

To: Brith Sholom Media Watch Subscribers  
From: Jerry Verlin, Editor ([jverlin1234@comcast.net](mailto:jverlin1234@comcast.net))  
Subj: Brith Sholom Media Watch Alert #377, 3/23/08

This Week In The Inq: An Astonishing Acknowledgement By the AP In Damascus  
=====

In “an ideal world,” as a straight-speaking friend of mine describes the one in which we don’t live, an unadorned straight-forward AP statement This Week In the Inq on the Arab-Israeli conflict’s core history wouldn’t have precipitated a national media watcher’s astonishment-expressing email to a local Inq-focused media watch here in Philadelphia. In our real world, in which the mainstream media typified by the AP and Inq relentlessly rechristen Palestine’s U.N. Partition as the “creation, establishment, founding” of Israel – abrupt, unilateral, artificial, as though out-of-the-blue –, and relentlessly rechristen Palestine’s partition-rejecting Arab invasion by multiple media-unnamed Arab states as “the war that followed Israel’s creation,” upon which seemingly exclusively Arab refugees are relentlessly blamed, a sudden AP-Inq departure from that line is astonishing.

Sunday’s (Inq, 3/16/08, A6, AP, Hamza Hendawi, Damascus) AP article quoted what the Inq’s sub-headline called “aging militants” based in Amman and Damascus on what might have been. The article quoted “the Palestinians’ best known female hijacker,” Leila Khaled, that the leadership in Palestine “jumped too quickly into negotiations with Israel and thus ‘defused’ the Palestinian uprising and ‘blocked the golden path that I and other comrades paved for the Palestinians.’” It quoted Mohammed Oudeh, “architect of Black September’s 1972 Olympics attack that left 11 Israeli athletes dead”: “Would you believe me if I tell you that if I had to do it all over, I would?”

The “architect” added: “But maybe, just maybe, we should have shown some flexibility. Back in our days, it was ‘The whole of Palestine or nothing,’ but we should have accepted a Palestinian state next to Israel.”

But such second-thinking, even from such a source, is not what makes this AP article astonishing. What makes it astonishing is how the AP itself described the Arab-Israeli conflict’s core history. It made a rare reference, not without residual imbalance, to the political event that historically happened, Palestine’s UN partition, instead of to the relentlessly media-reiterated “creation of Israel,” and a virtually unprecedented reference, again not without residual imbalance, to the war that historically happened, “the war that followed the Arab rejection of Partition,” rather than to the relentlessly media-reiterated “war that followed Israel’s creation.” Who knows if they’ll stick? Who knows whether the AP and Inq even consciously appreciate the magnitude of the deviation from the mainstream media norm of what this article said? But as Israel’s “60<sup>th</sup> birthday,” as this AP article puts it, approaches, it is worth taking a look at how close to actual balance this pair of astonishing AP acknowledgements of what historically happened actually comes.

[1] THE UN PARTITION PLAN'S ENVISAGED "JEWISH" AND "PALESTINIAN" STATES:

This Sunday's AP article led with a reference to "the U.N. partition plan of 1947, which envisaged Jewish and Palestinian states living side by side in peace." Certainly, mainstream Western media mention of Palestine's UN partition is light years closer to balance than its insistent "creation, establishment, founding of Israel" chronicled these past seven years in this media watch.

But a gap of light years from actual balance remains. The place being partitioned being "Palestine," characterizing its partition into two states described respectively as "Palestinian" and "Jewish" hardly constitutes balance. Despite two millennia of Britain's and its Palestine foreign rule predecessors' partially effective efforts, along with those of some European powers and popes, to keep Jews from their historical homeland, Palestine's entire partition-time population was less than two million, at least a good third of it the Jewish Yishuv. And as Bar-Illan repeatedly pointed out in his officially Palestine [sic] Post "Eye On The Media" column, Jews were Palestinians, by some even "the Palestinians," then.

Beyond that, it demeans and dishonors both the memory and meaning of the ever-present Jewish Yishuv – affirmed as the "heroic endurance of those who had maintained a Jewish presence in The Land all through the centuries, and in spite of every discouragement," writing the Zionists' "real title deeds," by historian Parkes – for Jews to acquiesce in the Associated Press' historical-Jewish-presence-dismissing characterization of Palestine's partition into "Palestinian" and "Jewish" states. The UN 1947 partition plan envisaged Palestine's partition into "Arab" and "Jewish" states. Indeed, in late 2007 (see last quote below), the AP said so itself.

[2] "THE WAR THAT FOLLOWED THE ARAB REJECTION OF PARTITION":

This Sunday's AP article's text referred, not to the relentlessly media-repeated "war that followed Israel's creation," but more historically accurately to "the war that followed the Arab rejection of partition." Certainly the latter characterization is light years closer to actual balance.

But here too a gap of light years remains.

[a] There was more to be said about that war than that it was "the war that followed the Arab rejection of partition." That war was Palestine's invasion by multiple Arab states, Arab states that the AP and Inq even here retain their refusal to name. And it wasn't a mere border skirmish. That invasion, utterly supported by Palestine's resident Arabs, had a very clear aim. How did the Munich massacre "architect" put it Sunday This Week In the Inq? "Back in our days, it was 'The whole of Palestine or nothing.'" And here's how British Foreign Secretary Bevin, no friend of ours, put it, shortly preceding partition: "For the

Arabs the essential point of principle is to resist to the last the establishment of Jewish sovereignty in any part of Palestine.”<sup>1</sup> Period.

[b] That war era saw a greater number of no less indigenous Middle Eastern Jews become refugees from vast Muslim lands, including these media-unnamed Palestine-invading Arab states, than Arabs left tiny Israel, but in this article and elsewhere the mainstream media mentions neither these Jewish refugees, nor the Muslim lands from which they became refugees, nor that Israel immediately took the bulk of them in, integrating them into the country and not keeping them in “refugee camps,” as “Palestinians” keep “Palestinian refugees” who never left Palestine to this day.

So, “The war that followed the Arab rejection of partition”? More balanced than “the war that followed Israel’s creation,” to be sure, but a long way from actual balanced reporting.

“Israel’s Creation” and “The War That Followed Israel’s Creation” in the Inq in 2007  
=====

The appended 1-page letter to the Inq’s bigs some of your still need to sign will go to them with a thick dossier of quotations from the Inq documenting the magnitude and persistence of its mainstream media misportrayal of the Arab-Israeli conflict’s core history. Perhaps the AP’s partial departure from that relentless portrayal This Week In The Inq will make even more vivid the stark contrast between what historically happened and what the mainstream media’s AP, Inq et ilk persistently purvey to Western publics’ eyes and ears.

Here’s the mainstream media, just on not calling Partition Partition, and not calling the Arab invasion the Arab invasion, all before the start of the now open media season on the Arab-Israeli conflict’s core history, in the Inq in 2007:

Inq, 4/12/07, AP: “... Palestinian refugees’ demands to return to land they fled or were driven from WHEN ISRAEL WAS ESTABLISHED IN 1948.”

Inq, 6/24/07, A2, Rena Singer, “Special To The Inquirer”: “The two communities [“West Bank” and Gaza], on divergent evolutionary paths since THE CREATION OF ISRAEL IN 1948 cut them off from each other, have had only limited contact in recent years.”

Inq, 7/9/07, A2, AP: “... THE 1948 WAR THAT FOLLOWED ISRAEL’S CREATION”

---

<sup>1</sup> Great Britain, Parliamentary Debates, Commons, vol. 433, col. 988, quoted in Bell, *Terror Out of Zion*, New York, St. Martins Press, 1977, p. 188.

Inq, 7/26/07, AP: "... the Palestinian demand that the 700,000 refugees from THE 1948-49 WAR THAT FOLLOWED ISRAEL'S CREATION, and their three million descendants, have the right to reclaim their original homes in Israel."

Inq, 9/5/07, A3, AP: "... the 'Green Line,' the cease-fire demarcation drawn at the end of THE 1948-49 WAR, WHICH FOLLOWED ISRAEL'S CREATION."

[Letter CAMERA's Washington Director, Eric Rozenman, responding to a similar article, Washington Times, 9/7/07:

"'THE CREATION OF ISRAEL IN 1948' did not 'force thousands of Palestinian Arab families to flee as refugees.' Responsibility for causing the flight belongs to the Arab countries and Palestinian Arab leadership. Their rejection of the U.N. General Assembly's 1947 partition plan for dividing British Mandatory Palestine into two states, one Arab and one Jewish, and the subsequent invasion of Israel by five Arab countries and Palestinian Arab irregulars led to Israel's 1948 War of Independence. Arabs who fled from Israel and became refugees did so to avoid fighting caused by Arab aggression . . . ."

Eric Rozenman  
Washington Director  
Committee for Accuracy in Middle East Reporting in America  
Washington

Inq, 9/10/07, AP: "News of the arrests [of neo-Nazis in Israel] came as a shock in Israel, which was FOUNDED nearly 60 years ago as a refuge for Jews in the wake of the Holocaust."

Inq, 10/31/07, AP: "These [looming Annapolis conference "core issues"] include borders, sovereignty over disputed Jerusalem, and a solution for Palestinians who fled or were expelled from their homes in THE WAR THAT FOLLOWED ISRAEL'S CREATION IN 1948."

Inq, 11/6/07, A2, AP: ". . . and other key issues such as final borders and a solution for Palestinian refugees from THE WAR THAT FOLLOWED ISRAEL'S CREATION IN 1948."

Inq, 11/29/07, A2, AP: "The Palestinians want refugees and their descendants to be able to return to homes they left, or were forced out of, in THE WAR THAT ACCOMPANIED ISRAEL'S CREATION. That is a deal-breaker for Israel, which sees it as a threat to its Jewish character."

Inq, 11/30/07, A3, AP: "the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of THE U.N. DECISION TO PARTITION PALESTINE, setting up separate Jewish and Arab [correct!] states. The vote led to A WAR [sic], and the Palestinian state was not created." [It was seized and occupied in "a

war" by two of the Palestinians' champions, Egypt and Jordan. Worthy of media mention?]

Regards,  
Jerry

=====

IF YOU HAVEN'T DONE SO YET, APPEND YOUR NAME TO THE FOLLOWING LETTER AND EMAIL IT BACK, OR SIGN AND MAIL IT TO ME, C/O BRITH SHOLOM, SUITE 106, 3939 CONSHOHOCKEN AVE., PHILADELPHIA PA 19134. TIME'S RUNNING OUT.

Mr. Bruce Toll, Chairman  
Mr. Brian P. Tierney, Chief Executive Officer  
The Philadelphia Inquirer  
Box 41705  
Philadelphia PA 19101

Dear Mr. Toll and Mr. Tierney:

May 15th, in Western calendar reckoning, will mark the State of Israel's 60th anniversary of its independence, a milestone that the Western media, including the Philadelphia Inquirer, will prominently cover.

I'm gravely concerned, based upon years of quotations from your paper enclosed with this letter, that the Inquirer will portray this milestone occurrence in a manner grossly unfair to Israel and the millions of Jews and Christians who recognize Israel not as a state artificially "created" or "founded in 1948," but as the Jewish people's continuous historical homeland since ancient times.

Specifically:

I object to the Inquirer's insistent substitution of expressions like "Israel's 1948 creation," "establishment," "founding," - i.e., anything abrupt, unilateral and artificial - for what actually historically happened, the UN's Partition of the remaining League of Nations Palestine Mandate between its Arab and Jewish populations, c. a million and six hundred thousand people, respectively.

I object to the Inquirer's religious rechristening of the multi-nation Arab invasion rejecting UN Partition as "the war that followed Israel's creation" without those invading Arab states so much as named.

I object to the Inquirer's adamant attribution of seemingly exclusively Arab refugees to that "war that followed Israel's creation" and not to the multi-nation Arab invasion.

I object to the Inquirer's persistent portrayal of these Arabs as "having fled or been forced from their homes," when many left with the encouragement of the Arab invaders.

I object to the Inquirer's incessant references to these Arab refugees from tiny Israel with virtually no reference whatever to that same era's greater number of indigenously Middle Eastern Jewish refugees from vast Muslim lands, the bulk of whom Israel absorbed.

For years, with as recent an instance as 2007, the Inquirer repeatedly preposterously exaggerated the c. half-million Arabs who left tiny Israel as "millions of Palestinian refugees and their descendants," sometimes as "nearly four million Palestinian refugees and their descendants," poisoning Western public perceptions of partitioned Palestine's actual 1947 population, which was less than two million, a good third of it Jews. That the Inquirer has apparently stopped repeating this preposterous exaggeration has not undone the persistent poisoning of public perception it wreaked. Real, if but partial, rectification can come only from the Inquirer ceasing to purvey the remainder of its persistent mis-portrayal of seemingly exclusively Arab (retrospectively called "Palestinian") refugees from a sudden "1948 creation" or "founding of Israel," a mis-portrayal of which these preposterously exaggerated "millions of Palestinian refugees and their descendants," still deeply ingrained in public perception, were a key formative part.

Very truly yours,