

ADELAIDE INSTITUTE

PO Box 3300
Adelaide 5067
Australia
Mob: 61+401692057
Email: info@adelaideinstitute.org
Web: <http://www.adelaideinstitute.org>

Online
ISSN 1440-9828



November 2012 No 659

-----Original Message-----

From: Peter Myers [<mailto:peter@mailstar.net>]
Sent: Sunday, 21 October 2012 6:27 PM

Subject: Bankrupted Töben declares "The World is my prison" Töben grounded

Peter Kohn, October 19, 2012

<http://www.jewishnews.net.au/tobengrounded/27971>

IF Adelaide man Fredrick Toben has any more plans to travel to Iran, where he's previously taken part in Holocaust denial campaigns, they are likely to be thwarted, after he was declared bankrupt by a Sydney court.

The Holocaust denier did not appeal last month's bankruptcy declaration by the Federal Magistrates Court in Sydney by October 15, the final date he could lodge an appeal.

Under Australian law, bankrupts are required to surrender their passports to keep them in the country and make it easier for their estate to be administered.

Toben, who has been jailed for Holocaust denial in Germany, visited Iran in 2003 to give a speech denying the Holocaust and in 2006, when he took part in a Holocaust-denial conference sponsored by the Iranian regime.

The bankruptcy declaration was made after Töben failed to cover legal debts arising from a 2009 contempt case against him by Jeremy Jones.

Jones, as president of the Executive Council of Australian Jewry at the time, was the plaintiff in a defamation case brought against Toben for rejecting the reality of the Holocaust and claiming Jews who were offended by his denial possessed "limited intelligence".

In 2002, the Federal Court found for Jones and ordered Toben to remove offensive, anti-Semitic materials from his website.

In 2009, Toben was found guilty of contempt of court for continually uploading more of the same content in defiance of the court order. He served a three-month prison sentence in Adelaide.

A creditor's petition was made against Toben's estate for \$175,618.97, the taxed legal costs incurred by Jones during the contempt proceedings.

Toben told the court he was being victimised politically and that he had no assets.

In being declared bankrupt, Toben follows in the footsteps of British Holocaust denier David Irving, who

1. Fredrick Toben bankrupted over Holocaust Denial suit
2. Australian Jewish News trumpets Töben's bankruptcy, surrender of passport
3. Bankrupted Toben declares "The World is my prison"
4. Judaism's Universal Values: "We don't want a Boer state"

*

1. Fredrick Toben bankrupted over Holocaust Denial suit

<http://www.jta.org/news/article/2012/09/24/310776/6/holocaust-denier-in-australia-declared-bankrupt>

Holocaust denier Fredrick Toben declared bankrupt in Australia, September 24, 2012

SYDNEY (JTA) -- Dr. Fredrick Toben, a Holocaust denier living in Australia, was declared bankrupt after a claim against him by a Jewish leader.

The Adelaide-based Toben was declared bankrupt in Federal Magistrates Court on Monday. He has 21 days to appeal.

Toben was ordered last year to pay \$175,000 in court costs to Jeremy Jones, a former president of the Executive Council of Australian Jewry, who filed the case against him. When Toben failed to pay the court costs, Jones lodged a bankruptcy claim against him.

Despite his financial woes, Toben said on his revisionist Adelaide Institute website that he will "not recant and continues to denounce the Holocaust lies." The Germany native was jailed in 2009 for contempt of a court order banning him from publishing anti-Semitic material on his website.

Jones said the bankruptcy declaration was an administrative ruling.

"It has nothing to do with the legal or moral argument at all," Jones said.

*

2. Australian Jewish News trumpets Töben's bankruptcy, surrender of passport

Israel Shamir adam@israelshamir.net 19 October 2012 18:22. No mention of Töben paying court costs last year that necessitated the selling of his modest home - all up \$75,000. ==

was bankrupted as a result of the costs of his ill-fated defamation claim against US Holocaust historian Dr Deborah Lipstadt, which he launched after she described Irving's statements as Holocaust denial.

*

3. Bankrupted Toben declares "The World is my prison" - Peter Myers, October 21, 2012

Last night, I rang Toben at his residence in Adelaide.

I don't agree with his position on the Nazi Holocaust of the Jews, but I oppose laws which selectively criminalize denial of such events.

Why are 6 million Jews so much more important than 6 million Ukrainians? Or 30 million Chinese?

Why is the Red Terror initiated by Lenin and Trotsky, and defended by them in the face of criticism by Karl Kautsky, not as fitting a subject for memory as Hitler?

Invasions and genocides have occurred for millenia.

The Jewish Bible even boasts of a genocide of Canaanites by invading Israelites under Joshua – a genocide supposedly ordered by God:

"So kill all the male children. Kill also all the women who have slept with a man. Spare the lives only of the young girls who have not slept with a man, and take them for yourselves" (Numbers 31: 7-19)

"The LORD your God will clear away these nations before you ... the LORD your God will give them over to you, ... until they are destroyed. ... you shall blot out their name from under heaven; no one will be able to stand against you, until you have destroyed them.

(Deuteronomy 7:22-4)

"the LORD our God gave him over to us; and we struck him down, along with all his offspring and all his people. At the time we captured all his towns, and in each town we utterly destroyed men, women, and children. We left not a single survivor. ..." (Deuteronomy 2:33-35).

More gory details at Joshua ch 6. Look all these verses up at <http://www.biblestudytools.com>

Archaeologists who have excavated these ancient towns, looking for evidence of the invasion, report that it did not happen: Biblical writers just made up the story, passing it off as "the Word of God". The Bible is not History, but Polemics.

The Greeks and the Hebrews of 1000 BC were part of the same cultural milieu in the Eastern Mediterranean.

The Greeks produced Homer; the Jews produced the Bible. The Bible castigates "Pagan" (Goy, non-Jewish) culture for its human-like gods, claiming the high ground with its more abstract God. (That God nevertheless retains traces of his anthropomorphic past, including having had a wife, Asherah - as Francesca Stavrakopoulou has shown). But the great sin of the Jewish world was to attribute their own writings to that God, giving them a false authority, and misleading hundreds of millions of people with such impersonations.

Israel's treatment of the Palestinians is deemed a Genocide in some quarters. It has initiated wars against its Arab and Islamic neighbours, and incited the US to invade them too; it is no less warlike than Nazi Germany.

Whereas Irving and Toben were bankrupted by the Lobby, Norman Finkelstein was forced out of his university job in part because his book *The Holocaust Industry* enraged the Lobby.

Toben told me, "the World is my Prison".

His bank account has been frozen, and he's not sure how he'll be able to receive his Old Age Pension payments.

In 2008, Toben's removal from a plane at Heathrow airport, while in transit to Australia, was front-page news. But his bankruptcy in 2012, initiated by the same hostile forces, has been totally ignored by the media - except for Jewish newspapers celebrating his demise.

Nevertheless, his spirit undaunted, he still claims the moral high ground: whereas he himself is "financially bankrupt", his enemies are "emotionally and intellectually bankrupt".

*

4. Judaism's Universal Values: "We don't want a Boer state"

<http://mondoweiss.net/2012/09/the-true-crisis-of-zionism-silent-majority-of-us-jews-have-never-supported-it.html>

The true crisis of Zionism: silent majority of US Jews have never supported it

by Allan C. Brownfeld on September 21, 2012

This review of Peter Beinart's book *The Crisis of Zionism* is to appear in the next issue of the journal of the American Council for Judaism.

Author Allan Brownfeld allowed us to post it ahead of publication.

There can be little doubt that the philosophy of Zionism----Jewish nationalism----is in retreat among American Jews. Zionism holds that Judaism is not a religion of universal values, but an ethnicity. It believes that Israel is the "homeland" of all Jews and that those living outside of Israel are in "exile.". Zionists urge emigration to Israel, "aliyah," as the highest Jewish value.

Most American Jews, quite to the contrary, believe that Judaism is a religion, not a nationality. They believe that they are American by nationality and Jews by religion, just as other Americans are Protestant, Catholic or Muslim. While they wish Israel well, they do not believe that it is their "homeland.". They believe themselves to be fully at home in America. This is nothing new. As early as 1841, at the dedication ceremony of Temple Beth Elohim in Charleston, South Carolina, Rabbi Gustav Poznanski declared: "This country is our Palestine, this city our Jerusalem, this house of God our temple."

In the years since the end of World War II, in the wake of the Holocaust, many American Jews had a brief

flirtation with the Zionist idea. Even the Union for Reform Judaism declared that, somehow, "Israel," rather than God was "central" to their religion. More recently, however, we see that identification with Israel is declining among American Jews, particularly young people.

"Israel Is Out"

Writing in the Israeli newspaper HAARETZ (June 26, 2012), Rabbi Eric Yoffie, formerly the leader of the Union for Reform Judaism, noted that, "I spoke a few weeks ago with someone who works with American Jewish organizations in planning programs for their meetings and conventions.

'Israel is out,' he told me. The demand for speakers about Israel or from Israel has dropped dramatically over the last decade. American Jews are simply interested in other things."

In a widely discussed book, "The Crisis of Zionism," Peter Beinart, a prominent liberal, former editor of THE NEW REPUBLIC, Orthodox Jew and self-declared Zionist, argues that Zionism has turned its back on what he believes are its own ideals.

Beinart laments that the American Jewish organizational establishment promotes "victimhood" while wielding power and that the State of Israel does much the same thing. "Perpetual victimhood," he writes, "is not a narrative that can answer the two great Jewish challenges of our age:

how to sustain Judaism in America, a country that makes it easy for Jews to stop being Jews, and how to sustain democracy in Israel, a country that for two thirds of its existence has held the West Bank, a territory where it's democratic ideals do not apply."

Mythical Israel

The Israel which young American Jews observe is quite different, in Beinart's view, from the mythical Israel embraced by their parents: "For

44 years, twice a college student's life span, they have seen Israel control territory in which millions of Palestinians lack citizenship.

And since the 1980s, they have seen Israel fight wars not against Arab armies, but against terrorists nestled amid a stateless and thus largely defensive Palestinian population. Thus, they are more conscious than their parents of the degree to which Israeli behavior violates democratic ideals and less willing to grant Israel an exemption because it stands on the brink of destruction."

What is needed, Beinart argues, is "...a new American Jewish story, built around this basic truth: We are not today's permanent victims. In a dizzying shift of fortune, many of our greatest challenges today stem not from weakness but from power. If non-Orthodox American Jewish life withers in the coming generation, it will be less because gentiles persecute Jews than because they marry them. And if Israel ceases being a democratic Jewish state, it is less likely to be because

Arab armies invade the West Bank than because Israel permanently occupies it."

Jewish tradition, Beinart believes, offers no simple lessons for how to wield power, and the lessons it does teach can sometimes be hard for modern liberals to stomach: "...it is striking that when describing the previous two times that Jewish sovereignty failed---the Kingdom of Judah's destruction by the Babylonian empire around 586 BCE and the Hasmonean dynasty's destruction by the Romans more than 500 years later--our tradition insists that physical collapse was preceded by ethical collapse. Again and again, Jewish texts connect the Jewish right to sovereignty in the land of Israel to Jewish behavior in the land of Israel. In the words of Jeremiah, 'If ye oppress not the stranger, the fatherless and the widow, and shed not innocent blood in this place, neither walk after other gods to your hurt: Then will I cause you to dwell in this place, in the land that I gave to your fathers, for ever and ever.'"

Even Zionism's primary architect, Theodor Herzl, was concerned about how the experiment he promoted would evolve. In his book "Altneuland"

(Old-New Land), the book's hero, presidential candidate David Littwak, admits, "There are other views among us.". The foremost proponent is Rabbi Geyer, who seeks to strip non-Jews of the vote. Herzl modeled Geyer on an anti-Semitic demagogue in his native Austria, thus raising the specter that once Jews enjoyed power, they might persecute others in the same way they were persecuted. The novel ends with the campaign between Littwak's party and Geyer's. "You must hold fast to the things that have made us great: to liberality, tolerance and love of mankind,"

one of Littwak's supporters tells a crowd. "Only then is Zion truly Zion.". In his final words, the outgoing president declares: "Let the stranger be at home among us.". After a fierce contest, Littwak's party wins. Geyer leaves the country, and in the novel's epilogue, Herzl implores readers to make his Zionist dream come true.

"As a vision of the Zionist future," writes Beinart, "'Altneuland' has its problems. While Herzl believed deeply in equality for individual Arabs, he could not imagine an Arab national movement demanding a state in Palestine of its own. (His rival, the cultural Zionist Ahad Ha-am, knew better, insisting that, 'This land is also their national home...and they have the right to develop their national potential to the best of their ability.')...'We don't want a Boer state,' wrote Herzl in his diary, expressing revulsion at racist Afrikaner nationalism. 'But a Venice!'"

Treatment Of Indigenous Arabs

The indigenous Arab population of Palestine has, Beinart notes, not been treated in the humane manner advocated by either Herzl or Ahad Ha-am. In the 1948 war, he points out, Zionist forces committed abuses so

terrible that David Ben-Gurion, Israel's first prime minister, declared himself "shocked by the deeds that have reached my ears." In the town of Jish, in the Galilee, Israeli soldiers pillaged Arab houses, and when the residents protested, took them to a remote location and shot them dead.

Similar atrocities occurred with some frequency.

"During the war," writes Beinart, "roughly 700,000 Arabs left Palestine and irrespective of whether most left their homes voluntarily or were forced out, Israel refused to let them return...A year after it eliminated its most flagrant discrimination against its own Arab citizens, Israel made itself master of millions of Palestinian Arabs who enjoyed no citizenship at all. Suddenly, Rabbi Geyer had a kingdom of his own."

Beinart laments the treatment of non-Jewish residents of Israel. The Or Commission, tasked by the Israeli government with investigating the conditions for Arab Israelis in 2003, found that, "Government handling of the Arab sector has been primarily neglectful and discriminatory."

This is especially true, Beinart shows, when it comes to social services. In part, because of restrictions on Arab access to Israeli public land, Arab citizens today own less than 4 per cent of Israel's land even though they constitute almost 20 per cent of its population. A 2010 study by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development found that Israel spends one third more per Jewish Israeli student than per Arab Israeli student.

Beyond this, Beinart declares, "Israel's flag features a Jewish star, its national anthem speaks of 'the Jewish soul,' and its immigration policy grants Jews, and only Jews, instant citizenship."

Israel's Theocracy

Israel's theocracy is something not envisioned by Herzl: "As Herzl makes clear...there is nothing in the Zionist project that requires Israel to cede control over marriage to clerics, thus forcing Jews who marry in Israel to be married by a rabbi and Christians or Muslims to be married by a minister or imam. Instituting civil marriage, and thus giving Arabs and Jews the right to marry inside Israel across religious lines, would not only mean greater liberty for Israel's Arab citizens but for its Jewish ones as well....For the past 44 years, on the very land on which Palestinians might establish their state---the state that could help fulfill the liberal Zionist dream---latter-day Rabbj Geyers, secular and religious alike, have forged an illiberal Zionism that threatens to destroy it."

Much space is devoted by Beinart to the growth of racism in Israel and the manner in which American Jewish leaders ignore it. He laments that, "As painful as it is for Jews to admit that race hatred can take root among a people that has suffered so profoundly from it, the ground truth is this: occupying another people requires racism, and breeds it."

The polling on Israeli Jewish attitudes toward Arabs is, Beinart declares, "shocking.". Seventy per cent of Jewish Israelis, according to a poll by the Israel Democracy Institute, oppose appointing Arab Israelis to cabinet posts. A survey by the Friedrich Ebert Foundation found that 49 per cent of Jewish Israelis aged 21 to 24 would not befriend an Arab. (Among Arab Israelis of the same age, 19 per cent said they would not befriend a Jew). Fifty six per cent of Jewish Israeli high school students, according to a survey by Tel Aviv University's School of Education, do not believe that Arab citizens should be allowed to run for the Knesset. And a poll by the Truman Institute at the Hebrew University reported that 44 per cent of Jewish Israelis believe that Jews should avoid renting apartments to Arabs.

Extreme Racism

The extreme racism of Rabbi Meir Kahane has, Beinart shows, become respectable in contemporary Israel. "In 1988, after Meir Kahane advocated the forced 'transfer' of Israel's Arab citizens from the country," he writes, "his party was banned. In 2010, in a speech before the United Nations, Israel's foreign minister, the former Kahane disciple Avigdor Lieberman, proposed 'right-sizing the state' by 'moving borders to better reflect demographic realities.'. In other words, redrawing Israel's border so as to exile hundreds of thousands of its Arab citizens against their will. When asked about his foreign minister's proposal, Benjamin Netanyahu said Lieberman's speech had not been coordinated with him, but did not disavow its substance."

Beinart shows that opinions which were once considered dangerous enough to ban political parties advocating them, have now become mainstream.

"Population transfer," warns liberal Knesset member Dov Khenin, "has turned from a nightmare into an operational plan." In 2009, Daniel Gordis, senior vice president of the Shalem Center, an Israeli think tank with close ties to the Netanyahu government, declared that while on the surface there are almost innumerable reasons to denounce transfer...the picture is not nearly so one sided as it is often portrayed...population transfers do not need to be catastrophic for those moved'...A 2010 poll by the Israel Democracy Institute found that

53 per cent of Jewish Israelis want their government to encourage Israel's Arab citizens to leave...The Israelis most committed to liberal democracy see Herzl's dream slipping away. And here in the U.S. the most powerful leaders of the Jewish establishment insist on seeing almost nothing at all."

Jewish Power

At the core of the problem, according to Beinart, is "the refusal to accept that both in America and Israel we live in an age not of Jewish weakness, but of Jewish power and that without moral vigilance, Jews will abuse power just as hideously as anyone else...By discussing power only as a means of survival, the American Jewish

establishment implicitly denies that Jews can use power for anything but survival.

They deny that Jews, like all human beings, can use power not merely to survive but to destroy. A few years ago, a journalist reported that Malcolm Hoenlein, the influential executive vice president of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, had a photo in his conference room of Israeli F-15s flying over Auschwitz. It is a photo of fantasy, Israeli jets never bombed Auschwitz and never will. What they have bombed, in recent years, is the Gaza Strip, a fenced-in, hideously overcrowded, desperately poor slum from which terrorist groups sometimes shell Israel. Hoenlein, in other words, has decorated his conference room not with an image of the reality that he helps perpetuate, but with an image of the fantasy he superimposes on that reality. In this way, he embodies the American Jewish establishment, which, by superimposing the Jewish past on the Jewish present, is failing the challenge of a new age."

In the aftermath of the Six Day War, Beinart declares, "American Jewish liberalism and organized American Zionism began drifting apart...When Israel won a shocking, lightning victory, American Zionism hit fever pitch."

Redefining Anti-Semitism

As Israel's treatment of its Arab citizens and the inhabitants of the occupied West Bank drew criticism, what the American Jewish establishment did, Beinart explains, was to redefine anti-Semitism:

"American Jewish leaders hit upon an explanation: the world was turning against Jews because it no longer saw them as victims. In 1974, Benjamin Epstein, the national director of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), co-authored 'The New Anti-Semitism,' a book whose argument proved so influential that in 1982 his successor, Nathan Perlmutter, echoed it in a book entitled 'The Real Anti-Semitism In America.'. Epstein's argument was that for a period after World War II guilt over the Holocaust kept anti-Semitism at bay. But with memories of the Holocaust fading, anti-Semitism had returned, largely in the form of hostility to Israel, because Israel represented Jewish power. 'Jews are tolerable, acceptable in their particularity, only as victims,' wrote Epstein and his ADL colleague Arnold Forster, 'and when their situation changes, so that they are either no longer victims, or appear not to be, the non-Jewish world finds this so hard to take that the effort is begun to render them victims anew.'"

Thus, at the very moment that Israel's occupation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip made it essential for American Jews to confront the ethical challenges of Jewish power, American Jewish leaders began insisting that to even acknowledge the misuse of Jewish power was to deny Jewish victimhood and thus victimize Jews anew.

"The argument caught on in the 1970s," notes Beinart, "victimhood especially as a strategy for defending Israel, supplanted liberalism as the defining ideology of organized American Jewish life."

Use Of Holocaust

The use of the Holocaust as an argument against criticism of Israel slowly evolved. In 1960, when Israel arrested and tried Adolf Eichmann, the ADL insisted that the trial was "not a case of special pleading for Jews because what happened to the Jews of Europe...can very well happen to other peoples.". But in the 1970s, writes Beinart, "American Jewish organizations began hoarding the Holocaust, reselling it as a story of the world's eternal hatred of Jews, linking it to criticism of Israel.

In 1973, the ADL embarked on a 'new international mission' to combat 'Arab anti-Israel propaganda,' and four years later created a Center for Holocaust Studies. In 1980, the ADL's Oscar Cohen advised the National Conference of Christians and Jews to link its Holocaust programming 'to Israel and the dangers which confront it.' The following year, as part of its bid to prevent the Reagan administration from selling AWACS surveillance planes to Saudi Arabia, AIPAC sent a copy of the novel 'Holocaust' to every member of Congress."

Peter Beinart's assessment of American Jewish organizational life is harshly critical. When it comes to Israel, he writes, there are today two kinds of mainstream American Jewish organizations: "Those whose tolerance for the occupation is warping their historic commitment to democratic ideals and those with no commitment to democratic ideals at all. The ADL has created a widely praised curriculum aimed at fostering awareness of genocide. But in 2007, the organization refused to back a congressional resolution declaring that Turkey had committed genocide against the Armenians---a decision the ADL's own New England regional director called 'morally indefensible'...for fear doing so would undermine relations between Turkey and Israel. Abe Foxman has eloquently condemned anti-Muslim bigotry. But in 2010, when that bigotry ran wild during the debate over a plan to build a Muslim community center near the site of the World Trade Center, he concluded that the religious freedom of Muslims must bow to the sensitivities of anti-Muslim bigots."

Don't Criticize Israel

American Jews should not criticize Israel, states the ADL's Foxman, because they do not live there and "do not bear the consequences of their opinions.". This, Beinart points out, is "a reticence that only applies to one side. If American Jews don't live in Tel Aviv or Sderot, neither do they live in Ramallah or Gaza City. Yet American Jewish groups constantly demand that Palestinian leaders change their policies, even though American Jews would not endure the consequences of those policy shifts either. In fact, American Jewish

leaders have spent recent decades criticizing government policy in a bevy of countries where American Jews do not live, from the former Soviet Union to Syria to Iran. If taken seriously, the claim that American Jews must live in a country in order to publicly criticize it, this would eliminate all public moral judgment of politics outside the U.S."

In 2009, an ADL ad in THE NEW YORK TIMES declared that "settlements are not an impediment to peace." Beinart reports that, "The ADL did not even acknowledge that in 2002 and again in 2009, the Arab League----representing every Arab government----declared that it would recognize Israel if Israel withdrew to the 1967 lines and reached a 'just' and 'agreed upon' settlement of the Palestinian refugee issue.

Not only did the ADL not mention the Arab League offer in its ad, it doesn't mention it in the 89 page 'Guide for Activists' it issued in 2010...In 2009 (American Jewish groups) condemned the White House's decision to award the Presidential Medal of Freedom to Mary Robinson, the first female president of Ireland because she had criticized Israeli policies in the West Bank and Gaza...What neither AIPAC nor the ADL mentioned was that Robinson had helped expunge the language about racial discrimination from the Durban Conference's final report thus angering Syria and Iran. Nor did they mention that after discovering that an Arab nongovernmental organization at the parallel NGO forum across the street was displaying anti-Semitic cartoons, Robinson offered an impassioned public denunciation of anti-Semitism, declaring, 'When I see something like this, I am a Jew.'. For these reasons, and others, seven Israeli rights groups issued a joint statement in Robinson's defense. But in their attacks on her, AIPAC and the ADL didn't mention that either."

Critics Labeled "Anti-Semitic"

All too often, anyone who criticizes Israel is labeled "anti-Semitic" by American Jewish organizations. Beinart declares that, "The claim that Andrew Sullivan, Bill Moyers, Jimmy Carter and the leaders of Amnesty International are anti-Semitic is absurd. After all, if they really hated Jews, wouldn't they express their hatred in some other form than criticism of Israeli policy? But for prominent American Jewish leaders, any harsh criticism of Israel that is not accompanied by equally harsh criticism of other countries constitutes anti-Semitism."

As Abraham Foxman puts it, "Most of the current attacks on Israel and Zionism are not, at bottom, about the policies and conduct of a particular nation-state. They are about Jews...When other countries and people pursue policies that are similar (or far worse than) those of Israel, do the critics condemn them? If so, do they condemn them with the same fervor as they condemn Israel? If not, it's hard to deny that anti-Semitism explains the discrepancy."

To this argument, Beinart provides his own assessment: "A Jew might do so because he simply cares more about Israel than about other countries.

Take, for example, me. If Egypt fails to become a democracy, I will consider it unfortunate. If Israel ceases to be a democracy, I will consider it one of the great tragedies of my life. Foxman never contemplates that disproportionate criticism of Israel's policies might reflect a disproportionate attachment to Israel itself. An American might pay more attention to Israel's misdeeds because the U.S., as Israel's foremost benefactor, is so deeply implicated in them....There is still anti-Semitism in the world and it should never be tolerated...But in their effort to inoculate Israeli policy from criticism, American Jewish organizations have stretched anti-Semitism's definition to the point of absurdity."

"Moral Promiscuity"

The attempt to silence Israel's critics as anti-Semitic, Beinart charges, is a form of "moral promiscuity" which "constitutes terrible abuse of the authority that Jewish leaders enjoy as a result of the history of Jewish suffering. It constitutes a kind of desecration, analogous to taking a sacred object and putting it to profane use. But most of all, it represents an unwillingness to accept that the world has changed, that although Israel still faces threats and anti-Semitism still exists, Jews today wield power, both in Israel and the U.S. With power comes the temptation to abuse it, and using the charge of anti-Semitism to shield Israel from criticism is the best way that Israel does exactly that."

The philosophy which dominates the thinking of Israel's current leadership, in particular Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, is that of Revisionist Zionism which, Beinart believes, turns its back on Judaism's humane and prophetic tradition. Revisionism's leader, Vladimir Jabotinsky, writes Beinart, did not like the Jewish belief "that they carried a moral message to the world. In his telling, the story of Jewish history went roughly like this: Once upon a time, when they still lived on their land, the Jews had been warriors, renowned for their fierce resistance to the empires of the day...The problem began, according to Jabotinsky and the Revisionists, with the prophets. Abba Achimeir, one of Jabotinsky's most militant disciples, was particularly hostile to Isaiah, who challenged the Judean kings to 'seek justice, relieve the oppressed.'. The Revisionists...often scorned those passages suggesting that Jews were tasked with a special ethical mission. 'The Bible says 'thou shalt not oppress a stranger for ye know the heart of the stranger, seeing ye were strangers in the land of Egypt,' wrote Jabotinsky in 1910. 'Contemporary morality has no place for such childish humanism.'"

Benjamin Netanyahu inherited his Revisionist philosophy from his father.

In 1939, Jabotinsky cabled the 36 year old former editor of a Revisionist newspaper in Palestine, Benzion Netanyahu, and summoned him to New York. Netanyahu complied and, until Jabotinsky's death the following year, worked as his private secretary. Beinart writes that, "Jabotinsky's influence permeates Netanyahu's writing. First, the yearning to recover the lost glory of Jewish militarism. 'The prowess of Jewish youth in Palestine should serve as a warning that the blood of the old warrior race is still alive in the Jewish people,' exulted an unsigned ZIONNEWS editorial during the time Netanyahu served as editor."

Examples Of Racism

Benzion Netanyahu's writings are filled with examples of "racism," Beinart shows: "In an essay in 1943, he called Arabs 'a semi-barbaric people, which lacks any democratic traditions and is fired by religious fanaticism and hatred for the stranger.'. Later, during Netanyahu's editorship, an unsigned editorial in ZIONNEWS described the Arabs as 'Ishmael, the wild man of the desert.'. Netanyahu conjured the same image 66 years later, when asked by MAARIV why he didn't like Arabs.

'The Bible finds no worse image than this of the man from the desert,'

the old man replied. 'And why? Because he has no respect for any law.

Because in the desert he can do as he pleases. The tendency toward conflict is the essence of the Arab. He is an enemy by essence. His personality won't allow him any compromise or agreement... His existence is one of perpetual war.'"

For Benjamin Netanyahu, Beinart notes, "It is always 1938. After Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin and Foreign Minister Shimon Peres signed the Oslo Accords in 1993, Netanyahu called Peres 'worse than Chamberlain.'. In 'A Durable Peace,' Benjamin Netanyahu repeatedly compares the West Bank to the Sudetenland, which the Nazis cleaved from Czechoslovakia en route to overrunning the entire country. Dismantling Jewish settlements, he argues, would mean a 'Judenrein' West Bank and a 'ghetto-state' within Israel's 1967 borders. If it is 1938, then Jews have no moral responsibility except to survive.... One of the most remarkable features of 'A Durable Peace' is Netanyahu's tendency to approvingly quote imperialists expressing racist views of Arabs. He quotes Winston Churchill as saying, 'Left to themselves, the Arabs of Palestine would not in a thousand years have taken effective steps toward the irrigation and electrification of Palestine.'. He cites Col. Richard Meinertzhagen, Britain's chief political officer in Palestine after World War I, as opining, 'The Arab is a poor fighter, though an adept at lootings, sabotage and murder.'"

Sadly, in Beinart's view, "American Jewish politics remains dominated by an establishment that defines support for Israel more as support for the policies of the Israeli government than as support for the

principles in Israel's declaration of independence. But the American Jewish establishment is dying, literally. The typical large American Jewish organization is run by a man in his sixties, who when he meets his large donors, is among the youngest people in the room...All have built their careers on stories of Jewish victimhood and survival. None accept that we live in a new era in Jewish history, in which our challenges stem less from weakness than from power...Young American Jews are far less likely to build their identity around victimhood...For the most part, young Jews are not redefining American Zionism. They are abandoning American Zionism."

Larger Orthodox Role

Beinart fears that the Orthodox will come to play an ever larger role in American Jewish organizational life as others drift away from the Israel-centered policies of Jewish groups. "There is ample evidence," he writes, that Orthodox institutions "indulge" in "bigotry," even "when it incites violence. The Orthodox Union is arguably the preeminent Modern Orthodox organization in the U.S. In June 2010, its representative in Israel posted an essay on its website entitled 'Reflections On a True Gadol (great person),' which lovingly eulogized the late Israeli chief rabbi Mordechai Eliyahu. Left unmentioned was Eliyahu's ruling that since God gave Jews the entire land of Israel, settlers have the right to steal Palestinian crops. Eliyahu, a close associate of Meir Kahane, also declared, 'A thousand Arabs are not worth one yeshiva student.'

When a tsunami struck Southeast Asia in 2004, he said God was punishing Asian governments for supporting Ariel Sharon's proposed evacuation of settlements in Gaza. None of these statements received even a pro forma condemnation from the Orthodox Union official, who praised Eliyahu's 'love and care toward every other Jew in the world,' without so much as acknowledging his respect for----indeed, hatred of-----those non-Jews who live under Israel's domain."

The embrace of racism and extremism within the Orthodox Jewish community in the U.S. is described by Beinart in some detail. In 2007, the Israel Day Concert in Central Park, an event cosponsored by the National Council of Young Israel, featured as its keynote speaker retired Israeli general Effie Eitam, who the year before had publicly proposed disenfranchising Israel's Arab citizens and physically expelling most Palestinians from the West Bank. He extolled the settlement's yeshiva, which he called 'a beautiful center of Torah and Tefillah (prayer)' and praised its leader, Rabbj Yitzhak Shapira, for teaching 'students for many years that every Jew must be mutually responsible for every other Jew.'. He neglected to mention that Shapira is at the epicenter of the 'price tag' policy in which settlers respond to Israeli government restraints on settlement growth by terrorizing their Palestinian neighbors. Nor did he mention that Shapira, in a 2009 book...declared it

religiously permissible to kill gentile children because 'of the future danger that will arise if they are allowed to grow into evil people like their parents'...American Orthodox officials proved brazenly indifferent to Israel's commitments to all of its people, Jewish and non-Jewish alike."

Toxic Currents

In what Beinart calls the "Orthodox global village" created by modern communications and transportation, these toxic currents are imported to the U.S. and then reexported back to Israel. Thus, in 1994, after Brooklyn-born settler Baruch Goldstein, a follower of Meir Kahane, massacred 29 Palestinian worshippers in Hebron, he became a hero among a radical fringe of Israeli settlers. A year later, after extremist Orthodox rabbis in Israel and the U.S. speculated that Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin might be a traitor to the Jewish people punishable by death under Jewish law for his willingness to cede parts of the West Bank to the Palestinians, a National Religious Israeli, Yigal Amir, took Rabin's life. More recently, Rabbi Herschel Schachter of Yeshiva University was caught on video in 2008 advising yeshiva students in

Jerusalem: "If the army is going to give away Yerushalayim (Jerusalem), then I would tell everyone to resign from the army---I'd tell them to shoot the ross hamemshala (prime minister)."

Beinart writes that, "It is no coincidence that Schachter, in addition to musing about shooting the prime minister...has in recent years said that 'the neshama (soul) of the Jew and the neshama of the non-Jew are made of different material' and that God 'forbids us to display any interest in any other religion...We may not study works of or about any other religion, watch films about them, or study any pieces of religious art.'...If the illiberal Zionism of young Orthodox Jews seems increasingly likely to define organized American Jewry in the coming years, it is partly because so many other young American Jews feel so little Zionist attachment at all...These young Jews are building a vibrant American Judaism that averts its gaze from the Jewish state...They do not see engagement with Israeli politics as a path to spiritual or moral fulfillment, and they are finding fulfillment in other ways."

Path To Peace

The path to Middle East peace, Beinart points out, has long been clear:

"...the Palestinians abandon their claim to the 78 per cent of mandatory Palestine inside the green line in return for a state on the 22 per cent that constitutes the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, with minor adjustments. It is a bargain that would have made most of Israel's founders-----who in 1947 accepted a partition plan that gave Israel a mere 55 per cent of the land----cry with joy. Yet the organized American Jewish community pretends that Israel can continually

transgress that bargain without bringing the entire two state paradigm crashing down and, with it, Israel's existence as a democratic Jewish state...The less democratic Israel becomes, the less liberal-minded American Jews will support it..."

In "The Kuzari," written around 1140, the medieval Jewish philosopher Judah Halevi imagined a dialogue between a rabbi and a pagan king. At one point, the rabbi extols the morality of the Jews. Unlike the Christian world----which according to Jewish tradition is called Edom

(red) because it is soaked with blood----the Jews, he declares, have held themselves to a higher standard. But the king is unconvinced.

Jewish morality, he insists, is merely the byproduct of Jewish weakness.

"If you had the power," he responds, "you would slay." Peter Beinart concludes that, "In Israel, we have the answer to the king. We can finally know whether the ethical traditions that so often made diaspora Jews the conscience of their nations can survive...Since 1967, Israel has taken a grave turn away from that principle...Israel is a great test of Judaism in our time..."

Emperor Is Naked

Peter Beinart has written an important book and has been excoriated for it by most of the organized American Jewish community. He is guilty, it seems, of reporting that the emperor, rather than wearing new clothes, is naked. By embracing an "Israel, right or wrong" philosophy, American Jewish leaders-----who, in fact, represent no one but themselves----have turned their backs on Judaism's universal moral and ethical values.

Still, Beinart is animated by a belief in his own kind of Zionism, believing that Jews are an ethnic group rather than adherents to a religion of universal values----at home in New York or London or Paris as well as in Jerusalem----and he seems to maintain that Israel is, indeed, the Jewish "homeland.". He believes that the original Zionists were believers in genuine democracy and that the current state of Israel has departed from their idealism.

Beinart has not properly confronted a contrary thesis---for which there is abundant evidence----that Zionism was flawed from the beginning, not only ignoring the indigenous population of Palestine, but rejecting the dominant spiritual history and essence of Judaism.

Heated Debate

This book has opened a heated debate about the real nature of Zionism and its effect upon American Jewish life. It is good that Zionism's excesses are being challenged, but these excesses, in reality, were inherent in the Zionist idea itself, an idea which a silent majority of American Jews have always rejected.

Allan C. Brownfeld is a nationally syndicated columnist and serves as Associate Editor of THE LINCOLN REVIEW

and editor of ISSUES. The author of five books, he has served on the staff of the U.S. Senate, House of Representatives and the Office of the Vice President.

Peter Myers
381 Goodwood Rd
Childers Qld 4660

Australia

ph. in Australia: 07 41262296

from overseas: +61 7 41262296

website: <http://mailstar.net/index.html>

Skype Name: petermyersaus. Or search for Peter Gerard Myers To unsubscribe, reply with "Unsubscribe" in the Subject line. Allow one day.

Candidly Speaking: Claims Conference self-aggrandizement

By ISI LEIBLER 04/04/2012 22:23

I would challenge Mr. Berman and his Chief Executive Officer to respond to the following issues which continue to concern Jews throughout the world.

The management of the Conference on Material Claims against Germany (Claims Conference) is ecstatic after having successfully forced two Israeli journalists to publicly apologize and praise them.

In 2008, Israeli TV aired a program titled *Moral Reparations – The Struggle Continues*, which bitterly condemned the management of the Claims Conference for refusing to prioritize financial disbursements to ameliorate the desperate plight of aging Holocaust survivors unable to live out their remaining years in dignity.

The program was partly based on a report commissioned by the Jewish Agency from forensic accountant Yehuda Barlev, but never released after the Claims Conference stated that it would review its allotments toward the Agency.

The Claims Conference sued the show's producers Orly Vilnai and Guy Meroz for libel, alleging that the program was "anti-Semitic" and presented "a cruel and distorted calumny."

In order to intimidate future potential critics, they demanded the exorbitant amount of NIS 4 million in damages. Ultimately, presumably at the behest of the insurance company reluctant to remain engaged in lengthy and costly court proceedings, a settlement was negotiated for a much smaller amount – NIS 150,000 – which it was agreed would be donated to a Holocaust survivor fund chosen by the journalists.

In addition, the Claims Conference obtained a written apology praising them for "acting tirelessly on behalf of the Jewish people" and its "unprecedented contribution to assisting Holocaust survivors."

However, while acknowledging that "in the course of our struggle to correct what we saw as a historical and inhuman injustice... we failed to present the whole picture," there was no acknowledgement by the journalists of any specific factual error in their film.

Moreover, as part of the settlement, Vilnai and Meroz insisted on including a sentence stating that "the frustrating gap between the desire to help Holocaust survivors which is shared by the entire Jewish people, and the actual condition of Holocaust survivors requires criticism – on occasion harsh if deserved – directed at those who set policy in this area, as well as of those who implement it, since this is a sacred task."

The Claims Conference management is now exploiting this settlement as a means of diverting attention from the legitimate criticisms and increasing anger directed against them over recent years. Chairman Julius Berman forwarded memoranda to the media and Jewish organizations, exulting over the outcome, even praising

by name the senior officers conducting the costly legal campaign which had been in process for years. He did not disclose how much money the Claims Conference diverted from Holocaust funds towards this lawsuit.

In order to attempt to balance the equation, I would challenge Mr. Berman and his Chief Executive Officer to respond to the following issues which continue to concern Jews throughout the world.

1. In view of the pitiful state of the diminishing number of ailing survivors, many of whom continue to be denied a dignified life in their remaining years and cannot even afford to pay for basic food, fuel and medical expenses: a) Has there been an independent review of the existing allocations provided toward major charitable causes like hospitals and Israeli infrastructure which do not directly benefit survivors? Has consideration been given to prioritizing funds from these projects toward survivors?

b) Will the Claims Conference consider temporarily freezing allocations to all nonsurvivor related funds in order to at least partially improve the catastrophic living conditions of these hapless people?

2. In February 2010, it was revealed that there had been a massive theft of funds specifically earmarked by the German government for Holocaust survivors. The Claims Conference initially specified that the amount stolen was \$350,000. But later it was reported that the theft was in excess of the staggering sum of \$50 million.

Last November *Der Spiegel* stated the sum had reached \$57 million! It was subsequently disclosed that six corrupt Claims Conference officials, including senior employees working out of their own New York head office, had been looting these funds for over 15 years – under the very noses of the highly paid senior executives. Repeated warnings that a single part-time internal comptroller was absurdly insufficient for an organization handling billions of dollars were ignored until it was too late.

Nobody can dispute that it was the responsibility of the Claims Conference management to oversee the allocation of these funds. Yet as of today, not a single person has accepted accountability. The CEO even had the gall to insist that everything was in order because there was no deviation from standard procedures. The management adamantly refused to authorize an independent forensic audit in order to evaluate what took place, ensure that no theft had occurred in other areas and that appropriate precautions had been imposed to avoid a repetition.

The issue was raised at the last Claims Conference annual meeting and, after the chairman praised the manner in which his officers had dealt with the issue, the board responded by enthusiastically carrying a bizarre motion of confidence in their management.

It is inconceivable that any normal private or public institution would refuse to accept accountability and fail to demand resignations or at least censure of management after such a massive fraud has been perpetrated on their watch.

The public is entitled to demand that the management reveal the precise quantity of funds stolen and advise as to whether there is any intention of introducing a genuinely independent forensic audit to review the entire organization.

Or has the question of accountability for failure to implement oversight over these funds now been permanently shelved?

3. The Board of Deputies of British Jews commissioned an independent review (the Gruder Report) following complaints from Holocaust victims that the Claims Conference lacked "transparency and accountability" and had behaved unethically in the sale of Jewish German properties.

The report was highly critical of the Claims Conference's moral conduct, suggesting that reprehensible efforts had been implemented to prevent heirs from recovering property stolen from their families. The matter was raised at the last annual board meeting – and dismissed by the chairman, who treated the request to review the situation with utter contempt. Is this the last word on this matter?

4. Is it acceptable for the largest charitable institution in the Jewish world, which has been responsible for the

disbursement of over \$80 billion of restitution funds, to continue to be headed by the same elected officers for over a decade, notwithstanding complaints that the chairman has inordinate powers and runs the organization like a personal fiefdom?

5. The board, which meets annually and whose directors have great difficulty comprehending the complexity of the allocation of funds, has rarely, if ever, rejected a recommendation from the allocations committee and effectively serves as a rubber stamp for the management.

This situation is exacerbated by potential conflicts of interest of directors whose organizations receive funding from the Claims Conference. Is it not now imperative to set up an independent committee to review the entire procedure of allocations in order to ascertain what can be done to ameliorate the tragic plight of the survivors – the greatest scandal of our time in the Jewish world? The concerns related to above have been frequently raised previously. Yet the Claims Conference management has arrogantly opted to deflect any criticism by demonizing anyone challenging their policies. What is needed is not self-aggrandizement, but genuine soul searching and, even at this late hour, fulfilling the obligation to consider drastic initiatives to overcome the scandalous suffering of elderly Holocaust survivors living in penury.

<http://www.jpost.com/Opinion/Columnists/Article.aspx?id=264859>

The Holocaust as a unique event in history

The Australian National University

Wednesday, November 7, 2012 from 9:30 AM to 10:00 AM (EST)

Canberra, Australian Capital Territory

Organizer

The Australian National University

The Australian National University (ANU) is a celebrated place of intensive research, education and policy engagement. ANU is home to an interconnected community of scholars. The University is located in the heart of Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, Australia.

<http://www.anu.edu.au/>

Law Link Theatre

Building 7

Fellows Road, ANU

Canberra, Australian Capital Territory 0200

Australia

Wednesday, November 7, 2012 from 9:30 AM to 10:00 AM (EST)

Event Details

The Holocaust is a watershed event in the history of the 20th century for both Jews and non-Jews. It forces us as human beings to look at ourselves and ask the eternal question: how was this humanly possible? The universal dimensions of this particular story can and do speak to us all. This presentation will address not only these universal aspects but explore the "unprecedented" nature of this historical event.

Mr Ephraim Kaye has a first and second degree in Modern Jewish History and the History of the Holocaust from the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. From 1978 to

2000 he taught courses on the Holocaust at several different Israeli colleges in Jerusalem.

Since 1980 Mr Kaye has been involved in Holocaust research and education. In 1988, he joined the educational staff at Yad Vashem in Jerusalem and since 1994 has been Director of International Seminars for Educators at The International School for Holocaust Studies.

He has developed many curriculum units and authored several books, including *The Responsa From the Kovno Ghetto* (1983) and *One Man's Journey – Teaching the Holocaust* published in *Working to Make a Difference* (2003) edited by Samuel Totten.

Op-Ed: Frankie Boyle — 'racist' comedians and 'racist' nonsense

By Alexander Baron. October 22, 2012

[London](#)- A comedian who sued for libel after being branded a "racist" has been awarded £54,900 damages. Does that mean we are all due for a payout?

The comedian [Frankie Boyle](#) has been awarded £54,900 damages against Mirror Group Newspapers after a [jury at the High Court](#) found this word had defamed him. He was awarded a further £4,250 over an allegation that he had been forced to quit the TV programme *Mock The Week*.

While Boyle said he was very happy with the verdict, one should ask why in 21st Century Britain should anybody - English, Scottish, white, black, Moslem or Jew - bother resorting to the civil law over such a vacuous epithet.

Frankie Boyle is a comedian who appears to specialise in outrageous jokes. You will of course find him all over YouTube. An admirer has compiled what he calls Boyle's four most outrageous jokes [here](#). One wonders what the [Heir to the Throne](#) must think about the joke Boyle made at the expense of his deceased first wife. More to the point, it beggars belief that a man who will tell a joke of that nature in front of a TV audience of millions can be offended by the word *racist*.

A review of some of Boyle's other material leads one to believe he doesn't give a monkey's who he offends, and his targets include everyone from the Queen herself and swimmer Rebecca Adlington to the Israeli Defense Force - heck, he must be an anti-Semite as well!

Seriously though, he appears on at least one occasion to have used the dreaded N word, but defended himself by saying [context is everything](#): "If you use this at a dinner party to insult someone that would be a terrible hate crime". No, it would still be a racial insult.

He is certainly correct that context is everything; let us not forget that John Terry used an even stronger racial epithet on the football field - one which nobody actually heard - and in acquitting Terry of this non-crime, the district judge who did so used the same insult no less than [nine times](#) in his ruling. Having said that, the word *racist* and declensions thereof is now used so freely in Britain and throughout the West as to be virtually devoid of meaning.

The word *racism* appeared in print for the first time as recently as 1935. This was at a time when there were still a few blacks alive in the Deep South who had been born into slavery.

Since then we have seen the abolition of state sanctioned segregation and of Apartheid in South Africa - neither of which has ever been entertained in Britain. We have seen also the erosion of class barriers not only in Britain but throughout the world, yet curiously, the better society gets in this respect, the worse the problem of *racism* becomes.

Not only that, different types of *racism* have been discovered (read invented). The following, in no particular order, are identified by Dinesh D'Souza in his 1995 tome ***The END of RACISM "Principles for a Multiracial Society"***

unintentional racism
intentional racism

Kinetic racism which "manifests itself by non-verbal means"
malignant racism

benign or benevolent racism

feel-good racism

well-intentioned racism

Process racism which "refers to procedures that generate racially disparate outcomes"

Dominative racism - as practiced in the Deep South

aversive racism - as practiced in the North

crypto-racism or neoracism

cultural racism = "A bigoted preference for one's own culture"

blatant racism

covert racism

subtle racism

enlightened racism

metaracism - racism which has been generated by modern technology

Missing from the above list are institutional *racism*, the chimera said to lie at heart of the police investigation into the [murder of Stephen Lawrence](#) way back in April 1993, and [statistical racism](#), which appears to have been first identified by the American House of Representatives in 1994, which rightly dismissed it as [arrant nonsense](#).

Process *racism* is sufficiently similar to the statistical kind to be considered more or less the same, and using this yardstick, every society, not simply white society must be deemed inherently *racist*, and for a good reason. Human beings are not statistics, and cannot be treated as such. The talents and abilities of human populations vary by race and many other factors, and would to some extent even if we were all genetically the same. Is [snooker](#) *racist* because to date every single world professional champion has been a white male, and all but two have been born in these islands? Perhaps it is also *sexist*?

Is table tennis *racist* because it is dominated by the Chinese? Or heavyweight boxing because it is dominated and has been for decades by black Americans? A level playing field does not mean equality of outcome. Perhaps we should elect our heavyweight champions in future? Maybe the next one should be a seven stone female Inuit? This is how silly this *racism* business gets.

Having said all that, Mirror Group Newspapers could have defended Mr Boyle's libel action successfully, not on the grounds of fair comment, but on those of universality. If we are all *racist* collectively as well as individually, then branding him *racist* or a *racist* was and is no better and certainly no worse than the myriad insults the race lobby has directed at the peoples of these islands for the past forty plus years.

<http://www.digitaljournal.com/article/335298#ixzz2A3vOOVRp>

Police Shackle Anat Hoffman for Saying Sh'ma at Kotel

By [Debra Nussbaum Cohen](#), October 17, 2012, 11:15am

Anat Hoffman was arrested at the Western Wall on Tuesday night for saying the Sh'ma Israel, Judaism's central proclamation of faith, out loud at Israel's holiest site.

"I was saying [Sh'ma Israel](#) and arrested for it. It's just unbelievable," she said in an interview from her bathtub, where she was soaking limbs bruised from being dragged by handcuffs across the police station

floor and legs shackled as if she were a violent criminal. "It was awful."

Hoffman has been detained by police at the [Western Wall](#) six times in the more than two decades that she has led [Women of the Wall](#), a group which conducts prayer services in the women's section at the start of each Jewish month. But on Tuesday night, when she was arrested for the crime of wearing a tallit and praying out loud, she was treated far more violently by police than ever before.

"In the past when I was detained I had to have a policewoman come with me to the bathroom, but this was something different. This time they checked me naked, completely, without my underwear. They dragged me on the floor 15 meters; my arms are bruised. They put me in a cell without a bed, with three other prisoners, including a prostitute and a car thief. They threw the food through a little window in the door. I laid on the floor covered with my tallit.



Women of the Wall - Anat Hoffman's arrest last night

"I'm a tough cookie, but I was just so miserable. And for what? I was with the Hadassah women saying Sh'ma Israel."

Hoffman, who chairs the 24-year-old organization, went to the Kotel with about 200 women who are in Jerusalem for the [Hadassah](#) centennial conference. She was leading them in the Sh'ma when a policeman approached her and told her to stop reciting the prayer or she would have to go with him.

"I stopped saying Sh'ma but there were 10 cantors and 200 women around me, and they continued," she told The Sisterhood. "Then he forced my hand behind my back and started walking me very fast to the police. Most of the Hadassah women were in shock. They didn't know exactly what to do. The board of Women of the Wall followed me. When I was moved at 3:00 A.M. from one police station to another, two members were waiting there for five hours."

Hoffman was handcuffed by police and told that she had refused to cooperate, "which was just a lie," she said. "There was no resistance at all."

When, at the police station, she was told to move from one chair to another, "I thought I should show him what noncooperation looks like," and refused to move, she said. "When I refused to move, he dropped me to the floor and dragged me with the handcuffs."

Later, when she was being taken to court, police put leg shackles on her. A judge released her on the condition that she agree not to go to the Western Wall for any reason for 30 days or be fined 5,000 shekels.

Throughout the entire experience, while she lay on the floor of her prison cell and when she was being led, in shackles and handcuffs, to court, "I was wearing my tallis." Asked why they didn't take it away from her, as they did her mobile phone, Hoffman, said, "They don't recognize it as a tallis."

Hadassah, the women's Zionist organization, is on Thursday presenting Israel's prime minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, with its Henrietta Szold Award, named for the organization's proto-feminist founder.

"If she were alive today she'd be with me, right there [at the Kotel]," said Hoffman. "And to give him the Henrietta Szold prize, I think they should give it to the Women of the Wall who were born from the Hadassah conference 24 years ago and say 'you are the continuation of Henrietta Szold.' I'm asking whether Henrietta Szold's spirit is still there."

Referring also to Israel's increasing gender segregation in public spaces, Hoffman said, "These topics are the final frontier, the essence of pluralism and equality. Israel has taken the holiest sites of the Jewish people and given them to a minority in Israel, and they are abusing their power," she said, alluding to Haredi control over the Western Wall.

"We need to liberate the wall again. We have to demand it," Hoffman said. "What is the function of arresting the chairman of Women of the Wall? The purpose is harassment of the group. To make the group frightened."

On Wednesday morning, while Hoffman was still in police custody, Women of the Wall held prayer services for Rosh Chodesh Cheshvan. "Though the services went smoothly and quietly with no disturbance, police arrested Lesley Sachs, director of Women of the Wall and board member Rachel Cohen Yeshurun, in the middle of prayer," the organization said in a statement. "The two women were detained and questioned for several hours," the statement said. "Upon release, the women were asked to admit to the crime of disturbing the public order, which they refused."

The Reform movement seems to be taking seriously Hoffman's plea for greater activism on this issue.

Rabbi Rick Jacobs, president of the Union for Reform Judaism, and David Saperstein, director of the Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, "have a call into" Michael Oren, Israel's ambassador to the United States, to speak with him about it, according to a spokesperson for the URJ.

Hoffman is executive director of the Reform movement's Israel Religious Action Center, in addition to her work with Women of the Wall.

<http://blogs.forward.com/sisterhoodblog/164434/poli-ceshackleanathoffmanforsavingshmaatkot/#ixzz29nbyERPv>