

Heinz Gess

Der ehemalige Präsident Carter outet sich in Buch „Palästina. Frieden nicht Apartheid“, das Joel Fishman untern rezensiert, als ein Antisemit. Der Zionismus ist für ihn nicht die Rettung der Übriggebliebenen vor der Vernichtung und Verfolgung, Israel nicht das rettende Bollwerk vor neuer Vertreibung oder Vernichtung und die materielle Grundlage für die Emanzipation der Juden, der Zaun, der das Israelische Kernland von den Arabischen Gebieten trennt, nicht ein Schutzzaun gegen das Massenmorden im israelischen Kernland durch antisemitische Mörder des listigen Götzens der Allmacht, der seinen Anhängern Lug, Trug und Mord um seiner Herrschaft willen gebietet und nur diejenigen narzisstisch liebt, die ihm in diesem Menschen verachtenden Sinn gehorsam sind, sondern er ist Ausdruck des jüdischen "Rassismus" und jüdischen "Apartheidstrebens", Israel mal wieder der neue "rassistische Staat", der die politische Emanzipation der palästinensischen Araber verhindert, und der Schutzzaun selbstverständlich ein rassistisches Machwerk, so wie die Berliner Mauer für manchen PDS Funktionär bis heute ein "antifaschistischer Schutzwall" ist.

Das eine ist so wahr, wie das andere. So wie die Berliner Mauer nie ein antifaschistischer Schutzwall, sondern die Gefängnismauer eines Volkstaatsgefängnisses war, so ist und war der Schutzzaun in Israel nie ein rassistisches oder faschistisches Machwerk, sondern umgekehrt ein Zaun, der Juden vor dem Rassismus/Antisemitismus von arabischen Judenhassern schützt, die den Juden den Tod wünschen und nur das eine Ziel haben, dass "Israel verrecke".

Aus Carter spricht der alte Judenhass christlicher Provinzheiliger. Er kann den Juden als "guter Christ" ihre "Verstocktheit" gegen die Religion der Erdnussfarmer und die bei Juden häufig anzutreffende Liberalität in Glaubenssachen einfach nicht verzeihen. Sie müssen darum böse und Feinde der einen, durch Christus (oder Mohammed) ‚erlösten Menschheit‘ sein, So projiziert er in des Judenstaat all das Böse hinein, das in ihm ist, dass er aber, der (Schein-)Heiliger und Sklavenmoralist, der er ist, bei sich selbst nicht wahrnehmen kann und darum abspalten muss: seine Arroganz, Besserwisserei, Verstocktheit gegen die Erfahrung, autoritäre Gesinnung etc. Er kann nicht anders. Er muss sich stets als Gutmensch präsentieren, allen schon um zu demonstrieren, das er innerlich erlöst ist. Deshalb müssen die anderen, die unerlösten Juden, vor allem jene, die nicht regelmäßig ins Bethaus gehen, die "Bösen" sein, und ein Staat, der voller Juden ist, muss erst recht böse sein. Das Böseste aber ist nicht der historischen Erfahrung des Nazi-Faschismus und des Krieges gegen ihn eben dieser Nazifaschismus und was ihn wesentlich ausmachte. Also müssen die Juden die neuen Nazi-Faschisten, die neuen Nazi-Rassisten, die neuen Herrenmenschen, etc. sein. Nur liegt das alles nicht an den Juden, sondern allein an Carter selbst, der sie als Projektionsfläche braucht, um sich innerlich "rein" und "erlöst", als "freier Christenmensch eben, zu fühlen. Er projiziert um seiner Reinheit willen, dass sich die Balken biegen. Fassungslos frage ich: Wie schlecht ist es um die Welt bestellt, in der ein Verrückter wie dieser, ein so hemmungslos pathisch Projizierender der mächtigste Mann der Welt werden konnte, der in der Lage gewesen wäre, die gesamte Erde zu "säubern"? Ist die Lage heute besser, wenn man an Ahmadinedjad, Putin, Nordkorea, Chavez, saudi-arabische ‚heilige Herrscher‘ Lafontaine, Solana und all die vielen anderen Saubermänner denkt, deren Projektionen von ähnlicher Natur sind – oder an Georg Bush, der auch nicht gerade frei von falschen Projektionen zu sein scheint, auch wenn diese eine andere Richtung nehmen. Muss einem da nicht Angst und Bange um die Menschen und ihre Erde werden und kann irgendjemanden da die Frage je noch kalt lassen: Was ist falsch an den gesellschaftlichen Zuständen, dass überall gerade solche Typen das Sagen haben - und wie jene, die solche Lüste nach grandioser Macht und Erlösung von allem Bösen, das böse erst durch die Abspaltung und Verdrängung wird, nicht haben, die gesellschaftliche Welt verändern können, damit es anders und besser wird? Wie sieht die bessere Praxis aus und was können wir tun, damit sie mehr und mehr Menschen ergreift?

An un-presidential projection of guilt

-by

Joel Fishman

Palestine: Peace Not Apartheid, by Jimmy Carter, New York: Simon & Schuster, 2006, 265 pp.

"According to repeated nationwide surveys, More Doctors Smoke CAMELS than any other cigarette!"

This was once the message of an ad in a vintage American magazine, showing a doctor in a white smock, cigarette in hand, and claiming: "Doctors in every branch of medicine were asked, "What cigarette do you smoke?" The Brand named most was Camel!"

This is an example of using "third party authorities" to plead a client's cause, a technique developed by Edward Lewis Bernays (1891-1995), the founder of public relations and nephew of Sigmund Freud. Bernays was particularly successful in using this method to promote the sales of bacon. He conducted a survey of physicians and widely reported their recommendation that people eat hearty breakfasts of bacon and eggs.

This glance at the history of advertising is relevant to *Palestine: Peace Not Apartheid*, just re-released in paperback, because author Jimmy Carter has stepped forward as a "third party authority" for the Palestinian cause. He claims to speak with the moral clarity of an elder statesman and man of honor but in fact he functions much the same as the physicians and admen selling the health benefits of nicotine and cholesterol.

There is little need to discuss here the academic flaws of Carter's book because his former colleague, Prof. Kenneth Stein of Emory University, has done so already in an article published in the Spring 2007 issue of *Middle East Quarterly*.

Nevertheless, in order to appreciate the significance of the book, one must grasp its context and message. It has several goals, foremost to revive public interest in the Palestinian cause and to undermine Christian support for Israel.

Carter cites Martin Luther King Jr., who once remarked that the worst thing that could happen to the civil rights movement is that the public would find it boring, yet this is what has happened to the Palestinian cause. Although their well-wishers may look the other way, the wider public knows of Palestinian corruption, violence and internal lawlessness, the smashing of greenhouses and desecration of synagogues after the disengagement in Gaza, as well as their constant antisemitic incitement. Since the publication of his book, the public has further learned about 'Farfur', a copy of Mickey Mouse who advocated suicide bombing on a Hamas children's television program, as well as the group's quaint practice of throwing enemies from tall buildings.

By opting for violence, the Palestinians painted themselves into a corner, and their claims for justice and sympathy have lost much of their resonance. At Camp David in August 2000,

Yasser Arafat rejected a peace agreement with Israel and missed his moment. Instead, he launched the Second Intifada. Several years later, Prime Minister Ariel Sharon devised a low key response: Withdrawal from Gaza and the construction of a security barrier combined with proactive operations against Palestinian terror. Although many Israelis detested the Gaza withdrawal, its net result for the Palestinians was to convert Gaza into the world's greatest prison, the message which Carter conveys, repeating the Palestinian propaganda line emanating from Ramallah to San Francisco. For example, the title of Chapter 16 is: "The Wall as a Prison."

Carter's message is identical to that of the ubiquitous pro-Palestinian advocacy literature, particularly the accusation of Israeli racism which is embodied in the objectionable term "apartheid." The now defunct Soviet Union first introduced the term in connection with Israel at an international women's rights conference held in Mexico City in late June 1975. As noted by historian Bernard Lewis, the resulting Declaration on the Equality of Women "repeatedly stresses the share of women in the struggle against neocolonialism, foreign occupation, Zionism, racism, racial discrimination and apartheid."

Similarly, in an English-language broadcast of July 5, 1977, TASS (the official Soviet news agency) reported: "If in the RSA [Republic of South Africa], the black people have been herded into so-called Bantustans and under the fear of death cannot appear in white-only districts, in Zionist Israel Arab-born citizens are compelled to live in special zones, reminiscent of the Jewish ghettos of the Nazi period" (emphasis in the original).

Further, on August 23, 1977, TASS released the following news item: "Tel Aviv and Pretoria are akin, just as Apartheid in the South African Republic and Zionism in Israel are simply different brands of racialism."

The "apartheid" accusation clearly belongs to the lineage of slogans branding Zionism as racism. Although Carter somewhat qualifies the "apartheid" accusation in his book, the effort is disingenuous. He uses the term prominently in its title, and the cover visually displays a contemplative Carter on one side and the separation barrier on the other. But why should a former American president use the vocabulary of Soviet incitement propaganda, a morally bankrupt totalitarian empire which suppressed human rights, held large populations in slave-labor camps, and suppressed Christianity? If the choice of language defines the man, it is fair to ask, what kind of a man is he?

According to the criteria of the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) which published its "Working Definition of Antisemitism," in March 2004, Carter's accusations could well be antisemitic. The following are examples of criticisms of Israel which are listed there as antisemitic:

- Denying the Jewish people's right to self-determination, e.g. by claiming that the existence of a State of Israel is a racist endeavor.
- Applying double standards by requiring of it a behavior not expected or demanded of any other democratic nation.
- Drawing comparisons of contemporary Israeli policy to that of the Nazis.
- Holding Jews collectively responsible for actions of the State of Israel.

Palestine: Peace, not Apartheid may cross the line not only because it contains the accusation of racism, but also because it applies double standards. In addition, it repeats the myth about

American Jews controlling the media. Also, the "Historical Chronology" of this book removes the Jews from the stage of history from the defeat of the Bar Kochba Revolt against the Romans in 135 CE until the Balfour Declaration in 1917.

Naturally, a book such as this reflects its author's personal vantage point. For example, Carter shows that he has a bad conscience about the way Native Americans were treated in his home state of Georgia:

I have to admit that, at the time, I equated the ejection of Palestinians from their previous home within the State of Israel to the forcing of Lower Creek Indians from the Georgia land where our family was now located; they had been moved west to Oklahoma on the "Trail of Tears" [ca. 1838] to make room for our white ancestors. (pages 27-28)

A little research reveals that the history of the American government and the Lower Creek Indians was one of dispossession, broken treaties, and profound human suffering. A great injustice was perpetrated, and if Carter really wanted to do the right thing, he would seek out the descendants of the Lower Creek Indians, beg their forgiveness, and return their land. The problem is that if he ever did so, his Plains neighbors would 'tar and feather' him.

To repackage the burden of one's personal sense of guilt and project it on Israel is much easier, but it represents an act of moral cowardice. Even so, Carter's comparison is wrong. It was the Jews — and not the Arabs — who were originally driven off the land. They returned to claim what rightfully belongs to them. In this case, it is the Jews who are the "Native Americans" of the Middle East, and their tribe has a name. It is Judah.

From the comfort of the Carter Center, deep in the heart of Georgia, which in our memory really practiced racism, in the only state of the Union where a Jew was lynched (Leo Frank in 1915), it is cheap and easy to seek out opportunities in distant lands for "waging peace," "fighting disease," and "building hope." It is much easier to blame the State of Israel and American Jews for defending Israel's open society which, despite its imperfections, has earned a solid reputation for the fairness of its judiciary, religious freedom and humane practices.

The Palestinian cause may have some merit, but its advocates have yet to produce an honest work which does not omit critical facts, distort information, or contain outright falsehoods.

Dr. Joel Fishman is a Fellow of the Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs; www.jcpa.org

