



Episode 1,282: DEBATE: Should Israel Give Up Territory?

Guest: Elliot Resnick and Gene Epstein

WOODS: Hi, everybody, Tom Woods here. Today, we are having a debate on quite a contentious topic between two folks who have a lot in common, as we were just discovering before starting the program. They both live in Manhattan. They're both Jewish, and they both have, of course, *The Tom Woods Show* as their favorite podcast. Now, I inserted that part.

EPSTEIN: Oh, it's true, Tom.

WOODS: See, Gene is just trying to get brownie points at the beginning of this thing.

EPSTEIN: Exactly.

RESNICK: It's actually true on my end, as well.

WOODS: All right, thank you, Elliot. I appreciate that. Well, let me introduce, first of all, the resolution, and then the debaters. The resolution being discussed today is: Israel should keep every inch of land that it currently possesses. And arguing the affirmative is Elliot Resnick, who is chief editor of *The Jewish Press*. He studied history and Jewish history at Yeshiva University. You can follow him @resnickelliot on Twitter. That's Elliot with two L's and one T. I'll link to all this at TomWoods.com/1282. *The Jewish Press* you can find at JewishPress.com. And arguing in the negative is Gene Epstein, who is formerly of *Barron's* and who is the director of the Soho Forum, a debating society in New York City, which you can find out about at TheSohoForum.org.

So the way this will work is, first of all, I'm going to hope that we can more or less police ourselves, because I would hate to have to run a clock that I then have to make buzzing noises and stuff like that. So try and more or less police yourselves. But what we'll do is we'll start with ten minutes, up to ten minutes for each person, then they'll get a five-minute rebuttal, and then we'll have some time for the two debaters to question each other, and then I'll let each of them sum up, and we'll be all finished. So having said that, since Elliot is arguing in the affirmative, he gets to go first. So Elliot, the floor is yours.

RESNICK: Okay, thank you, Dr. Woods for having me on your show. I would like to argue for this proposition from several angles, and I'll start from the most basic. According to the Bible, God gave the land to the Jewish people. Anyone familiar with the Book of Genesis knows that God on several occasions tells Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob that he will give the Land of Israel, then known as land of Canaan, to their descendants, i.e. the Jewish people. This is not controversial to anyone who's familiar with the Bible. Indeed, that is why, before there was

actually even a modern Jewish Zionist movement, there was actually a Christian Zionist movement, which was actually particularly popular in this country. It was known as restorationism, the notion being that we would restore the Jewish people to the Land of Israel. It was very popular in this country. John Adams actually wrote in 1819, quote, "I really wish the Jews again in Judea an independent nation," end quote, and he also envisioned 100,000 Israelites, well-disciplined as the French army, actually conquering the land. So Israel should keep the land it currently possesses because it has a divine right to it.

Okay, well, let's say somebody says, "Well, I couldn't care less what the Bible says." Well, first of all, it's not clear why he shouldn't care what the Bible says. The Bible claims to record the Word of God, so we're talking about absolute truth here. So if an all-knowing and omniscient being tells you that a certain country belongs to a certain people, one would think that that statement should be of some import. God's opinion on Israel, or for that matter on abortion or gay marriage or assisted suicide, should matter, one would think, as much as, I don't know, maybe Noam Chomsky's or Peter Singer's. In this regard, I'm actually reminded of Charles Murray's *The Curmudgeon's Guide to Getting Ahead*, in which he writes that if you're going to be an agnostic, at the very least you should be an educated agnostic, because religion is not exactly a small matter. If God exists, if God actually spoke to man, it's highly relevant what he said, highly relevant to one's life. We're talking about ultimate truths here.

Okay, but let's say somebody says, "I still couldn't care less what the Bible says," or, "I looked into it, and I decided Moses lied or he made up the whole thing." Okay, so why should Israel keep the land it has or not keep the land it has? Well, I actually find the whole question rather strange. I don't know, should America keep all the land it currently possesses? Should Poland keep all the land it currently possesses? Should Morocco keep all the land it currently possesses? I mean, why wouldn't it keep the land that it currently possesses?

Well, then some people say yes, okay, but the Jews stole the land of Palestine from the Arabs. Well, first of all, I don't think that's true, and I'm going to get to that in a second. But even supposing for a second that it were true, okay, so what? Virtually every nation on the planet has stolen the land it currently occupies from one nation or another at one time or another. I don't know, here in the United States, we basically took the land from the Indians. Does that mean we should give land back to the Indians and go back to Europe? You know, there's other examples. They didn't exactly speak Spanish in Mexico 1,000 years ago. They didn't speak Portuguese in Brazil 1,000 years ago. They didn't speak English in Australia 1,000 years ago. So you know, how far back are we going? If the Jews should leave Israel, then all of Washington, all Americans, all descendants of German immigrants this country should then return to Germany; let all descendants of Irish immigrants return to Ireland, and all descendants of Italian immigrants return to Italy. And exactly where we starting history? I don't know, the Anglo Saxons weren't in England 1,600 years ago. This whole notion that one nation is occupying land that doesn't belong to it, that means based on that theory, again, most of the world's population were not there at the dawn of time, so if you're going to go back in history, you would have to sort of uproot half the world's population, if not more. So that's that.

But that's even if someone supposes that Israel did steal the land from the Arabs, but they didn't actually, in fact, and that's true for several reasons. Among others and probably most importantly, because there was no Palestine country to steal it from. There was a Jewish Kingdom in that area for 1,000 years, starting roughly in the year of 1000 BCE, starting with King David. For around 1,000 years, there was this kingdom there. And then the Romans

destroyed the Jewish country, and they exiled many of the Jews. The Jews never left completely. There was always a Jewish presence there for all of history starting from that time. Again, I don't know when you want to start history. I mean, the Canaanites are not around anymore; the Girgasites, the Hittites, the Jebusites, none of these nations are still around. So in terms of the nations that are still around, the Jews were there before the Arabs. The Arabs came much later, so one could argue that the Arabs were trespassers on Jewish land. When the Jews came back to Israel starting in the late 1800s, in great numbers anyways, they found Arab trespassers there. So they didn't steal anyone's land; they were there actually first.

And again, there was no Palestine country. Palestine is a name of a region, was the name of a region for many years, and the Arabs who lived in Palestine lived under various empires, many Muslim empires; then starting in the 1500s, they lived under the Ottoman Empire for around 400 years. People forget that — we live in this modern world, and we think of everybody in terms of nationhood and nations. Nationhood, nationalism is foreign to the Arabs in many regards. It was forced upon them by the Western powers after World War I. The Arabs don't really think of themselves in terms of nationalities. Bernard Lewis, who was one of the greatest if not the greatest expert on the Middle East — he just passed away this past year human — he writes that, till today actually — you don't even have to go back. Till today, if you ask, let's say, an American, "What are you?" he'll say, "I'm an American." If you ask, let's say, an Iraqi, "What are you?" he'll say, "I'm an Arab. I'm a Muslim." He might tell you what tribe he belongs to. He might tell you what region he lives in. You know, fourth or fifth he'll say, "I'm an Iraqi."

So nationalism is foreign to the Arabs, and so the Arabs who lived in the area which we call Palestine or the geographic area, yes, they live in that area, and they were part of the Ottoman Empire, and then they were part of the British Empire, but there was no independent country of Palestine that the Jews took their land from. Today, one of the most popular newspapers in Israel is called *The Jerusalem Post*. That actually used to be called *The Palestine Post* until 1948. It was a Jewish newspaper called *The Palestine Post*. Jews in Israel, in Palestine at the time, had Palestinian ID cards. There wasn't an Arab Muslim nation; it just was the name of a region, and that's where the Jews came back to starting in the late 1800s. So again, there's no reason why — Israel did not actually steal anyone's land.

Now, the last thing that people would say is, well, Israel should give some of its land to the Arabs, because, you know, maybe they have a divine right or maybe they have a historical right to it, but if they give some of the land to the Arabs, there will be peace and that's worth it. Even if no normal person gives away something that's his voluntarily, but give it away anyway for the sake of peace. Now, this to me I find to be, if you'll excuse me, kind of a laughable claim. The Arabs in Israel have never, ever wanted peace with the Jews. They have been fighting the Jews there for the last hundred years at least.

You know, people claim, just give them the West Bank and Gaza and all will be well, but first of all, almost the entire West Bank was offered to the Palestinians in the year 2000 at the Camp David Summit in Washington, D.C. with Ehud Barak and Yasser Arafat. Arafat said no, and he launched a war. The representative of the Palestinian people is the PLO. PLO stands for Palestine Liberation Organization. That organization was founded in 1964, three years before Israel conquered the West Bank and Gaza. So it was founded not to liberate West Bank and Gaza; it was founded to liberate the entire land of Israel. Indeed, on their emblem is a map of the state of what we would recognize as Israel, what they recognize as Palestine.

Underneath it, it says, "From the sea to the river." The sea is the Mediterranean Sea; the river is the Jordan River. In other words, all of Israel. They want to liberate all of Israel — which is fine from their perspective. I don't begrudge them that necessarily. I'm just simply stating a fact, that if one thinks that if you give some of this plan to the Palestinians, that they will be satisfied, they certainly will not.

In 1929, they murdered 67 Jews in Hebron in one day. Why did they murder them? Because Israel owned the West Bank and Gaza? No, Israel did not at the time. They murdered 550 Jews between 1935 in 1938. Why, because Israel owned the West Bank and Gaza? No, Israel did not own the West Bank and Gaza at the time. You know, even religiously, the Arabs have a problem letting Israel stay where it is, because according to Islamic theology for the most part, the world is divided into two Dar al-Islam, the world of Islam, and the other world is the world of war.

And according to their beliefs, for the most, if Arabs or Muslims want to own a country, no other people could occupy that country afterwards. And since Palestine, Israel, Judea was under Arab rule for many centuries, not as an independent country but as part of an empire, therefore it cannot belong to the Jews now. It has to be returned to the Arab empire or the Arab — again, going back to the nationhood thing, they think of themselves as the ummah, the nation being a sort of pan-nation, the Islamic nation. They just simply do not want peace with the Jews. And there was some sort of study done by the Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research two years ago, and they found that 60% of Palestinians support terror attacks against Israeli civilians inside the Green Line, meaning not in the West Bank or Gaza, but in Israel, what is considered Israel proper.

So Israel should keep every inch of land it currently possesses, because it has a divine right to it, it has a historical right to it. There's zero reason that any country would ever give up any land that it currently possesses. If somebody claimed your house and said, "I'd like part of your house," you would say that that's very nice; I'm not giving it to you. And if somebody thinks that giving away some of the land would somehow bring peace to the Middle East, I would really say that person is, if you'll excuse me again, perhaps being delusional. Thank you.

WOODS: All right, thank you, Elliot. Now, Gene Epstein, you have ten minutes of your own for the negative.

EPSTEIN: Thanks. Well, let me begin by speaking to podcast listeners who share my strong sense of Jewish identity. I do believe that Zionists and Israelis have committed injustices and even heinous crimes against the Palestinians, but my pride in being Jewish is not diminished by this knowledge, any more than knowing about the even greater crimes of the US government diminishes my pride in being American. I even take pride as a Jew in knowing that many of the most reliable and vocal witnesses to these crimes have themselves been Jews and Zionists. We are a candid people who tell it like it is, and I feel nothing but contempt for Jew haters who cite the crimes of Israel to justify their hatred.

I've been told at times that my view is make me a self-hating Jew or even a Jew who hates other Jews. They might as well level that accusation against the Israeli Peace Now movement in Israel, itself established in 1978, or its sister organization, Americans for Peace Now, or against other Jews who have helped shape my critical opinions, such as Sheldon Richman or the Israeli expatriate Ilan Pappé. Many Palestinians were slaughtered by the Israeli military,

and hundreds of thousands forcibly expelled from their homes. That leaves us with the tragic irony that ethnic cleansing was perpetrated by Jews, who had themselves been victims of ethnic cleansing for centuries. There is no way for Jews, of all people, to justify these crimes, or to maintain that they were justified by the greater good of creating a Jewish state, and there is certainly no way for libertarians, of all people, to endorse these crimes either, since the nonaggression principle is our defining principle.

Speaking as a libertarian who also believes in property rights, there is no disputing that Palestinians have property rights in land that was forcibly taken from them by the Zionists. They were tillers of the soil, according to the principles set forth by John Locke. Some of them are still alive, but for most who are not, their children and grandchildren have a direct claim to the restoration of that property that any libertarian must support. Elliot Resnick would justify these crimes, and whether or not he's a libertarian in other ways, he has chosen mainly to invoke the Bible as the justification for giant Zionist actions.

Now, his other ploys have been to speak about nation states and nationalism and the fact that Palestine was not a nation state. If he's a loyal listener to *The Tom Woods Show*, he should recognize that that is not the argument that we libertarians make. The argument that we make has to do with property rights and property rights as defined by mixing your labor with the soil, being a tiller of the soil. And if Elliot is saying that this necessarily implies that other wrongs have to be righted, that other directly traceable property rights were denied my ancestors, that I can directly trace to my ancestors, then those cases can be brought.

By and large, however, as a practical matter, obviously, I don't even know whether I, as an Ashkenazi Jew, are descended from the Ancient Jews. There's arguments that I am not. And so clearly, the Jews alive today cannot trace property rights in land to 3,000 years ago. In fact, that was the debate settled on *The Tom Woods Show* with Jeremy Hammond. So again, I ask Elliot to focus on property rights and forget the Bible, because as he seems to grant, not all of us in the 21st century have to grant this form of religious fundamentalism.

Elliot in one of his articles quotes approvingly the destruction of the seven nations living in Canaan by the Jews and by God's edict, the mass murder of people whose only offense is that they live in a certain place that others want to expel them from. Again, there is no way for people of all creeds, libertarian or Jewish, to accept that kind of value in the 21st century. There is no way then to deny the right of the Palestinians to claim their land. There is also no denying that Israel's illegal settlements on the West Bank should be removed. That too is codified by the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, which prohibits countries from moving populations into territories occupied in a war. This was confirmed by the International Court of Justice in 2004. But again, libertarians don't need such backing to recognize that this seizure of property violates the nonaggression principle and violates property rights in directly traceable claims.

Now, with all that said, there is evidence that the Palestinians will not completely press their rights. One alternative is a two-state solution. To begin with, the settlements themselves makeup very little land. Palestinian negotiators, contrary to what Elliot seems to think, have produced detailed maps showing that it would be possible to give the Palestinians a contiguous state with more than half the Israeli colonists allowed to remain. That's a very generous offer, given the outrages the Palestinians have suffered. Elliot objects, because he thinks the settlers have a right to keep every inch of land they've seized. I've already dealt with that objection.

Apart from that, he seems to be convinced that the Palestinians are, in general, so depraved and so intractable that negotiating with them is next to impossible. It is true that Hamas, that the name is supposedly synonymous with terrorists, takes the formal position that Palestinians should be given back their property, which means it does not formally recognize Israel. But contrary to the claim or Elliott's implication that it seeks Israel's destruction, Hamas has, in fact, long declared its intention of seeking a Palestinian state alongside Israel, a position Hamas has repeated over the years. No such reciprocal statements have been made by the Israeli government. But that does not mean Israel's policies cannot change. And if a two-state deal is struck, much of the reason for Palestinian militancy will be removed.

But let's even imagine that the most violent elements do take control of the Palestinian state. Will it then be so foolhardy as to launch an attack on Israel? Given the balance of power, the outcome of such a conflict would be similar to the US having to repel a military invasion by Mexico. And just like the US, Israel has nuclear weapons. Instead, Elliot proposes the Palestinians be driven out and be allowed to float, according from one of his articles, live anywhere they wish in the Middle East's 22 states. If these 22 states open their doors, and if the Palestinians decide to move there, no one could object. By similar logic, no one could object if the US, Canada, Great Britain, Australia, Japan, the Nordic countries, and all the other countries of Western Europe offer open immigration to the Israeli Jews. If forcible transfer is an acceptable idea, then a better argument can be made that the Israeli Jews should be forced to live anywhere they wish in any of these 20 countries.

For all the hate crimes against Jews in the wake of the awful shootings in Pittsburgh, we Jews in the US arguably live in safer circumstances than our counterparts in Israel. Last year, the Pew Research Council released a poll in which Americans were asked to rate different religious groups by the warmth of feelings they inspired. The group that scored the friendliest response was the Jews, who score just above Catholics and mainline Protestants. And I bet Elliot isn't planning to leave Manhattan anytime soon, just as I'm not.

Unfortunately, tragically, the dream of Israel being a safe haven for Jews has so far been something of a nightmare. If these 20 countries open the gates to the Israeli Jews, it would be one important way for them to make amends for having shut the Jews out during the Holocaust and during its aftermath, when our people were in dire need of refuge. And the Israeli Jews are certainly desirable immigrants, a skilled and productive people, who would enrich these countries both culturally and economically. Of course, I'm only making this proposal to point out that it's a much better idea than Elliot's about the forceful transfer of Palestinians or the idea that Israel should keep everything inch of land it currently possesses. My real hope is that a two-state solution will ultimately to one state, in which Palestinian and Jews live together, just as they did before the Zionists arrived.

Finally, Elliot seems to think it's possible for Israel to be exclusively Jewish and be a democracy at the same time. I must counter that it's not possible for Israel to be exclusively Jewish and be a *liberal* democracy at the same time. In a liberal democracy, the default position is that everyone gets included unless there is a compelling reason to exclude. No such compelling reason can possibly apply to the Palestinians who live in Israel or the Palestinians in the occupied territories.

Let me end with a classic joke about the Jewish telegram. It reads: "Start worrying. Stop. Letter to follow." Elliot has been sending Jewish telegrams convinced that Israeli Jews are in a permanent kill-or-be-killed situation with the Palestinians and that both sides must act

accordingly. But even deep-seated hostilities can be healed over time if people of goodwill take the initiative. I urge Elliot to become one of those people of goodwill. I even urge him to attend the concert in New York City conducted by Daniel Barenboim, in which he's got musicians who are Palestinians and Israelis playing together. Barenboim said: you guys can agree about how best to play Beethoven, and I think you'll begin to agree about how best to live together. Thanks.

WOODS: All right, Gene, thank you very much. Elliot, five minutes to respond.

RESNICK: Okay, well, first of all, you talk about the nonaggression principle. If you want peace in the Middle East, it's very simple. The Arabs simply have to stop shooting. As soon as they stop shooting, there's instant peace. It's not Israel who's starting the fight or continuing the fight; it's the Palestinians who are continuing the fight. When we talk about aggression, every single day the people who are being aggressive are the Palestinians, not the Israelis.

I'm also a libertarian, by the way. Generally speaking, we, or at least modern libertarians, think that America should not really care very much about what happens in the rest of the world, shouldn't interfere, so I'm not sure why anyone in general cares very much about what happens in Israel. As somebody — you know, I'm with Dr. Ron Paul on these type of things. I think America should really have almost nothing to do with Israel. Let the Jews and Arabs fight it out, and whatever happens, happens. I do not think America should continue giving Israel money. I don't think America should continue giving Egypt money. I don't think America should be involved in this at all. They should be noninterventionist and have nothing to do with it.

To the extent that if somebody does believe in interventionism, I would argue, if anything, one should encourage the Jews in Israel to be tougher against the Arabs, because giving land to the Arabs does not produce peace. On the contrary, one could argue, before the Oslo Accords in 1993, there was terrorism, but nothing like there is today. You could walk, let's say, in Ramallah as a Jew with the yarmulke or kippah on your head and not be lynched. That's not the case today. If you walk into Ramallah as a Jew, you will be lynched. Terror increased vastly after the 1993 Oslo Accords when Israel started giving the Arabs land, and I would argue because the Arabs do not view compromise as an honorable mode of acting. They view it as weakness. So as soon as the Israelis started giving land to the Arabs, the Arabs said, oh my gosh, we actually could win this fight, and they actually increased violence rather than decreased it.

You say that I think that Hamas is so depraved that there's no negotiating with them and no talking to them. I actually do not think they're depraved. If I were an Arab, I would probably do exactly what they're doing. I see themselves as they want their country back. It's very simple as far as they're concerned, and I don't begrudge them for wanting to what they see as their country. It's not their country, but they see it as their country. Fine. They were there for a long time. I don't begrudge them for what they do, anything, actually. I'm an outlier on that. I don't even have a problem, per se, with terrorism as a tactic of war. If Hamas decided to start killing only Israeli soldiers rather than women and children, it wouldn't make any difference to me. I'm not against terrorism as a tactic of war. I believe both populations are in the fight together, so I don't begrudge Hamas for what they do. I mean, as a Jew, I do, but again, if I were them, I would do the same thing.

I'm just saying, as a fact, they actually want all their back. I said the Palestine Liberation Organization, PLO, they want to liberate all of Palestine. It was started in 1964 before Israel had the West Bank. You never quite addressed that point, that this organization was not founded to get the West Bank. It was founded to get all of Israel, and there was a poll that showed that most Arabs in Israel agreed to violence against Jews within the Green Line. This is simply not the case. Again, PLO, by the way, is the "moderate party," quote unquote. This was Arafat's party. I mean, the fact that people think it's a moderate faction, it's almost laughable.

Arafat, of course, was the founder of the modern hijackings. Mahmoud Abbas is the head of the PLO now and is a Holocaust denier, among many other things. The Palestinian authorities, they routinely name schools after terrorists, they routinely name causes after terrorists, they educate their children to grow up to be suicide bombers. This is not exactly a secret. You can go on Palestinian Media Watch. They watch Palestinian TV every single week and record instances. You even have little children as young as six or seven saying that they dream of growing up to be suicide bombers. So this is not a population that wants Israel to be there. And again, I don't begrudge them. If I were them, I wouldn't want Israel be there also. It's just a fact. If you see their TV, if you see their propaganda, if you listen to their speeches, they do not want Israel there.

Now, you talk about the property rights, libertarians, and you say if we could directly trace the claims, then you would think that even in other countries, we should bring these claims. I don't know if you need to directly trace claims. It's very well-known that the Indians occupied a large part of this country or a decent part of this country before the colonialists came from Europe. I don't see why do we have to trace an exact lineage when we know that the Indians were in certain places and we know that they're not there anymore. It's very simple. Give it back to them, if one really believes in property rights. And just lastly, before I conclude, you say we shouldn't care what the Bible says. Again, I'm not sure why we're dismissing the Bible out of hand. It's relevant. If the Bible is true, if God actually did speak to man, is it not relevant what God's opinion is? Again, his is not a small matter. It matters quite a lot whether actually God exists, if God actually spoke to man, and if he did, what he actually said. So I wouldn't just dismiss that out of hand as being irrelevant. Thank you.

WOODS: Wow, that was almost exactly five minutes. Very, very good. All right, Gene, five minutes for you.

EPSTEIN: Well, taking your points back to Elliot, as I said, it has been declared at a matter of international law that Israeli occupation of other territories is illegal. The International Court of Justice so declared in 2004. Now, they too read the Bible, and they too recognize that you cannot invoke the Bible to settle international differences, because if we start doing that, then other sides are going to start invoking the Qur'an and that way leads to fundamentalism. That's not the way of the Enlightenment. We are all entitled to our own religious beliefs, but theocracy is regarded as an evil in the 21st century.

You mentioned Indians who trace their general association with people to centuries ago or two centuries ago. Well, again, we are libertarians. Libertarianism is all about individualism. As I mentioned, I'm a Jew, and I do associate myself with the ancient Jews; however, I'm an individual, and libertarians have to treat me as an individual. I've got to trace specific lineage rights. That's how libertarianism works. We don't work in large groups. Large groups are not about individual rights. Large groups are about trampling rights.

You speak about being an Arab, and if you were an Arab, you would do what they're doing. You are indeed echoing the statements of people like David Ben-Gurion. Don't you realize that when you say that, you are violating the golden rule? That you can understand how they feel, and you would behave exactly the way they do if you were in their position? Do you see that — I've learned recently, by the way, that the golden rule, "Do unto others as you'd have them do unto you," or words to that effect didn't just appear in the New Testament. It's in the Old Testament, as well. So I won't even debate that with you. I'm sure you know your Bible better than I. I can only say that, that that's like a second rule of libertarianism, tolerance, putting yourself in the other person's position, because we believe my right to move my fist stops your chin. That's why we believe in the golden rule. That's why we believe in tolerance.

Now, you mentioned that — oh yeah, you were talking about how I did not acknowledge that there was militancy on the part of the PLO, indeed, militancy upon the part of the Arabs going back 90 years. Well, that was, of course — that was definitely a response to the Zionist takeover of the land, and they were at that time rejectionist, rejectionist in the strict sense. They did not want Israel to exist. However, that changed. That changed decades ago, Hamas has repeated over and over ago, I can quote you sources on this, that they will accept a two-state solution alongside Israel. The PLO by the 1980s renounced their rejectionist position. There has been no such acknowledgement of the Palestinian rights on the side of Israel. That's the imbalance. So again history is interesting to trace and relevant, but history becomes irrelevant in terms of your specific argument when you make the point that, at one point, the PLO were rejectionist.

Right now, at the moment, the Palestinians across all categories have endorsed a two-state solution. We could even quibble about what's happened in the year 2000. Arafat really was not offered a solid two-state solution. However, that's again beside the point. If Israel puts that on the table, as it has not, a viable, contiguous Palestinian state, indeed, long the lines of a map that the Palestinians have drawn, let's see what happens, since the Palestinians have continually said that they would accept it. The Israelis basically talk about concessions from their assumption that they own the entire West Bank.

But again, all of that's beside the point. I will send you the map the Palestinians have delineated about a contiguous state and let me let you determine whether that is acceptable to the Israelis. When you talk about the terrorism on either side, well, gee, we could argue about that too. But you do recognize, I assume, that Israel is a very powerful military state. Its initiatives and the punishment it's imposed on the Palestinians has been unfortunately a major crime.

And finally I agree with you. I mean, you latch upon being a libertarian and your one element of libertarianism is indeed valid. The US has been supporting the worst elements in Israel, and it should stop doing so. I completely agree with you. I only suggest to you that you sharpen your understanding of libertarianism generally. It's about individuals' right to property that is directly traceable. It's all about individuals. I guess that exhausted my five minutes, Tom?

WOODS: Yeah, well, that was about six.

EPSTEIN: Oh, gosh, I'm sorry.

WOODS: I'm being fairly liberal, but I'm giving Gene a warning officially here. Okay, now let's move into the period where you two can talk to each other directly. And in the past when I've had these debates, I've been very stilted in how I've done it. *This person speaks; now this person speaks*. As long as you're not shouting each other down, I don't mind a little bit of cross talk. But Elliot, why don't you start with a question for Gene?

RESNICK: Okay, I want to start with — I was watching actually a debate between an Israel far-right-wing nationalist and more of like a Peace-Now-type personality that you were referring to before, also a Jew, in 1989, I believe. And the Peace-Now-type person was arguing, you know, let's give them some land, and if they ever start being violent, you're warning them we'll give them a state that will make matters worse, rather than better. You know, if they start being violent, Israel's powerful enough that they'll just re-conquer the land, and all will be well, and then we'll just reverse ourselves. We will say: okay, we made a mistake, we're sorry, we thought giving them a state would work. We obviously were mistaken. I would wonder, with you, what would make you change your mind? If we gave — yes, that's basically my question. What would Arabs have to do to make you change your mind about their intentions?

EPSTEIN: Well, I'll shock you, Elliot, by saying absolutely nothing. Some of the most evil states have been Germany. I mean, I accept the reality of nation states, and I accept the reality that the creation of a contiguous nation state — not something like Gaza that's surrounded and blockaded, but a nation state that's viable and contiguous— is essentially a concession on the part of the Palestinians. They have property rights.

You don't have to be a nut — look, if you're a criminal, in other ways, you're going to end up in prison for your crimes. And if the nation state of Palestine decides to become a belligerent, as I said, then Israel has a right to respond. And as I said, if that does happen, it will be like Mexico being foolish enough to try to invade a nuclear power like the US. Then, indeed, Palestine will be the aggressor state, and Israel will have a right to repel that invasion. But we repelled the Germans. We repel the Japanese. They still have their nation state. That's pretty much the way it works in the world. I don't think that, first of all, the Palestinians are so foolish or even so evil, but especially so foolish as to think that if they have a nation state, they would take on the very powerful nuclear power that is Israel, so I'm not worried about that.

But again, to specifically answer your question, countries have been belligerents, but the prediction that they will become belligerent doesn't mean that in any way negate their right to the property that was taken from them, or as I said, their right to make a huge concession by accepting giving up on their property rights. And even in the in the case of the proposal by the Palestinians, a state that are will allow more than half of the Israeli settlers to keep their land. So nothing will change my mind after that. But as I said, to answer your specific question, a belligerent stage that commits aggression, the country that's aggressed against has a right to respond with defense.

RESNICK: All right, fair enough. That's all. Fair enough, okay.

EPSTEIN: My question for you is, again, just to sort of focus on the golden rule, let's say the situation were reversed, and let's say that the Jews were living in Israel and they had property rights. They had property, they tilled their labor with the soil. But somehow, the Arabs are coming from Europe and coming from Russia and elsewhere, and they claim the

Qur'an — I don't know, you probably know more about the Qur'an than I do — they claim the Qur'an as their justification for wanting to push the Jews out and wanting to take over the land and then hold onto every inch of property. Again, I guess I'm imploring you to think of the golden rule. What would you say then, if — let's say that the entire history of the Middle East were told where, every time we will read "Jew," it would read "Palestinian" — or not, we'd read "Arab," I mean, because they would be outlet, they would be coming from another country — every time we read "Palestinian," we'd read "Jew." Let's say the Jews were driven out the way the Palestinians were. If the situation was reversed and they invoked the Qur'an, how would you feel? What position would you take? [inaudible] better than their Bible? Is that what you say?

RESNICK: No. First of all, what I said before, "Fair enough", I just thought it was a consistent answer, not necessarily that I agree, but it was consistent, logical answer.

EPSTEIN: Oh, I'm sure —

RESNICK: No, it's fine. But yes, that actually is what happened, is the Jews were in Israel, the Land of Israel, and they were kicked out. That's precisely what happened. And also to your question, there are a few things that are a little bit difficult. We're talking about the Israelis, the Jews, the Palestinians. Those are groups. When you say we should all talk about individuals, it's kind of hard to do both. That's number one.

Number two, we're talking both as Americans and as Jews, and those are kind of two different arguments. As a Jew, I couldn't care less what the other person says. If you were living in a certain house — it's your house, you've been living here your whole life, it belonged to your parents — and then somebody comes from the street and says, "It's really my house," you wouldn't really care about his claims about his history, about his argument. You wouldn't care. You would just say, "Well, I'm sorry. I happen to live in this house. As far as I'm concerned with this house, you might have had a divine vision that it's your house. That's fine. It's your problem, not mine." I don't care what the Arabs think. As a Jew, I couldn't care less. They could have all the arguments in the world. I don't care. It's mine, and it was given to me by God. So that's the Jewish argument.

As an American or as an outsider, I would just say let them fight it out. Again, if you believe in the Bible, I think it's clear that the Jews are right. But supposing you don't believe in the Bible, there's arguments on both sides. Again, I'm not sure why the Arabs can't continue living exactly as they were living before. Nothing changed when the Jews came on the scene. The Arabs did not have an independent nation before. They were living under the Ottoman Empire. They could continue living under the Jewish country. Indeed, over a million and a half Arabs do live within Israel, and they have —

EPSTEIN: Do you deny that 700,000 of them were forcibly driven out?

RESNICK: No, a lot of them fled.

EPSTEIN: Yeah, okay, a lot of them fled. Are you saying that that if you were to flee — I don't know if you own a home in [inaudible], but if you were to flee your home because shooting starts, then you can't get it back? Is that the rule that you're imposing?

RESNICK: You're asking —

EPSTEIN: Let's even say they did flee. They fled because the Jews wanted them out.

RESNICK: No, they fled because their leader was asking them to leave.

EPSTEIN: I'm sorry?

RESNICK: They also left because their leaders told them to leave, to a certain degree. We could argue about that. There are several different debates on that.

EPSTEIN: Well, again, speaking as a libertarian who believes in property rights, are you really saying — my wife and I own our own co-op. If somebody tells me to leave because certain shooting starts, does that mean that I give up permanent rights in that co-op that I've bought and that I own? Is that your concept of property rights, that unless you have a good reason for departing your own property, you can't ever get it back? Is that your —

RESNICK: Well, again, I don't think it was their property. They were trespassing. It was Jewish land. I don't think we were kicking anybody out. The Arabs were trespassers on Jewish land for a long time. It was never theirs. But again, let's go backward. You know, you're talking about individuals. We're talking about individuals. The settlements were built on, for the most part, empty land. The Jewish cities in Israel that were built on Arab land are actually the cities in Israel proper, cities like Jaffa and cities on the coastline, the settlements for the most part were built on empty hilltops. So if anything, it would be the West Bank communities that will be more legitimate than communities in Israel proper. Israel, the Jews also built up half the country.

I mean, we're talking about individual rights. We're talking about particular great-grandsons of particular Arabs claiming a certain house on a certain street in a certain neighborhood. I mean, most of the country, Jews are not living in houses that belong to Arabs. The Jews built up most of the country. How many Arabs were there? Half a million Arabs at the time when Israel was created, maybe a little bit more?

EPSTEIN: The Jews owned 7% of the land in 1948. Actually slightly less than 7%. The other 93% was owned by Palestinians.

RESNICK: It was not owned. By default, by default maybe they owned it. They didn't own those —

EPSTEIN: Again —

RESNICK: But no — sorry, go ahead.

EPSTEIN: They owned it according to libertarian principles.

RESNICK: No, they didn't till most of that land. The Jews drained the swamps. Go to Israel today. Go to the West Bank. There's a tremendous amount of empty land there. This was not owned by anybody before. No one was working the area before.

EPSTEIN: Oh, by the way, let me grant a little bit on this, because I'm not — I mean, maybe you and I can have a little bit of a meeting of minds. As I said, you should be interested in the method that was drawn, in which it actually said that the Israeli settlers could keep, I think it was 63% of the settlers could remain and they can take — this is a Palestinian proposal.

RESNICK: It is not.

EPSTEIN: Yes. Okay, see, now —

RESNICK: See, I don't really care if it were. It's not reality, though.

EPSTEIN: What I'm saying is that the Palestinians again — I know, drain the swamps and all the rest of it — default. Again, I'm only trying to counter you. This is a clash of values, by and large, more than it's a clash on the facts. I'm only trying to appeal to your libertarian side. And again, when you talk about how we're confused by individuals and nation, I'm only saying specifically that the Palestinians, on strict libertarian grounds, have a right to the land that was taken from them. They owned 93% of it according to libertarian principles. But I'm saying that they will waive that. They will waive that and make a huge concession and [inaudible] a contiguous state. That's my main point. So then it does indeed become a matter of nation states and a two-state solution, although I think they should all live together, and I think that they can ultimately get along. Historically they did, by the way. They're both Semitic peoples, as you know, the Christians and Islamic, and of course, they have a direct association with the Jewish God. So there's a lot of good hope for this to happen.

But again, I'm only trying to urge on you the idea that you respect libertarian principles and not talk about reasons for why they might have left their land, because they fled, because people told them to, or that the Israelis drained swamps or whatever else. I'm only asking you to focus on their particular rights and property. And once you do that, then I think that a deal can be struck.

And then again, as I say, you seem to think that the burden is on the Palestinians not to show that they're belligerent. There's no burden [inaudible]. But obviously, they have a right — a deal can be struck. And when a deal is struck, all the bitter feelings are potentially allayed, then I think there can be peace, and I think they can be prosperous. But if that doesn't happen, I grant your point. If they turn into being a belligerent stage, then Israel has a right to meet it with belligerence.

And again, the one point I liked on your part — although I'm not even clear why you insist on it, so as I guess perhaps to associate yourself as a libertarian — is, indeed, the United States government has no right, should have no involvement at all in the Middle East. I agree with you. It shouldn't be sending money to Egypt, Israel, or any other country. But I submit to you, of course, that it does that to support some of the worst elements in Israel. That's why it does that, but I'm glad at least we agree on that point.

WOODS: Well, I wonder if I can jump in for a minute. Can I jump in?

EPSTEIN: A Gentile jumps in. Okay, go ahead, Tom.

WOODS: All right, I'm going to ask a question of each of you. I hope Elliot takes his time on this one, because I just forgot the question I was going to ask Gene. I can't remember what the heck it was. But you can find today, every now and then holding anti-Israel demonstrations, some anti-Zionist Jews who make the argument that Zionism itself, they say — now, this gets us a little bit beyond the scope of the conversation, but not too much. They said that Zionism itself was a form of hubris, that the Jewish people will be restored to their land at a time of God's choosing, not through man's unaided efforts, and that this is why, they said, the most religiously observant Jews were not Zionists at the beginning. Is that true? Or how does Elliot reckon with that?

RESNICK: Most of what you said is indeed true. There's actually a famous statement in the Talmud that God sort of made the Jewish people swear that they will not go back up to Israel, the words are "as a wall" — whatever that means exactly. There are different interpretations. The Jews will not return to Israel "as a wall" until God sort of starts the process to do it on its own. So some people get around that by saying, well, the Jews didn't go off and then conquer the land militarily; they conquered it, you know, through the Balfour Declaration, the English Empire gave it to them, and then the United Nations gave it to them. So that's one argument.

Another argument is that also there's three oaths that God made at the time. He made the Jews swear to several things. He also made the nations swear that they would not oppress the Jews too much. And so the more religious Zionists would say, well, the non-Jews broke their oaths, and so the oaths are interdependent, and so since they broke their oaths, then our oath no longer applies, and now we're allowed to conquer the land.

It is indeed true. You are right. Most religious Jews did not favor the Zionist movement, but there were several reasons. It wasn't just because of this reason, the three oaths. Another reason was most of the Zionists were secular, and the notion that the Jews would return to the Jewish homeland under the leadership of non-religious leaders was just inconceivable to the religious Jews. It was impossible that God would return us to the land with people who break the Sabbath, some people who don't even like Judaism. Many secular Zionists wanted to create a new Jew with nationalism at its core, rather than religion. So, yes, everything you're saying is true. Most religious Jews did not favor it for those reasons, one theological, but also because they didn't want to join a movement that was led by secular people.

But there were always exceptions. There was a religious Zionist movement from I think 1903, I believe, and increasingly today there are many more people, especially after the state was created. A lot of people thought it shouldn't happen that way, but it did happen that way. The Jewish homeland was reconstituted. So maybe we're not as smart as we think. Maybe God had different plans. And therefore, all religious Jews today support Israel. They might not believe it's the beginning of the Messianic process, but almost all Orthodox Jews support Israel. The people you're talking about, yes, they have beards, and they wear the black hat, so they're very visible, and they show up at Arab rallies supporting them, they show up in Israel rallies counter-demonstrating. you're talking about several dozen people, maybe a few hundred people. We're talking about a tiny fraction, so that doesn't really represent anymore the opinion of most religious Orthodox Jews.

EPSTEIN: Can I comment on that question, Tom?

WOODS: Yeah, quickly, because I would like to ask you a question.

EPSTEIN: All right, okay, I'll try to be quick. First of all, I just want to correct Elliot on one point. The United Nations General Assembly made a recommendation, a ridiculous recommendation about the petition of Israel in 1947, '48, and I could talk about why it was ridiculous, but the General Assembly recognized that that was only a recommendation. They had no right, nothing in the UN charter ever said that it could create a state. It died in the Security Council, because the Security Council recognized that it never had any right.

Aside from that, briefly, it doesn't matter how many people have these opinions, Elliot. The fact is that I have indeed been informed that interpretations of the Bible are ambiguous as to whether God really decreed that Israel should be a state. Again, it doesn't interest me, because then it's my Bible against your Qur'an. That way leads to bloodshed. But at the very least, grant that there is, as you seem to grant, there is a respectable opinion that even disagrees with your view that this is what God wants.

WOODS: All right, Gene, a question for you, and then we'll wrap up with closing statements from the two of you. My question involves something Elliott said. He made the point that the PLO was created in 1964, three years before the Six Day War, and before there were the so-called occupied territories. So does that not at least help you to understand why some Israelis would be concerned that there's an agenda beyond simply the occupied territory that's going on here, and that if Israel were to yield some of what it considers to be its land, you would not be appeasing these folks, but encouraging them to demand more and more and more?

EPSTEIN: The reason why it doesn't, Tom, is as follows: if you want to trace the history of what went on — Elliot actually talked about certain acts of violence in the 1920s. Indeed, the Balfour Declaration, the Zionist movement made it quite clear — Theodore Herzl, who is the godfather who was the one who started the Zionist movement, he was the one who said that the Palestinians have to be transferred out of the land of Palestine. The declaration right from the start into the '20s, '30s, and all the way up was always that a nation state would be imposed on the Palestinians and that they had to be transferred. That was the reason for the conflict. It wasn't that the Palestinians were being paranoid. That was what was being explicitly stated.

And when the PLO was formed, of course it was all about the fact that 700,000 Palestinians had been driven out and were not allowed to return to their land. So obviously, that's what added insult to injury. The very thing that the Zionists had promised had taken place. They'd been driven out, and they were not allowed to return. And so to say that that means that they're not arguing in good faith because the occupied territories hadn't taken place is completely beside the point. The crimes that I mentioned, the slaughter of Palestinians, the forcible expulsion of Palestinians had already taken place. They were not allowed to return. They were refugees.

Again, it's not just that you can go back to the formation of the PLO. You can go back to the 1920s. The British actually studied the situation and found that prior to the entry of the Zionists, Jews and Palestinians, there were no problems. They were amicable. They had mutual respect. It was only until the militancy of Zionism came to the Middle East that the Arabs began to respond not for paranoid reasons, but for quite valid reasons. So again, this says nothing, *nothing* about whether they can negotiate, especially since they themselves have put on the table a two-state solution making huge concessions, and no such concessions have been made by the far more powerful Israeli state.

RESNICK: If I could just comment briefly?

WOODS: Please.

RESNICK: So first of all, you say that Arabs lived amicably with the Jews. When Arabs are in charge, they always live amicably with the Jews, for the most part. Every once in a while, there's some violence. If you read the history of the Middle East with the Jews living there, it wasn't always peaceful. But if the Arabs are indeed in charge, indeed, they will often be nice. That's why if an Arab man is allowed to marry a Jewish woman, he's in charge, but a Muslim woman is not allowed to marry a Jewish man, because then the Jew would be in charge. As long as the Arabs are in charge, indeed, they often are nice.

Also, I just want to comment briefly. You say Herzl wanted the Arabs out. Now, I actually happen to want Arabs out. I think that would actually lead to a peaceful solution, Jews in one country; Arabs in another country. Indeed, that's what the left wing wants, a pure Arab states in the West Bank, no Jews there. I actually think a separation between Jews and Arabs would work, but that's actually not what the Zionists wanted. You're referring to one comment Herzl makes in his diary in I think in 1898 or so or 1899. Ben-Gurion also made one or two comments privately. Almost all mainstream Zionist leaders, including the revisionist Jabotinsky, all of them opposed forcible transfer. I actually support it, but almost all of them opposed it. In the 1967 war, there were many Arabs in the West Bank who were fleeing to Jordan. Moshe Deion stopped them at the bridges. He literally stopped them from fleeing. He said no, please do not go, stay here, we'll be nice to you. So this is not the mainstream Zionist opinion at all, not even close.

WOODS: All right, it's time now to wrap things up, so Elliot, you'll get up to five minutes to summarize your position, starting now.

RESNICK: Okay, I want to close with a few things. Number one, there seems to be people who talk about Israel — there's almost an obsession with Israel. They don't just merely dislike Israel; they detest it. And I think people should think about that for a moment. Sometimes people get upset: how come, when I criticize Israel, how come you're equating anti-Zionism with anti-Semitism? The reason people do that is because they notice a certain vitriol in the opposition to Israel.

Okay, so let's say you think incorrectly of my opinion. Well, let's say you think that the Jews fought back against the Arabs and they murdered several civilians, let's say. Okay. Hundreds of civilians are murdered all the time in Syria; there was much violence in Sudan. There's violence in so many different places around the world, and the same people who go apoplectic — I'm sorry, that word's not one of my favorites — over Israel do not say very much when it comes to these other places. There seems to be disproportionate reaction and disproportionate vitriol towards Israel. So I'd ask those people in this listenership, if there are any, those people who really detest Israel so, I would encourage them to ask themselves: is it just their opposition to Israel, or is there something deeper going on? And if so, perhaps there's something perhaps wrong with the character of these — perhaps some introspection is called for. Is their opposition to Israel purely in opposition to their policies? Or is there perhaps something deeper going on?

And I know you're not really supposed to say this in public, but I actually have no problem with mild distaste for certain people. You know, perhaps you don't like the French. You think

overall they're a little bit immoral. I don't know. Perhaps you don't like the Germans; you think they're too rigid. Perhaps you don't like people in Brazil; you think they're not as industrious as you would like. I don't know. I don't mind mild distaste for people. If you have a mild distaste for the Jews for whatever reason, I think you're mistaken, you're losing out, but okay.

But there's not a mild distaste for Israel. There's a vitriol towards Israel, and I would encourage people who have this vitriol to ask themselves if something's wrong with themselves, really, if there's something wrong with their reaction, because I think most of us can agree that anti-Semitism is not something which is really proper or good. So that's the first thing I would say.

The other thing I would say: people present this whole America, or the fight is a one-sided affair, America is only helping Israel; Israel's not giving anything to America. That's actually not true. Israel gives a tremendous amount to America. In terms of terrorism, Israel has a great intelligence service. America doesn't really have spies, let's say, in Syria or Iran and other countries that it's worried about. Israel most likely does. It has a lot of many Jews who live in those countries — 70 years ago were driven out by the Arabs, incidentally — and so they're familiar with the culture. And so Israel does have spies. They also have tremendous tech know-how, and they provide America with a lot of intelligence.

They provide America with many other things also, with water irrigation technology. It's called drip irrigation technology, I believe. Almost all major tech companies in California have either branches or research labs in Israel. If American ever needed a reliable ally in the Middle East in times of emergency, Israel is basically the only country that America could really rely on. So there is much in common and there is much that America gets out of being friendly with Israel. This is not a one-sided affair.

And just one also brief comment about the Israel lobby. People always complain about the Israel lobby, the Israel lobby. Yes, of course, there is to some degree an Israel lobby, but I actually interviewed Jack Abramoff, the infamous Jack Abramoff a few years ago, and I asked him about the Israel lobby. And he said — and I think he's right — he said yes, there is an Israel lobby, but there would never be the support for Israel that there is an America just with the lobby alone. It's because of a deep-seeded love for Israel among the Christian population. And I think he's absolutely right.

I was actually at a conference in Washington, D.C. a few months ago, the Road to Majority Conference. Every time a politician — this is hundreds and hundreds of Christians, maybe 15 Jews there. Every time Israel was mentioned, the fact that we moved the embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, huge rounds of applause, *huge*. There is a deep love among the populace of this country for Israel. So this is not some sort of Jews who are manipulating people to have America side with them. Again, if it were up to me, America wouldn't be involved at all. But to the extent that we are involved, this is not a one-sided affair, and this is not because Jews are manipulating anybody. There's really a deep-seeded love for Israel among the Christian population, among others in this country, as well, for many reasons, for strategic reasons, and so on so forth.

Last thing I would say is: don't trust me, don't trust Gene, don't trust any — go to Israel yourself. I would encourage people to go to Israel themselves, go there and see for themselves. I think you'll see a very diverse country. You'll see white Jews; you'll see black

Jews' you'll see Jews from Russia; you'll see Jews from Iraq; you'll see Jews from America; you'll see Jews from England. And you'll see a million and a half Arabs who live in Israel, very happily so. Many of them, Arabs in Israel have a higher standard of living than almost any other place in the entire Middle East. So I would encourage you to just go for yourself. See for yourself, see what kind of country it is. I think you might be surprised. Thank you very much.

WOODS: Thank you very much, Elliot. Gene, you get the final word.

EPSTEIN: Thanks, Elliot. I get five minutes. Well first, Elliot, as I began by saying, the Jew haters who use Israel to justify their hatred of Jews, I have nothing but contempt for them, so you and I agree about that. With respect to detesting Israel or Israelis, I do detest actions of the Israeli government. But just as I detested the Iraqi war and the Vietnam War, I have nothing, *nothing* against the GIs who were forced to fight those wars. I have sympathy for them. I have been to Israel, as well. I have many Israeli friends. I have Israeli friends who support my views.

And so I, again, want to counsel you to think in terms of the libertarian. You might say that, well, maybe you generally don't like certain nationalities or certain groups, and that's fine, or have different opinions about certain nationalities or certain groups. However, you know hopefully as a libertarian, that you treat everyone as an individual. Whether he's a part of that group or not, you judge him on the basis of who that – or her – on the basis of who that person is as an individual. You are quite right, by the way, that it's not the Israeli lobby. It is indeed the ideology of Christian fundamentalists that agrees with you about the divine right of the Jews to be in Israel, and that too is unfortunate.

Now, I was also raised – I think I'm a lot older than you, Elliot. I read the runaway bestseller *Exodus* by Leon Uris. I saw the movie with Paul Newman and Eva Marie Saint. And I was brought up with the same narrative, that the awful justices that have been done to the Jews are such that their relatively peaceful movement into Israel is really okay.

But let me return to a couple of facts, Elliot. I recommend that you read an article by the former is really Foreign Minister Shlomo Ben-Ami in *Foreign Affairs*. He wrote: "The noble Jewish dream of statehood was stained by the sins of Israel's birth. Those sins involved the often violent expulsion of 700,000 Arabs as Jewish soldiers conquered villages and towns throughout Palestine." That's former foreign minister Shlomo Ben-Ami quoting Ben-Gurion in 1948. Ben-Gurion declared, at that point, October 1948: "The Arabs of the land of Israel have only one function left to them: to run away." Ben-Ami wrote: "And run they did; panic stricken, they fled in the face of massacres in Ein Zeitun and Eilabun, just as they had done in the wake of earlier madness goes in Deir Yessin."

Now, I found that that's what happened. That doesn't diminish my pride in being a Jew. That doesn't diminish my enjoyment when I visit Tel Aviv or my reading of Israeli novelists. None of that is diminished. There is a way out. There is the potential on both sides. There is Daniel Barenboim, a Jew and Israeli, who's bringing a Palestinian-Jewish orchestra to New York City in the next few days. I read about that in *The New York Times*. I recommend that you attend that concert and recognize that there is potential to heal these wounds, to give up on hatred, and to recognize that we don't have to cite the Bible against their Qur'an. We don't have to be religious fundamentalists. It is possible even after all that's happened for Jews and Palestinians to live peacefully in the Middle East.

WOODS: All right, and with that, I will say thank you to both of these gentlemen, Elliot Resnick of JewishPress.com, Gene Epstein, the SohoForum.org. The fact that we were able to have this lively but friendly conversation on such a contentious topic says a great deal about these two gentlemen, and you know, a little bit about *The Tom Woods Show* itself, which I urge you to subscribe to over at TomWoods.com/ —

EPSTEIN: We can agree about that. *The Tom Woods Show* is our favorite show.

WOODS: [laughing] I'm in the middle of my pitch, here.

EPSTEIN: Sorry, well, I thought you'd want me to help you out, Tom.

WOODS: [laughing] Thanks, Gene. Thanks, Gene. The way to subscribe is over at TomWoods.com/iTunes. Thanks to you both, and I'll see everybody tomorrow.