

## Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Day Speech

By Shimon Peres (President of Israel) Israel President's office April 30, 2008

63 years have passed since the end of the most destructive, bloody war mankind has ever known - World War II.

Victory over Nazi Germany restored the values of the human race, and saved Europe from sinking into an age of darkness and destruction.

The racist madness of Nazi Germany cost sixty million people their lives. Six million Jews, a third of the entire Jewish people, were wiped out by that satanic machine. They were annihilated simply because they were Jewish. Their blood will never cease to cry out from the soil of Europe, most of which was conquered by the Nazis.

I have been a believer all my life, but that doesn't help me to understand what happened. To this day, I am unable to comprehend how young, educated Germans could aim their rifles at a pregnant woman, shoot her in cold blood, rip the hair off her head, pull out her teeth and then go away to eat and rest, only to return and shoot a day-old baby. Nothing has the power to drown out the cries of babies shot in cold blood.

Occasionally a madman makes his appearance. But how could it happen, I ask myself, that an entire nation could elect a madman, prostrate itself before his sadism and demagoguery, give him the title of "Chancellor", and shower him with acclaim? How does a nation not rise up at the sight of murderers rampaging through its streets, the sight of army tanks moving forward relentlessly and mercilessly, bent on destroying erstwhile neighbors and friends.

I find it hard to understand how other countries stood by, blinded and paralyzed in the face of this viper. Some of them even signed agreements with the Devil himself, joined his ranks and fought in his armies.

My heart trembles when I am reminded that Hitler could have developed nuclear weapons too. A genocidal leader with weapons of mass-destruction - what would have remained of our world then?

It is not easy for us to compose ourselves, and perhaps we shouldn't. The passage of time does not necessarily calm us. The poet's words about truth rising from the grave ring in my ears, and my heart vibrates with the memory of six million brothers and sisters, buried in a graveyard the likes of which have never been seen, nor will never be seen again. They live within every one of us.

"What I have lost is mine forever", wrote Rachel.

I also ask myself what would have happened to the Jewish people if we would have had the powerful country we have today in the time of Hitler. We could have done things that others refrained from doing.

It's possible that we were late in establishing a state, and paid a heavy price - for in history, one mustn't hesitate. But we did rise again, and gathered in our people. We returned to our Homeland, we resurrected our language, and we opened our gates to Holocaust survivors. We fended off seven military attacks and two intifadas designed to defeat us. We also signed two peace agreements. We began to tap the hidden potential we discovered within ourselves. While the shadow of death still hovered, new life started to take hold.

We established an army that knows how to win, and is capable of defending a peace-seeking nation. We proved that our spirit was not broken. The catastrophe of the Holocaust did not destroy our ability to establish a just way of life. The Holocaust demanded a supreme effort on our part. Even after our blood had been spilled, we succeeded in becoming first in the world - in agriculture, medicine, and self-defense.

We will not forget, we will not cover up, and we will not stop asking ourselves anew each morning, what we can do so that what happened will never happen again. And we will remember - history has taught us to be vigilant. We must cultivate both our spiritual and physical power. We have to strengthen our position, with the power of justice and justifiable power. We need to seek out friends in this world, and to demand that they keep their eyes open and recognize imminent danger, rather than offer comfort after the fact.

What is expected of us, we will bear on our shoulders. What is expected of the world should be acted upon without delay. If the countries of the world had not delayed, and would have identified the Nazi threat in time, they could have prevented Hitler from murdering tens of millions of people. They could have prevented war from breaking out.

We stand here today with tears in our eyes, and yet we will not immerse ourselves in our tears. Only a strong country is entitled to mourn its children. Only a nation that believes in itself can commemorate them in a fitting manner. Only a state with deterrence power, with an army worthy of its reputation, bent on peace, can ensure that the

memory of those who perished will never be obliterated.

## **Carter doesn't get it By Cal Thomas**

Just what about total annihilation of the Jews by Palestinian, Arab and Muslim people does Jimmy Carter not understand?

Mr. Carter's latest leap into the foreign policy breach resulted in his declaring the terrorist organization Hamas had accepted Israel's "right to exist," and would further accept the establishment of a Palestinian state on land occupied by Israel in the 1967 Arab-Israeli war, land whose borders had been changed after Israel was attacked by some of the very people who still want the nation's elimination. The working strategy of Israel's enemies is: If at first you don't succeed in killing enough Jews, then try, try again.

Hamas immediately denied Mr. Carter's claim it is willing to recognize Israel and introduced the usual caveats about Jerusalem as the capital of a Palestinian state, "right of return" for "Palestinian refugees" and so forth. We've heard it all before. Israel's and our enemies tell us what we want to hear while continuing their terrorist and murderous acts in order to achieve their objectives.

Mr. Carter has a history of believing (and smooching) murderous thugs. He has kissed and/or met with the late Soviet dictator Leonid Brezhnev (Mr. Carter expressed surprise that Brezhnev lied to him about invading Afghanistan in 1979. Memo to Carter: Dictators lie and so do totalitarian groups like Hamas); the late Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat, Hamas' political leader, Khalid Mashaal and North Korea's Kim Jong-il. Mr. Carter falsely claimed Mr. Kim agreed to suspend his nuclear weapons program.

In each of these meetings, Mr. Carter served the interests, not of peace or of his own country but those of the dictatorial regimes whose prestige was elevated by the visit of a former U.S. president.

The false premise on which all negotiations with Islamic terrorists have been based is that the terrorists lack something that, if they got it, would bring about instant peace, reconciliation and the study of war no more. This is wishful thinking bordering on self-delusion.

Despite multiple concessions over many years, peace overtures, goodwill gestures and offering up

## **King and the Jews**

**By Clarence B. Jones The Wall Street Journal April 30, 2008**

Earlier this month, at a Los Angeles event for the national African-American fraternity Kappa Alpha Psi, the keynote speaker launched into an anti-Semitic tirade – directed at the fraternity's guest of honor. The shocking episode shows just how far

We shall pray together. We will say Kaddish in their memory. And we will sound the notes of "Hatikvah" for the generations to come.

May their memory be blessed.

## **TownHall.com April 24, 2008**

land captured from the very people who tried before and will try again to destroy Israel, many on the political left in Israel, Europe and America cling to the fiction that only Israel is an impediment to "peace."

People who are not fully aware of the poison forced on Muslim and Arab people by their religious and political leaders would do well to take some time and inform themselves. The level of hatred and vilification for all things Jewish, Christian and Western sounds like the stuff out of a Ku Klux Klan handbook.

Young children are radicalized in their first school year with appeals that they become martyrs to expunge Jewish "filth" from the region and do Allah's will. This is what we and the Jewish people face. If the road to hell is paved with good intentions, all our good intentions will produce is a superhighway.

Jimmy Carter thinks he is doing God's will by "loving" his enemies. The expectation behind that biblical instruction is that such an act will soften the heart of the enemy.

But evil does not respond this way. Evil takes these acts (evil people know the commands, too, because they have studied us more than we have studied them) and use such notions to achieve their objectives. They will tell us whatever we want to hear in order to get their way. They believe the Koran allows them to lie to "infidels."

Why won't we understand this? Converts from Islam regularly warn us. Why do we persist in believing their lies when the only thing they have been consistent at is lying? If Mr. Carter trusts Hamas, whom else would he trust?

Nothing stinks as badly as a perishable item that has passed its "sell-by" date. That describes Jimmy Carter. His foreign policy was a failure when he was president, most notably his approach to Iran, which toppled that regime and gave us what we face now. Now, as ex-president, he continues to cause damage and undermine his country's foreign policy.

It is said we only have one president at a time. Apparently, Jimmy Carter thinks otherwise.

we've strayed from the original vision of the civil rights movement – and how far we have yet to travel to realize that vision.

The guest of honor, Daphna Ziman, an Israeli-American woman, had just received the Tom

Bradley Award for generous philanthropy and public service. But instead of praise, the Rev. Eric Lee berated her. "The Jews," he claimed, "have made money on us in the music business and we are the entertainers, and they are economically enslaving us." (Mr. Lee would later apologize to Ms. Ziman.)

It was bad enough that the event took place on April 4, the 40th anniversary of Martin Luther King Jr.'s assassination. Even more galling, Mr. Lee is the president-CEO of the L.A. branch of the Southern Christian Leadership Foundation – the very civil-rights organization co-founded by the slain civil-rights leader.

Martin would have been repelled by Mr. Lee's remarks. I was his lawyer and one of his closest advisers, and I can say with absolute certainty that Martin abhorred anti-Semitism in all its forms, including anti-Zionism. "There isn't anyone in this country more likely to understand our struggle than Jews," Martin told me. "Whatever progress we've made so far as a people, their support has been essential."

Martin was disheartened that so many blacks could be swayed by Elijah Muhammad's Nation of Islam and other black separatists, rejecting his message of nonviolence, and grumbling about "Jew landlords" and "Jew interlopers" – even "Jew slave traders." The resentment and anger displayed toward people who offered so much support for civil rights was then nascent. But it has only festered and grown over four decades. Today, black-Jewish relations have arguably grown worse, not better.

For that, Martin would place fault principally on the shoulders of black leaders such as Louis Farrakhan, Al Sharpton and Jesse Jackson – either for making anti-Semitic statements, inciting anti-Semitism (including violence), or failing to condemn overt anti-Semitism within the black community.

When American cities were burning in the summers before he died, Martin listened to any

number of young blacks holding matches blame Jewish landlords or Jewish store-owners in the inner city – no matter that Jews were a minority of landlords and store owners. He asked them, Who else might have bought the buildings that we lived in and rented us apartments? Who else was willing to come in and open stores and sell us the things we needed? Where were these Negroes with money who'd abandoned their communities? And if blacks had bought those businesses and buildings, would they have charged less for rent and bread?

As Martin wrote in 1967, "Negroes nurture a persistent myth that the Jews of America attained social mobility and status solely because they had money. It is unwise to ignore the error for many reasons. In a negative sense it encourages anti-Semitism and overestimates money as a value. In a positive sense, the full truth reveals a useful lesson.

"Jews progressed because they possessed a tradition of education combined with social and political action. The Jewish family enthroned education and sacrificed to get it. The result was far more than abstract learning. Uniting social action with educational competence, Jews became enormously effective in political life."

To Martin, who believed the pursuit of excellence would trump adversity, Jewish success should, and could, be used as a blueprint and inspiration for blacks' own success rather than as an incitement to bitterness.

Any blacks who subscribe to the views represented in Mr. Lee's speech would do well to heed the words and deeds of the man whose name and legacy they claim to represent.

**Mr. Jones was Martin Luther King's personal attorney and close adviser. He is the co-author, with Joel Engel, of "What Would Martin Say" (Harper, 2008), from which this was adapted.**

## First, refute the defamation

**By Andrea Levin The Jerusalem Post**

Almost simultaneously in early April, separate news stories underscored Israel's public opinion quandary. A new BBC poll of more than 17,000 people in 34 countries reported only Iran ranked worse than the Jewish state in having a "mainly negative influence in the world." North Korea, Pakistan and China rated more favorably.

Another report told of conflicting public relations endeavors by Israeli governmental departments; the tourism ministry argued for its campaign to disseminate positive images via YouTube to attract visitors, while the Foreign Ministry contended graphic photos of the terrorist attack on Merkaz Harav had to be displayed to communicate what Israel endures.

**April 20, 2008**

At the same time, a new UN World Health Organization report entered the information stream, harshly condemning Israel for allegedly inhumane conduct toward Gazan Palestinians - the very kind of ostensibly objective study by an international body that has incrementally helped undermine Israel's global reputation.

The 54-page document is familiar fare from the UN in its lack of neutrality and fairness, its disregard for Israeli concerns and scapegoating of that country for difficulties Palestinians themselves have plainly caused. An introduction entitled "Collective Punishment of the Weakest" by Ambrogio Manenti, head of the WHO's Gaza and West Bank office, enumerates factors relating to Palestinian difficulties gaining admission to Israeli hospital care. It omits

completely the ongoing rocket attacks and terrorist assaults on crossing points by Gazans that kill and maim Israeli civilians and necessitate Israeli countermeasures, including close monitoring of the entry of Palestinians - even those in ambulances.

(Nor, obviously, is there any hint of irony in the WHO's excoriating Israel for not doing a better job in caring for the medical needs of a people whose leaders are sworn to the destruction of the Jewish state.)

What is notable about the WHO story in the context of Israel's struggle to communicate the facts about its actions, is that media coverage of the UN report greatly benefitted from swift and effective response by Israeli officials. The New York Times, for example, noted in its second paragraph that "Israeli officials rejected the [WHO] findings on Wednesday. They said that the people who had compiled the report had never asked them about the cases, that Israeli officials had no records of entry permits being sought in some of the cases and that details of other cases were inaccurate."

Col. Nir Press, commander of the Israel Defense Forces' Gaza Coordination and Liaison Administration, was heavily quoted debunking the report. The Times, Associated Press, Chicago Tribune and others cited various of his statements. He responded specifically to a WHO claim that Israeli delays had caused the death of a critically ill boy. Disputing the charges, Press said Israel approved an application for the patient's transfer to an Israeli hospital the same day it was received, but that delay ensued at the behest of a Palestinian doctor seeking to stabilize the boy's condition before moving him.

Many of the news stories also included Press's reminder that delays in admitting Palestinian patients are unavoidable for security reasons. The Tribune reported: "Press said in May 2007 two Gaza women who received permits to travel for treatment were discovered under interrogation to have been sent to carry out suicide bombings. In June 2005 a woman allowed into Israel for medical care was discovered in a border security check to be wearing explosives." Elsewhere, Press was quoted saying: "They [Hamas] use humanitarian needs to attack us. We have to check every request."

Much more can and should be said about the shoddy, indefensible WHO report. (A haphazard chronology for one patient is suggestive of the careless attention to accuracy. A woman is said - in the study dated April 2008 - to have died on November 11, 2008 after a fall on September 24, 2007 for which she sought treatment on September 6, 2007.)

But Press's rejoinders and their reverberation in the media's coverage of yet another distorted attack on Israel are a reminder that nothing in the war of ideas and images takes the place of the all-important work of refuting defamation. One day perhaps journalists will interject a caveat whenever writing about a UN study on Israel cautioning readers that the contents are very likely propagandistic and unreliable. Meanwhile, Israeli officials should follow Press's example and respond rapidly and in detail to false, poisonous claims against the Jewish state from any source.

**The writer is Executive Director of  
CAMERA, Committee for Accuracy in  
Middle East Reporting in America.**

## The real reason the Syrian base was wiped off the map

**By Con Coughlin The Telegraph (UK)**

**April 25, 2008**

Piece by piece, the intelligence jigsaw puzzle concerning Israel's air strike on a top-secret military site in northern Syria last September is finally taking shape. When a squadron of Israeli F-15 fighter-bombers destroyed a hitherto unknown Syrian military facility at Dayr as-Zawr, close to the country's north-eastern border with Turkey, there was much speculation that Israel had staged a repeat of its 1981 mission against Iraq's Osirak nuclear facility, which thwarted Saddam Hussein's ambition to acquire a nuclear weapons arsenal.

The raid took place shortly after a mysterious North Korean ship - which had reflagged itself as a South Korean vessel so as to avoid detection - docked at the Syrian port of Tartous and unloaded its cargo, which was traced being transported to the Syrian military base. American and Israeli spy satellites were soon producing high-resolution photographs of the facility that suggested it bore an uncanny resemblance to North Korea's Yongbyon nuclear reactor, which produced the atomic device

that the North Koreans successfully test-fired in late 2006.

Despite much speculation, the reasons for the Israeli attack on Dayr as-Zawr remained unclear, not least because the Israelis suffered an uncharacteristic bout of reticence over their involvement. Normally, they are only too happy to boast about their heroic exploits in defence of the Jewish state. The daring rescue of the hostages held in Uganda in 1976 was immortalised in the film *Raid on Entebbe*, while Steven Spielberg's *Munich* captured the ruthless persecution by the country's intelligence agents of the Palestinian terrorists responsible for the murder of 11 Israeli athletes during the 1972 Olympics.

But on this occasion, Israel's political, defence and security establishments rigidly observed a code of omertà, personally imposed by prime minister Ehud Olmert. As one senior Israeli official remarked when I asked him about the attack last year: "I value my freedom far too much to mention it."

Even after CIA director Michael Hayden's briefing of Congress yesterday, when he confirmed that the North Koreans had indeed been helping the Syrians to build a nuclear reactor, the Israelis are still refusing to be drawn.

The reasons are twofold. When the Israelis first became concerned about the North Koreans' activities in Syria last summer, the Americans were negotiating a delicate deal to persuade Pyongyang to give up its nuclear programme in return for a relaxation of the trade sanctions that have crippled the North Korean economy. Had the Israelis gone public with the intelligence that the North Koreans were actively helping Syria to acquire nuclear technology, it might seriously have undermined Washington's diplomatic efforts. If the Americans want to expose North Korea's links to Damascus, that is their affair. For their part, the Israelis are happy to keep schtum.

The other reason the Israelis want to take a back seat is that they are keen not to reveal too much detail about the technical aspects of the air strike, which is regarded as the most sophisticated operation by the Israeli air force since Osirak. To carry out the attack undetected, the fighter-bombers had to be fitted with equipment that extended their bombing range, while the pilots also had to contend with the challenge of penetrating Syria's state-of-the-art, Russian-built air defence systems. The mission was so successful that the first that the Syrians knew of the attack was when their Turkish neighbours reported that the bombers had returned safely to their base in northern Israel.

The last thing the Israelis want is for the tactical details of their audacious raid to become public, particularly as they may need to use the same techniques again in the not-too-distant future. According to Hayden's closed-door briefing to Congress, last September's raid succeeded in destroying the Syrian facility long before a nuclear reactor could be assembled. But by highlighting North Korea's links to Syria, he confirmed the existence of the new axis of evil that has taken shape following the demise of Saddam Hussein's regime - that between North Korea, Syria and Iran.

While the Americans have explained the reasons for Israel's attack, they have been less forthcoming

about why the Syrians were trying to acquire nuclear technology in the first place. Given Syria's geographical proximity to Israel, any attempt by Damascus to use nuclear weapons against its near neighbour would be counter-productive, as the fallout would inevitably affect large tracts of Syria.

But Syria's experimentation with nuclear proliferation has more to do with its strategic alliance with Tehran than any pretensions the Assad regime might entertain about becoming a nuclear superpower. In response to the West's increasing pressure on Iran over its uranium enrichment programme, Tehran has stepped up its military co-operation with Damascus, and has signed a mutual defence pact. That has resulted in the Iranians promising to provide the Syrians with their Shahab-3 ballistic missile system. Last summer, dozens of Iranian and Syrian missile technicians were reported to have been killed while attempting to mount a chemical warhead on a Scud missile at a Syrian military facility.

Now, it appears that the Syrians are quietly helping the Iranians with their nuclear weapons programme. As part of their continuing efforts to acquire the technology to develop nuclear weapons, the Iranians have sent teams of their scientists to Pyongyang to examine the details of the North Koreans' successful nuclear test.

But with Western politicians getting more bellicose about Tehran's refusal to halt its uranium enrichment programme - earlier this week, Hillary Clinton threatened to "totally obliterate" Iran - the Iranians are keen that their mutual defence pact with Syria extends into the nuclear field. Western security experts believe that many North Korean scientists who were filmed working on the Syrian project were also frequent visitors to Iran's top-secret atomic facilities.

The US satellite photographs presented to Congress yesterday demonstrated that the Syrian facility had been entirely reduced to rubble by the accuracy of the Israeli air strikes. And unless there is a radical change of policy soon in Tehran, the likelihood is that the Iranian programme will suffer a similar fate.

## Egypt Builds a Wall and changes its tune on Israel's barrier

By David Schenker The Weekly Standard April 28, 2008

Much ado has been made of the Israeli security fence isolating the West Bank. When it is completed in 2010, the barrier--which runs roughly along the 1967 border between Israel and Palestinian territory--will span nearly 500 miles. Israelis say the purpose of the structure is to curtail terrorist attacks against the Jewish state. There's little reason to doubt them: Despite a March attack that killed eight students at a

Jerusalem seminary, statistics suggest that the barrier and a corresponding one around Gaza are working.

West Bankers condemn the structure because it encroaches into pre-1967 Palestinian territory, limits mobility, and separates farmers from their fields. Hamas, which has controlled Gaza since June 2007, describes its territory as "a big prison." Until recently, Egypt too was a vociferous critic. In 2003, Egypt's foreign minister at the time, Ahmed Maher,

described the structure as "defying international legitimacy and world public opinion."

Even as Israel moves expeditiously to seal off its West Bank threat, however, Palestinians face the prospect of another wall hemming them in. This latest wall is not being constructed by the Israelis, though, but by Egypt, which seeks more protection from its Palestinian neighbors in Gaza.

Cairo has every reason to be concerned. In January 2008, Hamas demolished the Gaza-Egypt border fence, allowing an estimated 700,000 Palestinians--nearly half of Gaza's population--to stream into the Sinai desert. Initially, Cairo viewed the Gaza breach as an opportunity to solidify its pro-Palestinian bona fides. Then reality set in. Egypt, it seems, was concerned that Palestinians entering the Sinai might exacerbate Egypt's own terrorism problem. In April 2006, 23 tourists were killed in a car-bomb attack in the Sinai resort town of Dahab; two days later, U.N. Multi-national Force Observers, enforcing the Egypt-Israel peace treaty, were targeted by suicide attacks.

For Cairo, the threat extends beyond Sinai. Islamists in Egypt--led by the Muslim Brotherhood--have been making significant political gains in recent years, winning an unprecedented 88 of 444 elected parliamentary seats in 2005. The prospect of Hamas's hooking up with the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood terrifies the government of Egypt. As one Egyptian political analyst describes it, "Hamas is the Muslim Brotherhood on steroids."

Less than two weeks after the Gaza breach, Cairo took draconian measures to return the Palestinians to Gaza. It arrested dozens--including a group of armed Palestinians reportedly planning to attack Israeli tourists in the Sinai--and quickly resealed the border with miles of barbed wire. Hamas cried foul and pledged that it would not allow the border to remain sealed. In February, two Egyptian border guards were injured by Palestinian gunfire and several more were treated for broken bones after being hit by rocks thrown across the border.

With tensions along the border increasing, Egypt has softened its position on Israel's West Bank barrier. In March, Foreign Minister Ahmed Aboul Gheit said, "Whoever wishes to build a security fence on his land is free to do that." Subsequently, it was announced that Egypt, with \$23 million in U.S. assistance, would build its own fence along the border with Gaza. Teams from the Army Corps of Engineers are expected in Egypt shortly to advise the project.

At least in part, Cairo's change in attitude was driven by Washington. For more than a decade, weapons have moved freely into Gaza via ubiquitous smuggling tunnels linking Sinai to Palestinian areas and bypassing Israeli scrutiny. Since Hamas's Gaza takeover, though, the issue has increasingly garnered attention, as longer-range katyusha rockets--presumably transported via these tunnels--have started falling on Israeli cities with greater frequency. During the 2008 budget discussions, Congress was so concerned about perceived Egyptian inaction on the tunnels that a clause was inserted to condition nearly \$100 million in U.S. aid on Cairo's countering these smuggling routes.

For Cairo, the U.S. pressure was a blessing in disguise. The Egyptian government gives a lot of lip service to the humanitarian crisis in Gaza, while privately it is apprehensive about the militant nature of Hamas-ruled Gaza. These sentiments have only been heightened by recent political and social inroads made by Egypt's own Islamists.

At the end of the day, the Gaza border is above all else a matter of Egyptian national security. So despite the obvious comparisons that will be drawn between the Israeli and Egyptian barriers, Cairo had few alternatives other than to move ahead with a wall of its own. As Israel learned some time ago, good fences make good neighbors, especially when your neighbors are your enemies.

**David Schenker is senior fellow and director of the program in Arab politics at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy.**

## **The Spy from New Jersey** By The New York Sun editorial April 23, 2008

It sounds like the plot of a Zev Chafets novel, or a Purim spoof: An 84-year-old New Jersey man active in the Jewish War Veterans and the Jewish Federation of Greater Middlesex County is accused of being an atomic spy for Israel, run out of an Israeli consulate in New York that is better known for the hummus served at its annual Israel Independence Day party. The feds say that the spy was compensated by being taken out to dinner at a restaurant in Riverdale. What's next, the Israelis recruiting Hadassah ladies as secret agents and paying them with pomegranates?

In all seriousness, Israel's friends in America have long counseled her to look for spies elsewhere

than in the American Jewish community, which can be of most use to Israel if its loyalty is not put in doubt. The details of the case have yet to emerge fully, but it is easy to understand the exigencies involved when the spying allegedly happened, in the early 1980s. Israel, as it does to this day, faced an existential security threat. Security cooperation between America and Israel was not as well developed as it is today, and there was even personal hostility to Israel among certain sectors of the Reagan administration, even if the administration overall was supportive.

These are not excuses — there can be none for breaking America's espionage laws — just context.

America surely faces graver threats in the current war than an 84-year-old federation activist. But surely, too, the law needs to be enforced impartially. The accused spy deserves due process of the law, and he will have much to learn from the case of

Jonathan Pollard, who pleaded guilty to a single count in hopes of leniency and landed instead a life sentence.

**(After so many pieces about Carter's misplaced meeting with Hamas terrorists, we present the next piece written by a terrorist with the newspaper's editorial about it following below. Ed)**

## **No Peace Without Hamas**

**By Mahmoud al-Zahar The Washington Post April 17, 2008**

President Jimmy Carter's sensible plan to visit the Hamas leadership this week brings honesty and pragmatism to the Middle East while underscoring the fact that American policy has reached its dead end. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice acts as if a few alterations here and there would make the hideous straitjacket of apartheid fit better. While Rice persuades Israeli occupation forces to cut a few dozen meaningless roadblocks from among the more than 500 West Bank control points, these forces simultaneously choke off fuel supplies to Gaza; blockade its 1.5 million people; approve illegal housing projects on West Bank land; and attack Gaza City with F-16s, killing men, women and children. Sadly, this is "business as usual" for the Palestinians.

Last week's attack on the Nahal Oz fuel depot should not surprise critics in the West. Palestinians are fighting a total war waged on us by a nation that mobilizes against our people with every means at its disposal -- from its high-tech military to its economic stranglehold, from its falsified history to its judiciary that "legalizes" the infrastructure of apartheid. Resistance remains our only option. Sixty-five years ago, the courageous Jews of the Warsaw ghetto rose in defense of their people. We Gazans, living in the world's largest open-air prison, can do no less.

The U.S.-Israeli alliance has sought to negate the results of the January 2006 elections, when the Palestinian people handed our party a mandate to rule. Hundreds of independent monitors, Carter among them, declared this the fairest election ever held in the Arab Middle East. Yet efforts to subvert our democratic experience include the American coup d'etat that created the new sectarian paradigm with Fatah and the continuing warfare against and enforced isolation of Gazans.

Now, finally, we have the welcome tonic of Carter saying what any independent, uncorrupted thinker should conclude: that no "peace plan," "road map" or "legacy" can succeed unless we are sitting at the negotiating table and without any preconditions.

Israel's escalation of violence since the staged Annapolis "peace conference" in November has been consistent with its policy of illegal, often deadly collective punishment -- in violation of international conventions. Israeli military strikes on Gaza have

killed hundreds of Palestinians since then with unwavering White House approval; in 2007 alone the ratio of Palestinians to Israelis killed was 40 to 1, up from 4 to 1 during the period from 2000 to 2005.

Only three months ago I buried my son Hussam, who studied finance at college and wanted to be an accountant; he was killed by an Israeli airstrike. In 2003, I buried Khaled -- my first-born -- after an Israeli F-16 targeting me wounded my daughter and my wife and flattened the apartment building where we lived, injuring and killing many of our neighbors. Last year, my son-in-law was killed.

Hussam was only 21, but like most young men in Gaza he had grown up fast out of necessity. When I was his age, I wanted to be a surgeon; in the 1960s, we were already refugees, but there was no humiliating blockade then. But now, after decades of imprisonment, killing, statelessness and impoverishment, we ask: What peace can there be if there is no dignity first? And where does dignity come from if not from justice?

Our movement fights on because we cannot allow the foundational crime at the core of the Jewish state -- the violent expulsion from our lands and villages that made us refugees -- to slip out of world consciousness, forgotten or negotiated away. Judaism -- which gave so much to human culture in the contributions of its ancient lawgivers and modern proponents of tikkun olam -- has corrupted itself in the detour into Zionism, nationalism and apartheid.

A "peace process" with Palestinians cannot take even its first tiny step until Israel first withdraws to the borders of 1967; dismantles all settlements; removes all soldiers from Gaza and the West Bank; repudiates its illegal annexation of Jerusalem; releases all prisoners; and ends its blockade of our international borders, our coastline and our airspace permanently. This would provide the starting point for just negotiations and would lay the groundwork for the return of millions of refugees. Given what we have lost, it is the only basis by which we can start to be whole again.

I am eternally proud of my sons and miss them every day. I think of them as fathers everywhere, even in Israel, think of their sons -- as innocent boys, as curious students, as young men with limitless potential -- not as "gunmen" or "militants." But

better that they were defenders of their people than parties to their ultimate dispossession; better that they were active in the Palestinian struggle for survival than passive witnesses to our subjugation.

History teaches us that everything is in flux. Our fight to redress the material crimes of 1948 is scarcely begun, and adversity has taught us patience. As for the Israeli state and its Spartan culture of permanent war, it is all too vulnerable to time,

### **Mr. Zahar and Mr. Carter** By The Washington Post editorial April 17, 2008

On the opposite page today we publish an article by the "foreign minister" of Hamas, Mahmoud al-Zahar, that drips with hatred for Israel, and with praise for former president Jimmy Carter. We believe Mr. Zahar's words are worth publishing because they provide some clarity about the group he helps to lead, a group that Mr. Carter contends is worthy of being included in the Middle East peace process. Mr. Carter himself is holding what appears to be a series of meetings with Hamas leaders during a tour of the Middle East. He met one militant in the West Bank town of Ramallah on Tuesday and was reportedly planning to meet Mr. Zahar in Cairo today before traveling to Damascus for an appointment with Khaled Meshal, Hamas's top leader.

Mr. Zahar lauds Mr. Carter for the "welcome tonic" of saying that no peace process can succeed "unless we are sitting at the negotiating table and without any preconditions." Yet Mr. Zahar has his own preconditions: Before any peace process can "take even its first tiny step," he says, Israel must withdraw to the 1967 borders and evacuate Jerusalem while preparing for the "return of millions of refugees." In fact, as Mr. Zahar makes clear, Hamas is not at all interested in a negotiated peace with the Jewish state, whose existence it refuses to accept: "Our fight to redress the material crimes of 1948 is scarcely begun," he concludes.

In that fight, no act of terrorism is out of bounds for the Hamas leader, who endorses the group's recent ambush of Israeli civilians working at a fuel depot that supplies Gaza. The "total war" of

fatigue and demographics: In the end, it is always a question of our children and those who come after us.

**Mahmoud al-Zahar, a surgeon, is a founder of Hamas. He is foreign minister in the government of Prime Minister Ismail Haniyeh, which was elected in January 2006.**

which he speaks was initiated and has been sustained by Hamas itself through its deliberate targeting of civilians, such as the residents of the Israeli town of Sderot, who suffer daily rocket attacks.

These facts would hardly need restating were it not for actors such as Mr. Carter, who portray Hamas as rational and reasonable. Hamas is "perfectly willing" for Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas "to represent them in all direct negotiations with the Israelis, and they also maintain that they will accept any agreement that he brokers with the Israelis" provided a referendum is held on it, the former president told the newspaper Haaretz. Compare that claim with Mr. Zahar's own words on the opposite page. In fact, Mr. Zahar has called Mr. Abbas "a traitor" for negotiating with Israel -- a label that is, in the Palestinian context, an incitement to murder.

Mr. Carter justifies his meetings with familiar arguments about the value of dialogue with enemies. But he misses the point. Contacts between enemies can be useful: Israel is legendary for such negotiations, and even now it is engaged in back-channel bargaining with Hamas through Egypt. But it is one thing to communicate pragmatically, and quite another to publicly and unconditionally grant recognition and political sanction to a leader or a group that advocates terrorism, mass murder or the extinction of another state. That is what Mr. Carter is doing by lending what is left of his prestige to an avowed terrorist such as Khaled Meshal -- or Mahmoud al-Zahar.

### **The false hope of embracing Hamas**

**By Robert Satloff** The Los Angeles Times April 19, 2008

Jimmy Carter's embrace of the radical Palestinian Islamist movement Hamas -- he actually hugged a senior Hamas official this week -- means that Ramsey Clark may finally get a run for his money as America's most embarrassing ex-somebody.

But no one should take the former president's freelance diplomacy lightly. Far more sober foreign policy experts than Carter have urged an end to Hamas' isolation. Carter's outreach to Hamas -- on Friday he also met Damascus-based leader Khaled Meshal -- could represent just the first ripple of a

tidal wave of dangerous and desperate initiatives designed to "save" the Middle East peace process.

Most advocates of engagement with Hamas fall into two camps. The first sees engagement as a way to strengthen Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas and thereby advance Israeli-Palestinian negotiations. A Palestinian "house divided" will never be strong enough to make peace with Israel, this argument goes, and diplomatic progress therefore requires reconciling Hamas and its bitter rival, Abbas' Fatah.

The second camp is more direct. Engaging Hamas reflects the reality of Hamas' power, popularity and ability to undermine any diplomacy in which it is not accorded its rightful role. Peacemakers should talk directly with Hamas, this argument goes, because the Islamist movement -- not Abbas -- is the most important player in Palestinian politics.

The first argument is illogical. No Hamas leader has ever endorsed a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, so embracing Hamas can never advance the prospects of such a solution. At the same time, it is unfair and patronizing to suggest that Palestinians must be unified to achieve diplomatic progress. After all, the world routinely expects Israel to make national decisions by the narrowest of margins, such as the 61-59 Knesset vote on a key 1995 peace accord. For the Israelis, the key ingredient is not unity; it is leadership. Why are the Palestinians any different?

The second argument may be more candid about Hamas' power, but it's also sadly defeatist. Advocates of this school seem to forget that we have seen this movie before, with Yasser Arafat in the starring role.

In 1975, the Ford administration defined conditions that Arafat's Palestine Liberation Organization would have to meet in order to merit dialogue with the U.S. government, including renouncing terrorism and recognizing Israel's right to exist. Despite pleas from around the world to soften these terms, successive presidents -- including Carter -- held fast. After 13 years, the strategy worked; Arafat uttered the magic formula and the Reagan administration, in its waning days, opened a dialogue with the PLO. Carter's trip strengthens those who are urging Washington to ease its conditions for dialogue after just two years of effort.

The difference between the internal PLO debate two decades ago and the debate inside Hamas today is critical. For the PLO, the historic divide was between advocates of a phased plan to destroy Israel and those willing to accept an independent Palestine

next to Israel. The idea of talking peace only ever made sense with the latter.

Hamas, by contrast, has no advocates of peace with Israel. The divide is between those who call for a tahdiya (a brief lull in the fighting) and those who favor a hudna (a longer-term armistice). Neither approximates peace with Israel.

Against this backdrop, it would be folly for the U.S. government to demand less of Hamas today than it asked of the PLO 20 years ago. Engaging Hamas also would knock the wind out of Abbas' administration, essentially throwing the Palestinians to the wolves of Hamas. Those who advocate this approach must somehow believe that Hamas is willing to be complicit in its own demise.

Unsatisfying as it may be, the right course for U.S. policymakers is to persist in the strategy adopted after Hamas' Gaza putsch last summer: Invest in economic and political success in the West Bank and further isolate Hamas in Gaza. The goal is to give Palestinians a clear choice: a chance for peace and prosperity, or a certainty of penury and bloodshed. So far, the strategy has not borne results -- but it hasn't been given the time and attention it needs to work.

The Bush administration's last-ditch effort to promote an Israeli-Palestinian peace agreement is, at best, a great gamble and, at worst, a costly distraction. Instead of fulfilling promises to build the Palestinian economy, civic institutions and a functional security structure, President Bush changed gears and is now pushing for a breakthrough by the end of his term. This dilution of U.S. effort will likely mean that nothing is achieved - neither diplomatic success nor progress on the ground.

The irony is that Carter and Bush, who are different in so many ways, seem to have forgotten the most important lesson of 35 years of U.S.-led peacemaking in the Middle East: The road to a secure peace has no shortcuts.

**Robert Satloff is executive director of the Washington Institute.**

## **Hamas' growing strength** By The Washington Times editorial April 17, 2008

When Israel withdrew all of its soldiers and civilians from Gaza in August 2005, it created a massive strategic void that has been filled by Hamas with extensive support from Iran and Syria. With the June 2007 putsch that expelled Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas' Fatah organization from Gaza, Hamas became the undisputed ruler there. Buoyed by Hezbollah's success in building a military force in Lebanon that proved capable of withstanding a withering military assault two years ago from Israel, the regional military superpower, Hamas is building a modern army.

Today, there are approximately 20,000 armed operatives in Gaza who answer directly to Hamas or

can be integrated into its forces in an emergency. These fighters often undergo training in Iran and Syria, and then return to Gaza -- either through an extensive network of tunnels or overland through the Rafah crossing, exploiting the weakness of the Egyptian security forces that are supposed to prevent such cross-border smuggling.

In addition to the weapons and personnel it has smuggled into Gaza, Hamas also possesses a substantial arsenal of 122-mm Grad rockets, anti-tank missiles, anti-aircraft missiles and machine guns, patrol boats and explosives. According to the Intelligence and Terrorism Information Center (ITIC), an Israel-based research organization, Hamas

is working on increasing the armor-piercing capabilities of its improvised explosive devices, or IEDs (much as al Qaeda is doing against American troops in Iraq.) Hamas is walking a very fine line: Like its patrons in Tehran, it is opposed to Israel's existence in any form, and is determined to strike it whenever possible. But it is probably in its interest to avoid for now the kind of mass-casualty terrorist attack that would provoke a large-scale Israeli military operation in Gaza analogous to Israel's war in Lebanon in 2006.

So Hamas adopted a multi-tracked approach: steadily amassing weapons for a war with Israel several years from now while fielding a guerrilla-warfare infrastructure to fight the Israeli military if it invades during the next few months. The Hamas arsenal, which has grown substantially during the past year, includes artillery rockets and mortar shells smuggled into the Gaza Strip which can reach 12.5 miles into Israel — a substantial increase over the

7.5 miles that Hamas' locally produced rockets can travel. This enables the Hamas rocket arsenal to reach Ashkelon, an Israeli city with a population of more than 100,000 people, and increases the threat to Israeli military forces operating near Gaza.

Advanced anti-tank weapons smuggled into Gaza improve Hamas' ability to wage anti-tank warfare against Israeli forces at night. Hamas is increasing the armor-piercing capabilities of its IEDs so that they can penetrate the Israeli military's armored vehicles. Its anti-aircraft equipment constitute a mounting threat to Israeli aircraft operating near Gaza. Like Hezbollah and Iraqi jihadists, Hamas is preparing to employ "asymmetric warfare" — conducting hit-and-run attacks and blending in with the civilian population, effectively turning them into human shields.

It is likely just a matter of time until this strengthened Hamas arsenal confronts the Israeli military for control of Gaza.

## **Incompetent or cruel By The Australian editorial April 28, 2008**

The petrol crisis shows the true colours of Hamas

The continuing tragedy of Gaza is that it was supposed to offer Palestinians an opportunity to show they were ready for self-government after Israel withdrew in August 2005. Unfortunately, the Strip has descended into poverty and chaos, a launching pad for thousands of rockets targeted at Israel's civilian population.

After months of heavy losses to superior Israeli commando raids, which have killed more than 420 people, mainly Palestinian terrorists, in the past eight months, Hamas is proposing a six-month truce. Israeli Defence Minister Ehud Barak, obviously, would welcome a cessation of rocket attacks. But, understandably, he is taking his time to respond, fearing Hamas would use the break to rearm.

What is clear at present is that Hamas is light years away from having the nous and goodwill, even towards its own people, to lead a Palestinian State. Fuel supplies on the Strip have dried up, forcing the United Nations Relief and Works Agency to suspend food aid to 650,000 impoverished residents.

The Israeli Government claims Hamas has created a dishonest crisis in an attempt to court international leverage. Hamas is blaming Israel for the crisis, but its arguments are not convincing. Late last year, Israel flagged fuel rationing as a means to combat rocket attacks. But it insists that enough fuel is stored in Gaza to cover essential humanitarian

needs. Israel also says that it tried to transfer fuel directly to UNRWA, but was thwarted by a farmers' demonstration supported by Hamas.

Tensions further escalated a few weeks ago when two Islamic Jihad terrorists killed two Israelis at the fuel terminal that supplies Gaza. At the time, Islamic Jihad said the fuel coming from Israel was "dripped in humiliation" and not wanted.

Hamas leaders also admit that at least part of the shortage stems from a three-week strike by Gaza suppliers, who claim that moving small volumes of fuel is too uneconomical. As the elected Government, however, it is the responsibility of Hamas to overcome such obstacles and get the fuel moving so that food aid given by the world in good faith reaches its people.

If, however, it is political point scoring motivating Hamas's failure to get the fuel and food moving, it is further proof, if any was needed, of the organisation's true nature. Hamas is responsible for hundreds of murderous suicide bombings and other terrorist attacks on Israel. This time, however, it seems prepared to let its own men, women and children go hungry. In doing so, it is showing the world that anybody who believes that Israel is the worst enemy of the Palestinian people needs to think again. The impasse does not advance hopes of a workable, two-state solution.

**If anyone would like to receive this newsletter by a weekly e-mail, please drop us a line at [sheldonb@rsfchart.com](mailto:sheldonb@rsfchart.com) and we will be glad to add you to our growing list of subscribers.**

**All of the newsletter archives can be found on the Suburban Orthodox webpage (Israel Action section) at [www.SuburbanOrthodox.org/iacn.php](http://www.SuburbanOrthodox.org/iacn.php).**

**Next Wednesday May 7 is Israel Memorial Day (Yom Hazikaron) and next Thursday May 8 is Israel Independence Day (Yom Ha'atzmaut) celebrating 60 years of an independent Israel.**