The Two State solution (TSS) is dead but rather than bury it, the US and the EU want to embalm it, in the off chance that it can be brought to life in a decade or two. In the meantime they are doing their utmost to prevent Israel from building Jewish homes east of the armistice lines, including in Jerusalem. They do this in knowing violation of Israel’s rights.

Moshe Arens, a former Israel Ambassador to the US, Israel Defense Minister and Minister of Defense, noted in Haaretz Israel’s version of the New York Times:

“These critics (of settlement construction) should be required to reread Article 6 of the League of Nations Mandate for Palestine, which states: “the Administration of Palestine ... shall encourage ... close settlement by Jews on the land, including State lands and waste lands not required for public purposes.” The “Palestine” referred to here is the entire area west of the Jordan River, including Judea and Samaria.

“Those who prefer to believe that this provision has lost relevance since the establishment of the United Nations and the termination of the League of Nations Palestine Mandate should refer to Article 80 of Chapter XII of the UN Charter. It states that the rights shall not be altered "of any states or any peoples or the terms of existing international instruments to which Members of the United Nations may respectively be parties."

The United States chose not to join the League of Nations, but the U.S. Senate ratified the Palestine Mandate in 1925.

The EU and the US justify these actions on the alleged basis that settlements are illegal or illegitimate, respectively, pursuant to the Fourth Geneva Convention (FGC), which prohibits forced transfers of populations.

Israel on the other hand argues that the FGC doesn’t apply and that even if it did, it doesn’t prevent Jews from building east of the armistice lines and in this case the movement is entirely voluntary. Recently, the Israel Foreign Ministry, published a document which affirmed the legality of settlements. This document was sent to all of her embassies informing all personnel to make the case, publicly, for their illegality.

The legal niceties of Israel’s position are set out in The Truth About The Occupation and The Settlements.

The US and the EU are not content to just strong-arm Israel to prevent Jewish construction. They are also backing illegal Arab construction in Area C contrary to the Oslo Accords to which both were witnesses. Regavim, an Israel NGO recently reported that in one area alone between Maaleh Adumim, an Israeli town of 37,000 inhabitants, and Jerusalem that over 1000 such structures have been illegally built by the Arabs and encouraged and funded by the EU.
Aside from this clearly illegal activity on the part of the EU, the EU is demanding that all products built by Jews in Judea and Samaria be so labelled so that their "West Bank" origin is fully noted. Israel considers this to be a boycott move and discriminatory, and argues that the EU does not require such labelling in any other place it considers to be in occupation.

The US, under the radar, has also boycotted the territories acquired by Israel in a defensive war in 1967.

Indeed, in 1985, the late Senator Jesse Helms of North Carolina questioned the Second Reagan Administration about its allocation of funds for Israel: "It is my understanding that when foreign assistance funds are disbursed to Israel, the U.S. Government requires Israel to sign a stipulation that none of the funds will be used for settlements on the West Bank. Is that correct?"

The State Department answered bluntly:

The stipulation requiring that foreign assistance funds provided to Israel only be used in the geographic areas which were subject to the Government of Israel's administration prior to June 5, 1967, has been the policy of every Administration since 1967.

In effect the EU and the US are doing exactly what they are preventing Israel from doing, namely putting facts on the ground. In supporting illegal Arab building in Area C they are violating the terms of the Oslo Accords. In preventing Israel from building they are preventing Israel from exercising her rights.

Israel's official position is that she is ready to negotiate the Two State Solution without preconditions. The Palestinian Authority (PA) will have none of it as they do not wish to make any concessions to Israel. Instead that are working on the international community to recognize Palestine with 1967 lines as their western border.

Lately, Abbas has threatened to disband the PA and hand the keys to Israel. Others have suggested that the PA is on its last legs. In response Prime Minister Netanyahu held a cabinet meeting to discuss the potential fall of the PA. It was decided to support the PA so it wouldn't fall. In addition they discussed what actions Israel should take if it did fall.

Abbas was quick to say that the PA is here to stay and will be followed by a Palestinian state. Nevertheless, In an interview with Israel public television, he explained what the PA had in mind when it talked about "dismantling" the PA.

A senior member of the Palestine Liberation Organization and the Fatah Central Committee told Al-Monitor on condition of anonymity that Abbas may be forced to make good on the warning given in his speech to the UN General Assembly Sept. 30 and pass responsibility over the West Bank to Israel as the occupying power.

This new approach/possibility of handing over the responsibility for "West Bank" security and civilian affairs to Israeli means first and foremost moving the Fatah leadership headquarters from Ramallah to Cairo or to Amman. It also means the dismantlement of the separation into Areas A, B and C, as Israel would regain full civil and security control.

The source detailed other key elements: Palestinian security cooperation with Israel would come to an end; and instead of assisting the PA directly, international aid would be channeled to Palestinian nongovernmental organizations and refugee camps in coordination with the Palestinian leadership abroad.

In parallel, he said, the UN General Assembly would pass a resolution by September 2016 declaring the "West Bank" a Palestinian state based on the 1967 lines under Israeli occupation. Such a drastic change would have grave repercussions on the region. There is little doubt that within such a scenario, a violent full-fledged intifada would break out.

At the moment the Oslo Accords benefits Israel, not the PA, as it gives Israel full control over Area C. Thus it legitimates the occupation. With the abrogation of the Accords, it will become necessary to replace it with another blueprint.

Netanyahu has consistently said that he is interested in a two-state solution with a demilitarized Palestinian state, conditioned on the recognition of the Jewish State of Israel and with stringent security measures throughout the "West Bank." He also wants to keep the settlement blocs.

Netanyahu also believes that now is the wrong time to move in that direction, as the entire region faces the threat of fundamentalist terror groups such as the Islamic State (IS), al-Qaeda, Hezbollah and Hamas. The Israeli public agrees with him.

Meanwhile there is a growing movement in Israel calling for Israeli sovereignty over all or at least part of Area C. The debate is over what Israel should do with the Arabs living in Judea and Samaria (West Bank): either offer them a path to citizenship (Caroline Glick and Michael Wise), offer them generous compensation to emigrate (Martin Sherman and Moshe Feiglin) or give them autonomy of an enlarged Area A where they live much like what they have now (Naftali Bennett).
President Obama made a big mistake trying to force a Palestinian state based on the '67 lines subject to swaps. From Israel's point of view such a solution disfigures the legal rights she has and requires her to expel hundreds of thousands of Jews who have lived in Judea and Samaria for decades.

UNSC Res 242, passed just after the '67 War, provided for:

"Withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict;"

"Termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force."

In effect it did not require Israel to withdraw from all territories and gave her the right to insist on "secure and recognized boundaries." The '67 lines are anything but.

In summary, the negotiations are over but the fight continues. The US, EU and the UN are backing the murderous PA. Israel stands alone.
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O! Jerusalem

It is not so much that the world wants Jerusalem — after all it was a wasteland and backwater location for many centuries whether under Christian or Moslem rule — it is simply that the world does not want the Jews to have Jerusalem.

The Jewish people and the world generally were witness this past week to yet another fulfillment of a biblical prophecy. The prophet said that a day will come when all of the nations — or at least a sizable portion of them — will attack Jerusalem and attempt to dislodge the Jewish people from their capital city and its holy environs. 128 nations voted for a UN General Assembly resolution denying the right of Israel and the Jewish people to claim Jerusalem as its capital.

Among the nations that voted for this resolution were the usual culprits — dictators, slaveholders, warmongers and many others of this ilk. And naturally the hypocritical democracies of Europe never have been able to overcome their anti-Jewish bias, developed over centuries of persecution and discrimination against Jews also supported this nefarious resolution.

There were countries, led by the United States of America, who voted against the resolution and spoke up about its bias and impracticality. In the long view of history those nations who defended Jewish rights eventually were blessed for their wisdom and kindness. The United States of America is the world's leading democracy and with all of its warts and faults remains a shining beacon of fairness and opportunity for individuals all over the world.

Supporting Israel's claim to Jerusalem is just simply choosing right over wrong and realistic history over illusory plans and policies. The United States committed its error in supporting an anti-Israel resolution last year under the Obama administration. And it made good on its policy of long-standing to protect Israel from these continued efforts by the United Nations to undermine its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

There is no use arguing this matter logically or even realistically. It matters little to the world that Jerusalem, for the first time in many centuries, is free for worship to all Faiths and
There is absolutely no logical explanation for this position but there it is anyway. The terrible virus of anti-Semitism affects all attitudes and positions regarding the state of Israel and certainly regarding Jerusalem. I certainly agree that there are religious difficulties for both the Christian and Moslem worlds regarding the status of Jerusalem as being a Jewish city and the capital of the state of Israel. However just as portions of the Christian clergy and Moslem nations have learned to live with the reality of the existence of the state of Israel – itself a religious difficulty to the theology of these faiths – so too I am confident that they will be able to adjust to the fact that Jerusalem is the capital of the Jewish state. Reality eventually affects beliefs and previously held opinions, even those that were once represented as being sacred and immutable.

The city of Jerusalem itself is thriving as perhaps never before in its long and turbulent history. The population is at an all-time high and every neighborhood in the city is experiencing new construction and refurbishment. The light rail system has proven to be a success and the good old green Egged buses are still plying their routes more or less in an orderly fashion and on a scheduled timeline.

The city has enjoyed an economic upturn and its government has improved many of the services, quietly and without boastful fanfare. The Arab citizens of Jerusalem – they are a little more than 30% of the population here - enjoy a standard of living and opportunity unmatched anywhere else in the Middle East:

Yet, this means nothing regarding the attitude of much of the world as far as Israel and Jerusalem is concerned.

The United Nations resolution, shameful as it is, is nevertheless nonbinding and non-enforceable. It is another one of the paper propaganda victories that the Palestinian Authority revels in, which brings them no closer to a state of their own, which by now most of us suspect they really don’t want.
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Op-Ed: How many Arab refugees were there in 1948? Maybe 300,000 - or less

The inflated number of third generation refugees claimed by Arabs and the UN started with an inflated number in 1948.

Most serious students of the history of Palestine would accept that the number of Arab refugees from Israel during and after 1948 claimed by Arab and UN sources—some 500,000 to 750,000—was exaggerated. It is very easy to make that estimate and many have already done it. — Yehoshua Porath

It is a common misconception that around 650,000 Palestinian refugees were created because of fighting that took place in 1948. But a closer look at both the population data and statements made by UN officials at the time suggest that the true figure is much lower, possibly as low as 270,000.

The conventional figure of 650,000 cannot be true for more than one reason. Firstly, there were fewer than 660,000 Arabs living in the part of Palestine that eventually became Israel: and secondly, UNRWA (the United Nations Relief and Works Agency), either through incompetence or deliberate manipulation, handed out multiple identity cards to the same persons, some of whom were not refugees at all but permanent residents who took advantage of the aid offered by UNRWA. This is attested by UNRWA officials.

Before taking a look at UNRWA’s role in the invention of the Palestinian refugee problem, it is worthwhile examining the population data of Eretz Israel/Palestine prior to the 1948 Arab-Israeli War.

The Statistical Abstract of Palestine in 1944-45 set the figure for the total Arab population living in what would become the Jewish-settled territories at 570,800. Another set of figures based on a census taken in 1944 suggests there were 696,000 Arabs living in what would become Israeli-controlled territory. Tsvi Misinai, an Israeli researcher and historian, believes the figure to be even lower. He believes that prior to the 1948 war, there were 390,000 Arabs living in areas that would fall into Israeli hands. (None of these figures include the number of Arab Palestinians residing in east Jerusalem, Gaza and Judea-Samaria. Figures vary, but the number of Arabs in those areas was probably 600,000, which brings the total number of Arabs residing between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean Sea to 1.2 million).

According to Misinai, there were in excess of 120,000 Arabs inside Israel’s borders by the end of the war, although most commentators believe the figure to be 160,000 or 170,000. (The discrepancy becomes less glaring when Israel’s repatriation of 20,000 Palestinian Arab refugees from Jordan is taken into account). This means that the number of Palestinian Arabs displaced from areas that came under Israeli control cannot be higher than 270,000.

Of the 270,000, most has ended up in neighbouring Arab countries, with the rest having fled to Judea-Samaria and Gaza. Around 4,000 had voluntarily moved from west Jerusalem into houses abandoned in east Jerusalem. During the course of the war, 77,000 Arabs (mostly Bedouin) returned to their homes in what would become Israeli territory. As the war went on, another 81,000 Palestinians fled, 24,000 of which had already fled and returned, only to flee again. By the war’s end, there were 270,000 Palestinian Arabs who had lost their homes and their land.

At first glance, this seems a rather low figure. A report submitted by the UN mediator Count Folke Bernadotte suggested that the number of Palestinian refugees totalled 330,000. Other contemporary reports put the number at around 424,000. Either way, it is statistically impossible for there to have been more than 430,000 genuine Palestinian Arab refugees from the 1948 war. This is the view of Dr Walter Pinner, who bases his figures on reliable census data carried out in the mid-1940s.
So we have a situation where no less than 270,000 and no more than 430,000 Palestinian refugees were created by the 1948 war. Minniti’s suggestion of 270,000 can be attributed to his rather low starting figure of 390,000 Arabs who resided in pre-state Israel. Perhaps if one takes into account the Arab migrants and citrus farm workers who had gone back to their country of origin, there may be a case for a final figure of 270,000. Plus, a reliable study undertaken in the mid-1960s suggests the figure of 270,000 may be close to the mark (more on this later).

Many books and websites quote a figure of 650,000 when discussing the number of Palestinian refugees created by the 1948 conflict. How did the figure of 650,000 arise?

One explanation is the attested fact that in the aftermath of the conflict, refugees were counted more than once. In order to receive extra funding, many refugees identified themselves twice before UNRWA officials. As a result, they received more than one identity card. One of the camp workers in Lebanon stated, “We try to count them, but they are coming and going all the time; or we count them in Western clothes, then they return in abaya and keffiyeh and we count the same ones again.”

This was not the only fraud committed by the refugees. Another was the concealment of natural deaths so that families could continue to collect the deceased person’s food. Births, however, were always registered. In 1951, UNRWA reported that “it is still not possible to give an absolute figure of the true number of refugees as understood by the working definition of the word.” A reason given by UNRWA for the erratic data was that the refugees “eagerly report births and reluctantly report deaths.” According to the July 23, 1955 edition of the Cairo-based Mideast Mirror, “There are refugees who hold as many as 500 ration cards, 499 of them belonging to refugees long dead… There are dealers in UNRWA food and clothing and ration cards to the highest bidder.”

Fraudulent claims were made regarding the number of dependents. It was alleged that refugees would “hire” children from other families at census time. In 1950, UNRWA director Howard Kennedy said that “fictitious names on the ration lists pertain to refugees in this area […] it is alleged that it is a common practice for refugees to hire children from other families at census time.”

The situation in Jordan was especially difficult because western Jordan was already populated by Arab Palestinians, so distinguishing a refugee from a non-refugee was particularly arduous. An UNRWA official noted that the Jordan ration lists alone “are believed to include 150,000 illegibles and many persons who have died.” A similar situation arose in Lebanon. In a 1950 report to the UN General Assembly, the director of UNRWA noted that “many Lebanese nationals along the Palestinian frontier habitually worked most of the year on the farms or in the citrus groves of Palestine. With the advent of war they came back across the border and claimed status as refugees.” UNRWA conceded that up to 129,000 Lebanese workers may have falsely claimed Palestinian refugee status.

In fact, this developed into a widespread trend. Because the UNRWA refugee camps were better than standard housing, some non-refugee residents of Judea-Samaria and Gaza declared themselves refugees in order to gain access to food, as well as medical and educational benefits. Many permanent residents of Judea-Samaria and Gaza came to carry both an UNRWA refugee card that had the address of a refugee camp and a regular ID card with their actual identity and address.

Another problem was the unrecorded movement of peoples, especially the Bedouin tribes who moved between Gaza and Judea-Samaria, and Gaza declared themselves refugees in order to gain access to food, as well as medical and educational benefits. Many permanent residents of Judea-Samaria and Gaza came to carry both an UNRWA refugee card that had the address of a refugee camp and a regular ID card with their actual identity and address.

By 1950, the UN disclosed that it was “not possible to give an absolute figure of the true number of refugees as understood by the working definition.” According to a report, the percentage of error in the UN statistics was “possibly as much as 50 per cent and represents a serious operational difficulty.”

Nonetheless, the UN kept revising its figures upwards because it pursued a maximalist position on who was a refugee, which ranged from a “needy person” who “has lost his home and means of livelihood” to persons whose normal place of residence was Palestine between June 1946 and May 1948. Even refugees who still had a house but who had lost all of their land were considered refugees. In addition, Arabs who had settled in Palestine illegally prior to 1948 were also given refugee status. No wonder the figures were artificially high.

In 1966, Dr. Walter Pinner identified a huge number of fraudulent refugee claims. Basing his findings on UNRWA’s own reports, he discovered that 484,000 refugees were Arabs from western Jordan and Gaza Strip; another 117,000 were unrecorded deaths; 109,000 were people who had been resettled in 1948 and were no longer refugees; and a further 225,000 had
subsequently settled elsewhere and become self-supporting. After subtracting the inauthentic claims, he concluded that there were 115,000 "old and sick" refugees, and 252,000 "other unsettled genuine refugees," totaling 367,000 legitimate refugees as of 1966.

Once the natural rate of increase between 1948 and 1966 has been subtracted, the number of genuine Palestinian refugees from 1948 cannot be much higher than 300,000. In which case, Tsvi Misnai's figure of 270,000 may not be far off the mark.

Significantly, UN Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold did not refute Dr. Pinner's findings, nor did he issue any corrections to Dr. Pinner's figures. He did, however, acknowledge receipt of Dr. Pinner's work, so it cannot be claimed that the UN wasn't aware of his analysis. It is probable that the UN, at least in private, agreed with Dr. Pinner's findings but did not want to admit that UNRWA had been defrauded of millions of dollars.

All told, the conventional figure of 600,500 Palestinian refugees from the 1948 conflict comes from the double counting of refugees, the non-recording of deaths, the vague and expansive use of the term 'refugee,' the counting of people who were not refugees, the counting of former refugees who had resettled elsewhere, and the untracked movement of peoples between Jordan, Gaza, Lebanon, and Judea-Samaria.

The implication is that many of today's Palestinian refugees actually derive from people who did not reside in Palestine at the time of the war or had lived there for only two years, which means more than half — possibly even two-thirds — of those who claim to be Palestinian refugees in 2016 are not descended from Palestinian refugees at all. (What is also galling is that the living conditions in the Palestinian refugee camps are much better than the conditions of their non-refugee Arab neighbours who do not receive international aid. Indeed, many of the Palestinian refugee camps are not camps at all, but are fully-functioning neighbourhoods.)

The Arab states themselves have been major players in the refugee fraud. Greed was one motivating factor because UNRWA money was, in effect, free money. In 1961 UNRWA director John H. David admitted that Arab countries overstated their refugee figures in the 1950s to get more funds. But the refugee crisis was useful for another reason. It was a way of exerting international pressure on the State of Israel to repatriate the so-called refugees, thereby demographically destroying the Jewish state. This explains why the Arabs didn't permanently rehouse the refugees in Judea-Samaria and Gaza, which were under Jordanian and Egyptian control respectively between 1949 and 1967.

The sordid history of the Palestinian refugee situation means the Israeli government must be extremely wary about compensating or repatriating Palestinians who claim to be refugees. Many of them are frauds or the descendants of frauds. If the Israeli government does decide to compensate or repatriate some of the refugees as part of a peace deal, then a detailed investigation needs to be conducted to ensure that only genuine claimants are assisted. In return, a wider compensation package is needed in which the descendants of Jews who lost their homes, savings and livelihoods in Nazi Europe (not just Germany) are compensated, and the Jews forced from Arab lands in the 1940s and 1950s are likewise recompensed. In addition, there needs to be some recognition that many Jews were killed and displaced in the 1948 war — a war instigated by an alliance of several Arab nations to destroy the Jewish homeland.

This article appeared on the author's blog.
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[Discussion and comments about the number of Arab refugees in 1948 and related historical perspectives and points of view.]
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Analysis of grants to Israeli NGOs, annual reports 2012-2014

All of the details on the grants in this report were taken directly from publicly available submissions to the Israeli Registrar of Non-Profits (a department of the Ministry of Justice), and no changes were made to the sums. Some NGOs list the same donors with slightly different names; in order to create an accessible and understandable database, NGO Monitor adjusted some entries to establish uniformity. For this reason we have also corrected typos and other spelling mistakes.

In light of the central role played by politicized NGOs in public discourse regarding human rights, an informed debate on their activities requires transparency in their funding. The following analysis presents all the grants that were reported annually by 27 Israeli NGOs in the years 2012-2014, and sorts the data according to donor type (private, government and unclear), while also identifying funding originating from church groups. (For the full list of grants click here.)

Main findings:

• In 2012-2014, the 27 NGOs received a total sum of NIS 261,122,525 in grants and donations. 65% (NIS 169,728,500) from governments (through direct and indirect funding) and 34% (NIS 88,695,690) from private donors and foundations, while the source remained unclear for the remaining 1% (NIS 2,698,335).

• Of the 27 groups examined, 20 receive more than 50% of their funding from governments. The three NGOs receiving the highest share of foreign government funding are Yesh Din (93.5%), Terrestrial Jerusalem (91.2%), and Emek Shaveh (90.2%).

• Twenty-one governmental and intergovernmental entities fund Israeli NGOs (this includes funding by the EU, UN and the Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law Secretariat- see below). The EU is the largest donor, providing NIS 28 million, followed by Norway and Germany.

• Of NIS 88,695,690 received in private funding, leading foundations are the Sigrid Rausing Trust (14%), the New Israel Fund (12%), the Open Society Institute (7%), the Moriah Fund (4%), the Social Justice Fund (3%), and the Rockefeller Brothers Foundation (2%).

• 19% (NIS 50,325,109) of the funding is donated by Christian groups (churches or Christian humanitarian aid organizations). Most of these institutions receive large sums of government funding. 5% of donations were given by private religious institutions and/or donors.

---

1 For more information on these foundations see: http://www.ngo-monitor.org.
Jerusalem belongs to the Jews: An Islamic truth

GANTA A. AHMED | JANUARY 26, 2018, 7:41 AM |

The Eternal City may never have been more contested than it is today. As many across the globe continue to challenge Israel’s right to claim Jerusalem as its capital, US Vice President Mike Pence’s delicate visit to the Middle East came at a critical time.

Palestinian rhetoric, triggered by US President Donald Trump’s announcement to move the US Embassy there from Tel Aviv, has been magnified by the President’s recent decision to sever $65 million in US aid to the Palestinians. Elsewhere in the region, the leaders of Egypt and Jordan, staunch US allies, must acknowledge Palestinian outrage without alienating the United States.

In his 2011 book, Jerusalem: The Biography, historian Simon Sebag Montefiore captures the theological mystery within which Jerusalem remains suspended, describing it as “the house of one God, the capital of two peoples, the temple of three religions, and she is the only city to exist twice — in heaven and on earth.”

But as a believing Muslim observing Islam, I am compelled by the Quran to support Israel’s sole claim to the Holy Land; the Quran says it is so.

The 80,000-word document 1.6 billion Muslims accept as the revealed word of God, the Quran, is categorical about the destiny of Israel and the people who can claim its ownership.

The Quran states: “Moses said to his people: O my people! Remember the bounty of God upon you when He bestowed prophets upon you, and made you kings and gave you that which had not been given to anyone before you amongst the nations. O my people! Enter the Holy Land which God has written for you, and do not turn tail, otherwise you will be losers.”

Nowhere does the Quran make mention of the Muslims’ claim to the Holy Land. Instead, God reveals in the Quran that The Holy Land is designated for the followers of Moses. Because the Promised Land is theirs according to the Quran, only the followers of Moses may determine where their capital must lie.
It is this Islamic truth that political Islamists vehemently deny.

Those who masquerade as Muslims

Fast-forward 1,300 years to the 21st Century and we find totalitarian Islamism – profoundly distinct from Islam – ensures a new anti-Semitism courses through the Muslim psyche.

Today’s Islamists cry ‘Islamophobia!’ when challenged on their ideology, arguing that calling it political totalitarianism amounts to anti-Muslim racism and bigotry. Indeed, the notion of Islamophobia is becoming so powerful a social construct that it is chilling public discourse even for Muslims who dare expose Islamism.

It is these convulsions that have shaped the global outcry against Jerusalem’s destiny as Israel’s capital. This outcry is not confined to Muslims but is spread throughout the wider world, as many glorify Islamists as a persecuted religious minority rather than the totalitarians they are.

In the process, those naïve of Islamism condemning the designation of Jerusalem as Israel’s capital (in the belief they are advocating for Palestinians), become willing instruments for an explicitly fascist ideology, an Islamism that seeks not an accommodation, or parallel statehood to Israel, but its figurative and literal annihilation.

In the Palestinian territories, as in many Muslim majority societies, Islamism is effectively ‘the other occupier’ — confining freedom of thought, critical analysis and educated scrutiny of Islam.

It’s time Muslims examined this other occupation of Islam by Islamism. In the guise of advocating for the Palestinian cause, many conceal or find socially accepted release for rabid yet sanitized anti-Semitism.

Unsurprisingly, arch-Islamists Hamas and Hezbollah, masquerading as Muslims, quickly announced ‘the Gates of Hell’ were to open in response to Trump’s recognition of Jerusalem as Israel’s capital. Hamas preachers in Gaza called for Palestinians to ‘rise up and stab Jews’.

One Muslim commentator echoed the sentiments of millions of Muslims around the world when he dismissed the Quranic declaration of Israel as the promised land for the Jews as irrelevant claiming, “The Quran is not a historical document.”

This is how far we Muslims have strayed.

Muslims in fervent anti-Semitism have abandoned all memory of what is confirmed as beloved and revered to us — the Torah and its followers, Moses and his message, and God’s own promise to his followers of sanctuary in a Promised Land.

This renunciation of what the Quran tells Muslims is an uncontestable truth today. Theological destiny for the Jews is at the root of the Middle East conflict; whether as Jews it is pursued, or by Muslims, it is denied.
The Holy Land which God has written for you

The Israel-Palestinian conflict is neither about politics nor Zionism, neither about borders nor land or water. It is not even about the fate of statehood for the Palestinians. It is about the central denial of an Islamic truth: the denial that the Jews are indeed People of the Book, that their path to God is divine and righteous, and that they are indeed, by divine writ, the inheritors of the Holy Land.

The scholarship of Islamic scholar Professor Khaleel Mohammed, professor of Religion at San Diego State University and member of SDSU's Center for Islamic and Arabic Studies is essential reading at this time. He writes that the Quran decrees that the Holy Land is destined for the Jewish people. He points out the Quranic use of the word, "written," as it conveys "finality, decisiveness and immutability." No mortal can overturn what has been written for another.

Muslim Author Tarek Fatah has noted in his 2010 book, *The Jew Is Not My Enemy: Unveiling the Myths that Fuel Muslim Anti-Semitism*, that the use of 'written' as divine and irrevocable decree occurs 22 times in the Quran.

Few Muslims may realize Moses is the most often mentioned figure in the Quran, mentioned more often than even the Prophet of Islam. The Quran portrays Moses as a great Messenger who displayed courage in the face of fear, overcoming his own vulnerabilities.

Yet today, millions of Muslims, under the influence of Islamism, pursue lethal hatred of Jews, abandoning the Quran itself. 2006 Pew research confirmed anti-Jewish sentiment remains overwhelmingly centered in predominantly Muslim Majority countries.

A genocidal hatred

Cosmic anti-Semitism (anti-Semitism pursued as a divine mission to combat a cosmic, not mortal, enemy) is kingpin to Islamist ideology. Islamism — a political totalitarianism masquerading as Islam — religionizes anti-Semitism, rendering the hatred of Jews as religious creed and perverse marker of devotion among Islamists today. In doing so, Muslims add to the ferocity and fanaticism of anti-Semitism, granting it dangerous — if false — religious legitimacy.

Lacking critical knowledge, and access to Islam free of Islamism, faith-illiterate Muslims (including the Middle East and North Africa Region and Western Europe) accept anti-Semitism as Islamic creed. All too often, the rest of the world follows suit.

It is only a short step to Holocaust denial which has also a marked presence in the Muslim majority world. More than 51 percent of Muslims surveyed said they believe the scale of Jews murdered in the Holocaust is greatly exaggerated. In the Middle East North African region this rises to 63 percent.
Islamists use Holocaust denial to garner grassroots support for delegitimizing Israel and to recruit Islamist “foot-soldiers” who are terrorist collaborators or operators. Because the Holocaust “wasn’t real,” Islamists argue, the state of Israel was created on “false pretenses.” Seeking de-legitimization with a view to full destruction of Israel quickly gains legitimacy.

This is the progeny of 20th century anti-Semitism mating with Muslim sensibilities. During Adolf Hitler’s rule over Nazi Germany, seeking to mobilize Muslim support for the Third Reich in the Middle East and North Africa, Nazi anti-Semitism was readily inoculated into the Muslim psyche and then expertly fomented by Arab nationalists as an instrument to reject European colonialism in the region.

Modern day Islamism – birthed by the Muslim Brothers in 1928 Egypt — has since incorporated a new anti-Semitism, a lethal genocidal hatred for all Judaica, all Jewry and Israel as a central tenet of belief. This blinds Muslims with a religionized anti-Semitism that prevents us from seeing that Islam has mandated Israel and its capital for the Jews.

As Muslims, we can be blind no more. Islam demands, we must see what is written.

---

Dr. Qanta A. Ahmed, MD, is a British American Muslim, author of In the Land of Invisible Women, member of the Council on Foreign Relations, and Next Generation Council Member of the University of Southern California’s Shoah Foundation Institute for Visual History and Education. @MissDiagnosis
The Arch of Titus and Saeb Erekat

Some questions for Mr. Erekat, who has asserted that his people have lived in the Land of Israel for thousands of years.

Recently, my wife and I visited Yeshiva University's museum on 16th St in NYC to see the Arch of Titus exhibit. We saw the museum's full-size 3-D computer recreation of the famous scene of the Jewish prisoners of war carrying the Temple relics (menorah, shulchan [table], trumpets) to Rome. We also saw the displayed collection of 20-30 coins of the Second Temple period, minted in Palestine, some by the Jews and some by the Romans.

In one small corner of a display case, I saw the "complete collection" of coins minted by non-Jewish Palestinian governments from 1917 back through the Byzantine period, the Arab (invaders from the Arabian Peninsula and the east) Period, the Roman period, the Greek period, the Persian period, the Jewish monarchy and before that.

The complete set of these coins minted by non-Jewish Palestinian authorities fits comfortably in one small corner of a display case because these coins do not exist and have never existed. There are no such coins. Zilch, zippo, nada, cero, efes, null, gornicht, nuttin. The empty set. There was never an identifiable, Arab Palestinian people, or a Palestinian ethnic identity until the mid-20th century when some Arab hate merchants realized that such a peoplehood and ethnic identity would be useful in opposing the national aspirations of the Jews.

Until the 20th century, "Palestine" was understood by Arabs to be a province in Greater Syria. From 1948 until 1967, Arabs in the part of Eretz Yisrael (the Land of Israel) living under Jordanian control were comfortable with Jordanian nationality and ethnicity. There was no problem in the Arab mind with Jordanian sovereignty on the West Bank of the Jordan River because everyone, Arab and non-Arab, knew that Jordan is Arab Palestine. The post World War I formation by the British of the country of Transjordan resulted in the first example of
thousands of years.

1. When the Romans invaded Judea/Palestine in the first century CE, did your Palestinian, non-Jewish - there were no Muslims then - ancestors a) fight alongside the Jews?, b) fight alongside the Romans?, or c) remain non-combatants like today's Quakers?

2. Since (as you assert) your ancestors were present in Palestine at the time of the Roman invasion, any choice above would have been significant. Why is it that not a single historian of that period mentions the choice that your ancestors made from the three alternatives above?

3. Do you share the belief that, until recently, the Jews never held sovereignty or even lived in Palestine?

If you are correct, how was it that Roman sculptors created a fictitious, Jewish-focused relief and chiseled it into the Arch of Titus? It is not credible that 1900 years ago, some early Italian Zionists paid those Roman sculptors to create a historical fraud and received permission to have it stand in Rome. How was it that no Roman writer mocked this historical fraud or mentioned it during the ensuing centuries?

Do you believe that an element in that relief, a 7- branched candelabrum (we call it a menorah), a relic from our ancient Temple, is really a lighting fixture from some pre-Muhammad Palestinian tavern? If your non-Jewish ancestors were in Palestine at that time, they probably frequented taverns or beer halls at night after work to drink liquor and eat ham sandwiches on pita. Obviously, they would have needed illumination there. We both agree that in the first century CE Muhammad had not yet been born so he had not yet provided humanity with his revelation which outlawed alcohol, pork, graven images, etc.

4. If Yassir Arafat, who was born and raised in Egypt, can be a Palestinian, why can't David Ben Gurion, who was born and raised in Poland, be a Palestinian (i.e., an Israeli)?

5. Do you believe both a) the Holocaust did not occur, and b) Israeli soldiers behave like Nazis? Well, if the Holocaust never occurred, then Nazis must have been good guys like the Brits and the Americans, smiling as they distributed candy to children.

Someone once observed that the chimpanzee is an organized sarcasm on the human race. The lies that flow from your mouth and your pen are an organized sarcasm on the truth. The fact that Arab Muslims and Arab Christians live within the borders of the State of Israel today is not a proof that their ancestors lived there. The fact that many Cleveland Indian baseball players live and work in Ohio today does not establish that their ancestors were all native Americans from what is now Ohio.

When Mr. Arafat told President Clinton at Camp David that there was never a Jewish Temple in Jerusalem, President Clinton objected because that ridiculous assertion contradicted what President Clinton had read in his Bible. President Clinton knew that his messiah had not chased moneychangers out of a mosque.

Ambrose Bierce wrote, "Any idiot can tell the truth, but it takes a genius to know how to lie well." Mr. Erekat, I am happy that you are no genius. You have acted in a dastardly way by spreading lies about the Jewish People and the State of Israel. That makes you a real dastard! (Yes, it's in the dictionary.)
When the guns fell silent on the evening of June 10, 1967, the Middle East and Israel were forever changed. The discussion Israel’s cabinet ministers began on June 14 forged the conundrum we live in now. Reading through transcripts of 20-some hours of discussions held the week after the Six-Day War demonstrates that, recent as they were, the past the ministers lived in was startlingly foreign. They held ideas that seem strange today to be self-evident, and never thought of things that we find obvious.

Listening to their deliberations has a strong whiff of foreignness, and not only because the Hebrew they spoke sounds surprisingly archaic. Israel’s key decision-makers lived halfway between our own time and World War I; they remembered the Great War and had experienced the systematic redrawing of maps in its aftermath that created the modern Middle East. The Shoah was as recent to them as the Clinton administration is to us, and Israel’s War of Independence was as recent in their eyes as the Monica Lewinsky scandal is in ours. The United States forced them out of Sinai in 1956, giving proof of the utter uselessness of the commitments Israel had garnered in return for that retreat. When Menachem Begin grounded his opposition to returning the West Bank to Jordan by citing the Polish annexation of eastern Germany after WWII, the West German acceptance of this alteration of German borders hadn’t happened yet. It would only happen three years later, in 1970.

It’s not surprising, then, that the familiar voices on the tapes keep on making arguments that sometimes sound plausible until veering off in the oddest directions. You listen to their discussions and wonder if they are really talking about the land outside your window.

The taped discussions took place between June 14 and 19 in five separate meetings, first in the Security Cabinet (SC), then in a subcommittee, again in the SC, then another subcommittee, and eventually in a long meeting of the full Cabinet on the 19th. The transcript of the June 19 meeting was declassified some years ago; the fact that it was part of a series of such meetings was unknown until now.
The topic of the first meeting, on June 14, was Israel's international position; the future of the territories was to be discussed on the 15th. By and large, the ministers managed just barely, to stick to the agenda. But Jerusalem kept coming up, as if the ministers couldn't keep their hands off the prize that Jews had yearned for over two millennia.

Yet what should be done with the Arabs who had moved into Jerusalem Jewish Quarter since 1948? Everyone agreed they had to leave. The simplest plan was Israel should clean and restore the dozens of original synagogues that had been destroyed after the Independence War by Jordan, which had systematically cleansed the Old City's Jewish population. Since some of the destroyed synagogues now housed Arabs, they should be removed somehow. Yigal Allon suggested "removing them intelligently"—triggering a typical Levi Eshkol barb "intelligently with bulldozers." Moreover, Allon emphasized the need to fill empty areas around the Old City with new Jewish neighborhoods. Moshe Haim Shapira, normally one of his main sparring partners, mostly agreed:

Regarding Jews settling in the Old City: I have a hard time saying this; you know I'm against forcing anyone out of their homes, but this is different. These are Jewish homes and Jewish land belonging to the Jews who were expelled in 1948, and now the Arabs live there. I don't think we should evict them, but over time we should make it clear to them that we're going to rebuild, and there will be lots of construction around the synagogues and it would be better for them to move. We need to find other apartments for them and move them from one place to another. Perhaps not all at once.

By meeting's end, it was decided to reunite Jerusalem and to prepare a plan for the removal of the Arabs in the Jewish Quarter to alternative homes in Jerusalem or its vicinity. Even before beginning the discussion about the territories, the future of Jerusalem had been decided.

Later that week, Eshkol asked Menachem Begin to report from a subcommittee which was drafting the law annexing Jerusalem:

Begin: We had someone draw an initial map of the United City. It's such a beautiful map! The Old City is right in the middle!

Pinchas Sapir: It's the center of the world.

Eshkol: The navel of the earth.

At 10 a.m. on June 15, a subcommittee of five ministers convened to draft a policy paper. Eshkol, never much good at controlling meetings, made a forlorn effort to keep it short:

Eshkol: We want to be practical and reach results. I'd like to start with a discussion of the Golan.

Allon: I think each of us should present his philosophy in 10 minutes. Maybe Eban or Dayan should start.

Eshkol: That's a waste of time, since each territory poses a different set of problems. Let's start with the Golan, because we're especially angry at the Syrians. We're not going to settle the area, so let's tell [President Lyndon] Johnson. "Look, we want
permission peace, no more threats to our water sources, and a 20-25 kilometer demilitarized zone."

At which point Abba Eban launched into a description of the American and Soviet positions. Eshkol tried again:

"We need to be short, if we’re to have a draft document for the security cabinet this evening, and perhaps then go to the full cabinet. But I understand you each want to present your position. So be it."

Begin went first, and his position on Sinai and the Golan is surprising: He was in favor of trading them in their entirety for peace. Begin was the only minister in 1967 who was destined to be prime minister. When elected, in 1977, Israelis and the world thought he was a hardliner, and in many ways he was. When in 1978 he traded the entire Sinai for peace with Egypt, many of us were astonished. Had we been able to read these top-secret transcripts we’d have known that was his position from day one.

Most of the ministers agreed with Begin about Sinai and the Golan. The majority of the discussions would focus on the points of disagreement: what to do with Gaza, the West Bank, and the hundreds of thousands of refugees who had been uprooted in 1948 and kept in camps by the Jordanian and Egyptian governments ever since, mostly in Gaza. Begin spent about 10 minutes talking about the future of “western land of Israel” (the eastern half of Palestine being the Kingdom of Jordan, which was sliced off of Mandatory Palestine by the British in 1923 as a reward for their throne-less Hashemite allies):

I’ll use the Latin term patria res sacra extra commercium (“the fatherland is beyond commerce,” i.e., it is not a thing to be traded). I see a danger if we talk only about Jerusalem: the yes will indicate the no. I think we have a strong moral case. Jordan attacked us, first by putting its military under Egyptian command and then by shelling us even as we asked them twice to desist.

The actions of the aggressor are important for defining self-defense. Who is King Hussein to claim the area? Jordan annexed it illegally in 1949 after a war of aggression. And what would we give up? Not Jerusalem, and not Hebron or Bethlehem. So what remains is the Triangle [a forgotten term for the northern half of the West bank], and that’s where the Jordanian artillery used to shell Tel Aviv from. The same goes for Gaza: Egypt has no legal claim to it.

If we show any willingness to partition what was Mandatory Palestine, we’ll be faced with demands to agree to a Palestinian state, and then they’ll demand Lydda, Ramle, and Jaffa. We need to explain that our position is based on right is might, while that of the Arabs on might is light [English in the original], and the world will understand us.

What should we do? The population can’t all have Israeli citizenship. Even in America it takes five years to acquire citizenship, and the Arabs on the West Bank have spent 19 years being taught to hate us. We’ll give them the rights of residents for seven years, so they won’t vote in the next three elections, and in the meantime we’ll bring more Jewish immigrants and raise our birthrate. After seven years, we’ll ask them who wants Israeli citizenship and who wishes..."