

1. ***Michael Trapido*** **We don't hate Jews, we hate Zionists**
The rise of the right and the possibility of another Fuehrer are no longer far-fetched because the custodians of our morality are cowards who ignore glaring abuse of human rights and assuage their guilt by picking on scapegoats who won't hurt them.
2. **Columnist in Egyptian Government Daily Launches Unprecedented Attack on Hamas**
The Gaza Strip has become a big prison isolated from the world, where the residents suffer grinding poverty while the leaders live in luxury,
3. ***Khaled Abu Toameh*** **The Palestinian Refugees: Why is everyone lying to them?**
PA leaders will never recognize Israel as a Jewish state because that would mean that they would have to give up the "right of return" for millions of Palestinians to their original homes inside Israel.
4. ***Douglas Feith*** **Can Israeli be Jewish and democratic?**
Does Israel affront its non-Jewish citizens by identifying itself as a Jewish state and by using traditional religious emblems as official national symbols?
5. ***Gil Troy*** **Boycotting Israel damages Palestinian cause**
Calling Israel an apartheid state is part of the New Big Lie which singles out only Zionism, Jewish nationalism, as racist.
6. ***Bits and Pieces*** **Clips from various media in the Middle East and elsewhere**

'We don't hate Jews, we hate Zionists'

Michael Trapido, thoughtleader, Mail & Guardian Online, November 2010

(Michael is editor of http://www.newstime.co.za/rs_main.asp)

As always I've been reading columnists from around the world and came across two lads bitching about pretty much the same thing. Firstly our own Dave Bullard who calls political correctness the curse of the chattering classes while Mark Steyn - who writes for far too many publications to mention here - was going on about free speech and political correctness as they apply to the Western response to the proposed burning of the Koran.

In respect of South Africa and the US, both authors succeed in outlining the hypocrisy and indeed the danger of euphemising terms and ignoring the reality of the situation on the ground.

As David correctly points out the fact that it's called an informal settlement rather than a squatter camp doesn't make it any more palatable to those who have to live there.

As Steyn points out:

"So just to clarify the ground rules, if you insult Christ, the media report the issue as freedom of expression: A healthy society has to have bold, brave, transgressive artists willing to question and challenge our assumptions, etc. But, if it's Mohammed, the issue is no longer freedom of expression but the need for "respect" and "sensitivity" toward Islam, and all those bold brave transgressive artists don't have a thing to say about it."

The problem, I'm afraid, is that through trying to bend over backwards to be politically and morally correct in the manner that it is being done now, people are in fact polarising society in a way that is becoming deadlier by the day.

Worse - those who do it aren't brave enough to carry it through.

Let's use an easy example; Israel with its tiny population and its miniscule territory.

The "moral champions" of our planet gasped in shock and horror when Israel invaded Gaza and some civilians were killed even though they were collateral to the targets being hunted. The same "moral champions" who ignored hundreds upon hundreds of rockets over years aimed at Israeli civilians where anything military would be collateral and which occasioned the invasion.

Then we read about the academics who would boycott an Israeli university because of its support for the Israeli government. A university that has in fact criticised that government's policies but apparently not enough.

Yet genocide in Sudan doesn't rate a mention among these giants of the academy, not one Zimbabwean university despite massacres and five million on the brink of starvation, Iran shooting its demonstrators - no call there - Stalin murdered between 30 and 50 million Russians but nothing said there and on and on and on.

May I point out to those academics in South Africa that I understand why you are calling for this particular boycott while ignoring all the rest.

The fact is that you are an anti-Semite.

And when you roll on the ground clutching your leg crying foul - please enclose ALL the boycotts of universities that you've originated flowing from gross abuse of human rights before you come bullshit me about the Israel university boycott. Then set out why Israel is more important than all the rest.

As for Jews who stand behind this boycott I can only admire the way you stand up for human rights. Please list those atrocities OTHER than the easy Israel scapegoat that you have been boycotting and set out why Israel's problem is bigger than say Sudan.

The fact that you are Jewish by birth does not mean you cannot be an anti-Semite. Hell, some of the worst anti-Semites are Jews.

Zionism versus Judaism? - a convenient cap to wear for hating the only Jewish country in the world. Why is it that nobody has a problem with a country being a Muslim country?

I don't.

If the bulk of the people follow Islam why can't it be a Muslim country or a Christian country as the case may be?

"We don't hate Jews, we hate Zionists."

Why - because five million Jews live there.

Nice to get all the politically correct garbage out the way.

The only reason people attack this tiny country with a minute population is because they are too afraid to tackle the big questions. As Steyn points out you can draw Jesus in urine but don't even mention Islam. Yet in those countries the worst abuse of human rights, gays, women and any other trendy cause are going on daily.

How do we assuage our moral cowardice - attack Israel.

Two bombs after the World Cup in Uganda because they are helping the Somali government against terrorists and what response from these moral champions? Those blast victims had done nothing other than live in a country whose government happened to be assisting a neighbour fight Islamists and what do our academics say and do?

Sweet FA - and that's not the body that looks after the Premier League.

Know why they don't attack the onslaught on gays, women and every other human right in those Islamic countries?

Because they might be physically hurt.

Back to Israel huh guys?

Yesterday the chickens finally started coming home to roost.

German Chancellor Angela Merkel confirmed that attempts to create a multi-cultural society in which people from various cultural backgrounds live together peacefully have failed.

More than half (58.4%) of the 2 411 people polled in Germany thought the about four million Muslims in Germany should have their religious practices “significantly curbed”.

“The study, by the Friedrich Ebert Foundation think-tank, showed that more than one third (34.3%) of those surveyed believed Germany’s 16 million immigrants or people with foreign origins came to the country for the social benefits.

Around the same number (35.6%) think Germany is being “over-run by foreigners” and more than one in 10 called for a “Fuehrer” to run the country “with a strong hand”.

The enormous swing to the right in Germany is being mirrored in Holland, Scandinavia and even the Swiss.

In the US the right-wing backlash to US president Barack Obama is becoming more evident daily. Just how far right, will become apparent in the November elections.

Britain is already seeing more and more right-wing protests.

Tony Blair who is at the forefront of Middle East peace negotiations said the West is being “outspent, outmanoeuvred and out-strategised” by violent Islamic extremism.

The former prime minister said that there had been a failure to challenge the “narrative” that Islam was oppressed by the West which was fuelling extremism around the world.

He said too many people accepted the extremists’ analysis that the military actions taken by the West following the 9/11 attacks were directed at countries because they were Muslim and that it supported Israel because Israelis were Jews while Palestinians were Muslims.

“We should wake up to the absurdity of our surprise at the prevalence of this extremism,” he said

“Look at the funds it receives. Examine the education systems that succour it. And then measure, over the years, the paucity of our counter-attack in the name of peaceful co-existence. We have been outspent, outmanoeuvred and out-strategised.”

Speaking in New York to the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, Mr Blair warned that it was impossible to defeat extremism “without defeating the narrative that nurtures it”.

Moderate Muslims who believed in co-existence and tolerance were, he said, being undermined by the unwillingness of the West to take on the extremists' arguments.

"We think if we sympathise with the narrative — that essentially this extremism has arisen as a result, partly, of our actions — we meet it halfway, we help the modernisers to be more persuasive," he said.

"We don't. We indulge it and we weaken them. Worse, a reaction springs up amongst our people that we are pandering to this narrative and they start to resent Muslims as a whole." (AP).

In other words when Israel is gone the war will be against the Christians and the atheists whose actions right now - in tip-toeing around the extremists - is bringing it nearer by the day.

The rise of the right and the possibility of another Fuehrer are no longer far-fetched because the custodians of our morality are cowards who ignore glaring abuse of human rights and assuage their guilt by picking on scapegoats who won't hurt them.

Into the lacuna - where moral bravery should be - will come an equal and opposing force but made up of extremists from the right.

World War III where people will have to choose between bad and very bad.

Columnist in Egyptian Government Daily Launches Unprecedented Attack on Hamas

In an article in the Egyptian government daily Al-Gumhuriyya, columnist 'Abdallah Al-Naggar attacked Hamas's "Islamic emirate" in Gaza and its leaders, saying that the Strip has become a big prison isolated from the world, where the residents suffer grinding poverty while the leaders live in luxury, and where fighters fire "primitive" rockets that serve only to prompt a deadly response from the enemy.

Following are excerpts:[\[1\]](#)

"The Islamic Emirate of Gaza and its Caliph, Sultan Isma'il bin Haniya, has become a diminutive model of our Muslim nation, accurately reflecting our [general] reality. It is an emirate isolated [from the world] on all sides. There is no road or entrance leading into it, and if you want to go in, you have to ask permission from its neighbours... It is divided [into isolated regions] and isolated from the world.

"The relations between the residents of this emirate and their homeland are like the relations between two rival brothers. Those living outside the emirate hate the emirate and those [living] inside, while those inside, who live in a large prison, curse their brothers and accuse them of collaboration and treason. [Inside], there is degrading poverty and pressing need. The plea [for help] is unending. People have no food or electricity, and the sick have no access to treatment or medicine. Women are unprotected and children do not receive their most basic needs.

"The leaders of this emirate are unrecognized outside its besieged walls, and need permission from their enemies to leave it... If [the enemy] refuses, they remain hidden within the [emirate's] boundaries, screaming, wailing and calling for help, but nobody comes to the rescue. When the residents of the emirate appear on [our television] screens, they are always crying and beseeching Allah to take quick revenge on all the Arabs [for abandoning them].

"This emirate, isolated from the world, has neither ambassadors nor consulates, neither schools nor universities, and the international community hasn't the slightest incentive to cooperate with it. Its only contact with the world [takes the form of] pleas for help that never comes and for aid that its enemies do not permit it to receive.

"[From time to time, its people] fire some primitive rockets from the territory of their emirate, with no way of knowing when and where they will fall. These [rockets] do not hit their target nor bring about victory. The enemy's response, [on the other hand,] is decisive and crushing, completely blind to the [anguish] of the defenceless, weak and wretched [residents]. It takes no pity on children, women, or the elderly, and sows death and destruction, encountering no resistance that can match it [in force]...

"After the disaster [of the 2009 Gaza war], the emirate celebrated its victory, and the Caliph [Isma'il Haniya] graced the survivors with a bombastic speech full of fiery phrases. [But] the tragedy repeated itself, and [eventually] he was forced to sign a secret agreement with the enemy, [promising] to stop the [firing of] rockets in return for a halt to the [enemy's] blows. [Yet] you will always find someone who will praise the [emirate's] courage and steadfastness [and refer to] the deeds of this glorious emirate as a kind of jihad [that will be remembered] for all eternity. [Meanwhile,] the Caliph lives in luxury, and drives a fast black car preceded by dozens of motorcycles, after the manner of generals and dignitaries around the world.

"This is a tragedy by any standards, for Palestine has lost its way. The Arabs and Muslims are humiliated and have nothing left but empty [gestures] that make them feel self-important but are actually meaningless. When will we wake up from this drunken stupor, open our eyes to the [interests] of the residents, and start employing [measures] that are [truly] serious and beneficial? When will we recognize our own worth, and launch a serious struggle, so as to find an effective cure for the disease?..."

Endnote:

[1] *Al-Gumhuriyya* (Egypt), October 22, 2010.

The Palestinian Refugees: Why Is everyone lying to them?

By Khaled abu Toameh, Hudson NY, 19 October 2010

<http://www.hudson-ny.org/1616/palestinian-refugees>

Palestinian Authority leaders are now saying that they will never recognize Israel as a Jewish state because that would mean that they would have to give up the "right of return" for millions of Palestinians to their original homes inside Israel.

These leaders are actually continuing to deceive the refugees into believing that one day they will be permitted to move into Israel.

The Palestinian Authority, like the rest of the Arab governments, has been lying to the refugees for decades, telling them that one day their dream of returning to their villages and towns, many of which no longer exist, would be fulfilled.

Meanwhile, the refugees are continuing to live in harsh conditions in their UNRWA-administered camps in the West Bank, Gaza Strip, Jordan, Syria and Lebanon.

No Arab or Palestinian leader has ever dared to confront the refugees with the truth, namely that they are not going to move into Israel. On the contrary, Palestinian and Arab leaders continue to tell these people that they will go back to their former villages and towns.

Arab and Palestinian governments are lying to the refugees because they want to avoid any responsibility toward their plight. The Arab governments hosting the refugees have done almost nothing to improve the living conditions of the refugees.

On the contrary, Palestinian refugees living in Syria, Lebanon and Jordan have long been subjected the victims of racism and other repressive and unjust measures and laws that deprive them even of basic rights. Governments such as Jordan receive a payment for each refugee, turning the refugees into nothing more than property, like stocks on Wall Street.

Since its establishment in 1994, the Palestinian Authority has also done very little to help the refugees. In the West Bank, most of the international aid is being invested in major cities such as Ramallah, Nablus, Bethlehem and Jenin, as well as scores of villages.

UNRWA is also not offering a solution to the refugees. Instead, the UN agency is perpetuating the problem by creating new generations of refugees. UNRWA is in fact encouraging the refugees to stay where they are. For UNRWA, refugees are a gigantic UN jobs program, providing over 30,000 of them, costing over \$1 billion USD a-year, or, according to separate sources, a third of all other UN refugee services combined.

The case of the Palestinian refugees is one of the most important issues in the Israeli-Arab conflict. It needs to be solved for once and for all -- and immediately. The refugees have the legitimate and moral right to continue dreaming about their original villages and towns. But the Arab and Palestinian governments do not have the right to continue lying to these people.

The issue of the refugees can easily be solved if the entire international community, with the help of the Arab world, gets together to find a solution. Israel alone will never be able to solve the problem.

The refugees should be offered financial compensation or resettlement in Arab and other countries. Those who wish to move to a Palestinian state that is established alongside Israel in the future should not be denied that right. Arab countries should be urged to absorb Palestinian refugees.

Western countries should also participate by taking some of the refugees and offering them a new life. Why not establish an international fund that would offer financial compensation to those who lost their homes and lands? And let us not forget that there are also hundreds of thousands of Jewish "refugees" who lost their properties in Arab countries.

The world needs to tell the Palestinian refugees that while they are entitled to many rights, they must forget about returning to Jaffa, Haifa and other places inside Israel.

The issue of the Palestinian refugees can be solved only when a courageous Arab or Palestinian leader confronts them with the truth. As long as the refugees are being fed with false hopes, there can be no solution.

Can Israeli be Jewish and democratic?

Douglas Feith, Wall Street Journal, 25 October 2010

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304410504575560670943882014.html>

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu recently asked Palestinian peace negotiators to acknowledge Israel as a Jewish state. Some critics have called this move cynical, because Palestinian leaders are unlikely to offer such an acknowledgment. But others oppose it for a more basic reason: They claim it is antidemocratic.

Israel, so the argument goes, affronts its non-Jewish citizens by identifying itself as a Jewish state and by using traditional religious emblems as official national symbols - eg, the Star of David on its flag.

Along the same lines, various Israeli intellectuals have proposed dropping "Hatikvah" (The Hope) as their country's national anthem, because it refers to the Jewish soul's millennial yearnings for a return to Zion. A few have urged repeal of Israel's longstanding law of return, which gives Jews from any country a right to immigrate and become citizens.

Some Israeli Arabs have advocated that Israel should become a state identified with no particular ethnic or religious group but rather a state of all of its individual citizens. Israelis commonly view this liberal ideal with suspicion, for it has no relation whatever to the political practices of any countries in the Middle East. Also, Azmi Bishara, the principal Israeli Arab proponent of "a state of all of its citizens" and a former member of parliament, outraged many Israelis by supporting Hezbollah against Israel in the 2006 Lebanon war.

Israeli law respects the voting, property, religious and other rights of its Arab citizens (most of them Muslims) who constitute some 20% of the population. Nevertheless, the

ongoing conflict over Palestine has created bitterness between many of them and their fellow Jewish citizens. Many Israeli Jews resent what they see as disloyalty on the part of Israeli Arabs. Many of the latter resent what they see as their second-class status.

But the larger question of Israel's identity as a Jewish state does not hinge on the particulars of its Arab citizens' current status. Rather, it is whether democratic principles are necessarily violated when Israel asserts a Jewish identity based on the ethnic and religious heritage of its majority group. That is a matter of interest to everyone who thinks seriously about self-government.

Israel is by no means unique among democracies in considering itself the embodiment of the national existence of a specific people. In fact, most democracies see themselves that way. Most have laws and practices that specially recognize a particular people's history, language, culture, religion and group symbols, even though they also have minorities from other groups.

The United States is unusual in this regard. It is among the most liberal of democracies, in the sense that it is committed to the principle that laws should, in general, ignore group identities (ethnic, religious or regional) and treat citizens equally as individuals. Canada, Australia and New Zealand - likewise lands of new settlement - are among the other countries on this liberal end of the democratic spectrum.

The democracies of Europe and East Asia and those in the former republics of the Soviet Union, meanwhile, tend to cluster on the ethnic side of the spectrum. Numerous laws and institutions in those nations favor a country's principal ethnic group but are nevertheless accepted as compatible with democratic principles. Christian crosses adorn the flags of Switzerland, Sweden, Greece and Finland, among other model democracies, and the United Kingdom's flag boasts two kinds of crosses.

Several of these democracies have monarchs - and in the UK, Norway and Denmark, the monarchs head national churches. France famously protects the integrity of the French language and the interests of French speakers, as do pro-French forces in Canada.

Ireland has a law that allows applicants of "Irish descent or Irish associations" to be exempted from ordinary naturalization rules. Poland, Croatia and Japan have similar laws of return favoring members of their own respective ethnic majorities. Many other examples exist.

Israel was founded as a national home for the Jews, recognized as a nationality and not just a religious group. After Allied forces conquered Palestine from the Ottomans in World War I, Britain, France, Italy and other leading powers of the day supported the idea that the Jewish people, long shamefully abused as exiles throughout the diaspora, should be offered the opportunity to reconstitute a Jewish-majority state in their ancient homeland of Palestine.

Those powers planned that the Arabs, whose nationalist leaders from across the Middle East insisted that they were a single, indivisible people, would exercise national self-determination over time in Syria, Lebanon, Mesopotamia (now Iraq), Arabia and

elsewhere. Britain soon decided to put the 78% of Palestine east of the Jordan River under exclusive Arab administration, barring Jewish settlement there.

The British government's wartime Balfour Declaration in favor of a Jewish national home in Palestine - incorporated verbatim in the Palestine Mandate, which received League of Nations confirmation in 1922 - made a crucial distinction between the collective rights of the Jewish people in Palestine and the individual civil and religious rights of the country's non-Jewish residents. The point was that all such rights, collective and individual, should be honored.

After World War I, numerous ethnic groups achieved statehood. It was not considered antidemocratic that the Hungarians or Poles, for example, should establish nations to embody and sustain their particular cultures.

All democratic countries have minority populations. Such countries do not believe that they have to shed their national ethnic identities in order to respect the civil, property and other basic human rights of their minority citizens. The distinction between majority collective rights to a national home and the individual rights of all citizens remains important in Israel and in all ethnically-based democracies.

So democracies vary in the degree to which their laws take account of ethnicity. Their common practices provide an answer to our question: It is not antidemocratic for Israel to protect its status as a Jewish state in ways similar to those used by the French, Swiss, British, Germans, Italians, Lithuanians, Japanese and others to protect the status of their countries as national homelands.

Boycotting Israel damages Palestinian cause

By Gil Troy, The Montreal Gazette, October 26, 2010

<http://www.montrealgazette.com/news/Boycotting+Israel+damages+Palestinian+cause/3715196/story.html>

Montrealers seeking peace in the Middle East should condemn the "All-Canada BDS Conference" convening here this weekend.

"BDS" stands for "boycott, divestment, and sanctions," a toxic cocktail designed to ostracize Israel. This tactic makes it hard to achieve a two-state solution that respects the national rights of both Jews and Palestinians.

Members of the postal union CUPW and other unions should be ashamed that their dues are subsidizing a conference dedicated to making that volatile region even more unstable. Members of the academic community should regret that the UQAM campus is being used as a forum for demagoguery and dishonesty.

Mutual recognition requires mutual respect. Exaggerated attacks on Israel as the world's bogeyman feed a cycle of de-legitimization.

Boycotting Israel economically, academically, and diplomatically assumes that Israel is so reprehensible that it deserves to be quarantined. This punishment is particularly absurd considering that these activists do not advocate boycotting truly repressive dictatorships such as Iran, North Korea, and Saudi Arabia.

Polls show that most Israelis now accept the legitimate national aspirations of the Palestinian people, but Israelis will be less likely to acknowledge those rights if they feel that Palestinians are assailing Jews' national rights and Israel's very right to exist. Nations, like people, stiffen when besieged. Even Israelis who advocate compromise are unlikely to compromise with adversaries calling for their country's destruction.

A peaceful future means nurturing relationships between Palestinians and Israelis, while fostering within the Palestinian national movement a culture of nation-building. But the many posters falsely accusing Israel of being an "apartheid state," and the many sessions promoted on the conference's website perpetuating that lie, suggest that this conference is more dedicated to trying to destroy Israel than to building a future Palestine.

Calling Israel an apartheid state is part of the New Big Lie which singles out only Zionism, Jewish nationalism, as racist. Apartheid was the system of racial segregation of the old racist South African regime. Using that ugly word to characterize Israeli policy and Israel itself suggests that Israel, like the old South African regime, cannot be reformed but must be destroyed.

Again and again, the BDS movement hides its exterminationist agenda behind a smokescreen of human rights rhetoric. Using liberal terms to hide a most illiberal agenda is an increasingly popular technique aiding the world's terrorists and dictators. Those of us living in free, liberal democracies must expose these frauds. Calling for peace while making it ever more elusive; targeting democracies while shielding dictators; and respecting the human or national rights of some but not all -these tactics mock the universal standards for human rights that Canadians helped the world define six decades ago.

Unfortunately, this masquerade has lured some trade unionists in Quebec and elsewhere into supporting a movement which is so busy being anti-Israel it often harms Palestinians. In a world where conflicts abound, union members should ask how a simplified, stick-figure version of the complicated Israeli-Palestinian issue has been catapulted to the forefront of their collective agenda. And in a Middle East where many Israelis and Palestinians are economically interdependent, union leaders must prove that assaulting the Jewish state economically would not harm many Palestinians.

The selective obsession with Israel also makes the BDS movement vulnerable to the charge of anti-Semitism. Of course, not all criticism of Israel is anti-Semitic, but too many in the BDS movement too frequently echo traditional anti-Semitism.

On campus today, we tread extra carefully to avoid offending historically disenfranchised groups. In that spirit, I challenge the participants to show equal sensitivity in distancing themselves from the historic anti-Semitism which has marred their movement. In combating prejudice, the burden of proof is on the bigot not the victim to distinguish between legitimate criticism and historic bullying. There is enough extreme anti-Semitism festering among anti-Zionists for true moderates to condemn, while still having

much opportunity to criticize Israeli policies they dislike.

This weekend, Quebecers can vote against this destructive distraction by responding to calls for a boycott with a "**buycott**." Buy one Israeli product -wine, cosmetics, or candy. Send an email to friends encouraging them to do the same.

Let's see a run on Israeli products in Montreal. With these separate acts by fair-minded individuals, we can show the BDS activists that their destructive campaign against Israel truly is counter-productive.

Bits and Pieces **Clips from various media in the Middle East and elsewhere**

ICEJ News, 28 October, 2010: Christian Embassy calls on Vatican to refute Bishop's smear against Jews: The International Christian Embassy Jerusalem has joined with those Jewish leaders currently calling on the Vatican to issue a firm and unequivocal repudiation of the outrageous and undignified comments by Archbishop Cyril Salim Bustros at the close of the special Catholic Synod of Middle East bishops which concluded last weekend in Rome.

"The Archbishop's remarks reflect a perilous reversion to classical Replacement theology, which bore such horrific fruits over many centuries for Jews living in the heart of Christian Europe," said ICEJ Executive Director Rev. Malcolm Hedding. "The Catholic Church renounced this teaching at the landmark Vatican II conclave, but that important reversal means nothing if they do not now censure senior clerics who so brazenly stray back into the poisonous mindset of contempt for the Jews."

ICEJ News, 28 October, 2010: Both Palestinian Authority chairman Mahmoud Abbas and Prime Minister Salam Fayyad insisted that they will soon press for a unilateral declaration of Palestinian statehood, with Abbas even saying it could come "within months."