



ISRAEL NEWS

*A collection of the week's news from Israel
From the Bet El Twinning / Israel Action Committee of
Beth Avraham Yoseph of Toronto Congregation*

Commentary...

American Jews - Stand Up And Be Counted By Isi Leibler
Ignore the soothing denials; the reality is that the crucial Israeli-US relationship is at stake.

Over the years, American Jews have established remarkably sophisticated agencies to advance the Jewish/Israeli cause. The pro-Israel lobby, AIPAC, helped create a bipartisan pro-Israel environment in Congress. American Jews (until recently) had no qualms in criticizing their own government when they felt it was behaving unjustly toward the Jewish state. Nor were they intimidated by accusations of dual loyalties. Indeed, they took pride in contrasting their assertiveness to that of European Jews, whom they frequently dismissed as "trembling Israelites."

Nevertheless, to this day American Jews cringe when they recall the behavior of their forbears in the 1940s. Fearful of an anti-Semitic backlash and mesmerized by the popularity and perceived moral infallibility of Franklin Roosevelt, the Jewish establishment, to its eternal shame, remained silent when their president refused to act on behalf of the doomed Jews of Europe.

However, in the post-war era, aside from Dwight Eisenhower's brutal threats in the wake of the 1956 Suez Campaign and a few brushes with presidents George H. W. Bush and Jimmy Carter, American-Jewish supporters of Israel were usually in sync with the White House. They certainly never encountered anything comparable to the confrontation looming with the Obama administration.

The current situation is especially sensitive because it is commonly believed that Barack Obama's strategy relating to Israel is being orchestrated by two key Jewish members of his administration, Rahm Emanuel and David Axelrod. Worse still, they may have succeeded in dividing the Jewish leadership.

American-Jewish lay leaders are basically unknown to the general public.

The three principal agencies promoting Jewish interests to the public are directed by civil servants - Malcolm Hoenlein of the Presidents' Conference, Abe Foxman of the Anti-Defamation League and David Harris of the American Jewish Committee, all of whom are dedicated professionals.

The administration is now seeking to exploit the weakness of the lay leadership. In line with established practice, as political tensions intensified, the Presidents' Conference (representing 52 major Jewish organizations) requested a meeting with the president. The White House agreed, but insisted on determining who would participate. Without consultation, critics like Morton Klein of the Zionist Organization of America were excluded while Israel-bashing groups like J Street and US Peace Now were invited. The administration thus not only provided equal status to fringe groups, it obliged mainstream organizations to share a platform with groups whose *raison d'être* is to force Israel to make additional unilateral concessions. During Operation Cast Lead, J Street even publicly condemned Israel's campaign against Hamas.

The reluctance of the Presidents' Conference to reject this arrangement may be a major strategic blunder. It enables the White House to determine who represents the Jewish community, and apply divide-and-conquer tactics against them. In short, it provides a mechanism by which the Obama administration can create an "amen" environment free of troublemakers.

American Jews face a watershed. Nearly 80 percent of them voted for Obama. That surely strengthens their right to convey concerns to the

president. However, many of the lay leaders are wealthy philanthropists unaccustomed to political confrontations. Moreover, fearful of jeopardizing donations from Obama acolytes, organizations are reluctant to adopt controversial positions. This in

turn makes it extraordinarily difficult for Jewish civil servants to carry the brunt of initiating opposition to a highly popular president.

That mainstream American-Jewish leaders lack a strategic plan at such a time is disconcerting. At the meeting with Obama, most participants appear to have been overwhelmed. Press reports suggest that most lay leaders remained silent, with some even expressing support for Obama's policies. "It was a wonderful exchange," gushed Andrea Weinstein, chair of the Jewish Council for Public Affairs.

"I believe the president got the impression that there is broad support for his policies and some difference on tactical levels... I am willing to give this president an opportunity to try his strategy," proclaimed Conservative Rabbi Steven Wernick. Reform leader Rabbi Eric Yoffie pointed out that "when it came to substance, not a single participant told the president: 'You're wrong.'"

No one raised concerns about the manner in which their president had embraced the Arab narrative and expressed moral equivalence between both parties. No one responded to Obama's outrageously patronizing remarks about the need for Israelis to "engage in serious self-reflection." No one pointed out that it was especially incongruous for the first African-American president to deny Jews the right to take up residence in Jerusalem, the cradle of Jewish civilization. Nobody suggested that by distancing the US from Israel, Obama was effectively discouraging the Palestinians from making peace.

However there is a ray of light. The statement recently released by Alan Solow and Malcolm Hoenlein, chairman and executive vice president of the Presidents' Conference, condemning the administration for its heavy-handed treatment of Israel in relation to Jerusalem may be significant. For Solow, until now a dedicated Obama supporter who had originally requested the meeting with the president, to publicly express such views may signal that Obama's negative attacks on Israel are at last beginning to affect his Democrat supporters. Similar remarks by David Harris of the American Jewish Committee criticizing Obama to a congressional group also reflect rising distress among Democrats as they begin to absorb the hollowness of the president's stated concern for the welfare of Israel.

A public campaign must be launched. It is crucial that the case for Israel not rest exclusively with Jewish Republicans or Christian evangelicals. Jewish Democrats must be at the forefront if the bipartisan approach which for decades has been the hallmark of US policy toward Israel is to be retained.

Democrat champions for Israel like Alan Dershowitz should explain to Obama why employing so-called "tough love" against Israel is both immoral and counterproductive.

The burden rests on American Jews. Hopefully they will succeed in persuading Obama that if he seeks to 'engage' with tyrants and enemies of freedom, he can do no less than behave likewise to the only democratic state in the region and stop bombarding them with diktats. They must stand up and be counted. Jewish activists should make Obama understand that if he continues to appease Arabs by distancing the US from Israel and renege on prior American commitments, the Jewish community, including many of his most devoted followers, will conclude that he betrayed them. (Jerusalem Post Jul 27)

It's Crunch Time for Israel on Iran By John Bolton

After years of failed diplomacy no one will be able to call an attack precipitous.

Legions of senior American officials have descended on Jerusalem recently, but the most important of them has been Defense Secretary Robert Gates. His central objective was to dissuade Israel from carrying out military strikes against Iran's nuclear weapons facilities. Under the guise of counseling "patience," Mr. Gates again conveyed President Barack Obama's emphatic thumbs down on military force.

The public outcome of Mr. Gates's visit appeared polite but inconclusive. Yet Iran's progress with nuclear weapons and air defenses means Israel's military option is declining over time. It will have to make a decision soon, and it will be no surprise if Israel strikes by year's end. Israel's choice could determine whether Iran obtains nuclear weapons in the foreseeable future.

Mr. Obama's approach to Tehran has been his "open hand," yet his gesture has not only been ignored by Iran but deemed irrelevant as the country looks inward to resolve the aftermath of its fraudulent election. The hardliner "winner" of that election, President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, was recently forced to fire a deputy who once said something vaguely soothing about Israel. Clearly, negotiations with the White House are not exactly topping the Iranian agenda.

Beyond that, Mr. Obama's negotiation strategy faces insuperable time pressure. French President Nicolas Sarkozy proclaimed that Iran must restart negotiations with the West by September's G-20 summit. But this means little when, with each passing day, Iran's nuclear and ballistic missile laboratories, production facilities and military bases are all churning. Israel is focused on these facts, not the illusion of "tough" diplomacy.

Israel rejects another feature of Mr. Obama's diplomatic stance. The Israelis do not believe that progress with the Palestinians will facilitate a deal on Iran's nuclear weapons program. Though Mr. Gates and others have pressed this fanciful analysis, Israel will not be moved.

Worse, Mr. Obama has no new strategic thinking on Iran. He vaguely promises to offer the country the carrot of diplomacy—followed by an empty threat of sanctions down the road if Iran does not comply with the U.S.'s requests. This is precisely the European Union's approach, which has failed for over six years.

There's no reason Iran would suddenly now bow to Mr. Obama's diplomatic efforts, especially after its embarrassing election in June. So with diplomacy out the door, how will Iran be tamed?

Mr. Gates' mission had extraordinary significance. Israel sees the political and military landscape in a very inauspicious light. It also worries that, once ensnared in negotiations, the Obama administration will find it very hard to extricate itself. The Israelis are probably right. To prove the success of his "open hand," Mr. Obama will declare victory for "diplomacy" even if it means little to no gains on Iran's nuclear program.

Under the worst-case scenario, Iran will continue improving its nuclear facilities and Mr. Obama will become the first U.S. president to tie the issue of Israel's nuclear capabilities into negotiations about Iran's.

Israel understands that Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's recent commitment to extend the U.S. "defense umbrella" to Israel is not a guarantee of nuclear retaliation, and that it is wholly insufficient to deter Iran from obliterating Israel if it so decides. In fact, Mrs. Clinton's comment tacitly concedes that Iran will acquire nuclear weapons, exactly the wrong message. Since Israel, like the U.S., is well aware its missile defense system is imperfect, whatever Mr. Gates said about the "defense umbrella" will be politely ignored.

Relations between the U.S. and Israel are more strained now than at any time since the 1956 Suez Canal crisis. Mr. Gates's message for Israel not to act on Iran, and the U.S. pressure he brought to bear, highlight the weight of Israel's lonely burden.

Striking Iran's nuclear program will not be precipitous or poorly thought out. Israel's attack, if it happens, will have followed enormously difficult deliberation over terrible imponderables, and years of patiently waiting on innumerable failed diplomatic efforts. Absent Israeli action, prepare for a nuclear Iran. (Wall Street Journal Jul 28)

The writer, a senior fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, is the author of "Surrender Is Not an Option: Defending America at the United Nations" (Simon & Schuster, 2007).

A Matter We Must Solve Ourselves By Moshe Arens

"The United States does not accept the legitimacy of continued Israeli settlements," President Barack Obama declared in his speech in Cairo last month, and called into question the legality of Jewish settlements in Judea and Samaria. But in terms of international law, there is nothing illegal about Jewish settlements there. Although it has been claimed over and over again that the Israeli communities in the territories were established in violation of the 1949 Fourth Geneva Convention on the rules of war, a reading of that convention and an acquaintance with the history of Palestine since the Balfour Declaration and the League of Nations Mandate for Palestine, as well as with the circumstances of the occupation of Judea and Samaria by the Jordanian army in the years between 1948 and 1967, make it clear that that Geneva Convention is not applicable to Israel's presence in these territories. None other than the late Eugene Rostow, a one-time dean of the Yale Law School, and under-secretary of state under president Lyndon Johnson, as well as one of the framers of UN Security Council Resolution 242 stated that the Jewish right of settlement west of the Jordan river is "unassailable."

The policy of settlements in Judea and Samaria is therefore an internal Israeli matter, and should not be a subject for negotiations with the United States. Whatever commitments Ariel Sharon made to President George W. Bush, in order to prepare the groundwork for the disengagement from Gush Katif with the Israeli public, were ill-advised and not binding on another Israeli government that was elected on a platform of opposition to that disengagement. It is similarly true that Bush's promise of American support for the idea of "settlement blocs" in Judea and Samaria, made as part of that arrangement, can hardly be viewed as a permanent commitment regarding U.S. policy in future years.

Whether settlements and outposts in Judea and Samaria are legal or illegal must be judged by the degree of their conformity with Israeli law. And from that point of view there is little doubt that some of those established in recent years were not established legally. It was the same Ariel Sharon who commissioned Talia Sasson of the Justice Ministry to prepare a report on the legal status of settlements and outposts in Judea and Samaria. As might have been suspected, and as Sharon surely knew before he saw the report, the Sasson report found that the Israeli government itself had funded the creation of Jewish settler outposts in Judea and Samaria that were illegal and in violation of stated government policy. One could have died laughing when Sasson, keeping a straight face, handed her report to the man who had been the architect of Jewish settlements and with little regard for the law had instructed settlers to establish themselves on any mountaintop that could be considered of strategic importance.

The fact is that over the years, successive Israeli governments have done almost nothing to enforce the law in this matter. Sharon, who thanked Sasson profusely for her work, also did nothing. What he subsequently did do was to order the uprooting of the settlements in Gush Katif and northern Samaria whose legal status was in no doubt at all, in blatant violation of the civil rights of the Israeli citizens who had been living there for many years.

A relatively large number of settlements and outposts in Judea and Samaria, some in existence for many years, lack a legal basis for their presence there. The forcible removal of so many illegal settlements now represents a serious, if not insurmountable, problem. This is a common problem whenever the authorities have been negligent in their enforcement of the law over many years. It is equally true for many illegal buildings put up over the years by the Palestinian population in Judea and Samaria, as well as for illegal building activity in Israel itself, especially in the Negev.

Under these circumstances, a reasonable government policy would be first to prevent the establishment of any new settlements or outposts that are in contravention of the law, while preparing a list of the illegal settlements in order of the date on which they were established, and dealing with the latest violators first.

Those young people who have established settlements and outposts illegally in Judea and Samaria, and who warn that they will resist the removal of any of those settlements, may be under the illusion that they are performing a great service for the Zionist cause. Actually they are causing it great harm, by creating the impression in the public mind that all settlements in Judea and Samaria have been established illegally. (Haaretz Jul 28)

A Jewish Obligation To Live In Jerusalem By Mordechai Kedar

Recently, pressure has been applied by US President Barack Obama to prevent the construction of a Jewish neighborhood in Jerusalem, the capital of Israel. If Israel deserves the title "state" it has to stand united in an effort to rebuff this pressure resolutely.

There are several justifications for this strong Israeli stand. First, the struggle over settlement in Jerusalem is at heart a struggle over Israeli sovereignty in the city, based on 3,000 years of Jewish history in the holy city, long before Washington was the capital of the United States, Paris the capital of France and Cairo the capital of Egypt. Jerusalem, and particularly the area of the Temple, embodies the hopes and is the focus of the prayers of the Jewish people since it went into exile 1,940 years ago.

Zionism is based on the idea of returning to Zion, meaning to Jerusalem, not to Beersheva or Haifa or Jaffa. Every year at this time, during the month of Av, we weep for the destruction of Jerusalem, with mourning for Yavne, Tzippori, Masada and Gamla added to the mourning for Jerusalem. The prophets of Israel prophesied the salvation of Jerusalem and no other city. Conceding any portion of the city, especially the Temple Mount, would create a sense of destruction among many Jews. They then might lose their faith in the Zionist enterprise and react in ways that could endanger the unity of Israeli society.

Second, if the state of Israel concedes the Temple Mount and other parts of Jerusalem it would be signaling world Jewry that it has lost its link to Judaism and would thereby risk losing the support of many Jews in the world who would consider this an act of treachery against our religion, our history and the Jewish hope of salvation that was realized in part 42 years ago.

Third, Jerusalem never was, even for a day, the capital of a Palestinian or Arab entity. After the Muslim conquest in the seventh century, the capital was Ramleh, located 40 km from Jerusalem. Even Jordan, which ruled East Jerusalem between 1948 and 1967 did not make it its capital. Accordingly, the Palestinian demand to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Palestine has no basis in history.

Fourth, in the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict the issue of Jerusalem does not stand alone: if Israel shows even a little flexibility on this question, it will invite pressures to concede "just a little" on the issue of refugees and the crack in the dam will widen and wreak destruction on the entire Zionist enterprise.

Fifth, concessions offered in neighborhoods adjacent to Jerusalem would place the capital of Israel within range of light weapons, enable snipers to target pedestrians and return the city back to the pre-1967 days of protective walls. Today the city is already within range of missiles and rockets from Ramallah and Bethlehem; moving the attackers even closer, within the line of sight of Jerusalem, would only increase their appetite for rendering the lives of Jews unbearable. No one in Israel or beyond can assure us that a future Palestinian government will deal with these attackers efficiently, without the bother of High Court injunctions and appeals from human rights activists.

Sixth, the territory of East Jerusalem was never under Jordanian sovereignty. Hence it is impossible to argue that East Jerusalem is "occupied territory". At most this is disputed territory, to which the non-Jewish contender cannot be defined in sovereign terms since it is not a state. Accordingly, Israel has a considerable judicial advantage in seeking recognition of its annexation. Only politics is delaying this process.

The conclusion that emerges from this discussion is that a concession on Jerusalem or parts of the city constitutes surrender to a baseless Palestinian, Arab and Islamic demand and could endanger both the capital of Israel and the entire Zionist enterprise. Israel must expand and enrich Jewish residence in the historic capital of the Jewish people in order to eliminate once and forever the possibility of partitioning the city. We don't have to generate superfluous friction by placing Jews in crowded Arab neighborhoods. But housing construction in the Shepherd Hotel location is important, if only because of the link between this structure and the Mufti, Haj Amin al-Husseini, who volunteered to recruit tens of thousands of Muslims for the Nazi extermination machine.

The entire city of Jerusalem should be developed on the basis of Jewish-Arab equality; interested Arab residents should be granted full Israeli citizenship. Israel should declare for all to see and hear on road signs, in official documents and in the language used by the Broadcasting Authority that the name of its capital is Yerushalaim, not Urshalim and certainly not al-Quds. The Islamic conquest of this country ended with WWI and there is no reason to perpetuate the name that desert tribes gave the eternal city of the Jewish people. (Bitterlemons.org Jul 27)

The writer is a lecturer in the Department of Arabic and a research associate at the Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies, Bar-Ilan University.

The Forgotten Factor That So Skews Goldstone's Mission

By Alan Baker

In reviewing the documentation and resolutions of the Human Rights Council that serve as the mandate of the United Nations Fact Finding Mission headed by Judge Richard Goldstone, the terminology used would give any objective observer the impression that Israel and Israel alone, unilaterally and indiscriminately, without provocation or justification, instituted a "massive.... military operation," "siege," "military aggression," "collective punishment," "massive and grave violations of human rights," "targeting of civilians and medical facilities and staff and the systematic destruction of Palestinian cultural heritage."

One is led to assume that Israel suddenly attacked a peace-loving Gaza Strip for no reason and without any provocation, merely out of some insane desire to create suffering and loss among its Palestinian population.

There is no reference to the Hamas terror organization that administers the area, or to its implacable hostility to Israel, and which, together with the Islamic Jihad and others, had for several years instigated hostilities, kidnappings and acts of pure terror against Israel's civilian population.

The minimal lip-service call for "the end to the launching of crude rockets against Israeli civilians which have resulted in the loss of four civilian lives and some injuries" is couched in minimal terms, without any reference as to who fired the rockets or from where, as if completely unrelated to the main body of the resolution, and without the slightest hint as to the nature, intention, true effect and aims of the eight-year, indiscriminate barrage directed against southern Israel's population centers.

The determination in the resolution that Israel's military attacks resulted in the "killing" (not, in this case, "loss of life") of "more than 900 and injury to more than 4,000 Palestinians" conveniently ignores the fact that over 900 of the Palestinian casualties were directly involved in fighting against Israel, either as Hamas and Islamic Jihad fighters, acknowledged by the Hamas Web sites that honored their "martyrdom," or human shields forced by Hamas to participate in the hostilities.

An additional misconception would be the false and misleading equivalence drawn between Israel on the one hand - a country whose southern citizens had been under constant armed attack and long-term indiscriminate rocket bombardment by a terror organization intent on instilling terror, a country that acted in self-defense against the perpetrators of the rocket fire - and, on the other hand, a group of terror organizations (Hamas and Islamic Jihad) that proudly and openly use and advocate the use of terror, brazenly undermining the norms of international humanitarian law in order to terrorize Israel's civilians and achieve their ideological objectives.

The virtually complete absence, in the documentation serving as the mandate of the Fact Finding mission, of any reference to the Hamas/Islamic Jihad rockets and their effect on Israel's civilian population does grave injustice to the Human Rights Council, which purports to base itself on the accepted norms of human rights and international humanitarian law.

The basic and customary norm prohibiting attack on or bombardment of towns, villages, dwellings or buildings which are undefended was laid down in article 25 of the 1907 Hague Rules respecting the laws and customs of war on land. Article 51 of Additional Protocol 1 of 1977 to the

Geneva Conventions clearly determines that "The civilian population as such, as well as individual civilians, shall not be the object of attack." The concept of terrorization as a tactic of war is addressed clearly in the same article, which states that "Acts or threats of violence the prime purpose of which is to spread terror among the civilian population are prohibited." The Protocol goes on to prohibit attacks not directed at specific military objectives, or which employ methods or means that cannot be limited

FROM ALL THIS, one may perhaps understand why the drafters of the resolution of the Human Rights Council went to such pains to downplay any reference to the Hamas/Islamic Jihad rocket bombardment of Israel's southern population - a bombardment that went on virtually without international concern for eight years, that exposed the one and a half million civilians in a radius of 40 km to daily terror.

In this context it is utterly irrelevant to describe the rockets as "crude." The fact that many of them exploded in schools and kindergartens, in private homes and on moving vehicles is sufficiently indicative of the purpose of the weapon - to indiscriminately terrorize a large civilian population. The fact that at any given time of the day or night such rockets could explode anywhere, virtually without warning, renders irrelevant any discussion as to their destructive potential. In this context, "luck" was the only factor that prevented far greater casualties.

The fact that Israeli municipal precautionary measures, bomb shelters and public warning mechanisms prevented a large number of casualties is equally irrelevant when considering the aims and purposes of Hamas and Islamic Jihad. The rockets were intended to strike civilian centers, schools, homes, shopping centers and so on. Launches were timed to affect a maximum number of civilians and create the greatest number of casualties. To all intents and purposes, all of southern Israel was, for Hamas and Islamic Jihad, a military target.

The "successful" outcome of this long-term bombardment was indeed the terrorization of Israel's civilian population in the south. The psychological effects of the bombardment have created thousands of casualties among all sectors of the population - young, old, infirm - who will require treatment for years to come. Children fear leaving their home; residents are afraid to walk in the streets or use public transport. These are only some of the ongoing effects of this terror campaign.

Let's hope that the deliberate and long-term targeting of Israeli civilians, as well as the use of civilians and civilian installations by the Palestinian terror groups as shields will receive serious attention by the Fact Finding Mission, despite the fact that these matters are virtually ignored in the documentation describing the mission's functioning.

The writer is a partner in the law firm of Moshe, Gicelter & Co. and is the former ambassador to Canada and a former legal adviser to the Israeli Foreign Ministry. (Jerusalem Post Jul 28)

The Source Of Obama's Anti-Israel Policy By E.W. Jackson Sr.

Like Obama, I am a graduate of Harvard Law School. I too have Muslims in my family. I am black, and I was once a leftist Democrat. Since our backgrounds are somewhat similar, I perceive something in Obama's policy toward Israel which people without that background may not see. All my life I have witnessed a strain of anti-Semitism in the black community. It has been fueled by the rise of the Nation of Islam and Louis Farrakhan, but it predates that organization.

We heard it in Jesse Jackson's "HYMIE town" remark years ago during his presidential campaign. We heard it most recently in Jeremiah Wright's remark about "them Jews" not allowing Obama to speak with him. I hear it from my own Muslim family members who see the problem in the Middle East as a "Jew" problem.

Growing up in a small, predominantly black urban community in Pennsylvania, I heard the comments about Jewish shop owners. They were "greedy cheaters" who could not be trusted, according to my family and others in the neighborhood. I was too young to understand what it means to be Jewish, or know that I was hearing anti-Semitism. These people seemed nice enough to me, but others said they were "evil". Sadly, this bigotry has yet to be eradicated from the black community.

In Chicago, the anti-Jewish sentiment among black people is even more pronounced because of the direct influence of Farrakhan and the Nation of Islam. Most African Americans are not followers of "The Nation", but many have a quiet respect for its leader because, they say, "he speaks the truth" and "stands up for the black man". What they mean of course is that he viciously attacks the perceived "enemies" of the black community - white people and Jews. Even some self-described Christians buy into his demagoguery.

The question is whether Obama, given his Muslim roots and experience in Farrakhan's Chicago, shares this antipathy for Israel and Jewish people. Is there any evidence that he does. First, the President was taught for twenty years by a virulent anti-Semite, the Reverend Jeremiah Wright. In the black community it is called "sitting under". You don't merely attend a church, you "sit under" a Pastor to be taught and mentored by him. Obama "sat under" Wright for a very long time. He was comfortable enough with Farrakhan - Wright's friend - to attend and help organize his "Million Man March". I was on C-Span the morning of the march arguing that we must never legitimize a racist and anti-Semite, no matter what "good" he claims to be doing. Yet a future President was in the crowd giving Farrakhan his enthusiastic support.

The classic left wing view is that Israel is the oppressive occupier, and the Palestinians are Israel's victims. Obama is clearly sympathetic to this view. In speaking to the "Muslim World," he did not address the widespread Islamic hatred of Jews. Instead he attacked Israel over the growth of West Bank settlements. Surely he knows that settlements are not the crux of the problem. The absolute refusal of the Palestinians to accept Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state is the insurmountable obstacle. That's where the pressure needs to be placed, but this President sees it differently. He also made the preposterous comparison of the Holocaust to Palestinian "dislocation".

Obama clearly has Muslim sensibilities. He sees the world and Israel from a Muslim perspective. His construct of "The Muslim World" is unique in modern diplomacy. It is said that only The Muslim Brotherhood and other radical elements of the religion use that concept. It is a call to unify Muslims around the world. It is rather odd to hear an American President use it. In doing so he reveals more about his thinking than he intends. The dramatic policy reversal of joining the unrelentingly anti-Semitic, anti-Israel and pro-Islamic UN Human Rights Council is in keeping with the President's truest - albeit undeclared - sensibilities

Those who are paying attention and thinking about these issues do not find it unreasonable to consider that President Obama is influenced by a strain of anti-Semitism picked up from the black community, his leftist friends and colleagues, his Muslim associations and his long period of mentorship under Jeremiah Wright. If this conclusion is accurate, Israel has some dark days ahead. For the first time in her history, she may find the President of the United States siding with her enemies. Those who believe as I do that Israel must be protected had better be ready for the fight. We are.

Never Again! (DanielPipes.org Jun 29)

The writer is Bishop of Exodus Faith Ministries, an author and retired attorney.
