



Schlaglicht Israel Nr. 06/12

Aktuelles aus israelischen Tageszeitungen

26. März – 15. April 2012

1. Kontroverse um das Gedicht von Günter Grass

Das am 4. April in der Süddeutschen Zeitung veröffentlichte Gedicht „Was gesagt werden muss“ von Günter Grass hat in Israel heftige Reaktionen ausgelöst. In dem Text warnt der deutsche Literaturnobelpreisträger u.a. davor, dass Israel in der Auseinandersetzung mit dem Iran und dessen Atomprogramm eine Bedrohung des Weltfriedens darstelle, da Israel über Atomwaffen verfüge, die keiner internationalen Kontrollen unterworfen seien. Israel hat den Besitz von Atomwaffen nie dementiert oder bestätigt. Eine Folge des Gedichts: Der israelische Innenminister Eli Yishai erklärte Grass in Israel zur „persona non grata“.

Israelis can be angry with Gunter Grass, but they must listen to him

„Grass' "What Must Be Said" does contain things that must be said. (...) But Grass exaggerated, unnecessarily and in a way that damaged his own position. Perhaps it is his advanced age and his ambition to attract a last round of attention, and perhaps the words came forth all at once like a cascade, after decades during which it was almost impossible to criticize Israel in Germany. That's the way it is when all criticism of Israel is considered illegitimate and improper and is stopped up inside for years. In the end it erupts in an extreme form. Israel has many friends in Germany, more than in most European countries. Some of them support us blindly, some have justified guilt feelings and some are true, critical friends of Israel. There are, of course, anti-Semites in Germany and the demand that Germany never forget is also justified. But a situation in which any German who dares criticize Israel is instantly accused of anti-Semitism is intolerable.“

HAA, Gideon Levy, 8.4.2012

Shame on Grass

„Günter Grass (...) displayed a disappointing moral bankruptcy. Grass's poem and the attempts by himself and other of his countrymen to defend it raise the question whether Germans – at least those supporting Grass – have learned anything from history. (...) Does he really think that he, an 84-year-old German who was a member of the Waffen SS as a teenager, should be the one recommending that Israel compromise its deterrence capability and, in the process, expose itself to existential threats? (...) the controversy surrounding Grass's poem has brought to the fore a modern manifestation of anti-Semitism, which is actually a form of mental pathology. Germans such as Grass are filled with Holocaust-era guilt. To alleviate their dissonance, some Germans project their feelings of guilt onto Israel. But regardless of the psychological mechanics behind his despicable poem, Grass, at the end of his life, has now been “exposed.” We hope he regains his moral bearings and issues a complete retraction. Anything less will cast a shadow on Grass's reputation as a moral voice for Germans who came of age in the generation after the Shoah.“

JPO, Editorial, 8.4.2012

Grass: Let's Be Brave Poets, Not Fearful Puritans

„Martin Luther once may have proved Germany as the mother nation of humanistic thinking, and earth-shattering theological reform (Germany was this, of course, for the Jews of the enlightenment). However, Luther, like Grass, turned to Jew-bashing and by doing so, spoiled his talent on hatred. (...) I, as a critic of poetry (...) can at least say this: aside from the fact that the poet is clearly anti-Semitic, his didactic lyric is extremely uncreative. (...) The poem is naught but a rant. (...) Why throw stones at this poet? Why not laugh at his unimpressive verse? If we are a cradle of culture and ingenuity, let us act

like it! Not to voice any sentiment of nationalism, but our poetry is almost always superior to this pseudo-artistic ranting.“

AS, Scott Krane, 9.4.2012

Israel has reacted with hysteria over Gunter Grass

„The reactions to Grass' claims focused on the man, not on his positions. (...) The emotions can be understood, but it's hard to accept the overreaction. (...) Because it's precisely his (*the Interior minister's*) decision not to let Grass enter Israel because of a poem he wrote that is characteristic of dark regimes like those in Iran or North Korea. (...) Yishai's use of his governmental authority is not legitimate. Any protest should be expressed within the democratic-liberal framework, which allows every person to express his views – provocative though they may be. Grass, a Nobel laureate for literature, did no more than write a poem. The State of Israel, through its interior minister, reacted with hysteria. It seems that at issue is less an undesirable person than an undesirable policy.“

HAA, Editorial, 9.4.2012

Israel's Grass fiasco

„Interior Minister Eli Yishai's decision to declare Guenter Grass a persona non grata appeared cynical and populist from the get-go. (...) the problem with Minister Yishai's decision was the timing. (...) Now, we are the bad boy, who exactly like the Iranians does not respect freedom of expression. (...) We again managed to outrage public opinion against us by acting without thinking. (...) the public relations battlefield is no less important than Israel's honor and our reaction policy. European public opinion has a dramatic effect on media coverage and the conduct of governments, and as it is, our global situation isn't fabulous, to say the least. We could have done without this miserable decision, which marked an effort to forcefully shut Grass up. One should not be undermining freedom of speech, and this is especially true in the case in question – after all, it does not appear that Grass had any intention to visit Israel, and now he is merely enjoying more attention.“

JED, Daniel Bettini, 10.4.2012

Gunter Grass' delusions

„What a monstrous secret wish has emerged from the depths of this great writer's psyche! What hellfire burns there, deep inside the soul of the former SS man. Demons erupt from the depths of the soul "with what ink remains," as he writes. The problem is not Gunter Grass. The problem is the 50 percent of the Süddeutsche Zeitung readership that agrees

with him, according to an Internet poll taken by the German newspaper. Does the entire Christian world have a psychological need for Israel to commit a worse crime than the ones committed by the Nazis? Is this the secret wish of all those who question Israel's right to exist? Do they hope that Israel will, once and for all, justify the general yearning to destroy it by giving the world the gift of a massive crime against humanity? Is their disease so malignant and incurable?“

IHY, Yehoshua Sobol, 9.4.2012

Silence of the scribes

„In the face of such a respected writer as Grass, a Nobel Prize laureate, would it not have been more appropriate if the response had come, first and foremost, from our own respected writers, those Israeli writers who never hesitate to make their voices heard on other controversial issues? (...) Grass' sentiments go far beyond the bounds of polemic questions over the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. He is telling us, essentially that we are not allowed to live in Tel Aviv, that we have no right to exist in it, or in Israel in general. (...) according to Grass, Israel - the big threat – has no right to exist. Perhaps that is not surprising, written by someone who admitted to serving in the Waffen S.S. This is not a debate on this or that policy – this is the classification of Israel as a threat to world peace. (...) Our writers' silence is both unfortunate and thunderous, in light of Grass' idiotic experiment and anti-Semitic effort to dismiss the legitimacy of Israel's existence.“

IHY, Yaakov Ahimeir, 9.4.2012

Grass' satanic verses

„The real issue is that anti-Semitism is not only alive and well among the radical Islamists; it has returned in full swing among European intellectuals. Proof of this lies in the openness with which Gunter Grass printed utterances that were, for a time, considered taboo. (...) There is only one question that should concern us all right now – and it is not why Eli Yishai thinks he can or should bar Grass from landing at Ben-Gurion Airport. It is how we have managed to look the other way while the forces that enabled the Holocaust were resurging, regrouping, and rearming. Can we, who vowed "Never Again," really rest assured?“

IHY, Ruthie Blum, 11.4.2012

Gunter Grass and the mute left

„While official Germany roundly condemned its leading writer, enlightened Israel lost its tongue. In the Gunter Grass test, Israel's moral left failed dismally. (...) Grass' profound moral failure and the Zionist left's profound failure to respond are a bad sign.

They show that the long years of occupation distort people's minds and make them forget key concepts. They show that leading intellectuals in the West and Israel are no longer capable of defending Israel. The words said by Grass and the words not said against Grass prove that the gangrene of delegitimization is gradually spreading and devouring us.“
HAA, Ari Shavit, 12.4.2012

2. Pläne zur Beschränkung der Macht des Obersten Gerichts

Der israelische Justizminister Yaakov Neemann hat vorgeschlagen, das Machtverhältnis zwischen dem Parlament und dem Obersten Gericht neu zu justieren. Verabschiedete Gesetze, die eine Mehrheit der Richter am Obersten Gericht als nicht vereinbar mit den „Basic Laws“ erachtet und für nichtig erklärt, sollen wieder in Kraft gesetzt werden können – und auch nicht erneut annullierbar sein – wenn mindestens 65 der insgesamt 120 Mitglieder der Knesset dafür stimmen. Der Initiative zufolge sollen diese Gesetze zunächst für fünf Jahre gültig sein und um weitere fünf Jahre verlängert werden können. Neemanns Vorschlag sieht überdies eine vorerst zeitlich unbegrenzte Anfangsphase vor, in der bereits 61 Stimmen ausreichen, mit denen ein vom Obersten Gericht annulliertes Gesetz wieder in Kraft gesetzt werden kann. Befürworter sehen in der Gesetzesinitiative eine Aufwertung des Parlaments. Gegner sprechen von einer politisch beabsichtigten Schwächung des Obersten Gerichts zugunsten der Regierung.

Balancing power

„If passed, Neeman's proposal would actually strengthen the Supreme Court and more carefully delineate its powers vis-à-vis the Knesset, ending decades of bickering and tension between lawmakers complaining of the hyper activism of the Supreme Court and champions of a strong judiciary warning of the tyranny of the majority. (...) The majority of a panel of nine Supreme Court justices would be empowered by law to annul Knesset laws which are interpreted by the court to contradict one of the basic laws. Currently, there is no law that upholds the court's power to exercise judicial review of legislation. (...) In a populist attempt to present itself as a champion of a free and independent judiciary fighting against a tyranny of the right-wing majority in the Knesset the opposition has attacked this clause as “anti- democratic”. (...) With most MKs not even present at the majority of votes in the plenum, it will be no easy matter to garner 65 MKs in three separate votes. (...) Minister-without-portfolio Bennie

Begin (Likud) has said that raising the number to 70 MKs is necessary in order to protect the autonomy of the Supreme Court. The question of 65 or 70 MKs is a relatively minor matter that can easily be negotiated. It is no reason to scrap a bill that could take a major step toward improving the balance of power between the Supreme Court and the Knesset.“
JPO, Editorial, 9.4.2012

Israeli Justice Ministry bypassing the High Court

„Hopefully, lawmakers this time won't allow their constituencies' narrow interests to prevent the rehabilitation of the relationship between the people and their government. (...) The legal system and the relationship between the High Court and the Knesset are too precious to be turned into a political pawn. Since this is not the first time Neeman has tried to damage this delicate fabric, the prime minister must tell Neeman to start a dialogue with High Court President Asher Grunis, who was not privy to discussions on the draft. The prime minister must do this before he puts his proposal on the cabinet table and submits it to the Knesset.“
HAA, Editorial, 10.4. 2012

Abolishing Israel's Bill of Rights

„A “transitional provision”, hiding in the lower reaches of the bill, states that for “an initial period,” of undefined length, the Knesset will be able to make do with a majority of 61 in each of the three plenum readings in order to re-enact invalidated legislation. (...) When will the initial period end? (...) The Knesset will never decide to end the initial period. The transitional provision will last forever. (...) The significance of an arrangement whereby 61 members of Knesset can re-legislate any law that the High Court of Justice has annulled is the *de facto* abolition of the Israeli Bill of Rights. Legislators sitting in the Constitution, Law and Justice Committee will seek to pass a law that drastically infringes the basic laws on the dignity of man, or on freedom of occupation, or on property rights. The lawyers will tell them that it will never get through the High Court of Justice, that it's manifestly unconstitutional. The Knesset members will say: Fine, the High Court of Justice will annul it, and we'll re-enact it. It will take just 61 members. Mustering 61 votes in the plenum is no great political achievement. It doesn't take cross-party support. All it amounts to is coalition discipline. For all that, the proposed Basic Law: Legislation is not fundamentally flawed. The bill is a good and important one, and represents a great step forward in the constitutional enterprise that has been stuck for two decades. All the problems with the bill stem from the gaps between the current draft and the bill drafted by the Neeman committee in 2004. A return

to that draft will make it an excellent law, a lasting achievement for Israeli democracy.“
GLO, Yuval Yoaz, 10.4.2012

Israeli democracy without the High Court and B'Tselem

„There is no doubt that the relationship between the legislature and the judiciary requires some adjustment. However, in a country where many Knesset members view the High Court as an enemy, minorities as a fifth column, the left as homegrown terrorists and religion as the basis of patriotism, it is not the legislature that needs strengthening but rather the court, which remains the last refuge of anyone who does not belong to the "mainstream." (...) The proposed law demands total recognition of the Knesset's supremacy, while the opinion of the High Court in trying to strike down an unconstitutional law will be given the status of a mere recommendation. (...) In effect, it is already the case today that members of the Knesset can cancel the power of the High Court to strike down laws that contravene Basic Laws. All they have to do is revoke the Basic Laws. Some of these – like the Basic Law on the Government, and the Basic Law on the Freedom of Occupation – need only 61 Knesset members to change them. (...) It would seem that here lies the core of the right-wing constitutional revolution – the High Court will exist and the Basic Laws will continue to exist, on condition that the High Court and the Basic Laws be locked up in two separate cells. The court will not be able to touch illegitimate laws, and the Basic Laws will continue to wear the guise of legitimacy as though they really were invulnerable. This is a perfectly legal masked ball, that will finally realize the nightmarish dream of which the slogan is "Without the High Court and without B'Tselem."
HAA, Zvi Bar'el, 11.4.2012

Israel's courts under attack

„What hasn't been said about Israel's Supreme Court? That it's elitist, that it's leftist, that it only represents one upscale Jerusalem neighborhood, that it's Ashkenazi, that it's imperialist, and that it seeks to wrest away the powers of other State organs. Indeed, the Court has been smeared in every way possible. Most of the attackers (...) were interested parties: Politicians who were already hit by the judicial system, politicians who fear indictments to be submitted against them, and settlers who took over private land in the territories and are angry at the courts, which dared order their evacuation from their homes. (...) The court was noble and enjoyed high stature, it was remote, and it remained uninvolved in disputes. It only ruled on disputes between others. The Supreme Court was at the top of the Olympus,

yet it was an Olympus entrenched at the heart of the Judean Mountains, as former Chief Justice Aharon Barak once remarked. However, in the past decade the Court has been under ceaseless attacks. It started with an offensive within the Bar Association, continued with mass haredi protests, and then the floodgates opened - with assaults coming in from all directions. Some brought up substantive arguments, yet many voiced demagogical charges meant to smear the judges in Jerusalem. In recent weeks this trend turned into a political campaign aimed at changing the Supreme Court's face. Several bills were meant to change the judge selection process. The apparent political views of judges also turned into a public issue. The purity of the judicial process was threatened. Tomorrow, when a person arrives at court, he will check who the judge is and what party the judge belongs to.“

JED, Moshe Ronen, 12.4.2012

3. Führungswechsel bei Kadima

Tzipi Livni, ex-Außenministerin und Oppositionsführerin sowie Vorsitzende der mit 28 Knesset-Sitzen größten Oppositionspartei Kadima, verlor bei der Wahl um die Spitzenposition ihrer Partei deutlich gegen ihren Herausforderer Shaul Mofaz. Livni hatte die von Ex-Premier Ariel Scharon 2005 gegründete Partei seit September 2008 geführt. Bei der damaligen Wahl um den Vorsitz hatte sie sich gegen ihren Mitbewerber Shaul Mofaz nur ganz knapp durchsetzen können. Jetzt erhielt Livni lediglich 37,2 Prozent der Stimmen. Mofaz, ehemaliger Generalstabschef und ex-Verteidigungsminister, erhielt 61,7 Prozent der Stimmen. Als neuer Kadima-Vorsitzender übernahm er von Livni auch das Amt des Oppositionsführers.

Why Livni

„To a large extent Livni is paying the price of the very high expectations of her that she did not really have the chance to meet. She is untypical of today's Israeli politicians: She speaks her mind, is willing to be in the opposition and does not boast about her Mossad past. But the political establishment finds Livni difficult to deal with also because she is a woman who did not experience the kind of oppression that most women do, and her campaign to be prime minister was the first time she bumped up against the glass ceiling. (...) Mofaz's political work is impressive, but beyond the fear that he might join up with Netanyahu there is another factor that makes him the wrong choice: he is close to rabbis, he speaks their language. In principle there is nothing wrong with this, of course. But at this point it

entails a great danger to Israeli society, which is increasingly given over to the hands of politicians who are allowing dark, ultra-nationalist religious values to gain control of the state's civil framework, (...).“

HAA, Merav Michaeli, 26.3.2012

The Kadima race

„Livni, despite her authoritative clipped cadences, came off increasingly as too acrimonious, testy and vindictive. Her criticism of the government – in any and all circumstances – was always personal, exuding ad hominem aversion toward Binyamin Netanyahu. The party which promised the nation new politics looks sullied, embittered and stuck in the mud. The incredible gap by which Livni lost, (...) disturbingly belies the hype of clean politics. If anything, it betokens an inability to shake off old-fashioned foul play. (...) Mofaz and Livni slugged it out ferociously, each seeking to inherit the mantle of national leadership, but there just may not be all that much left to inherit. (...) now that Kadima's internecine conflict is out of the way, the party may be ready for a more constructive opposition role, or joining a national unity coalition. This is what the country needs – certainly more than catcalls from the sidelines.“

JPO, Editorial, 28.3.2012

Can Mofaz defeat Bibi?

„Mofaz will seek to change Kadima's face. Livni mostly took pleasure in dealing with diplomatic issues, while Mofaz is more connected to social issues. They are important to him, and therefore he will be engaged in promoting them. This affinity to social issues also presents a strategic advantage: It may draw soft-right voters who feel they can no longer vote for Netanyahu, for whatever reason. Mofaz is also the first non-Ashkenazi premiership candidate who can be characterized as "significant". The combination of his vast military experience as a former IDF chief of staff (...) yet at the same time is sensitive to public distress, may end up working well within Israel's complex reality.“

JED, Attila Somfalvi, 28.3.2012

Livni didn't lose, she was booted out

„The bitter truth is that Kadima lost its relevancy long ago. Its collapse did not stem only from its weak leadership, but also from its thin platform. (...) the party lost its flavor, its scent. Sitting in the opposition, the Knesset's biggest party became the Knesset's department of cheap gimmicks. It remained silent on important issues, or alternately found its members at each other's throats without any ability to create a singular front. Kadima doesn't have a clear message on security or diplomacy, and

certainly not on economic or social issues. (...) The person who led Kadima with confidence and determination directly into the wall was Tzipi Livni. (...) Livni held substantive power. She could have done anything she wanted. (...) Livni didn't lose, she was booted out with sticks and stones by her friends. (...) Livni can find comfort in the fact that the Israeli public doesn't hold grudges. It has never said no to a comeback. The question now is whether or not she will have a party to come back to.“

IHY, Mati Tuchfeld, 28.3.2012

The great white balloon bursts

„The Israeli public had no mistaken illusions about Livni. It understood that she wasn't made of the stuff that makes a national leader. It was the elites who refused to understand. (...) Noble forces and less-noble forces alike maintained the Livni illusion and inflated the illusion to an absurdity. They turned the Kadima chairwoman into one of the strangest political balloons to every waft across these skies. (...) This week the balloon burst. (...) The era of Kadima-headed-by Mofaz will not be simple. Shaul is the exact opposite of Tzipi. He's not a man of words, but of deeds. He isn't a virtual figure invented by the media, but a real man of the people, a man of persistence and hard work. (...) With incredible hypocrisy, the left will oppose the chief of staff of the intifada who believes in a two-state solution. (...) Within a few weeks he will have to suggest a bold social and national agenda. Within a few months he will have to update his diplomatic plan and speak explicitly about evacuating settlements. Mofaz will have to quickly prove that he can lead on both social and security issues, that he has a diplomatic vision and a moral commitment that can be a counterweight to Netanyahu. If he hesitates or stutters, Kadima will also collapse like a pricked balloon. But if he does what he plans to do, the sky's the limit.“

HAA, Ari Shavit, 29.3.2012

Mofaz must lead a strong opposition against Netanyahu

„With Livni at the helm, Kadima seemed to fall asleep on its watch. A string of racist legislation, mistaken diplomatic decisions and the increasing lack of trust between Israel and the Palestinian Authority, which has brought peace talks to a dead end – none of these seemed to rouse her. (...) She even missed the opportunity provided by last summer's social protests. (...) In many ways, Mofaz is the total opposite of Livni, who grew up as a Likud princess. He's hungry to lead and enthusiastically promises he will fight for the privilege. But the desire to lead the struggle against Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu is not the be-all and end-all. As the chairman of

Kadima, Mofaz must stop his party from disintegrating and lead a strong, determined opposition. The opposition is the key. Only if Mofaz succeeds in dissipating the current political fog by expressing clear positions and leading his party to stand firmly against the government will there be a chance for a better future in Israel.“

HAA, Editorial, 29.3.2012

The fall of Tzipi Livni

„Livni turned from an asset to yet another politician struggling to position herself and Kadima among the mid-sized parties within Israel's political establishment. (...) Livni failed to grasp the political crisis she was facing. (...) Livni despises the art of politics with its deals and endless interaction with activists. She spoke about introducing a different kind of politics, but there is no such thing. Politics is made up of human beings with interests, needs, emotions and anger. Should you fail to invest an effort in maintaining ties with activists, all the time, they will desert you at times of weakness and crisis. This is exactly what happened to Livni. Her public stock sank, and at that difficult hour she was left without foot soldiers. While she was busy shunning politics, Mofaz enlisted the support of all those people who gave Livni her victory three years ago. (...) At this time it appears she's on her way out of politics. She won't be establishing a new party at this time, as she has nobody that would join forces with her and no cause to pursue. She also has no interest in being Mofaz's deputy. (...) Indeed, for the time being, it's over. But is this a final goodbye? In Israeli politics there is no such thing as final.“

JED, Attila Somfalvi, 30.3.2012

4. Medienquerschnitt

Die Vielfalt der in Israel relevanten Themen kann in einem Medienspiegel nicht umfassend wiedergegeben werden. Um den deutschen LeserInnen dennoch einen Einblick in das breite Themenspektrum, das in den Medien behandelt wird, zu gewähren, veröffentlichen wir in dieser Schlaglichtausgabe wieder eine kleine Auswahl an weiteren Themen, die in den vergangenen zwei Wochen die israelische Gesellschaft bewegten.

Über jüngste rassistische Ausfälle und Gewalt von Fans bei, während und nach Fußballspielen:

It's time to intervene against racism in Israeli soccer

„Popular sports, which are meant to provide entertainment for the entire family, have in recent years

turned into the gutter of Israeli society, through which flow phenomena that are not legitimate in any other area. Only in Israeli soccer can a club block Arabs from joining its ranks, and harsh violence is treated solely as a disciplinary infraction, to be handled by the Israel Football Association's internal court. The anarchy and lack of police enforcement have turned Israeli soccer into a source of violence, racism and hatred, and has even started to attract dubious characters, who at times manage the teams. The IFA is subordinate to international sports institutions, such as UEFA (...) and vehemently refuses the involvement of the Culture and Sports Ministry. But after several years in which Culture and Sports Minister Limor Livnat has proven incapable of getting rid of the rot that has penetrated Israeli soccer, it's time for her to get into the thick of things. She must adopt the model (...) which combines persistent, preventive police action against hooligans and tough sentences against violent fans. The State of Israel cannot allow a situation in which a sport avidly followed by hundreds of thousands of people, among them many youngsters, turns into an untreatable abscess of racism and violence.

HAA, Editorial, 2.4.2012

Arab soccer strike, now

„We've had enough of this. (...) Had I been a player and heard fans chanting or singing “death to the Jews” during a game, I would step off the field. The time has come for Arab players to take action and launch a strike in protest. We just can't have a situation whereby a country that fights racism and anti-Semitism is willing to tolerate mass racism. Thousands of people are tainting the reputation of all of us, while the soccer association punishes the teams, as if they are at fault. Running into the soccer pitch is a criminal offence, yet never in our history was a fan arrested for it. Indeed, criminals are being thrown out of the stadiums, only to return the following week. A strike by Israel's Arab soccer players would cause us such global shame that it may prompt the police to start arresting and dealing with racists in the stadiums. I call for a strike by Arab soccer players, now!

JED, Arie Maliniak, 28.3.2012

Über den „Land Day“, mit dem seit 1976 jährlich am 30. März mit Protesten an die Enteignung von Boden in palästinensischem Besitz durch den israelischen Staat erinnert wird

Why Land Day still matters

„The message is clear: Israel has failed, abysmally, in realizing its oft-cried role as “the only democracy in the Middle East,” with (...) discriminatory policies,

and a culture of antagonism and neglect vis-a-vis a fifth of its citizens. The original Land Day marked a pivotal point in terms of how Palestinians in Israel – living victims of Israel's violent establishment – viewed their relations with the state. Today, with no resolution in sight to the historic injustices inflicted upon them, Palestinians in Israel and elsewhere use this day to remember and redouble their efforts for emancipation. (...) For our part, as second-generation Palestinians born and raised outside Palestine, who have decided to return to live in this troubled land, we view Land Day as an ongoing wake-up call to Israeli Jews and Jewry worldwide to understand that land, freedom and equality are an inseparable package – the only one that can deliver a lasting peace to all involved.“

HAA, Sam Bahour and Fida Jiryis, 30.3.2012

The new Palestinian tragedy

„The Palestinians encountered another grave calamity: Israel's public opinion lost interest in them. For dozens of years, Israel's leftist camp turned the Palestinians into its defining issue. Yet suddenly the Left discovered that Israel moved on and that the issue is no longer on its agenda. When the Left also discovered that the Palestinians have no interest in peace or negotiations, just like Syria's Assad, it replaced the Palestinian agenda with a new one, premised on social issues like cottage cheese and the tent protest. (...) Land Day proved that the regimes in Lebanon, Syria, Jordan and Egypt, as well as Hezbollah, are unwilling to mess with Israel because of the Palestinians. On top of this come the domestic Palestinian divisions, which cannot be healed. However, another fact emerged on Land Day: The Palestinian Authority and Hamas regimes are also uninterested in a major flare-up, for fear that this will ultimately come at their own expense and spread against unpopular leaderships. Moreover, Israel is too strong and has much experience with facing crises and protests. All these developments require the Palestinians – both regimes and societies – to engage in self-reflection, yet such phenomenon of self-reflection and correction happens to characterize Israeli society, rather than Palestinian society. As was the case in the last dozens of years, the Palestinian public will continue to follow its leaders, who lead it, one generation after another, to defeats and failures.“

JED, Guy Bechor, 6.4.2012

Medien:

HAA = Haaretz
JED = Jedioth Ahronoth
JPO = Jerusalem Post
IHY = Israel HaYom
GLO = Globes
AS = Arutz Sheva

Veröffentlicht : 16. April 2012

Verantwortlich:

*Dr. Ralf Hexel, Leiter der Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung
Israel*

Redaktion:

*Helene Kortländer
Andrea König*

Homepage: www.fes.org.il

Email: fes@fes.org.il