



# OPINION and ANALYSIS

*Vol 7, Number 3: 12 July 2011*

**A selection of some of the more challenging and thought-provoking  
local and international writings on the Middle East**

<http://www.sazionfed.co.za>

- 1. *Pinhas Inbari*      **What are the Palestinians planning after September?**  
The PLO's declared policy of seeking UN recognition in September has gathered international support and encouragement and challenged Israeli diplomacy as never before.**
- 2. *Lauren Stone*      **Iranian meddling reaches new heights**  
As Washington struggles to deal with the changing Arab World in the wake of this year's uprisings, Iran is doing all it can to manipulate the changing regional dynamics, too, but in its favor instead.**
- 3. *Robert Wistrich*      **Durban III: Delegitimizing Israel and the apartheid analogy**  
During the past decade probably no falsehood has gained greater traction than the big lie that Israel is an apartheid "racist state" – not only towards the Palestinians but in relation to the wider world.**
- 4. *Elana Hayoun*      **Getting our facts right**  
The Palestinian agenda is not to concede, while making future negotiations for "peace" based on "refugees" rights to return to Israel proper, thereby negating the very essence of a Jewish homeland.**
- 5. *Bits and Pieces*      **Clips from various media in the Middle East and elsewhere****

## What are the Palestinians planning after September?

**Pinhas Inbari, 4 July 2011**

<http://www.jcpa.org/JCPA/Templates/ShowPage.asp?DRIT=1&DBID=1&LNGID=1&TMID=111&FID=442&PID=0&IID=7797&TTL=What Are the Palestinians Planning after Sep>

The official Palestinian position is that the preferred option is to return to negotiations, but as long as Israel refuses to confirm the principle of the 1967 lines with agreed swaps as the basis for a final settlement, the Palestinians have no alternative but to unilaterally apply to the UN for recognition as a full member state along those borders. In a speech to a Geneva Initiative conference in May, Palestinian negotiator Dr. Saeb Erekat strongly emphasized the 1967 lines as the crux of a solution.

Mostly, the international community is tired of the unending Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and the prospect of the United Nations “ending” it in September by recognizing Palestinian statehood is appealing to many. Moreover, many in the international community consider a solution based on the 1967 borders to be fair.

Hence, the PLO’s declared policy of seeking UN recognition in September has gathered international support and encouragement and challenged Israeli diplomacy as never before. A key point that makes the Palestinian position so attractive is the simple notion that the future Palestinian state will suffice with the 1967 borders and immediately engage in peace negotiations to end the conflict. The tired world is happy to hear that finally a Palestinian state will come into being and, as a “peace-loving state” – as required for state membership in the United Nations – will engage in peace and not in war or conflict. If that was really the case, and the application for statehood was aimed at completing peace negotiations on a “state-to-state” footing, this would have been a reasonable course of action deserving all possible support. However, if one studies the details of what the Palestinians really envisage after September, serious doubts arise. What they are actually planning is the opposite: to exploit a UN endorsement of statehood in order to legitimize an escalation of the conflict while destabilizing the entire Middle East during a critical period when the region is already agitated.

The Palestinians do not want to declare a state, but, rather, to leave the conflict open. After having the 1967 lines recognized so as to negate the results of the Six-Day War, they plan to seek recognition of the 1947 partition lines and thereby end the refugee problem – while attempting to inflict economic losses on Israel by suing it for “occupation damages,” suing IDF officers on war crimes charges, causing civil war in Israel over settler evacuation, and creating strife between Israel and the United States to the extent of ending their historical special relationship, if possible.

That is what the Palestinians are planning. Can they carry it out? Probably not;<sup>3</sup> the plans are too large and presumptuous for them. Nevertheless, it is crucial to be aware of this far-reaching scheme.

### **The 1947 Borders**

The most striking phenomenon in the internal Palestinian discourse is the revival of the 1947 UN partition plan. With the PLO declaring that the September move involves enshrining the 1967 lines, why is so much attention being given to the 1947 lines?

The answer can be found in PLO leader Mahmoud Abbas’ recent *New York Times* op-ed. Abbas ignited the anger of the Israeli government in what it called a distortion of history. His description of the 1947 events ran counter to recorded history as Israel knew it: whereas Abbas claimed that only Israel received its share of the partition plan, then attacked the Palestinians and expelled them, Israel recalled the fact that the Palestinians and the Arabs rejected the plan and attacked Israel, and Palestinians fled the country as a result of a war their side had initiated.

Abbas, however, is no historian, and he did not write the article as a historical thesis but as a statesman who has a claim: that, with the UN having given Israel its share of the partition plan, it is now the

Palestinians' turn to get their share. Thus, even before the UN has recognized the 1967 lines as borders, the PLO is raising the claim for the 1947 borders.

Does it make sense? Yes. The Palestinians' answer to the Israeli demand to be recognized as a Jewish state is that the UN partition plan already recognized a Jewish state along the borders of 1947.

Normally, the leaders of new states declare their independence from their home territory, and only go to the UN in order to obtain UN membership. Strikingly, Abbas does not want to declare a state in Ramallah, but wants statehood granted or acknowledged by the UN General Assembly. One clear reason for his reluctance to declare a state by himself is so that he does not commit himself to the 1967 lines, but rather leaves the conflict open, so that the Palestinian national movement can seek more territories in the future, starting with the 1947 lines.

The revival of UN General Assembly Resolution 181 and the 1947 borders is not a new Palestinian strategy. In May 1999, when the PLO argued that the Oslo Accords were about to expire, Nabil Sha'ath, Palestinian Minister of International Cooperation, proposed reviving Palestinian claims to the 1947 lines.

Palestinian Prime Minister Salam Fayyad has used the argument that the Palestinians do not need at present to declare a state since Yasser Arafat already made such a declaration on November 15, 1988, in Algiers. The basis of Arafat's declaration was Resolution 181. Therefore, from the Palestinian perspective the borders of 1947 are still a point of reference for future Palestinian claims.

### **The Third Intifada**

Abbas is well known for strictly rejecting the use of force, and in that regard he has contributed to the peaceful atmosphere since the Second Intifada, which was characterized by cruel terror activity within Israel. However, there are signs that this long period of quiet, for which Abbas deserves credit, is going to end after or just before September, and that Fatah is already preparing for the "Third Intifada."

This intifada is not planned to be a terrorist one as the Palestinians – including Hamas – have well learned the lessons from the terror they practiced in the Second Intifada. Instead it is planned to be an "intifada by peaceful means" of the kind that became very popular in the Arab Spring. Although the methods will not be terroristic, the aims of this Third Intifada are by all means terroristic and posit the destruction of Israel as the final goal.

Although this Third Intifada that is planned for September appears to be a kind of "spontaneous Facebook event," careful tracking of the leaders of the initiative reveals that they are mostly Hamas activists. Other promoters of the endeavor are radical leftist activists in the West Bank. The Fatah movement ... not only does not object to it but also is posting the link to the Third Intifada's Facebook page on some of its home pages, thereby expressing endorsement of the ominous contents.

Thus, the Third Intifada is a joint project of all parties in the Palestinian Authority (PA) and the diaspora: Hamas, radical leftists, Fatah, and even the PA government in Ramallah. The only difference appears to be that, whereas the actors outside the framework of government responsibility are outspoken, the governmental circles are more cautious. One cannot discern any sort of dispute within the Palestinian political body, but, rather, a consensus.

How do the Palestinians define the aims of the Third Intifada? Ahmad Abu Ruteima, a Hamas activist in Gaza, describes the objective of the Third Intifada: "The struggle is about the very existence of Israel and not about the 1967 borders. The defense minister, Ehud Barak, confirmed that the [Israeli] army is incapable of confronting a human influx from all directions." The Hamas activist is confident that the Israeli public ("settlers" as he defines them) "cannot withstand an attrition war" of this kind, and that "the persistence of these marches \*will send a message+ that the owners of the land are standing at the borders, ready to enter at any moment, and Israeli society will be constantly concerned and the settlers [Israeli public] will face difficult dilemmas, accompanied by nervous tensions, regarding whether to stay in a region encircled by enemies or return to live in the places they came from."

Senior Fatah figure in Lebanon Munir Maqdash said: "Raising the Palestinian flag on the borders in the Nakba events is a declaration of all the Palestinians that the Palestinian state is from the sea to the river...the third generation [of refugees] is the generation of liberation...and return."

Mazin Qumsiya, a member of the radical left in the West Bank, explains what the term “justice” means with respect to solving the refugee problem:

Palestinian refugees will have the right to return to their homes and lands and to receive reparation for their suffering as supported by UNGA resolution 194. Return and self-determination are key pillars of peace based on justice...all people who live in historic Palestine ... will have an effective equality of citizenship and will enjoy fundamental rights and freedoms as articulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Qumsiya is a veteran activist in the field of delegitimizing Israel and recruiting European leftists to the anti-Israeli campaign in the West Bank and across Europe and the Americas. He sees Israel on the western side of the Green Line as an “apartheid state” and the territory on the eastern side as “occupied territories.” Hence, the aim of the “refugee marches” is not to have a Palestinian state established on the 1967 lines but to create a single state on both sides of those lines.

It is true that the three above-quoted figures represent the extremes of the Palestinian political spectrum. The problem is that no one in the mainstream has contradicted them; Fatah websites sanction those views by posting the link to the Third Intifada Facebook page. Furthermore, the Hamas activist, Abu Ruteima, has even justified the non-aggressive approach practiced in Ramallah as “more effective.” Hence, Hamas’ readiness to adopt this modus operandi points to a new species which can be called “nonviolent terrorism.”

One might have expected that PLO leader Abbas, who is leading the campaign for the 1967-borders state, would express reservations or even lead the argument for a compromise based on those borders; but he has not. Instead he praised the Nakba Day marchers, mourning the dead “whose spilled blood will not be wasted” as “the right is stronger than time that has passed, and the will of the people remains and is stronger than the might of the despotic power \*Israel+ and occupation” ...

Many believe Abbas is sincere in his quest for peace, and that may indeed be the case. The Nakba events, however, were a test for his leadership, and he did not dispute the open, radical calls for Israel’s destruction including from the midst of his own Fatah power base ...

In his newly published book in Israel, *The Abyss*, former head of the Israeli delegation to Qatar, Eli Avidar, ... recounts that in a meeting between former Foreign Minister Shlomo Ben- Ami and the Emir of Qatar, Ben-Ami told the Emir that Israel had offered to absorb as many as two hundred thousand refugees within Israel and had even considered accepting double this number under the rubric of “family reunions” – but the Palestinians had rejected the offer ... The aim is not family reunions, but to shrink Israel to the 1947 borders on the clear basis of the right of return, thereby undoing the results of the 1948 war – after the United Nations undoes the results of the 1967 war in September.

According to a report published in *al-Quds al-Arabi* about the internal crisis in Fatah, the Fatah Revolutionary Council has endorsed the “Facebook intifada”; that means the Fatah sites’ posting of the Third Intifada link is an official act of the movement. A senior member of the Revolutionary Council, Hatem Abd al-Qader of east Jerusalem, is quoted as saying that in case Israel obstructs the political plans, Abbas will step down, general elections will not take place, the PA will dissolve itself, and nothing will prevent the Palestinians from returning to the struggle ...

Thus, in no way will UN recognition of the 1967 borders mark the path to a historic compromise. The Palestinians will not exploit this opportunity to declare a state, but, instead, will use it for international legitimacy to jumpstart the campaign for the 1947 partition plan ....

The issue of the 1947 borders has triggered discussions and symposia in the Palestinian academic community. In one of the symposia a leading Palestinian scholar in Israel, Prof. Adel Manna’, raised the argument that the 1947 borders did not reflect the demographic reality at the time, allocating to the Jews much more than their actual share.

This can also explain why the PLO so adamantly refuses any discussion of swaps between the Palestinian-populated areas in the Israeli Triangle region and the settlement blocs. That would be the most reasonable formula for a border agreement based on the 1967 lines. But the PLO, apparently, wants to leave the Palestinian-populated areas in Israel as an anchor for pushing Israel back to the 1947 borders or even further, as the territorial basis for exercising the right of return into Israel.

### **Prosecuting Israel in International Tribunals**

... Abbas has expressed on several occasions his firm insistence that not a single Jew or Israeli will remain in the future Palestinian state, triggering angry Israeli accusations of racism. Again, one may wonder why swaps that are based on the current demographic reality, as recognized in President Bush's letter to former Prime Minister Sharon, are so strongly rejected by the PLO?

The answer (is to cause) Israel the greatest possible hardships, including igniting internal conflicts, inflicting economic disaster, and dragging IDF officers to international war crimes tribunals.

In his *New York Times* article, Abbas was straightforward: "Palestine's admission to the United Nations would pave the way for the internationalization of the conflict as a legal matter, not only a political one. It would also pave the way for us to pursue claims against Israel at the United Nations, human rights treaty bodies and the International Court of Justice."

Actually the PLO has been preparing to pursue such claims for a long time, well before the current crisis and even during the "serious" negotiations with the Kadima government. The PLO's Palestinian Monitoring Group of its Negotiations Affairs Department used to publish almost regularly a "Daily Situation Report" in which it meticulously recorded all sorts of damage inflicted by Israel and the settlers on the Palestinians in a variety of ways: direct damage by soldiers or settlers, checkpoints, the "wall," and so on. This steady accumulation of data has only one logical function: to be forwarded in due time to international tribunals in order to sue Israel in a multibillion-dollar damage claim ...

Indeed, the PLO needs statehood recognition in order to overcome what has so far been the major impediment to its outreach to the international tribunals: not having the status of a state, since only states can appeal to these courts. Hence, the PLO has needed someone else to plead its case ..... The statehood status that the UN will be asked to grant the PLO in September is about meeting this need, not about establishing a state. What the Palestinians plan to do then is not to exercise statehood but to declare themselves a "state under occupation" in order to legitimize the escalation of the struggle ...

Suing Israel is, in fact, a separate phenomenon from seeking a statehood endorsement in September, and the Palestinians will keep doing so with or without a UN resolution. This can be learned from the recent meeting of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) in Indonesia at which the Palestinians finally found someone to file suit for them in case either the United Nations rejects their application or they decide not to take that step. The PA sent to the OIC meeting a high-ranking delegation led by Foreign Minister Riyadh al-Malki, as well as Prisoners Minister Issa Qaraqe' and UN envoy Dr. Riyadh Mansur. With the support of the new Egyptian foreign minister, Nabil al-Arabi, they succeeded to obtain the OIC's agreement to file suit for the PA in UN tribunals.

---

### **Iranian meddling reaches new heights**

***Lauren Stone, Jewish Policy Centre, 7 July 2011***

<http://www.jewishpolicycenter.org/blog/2011/07/iranian-meddling-reaches-new-heights>

As Washington struggles to deal with the changing Arab World in the wake of this year's uprisings, Iran is doing all it can to manipulate the changing regional dynamics, too, but in its favor instead.

According to a recent report, Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) transferred new lethal weapons to its allies in Iraq and Afghanistan in recent months in an effort to quicken the pace of U.S. withdrawal. Indeed, the attacks in Iraq in June that killed 15 US servicemen, the highest monthly casualty over the last two years, are attributed to Shiite militias trained by the IRGC as opposed to the Sunni militants that were largely responsible for deadly attacks inside Iraq a few years ago.

According to US officials, Tehran is also growing its influence in "Arab Spring" countries by increasing its intelligence and propaganda activities in Egypt, Bahrain, and Yemen - pro-U.S. countries whose leaders have either fallen or come under pressure. In Egypt in particular, Iran is reportedly "attempting to influence the political process...through efforts to connect with the Muslim Brotherhood," according to the head of IDF Military Intelligence Maj.- Gen. Aviv Kochavi. He also noted that aside from Egypt, Bahrain, and Yemen, Iran is working in Syria, Lebanon, Sudan, Iraq, and Gaza "to deepen their infiltration into states and organizations in the region."

Meanwhile, US officials confirmed last April that Tehran is helping its ally Syrian President Bashar al-Asad quell the popular uprising gripping his country. And finally, who could forget that Iran continues to develop its nuclear program, every day posing a greater threat to Israel, Arab countries, and the West.

Iranian meddling is reaching new heights, partly because of the window of opportunity opened by the Arab uprisings this year as well as US plans to withdraw from Iraq and Afghanistan before leaving the countries with strong, stable governments. Indeed, Washington must now proceed with caution when dealing with both the countries facing revolution, and the Iraq and Afghan wars.

-----

### **Durban III: Delegitimizing Israel and the apartheid analogy**

***Robert Wistrich, Jerusalem Post, 21 June 2011***

<http://blogs.jpost.com/content/durban-iii-delegitimizing-israel-and-apartheid-analogy>

It is almost ten years since the UN-sponsored World Conference against Racism in Durban inaugurated a new stage in the history of "anti-racist" anti-Semitism. The Durban gathering of August 2001, ostensibly devoted to commemorating the struggle against apartheid, was rapidly transformed by the assembled NGOs into a raucous hate-fest against Israel. During the proceedings Israel, to quote Canadian MP Irwin Cotler, found itself singled out as "a sort of modern-day geo-political anti-Christ." A flood of anti-Semitic slanders mixed with savage criticism of Israel, Iranian-inspired conspiracy theories, leftist anti-Zionism and hecklers ranting at Jews under the banner of human rights, irrevocably poisoned the atmosphere.

One of the more scandalous obscene Durban flyers even bore a picture of Adolf Hitler with the pointed question: "What would have happened if I had won? The Good Things. There would have been no Israel and no Palestinian bloodshed. The Rest is your guess." The NGO Forum also inserted deliberately relativistic references to genocides in general, holocausts (with a small "h") and, above all, to highlight the "ethnic cleansing" of Palestinians, allegedly perpetrated by Israel. Needless to say, this abysmal spectacle did not deter the UN from making Durban the centerpiece for its future "anti-racism" agenda.

In the circumstances, it was perhaps all too appropriate that the keynote speaker for Durban II in Geneva (held on April 20, 2009) was none other than the world's leading Holocaust denier, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. By some macabre coincidence he spoke at the UN podium on Hitler's 120th birthday, which also coincided with Holocaust Remembrance Day in Israel. Brazenly abusing the misplaced honor he had been given, Ahmadinejad once again vilified Israel as a "totally racist state,"

endlessly ranting on about the “Zionist racist perpetrators of genocide.” For the Iranian leadership this is most certainly not a matter of mere rhetoric but a determined geo-political strategy. Hard-core Holocaust denial is an integral part of its policy to delegitimize and dismantle the Jewish State. It is also a thumb in the eye of those nations that helped in its establishment. Some of these more pro-Israel countries, led by Canada and the USA – followed by Australia, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Italy, Germany and Poland – publicly refused to participate in the UN anti-racism charade. Canada and the USA have already indicated that they will also be absent from the Durban III masquerade planned for this coming autumn.

In terms of delegitimization, however, much of the damage has already been done. During the past decade probably no falsehood has gained greater traction than the big lie that Israel is an apartheid “racist state” – not only towards the Palestinians but in relation to the wider world. In retrospect, this canard can be seen as the greatest single triumph of Soviet propaganda in the mid-1970s, when the USSR and the Arab states masterminded the notorious UN Zionism=Racism resolution. Since then (and especially after Durban I), the charge has become solidly entrenched in many Western countries. Despite its obvious mendacity, it underlies the Boycott, Disinvestment and Sanctions (BDS) campaigns against Israel on university campuses in the West and the accompanying “Israel Apartheid Week” events as well as many of the anti-Israel condemnations by NGOs and in the UN Human Rights Council.

The apartheid analogy and the myth of Zionist racism are classic examples of cynical political warfare aimed purely at stigmatizing or delegitimizing Israel out of existence. Such fabrications totally disregard the context and content of South African apartheid, based on an institutionalized discrimination anchored in a formidable array of strictly enforced racial laws. From birth to death it was always skin color and statutory race classification that determined human and civic rights in white-controlled South Africa. The black majority (90 percent of the population) had no right to vote or to be elected; it could not freely choose its place of residence, work or occupation. Mixed marriages or even sexual relations across the race barrier were criminalized, there were separate benches in parks for whites and blacks, separate buses, hospitals, libraries, restaurants, as well as segregated places of entertainment.

Any person even casually acquainted with Israel’s vibrant democracy knows that there is not even the remotest comparison between its free and open society and the grim reality of South African apartheid. But then ideological delegitimization and slanderous misuse of the apartheid analogy is not about the “criticism” of Israel, let alone “learning the lessons of history” or achieving freedom for the Palestinians. The objective is not to help solve an intractable national conflict (made even more difficult by the rise of Islamic fundamentalism) but to demonize Israel as the embodiment of ultimate “racist evil” – an accusation designed to remove any moral grounds for its existence. Those engaged in delegitimization initiatives – whether Iran, the Palestinians, Arab states, left-wing militants or members of Western academic elites – are engaged in propaganda and politicide, not the pursuit of truth.

And while academics, activists and world leaders attempt to combat this evil, tenaciously pursuing the truth and trying to figure out if and how we can win the war against those who delegitimize Israel (as Canadian MP Cotler and his fellow panelists will at the third Israeli President's Conference: Facing Tomorrow 2011 in Jerusalem), I believe that the current success in defaming Israel is but a Pyrrhic victory. Like the repressive tyrannies and benighted theocracies in the Muslim Middle East, which are slowly crumbling before our eyes, their days are numbered. We will still be here after they are long gone.

---

## **Getting our facts right**

### ***Elana Hayoun***

Israel's narrative and legitimacy has been compromised by the media, unsuccessful appeasement policies and Arab propaganda. The time has come to enlighten the masses of Israel's true narrative. This narrative is not addressing a political or religious agenda, its telling the facts.

Most people are unaware that the United Nations Article 80 confers that even after the "League of Nations" ceased to exist, the "Mandate of Palestine" would still be in affect "until agreements have been concluded". This opinion that all Mandates (Syria, Palestine and Iraq) survived the "demise of the League of Nations" has been verified by the International Court of Justice (IJC Opinion of June 21, 1971)

Our rights in Judea and Samaria (West Bank) have never ceased and yet the world and many Israelis have taken on the Palestinian terminology of "occupation" and "illegal settlements".

Article 15 of League of Nations concurs that no one can be excluded from living in Judea and Samaria on the grounds of religion or race:

#### ARTICLE 15

" No discrimination of any kind shall be made between the inhabitants of Palestine on the ground of race, religion or language. No person shall be excluded from Palestine on the sole ground of his religious belief."??

The call to prohibit Jews from building in Judea and Samaria does not only contradict Article 15, it is in violation of basic human rights and calls for an establishment of an "Apartheid Palestinian state".

The fact that there are members of the European Union and the U.S administration calling Jewish settlement in Judea and Samaria "illegal" is incomprehensible and morally unethical.

The General Assembly resolution 181 in 1947, the partition plan of Palestine was accepted by Jews and rejected by the Arabs. As the resolution was a recommendation, not legally binding, and not implemented as a result of Arabs rejection of the proposal.

The quest by the Palestinians to declare a state unilaterally based on the 1967 lines is in fact the 1949 Armistice lines, which was never intended to be a border as per Article VI.

"These Agreements are agreed upon by the Parties without prejudice to future territorial settlement or boundary lines".

U.N Resolutions 242 and 338 affirms the right of Israel to live within secure borders, any concession in relinquishing land for peace has to be negotiated and not unilaterally declared.

Over the past 63 years Israeli governments have made several peace overtures to the Palestinians but to no avail. The question is not about land. Had it been, there already would be a Palestinian state today. It is very important to hold the Palestinians accountable for their impunity of not accepting generous peace offers. We need to examine their intentions and deeds closely. They have at every available opportunity tried to undermine Israel's legitimacy and refused to acknowledge Israel's historical attachment to the land. They have not prepared their people for reconciliation. Just the opposite, they have used incitement and propaganda to keep the conflict ablaze.

It has become clearer during the past months that the Palestinians have abandoned any peaceful reconciliation with Israel by their insistence of reconciling with Hamas and their bid to further their agenda in declaring a state unilaterally.

Israelis have become complacent, and in their bid to end the conflict have allowed the Palestinians to dictate terms of negotiations. Even though Israel is adamant that since peace talks failed, they will not be renewed at the point that they ceased. It has almost become 'fait accompli' that Israel is expected to concede 97% of Judea and Samaria with some "land swaps", without the Palestinians making one concession.

The Palestinian agenda is not to concede, while making future negotiations for "peace" based on "refugees" rights to return to Israel proper, thereby negating the very essence of a Jewish homeland.

We can no longer afford to remain complacent as Israel's very legitimacy is on the line. The time has come for us to reclaim our historical and legal rights to Judea and Samaria. By uniting and sending a loud message to the world and the Palestinians that we have rights in Judea and Samaria and although a solution must be found to accommodate the Arab population in Judea and Samaria, it should not be at the expense of our Jewish homeland

-----

***Bits and Pieces*      Clips from various media in the Middle East and elsewhere**

***ICEJ, 8 July 2011:*** The leaders of several prominent universities in the US will visit Israel this week on a trip sponsored by Project Interchange, an educational institute of the American Jewish Committee. "Our goal here is to show the complexity of the region, going beyond the headlines," explained Sam Witkin, Project Interchange's executive director. "Project Interchange tries to show a non-ideological view of Israel to dive into complex issues without prejudice. When confronted with issues on campus, this knowledge gives them a broader intellectual base so they can have a proper intellectual response." The faculty members will arrive Sunday and spend time with their counterparts from Israeli universities, NGO's, government officials and ordinary Israelis and Palestinians.

***ICEJ, 8 July 2011:*** Two scientists from the Hebrew University have made a ground breaking finding as they have been able to trace the parts in human DNA most sensitive in the first stages of cancer. They also discovered a special function able to slow down the DNA replication and sometimes stop it. Under stress the replication is weakened and removes the tools the cell uses which results in the breaking of the DNA. In the future the scientists hope that their findings will be helpful and eventually lead to some sort of treatment to restrain cancer. The final result of their study will be published in the prominent medical journal, Molecular Cell.

***NOTE: The views expressed in certain articles are not necessarily those of the SAZF***