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In January 1997, Netanyahu and Arafat signed the Hebron Protocol. Under this agreement, the Palestinians were granted 80 percent of the ancient Jewish city of Hebron.

In September 2010, Netanyahu agreed to a 10-month building freeze in Judea and Samaria, to bring the Palestinians to the negotiating table.

Under the leadership of Netanyahu, over 400 roadblocks have been removed, which made up 40 percent of all roadblocks in Judea and Samaria.
Dear Students,

It’s time to take back the word and meaning of “Zionism.” Zionism: the movement of the Jewish People to declare and establish Israel as our national homeland, a basic and fundamental right. We’ve allowed the term to be hijacked by our detractors. It’s our responsibility to make sure the beauty and power of Zionism remain a positive force in the young pro-Israel movement.

And it depends on YOU, the young Israel activist! Are you a proud Zionist? Then say so with confidence! Are you unsure of what Zionism means and how to relate to it today? Then do your research. If we lose our pride as Zionists, we risk losing Israel.

Also, you could pocket some nice change while you’re at it. We’re referring to ZOA’s new essay contest, which asks, “Why is Zionism Important in the World Today?” Look through this issue for an ad with more details about how to enter the contest. The grand prize is $1000 and a feature in our next issue of The College Zionist.

In this issue of The College Zionist, one author wants to get your wheels turning on the subject by asking, “Why Should I Care About Israel?” If you haven’t asked yourself that question, maybe now is the time to do so. We tend to take the things we have for granted and the State of Israel is no different. Our enemies may have picked up on this, which is why pro-Israel students on some campuses have been facing fierce opposition in the form of Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions movements, so-called “apartheid walls,” and weeks dedicated to Israel bashing. In many cases, professors and other administrative staff have joined in the inflammatory rhetoric against Israel without comment, let alone condemnation, from the university. The situation on some campuses has become so severe that legal action is warranted. ZOA’s Center for Law and Justice has worked hard to provide support to Jewish students facing a hostile campus environment. ZOA played a key role in getting the federal government to clarify that federally-funded schools must protect Jewish students from harassment and intimidation under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. Now, there are potentially financial ramifications for federally-funded schools that do not provide such protection. You’ll find one student exploring the benefits of the new Title VI protection in this issue. There is no reason for Jewish students to experience harassment and intimidation due to their Zionist beliefs. A few Title VI cases have already been filed on behalf of Jewish students at universities across the country.

To reiterate our intro, it is vital for pro-Israel students to proudly proclaim their Zionism. With social media outlets at everyone’s fingertips it’s even easier to make yourselves heard. We challenge you to declare your Zionism as your Facebook statuses and to tweet it to the world. Don’t take it for granted that we have a Jewish State in the land of Israel; instead, take advantage of the opportunities you have to declare your support for the Zionist movement that brought us our freedom to live in the independent Jewish State of Israel.

We at the Campus Department of ZOA practice what we preach.

Sincerely,

Sharona Whisler
Managing Director
ZOA Campus Programs

David Kadosh
Associate Director, ZOA Campus Programs

Aaron Marcus
ZOA Campus Coordinator
“I am a Zionist. I take pride in the resilience and determination of those who turned the dream of a Jewish State in Israel into a reality. They are my role models. I will never take Israel for granted. I am committed to activism to ensure our freedom in the Holy Land will never be a dream again.”

SHARONA WHISLER  
MANAGING DIRECTOR  
OF CAMPUS DEPARTMENT

“I am a Zionist because Zionists are proud. We believe in our nation and the strength of the Jewish people. The State of Israel is the Jewish homeland for the Jewish people and must be supported by Zionists the world over.”

DAVID KADOSH  
ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR  
OF CAMPUS DEPARTMENT

“I am a Zionist because for thousands of years the Jewish people were degraded, laughed at and made into second class citizens while the world stood by and watched. I am a Zionist because I believe the Jewish people possess a basic human right to self-determination, a right that was infringed upon before the creation of Israel. I am a Zionist because I believe in freedom and a thriving democracy that allows for every voice to be heard. I am a Zionist because if the Balfour Declaration were acted on in the 1920s there would be 6 million more Jewish generations in the world today. I am a Zionist because it is the right and moral thing to do.”

AARON MARCUS  
CAMPUS COORDINATOR  
FOR NORTHEAST REGION
Sharona Whisler began working for ZOA in 2007 when she graduated from The George Washington University. She was a student participant in the ZOA Student Leadership Mission to Israel and in Hasbara Fellowships and she was an Israel Project fellow and intern. Sharona studied abroad at Hebrew University in Jerusalem and upon graduation from college, she was presented with the ICC of Greater Washington award for Outstanding Leadership and an award of recognition from Hasbara Fellowships for her years of activism on campus. She has worked for ZOA as a campus coordinator in New York, Washington, and Miami. She has staffed three ZOA Student Leadership Missions to Israel. In November 2011 Sharona became the Managing Director of ZOA's Campus Department. She lives in Miami with her family.

David Kadosh was promoted to Associate Director of Campus Programs and has recently relocated to California to establish a Western branch of the ZOA Campus Department. He is a graduate of Hofstra University, where he earned a bachelor's degree in Political Science and two minors in Arabic and Middle East and Central Asian Studies. David is proficient in Arabic and Hebrew. He is the co-founder of Hofstra University's Israel advocacy organization, EMET (Educating for Middle East Truth). David loves to travel, especially to Israel, having gone there nine times so far! Since graduation, David has continued his work on Israel advocacy with the goal of getting young people more involved in the State of Israel. David has worked for the ZOA Campus Department for the past 3 years and was the Director of Young Professional Activities in New York.

Aaron Marcus recently graduated magna cum laude from Rutgers University in New Brunswick, NJ where he received his bachelor's degree in Political Science. During his time at Rutgers, Aaron led the charge against anti-Israel and anti-Semitic sentiment on campus. He challenged administrators, professors and students for standing against Israel and made a name for himself writing an unapologetically pro-Israel and Zionist column for the student paper. Aaron received international recognition for his campus activism efforts. He also paid a price, becoming a target for anti-Semitism by university officials and students. This hatred was the result of one thing only, his passionate, accurate and strong Zionist ideals. Before joining the ZOA, Aaron was a policy analyst covering the Middle East with an emphasis on Israel and Iran. His columns have been published in National Review Online and The Wall Street Journal Online. He has appeared on Fox News, Glenn Beck TV and has been quoted in various newspapers including the New York Daily News, London Daily Mail and Jerusalem Post.
President’s Message

Jihadis and the Obama Administration

It did not require the gift of prophecy to foresee that radical, anti-Semitic, anti-American jihadist movements like the Muslim Brotherhood would come to power in Egypt and other countries if the United States helped push long-standing authoritarian regimes in the Middle East from power. We at the Zionist Organization of America warned about this from the first moment of the upheavals in Cairo in 2011, and we opposed U.S. efforts to see the Mubarak regime removed and replaced with whatever emerged in new elections.

We did this, not because we are opposed to democracy; quite the contrary. In a society like Egypt that has known only autocracy and Islamism, we fully expected that early elections would see anti-democratic forces like the Muslim Brotherhood grow and, in time, gain power.

Unfortunately, the Obama Administration embarked on policies that have helped bring about this result. Already in June 2009, President Obama invited the parliamentary bloc of the Brotherhood, then a banned party, to attend his Cairo speech.

The Muslim Brotherhood was founded in 1928 by Hassan Al-Banna. Before and during World War II, it collaborated with Nazi Germany. Its leading intellectual figure, Sayyid Qutb, is the inspiration for Al-Qaeda and other Islamist terrorist movements. The Palestinian branch of the Brotherhood, Hamas, is a blood-soaked terrorist organization which calls for the destruction of Israel and the worldwide murder of Jews.

The Muslim Brotherhood platform calls for jihad, stating that “Islam is the official state religion and Islamic Shariah is the main source for legislation.” It stipulates that the president and legislative branch will be advised by clerics, who must approve decisions, and that non-Muslims will be barred from the presidency, which is also held to be unsuitable for women.

Yet, absurdly, Obama’s National Intelligence director, James Clapper, said that the group is “largely secular” and not particularly extreme while another Obama adviser, Bruce Riedel, argued that America “should not be afraid of the Muslim Brotherhood.” The only result of withdrawing support for the Mubarak regime was that the Brotherhood triumphed in legislative and presidential elections and now rules Egypt, the most populous Arab state and one that, for all its many faults and problems, had maintained a semblance of peace with Israel for three decades.

The Egyptian/Israeli peace treaty is now virtually a dead letter. Last year, the deputy leader of the Muslim Brotherhood, Rashad al-Bayoumi, said regarding the peace treaty that, “To me, it isn’t binding at all...On no condition will we recognize Israel. It is an enemy entity.” Yet, when queried regarding Bayoumi’s Arabic statement, State Department spokeswoman Victoria Nuland blandly responded, “We have had other assurances from the party with regard to their commitment not only to universal human rights, but to the international obligations that the Government of Egypt has undertaken.”

In short, the Obama Administration pretends that the Muslim Brotherhood’s gentle words in English confirm its moderate, democratic credentials. This blindness has resulted in helping to install the Muslim Brotherhood in power in Cairo and for similar groups to prevail in Libya, Tunisia and Yemen.

Blindness to extremism is not a viable policy. That is why we have been sounding a continuous warning against the folly and tragedy of embracing so-called “moderate Islamists,” an oxymoron term that can be stretched to mean every single Jew-hating, America-hating jihadist who—for the moment—abstains from directly attacking the United States.

We can see where blindness is leading us. Recently, Egyptian president Mohamed Morsi was revealed to have made in 2010 desppicable, anti-Semitic allegations. Morsi declared, “Dear brothers, we must not forget to nurse our children and grandchildren on hatred towards those Zionists and Jews, and all those who support them. They must be nursed on hatred. The hatred must continue.” He also spoke of “these blood-suckers, who attack the Palestinians, these warmongers, the descendants of apes and pigs.”

This vicious anti-Semitism was for once widely reported, yet the Obama Administration made no public condemnation until White House press secretary, Jay Carney, was asked about it at a press briefing. Until now, the repulsive record of the Muslim Brotherhood’s anti-Semitism and its support for Israel’s elimination has not disturbed the Administration from regarding the Morsi regime as a regime with which, as U.S. Ambassador in Cairo Anne W. Patterson stated a few weeks ago, “the Middle East proceeds with its challenging yet essential journey toward democracy.”

Now, the Obama Administration is sending top-of-the-range F-16 fighter jets and Abrams tanks to the Morsi regime in Egypt. Who are the likely future targets of this Egyptian weaponry? Is it Iran or Syria? Or is it Israel? The ZOA believes that the answer is obvious.

As we have said previously, even without the latest revelations about Morsi, common sense and prudence would have dictated that Obama withhold all aid to Egypt until and unless Morsi gave a written commitment to observe the peace treaty with Israel; repudiated the Muslim Brotherhood platform and statements opposing peace, human rights and the Egyptian/U.S. alliance; and rescinded his pledge to work for freeing Islamist sheikh Omar-Abdel Rahman, jumped by the U.S. for his role in the 1993 World Trade Center bombing that killed six people.

The ZOA will continue to warn the Administration, Congress, the media and the American public of the dangers of engaging “moderate Islamists.” We will continue to expose the dangers of arming regimes that will only prove hostile, that will endanger Israel, and that will imperil our ability to deal effectively and promptly with the new wave of extremism and terror in the Middle East.
WHY
Should
I CARE
About
ISRAEL
By
MICHAEL SNOW
The Jewish world needs to open the door to the difficult but necessary conversation which stems from the fact that, for many, the roots of modern Zionism aren’t nearly deeply entrenched or relevant enough anymore. The first step in this direction must be acknowledging that the question, “Why should we care about Israel?” cannot be dismissed with a simple answer. Indeed, engaging this very question, on a sophisticated level worthy of contemporary discourse, is entirely necessary if we want to save Israel from falling into total disaffection or disregard.

Obscure notions of Jewish peoplehood and nationhood fail to evoke or sustain entrenched personal identities. To the modern Jew, Zionism and anti-Semitism are predominantly historical phenomena belonging to a time and place when Jews were “the other” in European society. A Jewish state was the answer to centuries of persecution and anti-Semitism. But if we are no longer Alfred Dreyfus, what need is there for a Jewish state?

The Dreyfus affair, perhaps the seminal spark of modern Zionism, is about as relevant to the modern Jew as the Bundist movement, chapters best left to the historians. Dreyfus was a Jewish French artillery officer in the 1890’s who was wrongly convicted of treason for passing French military secrets to Germany. The then unknown Hungarian-Jewish journalist Theodor Herzl was assigned to cover the trial. Walking through the grand Parisian streets and squares, he was shocked by what he saw. In mass rallies around the city, the civilized and cultured French citizens bellowed, ”Death to the Jews!”

“We need to talk.
“It’s serious.
“Yes, it has to be now and no it can’t wait.
“We have a good time together, no? You visit me and it’s fun. But then what?
“You come, eat my falafel, and explore my ravines.
You see your cousins in Tel Aviv, cry at the memorials and pray in the ancient synagogues.
You say you love me, and will keep me in your heart forever. If you forget me, you declare, it would be like forgetting your right hand. As if I haven’t heard that before.
It wasn’t always like this. Before you had me, you yearned for me. Remember? Remember when the idea of me was nothing but a fantastic dream? Where are we now? Sometimes, it’s like you want nothing to do with me.”
It’s the conversation you dreaded but saw coming.
Though Herzl wasn’t passionately connected to his Jewish identity, the vicious demonstrations aroused his pintele yid, you could say. “Death to the Jews!” the protesters chanted. Not “Death to the traitor!” or “Death to the guilty,” but “Death to the Jews.”

This unabashed anti-Semitism befuddled Herzl’s beliefs that the Enlightenment, assimilation, and emancipation would allow Jews to be full members of European society. “I recognized the emptiness,” Herzl writes in his diary, “and futility of trying to ‘combat’ anti-Semitism.”

At this time, supposedly, Herzl realized that only through their own state could Jews be free. One year later he published *Der Judenstaat, The Jewish State*, effectively setting the Zionist project in motion. The First Zionist Conference was convened one year after that. The ball continued rolling, and the quest for Jewish sovereignty purportedly reached its climax in 1948. This is the mythology which frames Zionism. The historical accuracy of the Dreyfus affair’s influence on Herzl isn’t important. What matters is that we are no longer Alfred Dreyfus.

Jewish fears and desires today are radically different from what they were in 1896. Anti-Semitism isn’t a tangible motivating factor for most American Jews. That Jews qua Jews have reached a comfortable and protected position in secular society is wondrous in its own right. However, it also forces us to reexamine the notion of Israel as a place of perennial refuge.

Israel isn’t important because it’s a safe haven to which we can flee if the tide of American pluralism shifts. And Israel certainly isn’t worthy of our support because cell-phones were developed there.

Why then, should we care about Israel?

We need a new narrative that speaks to the fact that, for reasons outside our control, we were given the opportunity to act in historic times. Zionism did not end in 1948 (or ’67). Zionism is an ongoing story in which we each have a part to play. It’s a story which consists of an array of multifarious characters and ideologies. The new Zionist discourse must be reflective of this diversity.

Most importantly, we need a Zionism imbued with meaning. For our generation, words like redemption can finally be uttered genuinely and wholeheartedly. We have the choice to play a momentous role in the greatest story ever told. Yet unless we are able to answer the “why,” our grandchildren will inevitably return to weeping along the rivers of Babylon.
This is what a Christian Zionist looks like

BY

Hannah Johnson
I smile and wait patiently for the next question. But, I already know what that question will be. I know because I have been asked it many times before.

“'I am just curious,’” the interviewer says, “Are you Jewish?” I smile and energetically reply, “No. I am a Christian who loves Israel.”
That excerpt represents one of many conversations that have become part of my repertoire when discussing what I am doing at this stage of my life. I represent a larger group of people who, like me, are not of the Jewish faith but who staunchly and wholeheartedly support the Jewish state of Israel. Zionism is not confined only to Jews, and this is evident by the large number of Christian Zionists worldwide. One increasingly popular phenomenon that has gained a lot of support is the rally for Christians to be a voice for Israel in American politics. Christians United for Israel (CUFI) and Christian Israel Public Action Campaign are both organizations that have become very active in lobbying Congress on behalf of Israel. They have made it a priority to rally the Christian community to encourage and ensure that their congressional representatives are supporting Israel and legislation that would benefit the state. This past year CUFI became the largest pro-Israel Christian organization in the nation, with one million members. These organizations are essential to strengthening the American-Israel relationship.

The Christian community has already begun to raise its voice in support for Israel but we need to get a little louder, as scripture reads, ‘For Zion’s sake I will not keep silent, for Jerusalem’s sake I will not remain quiet, till her righteousness shines out like the dawn, her salvation like a blazing torch’. The Christian community has already begun to raise its voice in support for Israel but we need to get a little louder, as scripture reads, ‘For Zion’s sake I will not keep silent, for Jerusalem’s sake I will not remain quiet, till her righteousness shines out like the dawn, her salvation like a blazing torch’.

Eagles Wings ministries began to combat anti-Semitism on campus by taking young Christian leaders to Israel for an intensive trip to learn about the land, the realities of the situation that Israelis face, and ways to combat the lies and problems facing college students across the United States. Eagles Wings created the Israel Experience College Scholarship program. This also assures that new generations of Christians will be educated on why it is important to support Israel and share what they know in order to encourage others to do the same. In an exclusive interview with the director of the Israel Experience program, Michael said, “There is nothing more strategic and effective for the future of Christian Zionism than training Christian leaders in Israel.”

There are many more organizations in which Christian support for Israel and Christian Zionism are flourishing throughout the United States and the world. Though the majority of Jewish and pro-Israel communities are embracing the relationship between Christians and Jews in solidarity to support the state of Israel, some still have reservations. The most common concern is the motivation behind the Christian Zionist community. Some people still subscribe to the idea that Christian Zionists only support Israel in order to fulfill a prophecy of the end times, or that Christians want to convert Jews. Because of history and the horrible atrocities that have happened to the Jews in the name of Christianity in the past, this hesitation may never fully disappear. However, the future Christian leaders to be representatives for Israel in their spheres of influence.

Christian Zionism has recently taken various forms through organizations that support Israel based on their Biblical view that the state of Israel is the rightful homeland of the Jewish people. They have made it their goal to cultivate and this passage in Genesis supports why the Jews have a right to the land.

Zionism is the belief that the Jewish people have a right to their homeland, the land of Israel. Christians play an important role in supporting Zionism and the state of Israel.

Though Christian support for Israel has grown in recent years, the roots go far deeper. Christian Zionism has been around since the beginnings of Zionism itself. William Hechler was a Christian minister who in 1884 wrote a book entitled, The Restoration of Jews to Palestine. Hechler was a close friend to Theodor Herzl and supported him in his goal of creating a homeland for the Jewish people. Christian Zionists are influenced by the Biblical covenant between God and Abraham, the father of the Jewish people, and their right to the land of Israel. “All the land that you see I will give to you and your offspring forever.” Many Christians follow a Biblical worldview, and this passage in Genesis supports why the Jews have a right to the land.

Other organizations support Israel based on their Biblical view that the state of Israel is the rightful homeland of the Jewish people. They have made it their goal to cultivate and this passage in Genesis supports why the Jews have a right to the land.

Zionism is not confined only to Jews, and this is evident by the large number of Christian Zionists worldwide. One increasingly popular phenomenon that has gained a lot of support is the rally for Christians to be a voice for Israel in American politics. Christians United for Israel (CUFI) and Christian Israel Public Action Campaign are both organizations that have become very active in lobbying Congress on behalf of Israel. They have made it a priority to rally the Christian community to encourage and ensure that their congressional representatives are supporting Israel and legislation that would benefit the state. This past year CUFI became the largest pro-Israel Christian organization in the nation, with one million members. These organizations are essential to strengthening the American-Israel relationship.

The Christian community has already begun to raise its voice in support for Israel but we need to get a little louder, as scripture reads, ‘For Zion’s sake I will not keep silent, for Jerusalem’s sake I will not remain quiet, till her righteousness shines out like the dawn, her salvation like a blazing torch’. The Christian community has already begun to raise its voice in support for Israel but we need to get a little louder, as scripture reads, ‘For Zion’s sake I will not keep silent, for Jerusalem’s sake I will not remain quiet, till her righteousness shines out like the dawn, her salvation like a blazing torch’.

The Christian community has already begun to raise its voice in support for Israel but we need to get a little louder, as scripture reads, ‘For Zion’s sake I will not keep silent, for Jerusalem’s sake I will not remain quiet, till her righteousness shines out like the dawn, her salvation like a blazing torch’.
During the Intifada, when Jewish tourism in Israel decreased, Christian tourism increased in a show of support.

Many Christian Zionists support the Jewish communities of Judea and Samaria and oppose giving up land to Palestinians.

Christian Zionists’ support of Israel and the Jewish people is a pure one. Though some still like to focus on the differences between us, there are more commonalities than differences. “We just need to cultivate the relationships that allow us to discover the similarities,” says Onifer. This idea is one that is shared largely among the Christian Zionist community.

Israelis are also taking notice of how important Christian Zionists are to the future of Israel. Within the Knesset there is an entire division dedicated to connecting and coordinating with Christian leaders worldwide. The organization is known as the Knesset Christian Allies Caucus.[5] This group in the Knesset partners with Eagles Wings in support of the Israel Experience program for young Christian leaders. The Jerusalem Post wrote an article about this program, during which the students are brought to speak with members of the Knesset and the Christian Allies Caucus. Josh Reinstein, the Caucus director, was quoted in the article, stating, “The Knesset Christian Allies Caucus is proud to partner with this program, as it produces some of Israel’s top Christian ambassadors in the war for public opinion.”[6]

The gravity of the situation facing Israel today is daunting. The media, governments and the United Nations continue to demonize Israel. The number of supporters needs to be on Israel’s side. Christian Zionists help provide these numbers and with support increasing, these numbers will rise. If you asked me three years ago if I was a Zionist, I would not have said yes. I believed in supporting the Jewish people, part of which includes supporting Israel and the Jewish people’s right to the land. Now I know that I should have answered yes. I was raised in a church where supporting Israel was important to our congregation. My first exposure to anything related to the Jewish people, their faith and Israel took place before I knew or could understand its importance. Now, I know that both Christianity and Judaism share the same roots. They both value the same system of morals and share the Old Testament as sacred text. Essentially we are from the same foundation. To me, that is reason enough to support Jews as a people, and Israel as the land of the Jewish people.

I was afforded an incredible opportunity to be a part of the Israel Experience College Scholarship program last summer; it was my first time to Israel and has forever changed my life. It reinforced in me the necessity as a Christian to stand with Israel. I have taken that stand and proclaimed myself a Christian Zionist. I have become extremely active in bringing this fervor to my campus at Rutgers University. I feel that most Christians aren’t informed and don’t understand why it is so important to stand with and support Israel. I hope to help educate those on my campus, because there is a need for pro-Israel voices to rise up outside the Jewish community. The Christian community needs to take that stand. The Christian community has already begun to raise its voice in support for Israel but we need to get a little louder. As Scripture reads, “For Zion’s sake I will not keep silent, for Jerusalem’s sake I will not remain quiet, till her righteousness shines out like the dawn, her salvation like a blazing torch.”[7]

[ENDNOTES]
[7] Isaiah 62:1
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BY KEVIN MONTAG
Despite continued violence in the Middle East, the Israeli hope for peace continues to live on, as demonstrated by various efforts of Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. Netanyahu has continuously pushed for peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors since his first term as Prime Minister in 1996. Peace negotiations have unfortunately been stalled for the most part since 2009, due to the unprecedented demand by Palestinian leadership for a complete freeze in Israeli building throughout Judea and Samaria. [1] Despite being perceived as a hawkish leader, Netanyahu has signed and abided by numerous interim peace agreements, and has taken several controversial steps in order to advance peace.

Formal peace negotiations between Israel and the Palestinian Authority date back to 1993, when Israeli Prime Minister Yitzchak Rabin and Palestine Liberation Organization Chairman Yasser Arafat signed the Oslo Accords, marking the first formal talks between the two parties in history. [2] Both leaders claimed to want an end to the conflict that has claimed tens of thousands of lives. The landmark Oslo Accords stated that Israel would acknowledge the Palestinian Authority as the legitimate representative of the Palestinian people and in return, Arafat and the Palestinian people would acknowledge Israel’s right to a safe and peaceful existence. [3] Also, the Palestinians would formally acknowledge U.N. security resolutions 242 and 338, which recognize Israel as the Jewish State and call for a peaceful resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict through territorial compromise and not violence. [4] Arafat, for his part, would formally commit himself to the interim peace agreement and would refrain from inciting and organizing terror against Israel.

When Netanyahu was elected Prime Minister for the first time in 1996, he declared that he would accept the framework of the Oslo Accords. [5] Arafat, on the other hand, was not fulfilling his part of the agreement. Three years after signing the Accords, Yasser Arafat was giving speeches on national television, proclaiming that "struggle, combat, and jihad was the only path to take against Israel." [6] Despite Arafat’s anti-Israel incitement, Netanyahu continued to strive for a comprehensive peace agreement with the Palestinians. Under the guidelines of American President Bill Clinton, an attempt was made in 1997 to once again bring peace to fruition.

In January 1997, Netanyahu and Arafat signed the Hebron Protocol. [7] Under this agreement, the Palestinians were granted 80 percent of the ancient Jewish city of Hebron. [8] Netanyahu also agreed to withdraw Israeli troops from Hebron and to allow Palestinians access to the highways that surround the city. [9] While this difficult decision exposed Israeli citizens to Palestinian terrorism, Netanyahu argued that to achieve peace, Israel must be ready to make painful sacrifices.

Netanyahu continued to seek peace; in 1998, he signed the Wye River Memorandum. [10] Under this agreement, the Israeli and Palestinian governments agreed to take immediate steps to implement the Interim agreement of Oslo signed five years earlier. As part of the Wye River Memorandum, Israel agreed to withdraw from other parts of Judea and Samaria. [11] This decision was one of the most difficult for Israel to undertake, as Judea and Samaria are biblical lands that Jews believe are granted to them by God. Jews have inhabited this area continuously for over 3000 years. [12] Israel would be forced to uproot thousands of citizens and relocate them. Without control of Judea and Samaria, Israel would be in a compromised position should it come under attack. Its width would be reduced to a mere 9 miles at its narrowest point. [13] Despite these concerns, Netanyahu continued to surprise his critics by showing more willingness to concede territory and security in order to prove that he was serious about peace. In return, Arafat took no steps to implement his obligations under Oslo; instead he continued to incite and plan terrorist attacks against Israel and he demanded that Israel give up more land.

When Netanyahu spoke at Bar Ilan University in the beginning of his second term, he offered to meet with the Palestinians or representatives from any Arab country in the world to make peace. [14] Netanyahu believed the best way to improve the lives of the Palestinians was through his vision of an economic peace. Economic peace theory proposes cooperation between parties in order to increase the economic welfare of the less fortunate party, thus hopefully leading to positive political progress between the parties. [15] During his speech, Netanyahu declared “Economic peace is not a substitute for peace, but it is a very important component in achieving it.” [16] The Palestinians, however, immediately
In Mahmoud Abbas’s 2011 speech the United Nations General Assembly he claimed “Palestine” had been occupied for 63 years, which would make all of Israel “occupied territory.”

rejected Netanyahu’s vision for economic peace and only became more hardline in their rhetoric. PLO executive committee member Tayseer Khalid told Gulf News, “Israel will have no room to impose economic peace on Palestinians.” [17]

Under the leadership of Netanyahu, over 400 roadblocks have been removed, which made up 40 percent of all roadblocks in Judea and Samaria. [18] Ahmed Shataye, a Palestinian from Nablus, was recently quoted in The Daily Star of Lebanon, stating that due to the decision by Netanyahu to remove several roadblocks, his market trading business grew over 50%. [19] According to the International Monetary Fund, Palestinian territories in Judea and Samaria saw their economy grow 9% in 2009 and 2010. [20] In 2011, the gross domestic product in Gaza surged over 16% after restrictions on consumer goods were eased. [21] These restrictions were originally put in place due to the use of common materials, such as concrete, in weapons and terrorist activities. Often terror groups will use these materials to create rockets that are then fired into Israeli population centers. [22] These economic growth rates are the highest since the Oslo Accords were signed, and have been achieved under the leadership of Netanyahu.

In September 2010, Netanyahu agreed to a 10-month building freeze in Judea and Samaria, an unprecedented step, with the goal of bringing the Palestinians back to the negotiating table. [23] President Obama’s Special Envoy to the Middle East, George Mitchell, wrote in November 2010, regarding the freeze that “it is a positive development more than any Israeli government has done before.” [24] Despite the freeze and removal of roadblocks, the Palestinian Authority (PA) still refused to meet with Netanyahu to discuss a final status agreement until the last of the 10 months. This time, the PA was upset that Netanyahu refused to freeze building in eastern Jerusalem, an area that Israel views as part of its capital and land that it would never give up in any agreement. Building in Judea and Samaria was not part of the Oslo Accords. The Palestinian position that these communities are an obstacle to peace is false; it is just a new way to discredit Israel. The surrounding Arab countries and Palestinian Arab residents of Israel instigated three wars with Israel in order to destroy her, before any Israeli community in Judea and Samaria existed. The Palestinian government refused to sit down with Netanyahu for the first nine months of the building freeze. Finally, discussions were held in the 10th month to discuss peace, [25] after which the Palestinians refused to continue negotiations, because the building freeze was not extended. Yet Netanyahu continued to seek ways for improving the daily lives of the Palestinians.

In September 2011, Netanyahu addressed the UN General Assembly. In his speech, he made an explicit offer to negotiate peace anytime and anywhere in the world. [26] Netanyahu asked PA President Mahmoud Abbas, “If we genuinely want peace what is stopping us from meeting here today at the UN and working out our differences?” [27] Just like his speech at Bar Ilan two years earlier, Netanyahu again offered peace to all countries in the Arab world. [28] Netanyahu remarked during his UN speech that Abbas claimed earlier in the day that Israel had been occupying Palestinian land for 63 years. By claiming 63 years of occupation, Abbas made it clear that the UN partition plan in its entirety is not acceptable to the Palestinian people. [29] The Palestinian position is not for Israel to return to 1967 borders, but for Israel to cease to exist as a Jewish State.

During his two terms as Prime Minister, Netanyahu has released thousands of Palestinian terrorists. As part of the deal that helped bring home kidnapped Israeli soldier Gilad Shalit, Netanyahu released 1,027 Palestinian terrorists, including many who assisted in carrying out horrific suicide bombings, and committed other fatal terrorist attacks. [30] In May 2012, Netanyahu agreed to unilaterally release the bodies of 91 Palestinian terrorists who died in clashes with the Israel Defense Forces. [31] This gesture was made to support PA President Abbas in a hope for peace. Abbas has requested prisoner releases as a way to bolster his credentials in opposition to Hamas. And Hamas has secured thousands of prisoner releases in exchanges with Israel after kidnapping Israeli soldiers and civilians. [32]

Since 2001, Hamas has fired over ten thousand rockets at Israeli cities, and over the same time is responsible for the death and injury of thousands of Israeli civilians. [33] Israel on the other hand, continues to deliver humanitarian aid to the Gaza Strip, despite the fact that terrorists will use some of these materials to create more rockets. [34] During the period from May 27, 2012 to June 2, 2012, Israel delivered 27,797 tons of food and supplies, including 860 thousand liters of diesel fuel. [35] It is the hope of Netanyahu, the Israeli government and its people, that Gazans will acknowledge the humanitarian gestures and reject terrorism.

Netanyahu continues to seek peace with the Arab world and the Palestinian people, despite their persistent rejection. American officials involved in the peace process have said that no government has done more in the name of peace [36], all to no avail. The true nature of the conflict goes well beyond Israeli communities in Judea and Samaria and the narrative that Israel is not ready to make concessions. The true source of the conflict is Palestinian refusal to acknowledge the existence of the Jewish State and the inner desire to see Israel destroyed. Under Netanyahu, Israel has proven it wants peace. It’s time for the Palestinian leadership to end terror and join Netanyahu in the effort for peace.
[ENDNOTES]

[4] Ibid.
[8] Ibid.
[9] Ibid.
[16] Ibid.
[27] Ibid.
[28] Ibid.
[29] Ibid.
[34] http://www.israeltoday.co.il/default.aspx?tabid=178&nid=17216
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ISRAEL UNDER MEDIA ATTACK
MAINSTREAM MEDIA’S WAR ON ISRAEL

BY BLAIR HART NEWMAN
Early after Israel’s creation in 1948, media publications championed the young Jewish State as enlightened and democratic. Today these same publications use anti-Israel talking points to formulate their characterization of Israel.

Wars throughout history may have been fought on land, at sea and in the air, but one of today’s battlegrounds is far more complex. While it involves ideas and information instead of M-16s and rockets, it is no less threatening to Israel’s existence. The highly coordinated attack on the Jewish state, waged by mainstream media, is turning credible news publications into forums for Israel-bashers to delegitimize the state—all under the guise of honest reporting.

It is now more apparent than ever that the anti-Israel bias in the media is not just present—it’s pervasive.

In Israel’s early history, mainstream media cast the young state in a positive light. As the region’s underdog that shocked the world in its defeat of five invading Arab nations, the exemplary portrayal of the state came as no surprise. In 1973, Life magazine epitomized the media’s high regard for Israel when it described the state as “enlightened, robustly democratic and hip, a land of astonishing achievement.” [1] Yet in recent decades, the mainstream media has abandoned its support for Israel and instead, embarked on a full-blown war against the Jewish state.

In his recent Wall Street Journal op-ed, “What Happened to Israel’s Reputation?” Israel’s Ambassador to the United States, Michael Oren, acknowledged that the Jewish state would not be portrayed in the same light today as it was in 1973. Despite Israel’s democratic values and commitment to peace, the media would depict “Israel’s overwhelming military might, brutal conduct in warfare and eroding democratic values – plus the Palestinians’ plight and Israeli intransigence.” [2]

The cause of this shift, Oren said, “lies in the systematic delegitimization of the Jewish state. Having failed to destroy Israel by conventional arms and terrorism, Israel’s enemies alit on a subtler and more sinister tactic that hampers Israel’s ability to defend itself, even to justify its existence.” [3] This includes the media’s false portrayal of events. By constantly challenging the public’s perception of the Jewish state, the media has become a powerful, strategic tool in the war against Israel.

Much of the intolerance and hatred directed at Israel stem from pure ignorance of the facts — facts that are on Israel’s side. Taking the media’s high regard for Israel when it described the state as “enlightened, robustly democratic and hip, a land of astonishing achievement.” [1] Yet in recent decades, the mainstream media has abandoned its support for Israel and instead, embarked on a full-blown war against the Jewish state.

In his recent Wall Street Journal op-ed, “What Happened to Israel’s Reputation?” Israel’s Ambassador to the United States, Michael Oren, acknowledged that the Jewish state would not be portrayed in the same light today as it was in 1973. Despite Israel’s democratic values and commitment to peace, the media would depict “Israel’s overwhelming military might, brutal conduct in warfare and eroding democratic values – plus the Palestinians’ plight and Israeli intransigence.” [2]

The cause of this shift, Oren said, “lies in the systematic delegitimization of the Jewish state. Having failed to destroy Israel by conventional arms and terrorism, Israel’s enemies alit on a subtler and more sinister tactic that hampers Israel’s ability to defend itself, even to justify its existence.” [3] This includes the media’s false portrayal of events. By constantly challenging the public’s perception of the Jewish state, the media has become a powerful, strategic tool in the war against Israel.

Much of the intolerance and hatred directed at Israel stem from pure ignorance of the facts — facts that are on Israel’s side. Taking the media’s high regard for Israel when it described the state as “enlightened, robustly democratic and hip, a land of astonishing achievement.” [1] Yet in recent decades, the mainstream media has abandoned its support for Israel and instead, embarked on a full-blown war against the Jewish state.

In his recent Wall Street Journal op-ed, “What Happened to Israel’s Reputation?” Israel’s Ambassador to the United States, Michael Oren, acknowledged that the Jewish state would not be portrayed in the same light today as it was in 1973. Despite Israel’s democratic values and commitment to peace, the media would depict “Israel’s overwhelming military might, brutal conduct in warfare and eroding democratic values – plus the Palestinians’ plight and Israeli intransigence.” [2]

The cause of this shift, Oren said, “lies in the systematic delegitimization of the Jewish state. Having failed to destroy Israel by conventional arms and terrorism, Israel’s enemies alit on a subtler and more sinister tactic that hampers Israel’s ability to defend itself, even to justify its existence.” [3] This includes the media’s false portrayal of events. By constantly challenging the public’s perception of the Jewish state, the media has become a powerful, strategic tool in the war against Israel.

The article, written by Karl Vick, depicts Israelis living in a bubble, focusing on “the good life” and indifferent to making peace with the Palestinians. This portrayal, intending to show readers that Israelis are to blame for the stalled peace process, was both misleading and inaccurate. The article didn’t mention that in Israel, all citizens serve in the military. It didn’t tell readers that political debates are the norm in Israel’s many coffee shops. It didn’t mention that every Israeli has a heart-wrenching story about a friend, loved-one, or neighbor killed during a war. Truly, Israelis – a people with such a deep connection to their country
negotiate this deal with Hamas.

The New York Times is also a culprit in the media’s war against the Jewish state. As one of the world’s most widely read publications, the Times has a responsibility to report the truth. Yet its regular columnists “consistently distort the positions of [the Israeli] government and ignore the steps it has taken to advance peace.” [5] As Ron Dermer, senior advisor to Prime Minister Netanyahu, half-joked, “it would seem the surest way to get an op-ed published in the New York Times these days...is to attack Israel.” [6]

Among its most troubling pieces published in the last year is “Gilad Shalit’s Release,” an editorial from October 2011. While other news outlets weighed the costs of Israel’s decision – letting so many Palestinian prisoners go free for a single Israeli soldier – the New York Times seized the opportunity to condemn the Jewish state. The editorial criticized Prime Minister Netanyahu’s decision, stating that it would make him “less willing to make the necessary compromises to restart negotiations.” [7] They questioned his willingness to negotiate this deal with Hamas when he refused to negotiate seriously with the Palestinian Authority. The Times concluded, “the problem is not that he can’t compromise and make tough choices. It’s that he won’t.” [8]

Earlier that year, the publication’s usual anti-Israel fervor reached an unprecedented level. In May 2011, the New York Times published the Palestinian Authority President’s op-ed, allowing him to rewrite history. Mahmoud Abbas claimed that “Zionist forces expelled Palestinian Arabs to ensure a decisive Jewish majority in the future state of Israel.” [9]

While it is no surprise Abbas opts against laying blame on his Palestinian predecessors for their statelessness, it is surprising that the New York Times let a complete fallacy go to print. Had the Palestinian Arabs accepted the United Nations’ partition plan—or any of the countless other opportunities for peace—a Palestinian state would today be a reality.

Despite what he wrote for the New York Times article, Abbas has actually admitted Arab responsibility for the flight of Palestinians from Israel. In 1976 he wrote, “The Arab armies...abandoned them, forced them to emigrate and to leave their homeland, imposed upon them a political and ideological blockade and threw them into prisons.” [10]

While magazines and newspapers are filled with anti-Israel propaganda, television stations are not innocent either. In April 2012, CBS aired the 60 Minutes segment, “Christians of the Holy Land.” The segment is likely the most astounding example of the anti-Israel bias on television in recent history. Bob Simon, who reported the story, used severely slanted sources to support his claim that the Israelis are singlehandedly to blame for Palestinian Christians leaving the Jewish State.

Blaming Israel’s policies and settlements for pushing Palestinian Christians out of the region, Simon unfairly depicted the Jewish state as the oppressor. He portrayed the obstacles posed by West Bank checkpoints and the separation barrier as if Israel specifically targeted the Christians with these measures. Checkpoints, in addition to the barrier, severely inconvenience residents of the area. However, they were only implemented to decrease terrorism. Above all, Israel is the only country in the Middle East that protects—not oppresses, as Simon claimed—its Christian population.

These examples only begin to scrape the surface of the pervasive bias against Israel in the mainstream media, all carried out under the guise of honest, accurate and unbiased reporting. They serve as clear reminders that the media’s opposition to the state of Israel is rampant and there is no end in sight.

Now more than ever, it is clear that this bias must be addressed. It is not only about restoring the integrity of the mainstream media and providing readers with factual information. It is also a matter of Israel’s survival.

[ENDNOTES]

[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.
How Title VI Can Help Jews from being Victimized

By

Hannah Johnson
University and college campuses are places where young people should be able to learn, expand their horizons and exercise their right to voice their opinions. As of late, however, these sacred places of learning have become battlegrounds for spewing anti-Israel and anti-Zionist sentiment, harming Jewish students and even making them fear for their physical safety.

To remedy this problem, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is being used to compel federally-funded colleges and universities to respond to anti-Semitic harassment and discrimination. Using this tool has been highly debated; some, even in the Jewish community, worry that Title VI could be used to take away personal liberties, such as freedom of speech. As the battle rages on, one arena emerges as one of the most volatile—Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey. Rutgers—New Brunswick, the flagship campus, has been making headlines with its anti-Semitic and anti-Israel fervor. As a student at Rutgers, I have seen the effect this ongoing battle has had on the climate on campus. The university is divided into three camps—pro-Israel, anti-Israel and apathetic—and it looks like we are in for a long haul in uniting these camps and ensuring a safe and respectful campus environment for all.

The purpose of Title VI is to ensure that federally-funded schools live up to their legal obligation to address racial and ethnic harassment and discrimination, so that all students are able to learn, grow and achieve their full potential in a safe, non-hostile environment. In recent years, Title VI has become extremely important in combating anti-Semitism on college campuses.

Historically, the U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights—which enforces Title VI—did not interpret the law to protect Jewish students, because the language of the law prohibits discrimination based on “race, color, or national origin,” but does not mention religion. The Office for Civil Rights viewed Jewish students strictly as members of a religious group and therefore outside the protections of the law.

In October 2010, the Office for Civil Rights clarified its Title VI policy, stating, “Groups that face discrimination on the basis of actual or perceived shared ancestry or ethnic characteristics may not be denied protection under Title VI on the ground they also share a common faith.” In other words, the Office for Civil Rights understood that Jews are also an ethnic group as well as a religious group, and should be protected under the law when they are discriminated against based on their ethnicity or ancestry.

Several Title VI complaints have been filed on behalf of Jewish students facing anti-Semitic harassment and discrimination at their schools, including at the University of California (UC) at Irvine, UC Berkeley, UC Santa Cruz, Barnard College and Rutgers University. Some of these cases have been dismissed, while others are still being investigated or are on appeal.

Title VI has not been unanimously accepted as an appropriate means to combat anti-Semitism on campus, however. According to the Chronicle of Higher Education, a number of Jewish organizations, such as the David Project and the Jewish Council for Public Affairs, are hesitant about utilizing Title VI and fear...
that it could be misused. The Zionist Organization of America (ZOA) has wholeheartedly applauded this new legal protection for Jewish students, noting that Jewish students now have the same protections that other ethnic and racial groups have had since the law was passed in 1964. In an opinion piece for the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, the ZOA stated, “We should be fully supportive of Jewish students and holding schools accountable when they don’t respond to campus anti-Semitism.”

Anti-Semitism has caused problems on campuses across the country but has taken center stage and gained a lot of media coverage at Rutgers University in New Jersey. Rutgers is the largest state university in New Jersey with a student population near 40,000 at its New Brunswick campus alone. Its Jewish population constitutes about 16 percent of the undergraduate population. In 2011, Reform Judaism magazine listed Rutgers as having the fourth largest Jewish population of any public university in the nation. Rutgers has both a Hillel and a Chabad, as well as students within the Reform, Conservative and Orthodox communities who are active in religious and cultural activities. In spite of a strong and rich Jewish community life, anti-Semitism has had an underlying presence among students on campus. Anti-Semitic and anti-Israel activity on the campus dates back to at least 2001.

Over the past four years, this activity has escalated. For example, the Outreach Coordinator of the Center for Middle East Studies at the University harassed a Jewish student who was pro-Israel. Another incident that caused outrage in the Jewish community occurred at a Rutgers event called “Never Again for Anyone.” This event, organized by a student organization called BAKA (Belief Awareness Knowledge and Action), compared the Holocaust and Nazism to Israel’s policies toward Palestinians.

When this event took place in January 2011, many Jewish and pro-Israel students tried to attend, to peacefully share their opinions and challenge the falsehoods about Israel. BAKA had advertised the event as free and open to the public. But when the event organizers saw how many Jewish and pro-Israel students showed up, they changed the admissions policy and selectively enforced it against the students perceived to be Jewish and pro-Israel. These students were forced to pay a fee for admission, while others were allowed in for free.

More recently, a Jewish student who had already been harassed and intimidated for his vocal support for Israel was harassed again. A Rutgers satirical student paper called The Medium published an article about “the good things Hitler did,” and attributed it to the Jewish student, even using his name and image without his approval. This created a lot of media attention and reinforced the public that Rutgers is a highly volatile environment for Jewish students who support Israel.

As a pro-Israel student on campus, I have been in the midst of the crossfire between anti-Israel students and Jewish, pro-Israel students. With all the recent acts of anti-Semitism on campus, I am shocked that the administration and the student body have not done more to address the hostility.

Several Title VI complaints have been filed on behalf of Jewish students facing anti-Semitic harassment and discrimination at their schools, including at the University of California (UC) at Irvine, UC Berkeley, UC Santa Cruz, Barnard College and Rutgers University. The Zionist Organization of America (ZOA) has wholeheartedly applauded this new legal protection for Jewish students, noting that Jewish students now have the same protections that other ethnic and racial groups have had since Title VI was passed in 1964.

Last semester I was present at an event where two Israel Defense Forces soldiers came to speak to us about their experiences in the army. Several students staged a walk-out, and then some hecklers interrupted the presentation, making it difficult for the speakers to continue. The hecklers attacked not only those speaking, but also those in the audience who were pro-Israel. Though this was a non-violent protest and no one was physically hurt, the intensity of the hostility toward Israel and Israelis surely had a harmful impact on Jewish and pro-Israel students. The incident shows how deep the animosity runs on campus.

My perspective is slightly different from the perspective of the majority of pro-Israel students on campus because I am not Jewish, but a Christian student. I am extremely passionate about supporting Israel and the Jewish people.

In the future, it is important that more Christian students and pro-American students stand up in solidarity with Israel on campus. The environment on campus is tilted to the left and is extremely liberal, from the professors in the classroom to the student body and life outside of class. Often this means that Israel gets characterized as a brutal oppressor and the Palestinians as innocent victims. The characterization is unfair and untrue.

In describing the campus environment, Andrew Getraer, Executive Director of Rutgers Hillel, has noted that “for a number of students who are very active in the pro-Israel community, it has become hostile.” I would have to agree that the climate is tense on campus for pro-Israel students. The students are divided on
campus: Some are pro-Israel, others are anti-Israel, and the rest are apathetic. The apathetic camp represents the largest number of students on campus. By not speaking out against the demonization of Jews and Israel, they are taking a stand and contributing to the hostile environment. Unfortunately the administration is also taking a stand by not doing enough to combat incidents of anti-Semitism.

The use of Title VI in order to confront the administration is really important. If the administration does not stand up and condemn the behavior on campus as wrong, it will set a terrible precedent. This precedent would make it permissible to be anti-Semitic and demonize Israel on campus. This precedent would send the message that harassing and intimidating Jewish and pro-Israel students are acceptable. If our campus community does not begin standing up and speaking out, the number of anti-Semitic attacks will likely increase.

This precedent cannot and should not be set. The university campus must afford each and every student the right to develop as a person and learn what interests them as an individual. No one should be harassed or intimidated because their views differ from their peers. Edmund Burke, an Irish statesman, once said, “The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing.” Of the greater Rutgers University population and the Rutgers administration, I ask: Will you do nothing?

The purpose of Title VI is to ensure that federally-funded schools address racial and ethnic harassment and discrimination, so that all students are able to learn, grow and achieve their full potential in a safe, non-hostile environment.

Jewish and pro-Israel students from New Jersey to California face threats and harassment on their campuses.

[ENDNOTES]

[7] The Zionist Organization of America’s Memorandum in Support of Its Title VI claims against Rutgers University. 05/31/12
[8] The Zionist Organization of America’s Memorandum in Support of Its Title VI claims against Rutgers University. 05/31/12
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