

Graffiti for intellectuals



SIMON SAYS



WHOM DO YOU CALL IF YOU'RE IN TROUBLE?

Here is a popular bumper sticker from the turbulent 1960s in America: "If you hate cops, when you're in trouble, call a hippy!" This was a time when the word "pig" had become almost synonymous with "policeman" among the progressive, longhaired and hip. "Pig" was usually prefaced with the word "fascist".

The advice wasn't meant to be followed. It was meant to point out that the presence of police is an indispensable tool without which a civilized society cannot exist. Sam Goldwyn had famously said that a verbal contract isn't worth the paper it is written on. It is even more true that a law that cannot be enforced is also worthless. I am certain that when trouble strikes even the most militant ACLU-inspired critic of police, would hold his nose, overcome his convictions and dial 911.



"Bitter Cold, Bitter Fight" - A weary U.S. Marine in Korea, 1950

There are societies where the police are corrupt or don't have the power to enforce the law. Today's Russia, most African countries and a number of South American nations are an example of the former; today's Iraq is a good example of the latter. Even so, it is better to have bad police than no police at all - otherwise rule by armed, brutal and conscienceless gangs will surely follow.

This is so obvious that it puzzles me that so many intelligent people who wouldn't want to live in a neighborhood, city or country without police protection do not realize the need for a world policeman for the safety of all humanity. It is also obvious that the U.N., a body that was initially meant to be a parliament of all nations has neither the means nor the will to enforce its own decisions. It is largely irrelevant to the resolution of crises that, at worst, threaten to destroy much of mankind, and at the very least, involve genocidal and homicidal activities by some U.N. members.

The U.N. goes about its business of discussing, debating, deliberating, voting and resolving as if it made the slightest bit of difference to either the perpetrators or the vic-

tims. Since its founding, the U.N. - with just one exception - has not been able to claim a single success in settling wars, bringing and enforcing peace, arresting and punishing perpetrators or, in fact, doing anything more than passing meaningless resolutions. It was unable or unwilling to help in the occupation of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Tibet and parts of Germany and Japan and South Vietnam by communist armed forces. It was unable or unwilling to act in the genocidal conflicts

that pervaded much of Africa and Asia - the most recent are Darfur, Rwanda and Burundi, but there were many more: Biafra, Kashmir, Uganda, Congo, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Armenia vs. Azerbaijan, Cuban troops in Angola, Saddam's genocide of the Kurds, the strife in the Middle East, the ridiculous "war" between Argentina and U.K. over the Falkland Islands and the crisis in Yugoslavia that was solved after the U.N. was shown to be powerless.

It is unable to do anything about the destruction of the economy of formerly prosperous countries like Zimbabwe or Kenya, the starvation and gulags of North Korea or the civil war in Chechnya. The only success the U.N. can claim was the result of a Soviet blunder in boycotting the Security Council deliberations on the attack of South Korea by North Korea in 1950. Soviet absence enabled overwhelmingly American troops, with a relatively small foreign contingent, to fight under the U.N. flag and save South Korea from communist occupation.

History of the last century has proved that if you are in trouble there is only one number that should be dialed and it isn't that of the League of Nations in the 1920s and

30s, or the U.N. since 1945. The international 911 number is spelled USA. If America doesn't do it - no one else will.

I am not happy with America's role as a world policeman. It is expensive in lives and treasure. It is painful to have Americans die, unappreciated, on foreign soil. But the world would be an unimaginably horrible place if there were no U.S. to be the policeman for the world. Without America, the post-W.W.II Soviet superpower would dominate Europe and there would be no Israel in the Soviet Middle East. Asia - including Japan and Korea - would be united under communism.



The Dalai Lama at the Wall in Jerusalem

What is obvious, especially after the recent Hezbollah/Israel conflict is that no one - not Europe and not the U.N. - can keep the peace. U.N. representatives are already reassuring all interested parties that their soldiers wouldn't have

to fight anyone if they should go to Lebanon under the U.N. banner, but they cannot assemble even a fraction of the 15,000 bodies that are needed.

The U.N. is now in the process of issuing its 3rd deadline to Iran and soon might make a few more threats to North Korea. And there is no stopping the Russian and Chinese arms that Iran sends to Hezbollah via Syria.



If you hate war and are in trouble, call the U.N. You can be sure that there will be no war and no fighting. But if you really need help, call America and, if it can, America will respond. Just don't thank America afterwards - very few have. ☆

HEZBOLLAH'S FINAL SOLUTION

by Alan M. Dershowitz, August 2006

The Iran-Hezbollah axis is the greatest threat to world peace, to Jewish survival, to Western values, and to civilization.

The uniqueness of the Holocaust was not the Nazi's determination to kill the Jews of Germany and even of neighboring Poland. Other genocides, such as those by the Cambodians and the Turks, sought to rid particular areas of so called undesirables by killing them. The utter uniqueness of the Holocaust was the Nazi plan to "ingather" all the Jews of the world to the death camp and end the Jewish "race" forever. It almost succeeded. The Nazis ingathered tens of thousands of Jews (including babies, women, the elderly) from far flung corners of the world--from the Island of Rhodes from Salonika and from other obscure locations -- in order to gas them at Auschwitz and at other death camps.



The official leader of the Palestinian Muslims, Haj Amin al-Husseini, the grand mufti of Jerusalem, collaborated in the

Nazi genocide, declaring that he sought to "solve the problems of the Jewish element in Palestine and other Arab countries" by employing "the same method" being used "in the Axis countries". Husseini, who spent the war years in Berlin and was later declared a Nazi war criminal at Nuremberg, wrote the following in his memoirs:

Our fundamental condition for cooperating with Germany was a free hand to eradicate every last Jew from Palestine and the Arab world. I asked Hitler for an explicit undertaking to allow us to solve the Jewish problem in a manner befitting our national and racial aspirations and according to the scientific methods innovated by Germany in the handling of its Jews. The answer I got was: "The Jews are yours."

Husseini planned a death camp for Jews modeled on Auschwitz, to be located in Nablus. He broadcast on Nazi Radio, calling for genocide against all the world's Jews: "kill the Jews

wherever you find them--this pleases God, history, and religion." Professor Edward Said has acknowledged that this Nazi collaborator and genocidal anti-Semite "represented the Palestinian Arab consensus" and was "the voice of the Palestinian people." Yasser Arafat referred to Husseini as "our hero."



religious, ethnic or cultural group, regardless of where they live--not until now. Hezbollah's aim is not to "end the occupation of Palestine," or even to "liberate all of Palestine." Its goal is to kill the world's Jews. Listen to the words of its leader Sheikh Hassan Nasrallah: "If Jews all gather in Israel, it will save us the trouble of going after them worldwide." (NY Times, May 23, 2004, p. 15, section 2, column 1.) Nasrallah is one of the most admired men in the Muslim and Arab world today. Hitler made similar threats in Mein Kampf but they were largely ignored. Nasrallah has a reputation for keeping his promises.

His genocidal goals--to kill all Jews--were proven by two recent statements. He has warned the Arabs and Muslims to leave Haifa so that his rockets can kill only Jews. And he apologized for causing the deaths of three Israeli-Arabs in Nazareth, when a Katyusha struck that religiously mixed Israeli city. Hezbollah also worked hand-in-hand with Argentine neo-Nazis to blow up a Jewish community center, murdering dozens of Jews.

Nasrallah is a modern day Hitler, who currently lacks the capacity to carry out his genocide. But he is an ally of Iran, which will soon have the capacity to kill Israel's five million Jews. Listen to what the former President of Iran has said about how Iran would use its nuclear weapons:

Hashemi Rafsanjani, the former president of Iran, has threatened Israel with nuclear destruction, boasting that an attack would kill as many as five million Jews. Rafsanjani estimated that even if Israel retaliated by dropping its own nuclear bombs, Iran would probably lose only fifteen million people, which he said would be a small "sacrifice" from among the billion Muslims in the world.

Now listen to the current President of Iran, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, who denies

the Nazi Holocaust, but calls for a modern Holocaust that would "wipe Israel off the map."

Despite these anti-Semitic and genocidal threats, some of the hard left admire Nasrallah and his bigoted organization, as well as Iran and its anti-Semitic president. Others do not seem to take his threats seriously.

For example, the notorious Jewish anti-Semite Norman Finkelstein has said, "looking back my chief regret is that I wasn't even more forceful in publicly defending Hezbollah against terrorist intimidation and attack."



Finkelstein's hatred of Jews runs so deep that he has actually implied that his own mother, who survived the Nazi Holocaust, may have collaborated with the Nazis. If so collaboration with evil seems to run in the family, because Finkelstein has clearly become a collaborator with Hezbollah anti-Semitism and Nazism. Finkelstein's website is filled with Hezbollah promotion, including breathless reprints of Nasrallah speeches. Noam Chomsky, who works closely with Finkelstein, has said of Finkelstein that he is "a person who can speak with more authority and insight on these topics [Israel and anti-Semitism] than anyone I can think of."

The Iran-Hezbollah axis is the greatest threat to world peace, to Jewish survival, to Western values, and to civilization. Those like Finkelstein, who support Hezbollah, and even those who refuse to fight against this evil, are on the wrong side of history. They are collaborators with Islamofascists - today's version of Nazism.

Alan M. Dershowitz is the Felix Frankfurter professor of law at Harvard Law School and author of *The Case for Israel*.

Never before or since in world history has a tyrannical regime sought to murder all of the members of a particular racial,

THE GREAT WAGE GAP

By Paul Jacob 8/20/06

Let us now praise the underpaid, selfless civil servant. Wait — does such a person exist in federal employ? Excuse me while I chortle.

Oh sure, union officials, civics texts, and those blue-ribbon panels set up by defensive politicians often imply (and sometimes baldly assert) that government workers receive less pay than private employees. Sometimes they even bring up ideas like "selfless service."

Add a touch of cynicism to this, and you might say that government workers exchange higher pay for job security. (It can sure be hard to fire a bureaucrat.)

But it's high time to dismiss the myth. As the Bureau of Economic Analysis reported this month, federal civil servants receive far, far more in wages and benefits than workers in the private sector. Indeed, twice as much.

Average compensation for federal civilian workers last year came to \$106,579 — which Chris Edwards of the Cato Institute notes is "exactly twice the average compensation paid in the U.S. private sector." Throw out the benefits and the difference is less, but still a whopping 62 percent more for the federal worker.

Of course, past figures used to bolster up the "underpaid civil servant" notion ignore benefits and consider just the nominal wage rate. But today's 62 percent difference is hard to ignore, isn't it?

But face it: nominal wages aren't real wages; for a true comparison we must add on all the benefits, as Edwards does: "Federal workers receive generous health benefits during work and retirement, a pension plan with inflation protection, a retirement savings plan with generous matching contributions, large disability benefits, and union protections." Let me put a stop to transcribing here. There's a lot more, and I don't get paid enough to risk carpal tunnel.

Figuring in all the benefits, Edwards suggests that government employees should be paid *less* than private sector employees, not more.

Nice idea, but to get that to happen, wouldn't we first have to fire the unions? Hmmmm.

Now, the mere suggestion of lowering compensation — or even just curbing scheduled compensation increases — might be enough to incite incivility amongst our civil servants. But the point of bringing the matter up is not for the emotional reactions or to start a class war between net tax consumers and net taxpayers. It's not that federal employees are evil, deserving to be

punished. They are simply overpaid.

So, why is federal employee compensation so high?

Well, here's one big reason: In bad times, when private sector wage increases grind to a halt, federal wages rise merrily upwards.

There are others, more basic in nature.

Think about it: Who decides the pay? Legislators.

A century ago and more, during the days of the "spoils system," one tried to get government jobs for people not because the jobs necessarily paid that well, but because they paid well for the amount of work done. Government work was a good place for artists or college grads from liberal schools. That is, for people who couldn't make it as artists and artisans and preachers and teachers, people for whom clerking in private practice was something worth shirking. Nathaniel Hawthorne famously wanted federal employ. In those days, government jobs were rather like short-term sinecures (often limited to the term of the party in office). A federal job was great haven for a novelist waiting to crank out a best seller.

Nowadays, of course, the spoils system is over. So to speak. Fewer people get jobs in government because they know someone who knows the new president or the newly elected Senator. We have a "more

efficient" system now, the civil service. You have to take tests.

And it certainly helps to sport a college degree. But once you get hired, it's hard to get fired, and your wages keep going up and up.

Looked at one way, it's an improvement over the old way of doing things.

Looked at another, it corrupts the whole economy. (Does it really help workers to idealize a system wherein productivity means almost nothing?)

But it doesn't corrupt legislators. Much. It gives legislators precious little to dole out to supporters. Unlike under the spoils system, it's harder for representatives to buy off constituents (other than by a general increase in government and catering to public employee unions, of course). What to do?

Pork to the rescue! Porkbarrel spending on constituent and private projects is an

amazingly efficient way to dole out favors with other people's money. It's the spoils system reborn.

And as Mr. Edwards pointed out in another of his Cato reports, this sort of government favoring of private individuals is not limited to the federal government. Public debt for private projects amounts to 23 percent of today's total municipal debt. The old joke used to be "thank God we don't get all the government we pay for." Now taxpayers pay for so much that isn't government, we can repeat the old line only with an added bitterness.

There's something inherent in unlimited representative government, and that something is the spreading, thickly, of money to favored supporters. When the spoils system was replaced with a civil service, a new form of spoils grew to take its place.

Wouldn't it be nice if our representatives realized that it wasn't their job to spread money around without limit? If they could give up on the New Spoils System, on the one hand, and exercise some fiduciary responsibility regarding our paid employees, on the other, fiscal policy wouldn't be such a mess.

I won't be holding my breath.

And I won't be holding my breath for the people who complain about "overpaid corporate execs" to turn their ire against the thousands upon thousands of overpaid federal employees. The charge of "greed" will never affix to civil servants and their union representatives.

But greed is a cheap shot charge here as elsewhere. Everybody wants more money, and everybody has a right to ask for more. And employers have just as much right to offer only so much.

Perhaps it's just that, when negotiating with workers and unions, our representatives don't have much spine simply because the money "isn't theirs," and thus they have scant incentive to use it wisely.

The trouble with this explanation is not that it doesn't explain. It explains the situation too well: what room is left for reform? It suggests that politics and bureaucracies are themselves congenitally incapable of rational management.

Sure government workers are overpaid. But that only points to the bigger problem: the federal government has escaped popular control, and is increasingly run not for the benefit of the people, but for the benefit of the people in government. \$

Think about it: Who decides the pay? Legislators.



Graffiti for intellectuals

SIMON SAYS

Southern California Council for Soviet Jews publication
(affiliate member of Union of Councils for Soviet Jews)
P.O.Box 1542, Studio City, CA 91614

SEPTEMBER
11
2006

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
STUDIO CITY CA
PERMIT NO.62

RETURN SERVICE REQUESTED

Fax: 818-766-4321
email: esfrumkin@adelphia.net
Phone: 818-769-8862

HOW DO YOU FIGHT SOMEONE WHO IS NOT AFRAID TO DIE?

Mona Charen, Townhall.com, 8/18/06

When Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert addressed the Knesset and claimed victory against Hezbollah, some members of the body audibly scoffed, reports WorldNetDaily.com. Israel's tentative military campaign, Olmert asserted, "changed the strategic balance in the region." Well, he's right about that part.

By failing to crush Hezbollah, as 90 percent of the Israeli public, the U.S. government, the French and even the Saudis hoped they would do, Israel has sustained the most damaging defeat of its history -- and this defeat has hurt the United States as well. An Israeli columnist, calling himself an "optimist,"



A shirtless dead guy with green hat in his armpit

notes that contrary to Hassan Nasrallah's prediction that Israel would "'collapse like a spider web,' it didn't collapse." Those are not words to chill the hearts of Hamas and Hezbollah.

In a better world, the tactics of Hezbollah - crossing an international boundary in an unprovoked act of ruthless aggression; kidnapping soldiers; using civilians as human shields; deliberately targeting Israeli civilians - would have provoked universal revulsion. Every death of an innocent Lebanese would have been laid at the feet of Hezbollah. But in the world we actually inhabit, the European Union, Muslims throughout the world and many on the left in the United States condemned Israel instead. This war brought us not embedded journalists but embedded terrorists, woven into the fabric of civilian society -- missiles hidden in mosques, launchers within laundries.

Hezbollah, with a large assist from the Reuters news agency, boldly and blatantly falsified photographs and other news from Lebanon -- strategically posing human beings

(dead and alive), stuffed animals and weeping women for world media consumption (see www.aish.com/movies/JP/PhotoFraud.asp). Thanks to alert bloggers like those at LittleGreenFootballs.com, we have come to recognize the ubiquity of figures like



Same "dead" guy wearing his hat while removing rubble

"Green Helmet Guy" posing as a Lebanese rescue worker when he almost certainly works for the terrorists -- the Leni Riefenstahl of Hezbollah. One part of the world that proved particularly vulnerable to this manipulation was Israel itself. It fought this war with one eye on the camera. And though utterly unskilled in such tactics itself (where were the pictures of suffering Israelis?), the Israeli government worried excessively about the public relations price it was paying to defend itself. But by failing to finish the war, Israel did itself far more damage than any public relations hit could do. It emboldened the enemy -- and Israel's enemy in this war is our enemy, too.

How do you fight people who are not afraid to die? Well, certainly not by letting them believe that such tactics succeed. Iran, the font of so much misery in the world right now, has no reason to believe that defiance of the United Nations, Nazi-like belligerence toward the U.S. and Israel, funding and training of suicide bombers, and the pursuit of nu-

clear weapons have brought them anything but gain. Hezbollah was their cat's paw. Had it been crippled, they would have felt the pain. The psychic blow would have been enormous. The psychological war is every bit as important as the one fought with bullets (it has always been so). It's one thing to blow yourself up for a great cause that is everywhere on the march. It's quite another to sacrifice your life for futility.

At this moment, Israel has done the most dangerous thing we in the West can do: It has withdrawn from a fight without victory. The U.S. has offered some wobbly signals as well. Michael Rubin of the American Enterprise Institute reports that after Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice announced that the U.S. would "engage" Iran, a top Iranian official jeered, "Why don't you just admit that you are weak and your razor is blunt?" A few days later, an Iranian Revolutionary Guards boat unfurled a banner as it passed a U.S. Navy ship in the Persian Gulf. It read: "The U.S. cannot do a damn thing."

A Hamas columnist has predicted that Hezbollah's "victory" will open the door to a "third intifada."

We await the consequences elsewhere around the world -- from London to New York to Baghdad to Bali to Calcutta -- of jihadists who feel the wind at their backs. ☆



Working harder than ever, in spite of being dead.