

## Remembering the Hebron Massacre

By Jerold S. Auerbach The Wall Street Journal August 27, 2009

No theme is more deeply embedded in Jewish history than exile and return. The biblical exodus from Egypt to the promised land, the return from Babylonian exile, and, most recently, the establishment of the state of Israel all affirmed the enduring determination of the Jewish people to return to their homeland.

Yet another wrenching exile and return, now rarely remembered, occurred 80 years ago this week. On Aug. 23-24, 1929, the Jewish community of Hebron was exiled following a horrific pogrom. The tragedy is known as Tarpat, an acronym for its date in the Hebrew calendar.

Until 1929, Jews had lived in Hebron for three millennia. There, according to Jewish tradition, Abraham purchased the cave of Machpelah to bury Sarah. It was the first parcel of land owned by the Jewish people in their promised land. Ever since, religious Jews revered Hebron as the burial site of their matriarchs and patriarchs. Conquered, massacred and expelled over the centuries, Jews always returned to this sacred place.

After 1267, under Muslim rule, no Jews were permitted to pray inside the magnificent enclosure, built by King Herod in the 1st century, that still surrounds the burial caves. But following the expulsion of Jews from Spain at the end of the 15th century, a small group of religious Jews rebuilt a community of study and prayer in Hebron.

In August 1929, that community was suddenly and brutally attacked. Incited by the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem—who claimed that Jews were endangering Muslim holy sites on the Temple Mount in Jerusalem—Arab rioters swept through Palestine. In Hebron, the carnage was horrendous.

It began on Friday afternoon when Arabs attacked Jews with clubs and murdered a yeshiva student. The next morning, joined by local villagers, Arabs swarmed through Hebron screaming "Kill the Jews." They broke into the home of Eliezer Dan Slonim, where many Jews had gathered for safety. There they wielded knives and axes to murder 22 innocents. In the Anglo-Palestine Bank, where 23 corpses were discovered, blood covered the tile floor. That day, three children under the age of five were murdered. Teenage girls, their mothers and

grandmothers were raped and killed. Rabbis and their students were castrated before they were slain. A surviving yeshiva student recounted that he "had seen greater horrors than Dante in hell."

When the slaughter finally subsided, 67 Jews had been murdered. Three days later, British soldiers evacuated 484 survivors, including 153 children, to Jerusalem. The butchery in Hebron, Zionist and religious officials alleged, was "without equal in the history of the country since the destruction of the Temple." Sir Walter Shaw, chairman of an exhaustive British royal investigation, concluded that "unspeakable atrocities" had occurred.

Tarpat extinguished the most ancient Jewish community in Palestine. With synagogues destroyed, Jewish property converted into storerooms and barns for livestock, and the ancient cemetery desecrated, few signs remained that there had ever been a Jewish presence in Hebron.

But nearly 40 years later, after the Six-Day War of 1967, a small group of religious Zionists returned to Hebron to rebuild the destroyed community. "What was in the past in Hebron," declared their matriarch Miriam Levinger, "is what will happen in the future. Always!" So it would be.

The Jewish community of Hebron—some 700 people—recently celebrated the 40th anniversary of their return. This month they commemorate the 80th anniversary of Tarpat. All the other ancient peoples mentioned in the Bible have vanished. But Jews, a community of memory, still live in Hebron.

Hebron Jews are relentlessly vilified as fanatics who illegally occupy someone else's land. As religious Zionists, they are the militant Jewish settlers whom legions of Jewish and non-Jewish critics love to hate. It is seldom noticed that their most serious transgression—settlement in the biblical land of Israel—is the definition of Zionism: the return of Jews to their historic homeland.

**Mr. Auerbach, a professor of history at Wellesley College, is the author of "Hebron Jews: Memory and Conflict in the Land of Israel," published in July by Roman & Littlefield.**

## Teva: The king of generic drugs

By Mina Kimes Fortune Magazine August 5, 2009

**CEO Shlomo Yanai runs the world's biggest generic-drug maker. Watch out, Pfizer.** No one knows what the CEOs of the biggest drug companies dream about, but their nightmares probably look a little like this:

Perched on a hill in Jerusalem, there is a factory that makes more than 8 billion pills a year. Its rooms contain giant metal vats of powder and tablet-making machines. Pipes run through the floors, spewing out pills that fall, like colored raindrops, into plastic crates. Workers pour them into bottles, which are slapped with unrecognizable labels. Their names don't matter: These generic drugs are inexpensive copies of blockbuster pills, and Teva Pharmaceutical Industries, the owner of the factory and 37 others like it, is swallowing Big Pharma's market share.

Israel's Teva (pronounced teh-vuh) is the world's biggest generic-drug maker. By making knockoffs faster and in bigger quantities than the competition, the company now accounts for 22% of all generic prescriptions written in the U.S. Teva's worldwide revenues are on track to grow 27% this year, to \$14 billion, and investors have taken note. In the past year its stock has risen 13% at a time when the S&P 500 dropped by 25%. Locals are outspoken about their pride in Teva (TEVA); many call it "Israel's stock." A \$20,000 investment in the company in 1990 would be worth \$1.6 million today.

The country's interest in Teva resembles America's fascination with Apple, and local media cover CEO Shlomo Yanai's every move (think Steve Jobs). A hard-driving Israeli ex-general, Yanai, 57, last year stunned company watchers when at an investor conference he boldly announced that Teva, then a \$9-billion-a-year company, would attain \$20 billion in revenues and 20% profit margins by 2012. So far the drugmaker is on target to reach that goal, helped in part by its \$7 billion acquisition last year of generics maker Barr of Montvale, N.J.

Over the longer term, analysts expect the company to boost profits by 14% annually for the next five years, compared with flat earnings at the five biggest pharmaceutical companies. Because of its growth potential, Teva's market capitalization has ballooned to \$45 billion -- bigger than that of Bristol-Myers Squibb (BMY, Fortune 500) or Eli Lilly (LLY, Fortune 500).

Yet as the company grows, it might be hard to match its previous track record. "One of the biggest concerns on Wall Street is, When does Teva become the Pfizer of generics?" asks Ken Cacciatore, an analyst at Cowen & Co. "When does it become too big to grow?"

One challenge: Teva is reaping \$2 billion a year in revenue from a drug it actually invented itself, multiple sclerosis treatment Copaxone. (Teva is the only generics maker with its own blockbuster drug.) Copaxone, however, goes off patent in 2014. The company has some new drugs in the pipeline that it hopes will fill that looming hole, but for the most part it must rely on generics for growth. Teva plans to expand internationally, especially in emerging markets, where it faces competition from Big Pharma companies that are trying to launch their own generics divisions. "Competition is much fiercer than it used to be," says Yanai. "But what we have we can enhance and enlarge."

If anyone is tough enough to face down Teva's rivals, it's Yanai. Like all Israeli citizens, Yanai joined the army at the age of 18. He originally intended to leave after the required three years, but during the 1973 Yom Kippur War he was wounded when a missile hit his tank in Egyptian territory. The sole survivor of the attack, he spent the next six months in a hospital. It was then, he says, that he decided to stay in the military.

When he was 45, Yanai became the top strategist of the Israel Defense Forces (IDF), heading Israel's security delegation to Camp David in 2000. He says the Prime Minister at the time, Ehud Barak, told him to take a sabbatical to attend Harvard Business School's advanced management program, after which he would become deputy general chief of staff. Soon after he returned from the U.S., however, Barak gave the job to someone else, and Yanai quit the army. Lacking business experience, he nonetheless persuaded the chairman of agrochemical company Makhteshim Agan to appoint him CEO in 2003.

"I first decided to join the business sector. Then I made a decision that I'd like to take an executive role," says Yanai nonchalantly. Teva chairman Eli Hurvitz, who's considered by many to be the Bill Gates of Israel for his success in building wealth for his shareholders, was impressed by Yanai's knack for strategic thinking and hired him as CEO in 2006 despite the fact that the general had no industry experience. "So he's not in pharmaceuticals, not very experienced -- so what?" Hurvitz says. "I saw that he was clever, and I put an eye on him."

With dark, flashing eyes, Yanai looks intimidating even when wearing an ill-fitting lab coat and protective booties over his shoes. His hands are scarred from injuries incurred during battle. As he strides through Teva's Jerusalem factory, he names the different Tic Tac-like pills falling into open containers. The key to Teva's success? It started

selling many of these generic drugs even before the originals' patents had expired.

How can the company do that? In 1984, Congress passed the Hatch-Waxman Act, which says that generic-drug makers can start producing copies of a drug if they prove its patent is unenforceable. They would also get six months of sales exclusivity. In 2004, Teva filed an application to produce a copy of Novartis's blockbuster blood pressure medicine Lotrel, even though the drug's U.S. patent didn't expire until 2017. Teva argued that Lotrel's patent was "obvious" -- in other words, elements of the recipe for Lotrel were already in the public domain -- and that its own version wouldn't infringe. A district court agreed, and Teva launched its own version in 2007, bringing in an estimated \$330 million in revenue in six months.

Big Pharma isn't happy about the way Teva operates. "A comparable situation [to generic drugs] would be you building a house and putting a lock on the door and then after a period of time, anyone who can pick the lock can legally use your house," wrote Martin Voet, formerly a lawyer at Allergan (AGN), which makes Botox, in his 2005 book, *The Generic Challenge*. Some Big Pharma executives allege that because generic drugs cut into their exclusivity periods and profits, they impede their ability to invent new products. Yanai doesn't buy it. "There's no relation between length of patent and innovation," he says.

Over the next three years some \$89 billion worth of drugs will lose patent exclusivity, according to research firm IMS Health. Teva is waiting with open arms. Its 135 lawyers constantly scour patents looking for weaknesses, and the company currently has 197 applications out to the FDA to produce copies of drugs; Teva is challenging the patents of more than half of them. Its knockoffs will take a price cut of anywhere from 5% to 60%.

Teva is also targeting a sector of the pharmaceutical industry that has yet to spawn copycats in the U.S.: biologics, which are protein-based therapies that treat diseases such as cancer and are worth some \$60 billion a year. Although biologics are notoriously difficult to copy, generic-

drug makers like Teva are eager to produce "biogeneric" versions of drugs like Abbott's Humira, which treats arthritis. Unlike with traditional drugs, there is no legal way in the U.S. to sell generic copies of biologics, although the Senate is working on the issue. Teva isn't waiting idly: The company already sells them in Europe and is ramping up production capacities. "The good news for us is that, because [biogenerics] require high-cost investments, we're only going to see a few competitors," says Dr. Ben-Zion Weiner, Teva's R&D chief.

Those competitors have come out swinging. Swiss drug giant Novartis (NVS) recently won the rights to sell a biogeneric version of Pfizer's Genotropin, a human growth hormone, in Japan, and Merck (MRK, Fortune 500) announced plans to develop biogenerics through a division called BioVentures. "Teva is going to be competing with the big boys," says Sanford Bernstein analyst Ronny Gal.

Big Pharma also has its sights on the heart of Teva's business: the traditional generic market. After decades of calling companies like Teva second-class citizens, branded-drug makers want to join the race. Pfizer (PFE, Fortune 500) said recently that it would expand its portfolio of generics. GlaxoSmithKline (GSK) in June announced a partnership with Indian generic company Dr. Reddy's (RDY) to sell cheap drugs in emerging markets.

Yanai says branded-drug makers have tried to do this before and ended up selling their generics divisions. He isn't convinced that they can thrive in an industry with lean margins and cutthroat legal tactics. "With all due respect, you can't take a Persian cat and educate it to become a street cat," he says. "It's not just about making generic drugs -- you need to be lean and agile. And if one day someone tells you to get off the stove, get rid of your fat, go to the streets ..." He trails off. "You can imagine the likelihood of success."

Yanai has a lot of chutzpah -- but he could be right. After Pfizer announced its plan to go generic, Goldman Sachs analyst Jami Rubin had a question for the drugmaker: "Are you trying to be another Teva?"

## Can A State Be Built On A Pack of Lies

By Alan M. Dershowitz The Hudson Institute September 1, 2009

The so-called "spiritual" leader of Hamas has ordered that the Holocaust not be taught to Palestinian children. Younis Al-Astal—who is about as spiritual as Al Capone—has declared that the United Nations' proposal to include Holocaust education in a course on human rights would constitute a "war crime." It would be "marketing a lie and spreading it." Instead, he would have Palestinian children learn only about the so-called

crimes of the Israeli occupation and the self-inflicted wound that Palestinians call the Nakba.

I am not so sure I would trust the United Nations and especially its Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) to teach anything relating to Jews, Israel or the Holocaust. That agency has been part of the problem, not the solution, by perpetuating the refugee status of Palestinians who could have been integrated into the Palestinian mainstream over the past sixty years. By making an industry out of their

permanent status as refugees, UNRWA has made peace more difficult and hatred more acceptable. The agency has turned a blind eye to Hamas terrorists who routinely used UNRWA facilities as launching sites for rockets. It has protected terrorists. It has sought to legitimate Hamas as a social service agency rather than as a fascist group of anti-Semites who employ violence in the false name of Mohammad.

Now, perhaps in an effort to appear balanced, UNRWA has agreed to provide basic information about the Holocaust to eighth grade students. These would be the only Palestinian students who learn about the murder of six million Jews at the hands of Hitler, since the Palestinian Authority has banned the teaching of the Holocaust to students on the West Bank. It is unlikely that the UNRWA educational unit would include factual information about the leader of the Palestinians during the Second World War, Haj Al-Husseini (the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem) and his active role in the Holocaust when he lived in Berlin as a guest of Adolph Hitler. But even a sanitized, watered down account of the Holocaust is too much for the Hamas leadership, which does not believe in history, but rather in propagandistic accounts that serve the terroristic goals of the organization.

In the end, UNRWA will buckle to Hamas, as it always does. Even if a compromise were to be reached, it might be worse than the current situation in which nothing is taught. There is absolutely no way in which Hamas would ever allow any kind of objective analysis of the Holocaust to be taught to their students. The essence of Hamas education is brainwashing and the shutting down of any marketplace of ideas. What Hamas fears most is truth, science, history and objectivity.

A state built on lies cannot long endure, unless it is an entirely totalitarian state such as North Korea, which denies its citizens access to any alternative information or point of view. Even Iran cannot stop ideas from filtering through its network of censors. Nor can China or Venezuela. But Hamas can and does impose total censorship over those it

controls. If it were to become a state, its control over the minds and actions of its citizens would become even more total. The sad reality is that totalitarian censorship—provided it is completely totalitarian—really does work. The people of Gaza really believe that the Holocaust never occurred. They really believe that firing rockets at school children is God's command. They really believe that Jews are a combination of the devil monkeys, pigs and vermin. They really believe that Jews control the world and that Barak Obama is a puppet whose strings are pulled by hook-nosed "Yids." They really believe that Israel doesn't want peace and seeks to destroy the Islamic world and its holy places.

It is difficult to build an enduring peace on such a structure of lies. That is why the Oslo Accords, and other peace agreements between Israel and the Palestinians, insisted that the Palestinians stop teaching their children to hate, stop teaching their teachers to lie and stop inciting violence against the Jews. In this respect, the Palestinian leadership, both in Gaza and the West Bank, has been an utter failure. Not much can be expected from the Hamas leadership, but even the Palestinian Authority has failed miserably in this regard. Abu Mazen received his PhD for a thesis that denied the Holocaust. He claims to have changed his views, but he is still unwilling to teach his students the true history of World War II.

Israel, on the other hand, has a free and open press in which the Palestinian narrative is presented honestly and fully—indeed sometimes more favorably to the Palestinians than is warranted by the facts. Israeli books present varying accounts of the conflict and teachers may supplement the texts. Some schools and teachers obviously present biased views, but students are free to subject their teacher's biases to the open marketplace of ideas.

It should come as no surprise therefore that far more Israelis than Palestinians favor a compromise peace. The two-state solution cannot be built on lies. The truth, it turns out, is good for peace. The reality of the Holocaust is an important aspect of truth, regardless of what Hamas may say.

## Neve Gordon's divisive Op-Ed

By Rivka Carmi The Los Angeles Times

As president of Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, I have always remained open and impartial to the wide diversity of opinions within our academic faculty and their right to free speech, no matter how controversial their views or writings may be.

However, I strongly believe a call for a worldwide boycott of Israel written by a Ben-Gurion University faculty member, Neve Gordon, that appeared in The Times oversteps the boundaries of academic freedom -- because it has nothing to do with it.

September 1, 2009

Academic freedom exists to ensure that there is an unfettered and free discussion of ideas relating to research and teaching and to provide a forum for the debate of complicated ideas that may challenge accepted norms. Gordon, however, used his pulpit as a university faculty member to advocate a personal opinion, which is really demagoguery cloaked in academic theory.

Gordon argues that Israel is an "apartheid" state and that "a boycott would save Israel from itself." But the empirical facts show that it would destroy

the very fabric of the society that he claims to want to protect. Instead of investing in activities that promote coexistence, this "call for a boycott" is already being used to isolate Israel.

This is particularly pernicious for our university, a proudly Zionist institution that embodies the dream of Israel's first prime minister, David Ben-Gurion, to bring development and prosperity to all the residents of the Negev region. This work -- which includes community outreach and scientific innovation in Israel and around the world carried out by nearly 25,000 students, faculty and staff -- is being threatened by the egregious remarks of one person, under the guise of academic freedom.

A number of online campaigns have been launched calling for donors and other supporters of the university to "boycott BGU." We have heard the calls by those who demand that the university ignore Israeli law and fire Gordon, a tenured faculty member, on the basis of his statements. And we are also under attack by others who champion Gordon on the basis of freedom of speech.

Like it or not, Gordon cannot be readily dismissed. The law in Israel is very clear, and the university is a law-abiding institution.

At the same time, by calling on other entities, including academic institutions, to boycott Israel -- and effectively, to boycott his own university -- Gordon has forfeited his ability to work effectively within the academic setting, with his colleagues in

Israel and around the world. After his very public, personal soul-searching in his Op-Ed article, leading to his extreme description of Israel as an "apartheid" state, how can he, in good faith, create the collaborative atmosphere necessary for true academic research and teaching?

The primary effect of Gordon's Israel-bashing will be to detract from the work of his university. I am a doctor; my professional career has focused on preventing hereditary genetic diseases in the Bedouin Arab community. Today, the laboratory that I founded at Ben-Gurion University is working with Bedouin, Palestinian and Jordanian doctors and researchers to improve the health of Arab children across the region. This is but one of the many Israeli-Arab collaborations -- in fields that range from developing advanced water technologies to solar energy, environmental conservation and emergency medicine -- that will be compromised here if "collective punishment" for Gordon's actions or for my opposition to his views is imposed on BGU.

There are many more hopeful and pragmatic voices to be heard at our institution than Gordon's, and they are the ones who will ultimately guide us, and Israel, to a brighter future.

**Rivka Carmi is the president of Ben-Gurion University of the Negev in Beer-Sheva, Israel.**

## **The Rigged Game By Caroline Glick**

On Tuesday the Guardian reported that the Obama administration is now making Israel an offer it can't refuse: In exchange for a government order to freeze construction for Jews in Jerusalem, Judea and Samaria, the administration will adopt a "much tougher line with Iran over its alleged nuclear weapons program."

Israel should refuse this offer.

What the Guardian account shows is an Obama administration looking to blame Israel for the failure of its policy of attempting to appease the likes of Iranian dictator Ayatollah Ali Khamenei and President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad.

Come September, US President Barack Obama is going to have a difficult time of it. He set a September deadline for his strategy of diplomatically courting the mullahs. This policy involves deferring further sanctions against Teheran and all but openly renouncing the option of using military force to destroy Iran's nuclear installations while waiting politely for the mullahs to sit down for tea with US officials.

Far from accepting Obama's offer, the Iranians have spit on it. Indeed, they have been too busy brutalizing their own people and building bombs and missiles to even respond to him directly. Instead,

## **TownHall.com August 28, 2009**

they have signaled their contempt for Obama by promoting known arch-terrorists to high office. For instance, Ahmadinejad just appointed Ahmad Vahidi, the suspected mastermind of the 1994 bombing of the AMIA Jewish center in Buenos Aires that killed 85 people and the 1996 Khobar Towers bombing in Saudi Arabia where 19 US servicemen and women were murdered to serve as defense minister.

In support of Obama's appeasement efforts, both the House and the Senate Foreign Relations committees set aside veto-proof bills that would place sanctions on companies exporting refined fuel to Iran. But Congress, now on summer recess, reconvenes in September and members are anxiously awaiting a green light from the White House to put the bills before a vote.

So unless something saves him, Obama will look like quite a fool next month. His appeasement policy has given the mullahs eight precious months of unimpeded work at their nuclear installations. Their uranium enrichment facility at Natanz is now operating some 5,000 centrifuges, with another 2,400 centrifuges about to go on line. That is an eightfold increase in centrifuge activity from a year ago.

Obama now turns to Israel to avoid embarrassment. If he can convince Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu that the White House will only get serious about Iran's nuclear weapons program if Netanyahu freezes Jewish building in Judea, Samaria and Jerusalem, then Obama can present his sudden willingness to sign on to veto-proof congressional sanctions legislation not as a consequence of his own failure, but as a result of Israeli pressure.

If Obama succeeds in getting Netanyahu on board, the American media discussion of sanctions will focus on the issue of Israeli power over US policy. The so-called Israel lobby will be pummeled as pundits argue about whether Obama was right or wrong to succumb to Israeli pressure to support congressional sanctions. No one will remember that Obama was forced to support the sanctions because he had no other choice, since next month his engagement policy will become indefensible.

On the other hand, if Israel refuses to play ball and doesn't provide Obama with a concession which he will be "forced" to pay for with a harder line on Iran, then he will still have to adopt a harder line. In this case, however, it will be attributed to the failure of his appeasement policy toward Iran rather than to the success of his Middle East diplomacy against Israel.

Obama's apparent interest in setting Israel up as the fall guy for the failure of his engagement policy is the same policy he will doubtless follow if matters continue on course and Teheran acquires nuclear weapons. At that point, Obama can be counted on to claim that it was Israel's recalcitrance in the negotiations with the Palestinians or the Syrians or the Lebanese that forced the mullahs' hands. That is, he will say it is the absence of "progress" in the "peace process" due to whatever imagined Israeli intransigence that made it impossible for the Iranian "moderates" to convince the "hardliners" to give up their nuclear weapons program.

In Obama's defense, it should be noted that at least he worries about being embarrassed by the failure of his Iran policy. He knows that the overwhelming majority of Americans consider Iran to be an enemy of their country. In a poll of US voters taken in May, some 80 percent of Americans claimed that a nuclear-armed Iran would constitute a threat to US national security and 57% said that Israel would be justified in launching a preemptive strike against Iran's nuclear installations.

Things are different on the other side of the Atlantic. Obama's European counterparts do not face a comparable situation. They have no reason to fear being embarrassed when and if Iran emerges as a nuclear power, because their constituents view Israel as threat equal to or greater than Iran.

European politics - particularly as they relate to the Middle East - are not informed by rational

interests so much as they are defined by attitude. Facts today mean little in Europe. They are easily crushed under the weight of the fantasies that dominate European political discourse.

The main fantasy governing Europe's attitude toward the Middle East is the belief in Israeli militaristic venality, fundamentalist messianism, and territorial greed. It is this fantasy that protects European leaders from the need to account for their six years of failed appeasement toward Iran, during which Iran has made its swiftest progress toward completing its nuclear weapons program.

It is the predominance of anti-Israel attitudes throughout the continent that enables European leaders to make light of the Iranian nuclear threat even as ever growing swathes of the continent fall within the range of the Islamic republic's ballistic missiles.

A mere glance at the daily Middle East coverage of your standard European newspaper suffices to demonstrate the depths of Europe's obsession with hating Israel. The absence of peace is always Israel's fault. The fact that the Arabs have never accepted Israel's right to exist is either whitewashed or justified. So too, Arab terrorism is explained away while every act - small and large - that in any way asserts Israel's right to defend itself is pounced upon as proof of Israel's criminality and brutality.

Case in point is an interview Intelligence Minister Dan Meridor gave to Der Spiegel's diplomatic correspondent Erich Follath ahead of Netanyahu's visit to Germany this week. The entire interview consisted of interchanges like the following:

Follath: You blame Palestinian intransigence [for the absence of peace]. Western leaders are, of course, demanding that the Arab side compromise on some issues. But they are also putting pressure on Israel to make concessions, as well, especially when it comes to its aggressive settlement policy in the West Bank.

Meridor: There is no such policy.

Follath: You don't regard new settlements in the occupied territories as being a major stumbling block in the peace process?

Meridor: That's exactly why we aren't building new settlements. We haven't approved any.

Follath: You are sidestepping the issue. US President Barack Obama wouldn't urge Israel to stop its settlement policies if he didn't have a reason to do so...

Meridor: What you describe is neither the official policy of Prime Minister Netanyahu nor the official policy of the government."

Follath's questions, and his dogged determination to ignore everything that Meridor said reflect this general European propensity to embrace the fantasy of Israeli criminality over the reality of

Israeli willingness to do just about anything for peace.

Israel has for years based its public diplomacy regarding Teheran's nuclear weapons program on successive governments' assessments that given Iran's global reach and the threat it poses to global security, states will be more willing to act to prevent it from acquiring nuclear weapons than they are to acknowledge Palestinian terrorism which is employed almost exclusively against Israel. What Israeli leaders - including Netanyahu - have failed to recognize is that the antipathy of Europeans toward Israel is so great that they are willing to explain away Iran's nuclear weapons program because it is aimed first of all against Israel.

Case in point is yet another screed by Follath published in *Der Spiegel* in June. There he characterized Netanyahu and Ahmadinejad as "twins," who are united in their "apocalyptic religious visions."

As Follath sees it, both are equally responsible for the rising likelihood of war between Israel and Iran that is liable to suck in countries around the region and the world. As far as he - and his loyal readers - are concerned, Israel and Iran deserve each other.

Such views inevitably temper any propensity European leaders may have to act against the Islamic republic. This was demonstrated by German Chancellor Angela Merkel during her appearance with Netanyahu in Berlin on Thursday. Merkel rejected Israel's comparison of Iran's stated aim of destroying Israel to the Shoah, saying, "There is no comparison between the Holocaust and the Iranian nuclear program."

If there is no comparison, then Germany, which she claimed is duty bound to defend Israel due to the Holocaust, has no obligation to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear power.

But if Merkel is wrong, and as a result of the lackadaisical attitude she, her European colleagues, and the Obama administration have adopted, Iran

acquires nuclear weapons and as promised, uses them to commit a new genocide of Jewry, she has no reason to worry. The anti-Israel attitude now rampant in Europe will ensure that she will pay no price, and will not even be embarrassed for her failure to heed the warnings.

Case in point is the newest Swedish media blood libel against Israel, and the numerous blood libels - most prominently France 2's Muhammad al-Dura blood libel from September 2000 - that preceded it. Stories like *Aftonbladet's* fiction of IDF theft of Palestinian organs and France 2's false allegation that the IDF murders Arab children sell newspapers and raise television ratings because the popular animus against Israel is so great that people are willing to buy newspapers and watch television networks that propagate obvious lies that feed this irrational hatred. Indeed, it pays to disseminate such lies.

France 2's Charles Enderlain, the father of the al-Dura lie, just received France's *Légion d'honneur* from President Nicolas Sarkozy. Then, too, anti-Israel activist Felicia Langer just received Germany's Federal Cross of Honor, and Israel-hater and former Irish president Mary Robinson was just awarded the US Presidential Medal of Freedom.

The lesson of all of this for Israel is clear. Whether Netanyahu is dealing with Obama or European leaders, the game is rigged against us. Any move that Israel makes toward these leaders will simply facilitate their further castigation of the Jewish state and support their clear intentions to do nothing to prevent Iran from acquiring the means to destroy Israel.

As we have been all too often in our history, today Israel stands alone against our enemies. We can either defeat them, or we can be defeated. The choice is ours.

**Caroline B. Glick is the senior Middle East fellow at the Center for Security Policy in Washington, D.C., and the deputy managing editor of *The Jerusalem Post*.**

## Moroccan king chooses different Holocaust tact

By Alfred de Montesquiou *The Washington Times* August 26, 2009

From the western edge of the Muslim world, the king of Morocco has dared to take up one of the most inflammatory issues in the Middle East conflict - the Holocaust.

At a time when Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's dismissal of the Holocaust has made the biggest headlines, King Mohammed VI has called the Nazi destruction of the Jews "one of the most tragic chapters of modern history," and has endorsed a Paris-based program aimed at spreading the word among fellow Muslims.

Many in the Islamic world still ignore or know little about the Nazi attempt to annihilate the Jews

during World War II. Some disbelieve it outright. Others argue that it was a European crime and imagine it to be the reason Israel exists and the Palestinians are stateless.

The sentiment was starkly illustrated in March after a Palestinian youth orchestra performed for Israeli Holocaust survivors, only to be shut down by angry leaders of the West Bank refugee camp where they live.

"The Holocaust happened, but we are facing a similar massacre by the Jews themselves," a community leader named Adnan Hindi said at the time. "We lost our land and we were forced to flee."

Like other moderate Arab leaders, King Mohammed VI must tread carefully. Islamic fervor is rising in his kingdom, highlighted in 2003 by al Qaeda-inspired attacks in Casablanca on targets that included Jewish sites. Forty-five people died.

The king's acknowledgment of the Holocaust, in a speech read out in his name at a ceremony in Paris in March, appears to further illustrate the radically different paths that countries like Morocco and Iran are taking.

Morocco has long been a quiet partner in Arab-Israeli peace efforts, most notably when it served as a secret meeting place for the Israeli and Egyptian officials who set up President Anwar Sadat's groundbreaking journey to Jerusalem in 1977.

Though Moroccan officials say the timing is coincidental, the Holocaust speech came at around the same time that Morocco severed diplomatic relations with Iran, claiming it was infiltrating Shi'ite Muslim troublemakers into this Sunni nation.

The speech was read at a ceremony launching the "Aladdin Project," an initiative of the Paris-based Foundation for the Memory of the Shoah (Holocaust), that aims to spread awareness of the genocide among Muslims.

It organizes conferences and has translated key Holocaust writings such as Anne Frank's diary into Arabic and Farsi. The name refers to Aladdin, the young man with the genie in his lamp, whose legend, originally Muslim, became a universally loved tale.

The Holocaust, the king's speech said, is "the universal heritage of mankind."

It was "a very important political act," said Anne-Marie Revcolevschi, director of the Shoah foundation. "This is the first time an Arab head of state takes such a clear stand on the Shoah," she said in a telephone interview.

While the Israeli-Palestinian conflict often aggravates Arab sentiment toward Israel, Morocco has a long history of coexistence between Muslims and Jews.

The recent Israeli military offensive in the Gaza Strip has further inflamed resentment at Israel's treatment of the Palestinians, but Ahmed Hasseni, a Casablanca cabdriver, echoes a widely held view that it shouldn't affect relations with Morocco's Jews.

"We're not dumb," he said. "We don't confuse the Israeli army with the Jewish people."

Jews have lived in Morocco for 2,000 years. Their numbers swelled after they were expelled from Spain in 1492, and reached 300,000 before World War II, when yet more fled the German onslaught in Europe and found refuge in Morocco, then a French colony.

Today they number just 3,000, most having emigrated to France, North America or Israel, but

they are free to come back to explore their roots, pray at their ancestors' graves and even settle here.

Simon Levy heads the Jewish Museum in Casablanca, a treasure trove of old Torah scrolls, garments and jewelry illustrating the rich culture of Moroccan Jewry.

"That I still run the only Jewish museum in the Arab world is telling," he said.

Andre Azoulay, a top adviser to the current king, is Jewish and one of six members of the king's council in a monarchy that oversees all major decisions. Considered one of Morocco's most powerful men, he views his country as "a unique case" for the intensity of its Jewish-Muslim relations. "We don't mix up Judaism and the tragedy of the Middle East," he said in an interview.

A founding member of the Aladdin Project, Mr. Azoulay said part of the program's goal is to show the West that Muslims aren't hostile to Jews, and that Morocco was among countries that resisted Nazi plans to exterminate their Jewish populations. He points to King Mohammed V, the current ruler's grandfather, who is credited with resisting French colonial anti-Semitic policies.

Such actions were rare, but not unique in North Africa during World War II. In Tunisia, the late Khaled Abdelwahhab hid Jews from the Nazis on his farm, and was the first Arab to be nominated as "righteous among the nations," a title bestowed by Yad Vashem, Israel's Holocaust memorial, on those who risked their lives to save Jews in the Holocaust. His case is still under study.

The Aladdin Project is only just beginning. Its work has yet to reach schools or bookstores in Morocco, although the Shoah foundation's Ms. Revcolevschi said Anne Frank's diary is among Holocaust memoirs available in Arabic and Farsi on the Internet, and is being sold under the counter in Iran.

"People speak of a clash of civilizations, but it's more a clash of ignorance," she said. "We're countering this."

Hakim El Ghissassi, an aide to the senior Islamic affairs official who delivered Mohammed's speech, said the king is uniquely positioned to promote Islam's dialogue with Judaism, because his titles include "commander of the believers" - meaning he is the paramount authority for Moroccan Muslims.

"What the king has said on the Holocaust reflects our broader efforts," said Mr. El Ghissassi, listing such reforms as courses to reinforce Morocco's tradition of tolerant Islam by familiarizing local imams with Jewish and Christian holy books.

"We want to make sure everybody can differentiate between unfair Israeli policies and respect for Judaism," he said.

## What Palestinian Moderation Looks Like

By David Feith The Wall Street Journal August 21, 2009

**Conspiracy theories, duplicity and the glorification of terrorists.** What's Arabic for *plus ça change*? Because that was the message last week from the Palestinian city of Bethlehem, where the "moderate" Fatah party held its first general congress since 1989. Fatah—founded by Yasser Arafat in the 1960s and led since 2004 by Palestinian Authority president Mahmoud Abbas—demonstrated that Palestinian national politics remain as mired as ever in conspiracy theories, duplicity and the glorification of terrorists.

In opening the congress, Fatah elder statesman and former chief Palestinian peace negotiator Ahmed Qurei announced "We have in our midst the hero Khaled Abu-Usbah." Abu-Usbah's "heroism" derives from a 1978 terrorist attack that killed 37 Israelis. Time magazine (back then able to distinguish terrorists from "militants") described Abu-Usbah's mission: "The terrorists hijacked two buses filled with tourists and sightseers, took them on a wild ride down the road toward Tel Aviv, shooting along the way at everyone in sight, and finally destroyed one bus in an orgy of fire and death."

Lest anyone think the accolades accorded Abu-Usbah were merely a trip down memory lane for Fatah, the party still emphatically claims the right of "resistance"—code for killing Israelis, soldiers and civilians alike. "We stress that we have endorsed the path of peace and negotiations," said Mr. Abbas to the congress. But "we also reserve our authentic right to legitimate resistance."

An "Internal Order," published on Fatah's website, is clearer: "The armed popular revolution is the only inevitable way to the liberation of Palestine...The struggle will not end until the elimination of the Zionist entity."

Palestinian leaders have long made an art of doublespeak. As Mohammed Dahlan, elected this week to Fatah's chief governing committee, explained recently: "I lived with Chairman Yasser Arafat for years...Arafat would condemn [terror]

operations by day while at night he would do honorable things."

Fatah's current leaders continue to walk in their founder's footsteps. Responsible state-building would require of them a level of accountability they scorn. When pressed last week by delegate Hussam Khader to account for Fatah's finances over the past 20 years, Mr. Abbas shouted him down. The congress offered no financial accounting—neither to Mr. Khader, nor to western taxpayers whose aid to the Palestinians has often vanished by the billions.

Instead, the delegates descended into conspiratorial fantasy, resolving unanimously to open a sham investigation into Arafat's 2004 death in a Parisian military hospital. Arafat displayed symptoms of Parkinson's and possibly other illnesses, but no autopsy was ever conducted. Now Fatah wants to investigate, even as it already concluded, reported the Jerusalem Post, that "Israel bears full responsibility for his death, that the issue continues to remain open, and that the investigation enlists international support."

The U.S. has invested huge diplomatic and economic capital in Fatah, beginning with the 1993 Oslo Accords and accelerating two years ago, when Hamas took control of the Gaza Strip. Some of this investment may even be paying off: Economic indicators in the West Bank have inched up, bolstered by the leadership of Palestinian Prime Minister Salaam Fayyad, an independent appointed by Mr. Abbas. And the training of Palestinian security forces under U.S. Gen. Keith Dayton has allowed Israel to remove several West Bank security checkpoints. These are positive, albeit reversible, developments. Then again, Fatah's demonstration this week that it remains ideologically stuck in the terrorist pleasantries of the 1970s ought to be a stark reminder that when it comes to Palestinian "moderates," moderation remains a highly relative term.

**Mr. Feith was a Robert L. Bartley Fellow at the Wall Street Journal this summer.**

## The forgotten factor that so skews Goldstone's mission

By Alan Baker The Jerusalem Post July 28, 2009

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 served as former legal adviser to the Israeli Foreign Ministry and ambassador to Canada.**