

July 30, 2014

The Jerusalem Post examines European anti-Semitism.

The acclaimed British novelist Howard Jacobson opened his speech at the B'nai B'rith World Center in Jerusalem last October with piercing sarcasm: "The question is rhetorical. When will Jews be forgiven the Holocaust? Never."

However, there has been a shift in the underpinnings of anti-Semitism. Israel has become the collective Jew among the nations, as the late French historian Léon Poliakov said about the new metamorphosis of Jew-hatred.

Jacobson was piggy-backing on the eye-popping insight of the Israel psychoanalyst Zvi Rex, who reportedly said: "The Germans will never forgive the Jews for Auschwitz."

The anti-Semitic logic at work here is Europe's pathologically guilt-filled response to the Holocaust, which, in short, is to shift the onus of blame to the Jews to cleanse one's conscience. Two German-Jewish Marxist philosophers – Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno – coined an esoteric sociological term for what unfolded in post-Shoah Germany: Guilt-defensiveness anti-Semitism.

On the one hand, Adorno and Horkheimer may come across as kitchen-sink psychology. On the other hand, the explanatory power behind anti-Semitic guilt animating hatred of Jews and Israel can provide a window into Europe's peculiar obsession with the Jewish state. ...

Evelyn Gordon explains why the short-lived FAA ban on air travel to Israel was a big mistake.

... Whether the FAA's decision was actually political I don't know. Perhaps the agency was merely spooked by the previous week's downing of a commercial airliner over Ukraine. Yet the fact that the ban was reversed two days later even though the security situation hadn't changed, combined with the fact that major airlines like British Airways never suspended flights to begin with, support the contention that the decision, as Haaretz military analyst Amos Harel put it, "had no substantive professional basis," and was intended primarily to browbeat Israel into accepting Secretary of State John Kerry's completely unacceptable cease-fire proposal.

If so, to quote Harel again, it reflected "a fundamental lack of understanding of the Israeli mindset"—and not just about the cease-fire. That single FAA decision did more than any political argument ever could to ensure that Israel won't be leaving the West Bank anytime soon.

Having long argued that such a withdrawal would be untenably dangerous, I'm certainly not sorry. But for the Obama administration, it was definitely an old goal.

Matthew Continetti thinks Israel can prevail as long as Hamas is not saved by this administration.

... And yet the immediate danger to the success of this necessary war does not come from the electronic intifada. It does not come from resurgent anti-Semitism, or the United Nations Human Rights Council, or the failure of so many Western elites to recognize the causes of this war, their inability to distinguish between a democratic country struggling to protect its people and a terror

state using children as hostages. Hate, law-fare, decadence—they are all challenges for Israel. But Israel can endure them for now. Israel is used to it.

What Israel should not endure is the premature conclusion of hostilities. Disarming Hamas—seizing its rocket caches, collapsing its tunnels, killing and capturing its forces—is vital to Israeli security. And an artificial ceasefire imposed by outside powers, a ceasefire written in terms favorable to Hamas, would undermine the security gains Israel has made to date. President Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry have given no sign that they recognize this fact. Or maybe they understand it all too well: The Obama administration's top priority is imposing a ceasefire at exactly the moment when Israel's military success is becoming clear.

Secretary Kerry arrived in Cairo earlier this week. No one wanted him there. Egypt's ruler, General Sisi, has no interest in saving Hamas through international diplomacy: The Muslim Brotherhood is his mortal enemy. Kerry then went from Cairo to Jerusalem, where he met with U.N. Secretary Ban Ki-moon, who flew to the meeting on a plane chartered by Qatar, Hamas' primary source of cash. Kerry also met Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, who is too gracious to tell the secretary to go back to Boston. (Israel's former ambassador to the United States, Michael Oren, has said publicly what the Israeli government will not: Kerry is an unwelcome guest.) Next up was Mahmoud Abbas, president of the Palestinian Authority, who honored Kerry's presence by endorsing Hamas's call for a "Day of Rage" in the West Bank. Kerry "will soon decide if Hamas and Israel are willing to agree on a Gaza ceasefire," Reuters says.

Kerry will decide? Who died and made him king? ...

Bret Stephens says Palestine can make you dumb. But, Pickerhead says bringing dumb to this administration is like bring coals to Newcastle.

Of all the inane things that have been said about the war between Israel and Hamas, surely one dishonorable mention belongs to comments made over the weekend by Benjamin J. Rhodes, deputy national security adviser for strategic communications.

Interviewed by CNN's Candy Crowley, Mr. Rhodes offered the now-standard administration line that Israel has a right to defend itself but needs to do more to avoid civilian casualties. Ms. Crowley interjected that, according to Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, the Jewish state was already doing everything it could to avoid such casualties.

"I think you can always do more," Mr. Rhodes replied. "The U.S. military does that in Afghanistan."

How inapt is this comparison? The list of Afghan civilians accidentally killed by U.S. or NATO strikes is not short. Little of the fighting in Afghanistan took place in the dense urban environments that make the current warfare in Gaza so difficult. The last time the U.S. fought a Gaza-style battle—in Fallujah in 2004—some 800 civilians perished and at least 9,000 homes were destroyed. This is not an indictment of U.S. conduct in Fallujah but an acknowledgment of the grim reality of city combat.

Oh, and by the way, American towns and cities were not being rocketed from above or tunneled under from below as the Fallujah campaign was under way.

Roger Simon wants to know how much the UN knew about the Hamas tunnels.

... How much did the UN workers actually know about the secret tunnels? Many of them have been living in Gaza pretty much full time since the Israelis vacated Gaza voluntarily in 2005. Those of us who have been paying even partial attention to the situation remember the UN workers' frequent complaints — augmented by the naifs in Israeli peace groups like B'Tselem - that the poor Gazans weren't getting sufficient concrete to build their society.

Now that we know Gaza had more than enough concrete to build Olympic stadiums and chose to build terror tunnels instead, was that innocence or just a flat-out lie — and an evil one at that? We will see soon enough the proximity of tunnel entrances to UN facilities. (The Israelis have been taking pictures.)

If the UN is going to investigate the behavior of Israel, as Alan Dershowitz points out, it should investigate Hamas and the Palestinians as well. Beyond that, however, someone (Congress?) should investigate the UN. Of course, it's possible all those UN workers were wearing ear plugs for those nine years of digging, but I wouldn't want to bet on it. Occam's Razor tells us there's treachery afoot. It's one thing, as is generally accepted, that the United Nations is one of the world's centers of corruption and money laundering, but something else again if it's an accessory to mass murder. ...

In spite of all the facts on Israel's side, **Ron Fournier** says Netanyahu should be worried.

... Every nation has a story. Israel's is that Arabs have long been unwilling to negotiate with the Jewish state, and that terrorists among the Palestinians want to destroy it. For decades, three significant factors helped make this the dominant Middle East narrative. First, it's correct, at least when applied to the dangerous minority of Palestinians. Second, elite opinion-makers, including journalists and politicians in the West, embraced and amplified the Israeli case. Finally, public opinion in the West, and particularly in the United States, firmly supported Israel.

The first factor still holds. The United States would not hesitate to respond fiercely to attacks like those of Hamas. No country would. Israel has the absolute right to defend itself, and Netanyahu stood on firm ground as he described to Wallace the motives and tactics of Hamas.

The danger lies with the last two factors, starting with the near-monopoly Israel once enjoyed over the mind share of public-opinion elites. Israel must learn to act in a world of democratized media, where tweets and posts and pictures about Gazan casualties reach the global community instantaneously and without filter.

The newly interconnected world includes mainstream journalists, whose coverage of a decades-old story now includes an expanded array of sources who don't work for a government, a lobby, or an activist group. The past few weeks have exposed a subtle but significant shift in coverage—a more empathic view of the plight of Gazans, and a greater focus on the consequences of Israel's actions. ...

Here's a music video on the Mid-East titled **Maximum Restraint**. You'll like.

Jerusalem Post

Why Europe blames Israel for the Holocaust: Post-1945 anti-Semitism

The Austrian writer and Auschwitz survivor Amery recognized that “anti-Zionism contains anti-Semitism like a cloud contains a storm.”

by Benjamin Weinthat

The acclaimed British novelist Howard Jacobson opened his speech at the B'nai B'rith World Center in Jerusalem last October with piercing sarcasm: “The question is rhetorical. When will Jews be forgiven the Holocaust? Never.”

However, there has been a shift in the underpinnings of anti-Semitism. Israel has become the collective Jew among the nations, as the late French historian Léon Poliakov said about the new metamorphosis of Jew-hatred.

Jacobson was piggy-backing on the eye-popping insight of the Israel psychoanalyst Zvi Rex, who reportedly said: “The Germans will never forgive the Jews for Auschwitz.”

The anti-Semitic logic at work here is Europe's pathologically guilt-filled response to the Holocaust, which, in short, is to shift the onus of blame to the Jews to cleanse one's conscience. Two German-Jewish Marxist philosophers – Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno – coined an esoteric sociological term for what unfolded in post-Shoah Germany: Guilt-defensiveness anti-Semitism.

On the one hand, Adorno and Horkheimer may come across as kitchen-sink psychology. On the other hand, the explanatory power behind anti-Semitic guilt animating hatred of Jews and Israel can provide a window into Europe's peculiar obsession with the Jewish state.

Europe is largely consumed with imposing discipline and punishment on Israel. How else to explain the efforts by the German government and fellow EU member states to label products from the disputed territories? The EU refuses to apply the same label system to the scores of other territorial conflicts ranging from China/Tibet to Turkey/Cyprus to Morocco/ Western Sahara.

The origins of Europe's disturbing preoccupation with Israel can be traced to the late 1960s. The Austrian Jewish writer and Auschwitz survivor Jean Amery recognized that “anti-Zionism contains anti-Semitism like a cloud contains a storm.”

The German-Jewish author Henryk M. Broder perhaps best captured the toxic mix of pathological Holocaust guilt with the desire to dismantle Israel. In an article he wrote in the early 1980s he told his contemporary Germans: “You're still your parents' children. Your Jew today is the State of Israel.”

Sacha Stawski, an expert on anti-Semitism in the German media, told The Jerusalem Post on Monday that “Israel-related anti-Semitism is probably the most common and most persistent form of anti-Semitism in all levels of society today.”

Stawski, who is a German Jew and editor-in-chief of the media watchdog website Honestly Concerned, added: “Today it is no longer fashionable to hate Jews outright, but it is perfectly acceptable to debate about and to demonstrate against the very core of the Jewish state's existence – in a way and with emotions unlike that about any other country.”

The social-psychological theory articulated by Adorno and Horkheimer might, just might, provide a macro-level grasp of a pan-European epidemic that is fixated on turning Israel into a human

punching bag.

Benjamin Weinthal reports on European affairs for The Jerusalem Post and is a fellow at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies.

Contentions

"The Biggest Political Mistake of the War So Far"

by Evelyn Gordon

On Friday, the always perceptive Walter Russell Mead [termed](#) the FAA's decision to suspend flights to Israel last week "the biggest political mistake of the war so far." Mead was referring to the decision's impact on a cease-fire, but it actually has far larger political implications. In one fell swoop, it destroyed the main diplomatic return the Obama Administration hoped to earn on its years of generous support for the Iron Dome anti-missile system: increased Israeli willingness to withdraw from the West Bank.

While Congress's motive in supporting Iron Dome was mainly to save Israeli lives, the Obama administration always had an additional motive: countering Israeli fears that ceding the West Bank would lead to "rockets from Nablus, Ramallah and Jenin onto Ben-Gurion Airport," as Defense Minister Moshe Ya'alon [put it](#), just as leaving Gaza resulted in massive rocket fire on Israel's south. If Iron Dome could protect Israel from rocket fire, the argument went, then Israel needn't fear a West Bank withdrawal.

Until last week, that argument might have had a chance: True, Hamas was sending rocket barrages all over Israel and forcing Israelis into shelters several times a day, but the combination of Iron Dome and civil defense measures kept Israeli casualties negligible.

Last week, however, Israelis learned that even Iron Dome can't keep their main airport open when their neighbors are launching rockets at it. No anti-missile system is foolproof, and one [intentionally](#) missed rocket proved enough for most of the world to suspend flights to Israel.

As Mead correctly noted, the discovery that Hamas's rockets can threaten its main transportation link to the outside world makes it much harder for Israel to end the fighting without eliminating Hamas's rocket capabilities. But it also makes it much harder for Israel to quit the West Bank as long as there's any chance of it turning into a rocket launching pad like Gaza has.

The vast majority of Israel's foreign investment and trade comes from the West, and Israel's geographic distance from the West means this commerce depends on aerial traffic. With its airport shuttered, investors can't come in and time-sensitive exports can't go out. Thus Israel simply cannot afford to have its air links with the West at the mercy of a terrorist organization. Its economy wouldn't survive.

Whether the FAA's decision was actually political I don't know. Perhaps the agency was merely spooked by the previous week's downing of a commercial airliner over Ukraine. Yet the fact that the ban was reversed two days later even though the security situation hadn't changed, combined with the fact that major airlines like British Airways never suspended flights to begin with, support the contention that the decision, as *Haaretz* military analyst Amos Harel [put it](#), "had no substantive professional basis," and was intended primarily to browbeat Israel into accepting Secretary of State John Kerry's [completely unacceptable](#) cease-fire proposal.

If so, to quote Harel again, it reflected “a fundamental lack of understanding of the Israeli mindset”—and not just about the cease-fire. That single FAA decision did more than any political argument ever could to ensure that Israel won’t be leaving the West Bank anytime soon.

Having long argued that such a withdrawal would be untenably dangerous, I’m certainly not sorry. But for the Obama administration, it was definitely an old goal.

Free Beacon

[Israel Can Win](#)

If Obama doesn't save Hamas

by Matthew Continetti

Slandered, despised, insulted, degraded, Israel is nonetheless winning its war against Hamas. The number of rocket attacks launched by the terror group each day [has been halved](#). The IDF is uprooting the underground tunnels Hamas uses to smuggle weapons, contraband, and terrorists in and out of the Gaza Strip. On Wednesday evening, [Israel's Channel Two newscast carried footage of Hamas terrorists surrendering to the IDF](#). The jihadists carried white flags. They stripped to their shorts, proving they were not wearing suicide belts. These are facts Hamas does not want you to know, images Hamas does not want you to see.

And you probably won’t see them. Since the evening of July 17, when Israel launched its ground offensive, Western media has been filled with Hamas propaganda. In the United States, the debate over the conflict is invariably couched in terms favorable to Hamas: Are civilian casualties too high? Is it safe to fly into Ben-Gurion airport? Has the IDF targeted schools and hospitals? One MSNBC anchor calls Israel, which abandoned Gaza in 2005, the “[occupying authority](#).” Another praises a “[gutsy](#)” Israeli, who refuses to serve in her nation’s military.

On CNN, the Islamist Turkish prime minister says Israel has “[surpassed what Hitler did](#).” A CNN reporter calls Israelis “[scum](#)”; a NBC reporter tweets a scurrilous article calling U.S. Jews who join the IDF “[America's Israeli jihadists](#)”; and a writer for *Gawker* says it’s [time to send the Jews back to Germany](#). Reporters once embedded with military forces. Now the talking points of a military force—the talking points of Hamas—are embedded in the U.S. media.

And yet the immediate danger to the success of this necessary war does not come from the electronic intifada. It does not come from resurgent anti-Semitism, or the United Nations Human Rights Council, or the failure of so many Western elites to recognize the causes of this war, their inability to distinguish between a democratic country struggling to protect its people and a terror state using children as hostages. Hate, law-fare, decadence—they are all challenges for Israel. But Israel can endure them for now. Israel is used to it.

What Israel should not endure is the premature conclusion of hostilities. Disarming Hamas—seizing its rocket caches, collapsing its tunnels, killing and capturing its forces—is vital to Israeli security. And an artificial ceasefire imposed by outside powers, a ceasefire written in terms favorable to Hamas, would undermine the security gains Israel has made to date. President Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry have given no sign that they recognize this fact. Or maybe they understand it all too well: The Obama administration’s top priority is imposing a ceasefire at exactly the moment when Israel’s military success is becoming clear.

Secretary Kerry arrived in Cairo earlier this week. No one wanted him there. Egypt's ruler, General Sisi, has no interest in saving Hamas through international diplomacy: The Muslim Brotherhood is his mortal enemy. Kerry then went from Cairo to Jerusalem, where he met with U.N. Secretary Ban Ki-moon, who [flew to the meeting on a plane chartered by Qatar, Hamas' primary source of cash](#). Kerry also met Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, who is too gracious to tell the secretary to go back to Boston. (Israel's former ambassador to the United States, Michael Oren, [has said publicly what the Israeli government will not](#): Kerry is an unwelcome guest.) Next up was Mahmoud Abbas, president of the Palestinian Authority, [who honored Kerry's presence by endorsing Hamas's call for a "Day of Rage" in the West Bank](#). Kerry "will soon decide if Hamas and Israel are willing to agree on a Gaza ceasefire," [Reuters says](#).

Kerry will decide? Who died and made him king?

There is no ceasefire in Gaza because a ceasefire is in no one's interest. Israel's objective is clear: degrade Hamas' capability to fire rockets at Israeli civilians and attack Israeli communities from underground. As for Hamas, its interest is irrational, macabre, and deranged, but no less obvious: Promote itself as the leader of the worldwide struggle against Zionism and Judaism, while ensuring collateral damage that will foment outrage at Israel. That is why Hamas stores weapons in schools, why its military headquarters is in the basement of a hospital. Hamas is not interested in minimizing pain. Hamas wants to maximize it.

Who wants a ceasefire? Obama and Kerry. They need the diplomatic victory after the failure of their misguided and poorly executed bid to reconcile the irreconcilable. The president's approval rating on foreign policy is abysmal. A ceasefire might help the American people forget, just for a moment, that their president has failed to influence events in Ukraine, Syria, and Iraq, let alone advance American interests overseas. Since he became president, Israel is the one country in the world in whose affairs President Obama has seemed at all interested in intervening. It is the one country whose politics and actions Obama has had no trouble judging harshly. Next to golf, it's his favorite pastime.

Who wants a ceasefire? Qatar. The sheikhs who bankroll the Muslim Brotherhood, Al Jazeera, and Hamas would see their status rise. A ceasefire would lend credence to the theory that the traditional Sunni powers—Egypt, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia—have been eclipsed both by Shiite Iran and by Brotherhood-friendly Sunnis in the Gulf and Turkey. Having lost Egypt and possibly Gaza, the Brotherhood finds itself on the precipice. A Qatari-backed ceasefire that does not include disarmament of Hamas would pull the movement back from the abyss.

"One of the results, one would hope, of a cease-fire would be some form of demilitarization, so that again, this doesn't continue, doesn't repeat itself," said Tony Blinken, Obama's deputy national security adviser, [to NPR](#). One *would* hope so. Indeed, actual demilitarization—not hoped for, not partial—is exactly what the IDF is doing now, block by block, tunnel by tunnel. Why is the administration trying to stop it? Is a ceasefire that leaves Hamas with its arsenal really more desirable to them than another week of war?

This is not the time for President Obama and John Kerry to play to type, to promote bad agreements for self-satisfaction, for political gain. If they won't stand behind Israel, they should at least get out of the way. And let the IDF finish the job.

WSJ

[Palestine Makes You Dumb](#)

To argue the Palestinian side, in the Gaza war, is to make the case for barbarism.

by Bret Stephens

Of all the inane things that have been said about the war between Israel and Hamas, surely one dishonorable mention belongs to comments made over the weekend by Benjamin J. Rhodes, deputy national security adviser for strategic communications.

Interviewed by CNN's Candy Crowley, Mr. Rhodes offered the now-standard administration line that Israel has a right to defend itself but needs to do more to avoid civilian casualties. Ms. Crowley interjected that, according to Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, the Jewish state was already doing everything it could to avoid such casualties.

"I think you can always do more," Mr. Rhodes replied. "The U.S. military does that in Afghanistan."

How inapt is this comparison? The list of Afghan civilians accidentally killed by U.S. or NATO strikes is not short. Little of the fighting in Afghanistan took place in the dense urban environments that make the current warfare in Gaza so difficult. The last time the U.S. fought a Gaza-style battle—in Fallujah in 2004—some 800 civilians perished and at least 9,000 homes were destroyed. This is not an indictment of U.S. conduct in Fallujah but an acknowledgment of the grim reality of city combat.

Oh, and by the way, American towns and cities were not being rocketed from above or tunneled under from below as the Fallujah campaign was under way.

Maybe Mr. Rhodes knows all this and was merely caught out mouthing the sorts of platitudes that are considered diplomatically de rigueur when it comes to the Palestinians. Or maybe he was just another victim of what I call the Palestine Effect: The abrupt and often total collapse of logical reasoning, skeptical intelligence and ordinary moral judgment whenever the subject of Palestinian suffering arises.

Consider the media obsession with the body count. According to a daily tally in the [New York Times](#), as of July 27 the war in Gaza had claimed 1,023 Palestinian lives as against 46 Israelis. How does the Times keep such an accurate count of Palestinian deaths? A footnote discloses "Palestinian death tallies are provided by the Palestinian Health Ministry and the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs."

OK. So who runs the Palestinian Health Ministry in Gaza? Hamas does. As for the U.N., it gets its data mainly from two Palestinian agitprop NGOs, one of which, the Palestinian Center for Human Rights, offers the remarkably precise statistic that, as of July 27, exactly 82% of deaths in Gaza have been civilians. Curiously, during the 2008-09 Gaza war, the center also reported an 82% civilian casualty rate.

When minutely exact statistics are provided in chaotic circumstances, it suggests the statistics are garbage. When a news organization relies—without clarification—on data provided by a bureaucratic organ of a terrorist organization, there's something wrong there, too.

But let's assume for argument's sake that the numbers are accurate. Does this mean the Palestinians are the chief victims, and Israelis the main victimizers, in the conflict? By this dull logic

we might want to rethink the moral equities of World War II, in which over one million German civilians perished at Allied hands compared with just 67,000 British and 12,000 American civilians.

The real utility of the body count is that it offers reporters and commentators who cite it the chance to ascribe implicit blame to Israel while evading questions about ultimate responsibility for the killing. Questions such as: Why is Hamas hiding rockets in U.N.-run schools, as acknowledged by the U.N. itself? What does it mean that Hamas has turned Gaza's central hospital into "a de facto headquarters," as reported by the Washington Post? And why does Hamas keep rejecting, or violating, cease-fires agreed to by Israel?

A reasonable person might conclude from this that Hamas, which started the war, wants it to continue, and that it relies on Israel's moral scruples not to destroy civilian sites that it cynically uses for military purposes. But then there is the Palestine Effect. By this reasoning, Hamas only initiated the fighting because Israel refused to countenance the creation of a Palestinian coalition that included Hamas, and because Israel further objected to helping pay the salaries of Hamas's civil servants in Gaza.

Let's get this one straight. Israel is culpable because (a) it won't accept a Palestinian government that includes a terrorist organization sworn to the Jewish state's destruction; (b) it won't help that organization out of its financial jam; and (c) it won't ease a quasi-blockade—jointly imposed with Egypt—on a territory whose central economic activity appears to be building rocket factories and pouring imported concrete into terrorist tunnels.

This is either bald moral idiocy or thinly veiled bigotry. It mistakes effect for cause, treats self-respect as arrogance and self-defense as aggression, and makes demands of the Jewish state that would be dismissed out of hand anywhere else. To argue the Palestinian side, in this war, is to make the case for barbarism. It is to erase, in the name of humanitarianism, the moral distinctions from which the concept of humanity arises.

Typically, the Obama administration is hedging its bets. The Palestine Effect claims another victim.

Roger L. Simon

[Hamas Terror Tunnels: What Did the UN Know and When Did It Know It?](#)

Amidst news the Israelis have turned down secretary of State Kerry's latest, apparently Qatar-inspired, ceasefire, not to mention the other day's nauseatingly familiar anti-Israel fusillade from the mega-Orwellian UN Human Rights Council, comes word that Hamas had been planning a gigantic attack on Israel this September via its dozens of tunnels.

From the [Gatestone Institute](#):

Hamas had apparently been preparing a murderous assault on Israeli civilian targets for the coming Jewish New Year Holiday, Rosh Hashanah, which begins on September 24, according anonymous sources in the Israeli security services, as [reported today](#) by the Israeli daily *Maariv*.

The Hamas plan consisted of what was to be a surprise attack in which 200 fighters would be dispatched through each of dozens of tunnels dug by Hamas under the border from Gaza to Israel, and seize kibbutzim and other communities while killing and kidnapping Israeli civilians.

Assuming this to be true—and Hamas has already used the tunnels for a similar attack last week—questions arise. Why didn't Israeli and U.S. intelligence know about the extent and dangers of these tunnels earlier — if they didn't? And if they did, why didn't they do something about it?

Well, we don't know. But at least the Israelis are doing something about it now, even with resistance from the Americans.

Meanwhile, another culprit waits in the wings, perhaps the greatest enabler of all of Hamas terror — the United Nations. I strongly suspect the UN has not just been consistently biased and hateful toward Israel, it has also — at the very least — looked the other way as mass murder and kidnappings (sedatives and handcuffs have been found in the tunnels) were being planned against Israel's citizens.

We already know that Hamas hid missiles in at least two UNRWA (United Nations Relief and Works Agency) schools in Gaza. Ban Ki-moon claimed to be shocked, but I predict he will be really shocked if a full investigation were made because there is far worse.

How much did the UN workers actually know about the secret tunnels? Many of them have been living in Gaza pretty much full time since the Israelis vacated Gaza voluntarily in 2005. Those of us who have been paying even partial attention to the situation remember the UN workers' frequent complaints — augmented by the naifs in Israeli peace groups like *B'Tselem* - that the poor Gazans weren't getting sufficient concrete to build their society.

Now that we know Gaza had more than enough concrete to build Olympic stadiums and chose to build terror tunnels instead, was that innocence or just a flat-out lie — and an evil one at that? We will see soon enough the proximity of tunnel entrances to UN facilities. (The Israelis have been taking pictures.)

If the UN is going to investigate the behavior of Israel, as Alan Dershowitz points out, it should investigate Hamas and the Palestinians as well. Beyond that, however, someone (Congress?) should investigate the UN. Of course, it's *possible* all those UN workers were wearing ear plugs for those nine years of digging, but I wouldn't want to bet on it. Occam's Razor tells us there's treachery afoot. It's one thing, as is generally accepted, that the United Nations is one of the world's centers of corruption and money laundering, but something else again if it's an accessory to mass murder.

Finally, the truth about what's going on is not all that complicated. We don't need CAIR or even John Kerry to explain it. [Joan Rivers](#) will do just fine.

National Journal

[Why Benjamin Netanyahu Should Be Very, Very Worried](#)

Israel's defense is vulnerable to more than missiles as demographic and social changes threaten its global story.

by Ron Fournier

Chris Wallace of [Fox News Sunday](#) asked Benjamin Netanyahu whether he was worried about "a third intifada." The Israeli prime minister replied that Hamas "wants to pile up" Gazan casualties in hope of instigating an uprising. In other words, he ducked the heart of the question.

Netanyahu should be worried. The Israeli public should be worried. All supporters of the Jewish state should be worried—not only about the prospect of current events spiraling out of control, but also about a confluence of demographic and social trends that threaten Israel's ability to manage the war of perceptions.

Every nation has a story. Israel's is that Arabs have long been unwilling to negotiate with the Jewish state, and that terrorists among the Palestinians want to destroy it. For decades, three significant factors helped make this the dominant Middle East narrative. First, it's correct, at least when applied to the dangerous minority of Palestinians. Second, elite opinion-makers, including journalists and politicians in the West, embraced and amplified the Israeli case. Finally, public opinion in the West, and particularly in the United States, firmly supported Israel.

The first factor still holds. The United States would not hesitate to respond fiercely to attacks like those of Hamas. No country would. Israel has the absolute right to defend itself, and Netanyahu stood on firm ground as he described to Wallace the motives and tactics of Hamas.

The danger lies with the last two factors, starting with the near-monopoly Israel once enjoyed over the mind share of public-opinion elites. Israel must learn to act in a world of democratized media, where tweets and posts and pictures about Gazan casualties reach the global community instantaneously and without filter.

The newly interconnected world includes mainstream journalists, whose coverage of a decades-old story now includes an expanded array of sources who don't work for a government, a lobby, or an activist group. The past few weeks have exposed a subtle but significant shift in coverage—a more empathic view of the plight of Gazans, and a greater focus on the consequences of Israel's actions.

Consider these three stories and a question raised by each:

- NBC pulled foreign correspondent Ayman Mohyeldin out of the Gaza Strip, raising questions about whether his empathetic coverage of Palestinians led to his removal. Brian Stelter, who covers the media for CNN, [said his reporting](#) "strongly suggests that this was a situation caused by network news infighting and bureaucracy." Public backlash played a role in Mohyeldin's return to Gaza, Stelter said. Question: A decade or so ago, would a news organization receive this much pressure for a staffing decision?
- A Palestinian-American teenager accused Israeli authorities of beating him. Upon his [return to Tampa Fla.](#), 15-year-old Tariq Abu Khdeir said, "No child, whether they are Palestinian or Israeli, deserves to die." Question: A decade or so ago, would the beating be covered at all? As much?
- CNN correspondent Diana Magnay tweeted that the Israelis cheering bombs hitting Gaza, and who had allegedly threatened her, were "scum." The network [pulled her off the story](#). Question: A decade or so ago, would a network correspondent broadcast her bluntly negative opinion about Israeli soldiers? (What are the chances a network reporter would even *think* to call Israelis scum?)

Finally, a generation of global citizens is rising to power without the Israeli narrative embedded so firmly in its consciousness. The so-called Arab Spring and the United States' diminished influence abroad has created a new set of filters through which young people will consider the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, a viewpoint that might be less inclined to favor the Jewish state.

In the United States, younger Americans are far less likely to say Israel's actions in the Gaza Strip are justified. According to [Gallup](#), these are the percentages of Americans who support the Israeli position, grouped by age: 55 percent of those over 65; 53 percent of those between 50 and 64; 36 percent of those 30-49; and just 25 percent of those 18-29.

Again, none of this is intended to suggest that Israel should bow to Hamas's demands. Israelis must defend themselves. Neither is this a case for or against Israel completing its current mission to shutter terrorists' tunnels and silence the rockets. Rather, it's a warning that Israel's decades-old public relations and political dominance is coming to an end unless the nation's leaders change the narrative and reset their strategic position with moderate Palestinians.

David Grossman, an Israeli author and noted peace activist, [writes](#) in *The New York Times* today that Israelis and Palestinians are yoked to the same grindstone. He asks why.

Since I cannot ask Hamas, nor do I purport to understand its way of thinking, I ask the leaders of my own country, Prime Minister [Benjamin Netanyahu](#) and his predecessors: How could you have wasted the years since the last conflict without initiating dialogue, without even making the slightest gesture toward dialogue with Hamas, without attempting to change our explosive reality? Why, for these past few years, has Israel avoided judicious negotiations with the moderate and more conversable sectors of the Palestinian people—an act that could also have served to pressure Hamas? Why have you ignored, for 12 years, the Arab League initiative that could have enlisted moderate Arab states with the power to impose, perhaps, a compromise on Hamas? In other words: Why is it that Israeli governments have been incapable, for decades, of thinking outside the bubble?

He said pundits on the left are recognizing the depths of hatred toward Israel, which he colorfully calls "the Islamic fundamentalist volcano that threatens the country." Pundits on the right, he said, must realize that nobody will win this war.

There is no military solution to the real anguish of the Palestinian people, and as long as the suffocation felt in Gaza is not alleviated, we in Israel will not be able to breathe freely either.

Israelis have known this for decades, and for decades we have refused to truly comprehend it.

To me, on Sunday, the talking points Netanyahu deployed against Wallace were simultaneously accurate and archaic. Yes, the terrorists want to destroy Israel and are willing to kill their own people to do so. But why doesn't he seem worried about the consequences of his approach—one tailored for a world that is rapidly ceasing to exist?



HAMAS'S IDEA OF A CEASE FIRE



HUMAN SHIELDS.

LEADERSHIP IN MOTION

