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The U.S. Holocaust Museum has agreed, disagreed, and now agreed to allow a visit by Yasir Arafat, a visit accompanied by the pomp and circumstance of his position as President of the Palestinian National Authority. Museum board members and officials, as well as political commentators, have significant disagreements about the appropriateness of such a visit.

Of special interest are the arguments of those against the visit. Argument 1. Because of the Museum "flip flop," the visit can serve no useful purpose or will serve a noxious purpose. Counterargument 1. To the former, the Shakespearean perspective of "all's well that ends well" suggests the possibility of a useful purpose. To the latter, Arafat visiting the Museum might be conceived as the lengths to which he'll go to show his willingness for peace. (Of course, if his visit is merely a cold-blooded attempt to play to a U.S. audience without an accompanying intent for peace, the consequences could well be noxious for peace.) Argument 2. The visit would be divisive and injurious--through interjecting politics--to the Museum's integrity. Counterargument 2. Any act by a politician can be viewed as political, and any political act as divisive in that in fuels different interpretations as to intent and consequence. These phenomena should not thereby preclude acts--political or otherwise by politicians. Moreover, the very essence of the Museum--one might argue--is political. It deals with political horror that has never before or since been so chillingly and systematically conceived. To protect the Museum from the political is to protect it from itself. Argument 3. U.S. officials working on Mideast Issues have no business influencing Arafat's travel and meeting agenda within the US, and they don't have the authority to help initiate or perpetrate a political gimmick. Counterargument 3. It would seem that influencing Arafat's agenda in a manner consonant with U.S. policy is exactly what the appropriate U.S. officials get paid to do. Moreover, what one person may call a political gimmick, another may call an act fraught with symbolism, an act of political theatre that may possible be helpful in decreasing some elements of political conflict. Argument 4. Arafat's visit is supposed to be about significant Issues and decisions concerning Mideast peace, not a "ridiculous" Issue like the Holocaust Museum. Counterargument 4. Doesn't the Museum suggest the evil that can occur when there is no peace?