perhaps to move elsewhere. Even if most of them wish to be citizens, we can live with an Arab minority as we have so far. We also need to figure out some sort of economic union with Jordan. We have much to offer, and perhaps we’ll manage to create a booming economy for the benefit of both sides. As for the refugees of Gaza, we need to move them; perhaps we can settle them around El Arish [in northern Sinai], as was suggested to the Zionist movement [at the turn of the 20th century].

Allon, likewise a hawk, saw things through the perspective of 1948, when as a young general he had seen the results of war gain international acceptance:

The territories which are part of the Land of Israel are inhabited by many Arabs, while the areas we conquered from Egypt and Syria are mostly empty. It would have been a lot easier had it been the other way round.

The Hashemites are not a stable regime, and we shouldn’t be considering handing over control of any part of the Land of Israel except to the local Arabs. The first thing we should do is to launch a gigantic humanitarian project to settle the refugees of Gaza, of whom there are probably about 350,000, none of them with civil rights. Let’s put all our efforts into building homes for the first 50,000 of them, in northern Sinai, perhaps. This will change the dynamics of the situation.

We should annex the region south of Jerusalem right away, for security reasons and political ones. This area must be part of Israel. As for the Arabs of the triangle, I think there are about 800,000 of them. I’m not suggesting we create a sovereign Palestinian state there, but I think that once we’ve made some minor modifications to the border we should set up an Arab autonomy there, connected to Israel for 50-99 years. I would detach them from Jordan by annexing the Jordan Valley; there are hardly any Arabs, and we can put settlements there. We’ll give them free access to the port of Haifa. Who knows? Perhaps some of them will emigrate to the Gulf, or to Europe.

Moshe Dayan agreed with Allon and Begin that the Jordan needed to be Israel’s eastern border, but had a different suggestion for the Arab population:

We should try immediately to find local Arabs on the West Bank we can work with. Let’s set up a council of their representatives who will work with us. There will be the mayors, there will be an administration, there will be the council, and they’ll work with the military governor, and we’ll see what happens. We’ll supply services, and we can hope they’ll agree to cooperate for a while. As for resettling 50,000 Arabs from Gaza—that will take years. I don’t think we should plan that far yet. Who knows? Perhaps the leadership of the Arab countries will change sooner after all, they just lost a war so badly.

Eban agreed on peace with Egypt and Syria in return for Sinai and the Golan. He admitted he didn’t see any clear goal regarding the West Bank and Gaza, musing:

We see the example of Rhodesia, where some citizens vote and others don’t. It seems to me perhaps the best
The idea is to set up a unit to allow the populace to vote there and arrange their own autonomy. The thing is, they’ll probably want to join some Arab country, Jordan or perhaps Iraq...

Yaacov Herzog: Or perhaps Israel?

Eban: That would be great! In the meantime I suggest we set up an interim arrangement where they have autonomy and we control security. Maybe they’ll have a vote at the UN—well, we’ll have to see how things develop. Who knows? Perhaps Hussein will be willing to negotiate with us even if he knows we’re not going to give him Jerusalem. We’ll see how things develop.

When the Security Cabinet reconvened a few hours later, for what was to be a five-hour meeting, Eshkol began reading the summary of the morning’s meeting. He quipped, as he began, that “this is mostly fiction [because it’s just us talking to ourselves]. But the important thing is that we seek peace; we went to war so as to reach real peace treaties”. He seems to have regarded the entire series of meetings mostly as a necessary exercise in self-delusion that would enable Abba Eban to tell the Americans that should they deliver the Arabs to the negotiating table, Israel would negotiate.

So for the next three meetings, the ministers talked.

Pinchas Sapir, minister of finance:

If we add a million Arab citizens that will be explosive, it will change the political map. Nor can we live with two different populations, Jews with a high standard of living and Arabs with a low one. ... It’s possible to win a war and then remain in a state of permanent conflict that will be worse than war.

I’m not against settling the refugees in Iraq and Syria, I think it’s natural that some of them should settle there, so long as they aren’t right across our border. We can’t expect them to move to Egypt, where the population is already exploding. Someone mentioned Australia or Canada, ... just before the war, there was lots of international apprehension. Some were afraid the Jews were going to be slaughtered again, but many were afraid of a world war. They look at this region as a place that might ignite a world war. .... Maybe the world should solve the issue.

Eshkol: The world doesn’t solve issues.

Sapir: But the world is afraid of a third world war ... I guess it’s complicated.

Josef Burg was a junior minister and was to remain a feature of Israeli politics for the next 30 years, many of them as the leader of the National Religious Party, which would become the main home of the settler movement. But in 1967, he didn’t sound like a settler:

I think the idea of dividing the West Bank doesn’t solve anything. I think we need to see if there’s some kind of local leadership with which we can work on some sort of self-rule. I don’t know if this will work but see no better alternative. I don’t see any serious partner for peace talks. Maybe we can ask the Iranians if they can find someone we can talk to—if not, all this is just us talking to ourselves.
The leader of what would become Birg's party, Moshe Haim Shapira, also distanced himself from Begin's wish to control the West Bank and from Allen's plan to dissect it:

We must tell our friends and our enemies that we seek permanent peace, and we're not going to allow attacks and infiltrations. We seek peace but wish to be certain we won't be bombed daily, and that means Sinai and the Golan must be demilitarized. This may require some changes to the borders—we'll negotiate that when the time comes.

We should try to split the Arab front, and the best place to do that is by reaching an agreement with Hussein.

The UN is discussing refugees. We need to say that we wish to resolve the issue, and the way to do so is for the Arab states, and we, and the rest of the world, all to participate in the solution. I know I'm being contrarian, but I think we can integrate 900,000 Arabs—100,000 in Jerusalem, the 100,000 original populace of Gaza, and 100,000 of the refugees of Gaza. We already have 250,000 Arab citizens, so we'll have 550,000. We'll decide about our eastern border according to the negotiations with Hussein; better that than to decide among ourselves that the Jordan must be the border.

Ze'ev Shaffer agreed there was no sense insisting on the Jordan as a border. He also had two new arguments:

In the entire history of the Land of Israel, the Jordan was the border for 25 years, between 1923-1948. Throughout the biblical era there were Jews on both sides of the river. As for the security considerations, they're not clear. The army doesn't need the river as the border, and since there will be terrorist activities, it won't help. As long as we control the hostile populace of the West Bank, the terrorists will find bases among them and the external border won't make any difference.

My last comment relates to the Holy Sites. We need to be very careful what we say. We beat the Arab Muslims, but we didn't beat the Christians. We're going to have tough discussions with the Christian world. Bringing the Christian world to accept Jewish control over their holy places—we're not that strong. We're going to need to reconcile ourselves that we'll have to relinquish some form of control over the Christian sites. If we make irresponsible proclamations we'll find ourselves faced with the demand to internationalize Jerusalem, like in 1947.

Imagine the concept of a political Christian world! True, it had existed for more than a thousand years, but sometime between 1967 and 2017, it migrated from our world to the world of the past.

Zalman Aran was one of the last speakers:

I hesitate to speak since my positions are so different. People seem to assume we have time to wait and see. I disagree. We don't. There's an assumption we control the situation and how it unfolds. I'd love that to be true, but it isn't. The third assumption I don't accept is that we need territories that don't have Jews and do have Arabs. What we need is peace that
ensures our security—and that won’t be granted us by a piece of paper, which we know will be worthless.

So how do we ensure security? Peace with Egypt and Syria are important. Gaza stays in Israel. On the West Bank we need to hold onto territories the experts tell us are crucial for security, but nothing else. I think solving the refugee problem is crucial for our security. Maybe we can solve some of it by settling them on the West Bank.

Finally, there was Justice Minister Yaacov Shimshon Shapira (not to be confused with Moshe Haim Shapira):

What does it mean that the West Bank will have self-rule with security and foreign affairs are controlled by Israel, yet the population won’t be Israeli citizens?

The world is going through descolonization, and we’re accused unfairly of being colonial, and we’re considering ruling territories inhabited mainly by Arabs while keeping security and foreign affairs in our hands, like the sheikhs of the Persian Gulf. Who’ll accept that? Whom will we convince? Everyone will say we’re constructing a colony on the West Bank.

It’s either one way or another. Either we take the risk that they’ll be citizens of Israel, which will be the outcome if we control the West Bank or accept Begin’s ideas: Soon we’ll have a bi-national state, and after a while we’ll be a minority. Do you accept that most of the West Bank, with the exception of Jerusalem and some small border corrections, will become part of an Arab country. There’s no other way.

Later in the meeting, Eshkol came back to Yaacov Shimshon Shapira’s position:

Regarding the refugees, it can’t be that we can’t have a position. We must say that Israel will not solve the matter alone. There was a war, and now we wish to sit, face-to-face or around a large table, and solve the problem. So we can’t say anything about the refugees?

Y.S. Shapira: They’re in your country now. You’re responsible for them.

Eshkol: I fail to understand the anger when I said something earlier about exchanging populations. ... When coexistence is impossible and communities cannot live together, there will be population exchanges. We took in 100,000 Jews from Iraq, they should take 100,000 Arabs. It’s the same language, there’s water and there’s ample land. Maybe they won’t agree, but it certainly seems obviously legitimate.

Y.S. Shapira: No,

Eshkol: Why not?

Y.S. Shapira: Because they are the indigenous population here, and you control them. There’s no reason that Arabs who were born here should move to Iraq.

Just as Israel’s Cabinet ministers never foresaw their crushing military victory, so they never foresaw the decades we’ve been living in since. As they convened for their first postwar
discussion, it never crossed their minds they were forging a conundrum that would remain unsolved for generations.

The discussion they thought they were having was urgent and immediate: The UN was about to discuss the outcome of the Six-Day War, and Israel's foreign minister needed instructions. Yet then, astonishingly, it turned out that not only Israel understood that the dictated terms of 1956 had failed. Those countries that hadn't been willing to honor their commitments in May didn't want to make new ones in July, so they didn't force Israel out of the territories, as the Israelis half-expected them to. Then came the swift Arab rejection of peace overtures. Unexpectedly, the temporary arrangements that Israel stumbled into in the summer of 1967 evolved into longer-term realities.

The political Christian world disappeared. The Arabs of the West Bank became the Palestinians. Israel and Egypt forged a stunted but solid peace. Syria ceased to exist, while the Hashemites are still on their throne. The Palestinians achieved more than autonomy, but not sovereignty. They transformed from a cynical military tool of Arab states into Israel's most active adversary. A vocabulary of human rights appeared. Allon's musings about limited settlements became a project of 400,000 Jews. The shaping ideas of the past became obsolete—but the conditions they had inadvertently enabled are still with us. The past is a foreign land, and it isn't even past.

***
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When George Orwell died in 1950 at the age of 46, the literary critic Edmund Wilson found it symbolically appropriate. For in the new postwar age of play-acting Stalinists, Wilson saw Orwell as the last prophet of commonsense independent-minded thought on the left.

But there was one who took up the baton. Robert Warshow, born 100 years ago, approached film, literature, and politics, with uncompromising honesty and complexity in a difficult time. Like Orwell, he did not follow any “line,” be it Communist or McCarthyist. Dead at 37, he left behind very little work—enough to be collected in one slim book. Nevertheless, his output is exceedingly relevant for our times.

Unlike many of the “New York Intellectuals,” that postwar brand of liberal but anti-Stalinist writers—peopled by such literary heavyweights as Lionel Trilling, Mary McCarthy, and Dwight MacDonald—who dominated the opinion journals for a generation, and were then lionized by a generation of academics, Warshow never went through the obligatory Communist phase. While in college, he submitted articles to The New Leader, a social-democratic but fiercely anti-Communist magazine. After graduation, he worked for Commentary, then a liberal publication, as a managing editor. Hence, he could approach Communist politics without a sense of guilt or a need to overcompensate in his attacks on it.

Warshow’s particular métier was analyzing the Communist sloganeers that Orwell typified as “human gramophones,” and the damage they did to cultural and intellectual life. For him, the horrors of Stalinism weren’t limited to the purges, gulags, and mass executions and the American followers who defended them. It was the how it cut party members off from having any ideas connected to reality. He lamented that for his generation coming up in the 1930s the Communist Party’s influence was so great that it “determined what you think about and on what terms” well into the ‘50s.

As Orwell sought to save socialism from Soviet influence, Warshow tried to save high culture from Stalinism. Because of Communist domination of culture, one could no longer have “free judgments,” he wrote. One could no longer connect literature to one’s own actual experiences. Instead, culture was boiled down to politically correct individual “responses” promulgated in the most vulgar terms by literary commissars.

In an astute analysis of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg’s prison letters, Warshow noted that the supposedly “confidential” letters—later published—between the two accused atomic spies and Communist Party members were not actually intimate personal documents—rather, they were tailored for the public consumption of the party faithful. Hence, they constantly avowed their innocence, all the while knowing they did give atomic secrets to the Soviets. Julius, with one eye on giving those who protested for him ammunition, peppered his letters with “frame-ups” and “American fascism” against
"progressive" Jews like himself. (Communism was never mentioned, except in distancing quotation marks.) Even without the censorship of prison officials, Warshow saw that for them "the truth could not be told."

What Warshow found most revealing about Julius was the place in one prison letter where he told his wife about cutting out a copy of the Declaration of Independence from The New York Times and taping it to his prison wall. He reported reading from it the rights of "freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and of religion." Warshow pointed out that the declaration does not mention any of these concepts, and hence Julius could never have "read" about them. From this, Warshow concluded that the couple "had no internal sense of their own being but could only see themselves from the outside, in whatever postures their cases demanded"—in this case, a phony Americanism that in fact contradicted Rosenberg and the party's actual beliefs and doctrines.

Warshow's key target were "anti-anti-Communists," who saw attempts "to expose the Communist menace" as more of a threat to American democracy than Stalin. Warshow denounced this "equation" as "clearly absurd and too often conceals a desire to remain 'neutral' in the struggle against Soviet totalitarianism."

But Warshow had no radical past to lead him into the far right, either. In a review of My Son John (1953), an anti-Communist film so extreme that even some anti-Communists were embarrassed by it, he noted that the son, a thinly veiled Communist, and the father, a Bible-thumping American Legionnaire, were mirror images of each other in their fanaticism.

As Orwell sought to save socialism from Soviet influence, Warshow tried to save high culture from Stalinism.

With its Our Town setting, the film took the familiar and "true" theme of a father laboring to send his son to college only to have the son, after graduation, if not before, rebuke the father's values. But Warshow found "the hero" father no less "monstrous" than his Communist spy son. The father in frustration hits his son with the Bible and drunkenly roars patriotic platitudes. The pious mother, caught in the middle, sides with the father at film's end, admiring his wisdom because he "believes what is in his heart."

Warshow found the film repulsive not because it denounced communism but because it made anti-Communism one-dimensional and stupid. He did not quarrel with the film's depiction of communists being part of a conspiracy, nor did he doubt the possibility that Communists would murder their own, as happened at the climax of the film. But he reminded audiences, based on his and their experiences, that Communists were "complex and their lives much duller." What
was needed, be asserted, was a film that exposed “the melodrama” of Communist fanaticism masquerading as dull government servants.

Warshow lived and died in age different from ours. As of yet, Russia hasn’t assumed the menacing dimensions of Stalin, nor is PC culture as oppressive as Stalinism proved to be for writers like Orwell or Ralph Ellison. But the problem of liberalism that Warshow analyzed and lamented in relation to radical politics remains. As in his time, some liberals today also view radicals as admirable because they are idealistic, even if radicals are proven misguided later and the liberals realize that they were duped (rightists do this as well, especially the social conservative faction). The very act of having ideals, even with no relation to reality, is still to be admired if one’s “heart is in the right place.”

Stalin is dead. But Warshow may have been correct in his analysis that the damage that communists did to liberalism continues on.

***
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Exclusive interview: 'Son of Hamas,' the speaker who shocked the UNHRC

There is a huge difference between Israeli and Palestinian leaders," says Mosab Hassan Yousef, the video of whose speech at the UNHRC went viral, in an interview with Dr. Manfred Gerstenfeld.

"Hamas, which I know well, is an ideological political organization that views extreme violence as a means to achieve its political ends. In the 21st century an individual or group that tries to achieve its goals by violent means should not be legitimized by anybody. In my definition, Hamas is a terror organization.

"I have seen how radically different the behavior of democratic Israel is from that of Hamas and Fatah. Hamas is still living in the 7th century, something Europe cannot even understand. Over the years I have realized that due to their religious views, Hamas cannot make peace with Israel. Their interpretation of Islam requires that cease fires alone are possible with infidels, not peace. Such a cease fire can last no more than 15 years. No political solution will ever satisfy Hamas in the long term. It is not about borders but who believes in their God and who does not. Hamas' target is not just Israel, but for Islam to gain control over all non-believers."

Mosab Hassan Yousef was born in 1978 in Ramallah, son of Sheikh Hassan Yousef, a founder of Hamas. After involvement in anti-Israeli activities he was arrested by the Israeli Shin Bet security service. When he was imprisoned he initially decided to become a double agent. After he saw the huge difference in behavior between Israel and Hamas he served as a key agent of the Israeli security services and continued to act in that capacity for ten years.

Yousef's story is described in the 2010 bestseller, "Son of Hamas, A Gripping Account of Terror, Betrayal, Political Intrigue, and Unthinkable Choices" which has been translated into many languages. The movie "The Green Prince" which tells his story was released in 2014. Yousef converted to Christianity and now lives in the United States where he was granted asylum in 2010.

This interview was carried out on 27 September 2017, two days after Yousef spoke—under the auspices of UN Watch— at the United Nations Human Rights Council in Geneva. The video of that speech received millions of hits. In our conversation he repeated several of the statements he made at the UNHRC.
Regarding the Palestinian Authority, Yousef said: "In fact, the Palestinian individual and their human development is the least of your concerns. You kidnap Palestinian students from campus and torture them in your jails. You torture your political rivals. The suffering of the Palestinian people is the outcome of your selfish political interests. You are the greatest enemy of the Palestinian people."

Yousef quoted what he had said about the PA at the UNHRC: "In fact, the Palestinian individual and their human development is the least of your concerns. You kidnap Palestinian students from campus and torture them in your jails. You torture your political rivals. The suffering of the Palestinian people is the outcome of your selfish political interests. You are the greatest enemy of the Palestinian people."

Yousef remarked: "I have often said that the Israelis care more about the Palestinians than the Fatah or Hamas leadership." He added: "I do not believe that the violent Palestinian struggle is justified."

In another meeting in Switzerland he pointed out that neither Hamas nor Abbas has an interest in ending the conflict since maintaining it allows their organizations to receive billions of dollars.

On the wider issue of Islam Yousef said: "I was born a Muslim, it was not my choice. Islam has an ambitious dogma which contains violence. With that violence I totally disagree. Murder in the name of Allah is a wider Islamic problem which Western societies do not sufficiently realize. Western political correctness is conducive to Islamic terror. I do not want Islam to collapse, but to reject violence in our days. I believe that a new generation of Muslims must be educated to know love instead of hate.

"The Palestinian people are very tired. They have been misled... with false hopes of state borders. It is time for the Palestinian people to finally realize that Israel is a reality and its security in the region cannot be compromised.

"I decided to convert to Christianity, a religion which is seen negatively by Muslims. Christianity helped me to love the other. Israel and the West love life, Hamas and Fatah glorify death. That is another reason why it is so hard to negotiate. How does one find a common interest when coming from such different value systems?"

Concerning peace between Israel and the Palestinians Yousef says: "The Palestinian people are very tired. They have been misled by Palestinian leaders with false hopes of state borders, independence and self-determination. It is time for the Palestinian people to finally realize that Israel is a reality and its security in the region cannot be compromised.

"Palestinians need to start thinking about priorities. Is a political goal really their main priority? If they choose to be fooled by their leadership their fate will be continued suffering, pain and misery. The priorities can also be non-political: developing their economy, working for better education, increased individual rights, improved health and upgraded infrastructure. For that to happen the Palestinian people would have to become pro-active.

"In that case Israel and the rest of the world can help them improve their towns and villages. This would enable them to develop not only a solid economy and improved medical institutions. It would also make it possible for the Palestinian people to build bridges with the world. These seem to me to be much better priorities than following fancy political goals imposed by corrupt politicians who do not care about their people's fate."

When asked whether he will form a movement Yousef laughed and said: "I am not thinking of starting a movement nor do I belong to any organization. I am an individual who does not represent anyone. I thus speak on my own authority which is based on my own experience."
DOES ISRAEL DISCRIMINATE AGAINST ARABS?

OLGA MESHOE

Maybe you’ve heard someone say that Israel is an apartheid state. That Israel has a policy of segregating and oppressing the minority population within its borders – like South Africa once did.

Maybe you’ve been so outraged by this information that you have considered joining the BDS movement— the effort to boycott, divest and sanction Israel until it ends its alleged “racist” policies.

I don’t blame you. Apartheid is a great evil and deserves to be fought wherever we find it. But here’s the thing: You won’t find apartheid in the State of Israel. So, I’ll put it bluntly: The BDS movement is a slick propaganda effort built on lies.

I think I have the credibility to make this claim.

Having grown up in South Africa, and having spent a fair amount of time in Israel, I know what apartheid is and what it is not. My parents were raised under real apartheid where blacks were, by law, separated from whites at every level, from education to drinking fountains.

Blacks couldn’t vote, couldn’t own land, couldn’t live next to, or use the same transportation system as whites. I remember my father telling me about how my grandfather was kicked and humiliated in public by a young white boy. All he was permitted to say was, “Please stop, little boss.” That was the world my family lived in.

That was the world of apartheid South Africa.

But in Israel, the law is color-blind. Israeli Arabs have the same rights as Israeli Jews. They ride the same buses, study in the same schools, and are treated in the same hospitals. Arabs are elected to Israel’s parliament, serve as judges, and fight in the Israeli military.

On my first trip to Israel, the group I was with had a Jewish tour guide and an Arab bus driver. Imagine our surprise, having heard that Israel is an apartheid state. This would have been inconceivable in apartheid South Africa. All these things would be self-evident to anyone who did any kind of actual research, or, even better, visited Israel— something I encourage everyone to do.

BDS doesn’t want you to do research or visit Israel. It depends on the ignorance of its audience. Sadly, on American college campuses, BDS has a significant presence. It succeeds by playing on the good intentions of good people through deliberate deception.
In short, they lie.

And lies really make me angry because lies empower evil.

Lies about blacks empowered apartheid in South Africa.

Lies about Jews made the Holocaust possible.

And lies about Israel are misleading a lot of good-hearted young people into opposing the only country in the entire Middle East that doesn’t segregate and oppress its minority population. Just ask the next Egyptian Copt or Iraqi Christian you meet on campus.

So, the question people should really be asking is: What does the BDS movement want? The answer is simple. They want to destroy Israel. They can’t do it militarily, so they try to do it through lies.

They say that Jews have no historic claim to Israel. Lie.

They say that Israel treats its Arabs as second-class citizens. Lie.

They say that Israel doesn’t want peace with its Arab neighbors. Lie.

If you tell lies, and you tell them often enough, people who don’t know the truth start to believe them.

The BDS movement’s leaders barely try to hide this charade. They will lie and say that they only want a Palestinian state living side-by-side with Israel, and then they say this: “We oppose a Jewish state in any part of Palestine....Ending the occupation doesn’t mean anything if it doesn’t mean upending the Jewish state itself.” That’s from Omar Barghouti, a founder of BDS.

Barghouti lives in Israel, so you might expect that he said this from inside an Israeli prison, like Nelson Mandela during South African apartheid. You would be wrong. Barghouti is a PhD student at Israel’s Tel Aviv University, where he enjoys the same rights as every Israeli.

My parents could only dream of that kind of freedom.

Is Israel a perfect country? No. There are as many perfect countries as there are perfect people. But to call it an apartheid state is not only an insult to the only democracy in the Middle East and the only country with equal rights for all its minorities, it’s also an insult to the actual victims of apartheid—like my parents and all those who suffered under it.

I’m Olga Meshoe for Prager University.
Germany on Wednesday formally accepted an international definition of anti-Semitism in a move designed to provide clarity for the prosecution of related crimes, JTA reports.

The German Cabinet announced it unanimously adopted the working definition promoted by the International Alliance for Holocaust Remembrance, a body with 31 member states.

In addition to classic forms of anti-Semitism, the definition offers examples of modern manifestations, such as targeting all Jews as a proxy for Israel, denying Jews the right to a
The European Parliament in January voted to adopt a resolution calling on member states and their institutions to apply the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance's definition of anti-Semitism.

Britain, Austria and Romania have also adopted the definition.

"We Germans are particularly vigilant when our country is threatened by an increase in anti-Semitism," Minister of the Interior Thomas de Maizière said following the Wednesday morning meeting.

"History made clear to us, in the most terrible way, the horrors to which anti-Semitism can lead," he added.

Josef Schuster, head of the Central Council of Jews in Germany, welcomed the announcement "as a clear signal" that anti-Semitism is not tolerated in Germany.

Schuster said he hoped the definition would be "heeded in schools, in the training of public servants and in the courts," and that it would help police to categorize crimes effectively.

"Cases of anti-Semitism are all too often overlooked or even ignored by authorities due to the lack of a uniform definition of anti-Semitism," said Deidre Berger, director of the American Jewish Committee's (AJC) SFramer Institute for German-Jewish Relations in Berlin, according to JTA.

"This will change dramatically with the adoption of the Working Definition, which will make it more apparent when anti-Semitism rears its ugly head," added Berger.

"This decision, coming at the beginning of the Jewish New Year, sends an important and reassuring message to the Jewish community in Germany."

The adoption of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance's definition of anti-Semitism was recommended by the independent Bundestag Commission on Anti-Semitism. The commission also has urged the appointment of a federal commissioner for anti-Semitism affairs — a move the AJC and other Jewish organizations have promoted as essential to "fight[ing] anti-Semitism as well as respond[ing] to current manifestations," Berger said.

The IHRA definition says anti-Semitism "is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of antisemitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities."

(Arutz Sheva's North American desk is keeping you updated until the start of Rosh Hashanah in New York. The time posted automatically on all Arutz Sheva articles, however, is Israeli time.)
Report: UN promotes anti-Semitic, pro-terror groups

Human rights NGO issues stinging report showing how UN gives accreditation to anti-Semitic groups and groups which support terror attacks.

The United Nations has supported and endorsed dozens of organizations which are anti-Israel, anti-Semitic, and promote terrorism, according to a new report.

According to the report by Human Rights Voices, a UN watchdog organization, the UN has granted formal accreditation to hate groups which use the legitimacy the UN gives them to spread anti-Semitic propaganda against the Jewish people and the Jewish State.

The report states: "Accredited non-governmental organizations have been allowed to flaunt the core of the UN mission by advocating terror and
It continues: "Most striking for an organization founded on the ashes of the Holocaust, the UN enables its accredited NGOs to play a central role in promoting modern anti-Semitism. Although the preamble of the UN Charter promises the equal rights of nations large and small, UN-accredited NGOs foster the destruction of the UN member state of Israel."

The report details numerous examples of anti-Semitism from UN-accredited NGOs, including explicit support for the Hamas terrorist organization and terrorist attacks on Israeli citizens, comparisons between Israel, the Jewish people, and the Nazis, denial of Israel's right to exist, and claims that the Talmud is "racist," among many others.

Anne Bayefsky, senior editor of Human Rights Voices, told the Washington Free Beacon that many of these UN-accredited NGOs act in violation of the UN's own bylaws.

"The United Nations was founded as a global pact among states, but over the decades—in the name of transparency and openness, and in order to further the aim of globalization—the U.N. has opened its doors to non-governmental organizations," Bayefsky said. "More than 6,200 NGOs [non-governmental organizations] have been invited to participate on a year-round basis in U.N. activities, and have thus been handed a coveted global megaphone."

"An examination of these NGOs, however, reveals that both by design and gross negligence on the part of U.N. member states, the NGOs' ranks include bigots, anti-Semites, and terrorist advocates who are now spreading hatred and inciting violence from the world stage," she added.

The report noted that western countries, in particular the US, "control the purse" of the UN, and could use their influence to counter the UN's support for anti-Semitic and pro-terror groups.

Congress is already moving to deny funding to the UN as long as it supports anti-Semitic groups. The US withdrawn from UNESCO last week over the organization's anti-Israel bias. And a new piece of proposed legislation, the 'Countering Anti-Semitism and Anti-Israel Activities at the United Nations Act of 2017,' would withhold US funding from the UN unless the president certifies that no UN agency grants accreditation to any NGO which promotes anti-Semitism.

Senator Marco Rubio, (R-FL) the author of the legislation, told the Beacon: "Far too often, the United Nations and related organizations are being used to discriminate against the Jewish state of Israel and promote anti-Semitism;"

"After the United States rightly withdrew from UNESCO in response to the vile anti-Israel agenda of its member states, the Trump administration and Congress should continue working together to promote accountability and ensure that Americans' tax dollars are not used to further hateful, anti-Semitic agendas." Rubio said.
Why Does the IDF Have ‘No Intention’ of Killing Jihad Terrorists?

NISSAN RATZLAV-KATZ | OCTOBER 31, 2017, 1:10 AM |

This blog entry is going to be pretty short.

The headline said: “IDF says it didn’t mean to kill senior Islamic Jihad members in tunnel blast”.

The body of the report quoted an IDF spokesperson as saying, “There was no intention in any way or at any stage to hurt senior figures.”

My only comment is: What?! Why not?!?

The Palestinian Islamic Jihad has murdered plenty of “senior figures”, such as:

Marcel Cohen, 73, of Nice, France, murdered along with 10 other not-so-senior figures by an Islamic Jihad suicide bomber at a shawarma restaurant near the old central bus station in Tel Aviv. Other victims were: Philip Balhasan, 45, of Ashdod; Rozalia Beseneyi, 48, and Pirosca Boda 50, of Romania; Ariel Darhi, 31, of Bat Yam; Victor Erez, 60, of Givatayim; Binyamin Haputa, 47, of Lod; David Shaulov, 29, of Holon; Lily Yunes, 42, of Oranit; Lior Anidzar, 26, of Tel Aviv; and Daniel Wultz, 16, of Weston, Florida (USA).

The “senior figures” Michael Kaufman, 68, Genia Poleis, 66, and Ya’acov Rahmani, 68, were murdered by an Islamic Jihad suicide bomber who detonated himself at the Hadera open-air market. Also murdered were Pirhiya Machlouf, 53, of Hadera, Sabiha Nissim, 66, of Moshav Ahituv, and Jamil Qa’adan, 48, of Baka al-Gharbiya.

“Senior” Alexandra Garmitzky, 65, was murdered in an Islamic Jihad suicide bombing at the entrance to the Sharon shopping mall in Netanya. The non-senior victims were: Haim Amram, 26, of Netanya, a security guard at the mall; Daniel Golani, 45, of Nahariya; Elia Rosen, 38, of Bat Hefer; and Keinan Tsuami, 20, of Petah Tikva.

A “senior figure” named Meir Haim, 74, of Azor, and 22 other people were murdered near the old Central Bus Station in Tel Aviv in a double suicide bombing by the Islamic Jihad. The other Israeli victims were: Moshe (Maurice) Aharfi, 60, of Tel-Aviv; Mordechai Evioni, 52, of Holon;
Andrei Friedman, 30, of Tel-Aviv; Hannah Haimov, 53, of Tel Aviv; Avi Kotzer, 43, of Bat Yam; Ramin Nasirov, 25, of Tel-Aviv; Staff Sgt. Mazal Orkobi, 20, of Azor; Ilanit Peled, 32, of Azor; Viktor Shebayev, 62, of Holon; Boris Tepalshvili, 51, of Yehud; Sapira Shoshana Yuizari-Yaffe, 46, of Bat Yam; Lilya Zibstein, 33, of Haifa; Amiram Zmora, 55, of Holon; Igor Zobokov, 32, of Bat Yam. The foreign workers murdered in the attack were: Krassimira Mitkova Angelov, 32, of Bulgaria; Steven Arthur Cromwell, 43, of Ghana; Ivan Gapontiak, 46, of Ukraine; Ion (Nelu) Nicolae, 34, of Romania; Guo Aiping, 47, of China; Li Peizhong, 41, of China; Mihai Sabau, 38, of Romania; and Zhang Minmin, 50, of China.

Mazal Afarri, 65, a “senior figure” from Moshav Kfar Yavetz, was murdered and three of her grandchildren were wounded when an Islamic Jihad terrorist carried out a suicide bombing — in her home.

The “senior figures” Ze’ev Almog, 71, and his wife Ruth, 70, were murdered in an Islamic Jihad suicide bombing carried out by a female terrorist from Jenin in the Maxim restaurant in Haifa. Ze’ev and Ruth died alongside their son Moshe, 43, and grandsons, Tomer, 9, and Assaf, 11. But they were not the only families destroyed in an instant in that horrific attack. Bruria Zer-Aviv, 59, her son Bezalel, 30, and Bezalel’s wife Keren, 29, were murdered alongside their children — Liran, 4, and Noya, 1. The couple Mark and Naomi Biano, 29 and 25 respectively, were also murdered that day. The rest of the 21 people Islamic Jihad murdered were: Zvi Bahat, 35, of Haifa; Hana Francis, 39, of Fassouta; Mutanus Karkabi, 31, of Haifa; Sharbal Matar, 23, of Fassouta; Osama Najjar, 28, of Haifa; Nir Regev, 25, of Nahariya; Irena Sofrin, 38, of Kiryat Bialik; Lydia Zilberstein, 58, and George Matar, 57.

“Senior figure” Mogus Mahento, 75, along with Sgt. Michael Altfiro, 19, St.-Sgt. Shimon Edri, 20, SWO Meir Fahima, 40, Cpl. Aharon Revivo, 19, Alon Goldenberg, 28, and Bella Schneider, 53, were murdered in an Islamic Jihad suicide bombing of a passenger bus traveling from Tel Aviv to Nazareth at the Musmus junction near Afula.

The most “senior figure” I could find before I could no longer go on with this endless, heartwrenching list is Maharatu Tagana, 85, of Upper Nazareth, who was murdered when an Islamic Jihad suicide bomber exploded aboard a passenger bus as it entered the Afula central bus station.

This is only an extremely fractional listing of the very many innocent victims of the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, which also includes such “non-senior figures” as: teenagers Avihai Levy, 17, Aviad Mansour, 16, Gaston Perpiñal, 15, Rachel Ben Abu, 16, Nofar Horowitz, 16, Adi Dahan, 17, Osnat Abramov, 16, Gavriel Hoter, 17, and Zvi Zisman, 18, Malka Roth, 15, Tehila Maoz, 18, Michal Raziel, 16, and Ra’aya Schijveschuurder, 14; and the Hatuel children Hila, 11, Hadar, 9, Roni, 7, and Merav, 2, seven-month-old Shaked Avraham, the Schijveschuurder siblings Avraham Yitzhak, 4, and Hemda, 2, Tamara Shimashvili, 8, Yocheved Shoshan, 10; and far too many others.

There are more names. A lot more. And this does not even take into account the hundreds of rockets the Islamic Jihad fired into Israeli cities and towns.
Sorry, this turned out to be kind of long in the end anyway. So, let me summarize. In my opinion, the statement by the IDF should have gone something like this:

'We were destroying terrorist tunnels intended to be used to kill Israelis. There was no intention on our part to kill those senior Islamic Jihad figures at this time. But we are extremely pleased that we have. With any luck, we will have the opportunity to repeat this achievement soon – but on purpose this time. Thank you.'
Tsunami in the Arab world

One interview in which I told the truth to Arab viewers in their own language has caused a veritable tsunami on the Arab street.

The most popular program on the Qatari-based channel al Jazeera is a weekly debate broadcast Tuesdays at 9p.m called "The Opposite Direction," in which two people of diametrically opposite views on a current political issue are pitted against one another. The anchor, Dr. Faisal al-Qassem, a Syrian Druze, tries to heat up the atmosphere so as to provoke his guests into carrying on a shouting match with one another. There have been instances where guests who were present in the studio attacked one another physically, while sometimes the participants are in different countries and their opinions are beamed live by satellite.

The program is produced by an independent broadcasting company owned by al-Qassem, not by Al Jazeera itself, and is sold to the channel as a finished product. Faisal al-Qassem decides on the participants and edits the program as he wishes to – and if once in a while things are said which do not suit the agenda of Al Jazeera, the Qatari channel chalks that up to its motto: "Opinions - and other opinions."

I received an invitation to participate in the program broadcast on December 12, dealing with President Donald Trump's declaration recognizing Jerusalem as Israel's capital city, an act condemned in the entire Arab and Islamic world. This is not surprising since the declaration grants international recognition to the country that the majority of Arabs and Muslims would like to see erased from the face of the earth.

On the program, I declared that my people, the Jews, monotheists worshipping the One and Only Creator, have been in Jerusalem for 3000 years, establishing their capital city while Muslim antecedents were still drinking wine and hard liquor, burying females alive and worshipping idols. Later on, when the moderator asked if I am not apprehensive about the effect of Trump's declaration on the possibility of a peace process, I told him that the Arab
What riled viewers the most was when I took a verse from the Quran "You (Muslims), the best nation among mankind" and changed one word, saying: "You (Muslims) are the worst nation among mankind." And I continued: "Who wants to talk to you? The Arab world is a failure, the Islamic world is a failure, mired in blood, fire and tears." The other guest, Sheikh Abed Al-Rachman Koki, a Syrian Islamist whose opinions are somewhere between Hamas and al-Qaeda, manifested a profound ignorance on the subject of the history of the Land of Israel and the Jewish people.

From the morning following the broadcast, Arab media are fulminating over the fact that I was invited to the program and over the things I said on it. There have been tens of articles in newspapers and on websites, endless comments on media broadcasts, thousands of posts on Facebook and Twitter, a few supporting me, but most expressing their fury at me about the things I said, at al Jazeera for broadcasting them and at Faisal al-Qassem for inviting me.

The Al Khaleej newspaper, published in the Persian Gulf area, included an article by Dr. Abdallah Al-Savitchi titled: "Oh, al Jazeera, are we really the worst nation?" in which he attacks the moderator, Faisal al-Qassem for favoring the Israeli over the Muslim guest. He may be right, because one of the questions Al-Kassam asked the Sheikh was the barbed "So what are you doing about liberating Jerusalem? Launching Twitter missiles? Facebook bombs?"

Interspersed in the program were clips taken from speeches made by today's leader of Arab anti-Israel sentiments, Hassan Nasrallah, contrasting his enthusiasm when talking about Hezbollah's intervention in Syria with his calm tones when speaking about Israel. He called for using every kind of weapon against Syrian rebel forces, but when it came to Israel, called for using social media.

One of the small group who supported my words, tweeted: "That Israeli S.O.B. is right, we are a very problematic people for sure." Another wrote that "the violence and slaughter that have infected us in the name of Islam (read ISIS) are our problem, not Israel's."

That, however, is the exception, not the rule. Arab media are filled with the opposite message, and someone, probably a Palestinian Arab, sent me the following Facebook message: "Are you really a researcher in the field of the Arab and Islamic world? I think that's a bit much, and I believe you are really a despicable spy who earns his living at the expense of those suffering in the region. The stereotype of the Jews among the nations of the world has not altered. The Jew is still an opportunist, liar, and coward, who assumes a false mask of righteousness and confuses us all. The Jew loves money and gives up his life, honor, and everything he has to acquire it. Rest assured, Mordechai, that your presence on Palestinian land is temporary and your exit from that land is inevitable according to the laws of international physics. Your temporary presence in Palestine is only due to the Crusaders, whose interests you served. You are merely a function of the historical period and once the reasons for your appearance in our country disappear, you will as well... Know well, Mordechai, that the curse of Allah will follow you along with the curses of all of Mankind. Every country in the world hates you, all are repelled by you and hope to see you eliminated as soon as possible - because they know you well, even though today they go along with you and agree with you temporarily. Your heretic politics and mendacious claims of ownership over Palestine are the continuation of your religious heresy (when you rejected Mohammed). You had no real existence in the past and therefore you will have none in the future. And if you are betting on the Arab regimes and their role in strengthening your presence in Palestine, you are leaning on a slim reed and will fail - absolutely. You know very well that your real enemy is not the Arab world but the Palestinians, they are your everlasting curse, one that will follow you for hundreds of years until the Day of Judgement. Shame on you, Mordechai, because you are Jewish."
opposition coming from the chief anchorman, Jamal Rian, who is also responsible for content. He is a 64-year-old Palestinian Arab born in Tul Karem, raised in Jordan and rumored to have been active in the Muslim Brotherhood, the reason King Hussein banished him from Jordan. Rian turned to Qatar, was a member of the group that established al Jazeera and was the first to broadcast in November 1996, when the station went on the air for the first time.

Jamal Rian interviewed me on the news program he presented on July 1, 2008, Jerusalem Day eve, and asked about Israeli construction in Jerusalem. We argued back then on the rights of Jews to build in the city that has been their capital for 3000 years – when, as I said to him, Muslim forbears were drinking the wine forbidden by Islam, burying their daughters alive and worshipping idols. He never invited me back and it seems he does not want to see me on al Jazeera again. That explains his opposition to my appearance on al-Qassem’s program, but, as I mentioned earlier, that program is produced in a broadcasting studio run by the moderator, who insisted on airing the show as is.

The media storm has not yet abated, and as a result, I have come to a clear conclusion: Israel must find people who are fluent in literary Arabic and knowledgeable in the fields of Arab history, culture and Islam – people confident enough to get their point across – who can face the Arab media and public on their own turf. If Israel wants to be accepted in the Middle East, it must radiate power, steadfastness, and knowledge, because this is what the Middle East respects and understands.

Someone willing to give up his house, land, and rights is seen as a a lowly weakling in the Middle East, worthy of being kicked straight to oblivion. If Israel wants to live in peace with its neighbors, it must radiate strength and a firm belief in the justice of its cause where the Arab public can hear it. Only then will it gain respect and be left alone.

Translated from Hebrew by Rochel Sylvetsky
An inside look at Israel’s Christian minority

More than 170,000 Christians live in Israel, representing some 2% of the population, according to Central Bureau of Statistics data published Sunday.

At the end of 2016, 78.6% of Israeli Christians were Christian Arabs. The rest were Christians who immigrated to Israel with their families under the Law of Return. Most of them arrived during the wave of mass immigration from Eastern Europe in the 1990s after the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989.
Christian Arab mothers.

The average number of children under the age of 17 in Israeli Christian families was 1.8, and in Christian Arab families 2.0, which is less than the comparative levels in the Jewish community (2.4) and the Muslim community (2.8).

A total of 26,787 Christian pupils studied in grade schools and high schools, some 1.6% of all students.

Of all Christian Arab twelfth graders, 73.9% were eligible to receive matriculation certificates (Bagrut).

A high proportion (66.2%) of Israeli Christian 12th grades who took the matriculation exams earned scores high enough to make them eligible for university-standard studies, as opposed to 51.9% of Israeli Druze, 41% of Israeli Muslims and 55.1% of Israeli Jews.

More than two-thirds (68.5%) of Christians aged 15 and above participated in the workforce in 2016.
The UN breached its own Charter in vote against Trump on Jerusalem

The UN reached a new legal low when it violated three articles in its own Charter by voting against the US President’s decision to recognize Jerusalem as Israel’s capital.

Article 2(7):
"Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the Members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter; but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under Chapter VII."

President Trump’s decisions to recognize Jerusalem as Israel’s capital and move the US Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem were made in accordance with the Jerusalem Embassy Act passed on 24 October 1995 by the Senate 93-5 and the House 374-37.
The UN breached its own Charter in vote against Trump on Jerusalem - Israel National News

Article 12(1):
“While the Security Council is exercising in respect of any dispute or situation the functions assigned to it in the present Charter, it must make any recommendation with regard to that dispute or situation unless the Security Council so requests.”

The Security Council had considered the situation brought about by President Trump’s decisions three days prior to the General Assembly meeting - when a draft UN Security Council resolution rejecting US policy shift on Jerusalem was vetoed by the United States.

The General Assembly was not empowered to make any recommendations whilst the Security Council remained seized of the issue - unless the Security Council requested the General Assembly to so act - which was not the case.

The General Assembly’s Resolution was passed in breach of Article 12(1).

Article 80(1):
“... nothing in this Chapter shall be construed in or of itself to alter in any manner the rights whatsoever of any states or any peoples or the terms of existing international instruments to which Members of the United Nations may respectively be parties.

This article preserves the legal right of the Jewish people to reconstitute the Jewish National Home in Jerusalem in accordance with the Mandate for Palestine – unanimously endorsed by all 51 member States of the League of Nations in 1922.

50 of those League of Nations member States are members of the United Nations and voted on the Resolution as follows:

11 abstained:
Argentina, Australia, Canada, Colombia, Czech Republic, Haiti, Latvia, Panama, Paraguay, Poland and Romania,

1 did not vote:
El Salvador,

2 Voted against the Resolution:
Guatemala and Honduras

36 voted for the Resolution:
Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, India, Iran, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Uruguay, United Kingdom, Venezuela,

The votes of these 36 States delimited the legal rights of the Jewish people that their very own respective countries had been instrumental in creating in 1922.
Funding is generally granted by two types of donors:

**Government Funders**

- **Foreign governments**: Many Western countries see the promotion and upholding of human rights and providing of humanitarian aid as part of their foreign policy. Funding for these purposes is channeled through embassies, foreign ministries, departments and ministries of international aid and development, consulates, and aid agencies and programs.

- **Regional/international bodies**: The EU, UN, and the Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law Secretariat are fully funded by governments and have their own disbursement mechanisms for human rights and humanitarian aid purposes, which generously fund Israeli NGOs.

- **Indirect government funding**: Governments provide sums estimated in the range of hundreds of millions of euros per years to external bodies, including humanitarian aid organizations, Christian groups, and various funds and foundations for the non-governmental groups to promote human rights and humanitarian aid. In certain cases, these entities are also funded almost entirely by governments.

**Private Funding**

- **Private foundations**: Some non-profits that provide funds to NGOs have their own endowments, from which they disburse according to their objectives; others serve as a conduit for donations from private individuals.

- **Private donors**: Private individuals in Israel and abroad (including bequests) also directly donate to Israeli NGOs.

Due to unclear, partial, and misspelled reporting, initially NGO Monitor could definitively categorize only 68% of the grants listed in the annual reports. After intensive research and crosschecking, NGO Monitor has succeeded in categorizing 99% of donors as either private or governmental.

**Methodology**

The NGOs examined meet all of the following criteria:

- Politically active in the Arab-Israeli conflict.
- Registered in Israel as a non-profit association (Amuta) or as a corporation for the public benefit, and report their income annually.
- Received at least one (direct or indirect) grant from a foreign government.
- Conduct a considerable part of their activities abroad, including: involvement in the Goldstone Report (following the 2008-2009 Gaza

---

2 “The Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law Secretariat” is a joint government funding mechanism of Sweden, Switzerland, Denmark and Netherlands. This report defines this body as a separate foreign entity, similar to the EU and UN.
War); the Schabas/Davis Report (following the 2014 Gaza War); ICC campaigns; lobbying the EU, US and UN.

**Alternative Data Sources:** The vast majority of the grants and donations were taken from the annual reports as submitted by NGOs. In certain cases these reports were unavailable, and the data was taken from alternative sources such as quarterly or other submissions to the Israeli Registrar of Non-Profits.

**Chart 1**

**Annual Funding to 27 NGOs 2012-2014**

- Government: 169,728,500, 65%
- Private: 88,695,690, 34%
- Unclear: 2,698,335, 1%
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Donations by NGOs

Chart 2

NGOs by Government, Private and Unclear Funding

- Governments
- Private
- Missing / Unclear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donations Range</th>
<th>NGOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 - Numbers and Percentage by NGOs, in New Israeli Shekels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B’tselem</td>
<td>19,401,903 (64.7%)</td>
<td>10,562,839 (35.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>29,964,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Association for Civil Rights in Israel (ACRI)</td>
<td>11,284,904 (39.6%)</td>
<td>16,816,456 (59.1%)</td>
<td>375,001 (1.3%)</td>
<td>28,476,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicians for Human Rights (PHR-I)</td>
<td>12,083,000 (51.1%)</td>
<td>11,477,000 (48.5%)</td>
<td>92,000 (0.4%)</td>
<td>23,652,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HaMoked</td>
<td>15,927,680 (85.3%)</td>
<td>2,752,189 (14.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,679,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbis for Human Rights (RHR)</td>
<td>7,940,503 (47.6%)</td>
<td>8,716,862 (52.2%)</td>
<td>35,273 (0.2%)</td>
<td>16,692,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yesh Din</td>
<td>15,288,125 (93.5%)</td>
<td>1,056,714 (6.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,344,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adalah</td>
<td>9,178,632 (58.9%)</td>
<td>6,402,284 (41.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,580,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bimkom</td>
<td>10,735,990 (79.4%)</td>
<td>2,782,809 (20.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,518,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents Circle</td>
<td>7,181,135 (68.1%)</td>
<td>3,288,342 (31.2%)</td>
<td>76,564 (0.7%)</td>
<td>10,546,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking the Silence</td>
<td>6,676,215 (68.8%)</td>
<td>2,738,195 (28.2%)</td>
<td>296,269 (3.1%)</td>
<td>9,710,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ir Amim</td>
<td>5,653,888 (62.6%)</td>
<td>3,380,290 (37.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,034,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossowa</td>
<td>7,114,063 (83.0%)</td>
<td>798,165 (9.3%)</td>
<td>658,096 (7.7%)</td>
<td>8,570,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Public Committee against Torture (PCATI)</td>
<td>7,433,530 (87.0%)</td>
<td>1,096,340 (12.8%)</td>
<td>14,116 (0.2%)</td>
<td>8,543,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gisha</td>
<td>4,684,475 (58.5%)</td>
<td>3,329,556 (41.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,014,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Now</td>
<td>5,914,263 (80.6%)</td>
<td>1,420,896 (19.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,335,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comet ME</td>
<td>4,029,582 (63.2%)</td>
<td>2,343,279 (36.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,372,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zochrot</td>
<td>3,934,263 (80.0%)</td>
<td>880,367 (17.9%)</td>
<td>102,873 (2.1%)</td>
<td>4,917,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition of Women for Peace (CWP)</td>
<td>3,958,001 (80.5%)</td>
<td>948,967 (19.3%)</td>
<td>9,597 (0.2%)</td>
<td>4,916,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machsom Watch</td>
<td>1,448,559 (41.4%)</td>
<td>2,047,378 (58.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,495,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial Jerusalem</td>
<td>2,494,750 (91.2%)</td>
<td>11,618 (0.4%)</td>
<td>229,370 (8.4%)</td>
<td>2,735,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Social TV</td>
<td>1,225,884 (44.9%)</td>
<td>1,505,070 (55.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,730,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabeel</td>
<td>1,080,919 (42.0%)</td>
<td>1,480,440 (57.5%)</td>
<td>14,493 (0.6%)</td>
<td>2,575,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights Defenders Fund (HRDF)</td>
<td>1,664,307 (75.1%)</td>
<td>553,042 (24.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,217,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emek Shave</td>
<td>1,803,351 (90.2%)</td>
<td>149,447 (7.5%)</td>
<td>46,911 (2.3%)</td>
<td>1,999,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combatants for Peace</td>
<td>426,159 (26.1%)</td>
<td>505,067 (31.0%)</td>
<td>700,060 (42.9%)</td>
<td>1,631,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Profile</td>
<td>999,019 (62.8%)</td>
<td>543,909 (34.2%)</td>
<td>47,712 (3.0%)</td>
<td>1,590,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>972 Magazine</td>
<td>169,728,500 (88.9%)</td>
<td>88,895,690 (87.0%)</td>
<td>2,698,335</td>
<td>261,122,525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2 – Funding by Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding by Areas/International Bodies</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europeans States (Including outside the EU)</td>
<td>129,287,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>28,196,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>6,267,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>5,584,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Canada, Israel, New-Zealand etc')</td>
<td>392,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>261,122,525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 3 – Government Funding by State in Descending order**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country / Body</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Country / Body</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>28,196,067</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>5,289,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>27,661,366</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>5,204,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>23,618,655</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2,659,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>16,336,064</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1,731,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>13,105,574</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>794,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden, Netherlands, Denmark Switzerland</td>
<td>12,701,003</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>340,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>7,469,977</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>254,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>6,281,553</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>112,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>6,267,512</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>22,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>6,093,389</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>3,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>5,584,601</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>169,728,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Private funding from 6 major funds

Chart 5

NGO Funding from Private Sources

- Social Justice Fund: 3,053,521 (3%)
- Rockefeller Brothers Fund: 1,357,780 (2%)
- Open Society Institute: 6,394,453 (7%)
- New Israel Fund: 11,024,100 (12%)
- Sigrid Rausing Trust: 12,002,728 (14%)
- Moriah Fund: 3,274,800 (4%)
- Other: 51,588,308 (58%)
Church affiliated donors – Government and Private

Chart 6 – Churches

**Church Funding Versus Non-Church Funding 2012-2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gov't Church Funding</th>
<th>Private Church Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47,056,507</td>
<td>3,268,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church funding</td>
<td>50,325,109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Church funding</td>
<td>210,979,416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 – Government funded Church Aid societies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church NGO</th>
<th>Government Donor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EED</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>8,043,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bread for the World</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>4,886,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diakonia</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>3,834,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Aid</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>3,412,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misereor</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3,081,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEKS EPER</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>3,055,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broederlijk Delen</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>3,050,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordaid</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>3,041,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Church Aid</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2,378,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1,997,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trocaire</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1,746,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Relief Services</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1,575,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian Church Aid</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1,382,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerk in Actie</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1,037,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCFD</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>939,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Church Aid</td>
<td>Europe Union</td>
<td>779,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCO &amp; Kerk in Actie</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>777,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFOD</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>424,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Scotland</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>340,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Swedish Church</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>232,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caritas</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>225,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finn Church Aid</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>189,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caritas</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>143,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Vision</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>123,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United Church of Canada</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>112,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stichting Het Solidariets Fonds</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>70,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det Norske Menneskeretning Hetspond</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>68,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Francis on Sunday to become third pope to visit Rome’s main synagogue

While welcoming pope’s gestures, some Jews question Israel stance

Vatican’s recognition of Palestinian state has raised ire in Jerusalem, though top rabbi insists pontiff is greatly supportive of Jewish state

BY NICOLE WINFIELD | January 16, 2016, 5:10 pm

VATICAN CITY (AP) — Pope Francis on Sunday becomes the third pope to visit Rome’s main synagogue in a sign of continued Catholic-Jewish friendship that was highlighted by a recent Vatican declaration that it doesn’t support official efforts to convert the Jews.

But the visit also follows a series of developments that have upset some in the Jewish community, including a new Vatican treaty signed with the “state of Palestine” and Francis’s own words and deeds that have been interpreted by some as favoring the Palestinian political cause.

The chief rabbi of Rome, Riccardo Di Segni, said in an interview Friday that the papal visit is aimed at showing five decades of improving Christian-Jewish relations and interfaith harmony, at a time of Islamic extremist violence around the globe.

But he said some recent Vatican developments “cannot be so appreciated by the Jewish community.”

Earlier this month, a treaty went into effect regulating the life of the Catholic Church in the Palestinian territories. It was the first treaty the Holy See had signed with the “state of Palestine” after the UN General Assembly recognized Palestine in 2012.

Before that, in May last year, Francis privately told the visiting Palestinian leader, Mahmoud Abbas, that he was “a bit an angel of peace.” And a year before Francis began his visit to the region in Bethlehem, not Israel, and stopped his popemobile to pray at the security barrier Israel had built around the West Bank city.
Given all that, Jews welcomed a document issued by the Vatican last month tracing 50 years of improved relations following the Second Vatican Council’s “Nostra Aetate” declaration which, among other things, repudiated the centuries-old charge that Jews as a whole were responsible for the death of Christ.

In the new document, the Vatican went farther than “Nostra Aetate” or any subsequent Vatican statement making clear that Jews are in a salvific relationship with God and that the Catholic Church “neither conducts nor supports any specific institutional mission work directed towards Jews.”

“This document is very significant,” said Rabbi David Rosen of the American Jewish Committee, the Vatican’s longtime dialogue partner with the Jewish community who will attend Sunday’s visit as a representative of the chief rabbinate of Israel.

But Rosen, during the official Vatican launch of the document, pointed out the absence of any reference to Jews’ relationship with the land of Israel, or to the establishment of diplomatic relations between Israel and the Holy See in 1993. That development alone has paved the way for successive papal trips to Israel.

The absence is likely explained by the realpolitik of the Vatican’s diplomacy in the Middle East and the reality of the Catholic Church in the region, where Christians are a minority — and a persecuted minority at that.

Rosen, however, is certain that Francis recognizes the special relationship of world Jewry with Israel. Francis, whose longstanding friendship with the Jewish community in Argentina is well known, reportedly told a recent visiting Jewish delegation that attacks on the state of Israel amount to anti-Semitism.
"I think Pope Francis is even one step ahead of his predecessors in his understanding of the importance of the land of Israel for the Jewish people," Rosen said in a telephone interview. "That doesn't mean that within the Curia, even if sympathetic, there aren't those who still feel that there has to be an official caution that is required by manifold interests."

Di Segni, the chief rabbi of Rome, told reporters this week that he would underline the crucial link between Jews and Israel in his speech on Sunday. And while welcoming the theoretical declaration that the Catholic Church cannot support institutional efforts at converting Jews, he said he hoped Francis would provide "concrete signs" translating that during his synagogue visit.

Most of all, Di Segni said Sunday's visit would be an opportunity to show the continuity of Catholic-Jewish friendship at a time when the world is confronting a spate of religiously inspired violence.

"We are living in very difficult times, facing a wave of violence and hatred and destruction of society based and inspired by distorted visions of religion," he said. "So the aim of this visit should be to demonstrate that different religions — that must be different — can live together in good harmony and work together for the good of the society."

Copyright 2016 The Associated Press. All rights reserved.
ROME — Pope Francis made his first visit to a synagogue as pontiff Sunday, greeting Rome’s Jewish community in their house of worship as his two predecessors did in a show interfaith friendship at a time of religiously-inspired violence around the globe.

During a visit marked by tight security and historic continuity, Francis also rejected all forms of anti-Semitism and called for “maximum vigilance” and early intervention to prevent another Holocaust.

Francis joined a standing ovation when Holocaust survivors wearing striped scarves reminiscent of their camp uniforms were singled out for attention at the start of the ceremony.

Francis began his visit laying a wreath at a plaque outside the synagogue marking where Roman Jews were rounded up by the Nazis in 1943 and at another marking the slaying of a 2-year-old boy in an attack by Palestinians on the synagogue in 1982.

He met with members of the boy’s family and survivors of the attack before entering the synagogue, the seat of the oldest Jewish community in the Diaspora.

Evoking “the unbreakable bond between Jews and Christians,” the pope delivered a message of peace.

"Violence against men is in contradiction with any religion worthy of the name, and in particular the big monotheist religions," he said.

The visit comes amid a spate of Islamic extremist attacks in Europe, Africa and elsewhere, and Francis was expected to denounce all violence committed in the name of God as he has done on several occasions.
"The hatred that comes from racism and bias or worse which uses God's name or words to kill deserves our contempt and our firm condemnation," Ruth Dureghello, president of the Rome's Jewish community, said in introductory remarks.

Francis' visit is meant to continue the tradition of papal visits that began with St. John Paul II in 1986 and continued with Benedict XVI in 2010. It also highlighted the 50th anniversary of the landmark shift in Christian-Jewish relations that was represented by the Second Vatican Council.

The council document “Nostra Aetate” revolutionized the Catholic Church's relations with Jews by among other things repudiating the centuries-old charge that Jews as a whole were responsible for the death of Christ.

The Argentine Jesuit has a longstanding friendship with the Jewish community in Argentina from his time as archbishop of Buenos Aires.