington Times* January 22, 2007

When Sacha Baron Cohen, now famous everywhere as Borat, collected his Golden Globe last week as the best actor in a comedy, Jews everywhere asked each other a familiar question: "But is it good for the Jews?" Jews who laugh with Borat, the wild and crazy journalist who satirized anti-Semitism in the movie "Borat: Cultural Learnings of America for Make Benefit Glorious Nation of Kazakhstan," think he's the Jewish counterpart of Archie Bunker, the lovable bigot in a sitcom of yesteryear. But other Jews think Borat fans the fires under the stew of prejudice and fanaticism always ready to boil on a back burner. Columnist Charles Krauthammer, observing how easily Borat taught the lyrics of his "Throw the Jew Down the Well" to an astonished audience in an Arizona tavern, accuses him of looking for anti-Semitism in the wrong places: "Can a man that smart... really believe that indifference to anti-Semitism and the road to the Holocaust are to be found in a country and western bar in Tucson?"

But that may not be the point. Borat shows how easy it is to tap into prejudice, to lure a man to express bias openly when he thinks he's in friendly territory. On the day Sacha Cohen won the Golden Globe, the New York Times Sunday magazine profiled Abraham Foxman, the director of the Anti-Defamation League, who is often accused of looking for anti-Semites under every bed like those who imagined communists were lurking everywhere in the 1950s. But that's not the point, either. A cursory examination of anti-Semitism over the centuries shows how swiftly bigotry can show itself once Jews -- or anyone who decies it -- let down their guard. Although Mr. Foxman frets that unsophisticated moviegoers will find Sacha Baron Cohen's "comedic technique" encouragement for their bigotry, the ADL nevertheless defends his unmasking of the absurd and irrational side of anti-Semitism.

Mr. Foxman's own story as he describes it in his book, "Never Again: The Threat of the New Anti-Semitism," is instructive. When his parents were forced into a ghetto in Vilna, Lithuania, during War World II, they put the infant Abraham in the care of an uneducated Christian nanny, a warm and devoted protector whom he came to love as a mother. But he also learned from her the secret prejudices that can

But this dream becomes even more distant if we continue burying our heads in the sand and fail to take determined action to bring a halt to the ongoing encouragement of substantial numbers of our citizens into undermining the state in which they live and hating their Jewish neighbors.

The writer chairs the Diaspora-Israel relations committee of the Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, and is a veteran international Jewish leader.

be hidden in a "good person." In his nanny's care, the little boy learned to spit at a Jew in the street, to mock him as "dirty Jew." He remembers now the warmth at her hearth and bosom, but she unwittingly gave him the cold, critical eye he casts toward bigotry now.

Abraham Foxman's focus on anti-Semites in America, where Jews prosper and bask in unquestioned acceptance, seems obsessive to his critics -- many of them Jews -- but he's the needed reminder that the haters of Jews in Germany were once dismissed as merely unpleasant but harmless cranks. Jimmy Carter, a former president, is not the typical anti-Semite, but in his recent book he likens Israel's dealing with Palestinian radicals to South Africa's apartheid, and condones violence against Israelis until the Jewish nation gets on with the "road map to peace." "President Carter's embrace of rhetoric frequently used in extremist circles has had the unintended consequence of encouraging anti-Semitic extremists to exploit and run with it," Mr. Foxman argues.

In the wake of this controversy, a former Justice Department official says the former president sought "special consideration" in 1987 for a onetime member of a German SS Death Squad who was proven to have murdered Jews in the Mauthausen death camp in Austria. Neil Sher says he went public with the information now because Mr. Carter's book exposes "where his heart really lies."

Anti-Semitism is never funny, but Borat is funny in the way he makes us aware of what we had rather not acknowledge. Vaudeville, radio, the movies and early television were awash in Jewish comics, but they vanished from the public eye for a time after World War II. Jewish characters and Jewish jokes were dropped from scripts by Hollywood producers, many of them Jews. "When Hitler forced Americans to take anti-Semitism seriously," writes Henry Popkin in a widely circulated article in Commentary magazine in 1952, "the American answer... was the banishment of Jewish figures from the popular arts in the United States."

Borat's Golden Globe shows how far we've come since then. He's not only good for the Jews, he's good for others, too.