

Writing on the Wall

Notes on current German-Israeli Relations

The relationship between Germany and Israel is of necessity a complex one. Given the fraught historical and political context one can easily get over-emotional. It would appear that this relationship, always fragile, is now close to breaking point. German by birth and Israeli by choice, which is itself an unusual choice in this day and age, I can claim more authenticity (although not neutrality) than many others who hold forth on this topic. I am far from discouraged; quite the contrary, I am inspired at this dark moment to seek the truth and the clarity and to confront the nonsense. The two nations which I can call my own are seriously at odds, the unity of the Adenauer-Ben Gurion days is now a dim memory, ties are overgrown today by a dense thicket of prejudice and misunderstandings. The first misunderstanding is that the conflict over Palestine - correctly stated: the conflict between Israel and the Arab countries - has been the main reason for tensions that exist between Israel and Germany.

Guilt

Relations between the two German Post-war-states and the Jewish state (founded on May 15th 1948) were, from the beginning, overshadowed by the catastrophe of German-Jewish assimilation and the trauma of the Shoa. As a consequence of Germany being halved by the superpowers, German attempts to come to terms with historic guilt towards the Jews, a painful process called *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, was dealt with in the two German states quite differently.

In West Germany, *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* became one of the central issues of intellectual life. Certainly after 1968 (the students' revolt and its long aftermath) it became obligatory for German intellectuals to write and make public statements about German guilt. German intellectuals felt themselves to be in a process of learning; how to overcome the disastrous failure of their fathers, how to learn from the Western victors, above all, how to adopt parliamentary democracy, a system that had almost no tradition in authoritarian Germany, as well as personal values of tolerance, mobility, openness to the world.

This self-imposed obligation played a decisive role in almost all sectors of West German life until 1990. With re-unification, West German society's habits changed dramatically and almost immediately as if now, having regained the status of great power, the posture of penitent student was no longer

necessary. Indeed, Vergangenheitsbewältigung in its exaggerated, sometimes total claim on intellectual life, became claustrophobic and repressive, and one realizes that there was much of the old authoritarian character underneath. Nevertheless, even with the frozen rituals of self-accusation, the ‘consensus in whispers’ (1), the artificial philo-Semitism and other theatrical displays, German attempts to come to terms with the past unquestionably changed intellectual life for the better. West Germany became more open to tolerance, transparency and intellectual mobility than any German society before. The era of ‘reviewing the past’ (Aufarbeitung) yielded a flood of educational literature, scientific research, severe soul-searching, even readiness to make active atonement to the State of Israel and the Jewish people.

The New Left

German chancellor Konrad Adenauer had early set the tone regarding West Germany’s relation with the fledgling Jewish state: his efforts, motivated by his personal Christian ethos (as a strong Catholic, he had been persecuted in Nazi Germany himself), led in 1952 to a series of treaties concerning reparation payments. These treaties were opposed in the German parliament by the Social Democrats SPD, the same SDP which now governs unified Germany. As a generality it can be said that, throughout the four decades of the old West German Bundesrepublik, Christian-Conservative circles held a positive, atoning and supportive attitude towards Israel (2).

The ‘New Left’, on the other hand, in spite of its condemnation of traditional, nationalist German anti-Semitism, found pretexts to attack that part of contemporary Jewry which lives in, or backs, the Jewish state. For the representatives of the generation of '68, now in power in German politics, business, media and culture, defining Israel as a lapdog of US global policy became an article of faith. The victories of the Jews in their wars of self-defense were hard for these Germans to take. Not just because Germany had just lost a war and was banned from all military undertakings, but because of the untoward sight of victorious Jews. Their attitude towards the Jewish state was schizophrenic; the Jews who lived in it were to be pitied and assisted by means of reparation payments, yet they observed that this new sort of Jew – the Israeli - did not display the role-specific behavior of ‘victims of history’ to which they had grown accustomed. For many Europeans the image of the Jew as noble warrior is far too unlikely and entirely incompatible with the picture they carry in their collective memory.

Israel is a Western democracy. It is situated in the middle of the Arab world, states that have no elected governments, parliaments or democratic structures, that are ruled by kings, sheikhs, family clans or military juntas.

Several of these rulers, as Arafat or Saddam, were held up by European intellectuals as models of anti-capitalist resistance. In spite of their inhuman cruelty towards their own peoples and totalitarian style of rule, for many they stand to this day for the possibility of a better world not dominated by the inequities of American-style capitalism, leaders of 'liberation' movements of the Arab masses against oppression by the Western world. Israel, which fights alone against them, is viewed therefore as the main obstruction to these liberation movements, and must consequently be a reactionary, colonialist structure. By and by, a repentant, pitying, patronizing attitude towards the Jewish state has morphed into one of outright condemnation; Israel, in the eyes of many Western intellectuals, is an aggressive, occupying state, violating international law, opposing the resolutions of the United Nations, disrupting 'world-peace', and therefore the main cause of international terrorism. These accusations, often coated in a sentimental philo-Semitism towards the victimized Jews of history, became the predominant attitude of the European Left.

Israel's Image in East Germany

Much simpler was the attitude of East Germany and other communist countries towards the Jewish state: they thought and did precisely what the USSR told them to think and do. The USSR was antagonistic to Israel, although not immediately (it was among the first states to recognize Israel in 1948, before Stalin's anti-Semitic paranoia broke out to full extent in the last years of his life), but from the early fifties until its final collapse, the Soviet Empire with all its satellites was stridently, belligerently pro-Arab.

Official propaganda in East Germany (officially called GDR, German Democratic Republic) was not only strictly anti-Israel, but also repressive of any manifestation of a Jewish vitality, especially the religious kind, past or present. A Jewish future was simply denied, for Judaism was considered *per se* a nationalist, reactionary concept. The word Jew was widely taboo, and only applied to showcase Jews who were "progressive" or "anti-fascist" in the very narrow, communist definition of these terms. There was a general silence about all matters of Jewish wisdom, history, life-style, religion, tradition. No book about these matters could be published, and books of former times still existing in state-controlled libraries or universities, were not available to the general public (3).

A few Jewish communities existed on East German territory, in Berlin, Leipzig, Dresden, Magdeburg, permanently monitored by the East German secret police (*Staatssicherheit*), living in the shadows, slowly but steadily dying out because, in a state generally denying the existence of a Jewish

people as a cultural and national entity, young Jews were kept off. For almost five decades there was no circumcision, Bar Mizva or any other Jewish ritual celebrated in East Germany. Until 1984 – 5 years before the collapse of the communist regime – there was neither a Rabbi nor mohel in the entire country (4).

In all communist countries, Zionism had been considered a criminal movement since the early fifties, when in several political trials in Moscow, Prague and Budapest (for instance the infamous Slansky trial), Jewish party functionaries were tried for being ‘agents of Zionism’ or ‘Cosmopolitanism’, and frequently sentenced to death. Soviet propaganda – as Nazi-propaganda had done before, and the propaganda of radical Islam does today – unearthed ‘evidence’ of an occult plan for Jewish world dominion. “We were led”, as I wrote in 1989 about my childhood in communist East Germany, “to mentally link the word Israel, and behind it the word Jewry, to a disturbing, destructive power that worked to thwart peace and justice in the world. Without knowing precisely how or why, we were brought up with the traditional prejudices of anti-Semitism.”(5)

Equally in West Germany, there was little public interest in, and information about, Jewish life. The word Jew remained associated with the Shoa and with victim-status in general. Until today, many Germans, educated in the East as well as in the West, live in total ignorance about all aspects of Jewish history, religion and culture. In particular, they have almost no knowledge about the State of Israel, its prehistory and establishment, nor about the constant threat from its Arab neighbors. This ignorance is one of the reasons for the rise in anti-Israeli prejudice during recent years in Germany as well as in most of ‘old Europe’.

Revival of Jewish Life in Germany

Since the German re-unification about ten years ago many efforts have been made to revitalize Jewish life in Germany. Some tens of thousands Russian Jews have been allowed into Germany, most of them have been, so far, successfully socialized. Jewish community leaders often complain that these Jews had little interest in Judaism and Jewish community life on arrival, and none at all after they became integrated into German society. Once they got the home, the job and the social benefits connected with their Jewish immigrant status, they would often turn their back on the Jewish community, both to avoid Jewish community taxes and, increasingly, to be hide from the rising anti-Semitic sentiments of their German fellow-citizens (6). Tens of thousands former Soviet citizens of German descent (so called Russland-Deutsche) were admitted to Germany in the same period, and many Russian

Jews have attempted to blend into this group, denying their Jewishness and actually masquerading as ethnic Germans (7). Thus it is argued by some critics that the state-led process of Russian Jewish immigration was no more than an effort to ‘restock the pond’ with Jews – to show the world that Germany has come to terms with its past. In fact, the younger of these Russian-German Jews have an untranslatable name for themselves, Kontingent-Juden, Jews to fill the quota that a modern, democratic country must possess.

It is undeniable that the number of Jewish communities in Germany has multiplied, many synagogues (destroyed during the Nazi era) were expensively renovated, community buildings newly built, stipends generously distributed, study centers founded, the possibilities to learn Hebrew at universities and elsewhere greatly increased. In several towns there are university departments for Jewish studies, in Berlin even a first yeshiva (with money from the American Lauder foundation). The few Jewish artists and writers living in Germany are supported by cultural institutions and encouraged to give public statements, some Jewish journalists and TV personalities have been showcased. For a number of years new Jewish life in Germany seemed to prosper, evidence of a new German society overcoming its anti-Semitic past, once and for all.

However the reach of this activity was limited. Most Germans were untouched by it, and the number of Germans who engaged in overcoming anti-Jewish prejudice by learning about Jews and Jewish life has remained low. While media interest in all matters Jewish has almost been excessive, there is no deeper interest in Jewish history, culture, religion or on the part of a majority of Germans. It was myopic to imagine that a cult of sympathy for Jewish victims of German persecution would evolve into a general sympathy with Jews and Judaism. The growing numbers of restored Jewish cemeteries and museums, the nerve-racking public discussions about a Holocaust memorial (Holocaust-Gedenkstaette), the flood of books, films, memoirs dedicated to the mass murder, the showing of photographs of Jewish corpses – which all became a staple of German media presentation – has, on closer inspection, produced ambiguous results. The ritualized invocation of death can easily turn against the living, it can become a substitute for real tolerance towards living Jews, and especially for their living state, Israel. It shrouds the Jew, now and forever, in a *sensus moriendi*, a thing inevitably doomed to die, not unlike the Christian concept of the Jewish people over the centuries. “This kind of sympathy with the Jews”, I wrote about ten years ago, “turns out to be a means to petrify them in the status of eternal victims, to fix them at Auschwitz as the appropriate place for them to be.” (8)

But even if there really had been a growing interest in Jewish life in Germany after re-unification – in vital Jewish life, I mean, willing to survive, not Jewish mass graves – it never embraced the Jewish state. As far as Israel was concerned, unified Germany gave a different, clearly negative sign. Already by the first Gulf War in 1991 there emerged an anti-American, anti-Israeli mass movement, less powerful than in Gulf War II, not yet orchestrated by the German government and not openly directed against the vital interests of Jewish state, nonetheless, out there. Although it was well-known that Saddam intended to launch rockets at Israel - to kill Jews -, German intellectuals, most of the media and not a few politicians showed widespread solidarity with the dictatorship of Saddam, not with the Jewish state.

For former East Germans it was a first and orienting experience with Western German democracy, especially Western German protest culture. The protest was directed against the state Israel, and the accusations followed a pattern well-known from communist times: Israel as the aggressor and trouble-maker, standing in the way of ‘world-peace’ and ‘progress’. Condemnation of Israel gave a comforting feeling of continuity to those Germans who were overwhelmed by economical, social and other changes in the re-unified country. German society, deeply split over many issues, could at least find a common language over Israel: that the Jewish state was negative, reactionary, oppressive. One might idly wonder if anti-Israeli and anti-American feelings have played a role in molding European countries into one unity. Will they become characteristics of a future European policy?

The role of the Jews in dealing with the past

The burden of facing up to the problems of the German-Jewish past and present also rests on the Jews, those who emigrated from Germany during the last century, but still feel connected to it, and those mostly Russian Jews who came looking for a better life in one of the richest countries of the world. Jews have lived in Germany for more than one and half millennia, the first German-Jewish community known is that of Cologne, mentioned in an edict of the Roman Emperor Constantine in 321 C.E. (9). The expulsion and extinction of the German Jews during the Nazi era terminated one of the oldest Diaspora cultures in history. In the words of a British scholar, “German Jewry, from being the proudest, most assimilated and apparently most secure of all European Jewish communities, became, almost overnight, a harried minority, struggling for unity and dignity under almost impossible conditions”. (10)

Whatever the German Jews had to endure in these 1700 years – there was

always discrimination, persecution and hatred – ultimately the co-existence of Germans and Jews was remarkably productive and fruitful, eliciting an unprecedented and far-reaching level of assimilation of German Jews to the point of super-patriotism. Integration on this scale had been achieved only in the Roman Empire, mediaeval Spain and recently in the United States. The symbiosis had its climax in the so-called 'Golden Decades of the German Jews', about sixty years, from the 1870's to the 1930's.

The Jewish contribution to German cultural and intellectual life was immense. The German Empire of 1871 came into being through the generous support of German Jews such as the banker Baron von Bleichroeder who financed the German war against France in 1870. What the Nazi era irreversibly destroyed caused a deep 'pain of loss' (Verlustschmerz) on both sides. Until today German Jews or their descendants cling to a German culture that was created, influenced and sponsored to a considerable extent by German Jews (although not sufficiently appreciated in Germany until today). The last representatives of that type of German Jew, still in love with 'German culture', inclined to overestimate German qualities, bare a share of the responsibility for misunderstandings in the relationship between Israel and Germany (11).

Phantom “World Peace”

The deeper reasons for German-Israeli discord today have dropped out of the public consciousness. Obscured by the confusion of a rapidly changing political landscape, or deliberately repressed, the antagonism simmers. The European stand on Israel is emotionally loaded, often passionate. German dismay at the change in the status quo in the Middle East (the Gulf Wars and aftermath), coupled with its own sense of frustration and dashed hopes was directed increasingly, often exclusively, towards Israel: as if 'world peace' were dependent on this small, comparatively young country.

I think it sensible to put the term 'world peace' in inverted commas, because as a term in day-to-day politics it is somewhat out of place. It can become a dangerous phantom if it is allowed to mystify vital perception. 'World peace' is a religious, messianic vision. It presupposes that a state of peace – in juridical terms – is one of our 'absolute rights'. Peace is, without doubt, a desirable status, even universal peace, as desirable as universal justice or health, but in the course of life almost everyone has to learn that peace depends on agreement with others and is therefore only a 'relative right'. The 'multi-polar world order of peace and justice', disingenuously visualized by German chancellor Schroeder on the eve of the American action against Saddam's Iraq, was nothing more than an argument for a status quo

which benefited the German nation.

Reluctance to accept the appearance of tectonic change in the world order, however, was not a uniquely German phenomenon. Hostility to the American ‘War on Terror’ – on the basis that it shattered an existing state of ‘world peace’ – was international. The result for Germany may be more painful than for other countries. German-American relations reached the lowest point since World War II, an outcome that will certainly cause more damage to Germany than to the United States.

Context in World Politics

In the final analysis, European-Israeli relations are largely determined by economic considerations. These are so strikingly clear and seemingly inescapable that I have to console myself by reflecting that such considerations are temporary in nature and subject to the whims of history. Hanan Ashravi, a Palestinian spokeswoman, was fairly candid when she stated, “The Europeans need us, our oil and the Arab market (...) The Europeans have heavily invested in the ‘peace process’ (...) Whatever happens in our region, will have its impact on Europe.” (12)

Most European – foremost Germany’s – economies depend on Arab oil and European exports to Arab countries, the input and the output of their economic circuit is both controlled by the same Arab countries. Naturally, the Europeans seek to build a ‘Peace Order’ in the Middle East that dovetails with their requirements, in a manner that will strengthen this partnership. At the same time European nations may have discovered that they are locked-in with some fairly unpredictable and sometimes untrustworthy partners. European aid money, for instance, destined to improve the living conditions of the unfortunate Palestinian populace, has been embezzled by Arafat and his cronies or misused to equip terror groups and to finance anti-Jewish hate campaigns for many years, a deplorable, but tolerated situation (13). There are many such examples. European irresolution has meanwhile encouraged Islamic terror groups to openly blackmail the democratic process in Europe itself (14).

Today it would appear that the European Union under German-French leadership has picked up where the Soviet Union left off. Dependent on unstable and economically unviable Arab regimes, the European Union is inevitably drifting into a conflict of interests, even a confrontation with the United States and Israel, courting the same calamities that contributed to the ruin of the former Soviet Empire. The amount of money which the Soviet Union ploughed into its Arab clients – for which it received little in return – will never be known. But certainly the unsuccessful Middle East policy, the

enormous losses caused by treacherous allies, had a big share in the financial collapse of the Soviet Empire.

Germany's situation is even worse than that of the other European countries. Britain, for example, has its own oil. Italy deals with Libya, whose dictator Gaddafi is no longer an obstacle to Italy's pro-American stand (in fact, he opposes Palestinian statehood, hates Arafat, was against Saddam, supports the War on Terror, and has now renounced all WMDs). Germany, by contrast, is dependent on oil from the worst enemies of the US and Israel. European politicians undoubtedly understand the pickle they are in, but don't know how to extricate themselves. For the last decade – subject to mounting political blackmail and extortion from their Arab partners – they have been caught in a painful political deadlock, a product of their own errors, self-deception and policy failures, not least the notion that they could challenge the United States in the Middle Eastern and on the world political stage. Their failure has created a backlash in the form of recriminations against the US and Israel for having 'engendered' a warlike situation between the Muslim nations and the West.

The Palestinian Conflict

In this context, the focus of European recriminations is the conflict between Israel and the residents of the disputed territories, 3.5 million dispossessed, stateless Arabs who call themselves Palestinians. The Neighboring Arab countries do nothing to ease the suffering of this wretched population, and have no use for them beyond permanently inflaming their suffering in order to provide a non-stop 'circus' for their own profoundly disaffected citizens. 'Never mind the shortages, summary arrests and chronic economic decline in our country', the Arab despot tells his people, 'look at how the Zionists and the Americans humiliate our brothers in Palestine.' It works like a charm, and not only for the Arab regimes. Also for the European Union, and even for some third world nations not even vaguely a party to this dispute.

Yassir Arafat, the leader of the Arabs of Palestine is, along with Fidel Castro, the world's last icon of the Left Radical Chic, his perennial kefiyeh cum Stalin tunic a sentimental throwback to better days of the 'revolutionary liberation of enslaved peoples from imperialism', and, more recently, a symbol of resistance against globalisation and American hegemony. But in reality Arafat is not and has never been a suitable symbol for people's liberation or any other progressive notion. His own rule in the disputed territories, based on violence, summary justice and corruption, became a symbol for a new despotism and anti-democratic style. By 1998, Hanan

Ashravi was explaining in an interview why she could no longer, in good conscience, remain in Arafat's cabinet: "I mean that we first have to lay the fundamentals of a really democratic system. A pluralistic system based on law and human rights (...) This kind of separation of powers within a democratic government will give all Palestinians possibilities of influence. Unfortunately, nothing of that has been established." (15)

Still more telling was the resignation speech of Mahmoud Abbas (Abu Mazen) who as Palestinian prime minister had tried to take some small steps in the direction of democracy. Even his modest attempts to establish some order out of the chaos, such as paying state employees through their bank accounts, were thwarted by masked gunmen. "What ever happens here", he stated, "is ordered by Arafat (...) The Ministry of Finance has been wrecked (by militants) and its property in Gaza stolen (...) Millions of US Dollars have been stolen by functionaries of the Palestinian Authority whose armed forces...are controlled by Arafat." (16)

Problems of a Two-State-Solution

One of the imponderables in the search for peace in the Middle East is whether or not the Arabs of Palestine actually want their own state, and what indeed they mean by that term. The dictatorial character of Arafat's regime makes free expression of opinion impossible, thus elections or polls in the 'territories' have the same value as in former Eastern Europe. It is curious that Palestinians living abroad had the same ambivalence to statehood, or any separation of the two peoples. For instance, Professor Edward Said, living in the US, who was considered a rather moderate voice within the Palestinian spectrum, was still, in the year 2000, justifying the Arab's rejection of the 1947 UN Partition plan: "My instinct is to say no (...) I can understand that the Partition plan was unacceptable to the Palestinians." (17)

The demand for a Palestinian state became a "tactic to eliminate the Jewish state", according to American international law specialist Alan Dershovitz. In his opinion the Palestinian demand was not more justified per se than that of Tibetans, Kurds, Basques, Turkish Armenians and other peoples fighting for statehood, but was granted much more attention and benevolence by the UN and the European Union. The reason was, as Dershovitz writes, that the Palestinians, as opposed to the aforementioned groups, have learned to use terrorism as a political instrument in a manner that evinced not rejection by European nations, but sympathy and understanding.

The actual meaning of the term state and other societal structures differs in Islam and in the West. Because I live in the Middle East it is easier for me to

see, first hand, how this can lead to misconceptions of complex problems. One example: when Islam talks of the duty to wage a religious or Holy war (*jihad*) against the non-believer, it does not refer directly the individual (*jihad* is not among the five main duties or “columns“ of the devout Muslim), but to the state. A second example: many Muslims regard the state as a ‘masculine’ entity, its function therefore limited to military and political power issues, whereas social matters, health, education, etc., are traditionally ‘female’ functions, therefore outside the purview of the state. This aspect of Arab culture needs to be understood. It does not mean that Arab nations do not have the capability to build modern, democratic states. What it does mean, however, is that the process could take considerably longer than many people in the West imagine.

Today it seems as if there is no alternative to the two-state-solution. “The current worldwide consensus supports this premise”, Dershovitz writes, “that there should be two states, one Jewish and one Palestinian, existing side by side” (18). But to realize that concept, you need two state systems, reliable, responsible, lawfully consolidated, organized, with an infrastructure that has proved itself (a demand that many Palestinians echo). A Palestinian state cannot be a body whose sole purpose is arm itself to the teeth; it must be ready to take on not just health care, education and social welfare, but postal services, garbage collection etc, and at the same time guarantee the basic rights of its citizens, women and children included, and the protection of minorities on its territory.

The Israeli “peace camp”, supported by the Clinton Administration, has tended to begin with the conclusion instead of the premise, trying to establish the two-state-solution before there really were two states, assuming the Palestinian state would emerge out of the ether once the treaty for the two-state-solution was provided – a somewhat daring, illogical attempt from the outset. The two-state-solution will remain fantasy as long as the pre-conditions for a Palestinian state are not in place, even the minimum conditions as set out by Hanan Ashravi (as quoted above).

Such a state must grant, for instance, equal rights to minorities living within its borders. That is to say, equal rights to Jewish settlers, in the same way that the Jewish state grants Arabs living on Israeli territory. As Jerusalem writer Lea Fleischmann stated: “There can only be peace with a democratic Palestinian state that accepts Jewish villages. The Jews must get Palestinian citizenship and the right to elect their representatives into (a Palestinian) parliament just as Arab Israelis elect theirs to the Knesset. Thus every demand to dismantle the settlements is nonsensical; there won’t be a Palestinian state ‘ethnical cleansed’ of Jews.” (19)

Indeed, the position of many Israel-critics, that Jewish settlements in Judea, Samaria and Gaza must be removed as a pre-condition for a Palestinian state-to-be, is absurd and unjustifiable from a legal standpoint. The acceptance of Jewish settlements by a future Palestinian state should be considered the litmus paper for the democratic credentials of the planned state. Unanimous endorsement by the West (vociferously supported by the Israeli ‘peace camp’) of the establishment of a state which is ab ovo intended to be anti-democratic is entirely without plausibility.

While it is argued that the settlements were the product of an illegal occupation, they were in fact established as a direct consequence of an Arab war of aggression. As a rule in international law, a successful combatant is not deprived of territories won during a war of defense. For instance, there is no demand to return the so-called German Ostgebiete (Eastern territories) from Poland after Germany lost them in World War II, and to relinquish all further claims on them was a pre-condition for German unification, signed by the German government in 1990. Thus, UN resolution 242 was the first regulation in history, as Dershovitz observes, to call upon a state “to return territories lawfully captured in a defensive war.” (20)

Treatment of Minorities

We consider the toleration of minorities a *conditio sine qua non* for every modern, democratic state. The treatment of those groups, for instance the Palestinian Christians, throws some light on how Arafat’s ‘Palestinian Authority’, once in power, intends to rule. The Christian population within the territories has dropped from 110,000 to 50,000, a loss of more than half (21). Most Palestinian Christians fled the ‘territories’ and went abroad after Arafat’s functionaries confiscated their land or committed acts of violence against their privacy or family. A Christian businessman from Beit Sahur recently listed to American journalists 34 cases of illegal land-expropriation by Arafat’s functionaries within his district alone. According to a spokesman for the Latin Patriarch in Jerusalem, there is a clear intention to islamize Bethlehem (22). It is striking that most European Christians show no solidarity with their fellow believers, preferring to exhaust all their protests on the Jewish settlers.

In marked contrast to the dwindling Christian population under the Palestinian Authority, the number of Muslims who live in the Jewish areas grew dramatically. Reviewing the pre-state period, Dershovitz notes, “after Jewish settlements blossomed not only because many Arabs were attracted to the newly settled areas and the newly cultivated land but also because the

Jewish presence improved health care, cut infant mortality and expanded adult life expectancy” (23). Already in 1937 a British report to the League of Nations stated that most Jewish settlements in the area were surrounded by immigrant Arab felahin (24). Today no one remembers the benefits that the early Jewish settlers brought to the Arab populace of a region which had been systematically neglected under Turkish-Ottoman rule. The long-downtrodden Arabs were provided with such accoutrements of civilization as water supply, medical care, hospitals etc., freely given by the Jewish settlers for practically nothing in return. This generosity was never acknowledged, today it is rather forgotten, memory of it repressed. And not only in the Arab countries this amnesia took place, also in Europe. I know of no official or media voice in the German language during the last decade which has acknowledged that there have been benefits resulting from the Jewish presence in the area.

While the Palestinian Authority withholds democratic rights from anybody who stands outside the silent, Arafat-enduring Muslim mainstream, the State of Israel embraces cultural diversity. In fact, there are few, if any, countries in the world with a greater variety of peoples, religions, cultures and languages within its borders. Jews, Muslims, Christians, Druses, Samaritans, Armenians and other ethnic and religious groups live peacefully together, the Jews alone are immigrants from about 140 different countries (including, most recently, Argentine and the Horn of Africa). In that multitude, also within the variety of the Arab populace, the Palestinians are only one group among others, so one may reasonably pose the question, why they and only they live in a permanent conflict with the Jews.

The ‘occupation’ is not the root cause of Palestinian rage, it is merely a pretext. European nations should remember that the presence, for instance, of American troops in the aftermath of World War II, turned out to be helpful for their own process of building or re-building democracies. Germany itself is the best example that a nation can build up democratic structures despite or because of occupying troops present on its territory.

It is one thing to understand how and why the Arab nations use Israel as a whipping boy for their failure as nations and, more widely, as a culture, it is quite another to understand why Europe underwrites this gross and catastrophic self-deception. Arab nations are being used by Europe as hatred-bearers act in proxy. The clamorous struggle that the Palestinian activists have for decades lead against the ‘Jewish oppressor’ satisfies many a Jew-hater in Europe who, trying hard to be democrats and modern liberals, must hide all ‘incorrect’ feelings. Thus not only are the Palestinian people misused by their own oppressors, Arafat and his networks of terror, but that oppression is sustained by a third party, acting out its own forbidden drives. In

consequence, terror groups like Hamas are funded by the European governments who pretend not to know that the money is being funneled into violence and terror.

Case Study: Security Fence

Dealing with the situation of the Palestinians requires some knowledge about the history of the conflict. I rely mainly on the analysis of Harvard Professor Alan Dershovitz, an International Law specialist, in his recent book "The case for Israel." One of the much disputed questions may serve as an example: whether Israel, erecting a so called 'security fence', violates international law. Building such a fence, its critics say, means illegal requisition of land for the Israeli infrastructure within the 'territories' (settlements, streets, checkpoints).

Dershovitz argues that UN resolution 242 of 1967 explicitly gives Israel the right to do so. The formula in this resolution is not, as many in Europe suppose, that Israel has to withdraw its troops from *all* territories won in the Six-Day-War, but simply 'from territories', without article and epithet: "Withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict." This sentence was a compromise between the claims of the Arab countries and their protecting Great Power, the Soviet Union, demanding a withdrawal from all the territories, and those of Israel, demanding guarantees for her security. The compromise, as Dershovitz reports, was reached only after many days of negotiations, mediated by the American ambassador to the UN. The almost never and nowhere quoted second paragraph of that resolution states that the opposing side has to grant Israel "the right to live in peace within secure boundaries free from threats or acts of force." (25)

To defend her security, Israel is permitted by the UN Security Council to carry out "territorial adjustments", and "(to retain) territories necessary (to secure) boundaries free from threats or acts of force" – the quoted UN resolution 242 was temporarily opposed by the Arab side. Nevertheless, through sustained propaganda, media campaigns and incessant distortion on the part of the Arabs, world opinion is now persuaded that the fence is being constructed on Arab land. In fact, the placement of the security fence was anticipated by 242 and is, according to that UN resolution, entirely justified in international law.

Meanwhile other countries have started to build 'security fences', too; for instance Thailand and India, to keep off Islamic militants, or the US, to stop illegal immigration at the Mexican border, projects that have not stirred up any international protest (26).

The target of modern Jew-hatred is the Jewish state, as the most prominent, most powerful embodiment of Jewish life. Israel is attacked on a daily base, not only by means of terror, also of tendentious UN resolutions, media distortions and pseudo-scientific research. Dershovitz lists the questions dominating the discussion about Israel in European media and society: Is Israel a colonialist, imperialist state? Is Israel's foreign policy aggressive, expansive, occupying, thus rightly accused of being in permanent violation of International Law by the Arab countries and the European Union? Was the occupation of the 'territories' unjustified? Is the way Israel is treating the Palestinians the impetus for the Israeli-Arab conflict? Has Israel caused the 'Palestinian refugee problem'? Is Israel a racist state? Does Israel commit genocide? Is Palestinian terrorism part of a legitimate struggle for independence? Is that terrorism nothing but an inevitable part of a 'cycle of violence', partly, if not mainly, caused by Israel? Is the Israeli 'policy of occupation' the *causa principalis* of the problems in the Middle East? Are the Jewish settlers the main obstacle to peace in the region?

In most international forums today, the answers to these questions are invariably unfavorable to Israel. Most of the European media reporting has been, during recent years, so one-sided and emotional that a mass hysterical reaction against the Jewish state could not fail to materialize. The process has been exacerbated by a second potent factor: Europeans, out of a general fear of Muslim extremists in their midst, are attempting to place the blame for the Islamic animus on Israel as if, for all the world, Islamic extremists were at war with the Jews alone, and had no issues with Christians, Hindus, Buddhists or everybody, religious or non-religious, who does not follow their way of life.

Responsibility of the Media

Overlooking the last decade, European mainstream media is largely to blame for fanning the flames of anti-Israel passion. More and more their reporting became biased against Israel, distorting facts (be it deliberately, be it out of ignorance) and evoking – especially in the eyes of young people who don't know about the life-threatening hostility of Israel's Arab neighbors from the very beginning of Jewish settlement in the area – the impression of a pariah state (27). If there is a return of open anti-Semitism in Europe today, the media has a share in it. In many cases their overheated, one-sided presentation of Israel as "aggressor", "occupier" and "peace-violator" has crossed the line from criticism of Israel to ordinary Jew-hatred.

Of course everybody has the right to criticize Israel like any other country

in the world. Radical Israel-critics will not only deny being anti-Semites but will assert that they mean the Jews well, and that, being concerned about peace and the safeguarding of human rights, they are merely drawing attention to possible aberrations. The more and the deeper that they hurt the vital interests of the Jewish state, the more they will proclaim their best intentions and deep concern for the welfare of the Jews. Many of them, including not a few Jews, insist that Israel and the Jews are not necessarily one and the same, and that one should not confuse wholesome criticism of Israeli policies with Jew-hatred.

Recent developments, however, have not born out this assertion. At a certain point, criticism against Israel leads inevitably to the inherent dynamism of traditional anti Jewish prejudice. I have addressed this subject in a previous article: “What may start as well-meaning criticism of Israel’s occupation policy may easily pave the way for questions concerning the Jews’ claim to be in Israel at all. Was not the foundation of their state in 1948 an arbitrary and unlawful act, violating the interests of other peoples in the region? Is not a tendency to violate the interests of other peoples, to cheat and betray them, a Jewish trait since time immemorial? Are not the Jews infamous for being impossible to live with, does their character not bring down on themselves their own calamities, including Jew-hatred and persecution?” (28).

But the struggle over the word anti-Semitism – whether it is applicable to radical Israel-critics or not – is anachronistic anyway. At a time when the most militant haters of Jews are primarily radically Muslims, who themselves would be considered ‘Semites’ by those who coined the expression ‘anti-Semitism’, the term is not any longer helpful. The terminology was, and has remained, an attempt to clad ordinary medieval Jew-hatred in a kind of a scientific, academic cloak, which is what its ‘creator’, the German Wilhelm Marr, had in mind when he wrote his pseudo-scientific books on the subject, and founded the ‘League of Antisemites’ in 19th century Germany with a membership of university professors, clergymen and other educated people (29). In truth, the phenomenon had never been based on rational or scientific reasons, but on resentment and prejudice since ancient times. Today Jew-hatred, after the disastrous failures of the last century, is looking for new names and modern patterns of legitimacy with which to conceal itself.

Need for new concepts in Middle East

The increasing hostility towards the State of Israel must give cause for concern. And not only to Jews. Anti-Semitism has always contained a counter-productive, even self-destructive element for the non-Jewish society

be seized with it. Thus we find people worried about the current situation, intellectuals, politicians, citizens, all over Europe. They know that such tidal waves of public opinion are not constant even if they seem overwhelming at certain moments in history. It seems the right time for European politicians – especially the parties in opposition, not burdened with the responsibility of past errors – to think about new concepts for the future. For decades, Western Europe wrote off Eastern Europe by acquiescing in the most inhuman, violent, anti-democratic regimes (Ceausescu in Romania et al.) for the sake of maintaining a dubious status quo, thus abandoning those countries to their tormentors. Now they play the same game with the Arab countries, writing them off as a lost cause, and supporting Arafat on the pretext that it is the right way to help the region in general and the Palestinian people in particular.

It has turned out that collaboration with Arafat, Saddam and other despotic rulers in the Middle East is at the expense of their oppressed peoples. European politicians and media would have it that these Arab rulers are popular, they ingenuously take the silence of the ruled as proof, ignoring the fact that the silence is imposed and that in these societies freedom of expression does not exist. Who really knows whether the Palestinian populace would back Arafat if he was stripped of his European backing and, consequently, of control over the armed gunmen who terrorize the Arab cities in the disputed territories?

When Saddam fell neither the Iraqi people, nor the army, nor even the elite units were willing to fight for him, and they were fully cognizant of who had given succor and support to their abominable leader up until the last moment. Among the first official buildings looted by the enraged people of Baghdad was the German Embassy. This incident should be read as a warning, ‘the writing on the wall’, a harbinger of the end of Europe’s credibility in the region.

Priority of Dreams

From the outset the two-state solution for Jews and Palestinians suffered from a difference of standards as applied to the two states. The Jewish state had to be guided by tolerance and human values, whereas nothing was asked nor expected of the other party because it enjoyed the hallowed status of victim. Victim not of Arafat and his network of terrorist organizations of course, but of the Israelis who bore guilt and obloquy for any and all ills that befell them. This produced, as a side effect, a satisfying emotional bonanza for Europe; it had the effect of exonerating European nations involved in the holocaust from their guilt-feelings, replacing those feelings with the firm

belief – reinforced by the European media and popular prejudice, even in the academic world - that Jews were no better than their former persecutors. Their logic ran like this: peace in the Middle East is the pivotal pre-condition for ‘world peace’. The Jews and their aggressive state are the obstacle to peace in the Middle East. Therefore, were it not for the Jews, there would now be peace in the world.

In view of the number of bloody conflicts raging throughout the world since 1948 (more than half of which involve a Muslim state or organization – see Samuel P. Huntington’s Clash of Civilizations), which have no connection with the state of Israel, this accusatory syllogism is absurd bordering on evil. The most bizarre element is the participation of certain prominent Israeli intellectuals on the side of the accusers, and here one can observe a curious and complex pathology at work.

There is some messianic vocation in this idea, and, in case of failure, a potential of Jewish self-hatred. Early, non-religious Zionism was deeply inspired by the ideas of Marx and other communist philosophers, and there are followers of these ideas to this day, taking responsibility for the sins of humanity in order to feel worthy of the miracle of Israel’s survival. Their vision was of a socialist utopia of kibbutzim, collective-farms and similar constructs, and there is still, among the followers of the shrinking Avodah party, some 19th-century romanticism alive. In the last election but one, the government they formed concentrated almost exclusively on a ‘demand’ for an unconditional peace with the Palestinians as a result of which they appeared to lose touch with the majority of Israeli voters.

In the inner-Israeli debate, the ‘peace question’ brought to the surface in dramatic fashion the deep cleft between the old Israeli Left and the growing numbers of religious and traditional Jews, the self-proclaimed Ashkenasi elite versus an overwhelming majority of Sephardim and Russian immigrants. The so called ‘peace camp’ does not represent, as its name suggests, peace loving Israelis – for almost everyone in the country does so -, but a dreamy variety of self-declared heirs of early Zionism, still convinced of their own moral superiority over newcomers, who look at the Israeli-Palestinian conflict less ideologically, more pragmatically. Thus the ‘peace camp’ has long since lost the support of the Israeli mainstream, and is fast becoming a fond memory.

Selective Transmission of Information

One of the reasons of the unsuccessful Middle East policy of Germany and other European countries is their determination to see only what they want to

see, and to ignore the realities on the ground. Israeli society is moving and changing, and images that were applicable yesterday, may be wrong today, certainly tomorrow. Foreign observers need a lot of intellectual mobility to follow the sometimes surprising changes that characterize the Israeli political scene. To complicate matters still further, we have increasingly to deal with the phenomenon of *infotainment*, a self-deceptive tendency within the media institutions who, in the constant drive for ratings, encourage the editor-salesman – in an office remote from the events he is reporting – to suggest to his correspondents the kind of story that will ‘sell’.

To give one recent example: Most German media with correspondents accredited in Jerusalem were entirely caught by surprise, even shocked, by prime minister Barak’s fall and Sharon’s election in 2000. Obviously most of the correspondents had not noticed or if they had noticed, they had not reported, how weak the Israeli left had become over the last decade, weak enough to make it impossible for Barak to build a government without settlers and orthodox-religious parties who would certainly abandon him the moment he made too far-reaching concessions to the Palestinian leadership, for instance in the question of Jerusalem. German, French and other European media fed their audience the view that Sharon was ‘unelectable’ (as one correspondent said in a conversation with me). Their reporting created an atmosphere that enticed the president of German parliament (Bundestag), Wolfgang Thierse, to try to interfere in the Israeli election process by making imprudent comments in an interview with the “Jerusalem Post”, warning that the election of Sharon would ‘cost Israel European friends and benefits’ (30), which did nothing to help the German government gain the confidence of the newly- elected Israeli prime minister.

Unfortunately, certain Israeli intellectuals play a key role in this process of self-deception. Permanent interview partners in German media such as ‘peace activist’ Uri Avneri, political scientist Moshe Zimmermann of Hebrew University in Jerusalem, or writers gathered around the Institute for the Translation of Hebrew Literature, as A.B. Yehoshua, David Grossman, Batya Gur, Yoram Kaniuk and others, routinely stigmatize certain sectors of the Israeli public such as religious Jews and settlers, and slander Israel’s current leadership. Some of the above names are beholden to the European book market, media, sponsoring institutions etc. (31), they say in public what their European sponsors want to hear, at the expense of truth and intellectual integrity, thus causing twofold damage: they belittle Israel’s reputation in the world, and they mislead European politicians, media people and other decision-makers.

In short, there is barely a country in the world about which so many

misleading opinions are disseminated by the media, even by correspondents living ‘on the spot’. The damage for Israel may be great, but the unsuccessful European Middle East policy shows that the European countries also pay a heavy price. Squandering billions of Euros on Arafat and his terror groups (not to mention the losses with Saddam), could have been avoided if the information was less selective, if some of the warnings about the criminal character of the current Palestinian leadership had been heeded, if there was less political bias in the European mainstream media’s view on Israel.

Auto-Suggestive Impact of Anti-Semitism

European Middle East policy, especially that of Germany during the last decade was informed by the notion that it was possible to force the State of Israel to abandon its own security. European media worked on Israelis to get them to expose their country to political experiments harmful, even destructive to the Jewish state and its citizens. The attempt of German parliament’s president Thierse to intimidate and threaten Israeli electors shortly before election day has already been mentioned, it belongs to a series of embarrassing statements of German politicians, among them chancellor Schroeder’s recent verbal attack on the occasion of his state visit to Egypt, October 2003, shortly after Israeli jets had bombed the bases of Islamic terror groups on Syrian territory.

All these attempts to influence Israeli policy have been damaging to Germany’s reputation in Israel and in the eyes of Jews worldwide. Although Post-War-Germany was never considered an ideal place for Jews to live, its creditable attempts to come to terms with its past helped build up a certain confidence in the Germans as a people, and in their country as a place to trust. Today the confidence of most Israelis towards Germany has sunk to a low point, opinion polls among young Jews reveal that Germany is again their least favorite place in the world. In Israel, even pro-European papers label the conduct of German representatives and the reporting of the German media as a “new anti-Semitism”.

The 19th century Zionist movement – which led to the foundation of the State of Israel – was triggered by anti-Semitism: it was the Dreyfus case in France that inspired the assimilated Jew Theodor Herzl to write – in German language – his famous book “Der Judenstaat”, The State of the Jews. Herzl’s shock – and inspiration – came from the amazing fact that Jew-hatred had returned with its old ugliness and barbaric power after many Jews had become convinced ‘it could never happen again’ in a civilized, democratic country at the very center of European modernism at the time. Napoleon granted the Jews civil rights and social equality, and some 60 years later in

the same country those rights were removed at a stroke in a shameless, mediaeval-style proceeding against a French officer who happened to be Jewish. Herzl concluded that anti-Semitism was both incurable and insoluble, and that it was time, finally, for Jews to take matters into their own hands.

After long, and painful experience the Jewish people have become adept at spotting the phenomenon in whatever guise it appears. Hostility to the nation of the Jews, under the sweetest-sounding names: 'love for peace', 'humanist concern', 'solidarity', 'academic responsibility', 'truth and information', call it what you like, turns out to be traditional Jew-hatred, no different to that of fifth Century BCE Haman, the pogroms of ancient Alexandria, and so on throughout history, a phenomenon that surfaces time and again. We find it connected with ambitions in world politics, with games of power and rule, with European hopes to strip the United States of its position as the leading World Power in our days. The longer we observe it, the better we learn, as Biblical scholar Yoram Hazoni found out, "to comprehend the incomprehensible, that the torment of the Jews in history has a cause, that no matter the time or the place, the one who seeks rule will, through the exposure to the Jews, relearn the anti-Semitism of Pharaoh, Amalek and Haman." (32)

As we know from history that Jew-hatred is destructive and damaging for the bearer. The success of the Jew-hater can only be short-lived. Nevertheless, there are always people, rulers, groups of people, even majorities, who try it. We also know that educated, rational man is not immune to it and 'modern' society can be infected as every society before. The Federal Republic of Germany is a young democracy. Only in 1973 did its allies find this state trustworthy enough to become a member of the United Nations. Today, only thirty years later, we find Germany side by side with the most questionable regimes in the world, with the bloodiest, most despotic rulers, with the self-declared enemies of Western democracy. 'You judge a man by the company he keeps'. Can a nation, just liberated from the darkness of inhumanity – and not even by itself – afford to be friends with Saddam's Iraq, the Ayatollah's Iran and other countries of that ilk?

Prospect

An explicit anti-Israel policy must sooner or later encourage anti-Semitic tendencies within a society, destabilize democratic structures, discourage creative powers and cause other serious consequences, especially in a country with Germany's recent past. The capacity at this time to recognize a dangerous political tendency is vital to the stability of the country, and the current German government appears not to have it. The worsening German-

Israeli relations are a token of a general failure of Germany's current foreign policy. Germany, France and other European countries are poised to sacrifice the corner-stone of their post war recovery, their fateful alliance with their savior and protector, the United States. After September 11th Germany and France have taken the lead in a worldwide 'movement of opposition' to United States' 'hegemony', acting as if a violent Islamic movement had not declared war on the West in general. Until this day they seem unwilling to accept the undeniable reality that the political context has dramatically changed, and that the 'War on Terror' must necessarily remain at the top of the American agenda irrespective of who wins the next Presidential election.

One doesn't have to be a prophet to see that the current European Middle East policy is doomed to fail. Not only because it is one of ingratitude and treachery towards the nation that once helped Germany, France and other European countries at its moment of deepest despair. What is more, these nations are repeating well-known patterns of historic failure: anti-Semitism, uncontrolled hatred, malice, self-righteousness, the early signs of mindlessness and megalomania. As always in history, Jew-hatred is among the early recognizable symptoms of the clinical condition.

Notwithstanding, there is hope. While most of the media, politicians and mainstream intellectuals harbor hostility to Israel, the Jewish state also has friends in Germany, many of them non-Jewish, also this a special phenomenon in the relationship between those two nations, a phenomenon likewise emerging from the long history of Jews living in Germany. Many Germans feel that losing 'their' Jews was a damage to their country, their culture, their quality of life, what all they put in the untranslatable German term *Verlustschmerz*, 'pain of loss'. Or at least the awareness that hostility towards Jews was always the beginning of their own failure, that the guilt of Auschwitz and the catastrophe of their own nation in 1945 were inseparably connected.

For these and other reasons, there is a sizeable undercurrent of supporters, sympathizers and private donors, unwavering in their affection for the Jewish state who have not allowed themselves to be swept away in the tidal wave.

They may not be exactly the mouthpiece of German and European public opinion today, may not get a lot of airtime in the media, may not even get a single word in, but they exist, they are present. They tell me that they are quietly waiting for the current dementia to wear off. They stand for reflection and sensibility, for Germany's and Europe's return to reason.

© CHAIM NOLL, 2003

Translated by the author and John Krivine, Sde Boqer Campus, Israel. The English version is abridged.

A German version of the essay was published in the political review "Deutschland Archiv", 1/2004, pp. 42-57

Notes:

(1) Chaim Noll, *Nachtgedanken über Deutschland* (Night Thoughts About Germany), Reinbek 1992, p.122 ff.

(2) Although just these days a Christian conservative Member of Parliament caused a stir with his anti-Semitic remarks, proving that no political party in Germany is immune against anti-Semitism, cf. Israeli newspaper *Yediot Acheronot*, 2.11.2003

(3) About the situation of the Jews in the Eastern bloc and Soviet policy in the Middle East cf. Evan R. Chesler, *The Russian Jewry Reader*, Berman House, New York 1974, chapter 10 *Stalin and the Jews* and 11, *Soviet Jewry under Khrushchev*, and Judd Teller, *The Kremlin, the Jews and the Middle East*, Yoseloff, New York 1957

(4) Chaim Noll, *Früchte des Schweigens. Jüdische Selbstverleugnung und Antisemitismus in der DDR* (Grapes of Silence. Jewish Self-Denial and Anti-Semitism in the GDR), DeutschlandArchiv Köln, 7/1989

(5) ibd.

(6) Cf. Andreas Nachama, then president of the Jewish Community Berlin, at the conference *The Impact of the German-Jewish Experience on Western Culture*, Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Beer Sheva, Israel, 9.3.1998, or Erwin Angress, Chairman of Jewish Community Paderborn, at the symposium *Jewish-Christian Future in the Third Generation after the Holocaust*, Deutsches Institut für Bildung und Wissen, 6.11.1997, cf. O.Kohler, W.Marcus (ed.), *Jüdisch-Christliche Zukunft in der Dritten Generation nach Auschwitz*, Paderborn 1997, p.48 f.

(7) Information of the current President of the Jewish Community Erfurt, 2.3. 2004

(8) Chaim Noll, Fragen nach der deutschen Solidarität mit Israel: Muss ein Jude tot sein, damit man ihn liebt?, Die Welt, Bonn 23.3.1991

(9) Cf. Ruth Gay, *Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland (History of the Jews in Germany)*, Munich 1993, p.18f.

(10) Naomi Shepherd: *A Refuge from Darkness. Wilfrid Israel And the Rescue of the Jews*, New York 1984

(11) For instance 80 years old Israeli ‚peace activist‘ Uri Avneri (Helmut Ostermann), born in Beckum, Westfalen, Germany, who recently stated that „the Jewish soul“ feels more attracted to German nature than to that of all other peoples. Cf. Uri Avneri, Shalom, Salaam, Friede, in H.Jahn, G.Scheidler (ed.), *Sieben Tage in Jerusalem*, Gerlingen 2002, p.11 ff.

(12) Hanan Ashravi, Jerusalem gehört keinem allein, Mut, Asendorf, 10/1999, p. 72 ff.

(13) About foreign aid money „disappearing“ in Arafat’s secret bank accounts cf. e-mail-info of Jerusalem based news agency KNA (Ulrich W.Sahm), 28.2.2003, based on american magazine Forbes where Arafat’s private fortune was estimated between 0.5 and 1.3 billions of Dollars, more than that of the British Queen.

(14) Obviously the outcome of last parliamentary elections in Spain, 15.3.2004, just three days after an al-Qaeda-launched terror attack in Madrid with hundreds of victims, that produced a sharp turn to the anti-American left,

although polls before the attack had predicted a victory of the right-wing coalition parties.

(15) Ashravi, loc.cit.

(16) Resignation speech of former Palestinian prime minister Mahmoud Abbas (Abu Mazen) to the Palestinian Council, 6.9. 2003, translation into German Daniela Marcus (Arbeitskreis Hilfe für Israel, Winfried Amelung, [http: home.t-online.de/home/Amelung](http://home.t-online.de/home/Amelung))

(17) Edward Said, interview with Israeli newspaper HaArez, 18.8.2000

(18) Cf. Alan Dershowit, *The Case for Israel*, J.Wiley Publishers, New York 2003, p.65

(19) Lea Fleischmann, Dialog mit einem Schriftsteller. Kritische Auseinandersetzung mit David Grossmans ‚Friedenschronik‘, Frankfurter Jüdische Nachrichten, September 2003

(20) Dershovitz, loc.cit., p. 96

(21) Dark Days in Bethlehem, Newsweek, 29.9. 2003

(22) ibd.

(23) Dershovitz, loc.cit., p.28

(24) Report by His Britannic Majesty’s Government to the Council of the League of Nations on the Administration of Palestine and Trans-Jordan for the Year 1937, Colonial No.146, p.223 f.

(25) U.N.Security Council, Resolution 242, 22.11.1967, cf. Dershovitz, loc.cit., p.97

(26) American news magazine Time, 15.3.2004

(27) German media was among the pioneers in this „general tendentiousness“, as Jerusalem based newspaper Jerusalem Post observed already in 1995, cf. German Sins Irritate More, Jerusalem Post, 15.9.1995

(28) Chaim Noll, Nur noch Worte von gestern (Only Talk of Yesterday), liberal, Berlin, 4/2002, p.48

(29) German writer Wilhelm Marr (1818-1904), author of „Der Judenspiegel“ where the anti-Semitic theories of the time were first outlined. At the same time pseudo-scientifically coated Jew-hatred in the writings of Gobineau, Heinrich von Treitschke, Richard Wagner, Imperial court chaplain Wilhelm Stoecker et al.

(30) Wolfgang Thierse, Interview The Jerusalem Post, 25.12.2000, cf. news agency Idea 4/2001, public protest of the German Arbeitskreis Hilfe für Israel (Help for Israel), 28.12.2000, and Thierse's answer, 10.2.2001

(31) The Institute for the Translation of the Hebrew Literature translates Hebrew written texts into European languages. Often these books are published in European countries before the Hebrew original is published in Israel. The publication of those books in Israel depends on European sponsorship (Druckkostenzuschuss, contribution to printing costs) that can be found only after the book was published abroad. Thus, the writer tries to satisfy his European audience at any cost. A recent example is Yoram Kaniuk's collection „Der letzte Berliner“, published in Munich in 2002 as a German translation, but still unpublished in Israel. Libellous statements against Israeli citizens could be removed from the forthcoming Hebrew edition only after the German translation had already been published.

(32) Yoram Hazony, The Dawn. Political Teachings of the Book of Esther, Jerusalem 1995, p.111