

OPINION and ANALYSIS

Vol 7, Number 10: 1 December 2011

**A selection of some of the more challenging and thought-provoking
local and international writings on the Middle East**

<http://www.sazionfed.co.za>

1. *Melanie Phillips* Overrated: Mahmoud Abbas

Abbas has made it plain that his bigotry is directed not just at Israel. Considering the possibility that Nato forces might be brought in to police a settlement, Abbas declared: "I will not accept the presence of Jews in these forces."

2. *Meir Litvak* Hamas at a Crossroads

Hamas is the Palestinian off-shoot of the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood movement, which seeks to Islamize Palestinian society through religious propagation (*da'wa*) and social activity, and at the same time, it is a nationalist and military movement waging a jihad against a foreign enemy, Israel.

**3. *Anne Herzberg* Israeli groups like Breaking the Silence reinforce
Israeli culpability, Arab innocence**

It is inconceivable that any European country would accept a situation where another democratic government provided funds to an organization whose primary aim was to trash that country's armed forces before hostile audiences.

4. *Jeffrey Goldberg* Praise Arab Spring, except for Anti-Semitism

The desire of Arabs to be free of their spiteful and pitiless dictators is sometimes expressed in grotesquely anti-Jewish terms.

Overrated: Mahmoud Abbas

Melanie Phillips, Standpoint, October 2011

<http://standpointmag.co.uk/node/4113/full>

Mahmoud Abbas is the man who Britain, America and Europe think deserves to be the president of an independent state of Palestine — the establishment of which, they tell themselves, would end the Middle East impasse.

To Western eyes Abbas, the Fatah-backed President of the Palestinian Authority, is a moderate. It is, however, simply astounding that he should be viewed in this way. It is even more astounding that Western liberals should endorse him and give him a free pass for his behaviour.

Both he and the Palestinian establishment he controls repeatedly say they will never accept Israel as a Jewish state. So his aim remains the destruction of Israel. He and his people repeatedly say that not one Jew would be allowed to live in Palestine. Such a state would therefore be a racist entity ethnically cleansed of Jews.

Abbas has gone even further in making plain that his bigotry is directed not just at Israel. Considering the possibility that Nato forces might be brought in to police a settlement, Abbas declared: "I will not accept the presence of Jews in these forces."

Such bigotry is hardly surprising given that he earned the Soviet equivalent of a PhD in Moscow for a dissertation published in Arabic entitled "The Other Side: the Secret Relations between Nazism and the Leadership of the Zionist Movement" in which he claimed that the Holocaust didn't happen.

He declared that the gas chambers were never used to murder Jews, and that at most 890,000 Jews were killed by the Nazis. This happened, he claimed, in part because the Zionists led a campaign of incitement against the Jews living under Nazi rule in order to fuel their extermination and so bring about the victory of Zionism.

Not only does Abbas thus odiously deny the Holocaust, but he and his cronies also repeatedly deny the history of the Jewish people in their false claim that the Palestinians, rather than the Jews, were the authentic inhabitants of the land.

Despite mouthing platitudes in English about the aim of two states living side by side, when speaking in Arabic Abbas and Co deny Israel's right to exist at all.

Although the Jews are the only people for whom Israel was ever their nation-state, the PA-controlled paper *Al-Hayat al-Jadida* stated earlier this year: "The Zionists must acknowledge publicly, in front of the world, that the Jews have no connection to the Palestinian Arab land." And last May (in a speech read by an adviser), Abbas scorned as a mere Israeli claim the 3,000-year old historical presence of the Jews in the Land of Israel and asserted an entirely fictitious 9,000-year-old Palestinian presence dating back to 7000 BCE. Despite the fact that no such people as the Palestinians then existed, Abbas declared that this made them "the owners of history".

Abbas may look like a mild-mannered businessman but in fact he is steeped in terrorism. He has boasted of dispatching "fighters" to murder Israeli civilians during the terrorist intifada of 2000-05. And today he persists in glorifying the murder of Israeli innocents and showering honours upon their killers.

Once again, he speaks out of both sides of his mouth in English and Arabic. In a recent interview with Israeli TV, he condemned the Palestinians' naming of a square after Dalal Mughrabi, the terrorist who perpetrated an atrocity in 1978 when nearly 40 Israeli civilians were burned alive in a hijacked bus.

However, when speaking to Palestinians in 2010, Abbas said: "Of course we want to name a square after her...We carried out a military action. Can I then later renounce all that we have done?"

Under Abbas, the PA regularly glorifies terrorists and turns them into role models. After the death of Amin al Hindi, a senior planner of the massacre of Israeli athletes in the 1972 Munich Olympics, Abbas personally attended the official red-carpet military funeral provided for him by the PA.

He described another of the Munich terrorists, Muhammad Daoud Oudeh, as "a wonderful brother, companion, tough and stubborn, relentless fighter". And he does nothing to end the incitement to hatred and murder of Jews and Israelis promulgated in the educational materials, sermons and media under his control.

This is not the behaviour of a moderate. This is a man who should be in a courtroom being prosecuted for mass murder. Yet this is the man to whom the West declares that Israel must make concessions so that he can plant a state of his own on its border, which the people around him make clear will be used as a springboard from which to destroy Israel.

The fact that Abbas has made no concessions is ignored. The fact that he demands an end to settlement building but nevertheless refused to negotiate while such building was frozen is ignored. The fact that he is a Jew-hater committed to ethnic cleansing and the destruction of a country is ignored.

The West gives Abbas a free pass because they think there is no alternative solution to the one he proposes. But, appallingly, the solution that he represents risks being a final one.

Hamas at a Crossroads

Meir Litvak, inFocus Quarterly, Fall 2011

<http://www.jewishpolicycenter.org/2499/hamas-crossroads>

Hamas (acronym of *Harakat al-Muqawama al-Islamiyya*, the Islamic Resistance Movement) is standing at a historic crossroads, particularly in view of the ongoing upheaval in the Arab World and the Palestinian Authority's (PA) turn to the UN to recognize a Palestinian state alongside Israel's pre-1967 borders: the Gaza Strip, West Bank, and East Jerusalem. On the one hand, Hamas achieved more than other Arab-Islamist movements. It won democratic elections in 2006 and, more importantly, it has enjoyed absolute control over a specific territory, the Gaza Strip since 2007, enabling it to implement its Islamic agenda. Conversely, these gains as well as regional developments confront Hamas with challenges that may force it to undergo a significant, maybe even historical, change in its conduct if not ideology.

This situation stems from Hamas's unique position. It is the Palestinian off-shoot of the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood movement, which seeks to Islamize Palestinian society through religious propagation (*da'wa*) and social activity, and at the same time, it is a nationalist and military movement waging a jihad against a foreign enemy, Israel.

In addition, Hamas is a political movement that seeks not only to preserve its rule over Gaza, but to takeover the PA and the entire Palestinian national movement. It is also a government that has

to manage the Gaza Strip's difficult socioeconomic problems. These traits explain Hamas's strength, but also some of the limitations to its behavioral and ideological flexibility.

Hamas as an Ideological Movement

According to Hamas, the Palestinian-Israeli conflict is not merely a territorial dispute over land. Rather, it is first and foremost a "war of religion and faith" between Islam and Judaism. As such, it is portrayed as an unbridgeable dichotomy between two opposing absolutes—as a historical, religious, and cultural conflict between faith and unbelief, between the true religion that supersedes all previous religions, i.e. Islam, and the abrogated superseded religion, Judaism. It is a war between good, personified by the Muslims representing the party of God (*Hizballah*), and evil, or "the party of Satan" (*hizb al-shaytan*) represented by the Jews. Consequently, the conflict is considered an "existential battle, rather than a dispute over borders" (*ma'rakat wujud wa-la hudud*). This depiction has led Hamas to adopt strong anti-Jewish rhetoric borrowing themes from European anti-Semitism such as the notorious Protocols of the Elders of Zion, and from early Islamic tradition.

As a nationalist movement engaged in a national conflict with the Jews, Hamas sought to reconcile the universal message of Islam with the particularist foundation of nationalism by "Islamizing" Palestinian nationalism and by "nationalizing" Islam. In practical terms that meant sanctifying Palestine as a holy territory for all Muslims based on two elements. The first is Jerusalem's holy status in Islam following Mecca and Medina, because it was in Jerusalem that the Prophet Muhammad made his miraculous nightly journey on his mare from Medina and later ascension to heaven where he met previous prophets, before descending back to earth. In addition, Palestine—meaning the entire Land of Israel from the Jordan River to the Sea—is viewed as a religious endowment (*waqf*) that does not belong to the Palestinians alone, but to the Muslim nation as a whole for eternity. Hence, no Palestinian or Arab leader has the right to permanently cede even one inch of its territory to the usurping Jews.

The fusion of the two elements—a religious conflict and a sacred land—led Hamas to the ideological conclusion that peace with Israel is unacceptable. True peace is only possible under the flag of Islam, which would require the dismantling of Israel and the return of the Jews to live as a protected minority under the benevolent rule of Islam. Since Jews refuse to accept this generous offer and insist on having a state of their own, the Palestinians have no other option but to wage jihad against them.

Like all other Islamic movements, Hamas regards the jihad against Israel as defensive in nature for two reasons. The first is what it sees as the usurpation of Palestine and the dispossession of its true inhabitants, the Muslim Palestinians, by the Zionists. In this perspective, Zionism is viewed as the latest and most fateful phase of the relentless onslaught waged by Western imperialism and culture against Islam since the Eleventh Century Crusades. The second reason is the war which, Hamas claims, the Jews have waged against Islam since its inception in order to eliminate or, at the least, denigrate it. In the eyes of Hamas, the 1967 Israeli capture of the al-Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem, the third holiest site in Islam, combines both these elements. As a defensive war, jihad becomes an individual duty (*wajib 'ayn*) incumbent upon every able-bodied Muslim. Hamas also adopted the position of 'Abdallah 'Azzam, the radical Palestinian thinker and ideological mentor of al-Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden, who asserts that any land that was once under Muslim rule but was subsequently lost to the infidels should be restored to Islam through jihad as the individual duty of every Muslim. The epitome of jihad is martyrdom, which is depicted as a transaction between the warrior and God, and in which the price is paradise. The end-goal of jihad is not only the elimination of Israel as a state, but the eventual extermination of the Jews as a people, often described as a precondition to the coming of the Messiah at the end of history.

Hamas as Governing Body

While the political fortunes of Hamas have changed significantly, its basic ideology has remained consistent. Equally important, while differences over tactics have emerged among Hamas leaders particularly after seizing control of the Gaza Strip, the consensus around its ideology appears to have remained unchanged. Many ideological movements are forced to compromise once they attain power but the extent to which they can is influenced and often constrained by their basic worldview. Hamas is no exception, as it has continued to promote the jihadi discourse and has refused to cross certain ideological red-lines even when it was forced to follow a more pragmatic path in its daily conduct.

Following the 2007 violent takeover of Gaza, Hamas faced severe contradictions among its conflicting goals. Continued armed struggle against Israel precluded the possibility of international recognition of Hamas as a legitimate government and deprived Hamas of much needed economic aid. Persecuting activists of the rival Fatah movement in Gaza pushed the PA to tighten its security cooperation with Israel against Hamas's infrastructure in the West Bank. Economic hardships in Gaza made it more difficult to advance its religious agenda in Islamizing Palestinian society.

Hamas sought to cope with these conflicting desires by adopting tactical flexibility while adhering to its strategic goals. It had consistently refused to abide by the demand of the Quartet (the U.S., Russia, UN, and EU) that it recognize Israel and cease armed struggle against it in return for generous economic aid to the impoverished Gaza Strip under its control. Moreover, it rejected a more mild Saudi formula in which it would recognize past agreements signed by the PA i.e. the 1993 Oslo Accords, without it having to negotiate or face Israel directly. While willing to endure economic pressures and the suffering of the people of Gaza, Hamas waged a war of attrition against Israel by launching approximately 8,000 missiles at Israel from 2005 to 2009.

Concurrently, Hamas developed creative solutions designed to bridge between its ideological commitment and practical necessities. One has been the idea of temporary armistice (*hudna*), which is legally lawful for Muslims if the enemy is powerful while the Muslims are weak and need time to recover their strength. Such an armistice should not exceed ten years, the period that the Prophet accepted in his agreement with the people of Mecca at Hudaibiyya in 628CE. The *hudna* can be extended for similar periods as long as the enemy remains powerful and would end once the Palestinians could renew the struggle. As preconditions for accepting a *hudna*, Hamas leaders demanded that Israel withdraw back to the 1967 borders and allow all Palestinian refugees to return to their lost homes. Yet they insisted that such a truce would not mean giving up Palestinian claim and their "rights" for all of "Palestine." For Hamas, a Palestinian state on part of Palestine was acceptable provided that it advanced the strategic goal of liberating all of Palestine.

A complementary solution was the development of the doctrine of *Muqawama* (Resistance) or a long term war of attrition, which may include short periods of ceasefire necessary for rebuilding Palestinian fighting capabilities. Accordingly, the Palestinians should not wait for the balance of power between them and Israel to change. Rather they should perform the imperative of continual warfare, if only on a small scale, by employing innovative tactics in order to bleed the enemy and change the balance of power in their favor. In this war of attrition, the decisive factors that will bring about victory in the long run are the will power and perseverance of each society. Consequently, taking casualties is not a defeat or loss but a manifestation of victory as long as the movement survives. There is no need to defend territory against Israeli occupation or to try to conquer land, as the goal of the *muqawama* is the methodical erosion of the enemy's resolve. The motto is blood, not land, and the effort is directed at denying the enemy of victory, not at achieving a quick result. Jihad is not a national struggle, and fighting is undertaken for the sake of God. In other words, it is not confined to Palestinians but designed to bring along other Arab and Muslim peoples. The essence of this doctrine is that the Palestinians and Hamas can suffer

heavy almost unlimited casualties or tactical defeats, since as long as the struggle continues the enemy's attrition is achieved. Moreover, the mere survival of the movement is in fact a victory over the enemy, since its actions are designed to bleed the enemy until the attainment of victory.

Since the 2008-09 Israeli Operation Cast Lead, Hamas has largely refrained from continuing its missile attacks against Israel, giving preference to its state building efforts. Concurrently, it continues to accumulate hundreds of mid-range missiles in preparation for the future confrontation with Israel.

Choosing the Course

The current upheaval in the Arab World has brought both new prospects and challenges to Hamas. The removal of President Mubarak in Egypt presented Hamas with a friendlier regime on its southern border, offering the chance to circumvent whatever is left of Israel's siege and enabling it to bring in larger amounts of weapons. At the same time, the continuous upheaval in Syria, a major sponsor, confronts Hamas with a dilemma. How can Hamas openly support Bashar al-Asad's regime, which massacres hundreds of Sunni Syrians and is opposed by the Syrian Muslim Brothers? Concurrently, Hamas is afraid of abandoning its Damascus shelter and giving up Syrian support. As a way out, the movement apparently decided to draw closer to Egypt and sign the reconciliation agreement with the PA, enabling the Palestinians to demonstrate a modicum of unity while appealing to the UN for recognition of a Palestinian state.

One can surmise, however, that this is not a true reconciliation, that Hamas will not allow free elections in Gaza in which it may lose, or allow Fatah personnel to resume their activities in Gaza. Rather, it is more plausible that Hamas will seek to use this agreement in order break its international isolation and take the PA from within. Nor is it likely to abandon its ideology of eliminating Israel and openly adopt the two-state solution. Rather, Hamas will more likely postpone its hope of implementing its maximalist goals to the more distant future.

Israeli groups like Breaking the Silence reinforce Israeli culpability, Arab innocence

Anne Herzberg, NAftali Balanson, YNet News, 20 November 2011

<http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-4150695,00.html>

From November 13-16, Hebrew University sponsored a conference on "The Potential Role of Transitional Justice in Ongoing Conflict." Several of the panels addressed the Arab-Israeli conflict and what local groups are doing to promote its resolution. In particular, the panelists highlighted the work of Breaking the Silence (BtS). They concluded that BtS may offer an interesting perspective on the conflict, but ultimately, the impact of its work is questionable.

Although the panelists touched on some of the reasons for BtS' limited effectiveness, the primary causes were not discussed. Namely, in contrast to the perception that BtS is rooted in Israeli civil society and addresses the Israeli public, the organization, in fact, focuses on lobbying and advocacy before foreign audiences. BtS exemplifies a serious problem, which has triggered a robust debate in the Israeli public and Knesset about the role of NGOs and NGO funders.

Breaking the Silence describes its mission as “expos(ing) the Israeli public to the routine situations of everyday life in the Occupied Territories....pushing Israeli society to face the reality whose creation it has enabled.” Yet, as NGO Monitor has documented in its report on the frequent international campaigning of Israeli NGOs, BtS conducts a significant amount of its activities outside of Israel.

In the past year, BtS has addressed the Irish Parliament, a crowd in Washington that included the United Arab Emirates UN Ambassador and the First Secretary of Pakistan to the UN, and numerous college campuses in the US, among other similar engagements. At one event in Sweden, BtS activist Yonatan Shapiro even stated, “We are the oppressors, we are the ones that are violating human rights on a daily basis. We are creating the terror against us, basically.”

In May 2011, controversy erupted when another BtS official was scheduled to speak at an event in Ramallah, hosted by a German NGO. The event was subsequently cancelled.

Most recently, on November 20, BtS representative Oded Na'aman spoke at the University of Pennsylvania, at an event sponsored by Penn for Palestine (formerly Students for Justice in Palestine), a pro-boycott, anti-Israel organization. One must question why a group that claims to want to impact Israeli society spends so much time speaking to anti-Israel audiences abroad and reinforcing the image of the Israeli soldier as evil doer and “war criminal.”

Alienating the mainstream

Another significant problem is that BtS is a patron of several European governments. More than 75% of the organization’s 2010 budget – the last available public documents – came from government funding sources, under the pretense of support for human rights and democracy.

However, as repeatedly emphasized by officials from BtS, “the political significance is the only reason for doing it.” Within Israel, BtS’ political agenda is not illegitimate, albeit marginal. But foreign government support for that agenda is absurd.

It is inconceivable that any European country would accept a situation where another democratic government provided funds to an organization whose primary aim was to trash that country’s armed forces before hostile audiences.

It is therefore hard not to wonder if BtS is a genuine expression of Israeli sentiment, or whether its representatives simply serve as the mouthpieces for Europeans. If the goal is “political,” then is this not a subversion and manipulation of Israeli democracy? It is equally disturbing and offensive that European officials appear to be blind and deaf to these issues.

Along with Europe, the New Israel Fund (NIF) also funds BtS. But given the myriad of BtS activities outside Israel, the question must be asked – why did the NIF provide \$152,540 to BtS in 2010? If BtS were an Israel-focused group, it might make sense, as NIF “strongly believes that (its) job is to work within Israel to ensure democratic accountability.” But, the reality, as discussed above, is fundamentally different.

Worst of all, the European and NIF donors do not get value for their funding. As NGO Monitor has documented, BtS publications consist of anecdotal, anonymous, and unverifiable accounts of low-level soldiers, often based on hearsay. And a close reading of their “testimonies” shows that misconduct is punished by the Israeli army, undermining one of BtS’ central politicized claims.

Although the scholars at the Hebrew University conference posited that groups such as BtS may foster reconciliation between Israelis and Palestinians, BtS' activities are counterproductive. They simply reinforce a narrative where Israelis are solely responsible for the conflict, and Palestinians are blameless victims with no agency or responsibility for the current situation.

More importantly, BtS has managed to alienate mainstream Israeli society, while simultaneously drifting toward foreign audiences. BtS is, therefore, but one example of how Europe's and NIF's funding practices make peace even more elusive.

Praise Arab Spring, except for Anti-Semitism

Jeffrey Goldberg, Bloomberg News, 29 November 2011

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-11-29/praise-arab-spring-except-for-anti-semitism-jeffrey-goldberg.html>

The bravery of the youth of Tunisia, Egypt, Syria and Libya can't be denied. It isn't pepper spray that they've been facing. Nor can the idealism of the Arab Spring be denied. The people of the Middle East are finally awakening to the promise of liberty.

There is another truth, however, that shouldn't be denied. The desire of Arabs to be free of their spiteful and pitiless dictators is sometimes expressed in grotesquely anti-Jewish terms.

On the surface this makes no sense: Arabs are rising up against Arabs, so what does this have to do with the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion"? There has been a tendency in the Middle East to blame the general wretchedness of life on the hidden and malevolent hand of Israel, or more generally -- and more prejudicially -- on "the Jews," but the Arab Spring's approach at first seemed radically different. Tunisians, Egyptians, Syrians and Libyans were engaged in demonstrations against the actual causes of their day-to-day misery, rather than against Israel. In Tahrir Square, in the early days of the revolution, Israel seemed an afterthought.

But now in Cairo, and across the Arab Middle East, Israel and the Jews are serving once again as universal boogeymen. Once dictators used anti-Semitism to divert their citizens' attention away from their own problems. Now expressions of the most ridiculous conspiracy theories seem to rise up organically.

This truth doesn't conform to the generally accepted narrative of the Arab Spring, but ignoring it won't make it disappear.

'No Place'

Libya provides an interesting example. Its late, unlamented dictator, Muammar Qaddafi, was a terrible anti-Semite, and often argued for the elimination of Israel. At the beginning of his reign, he expelled several thousand Jews (members of a community that predated the Muslim conquest of Libya by hundreds of years). His regime confiscated Jewish property, converted synagogues into mosques and razed Jewish cemeteries. And yet some of the revolutionaries who overthrew him

fomented the charge that he was at least part-Jewish, and that his regime operated on behalf of Zionism.

When a Libyan Jew in exile returned to Tripoli earlier this year, he was nearly lynched by a mob that surrounded the shuttered synagogue he was hoping to restore. "There is no place for Jews in Libya," read demonstrators' signs. In the Forward, Andrew Engel, who recently visited Libya and discovered endemic anti-Semitism there, described one popular rap song that went, "The anger won't die, the one who will die is Qaddafi, his supporters and the Jews."

The Syrian ruler, Bashar al-Assad, is also utterly hostile to Israel and to Jews. He supports Hezbollah and Hamas, each of which seeks the physical elimination of the Jewish people. And yet the Syrian opposition finds it beneficial to spread the lie that Assad is a Jewish agent.

According to a translation posted by the Middle East Media Research Institute, the Syrian writer Osama Al-Malouhi wrote recently on an opposition website that Jews "want that sucker of Syrian blood to remain and continue to prey and suck blood. They not only want their security, but also to enjoy the sight of Syrian blood being spilled." He went on, "Asking myself why Jewish support of Bashar increased after they saw rivers of Syrian blood this mass-murderer spilled in Syrian towns, an old image leapt to my mind, of Jews bleeding people and using their blood to prepare matzas. Logic does not accept this, but the facts prove it."

Even in Tunisia, which is commonly thought of as the most moderate of Arab states, the leader of the powerful and putatively reasonable Islamist party, Ennahdha, recently stated that he brings "glad tidings that the Arab region will get rid of the germ of Israel," according to the Middle East scholar Martin Kramer.

'Betray, Conspire, Extort'

Cairo is rife with anti-Semitism. On my last visit, I met with leaders of ostensibly liberal parties who were convinced Jews were conspiring to bring about the collapse of the Egyptian economy (something that Egypt's military rulers are accomplishing all by themselves). One suggested to me that George Soros, Benjamin Netanyahu and a certain "Dr. Rothschild" were working jointly to buy the Suez Canal from Egypt.

A BBC journalist named Thomas Dinham recently wrote of his own encounter with anti-Semitism in Cairo. Dinham, who is neither Israeli nor Jewish, told of one potentially dangerous confrontation: "Someone pushed me from behind with such force that I nearly fell over. Turning around, I found myself surrounded by five men, one of whom tried to punch me in the face. I stopped the attack by pointing out how shameful it was for a Muslim to assault a guest in his country, especially during Ramadan." He went on, "I was appalled by the apology offered by one of my assailants. 'Sorry,' he said contritely, offering his hand, 'we thought you were a Jew.'"

Expressions of anti-Semitism are common even at the higher reaches of Egyptian politics. Presidential candidate Tawfiq Okasha, speaking on the television station he owns, recently said, "Not all the Jews in the world are evil. You may ask: Tawfiq, what is the ratio? The ratio is 60-40. Sixty percent are evil to varying degrees, all the way to a level that words cannot describe, while 40 percent are not evil." He noted that French President Nicolas Sarkozy is "one of those Jews who adhere to the Zionist ideology, which is one of the worst ideologies."

Okasha did concede that, while even among the 40 percent of non-evil Jews there is only one in a million who is blameless, it is possible to "coexist" with this sort of Jew because they "do not betray, conspire, extort or view others as Gentiles."

In Cairo today, this might count as a progressive idea.

The Arab Spring should liberate people not only from oppressive rulers, but also from self-destructive and delusional patterns of belief. Anti-Semitism, the "socialism of fools," not only threatens the Israel-Egypt peace treaty and dehumanizes Jews. It also undermines rationality. It prevents its adherents from seeing the world as it is -- and it will only be an impediment to actual change in the Arab world.

NOTE: The views expressed in certain articles are not necessarily those of the SA

South African Zionist Federation

Tel : (011) 645-2505

Fax: (011) 640-6758

E-mail: froma@beyachad.co.za

Website: [<http://sazionfed.co.za](http://sazionfed.co.za)

[PBO NUMBER: 930014277](#)