



## From the PA Media...

### Hamis Video: We Will Drink the Blood of the Jews

By Itamar Marcus and Barbara Crook

The Hamas website this week presented the parting video messages of two Hamas suicide terrorists. One message was for Jews, whose blood Hamas promises to drink until Jews "leave the Muslim countries," and the second to a mother, as she helps dress her son for battle prior to his suicide terror mission.

Each terrorist had a separate message for Jews. This first said "My message to the loathed Jews is that there is no god but Allah, we will chase you everywhere! We are a nation that drinks blood, and we know that there is no blood better than the blood of Jews. We will not leave you alone until we have quenched our thirst with your blood, and our children's thirst with your blood. We will not leave until you leave the Muslim countries."

The second terrorist said "In the name of Allah, we will destroy you, blow you up, take revenge against you, [and] purify the land of you, pigs that have defiled our country... This operation is revenge against the sons of monkeys and pigs."

One of the terrorists saw his death as a wedding with the Maidens of Paradise: "I dedicate this wedding [i.e. death for Allah] to all of those who have chosen Allah as their goal, the Quran as their constitution and the Prophet [Muhammad] as their role model. Jihad is the only way to liberate Palestine - all of Palestine - from the impurity of the Jews."

The message to one of the terrorist's mother was instruction for her to be joyous over his death and his "wedding" with the "Maidens of Paradise." "My dear mother, you who have cared for me, today I sacrifice my life to be your intercessor [on Judgment Day]. O my love and soul, wipe your tears, don't be saddened. In the name of Allah, I've achieved all that I've aspired. Don't let me see you sad on my wedding day with the Maidens of Paradise. So be happy and not sad, because in the name of Allah, after death is merciful Allah's paradise."

Included in the clip is the farewell scene between the mother and terrorist son while she helps him don his military vest. In the background one can hear the lyrics, "My dear mother, don't cry over us."

Such words are eerily familiar to a music video that ran on Palestinian Authority Television for years, in which a boy asks his parents to be happy over his sought after death. Two lines from the music video ran, "My beloved, my mother, dearest to me most Be joyous over my blood and do not cry for me"

Palestinian Media Watch has noted that on numerous occasions, the final messages of Palestinians that went on suicide missions reflected the messages they had been hearing in the Palestinian Authority media.

After filming their goodbyes, the two Hamas suicide terrorists went to the Karni Crossing and killed an Israeli soldier. The clip includes scenes of preparation of a tunnel, and hiding explosives in the tunnel.

Hamas placed the video on its website in February 2006 - after the Palestinian parliamentary elections. The terrorist act glorified in the video occurred over a year ago, on December 7, 2004.

The transcript of the Hamas video is "My message to the loathed Jews is that there is no god but Allah, we will chase you everywhere! We are a nation that drinks blood, and we know that there is no blood better than the blood of Jews. We will not leave you alone until we have quenched our thirst with your blood, and our children's thirst with your blood. We will not leave until you leave the Muslim countries."

"In the name of Allah, we will destroy you, blow you up, take revenge against you, purify the land of you, pigs that have defiled our country... This operation is revenge against the sons of monkeys and pigs."

## 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*

"I dedicate this <sup>בט"ו</sup> wedding [i.e. death for Allah] to all of those who have chosen Allah as their goal, the Quran as their constitution and the Prophet [Muhammad] as their role model. Jihad is the only way to liberate Palestine - all of Palestine - from the impurity of the Jews..."

"My dear mother, you who have cared for me, today I sacrifice my life to be your intercessor [on Judgment Day]. O my love and soul, wipe your tears,

don't be saddened. In the name of Allah, I've achieved all that I've aspired. Don't let me see you sad on my wedding day with the Maidens of Paradise. So be happy and not sad, because in the name of Allah, after death is merciful Allah's paradise."

"My dear mother, don't cry over us; We have to seek, my mother, the help of Allah; My dear mother, don't cry over us; We have to seek, my mother, the help of Allah" [Hamas website, Feb 12] (Palestinian Media Watch Feb 14)

## Commentary...

**So Long, NRP** By Israel Harel

Something happened a week ago in the annals of the political parties: The National Religious Party, the last of the historic parties from the days the state began, joined National Union, thereby essentially ceasing to exist. The NRP does say that it will retain its uniqueness and organizational framework, but then Herut claimed the same when the Herut-Liberal Bloc (Gahal) and then the Likud were founded. The same was true of Mapam when it joined Meretz. The end of both Mapam and Herut, as well as other parties that were compelled to give up their names, is well known.

In order to goad religious Zionism, people spread numerous false accusations about it, including total lies. One of the major lies is the one about the "historic alliance" people say existed between religious Zionism and secularism until Gush Emunim came along, swept the NRP into political extremism and cut the umbilical cord. The truth is that Gush Emunim did not try to sweep away the NRP from the direction of secular Zionist, but the opposite - toward strengthening the connection of the religious Zionist camp with socialist parties that at that time led the settlement movements.

It was not for nothing that Gush Emunim people were embraced warmly and publicly by the heads of those movements, including Yaakov Hazan (Mapam), Yitzhak Tabenkin, Yisrael Galili and Yigal Allon (the Ahdut Ha'avodah, or Unity of Labor, party). Even David Ben-Gurion was fond of the movement. Large delegations arrived at Sebastia from kibbutzim in the Jezreel Valley, Galilee and Negev to reinforce those holding onto the land of Samaria.

There never was an earlier historic alliance. And if there was, it was an alliance between a horse and its rider. In those idealistic years, for instance, those who had blue Hapoel Hamizrachi membership cards had to switch them for red socialist ones. When many of them refused, like my late father, they were fired. When religious workers dared to protest against this discrimination or demonstrate against Shabbat employment at Histadrut factories, Hapoel factions would use truncheons to attack them or the religious Bnei Akiva children who joined the protests. The police would arrest the ones being beaten, including children whose heads had been bashed in - and I say this from personal experience. The religious generation that reached adulthood in 1960s rebelled - like the rebellion in America - against this "historic alliance."

In the days of the pre-state Yishuv and the two first decades of statehood - the era longed for by those who buy the "alliance" lie - the religious Zionist public was atrophied and despondent, in terms of size and political power, and lived off the leftovers that Mapai (Labor's predecessor) tossed it. It had no access to areas outside the religious realm. Everything else, especially security issues, belonged to the socialist camp. And the national secular camp, to which Herut belonged, also provided no access.

When rabbis Yehuda Amital, Michael Melchior and Yehuda Gilad established the Meimad party, religious voters were concerned that voting for

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.  
See *Israel News* on the internet at [www.bayt.org](http://www.bayt.org) and [www.frumtoronto.com](http://www.frumtoronto.com) Visit the *Israel News Blog* at [www.frumtoronto.com/news/index.asp](http://www.frumtoronto.com/news/index.asp)  
Opinions expressed do not necessarily represent the views of BAYT. Thank you to Continental Press for their ongoing support.

the party would mean the return of religious Zionism to the ghetto of dealing with mikvas (ritual baths) and kashrut, and supplied Meimad with only 18,000 votes. Nonetheless, Gilad dares to speak in the name of "a large religious Zionist public that sees itself [after the receivership of the NRP] without a political home," as he wrote this week. If this public really were big, Gilad and his colleagues would return and march it to the polls, rather than joining the Tafnit party, as Gilad is doing, or getting themselves a reserved spot in the Labor Party, as Melchior is doing for the third time. No party comes apart of its own volition.

The polls, which showed that it was barely getting over the electoral threshold, are what pushed the NRP into the arms of National Union - not the strong public demand for uniting forces. Many lament the move as putting religious Zionism at the "edge of the margins." The central argument here, and that of most of the analysts, is that the NRP has deteriorated because it left the middle way and became a party of religious and political extremism that sent its voters fleeing.

But the facts show the exact opposite to be true - it deteriorated because it never took the hard line and became too left wing, in the eye of the voter. The NRP reached its peak - 12 seats - exactly when it followed the path that is called extreme. Only when it began to abandon the path that most of the secular Zionist camp at one time also followed did the NRP go down to six seats, and then to four. That was after Yosef Burg, Zevulun Hammer and others supported the first uprooting - of the communities in the northern Sinai.

The NRP reached the end of its path not because of its lack of involvement in social issues, as its opponents say. Religious Zionists are more involved than any other sector in these issues; one has only to see who is involved in social action in low-income areas. The voters were ready to bring the NRP down because they had reached the conclusion - based on the behavior of its leaders before and during the uprooting from Gush Katif and which was proved two weeks ago in Amona - that they could not rely on the party leaders' involvement in the difficult struggles expected over additional uprootings. (Haaretz Feb 15)

---

**Iran or Bust: The defining test of Bush's war presidency.** By Jeffrey Bell

Events are converging to elevate the nuclear crisis with Iran into the central crisis of the Bush presidency. War presidents are graded not by circumstances they inherit, including those that lead to war. They are judged by how they react to those circumstances.

Franklin Roosevelt as a war president is defined not by the attack on Pearl Harbor, but by the radical war aim he laid out against Japan and Germany in the wake of Pearl Harbor--unconditional surrender--and by his relentless and successful pursuit of that war aim until the day he died.

When Lyndon Johnson became president in November 1963, he inherited a chaotic situation in South Vietnam due to an ill-advised military coup against the civilian-led Saigon government countenanced by his predecessor, John F. Kennedy. As vice president, LBJ had fought to prevent the anti-Diem coup, which proved to be a ghastly mistake. Yet Johnson as a war president receives a failing grade for one reason only: When he left office in January 1969 the United States was in a far weaker geopolitical position, in Vietnam and globally, than it had been when Johnson took office.

In the same way, long after the present wartime president leaves office, his success or failure will be judged not by the enemy attacks of 9/11 but by how he responded to those attacks--and by whether his responses prove right or wrong.

In response to 9/11, Bush and his administration put down clear markers and bright lines. The days of treating terrorism as a criminal activity, to be solved primarily by the work of policemen, prosecutors, judges, and juries, were over. The president served notice that foreign governments providing safe haven for terrorist enemies of the United States would be treated as if those governments were mounting terrorist operations themselves--that is, as enemies of the United States in a world war. And he announced that rogue states would not be allowed to acquire weapons of mass destruction.

To achieve these war aims, Bush proclaimed two new doctrines. The new military doctrine, a marked departure from the Cold War doctrine of deterrence, was that of preemption: We would no longer wait for military mobilizations or attacks before striking against a growing terrorist threat. Preemption comprised a series of military options up to and including invasion, occupation, and regime change.

The new geopolitical doctrine was the promotion of democracy as a central U.S. policy goal around the world but with particular focus on the Arab and Islamic cultures. Without political reform in the Islamic world, Bush argued, eliminating one set of terrorists would achieve no more than a respite before terrorism's next wave.

By the time of the January 2002 State of the Union speech that singled out an "axis of evil"--Iraq, Iran, and North Korea--as the most dangerous of the world's surviving rogue states, Bush had successfully defined his response to

9/11. He had also laid out a coherent U.S. military and political strategy to deal with the protracted world war he believed us to be in. You could disagree with the strategy, and many did. But no one could deny that such a strategy had been laid out.

In the years since 9/11, the Bush war strategy has yielded some undeniable successes: the turning of Pakistan from a fomenter of terrorism and of nuclear proliferation into a semicollaborator of the United States; the ousting of the Taliban government and its al Qaeda mentors in Afghanistan; and the renunciation by Libya of its nuclear program, to name three. Claims can be made as well for the Syrian withdrawal from Lebanon followed by free elections and for the advance of democratic reforms in a number of other Islamic countries.

Beginning with the March 2003 invasion, the war in Iraq has taken center stage as the toughest, best-defined test of the Bush war strategies: in a nutshell, military preemption and regime change, followed by democratic reform in the wake of terrorist challenges from Sunni revanchists and Islamist terrorists swearing allegiance to al Qaeda. Iraq has tested every element of the Bush war strategy. Until fairly recently, it seemed plausible that the success or failure of Bush's global strategies, and thus of the Bush presidency itself, would hinge on U.S. success or failure in Iraq.

With the election of Mahmoud Ahmadinejad as president of Iran last June, this began to change. There may or may not be elements in the Iranian government willing to accommodate the emerging Shiite-majority government in Iraq. There may even be factions in Iran that would hesitate before providing a direct challenge to Bush's preemption doctrine. If such factions exist, however, they are irrelevant today. Ahmadinejad, for whatever reasons, appears determined to force Bush to live up to his post-9/11 strategy or tacitly admit that he has abandoned it in the face of difficulties in Iraq.

One by one, Iran's radical president is removing the pretexts for U.S. inaction or delay. Could we live with a nuclear Iran? Not one led by a man who says the Jewish Holocaust never happened and muses about the possibility of correcting that Nazi failure by dropping a nuclear bomb on Israel. Is there a way to take advantage of the fact that the Shiite wing of Islamism has not taken part, so far, in a shooting war with the United States or its allies? Not with an Iranian president who convenes a terror summit in Damascus with Bashar Assad, the all-but-proven murderer of the former premier of Lebanon, and with Hamas, the avatar of Sunni terrorism in the Palestinian territories. Given these events, it would no longer be shocking to see Ahmadinejad at a summit with Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, the head of al Qaeda in Iraq and an advocate of the mass murder of Shiites as a tactic in the war against U.S. forces and the Shiite-led Iraqi government.

Reports out of Iran suggest Ahmadinejad may see himself as a central actor in an Islamic apocalypse. A man with this mindset might see provoking the United States as forwarding the end game of Allah. And he might not fear provoking Israel into an attack on Iran's nuclear facilities that could trigger convulsions throughout the Middle East and beyond.

Much depends on how far Iran is from putting together its first nuclear warhead. Some reports, particularly those traced to Israeli intelligence, point to the very near future. Even if the ominous date turns out to be much further away, Ahmadinejad shows little sign of pausing for breath. Indeed, the Hamas sweep of the Palestinian parliamentary elections is no doubt being seen in Tehran as a vindication of Ahmadinejad's Damascus terror summit days earlier.

If the Bush administration is developing a military option to deal with Iran's acquisition of nuclear weapons--a form of preemption--it is doing so very quietly. On the pure military level, this is, of course, appropriate. If you had to pick one flaw in the superbly organized U.S. invasion of Iraq, as Jed Babbin recently pointed out, it would be the lack of an element of surprise.

But what is starting to become clear is that Ahmadinejad's seemingly reckless challenge will extract, and is meant to extract, a cost in U.S. standing among our friends and allies, in Iraq and across the globe. A war president who can be portrayed as having given up on the core of his own war strategy will be seen as a leader considerably less capable of deterring our terrorist enemies, wherever they are and whatever it is they are plotting.

*The writer is a principal of Capital City Partners, a Washington consulting firm.* (Weekly Standard Feb 6)

---

**Amona Was Not like Sebastia** By Naftali Lau Lavie

For nearly five years I lived on the threshold of the Nazi hell, in a ghetto and in the concentration and death camps. I saw entire communities on their final way and babies and children flung into pits that became mass graves. The desperate cries of the victims still echo in my ears. It seems to me that until my last day I will be pursued by those terrifying voices.

For about 60 years I have had the privilege of being among those who founded the Jewish state and worked to establish and fortify it. During those years I also had the privilege of raising two generations of fulfillers and

fighters. It is they who are the guarantee of our existence here in the land of the Patriarchs. In the official tasks and missions that were delegated to me I could point with pride at our achievements in various areas of life. Though I never had the pretension to claim that we are a light unto the nations, I definitely believed that Israel was among in the world.

This illusion was shattered last week, the moment my eye fell on a shocking newspaper photograph of a uniformed horseman riding his mount over a person lying on the ground. For a moment I imagined a Roman legionnaire pursuing a Jew in the days of the destruction of the Temple, or a Khmelnitzki Cossack in a pogrom against the Jews.

I was ashamed and embarrassed at the sight of this awful photograph, which takes us back to the abysses of oblivion from which we are trying to distance ourselves. Is it possible to imagine that an Israeli in uniform would act so disgracefully? Where are those responsible for the policing action who made such barbaric conduct possible?

I do not intend to descend here into the argument about the legal settlements, the semi-legal settlements and the illegal settlements that have to be evacuated or left standing. I shall mention only one event that occurred at the start of the settlement actions, not at the government's initiative but rather under public pressure after the Yom Kippur War. This was the event at Sebastia in Samaria, when thousands of demonstrators came to the abandoned railroad station, demanding the establishment of a Jewish settlement in the region. The propelling force behind this act was Gush Emunim, facing the government of Israel headed by Yitzhak Rabin as prime minister and Shimon Peres as defense minister.

As spokesman and aide to the defense minister, I accompanied him to the government meeting in Jerusalem. There were those who saw the demonstration as the start of a revolt against the government, but the voices of a number of ministers, among them then-justice minister Haim Zadok and minister Yisrael Galili, calmed things down. They demanded that the demonstrators be evacuated in the course of a dialogue with the leaders. The prime minister turned to the defense minister and asked him to go there in order to evaluate the situation and decide on the steps necessary for evacuating the demonstrators.

In the Israel Defense Forces helicopter in which we hovered over the demonstration at Sebastia, Yitzhak Rabin asked the chief of staff, Motta Gur, how many forces would be needed to evacuate the demonstrators. Gur looked out the window, surveyed the mass of demonstrators and replied: "There will be terrible bloodshed here." Shimon Peres, who was seated beside me, said to me that we must find among the settlers' leaders people with whom it was possible to talk. We returned to the helicopter pad next to the Knesset, and the prime minister, the chief of staff and their entourages alighted. Peres and the two people accompanying him returned to Sebastia to talk with the demonstrators.

In a large tent around which the demonstrators had gathered, the defense minister informed the leaders of the demonstration that they would have to leave the area before any discussions could be held on their demand to start a settlement there. Among the leaders was Rabbi Moshe Levinger. He rent his clothing as a sign of mourning over the decision to eliminate a Jewish settlement. Among the demonstrators a storm erupted and even the soothing efforts of poet Haim Gouri, who had come there to attempt to find some sort of solution, were also to no avail.

Disappointed with the encounter, we left the area and took off northwards for Nahariya. On our way, I suggested to Peres that at 7 A.M. the following morning we hold a meeting with some of the demonstration leaders in a calmer atmosphere. Peres agreed, on condition that Levinger, who had inflamed tempers by rending his clothes, not take part in the meeting.

At midnight, upon my return home, I invited five of the more moderate leaders to the defense minister's bureau for discussion of a possible solution. But early next morning, when I arrived at the Kirya (IDF headquarters) in Tel Aviv, waiting at the gate was Rabbi Levinger (whom I had not invited to the meeting). Out of politeness, I invited him to my office above the minister's bureau, and thus in a calm atmosphere we were able to have a discussion that was to the point and ended with an agreement to disperse the demonstration in return for the promise to establish a settlement at the Qadum camp that served as military police base.

Two days later Major General (Res.) Ariel Sharon, who at that time had no official position, walked into my office. He clapped me on the shoulder and said, "Tell Shimon, congratulations for having had the sense to arrive at an agreement without clashes."

I do not know who the advisors to the acting prime minister were who gave him such bad advice and led to the huge disgrace at Amona. Those who were responsible for the disgrace should be reprimanded, and perhaps put on trial (Haaretz Feb 10).

*The author has served as a member of the editorial board of Haaretz, Israeli consul general in the United States and vice chairman of the World Jewish Restitution Organization (WJRO).*

## **Hamas and the IRA** By Asaf Romirowsky

When Palestinians revealed their true colors electing Hamas to 74 seats in the Palestinian Legislative Council, the Arab world was dumb-struck. An Islamist terror group had finally snatched power from the ruling old guard and woke up the world to a new Middle East reality. But does Hamas' victory really represent the decisive shift where Palestinian politics began going down-hill?

Historians and students of current affairs often compare the Israeli-Palestinian conflict to that between Northern Ireland and the Irish Republican Army (IRA), in which an organization claiming to represent Catholics took up arms against Irish Protestants and the British. For decades, the IRA's modus operandi was slaying thousands of innocent men, women and children. It also utilized terror tactics such as human bombs, which involved chaining one of its unfortunate victims to the steering wheel of a lorry laden with explosives, which was then exploded. The IRA was Western Europe's most successful terror organization and has spread its malign tentacles across the globe. The parallels with Hamas are inescapable.

Since the IRA has disarmed, the IRA's days of major violence are behind, but certain comparisons are still instructive. Even when the IRA agreed to a cease-fire or a hudna they not only continued to plan but also implemented attacks. Splinter groups such as the 'Real IRA' continue to threaten and undertake smaller scale operations, although it is unclear whether these are in fact rogue operations or in fact sanctioned by the IRA itself. And most importantly, throughout the many years of negotiations, the IRA continually threatened to return to violence if its conditions were not met. So are Hamas and the IRA similar in their actions and practices? Can the IRA case help us predict Hamas' actions?

The IRA's willingness to accept a cease-fire was recognized as well received; however, the IRA's possession of illegal weapons quickly generated friction and tension that took years to overcome. Terrorist expert Ely Karmon explains the IRA's enduring attachment to arms and their difficulty with disarmament:

"No paramilitary organization - even those which ostensibly support the Belfast Agreement - is prepared to surrender its weapons. The Irish Times reports that hundreds of tons of weapons are said to be cached all over Ireland, 'from bunkers in the midlands and southwest of Ireland to concreted holes under kitchens in houses across Northern Ireland.'"[1]

It is also worth noting that the single most deadly bombing, the Omagh bombing of August 1998, took place after the signing of the Good Friday Agreement and its overwhelming approval by the Northern Irish electorate. The "Real IRA" was quickly repudiated by all parties. Still, these events brought into high relief the question of verifying IRA decommissioning, a problem that brought the peace process to a standstill. The IRA's vague promises of "putting weapons beyond use" were insufficient, and the crisis of 2002, where devolution was suspended and direct rule reintroduced nearly brought open warfare. It was not until the spectacular bank robbery of December 2004, in which the IRA was a suspect, and then the horrific beating death of Robert McCartney in January 2005, that unprecedented pressure was put on the IRA, even from Gerry Adams.

So based on the IRA model are we to expect Hamas to reform and democratize? Ironically before the elections it was the Fatah-controlled Palestinian Authority that continually refused to disarm Hamas. Now Hamas will become the Palestinian Authority. Having fought, literally, to keep its weapons for many years, the chances of Hamas voluntarily disarming are tiny, particularly since their ideology calls for continuing warfare against Israel and Jews.

All these contrasts come back to the one major difference between the IRA and Hamas -- religion. For the Irish, religion is not rooted in all facets of life as it is in with Israelis and Palestinians. Religion in Northern Ireland is understood as a cultural and historical force, while in the Middle East it ties Israelis and Palestinians to the same land. Furthermore, Hamas being a religious organization claims religious justifications for attempting to wipe out Israel. This factor is what differentiates the two groups and will ultimately prove how futile Hamas' reform efforts are.

There is a domestic side to Hamas' victory. Hamas popularity did not increase because of Abbas' weakness; it actually began even before Oslo as a political counter force to Arafat's PLO. And as Arafat's corruption grew, the support for Hamas within Palestinian society became stronger.

One of Hamas' biggest achievements is demonstrating its agility to differentiate between the short-term objective of a Palestinian State within the West Bank and Gaza and the long term objective of creating an Islamist State on the land of Palestine that would eliminate Israel. Maintaining this balance is what allowed Hamas to survive. But regardless of tactics, eliminating Israel is fundamental to Hamas' theology. For its part the IRA wanted England out of Ireland, not England out of England.

During the "Oslo - years of hope," while Arafat and the PLO were signing agreements with the "Zionist entity," Hamas was focusing on blowing up

Israelis and the peace process. And while Arafat and his cronies were living the good life on the backs of Palestinian society it was Hamas' schools and medical facilities that served the masses. Arafat knew he couldn't avoid the growing support for Hamas; thus, he paid them off as well as giving them his blessing for attacking Israel. As then Israeli Chief of Staff Lt.-Gen. Amnon Lipkin-Shahak told Israel Radio on March 23, 1997, "organizations such as Hamas and Islamic Jihad have an understanding from the Palestinian Authority to carry out attacks." Furthermore, in his early days in Egypt, Arafat was associated with the Muslim Brotherhood so it was not a stretch for this seemingly secular revolutionary to lend a hand to Hamas.

The Palestinian Authority's lack of control over extremists during Fatah's rule proved abortive and now under Hamas' leadership there is no doubt that Israelis require an unabated need for more security. The only positive outcome of these elections is now when the PA attacks Israelis there can be no hiding behind the canard of "extremists" who cannot be controlled. Furthermore, when the IRA bid farewell to its arms it was welcomed with open arms into the EU which translated into economical incentives. Palestinians, however, value their ideology of hate much more than they do such incentives, and they will not give it up no matter what the cost. (FrontPageMagazine.com Feb 14) Note 1: <http://www.ict.org.il/articles/articleDet.cfm?articleid=73>

### **Does Israel Have a Strategy?** By Ze'ev Schiff

What is Israel's strategy for dealing with the anticipated Hamas takeover of the Palestinian Authority? The government has decided that for now, Israel should carry on as if nothing has happened; in other words, as if Mahmoud Abbas - who failed to prevent terror, implement reforms and uphold his part in the road map peace plan - was still in power. Israel will continue to transfer money to the Palestinian Authority; the siege on the Gaza Strip will remain in place; and the West Bank will remain under military rule. The Qassam rockets will continue to land in Israel, and Israel will respond with targeted killings.

The idea behind this interim strategy is that Israel cannot be the cause of a humanitarian disaster in the territories while Abbas remains in office. As for the future, Acting Prime Minister Ehud Olmert has issued a warning that Israel will not cooperate with a Palestinian government that includes Hamas ministers.

This is not a comprehensive strategy, but rather a cautious move designed to win international support against Hamas in the future. For now, Israel is acting as if nothing has happened, as if the political clock on the Palestinian side has stopped. Clearly, however, Hamas will not forgo the opportunity that has come its way. The Palestinian Legislative Council will convene in the near future, and the chairman it elects will be a Hamas man, who will serve as deputy to President Abbas, in the event the latter resigns or retires for some reason or another.

Hamas has yet to decide on the political formula it will adopt without waiving its belligerent ideology. It is examining how to run the daily life of the Palestinian population under its leadership, and it is looking for ways and means to deceive the United States, Europe and other donor countries so that they continue sending money to the PA, without Hamas having to give up its ideology that calls for the destruction of Israel.

Thus, instead of talking about eliminating Israel, Hamas is speaking ambiguously about erasing the results of 1948. The international community has already come up with compromise proposals that come at the expense of Israeli security; for example, the so-called "Cohabitation" proposal, which speaks of a government in which Hamas and Fatah act in unison. This is a trap that will allow Hamas to work behind the scenes without changing. The current development is clearly leading to Hamas control, including control of the Palestinian security services. Instead of the Fatah representatives, Hamas officials will be the inspectors at the Rafah border between Egypt and Gaza.

The Palestinian public is fed up with Fatah and its corruption; but it did not elect former finance minister Salam Fayyad, an honest economist who wants peace, but Hamas, which calls for continuing the war. By the way, one cannot ignore the fact that quite a few Israelis, including former senior defense officials, benefited from that corruption as partners in various projects, like the Jericho casino.

It would be best if a dialogue were to develop between the majority of the Palestinian public, which seeks normalcy, and Hamas. This dialogue will not ensue if Israel continues to send money to the PA as if nothing has happened. Israel must exhibit unflinching determination when it comes to existential affairs, even if the harm done to Palestinians runs deep. To this end, Israel needs international support. The Israeli strategy must lead to a split in Hamas such that the pragmatists in the organization forgo the idea of destroying Israel, just as Fatah and the Palestine Liberation Organization did in their day.

If Hamas refuses to capitulate and keeps following its same line, Israel will become embroiled in a violent and harsh conflict. If it fails in this conflict, the deterioration will be widespread, and spill over into Jordan too. (Haaretz Feb 10)

### **The Ironies of the Cartoon Jihad** By Jackie Mason and Raoul Felder *Giving kultur kampff an entirely different meaning*

The Muslims have pronounced their verdict. The cartoon man has been found guilty. The real crime is, of course, not being a Muslim. Now that they have established the crime, they have also pronounced the sentence. Even if you never saw or heard of the cartoon, you deserve to be hit with rocks, your car wrecked, and your embassies destroyed because you are an infidel - and incidentally, there are no appeals. There was even television coverage of a Muslim religious leader screaming in some unintelligible language. However, on the bottom of the screen the translation appeared. This religious leader was shouting that whoever drew the cartoon should have his hands cut off. This hardly seems for us to be a reasonable penalty for somebody taking a piece of paper, picking up a pen, and drawing something.

Could you picture a Jew doing something like this? Ironically, the cartoonists were not even condemning Islam, they were merely creating a satire of a terrorist. They weren't insulting their religion, they were satirizing a fanatic. But, the Muslims have decided that there are no laws, limits, or boundaries that apply to their behavior. They not only have the right to take your life, they now have the right to rob you of your freedom of expression.

Could you picture a Jew killing anybody for such meaningless reasons? If a Jew gets mad he might sneak into your house and steal your lipitor or he would make a deal with your doctor to lie about your cholesterol number, or just when you have fasted a whole day on Yom Kippur when you finally could eat you would find that he snuck into your house and stole all your pastrami sandwiches.

I never saw a Jew going into meaningless fights. That is why you seldom see Jewish football players. A Jew is not going to take a chance in spraining his neck or tearing a ligament in his knee or wrinkling his clothes just because he was fighting with somebody about catching a ball. He would rather go to a store and buy another ball and avoid the whole problem. That is why there are also no Jewish hockey players. Hockey players spend all their time hitting each other in the mouth with sticks. When Jews saw how Gentiles played hockey that is how Jews found out that instead of becoming a hockey player they would become dentists, and that way they decided to let other people play the game while they found a way to make a profit from it.

Jews are never known to get into unnecessary physical battles. That is why people are never afraid of being attacked by a Jew. Did you ever hear anybody say, "Don't go into that neighborhood it is very dangerous, there are a lot of Jews there?" Jews have for so long been accustomed to being threatened and persecuted all over the world that they could never dream of creating needless violence anywhere because they would be grateful to even find a place where they are allowed to live in peace. Jews could never dream of threatening innocent people with inexcusable violence. Meanwhile the rest of the world is reacting to the Muslims with an amazing cowardice. Instead of a collective fury, we are pleading for forgiveness, and promising not to offend them with any more cartoons. Could anything be more perverted? The same people who are not offended by suicide bombers and terrorist killings, murder, mayhem, and destruction around the world have now decided that a cartoon... "OY VEY IS THIS TERRIBLE!"

Everyday Muslim and European newspapers insult and degrade Jews as animals and rodents, which is not only insulting but, additionally, encourages the hatred of Jews. But did you ever hear any Jewish authority anywhere demanding that we find any of these cartoonists so that we can choke them to death or cut them up. Did you ever hear of an Israeli death squad searching for a cartoonist? If the Jewish people applied the same insult standard requiring a death sentence no Muslim would be safe now, anywhere in the world. Could you picture a Jew deciding that he has the right to kill but you have no right to draw an insulting picture?

Nobody has ever died from a cartoon. If the worst thing the Nazis ever did had been to draw cartoons of death camps instead of putting Jews in them, six million Jews would be alive today. When was the last time any country decided to kill a Muslim anywhere in the world because they felt insulted? But the Muslims have created a new international law called the "insult law." This means they have the right to kill you whenever they please, and you have no right to do anything about it. If a Muslim were walking down a street in Israel with a picture of an insulting cartoon in hand, no Israeli would threaten his life. They would be too busy celebrating the fact that it was a cartoon and not a bomb. (Jewish World Review Feb 14)