



Jerusalem 4:06; Toronto 4:33

Commentary...

Judicial Discrimination

By Larry Zeifman

In a courtroom this week, dedicated Jews who expended great efforts to disseminate Torah and Zionism were sentenced to jail. No, this did not happen in a country where teaching Torah is illegal. It did not happen in a country where Zionism is illegal. It happened in our beloved Israel.

Now anyone who knows me knows how painful it is for me to criticize Israel, and especially as venerable institution of the State as the Israeli Justice System.

Yes, Arutz 7 operated outside the law. It broadcasted from a ship outside Israel's territorial waters. And it may, on very rare occasions, have allowed the ship to cross into Israeli territory. But consider the following:

- There are very many other "pirate" radio stations, none of which incur the tremendous cost of broadcasting from a ship, and all of which broadcast only from Israeli territory - none of their managers and broadcasters have been sent to jail.
- These other "pirate" radio stations have been accused of dangerously transmitting radio frequencies that conflict with those of Ben Gurion airport, but Arutz 7 has never done so.
- These other "pirate" radio stations often do not pay royalties to the owners of the music they play, but Arutz 7 always paid such royalties.
- Abie Nathan operated his radio station "Voice of Peace" from a ship in the Mediterranean Sea for several years and he was never prosecuted.
- Despite difficulties receiving the station in many places around the country and even in Jerusalem, Arutz 7 was ranked the third most popular radio station in the country, ahead of many of the country's "official" radio stations, by servicing a growing and un-serviced market.
- What Arutz 7 was giving its listeners was what one would think Israeli authorities would want them to hear: Nationalistic, Zionist outlooks on current events, Torah lessons, and exclusively Jewish and Israeli music.

Look at the makeup of the people that were sentenced this week. Were they motivated by personal profit, greed or glory? Certainly not. These are war heroes and Torah leaders working for the benefit of the not-for-profit institutions of Bet El. They seek no personal glory. They built up the station out of a devotion to the Land, the Torah, the State and the People of Israel. They have lost family members and close friends in the defense of Israel both as members of the IDF and as residents of Bet El and other communities under ongoing threat of terrorist attack.

They are united in their belief in the Kedusha and sovereignty of all of the Land of Israel as the Jewish State.

And that must be what so irked the judicial system that they would expend millions of dollars on their prosecution to the exclusion of these other, arguably dangerous, "pirate" radio stations. They saw in the devotion of Katzele and others a serious challenge to their vision of Israel as a left-leaning, secular, smaller State for the Jews. They saw this as an opportunity to decapitate a growing devoted movement of religious nationalistic Zionists.

These secular leftists had thought that the Oslo process would accomplish this decapitation of the "Arutz 7 movement." But Oslo failed miserably, and the Movement, despite all odds, survived and strengthened, largely due to Arutz 7.

Look at the facts: The numbers of residents of the yishuvim in Yesha increased consistently in the ten years since the handshake in Washington, and even increased annually in the three years since Arafat took off his peace mask. In that time, the residents of the yishuvim continued to build and develop their communities and their institutions, despite all odds.

More new officers in the Israeli army wear Kippot than do not, occupying the leadership role formerly held by the young men of the kibbutzim. And instead of following their secular army buddies to India after they complete their service, the second generation of Yesha residents is taking its place in the struggle to build Eretz Yisrael by creating their own communities and "outposts".

And many secular Israelis were coming to have greater respect for this sector of the community, especially in light of the failure of the "peace" moves and

ISRAEL NEWS

*A collection of the week's news from Israel
A service of the Bet El Twinning Committee of
Beth Avraham Yoseph of Toronto Congregation*

post-Zionism of the left.

So the left determined it needed to fight back. It needed to use its base of control of the judicial system to get some wins. And they started with Arutz 7. How else to explain this clear discrimination against Israel's leading nationalistic independent station?

In sentencing the "Arutz 7 Ten" this week, the judge decreed that the four receiving jail terms, including Katzele, could serve their time through

community service. The irony is that their whole lives are devoted to community service.

As Katzele said this week, "...We have to have faith. Rav Melamed has always taught us that from every negative thing we reap gain. We are men of faith and we adhere to Hashem and to those who teach His Torah. Arutz-7 will continue to grow, with radio and internet and our newspaper [B'Sheva] and soon television, and soon we will hold the Jerusalem Conference with Senators, ministers, and other important public figures, and we will grow and continue to provide the truth for the people of Israel."

Believe him. This is not a man the Left can slow down.

The writer is the editor of Israel News.

Put Me on Trial, Too By Tzvi Fishman

In the famous novel *The Trial*, written by Franz Kafka, an innocent man is suddenly arrested and accused of crimes that he did not commit. He is thrown into prison and no one comes to his aid. Afraid of the authorities, his family and friends all abandon him. Even his lawyer accepts his guilt as a fact and barely goes through the motions of defending him. Overnight, the hero of the novel finds himself in a nightmarish world where everything has flipped upside down. The State that he cherished has transformed into a cold, uncaring enemy, and there is no where to turn for salvation.

Though I read Kafka's book dozens of years ago in my youth, its frightening scenes flashed through my mind as I sat in a Jerusalem courtroom last month. I was there to hear prosecuting attorneys explain why the managers of the Arutz-7 radio station should be served harsh punishments, including time in prison. While the prosecutor (a young woman who looked like she was just out of law school) read out an almost two-hour summation of similar cases and sentences, the defendants sat in stunned, Kafka-like silence, as if unable to utter a word. The lawyer for the defendant acted politely, in a very professional manner, respecting the rules of the court. A character witness was allowed to testify on behalf of Yaakov Katz (Ketzelah), describing his heroism and spirit of self-sacrifice during the Yom Kippur War, and letters of recommendation were submitted for the other equally upstanding and patriotic defendants, but no one put up a fight, no one protested the absurdity and insanity and injustice of the whole despicable circus - just like in Kafka's horrifying tale.

I sat in the back row of the crowded courtroom, reading a special prayer based on Pitom HaKetoret, designed to stop plagues against Am Yisrael. Yes, there are times, like in Kafka's novel, when a government and system of justice can turn into a plague against the very citizens whom they are supposed to protect.

What was on trial, I realized, was not a pirate radio station, or the issue of broadcasting from sea or from shore. It wasn't even the defendants who were on trial, Rabbi Zalman Melamed and his wife, Yaakov Katz, Yoel Tzur, Adir Zik, Haggai Segal and others. On trial were the things they represented, the ideals they believed in. First and foremost, the Land of Israel was on trial. The Torah was on trial. The settlement movement, Zionism, patriotism and the spirit of self-sacrifice were on trial. Democracy and the right of Free Speech and Freedom of Expression were on trial, as well.

Even the prosecutor had to admit that the defendants were respected leaders of the community with a long list of national contributions to their credit. Hearing this brief outburst of sanity, I breathed easier. "But for this very reason," she said, tightening the Kafkaesque web, "their punishment should be even harsher for their disdain of the law."

The only comfort I could find was recalling a Gemara at the very end of tractate Sotah. In the times just preceding the Mashiach, it says, prices will soar, children will be at odds with their parents, chutzpah will be rampant, the Torah scholars will be scorned, and truth will disappear. Judging from

Yasher Koach and thank you to our supporters. Thank you also to Continental Press for their ongoing support.
Readers are requested to please mail contributions to: BAYT - re: Israel News, 613 Clark Avenue West, Thornhill, Ontario. L4J 5V3
Annual Rates: Friend - \$36, Supporter - \$50, Benefactor - \$180. Dedications are welcome at \$120/week.
Call (905) 886-3810 for further info. Israel News can be viewed on the internet at www.bayt.org

these forecasts, and from the trial of Arutz-7, we are on the right course toward Redemption, as upside down as it may seem.

But tachlis (practically), what can we do to help right this terrible wrong? Cynically, I suggested to one of the court workers that Arutz-7 should have moved their broadcasting facilities across the street from Beit El to Ramallah. In Ramallah, a radio station can broadcast whatever it wants, including round-the-clock incitement against Jews and the Jewish State, and no one does anything to stop it, not the Israeli police, not the Attorney General, not the prime minister, not even all of the Israeli judges and all the Israeli courts.

If Arafat wouldn't agree to hosting a bunch of patriotic settlers in Ramallah, then certainly our peace partner in Jordan would let Arutz-7 set up an antenna on one of their mountains for a few hundred thousand dollars a year.

For my part, I am ready to join the Arutz-7 defendants. Though I was never a manager of the station, I did have my own interview show on the air. In fact, if all of the show hosts were to appear at the Jerusalem court and demand to be put on trial too, it might help expose the travesty of justice that is being perpetrated in the name of the law. I am talking about Minister of Tourism Rabbi Benny Elon, and Rabbi Shlomo Aviner, and Rabbi Dov Lior, and Rabbi Dov Halperin, and Rabbi Simcha HaKohen Kook, and former Chief Rabbis, Rabbi Meir Lau Rabbi Mordechai Eliahu, to name just a few.

And we should, in all fairness, be joined by everyone who enjoyed air-time on Arutz 7 to further their personal or political interests - like Arik Sharon, and Bibi Netanyahu, and Ehud Olmert, and Minister of Education Limor Livnat, and the President of Israel, too. For all of the Oslo years when the Labor Party was in power, Arutz-7 was the only media outlet loyal to the Likud. Where are they now?

And since we are inviting people to join our demonstration, why not invite all of Arutz-7's hundreds of thousands of listeners, too? After all, the managers of Arutz-7, who are on trial and who face heavy fines and possibly years in prison, did what they did for us - so that we could listen to Torah lectures, and enjoy holy music, and hear an objective presentation of the news.

They didn't buy a boat for themselves - they did it for us. In fact, we gave them the money to do it. Remember all of those marathon radio fundraisers? We were the ones who paid for the microphones, transmitters, and for the captain of the ship. So we are the ones, the hundreds-of-thousands of Arutz-7 listeners, who should be on trial, not them.

Maybe if we all get together, Arik, Bibi and all the rest of us, and stand outside the Jerusalem Courthouse, carrying signs that say, "PUT ME IN JAIL TOO," maybe if enough of us come, we can turn a Kafkaesque nightmare into a victory for Torah, for the Land of Israel, for real democracy, and for the Right of Free Speech. (IsraelNationalNews.com Dec 28)

Fence-Building Anarchists Jerusalem Post Editorial

Yesterday this newspaper ran a picture of Chief of General Staff Lt.-Gen. Moshe Ya'alon being lectured to by wounded anarchist and former paratrooper Gil Na'amati from his hospital bed. The picture of our highest-ranking officer patiently listening to a young man who may still be charged with sabotaging the security fence speaks volumes both regarding the nature of Israeli democracy and the bizarre turns we must take to defend ourselves.

Na'amati was in a group of protesters who were allegedly shaking and cutting the chain-link security fence. There were reportedly only four soldiers opposite a much larger group of agitators, some of them masked, who seemed to be trying to break through the fence and cross to the Israeli side. After shouting and firing warning shots in the air, the soldiers reportedly asked and received permission to fire at the legs of the would-be infiltrators.

Much attention has been paid to the question of whether the soldiers knew they were firing at Israelis or not. This question would seem to imply that if the protesters were Palestinians, shooting at them would be more acceptable.

We must be clear: Deadly force should not be used against peaceful protesters, be they Israelis or Palestinians. That said, it is not always possible for a soldier to know who is a terrorist and who is an unarmed demonstrator. And breaching a border fence is hardly a legally protected form of free speech.

One soldier who was there said, "I will tell you the truth: I was afraid... We were terrified that they would throw grenades at us."

The IDF judge advocate-general has ordered a full investigation into the incident, and Na'amati has already been questioned under warning. We encourage these investigations and are confident that whoever violated orders or the law will be punished.

The other question being raised is why the soldiers were not equipped with riot gear. In retrospect, they should have been. But it should also be recognized that a border, temporary or not, in a time of terrorism is a dangerous place. Many Palestinians have been killed trying to breach the fence around the Gaza Strip. Some of them were armed terrorists, some were hapless laborers looking for work in Israel.

Even if the IDF's training and equipment are improved, it is not realistic to expect a perfect ability to distinguish between deadly terrorists, jobless migrants, and violent anarchists or other political grandstanders. Protesters who choose battle zones as their venue are taking a risk that cannot be eliminated and is at least partly their responsibility.

At the same time, we must remember that those who sympathize with terrorism against us or oppose even our non-violent means of self-defense, such as a fence, both expect to be protected by Israeli democratic values and are attempting to stretch those values to the breaking point.

Groups like Na'amati's "Anarchists Against the Wall" will always take advantage of the fact that democracies believe in the right to protest. You won't see them protesting in Ramallah or Gaza in opposition to suicide bombings against Israel, either because they support terrorism, or because the Palestinian Authority would never permit such a protest.

It is ironic, of course, that "anarchists" would feel closer to a police state than to a democracy. But the protesters are misdirected even on their own terms, that is, even if they only care about Palestinians and not Israelis.

It is true that the current war is causing all kinds of hardships for the Palestinians, including those born of security measures that affect Palestinians in general, not just the terrorists who attack us or the regime that oppresses them. The security fence and assorted road blocks are obvious examples.

Yet the complaint of the Palestinians and their fellow travellers generally boils down to "it all started when he hit me back." Want to help the Palestinians? Tell them to stop attacking Israel, and the record shows that Israel will quickly reciprocate by easing its onerous security measures.

Indeed, if the Palestinians were to implement the road map rather than torpedo it, and drop their claim of a right to live in Israel (the "right of return"), there could be final-status negotiations that would obviate the need for a temporary fence unilaterally imposed by Israel. In the meantime, it is Palestinian terrorism that is building the fence, with the help of its supposed friends. (NaomiRagen.com Dec 31)

The Mentor's Inspiration By Sarah Honig

No wonder Knesset Speaker Reuven Rivlin refused to personally present the Wolf Prize to Daniel Barenboim. Anyone with a residue of national pride should be revolted by how Barenboim thumbed his nose at the Jewish state and proceeded to conduct a Wagner piece at the 2001 Israel Festival, despite its removal from the program.

It's equally unsurprising that Rivlin's deputy, Muhammad Barakei, volunteered enthusiastically to stand in. Perversely, it's the perfectly fitting conclusion to the sordid episode, underscored by the announcement that the \$50,000 prize would be donated to Ramallah Palestinians. Had Wagner lived today he'd approve of Barenboim's gesture. Ramallah terrorists would've doubtlessly benefited from Wagner's own proven largesse towards any anti-Jewish cause.

Unlike the numerous anti-Semites of his day, Wagner put his money where his mouth was. Others just did the acceptable thing, and denounced Jews with virulence that would send today's incredulous Israelis reeling. Post-Holocaust political correctness generally generates a more careful, often camouflaged anti-Semitism - not less dangerous, but less in-your-face. No sanctimonious constraints existed before WWII, not even among the artistic elite, whom some of us misguidedly credit with higher moral stature.

A recent random Google took me to a sickening site, aptly named anti-Zion. Its neo-Nazi compiler assembled manifold gut-churning quotes by a veritable pantheon of the illustrious and infamous. Most of us would be knocked for a loop to discover which cultural icons contributed to this compendium of spite and slander.

Yet no one would suggest we blacklist anything produced by T.S. Eliot, Eugene O'Neill, H.G. Wells, Pushkin, Kipling, Degas, Rodin, Renoir, Cezanne, Liszt, Brahms, and a very long list of other immortal talents, just because they hated the likes of us. It was bon ton in their milieu. We can separate their art from their odious opinions.

But Wagner is a special case.

Though one of the greatest composers of all time - who fundamentally transformed European musical, literary and theatrical life - his sinister underside sets him far apart from the garden-variety creative anti-Semite.

Wagner was consciously and actively an anti-Jewish standard-bearer. He avidly abetted anti-Semitic societies in mid-19th-century Germany and fervently propagated the then-new racial anti-Semitism.

He was a leader, not a follower.

He attracted and took under his wing Europe's most obnoxious anti-Semites, rescuing them from oblivion by publishing and disseminating their repulsive theories. He gave them resonance and respectability.

The list of his proteges is long and loathsome.

History would have largely overlooked French aristocrat Joseph Arthur, comte de Gobineau, had he not sought Wagner out in 1876, and with good reason. Wagner's anti-Semitism was legend by then. Wagner's 1850 treatise, *Judaism in Music*, made him a cult figure to all Jew-haters. Its theme was that, while Jewish lucre lubricates European culture, racial inferiority renders Jews incapable of any original cultural contribution.

WAGNER'S PATRONAGE made Gobineau the guru of Aryan-superiority adherents, while Gobineau's concept of Teutonic supremacy served Wagner's own relentless anti-Jewish crusade. The

collaboration earned Gobineau renown in Germany and spread his fame back to France.

Houston Stewart Chamberlain, another Wagner groupie, combined Gobineau's Aryan superiority philosophies with his own notions of Jewish inferiority, and went on to become the preeminent progenitor of Nazi ideology. Chamberlain married Wagner's daughter Eva and in time became Hitler's personal chum and mentor.

The direct line from Wagner to Hitler isn't incidental. Wagner preached long and loud that Jews are intrinsically incorrigible, that conversion and assimilation will only allow the bad seed to contaminate pure Germans.

His logical conclusion was that the one final solution is annihilation. In 1881 Wagner cheered Czarist pogroms by asserting that the Russians are doing "what's left to be done. Their laudable action genuinely expresses the people's power."

The ultimate remedy, he insisted, will come when "the Jews are finished off, when there are no more Jews."

The people, he wrote, "instinctively and justifiably hate the Jew. His personality and essence are repugnant. Judaism is rotten to the core. Anti-Semitism is a natural reaction."

He reserved particular venom for urbane urban Jews, like Barenboim. He called them "civilized Jews" and "parasitic Jews." He wrote that "plutocratic Jews are the most heartless of all humanoids. I see in the Jew the innate enemy of everything noble in man. He can only be demanding, coveting and cunning."

Wagner, the outstanding proponent of "the renaissance Germanic spirit," regarded Jewish pluralistic liberalism as Germanism's intrinsically inimical antithesis. He therefore advocated that Jews be physically exterminated.

Hitler knew whereof he spoke when he maintained that "anyone who wishes to understand National-Socialist Germany must study Wagner." He, after all, was the inspiration.

That's why Wagner was boycotted here for decades. This isn't the private peeve of elderly hypersensitive survivors. Like some enlightened Ramallah humanists, Wagner aspired to see all of us dead. (Jerusalem Post Dec 28)

Iran Clarifies the Middle East By Dennis Prager

If you want to understand the Middle East conflict, Iran has just provided all you need to know.

A massive earthquake kills between 20,000 and 40,000 Iranians, and the government of Iran announces that help is welcome from every country in the world ... except Israel.

This little-reported news item is of great significance. It begs commentary.

Israel not only has the world's most experienced crews in quickly finding survivors in bombed out buildings, it is also a mere two-hour flight from Iran. In other words, no country in the world would come close to Israel in its ability to save Iranian lives quickly.

But none of this means anything to the rulers of Iran. The Islamic government of Iran has announced to the world that it is better for fellow countrymen and fellow Muslims – men, women and children – to die buried under rubble than to be saved by a Jew from Israel.

That is how deep the hatred of Israel and Jews is in much of the Muslim world.

Hundreds of millions of Muslims – Arab and non-Arab, Sunni and Shia – hate Israel more than they love life. Leaders of the Palestinian terror organization Hamas repeatedly state, "We love death more than the Jews love life." And now, Iran announces that it is better for a Muslim to asphyxiate under the earth than be rescued by a Jew from Israel.

Naive Westerners – which includes most academics, intellectuals, members of the international news media, and nearly all others on the left – refuse to acknowledge the uniqueness of the Arab-Muslim hatred of Israel and Jews. Yet, there is no hatred in the world analogous to it. Not since the Nazi hatred of Jews has humanity witnessed such hate.

That is why finding survivors from earthquakes, creating a Palestinian state and life itself are all far less important in much of the Islamic and Arab worlds than killing Jews and destroying the little Jewish state.

That is why Arab newspapers run articles by Arab professors describing how Jews butcher non-Jewish children to use their blood for holiday meals.

That is why Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad could get a standing ovation from the heads of every Muslim country when he told them "the Jews rule the world by proxy."

That is why Palestinian parents celebrate the suicide terror of their sons – the joy of killing Israeli families far outweighs the pain of the death of their child.

Western naïfs like to believe platitudes such as "Deep down, all people are really the same," "All people want peace," and the great untruth of multiculturalism that no culture is morally superior to another. That is why they choose not to face the truth about the Nazi-like hatred that permeates the Arab-Muslim world and the consequent moral gulf that exists between it and Israel. It shatters too many of their illusions.

Surely the Iranian refusal of rescuers from the Jewish state ought to help all these people acknowledge the unique hatred that is at the root of the Arab-Israeli dispute and recognize it is, therefore, a conflict unlike any other on earth.

So, too, the immediate and sincere Israeli offer of rescuers to Iran should make

the moral gulf between Israel and its enemies as clear as day. Despite the fact that Iran is the greatest backer of anti-Israel (and anti-American) terror and despite the fact that Iran repeatedly declares that Israel must be annihilated (in other words, seeks a second Jewish Holocaust), Israel offered to send its people to save Iranian lives.

The two reactions – Iran's preference for Iranian deaths to Israeli help and the Jewish state's instinctive offer to help save Iranian lives – ought to be enough anyone needs to understand the source of the Middle East conflict. But they won't. Because those who are anti-Israel or "evenhanded" are not so because of the facts, but despite them. (World Net Daily Dec 30)

Not to Reason Why By Sarah Honig

In 1864 Alfred, Lord Tennyson, commemorated the senseless suicidal charge a decade earlier by British cavalrymen in the Crimean War. It left 247 of them dead. Terrifyingly he described their ride "Into the Jaws of Death, / Into the mouth of Hell," because "Some one had blunder'd."

Palestinian suicide bombers are sent to the mouth of hell not because of incompetent commanders but because of malicious warlords who deliberately brainwash them and callously dispatch them to blow themselves up among Israeli children. They then extol the fall guys as martyred heroes, indoctrinate youngsters to emulate them, conduct mass memorials for them and reward their families.

Fools are blown to bloody bits at the behest of malevolent manipulators who promise them a hedonistic heaven replete with nubile virgins because they had given Allah what he craves – the blood of the infidel Jew.

There's no Tennyson in their milieu to raise so much as a murmur against the inane carnage. Their ruthless chieftains have deified themselves, and, like pagan gods, can exact terrible retribution from those who dare doubt, or bestow fantastic bounty on those who demonstrate boundless loyalty. They're simultaneously feared and revered. Their word is unchallenged gospel.

Like Saddam's in Gaza and Jenin. He had been a favorite there since he scudded central Israel while our peace-partners danced for joy on their roofs and chanted ecstatically: Ya Saddam, Ya habib - udrub, udrub Tel Abib - Oh Saddam, Oh Beloved - beat, beat Tel Aviv). Their own Arafat pledged his undying allegiance to Saddam, even when he subjugated Kuwait, a fraternal Arab state. Venomous hatred of Israel sufficed to justify and legitimize any tyranny, any excess. The self-styled neo-Nebuchadnezzar, committed to vanquishing today's Israelites, was entitled to a free hand.

This didn't deter Oslo bunglers from betting on Arafat's honor and goodwill, importing him from Tunis and providing him with a base of operations. When Arafat exploited the incredible infrastructure offered by Oslo to launch his intifada three years ago, Saddam, comrade-in-arms that he was, repaid Arafat with unstinting support.

WITH THE full backing of Arafat's bureaucracy, Saddam set out to subsidize mass-murder. He spent at least \$35 million to pay off families of "martyrs," most handsomely those of suicide bombers. The latter category of kin made \$25,000 per household, for the sacrifice of an offspring to the ever-ravenous Moloch.

Instead of reviling Saddam for funding slaughter and tempting dupes to their horrific deaths, Palestinians loved him for his lavish generosity.

Last March 12, on the eve of the American invasion of Iraq, \$245,000 he sent via a Jordanian-Egyptian bank was distributed in Gaza to 21 relations of local terrorist casualties. "Iraq and Palestine are in one trench - Saddam is our hero," proclaimed a huge banner, which festooned a two-meter-tall picture of Saddam and Arafat that dominated the ceremonious proceedings.

At a similar occasion in Tulkarm one year earlier, a \$500,000 gift from Saddam was handed out to 47 recipients. The blood-money incentive to escalate the bombing spree was dangled enticingly for all to see and covet, amid shouts of Allahu Akbar - God is great, celebratory gunshots and frenzied stomping of Israeli and American flags.

But Saddam, who provocatively sponsored terror by doling out dirty financial inducements, didn't himself fight to the bitter end as he incited others to do. He was caught with a loaded pistol he didn't use, not even on himself, not even as Hitler had. He was ignominiously plucked from a rat hole and passively submitted to being prodded, poked and examined with all the dignity of a trapped rodent. This prideless symbol of Arab defiance exhorted those he played for suckers to lay down their lives, but he didn't take his own.

Had Saddam's and Arafat's fanatic followers been predisposed to rational reflection and critical appraisal, they'd have realized long ago that they are sent to die by corrupt cowards and despotic hypocrites - Saddam and Arafat both.

The only difference is that the Americans are free to video the humiliation of Saddam and put him on trial. Yet, applying other standards to little Israel, they sternly dictate that the beleaguered democracy abstain from doing much less to the equally deserving Arafat. No war-crimes

tribunal for him; no answering for his homicidal sins.

Israel is forced to keep Arafat hale and hearty enough to receive foreign dignitaries, appoint premiers, form and dismantle governments, embezzle international grants, inflame passions and keep his minions from drawing logical conclusions from Saddam's dishonorable downfall.

Enjoying American-imposed immunity, Arafat can safely continue to instill in his mindless disciples his sinister version of the motto which guided Tennyson's light brigade to its doom. Shielded, he can cynically impress upon them that "Their's not to reason why./ Their's but to do and die." (Jerusalem Post Dec 26)

Of Intellectual Bondage By Caroline Glick

"How could you report the war in Iraq if you sided with the Americans?"

"How can you say that George Bush is better than Saddam Hussein?"

These are some of the milder questions I received from an audience of some 150 undergraduate students from Tel Aviv University's Political Science Department. The occasion was a guest lecture I gave last month on my experiences as an embedded reporter with the US Army's 3rd Infantry Division during the Iraq war.

Many of the students were visibly jolted by my assertion that the patriotism of American soldiers was inspirational. The vocal ones among them were appalled when I argued that journalists must be able to make moral distinctions between good and evil, when such distinctions exist, if they wish to provide their readership with an accurate picture of the events they describe in their reports.

"Who are you to make moral judgments? What you say is good may well be bad for someone else."

"I am a sane human being capable of distinguishing good from evil, just like every other sane human being," I answered. "As criminal law states, you are criminally insane if you can't distinguish between good and evil. Unless you are crazy, you should be able to tell the difference."

When the show was over, and the students began shuffling out of the lecture hall, a young woman approached me.

"Excuse me," she said with a heavy Russian accent.

"How can you say that democracy is better than dictatorial rule?"

"Because it is better to be free than to be a slave," I answered.

Undeterred, she pressed on, "How can you support America when the US is a totalitarian state?"

"Did you learn that in Russia?" I asked.

"No, here," she said.

"Here at Tel Aviv University?"

"Yes, that is what my professors say," she said.

In the weeks that have passed since I gave that lecture, I have not been able to get those students out of my mind.

While campuses throughout the Western world are known as hotbeds for radicalism, it is still hard to believe that Israeli students, who themselves served in the IDF, and who as civilians have experienced more than three years of unrelenting terrorist attacks on their cafes, night clubs, campuses, highways and public buses, could subscribe to such views.

How can they believe it is impossible to make moral distinctions between those fighting terrorism and totalitarian regimes and those perpetrating terrorism and leading such dictatorships?

It is an open secret that many of the most prominent Israeli academics and professors are also identified with the radical leftist fringes of the Israeli political spectrum.

The Hebrew University's Political Science Department was dominated for years by the leaders of Peace Now. Tel Aviv University's Social Science and Humanities Faculties are the professional home to some of the leaders of the even more radical Ta'ayush and Yesh Gvul organizations.

Israeli professors have signed petitions calling for boycotts of Israeli goods. Some have even supported the boycott of Israeli academics by foreign universities and academic publications.

Israel Radio reported this week that the letter written by 13 reservists from the elite Sayeret Matkal commando unit in which they announced their refusal to serve in the territories was written for them by a Tel Aviv University professor.

Prof. Rafi Yisraeli from the Hebrew University notes, "It is ironic that the university presidents and Minister Natan Sharansky are now organizing a campaign to stop the boycott of Israeli academics in foreign universities."

A year ago, I discussed the issue, as well as the rampant anti-Semitism on European campuses, with the president of the University of Paris. He told me, "What do you want from us? All we are doing is repeating what we hear from Israeli professors."

Case in point is Tel Aviv University law professor Andrei Marmor.

Marmor is currently a visiting faculty member at the University of Southern California Law School. Recently he published a policy paper at USC where he argues that Israel's territorial claims to land it secured during the 1948-49 War of Independence are no different from its claims to land secured in the 1967 Six Day War. In his view, both are illegitimate. Marmor goes on to argue that Zionism cannot claim to be a liberal movement unless it accepts the "right of return" of

Palestinians to Israel.

In the mid-1990s, a Tel Aviv University graduate student conducted a survey of the political views of university professors. The student discovered that not only were the professors overwhelmingly self-identified with far left and Arab political parties, most also expressed absolute intolerance for the notion that professors with right-wing or even centrist views should be allowed to teach in their departments. "Over my dead body," said one.

All of this is well known. Yet knowing of the professors' radicalism, and seeing the effects of such dogmatic views on university students, are different things.

Since my exchange with those students, I have spoken to professors and students at the five major liberal arts universities in Israel to try to understand how the intellectual tyranny of the radical Left on campuses impacts their educational and professional experiences.

Students speak of a regime of fear and intimidation in the classroom. Ofra Gracier, a doctoral student in Tel-Aviv University's humanities faculty explains the process as follows:

"It starts with the course syllabus. In a class on introduction to political theory for instance, you will never see the likes of Leo Strauss or Friedrich Hayek or Milton Friedman. You will only get Marx and Rousseau and people like that. So, if you want to argue with Marx, you are on your own. You don't know anything else.

"But say you want to dispute your professor. I was taught this class by Yoav Peled, an avowed communist. He was explaining why capitalism is evil. I mentioned the Asian economic miracle - South Korea, Japan, Singapore. He went nuts and spent the rest of the class screaming at me.

"Then there is the grading system. In a history course I took, I took a Zionist line in a research paper. My professor gave me a low grade and explained that my grade was the result of my argument.

"Most people toe the leftist line even when they disagree because of the grade discrimination. If you get low grades, you can't get accepted to a master's program and if, in the master's program you get low grades you won't be accepted into a doctoral program."

Avi Bell, a lecturer at Bar-Ilan University's Law School, relates a separate but related problem. "Last year I taught a course on the legal aspects of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Most of my students were clearly Zionists and also knowledgeable about Israeli history.

And yet, when I received their seminar papers at the end of the term, I saw that most of them wrote anti-Zionist arguments. "The reason this happened is because there is a dire lack of scholarship in certain areas. For instance, if you want to research the issue of Palestinian policies of land discrimination against Jews, you have to go to primary sources.

No one has written a book about it even though it is a huge issue. But if you want to research the question of alleged Jewish land discrimination against Arabs, you have a bookshelf full of books at your disposal."

Indeed, Dr. Martin Sherman of Tel-Aviv University's Political Science Department was unable to get the university's Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies to publish his original work on the hydro-strategic impact of a Palestinian state on Israel.

Sherman, with degrees in physics and geology and practical experience as a water adviser in the Ministry of Agriculture, is a recognized expert in the field.

"My paper showed conclusively that the establishment of such a state would involve the transfer of control over 60 percent-70 percent of Israel's water sources to the Palestinians. They wouldn't have it. I was strung along by Shai Feldman [the head of the Jaffee Center] for months and months, until it was finally made clear that it wouldn't be published."

Citing alternate publications in research papers is also not allowed. Another graduate student explained that her professor gave her a low grade on a paper because she cited research published in Netiv magazine. "That is a right-wing propaganda sheet, published in the Occupied Territories," she was told. Her argument that most of Netiv's articles are written by academics and are based on original research didn't matter.

She ran into a similar problem when she cited an article published in the Shalem Center's journal Azure.

Most of the academics and students that I spoke with were happy to discuss their situations and yet averse to the notion of being quoted by name. "I am up for tenure," and "I still need my dissertation proposal approved," were some of the most frequent explanations.

A survey carried out by the left-wing Israel Democracy Institute on Israeli attitudes toward the state was published on Thursday in Haaretz. According to the findings, a mere 58% of Israelis are proud of being Israeli, while 97% of Americans and Poles are proud of their national identity.

Mexicans, Chileans, Norwegians, and Indians all have higher degrees of pride in their national identities than Israelis. Is it possible that our academic tyrants have something to do with the inability of 42% of Israelis to take pride in who they are? (Jerusalem Post Dec 28)
