



Jerusalem 5:00; Toronto 5:53

## 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*

### Commentary...

#### From Tannenbaum to Gaza

By Evelyn Gordon

The plea bargain reached between the state and Elhanan Tannenbaum last week has understandably generated considerable public anger. Yet offensive though it is, this deal is no more than a sideshow.

The real issue is the earlier deal that secured Tannenbaum's release from Hizbullah - and what, in light of the new information revealed by the plea bargain, that exchange says about the judgment of the people running our country.

Tannenbaum, a civilian who holds the rank of colonel in the army reserves, was kidnapped by Hizbullah in October 2000 and freed in a prisoner exchange this January. Under the deal, Israel released 400 Palestinians, 23 Lebanese and 13 citizens of other countries, mostly Arab, who had been jailed for hostile activity against Israel; it also returned the bodies of 60 Lebanese killed in clashes with the IDF.

In exchange, Israel received Tannenbaum plus the bodies of three Israeli soldiers killed by Hizbullah.

This was clearly a terrible deal for Israel. Not only did it encourage further terrorist kidnappings by proving that they pay off handsomely (Hizbullah itself started threatening new kidnappings the very day of the exchange), it also greatly expanded the circle of potential Israeli targets. Previously, all terrorist kidnap attempts had targeted soldiers since the government felt obliged to pay ransom only for soldiers captured in the line of duty.

In the Tannenbaum deal Israel paid an exorbitant price for a civilian - turning Israeli civilians anywhere on the globe into attractive targets. The deal also made Hizbullah - one of the leading financiers and organizers of terrorist attacks against Israel, and therefore an organization that Israel has every interest in discrediting - into a pan-Arab hero, allowing it to claim credit for "liberating" prisoners from throughout the Arab world.

And finally, it put 400 Palestinian terrorists back on the streets - of whom, based on Shin Bet statistics from previous prisoner exchanges, some 50 percent will probably resume terrorist activity.

For all these reasons, the deal seemed wildly irresponsible. Yet at the time, it was possible to argue that perhaps the government knew something the rest of us did not - something that somehow justified the transaction.

This weekend, however, all the hidden details were revealed: As part of the plea bargain Tannenbaum gave his Israeli interrogators the full story of his capture in exchange for a promise that he will not do jail time. And it turns out that he was kidnapped from Dubai while trying to conclude a drug deal with a man Israel's security services have fingered as a top Hizbullah agent.

In other words, our government endangered all our lives, in all the ways enumerated above, to rescue a drug dealer who is buddy-buddy with Hizbullah operatives.

Moreover, the cabinet knew this when it approved the exchange: The whole story had been published in the media, attributed to government sources. Yet the government brazenly declared those reports to be unsubstantiated rumor.

A POSSIBLE clue to the government's motives can be found in another bit of information revealed by the media this weekend: Throughout the three years of Tannenbaum's captivity the army paid his family the salary of a full colonel, even though Tannenbaum was not on active reserve duty at the time of his capture.

This is the same army that has spent the last three years claiming that it lacks the funds to buy bulletproof vests for all its soldiers - a shortage that has caused untold needless deaths in Palestinian attacks. Yet somehow it found the money to pay three years of a colonel's salary - a sum sufficient to buy hundreds of flak jackets - to someone who had no claim to it at all, just because he was "one of the boys."

It is admittedly outrageous that Tannenbaum, whose confessed crimes are enough to put him behind bars for years, will do no jail time at all under the plea bargain unless he proves to have also spied for Hizbullah. Yet even if he spent the rest of his life behind bars it would do nothing to ameliorate the enormous damage caused by the deal that bought his freedom from Hizbullah. Thus to fret about the plea bargain is to fret about a triviality.

Instead, the focus should be on learning lessons for the future - because Prime Minister Ariel Sharon and Defense Minister Shaul Mofaz are already trying to sell us another dubious deal, which needs to be evaluated in light of what the Tannenbaum affair tells us about their judgment. That deal is called unilateral withdrawal from Gaza.

Under Sharon's withdrawal plan, Israel would give the Palestinians every inch of Gaza while receiving nothing at all in exchange. It would even uproot settlements - a key Palestinian demand, to which Israel has hitherto refused to accede outside the context of a permanent agreement. Not surprisingly, every armed Palestinian organization has declared this a major victory for terrorist tactics, and even moderates have been forced to concur that terrorism has won for nothing what negotiations would only have achieved

at a substantial price.

Thus the withdrawal plan, like the Tannenbaum deal, appears to provide a major incentive for more terrorism. And Sharon, just as in the Tannenbaum deal, is trying to counter this charge by claiming that ordinary citizens lack the complete picture available to the prime minister.

Unfortunately, that "complete picture" is now available in Tannenbaum's case - and it is a picture of a prime minister willing to sacrifice vital national security interests for the sake of a drug dealer who happens to be "one of the boys." With the Tannenbaum deal, Sharon forfeited any claim to the nation's trust. He deserves no benefit of the doubt on Gaza. (Jerusalem Post March 1)

#### Jibril Rajoub's Chums By Nadav Haetzni

*Over a juicy steak dinner, Jibril Rajoub, terrorist envoy of the Muqata, managed to trick Israeli journalists once again. Oslo's jolly days of deception are back.*

Two weeks ago, Jibril Rajoub invited Israeli journalists to a press conference in Ramallah. Rajoub, if you recall, was once regarded by the GSS as the shining knight in armor, who would vanquish the terrorists. He proved to be a disappointment, his offices were destroyed and his power eliminated. But lately he's back serving the Chairman, setting up propaganda meetings with Israeli journalists.

The meeting two weeks ago started as it always does, but at some point the Palestinian general managed to get everybody over to the Bardouny restaurant. There, over spare ribs and juicy steaks, despair seemed a lot more comfortable.

The results of this successful journalistic event were visible in the foreign and Israeli press immediately after. The message Rajoub relayed went down well in the stomach, and appeared in Israel well chewed and processed. The headlines quoted the Palestinian functionary as promising that if Israel withdrew from Gaza, the PA would prevent Hamas from taking control and would fight the organization. What Rajoub's promises are worth we all know already. But the Israeli journalists didn't see any reason to make his life difficult. When the message serves the interests of Sharon's evacuation plan, and it digests well, who asks questions?

Just to remind you that the steak dinner at Bardouny's took place just three weeks after a terrorist from the Al-Aqsa Martyr's Brigades-Rajoub and his master's organization-blew himself up on a bus in Jerusalem. The terrorist came from Bethlehem, a city that Rajoub and his cohorts have taken over responsibility for, and which has since become a capital of terror. A week after the gluttony at Bardouny's, another Bethlehemite from the Al-Aqsa Brigades massacred Jerusalem teenagers on their way to school by bus. If there were any difficult questions about this that may have concerned the journalists, it certainly didn't show up in their articles. The propaganda was slipped in deceitfully and only its tip could be discerned.

The culinary event with the terrorist envoy from the Muqata, gives us an extreme example of a new but old phenomenon-the return of Israeli journalism to the murky patterns of Oslo. Lately the fashion is to hear senior Israeli journalists beating their breasts over the journalistic treatment of the Oslo proves. In their words, the blind devotion with which the Israeli media accepted the disastrous fantasy tales of the day are widely agreed upon. But this admission does not prevent the media from repeating the same mistakes in a big way. Once again we are receiving selective reports about good terrorists and bad terrorists. Once again the most elemental questions are not being asked. Once again the media is helping the ones who will realize the senior journalist's convictions.

For example, in the last two bus massacres in Jerusalem, we received laconic reports of Fatah terrorists taking responsibility for the attacks. But no further journalistic inquiries were made or reported. The government, as we know, did nothing in light of the horrible events, and neither did the media. No questions asked about Sharon's logic in dealing with the events. No investigation explodes before us-Sharon and the PA enjoy a pleasant backwind from the media.

As part of this trend, no questions were asked about last week's raid on several banks in Ramallah. The raid focused on the bank accounts of the

**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](http://www.bayt.org)**



our Christian fundamentalists – the "home-grown Talibans," as The New York Times's Frank Rich called them, in the course of demanding that John Ashcroft, the attorney-general, round them up.

Two years on, if this thesis is going to hold up, these Christians really need to get off their fundamentalist butts and start killing more people.

Critics berating Gibson for lingering on the physical flogging of Jesus would be more persuasive if they weren't all too desperately flogging their own dead horse of fundamentalist moral equivalence.

The more puzzling question is why so many American Jewish leaders started crying anti-Semitism months before anyone had even seen the picture. It requires a perverse inability to prioritize to anoint Mel Gibson as the prime source of resurgent anti-Semitism. Not to mention that it's self-defeating.

As Melanie Phillips, a British Jew, recently noted in The Observer: "Let us all agree on one thing at least. The more Jews warn that anti-Semitism has come roaring out of the closet, the more people don't like the Jews."

There's something to that. During the New Hampshire primary, I prompted the following complaint from Barbara Baruch of New York: "What motivated Mark Steyn to describe Joe Lieberman as the 'Yiddisher pixie'? As this has absolutely no relevance to Lieberman's political viability, it's obvious that Steyn's linguistic choice is nothing less than insidious anti-Semitism."

Oh, phooey. I called him a pixie because, in contrast to John Kerry, he was jolly and beaming, and yiddisher is an allusion to the old song "My Yiddisher Momma," since Joe was always going on about his own momma. "Yiddisher pixie" is a term of affection, and the best way to demonstrate the preposterousness of Baruch's assertion is a simple test:

Try to imagine Sheikh Akram Abd-al-Razzaq al-Ruqayhi, the A-list imam at the Grand Mosque in Sanaa, who does the Friday prayers live on Yemeni state TV, breaking off from his usual patter on Jews – "O God, count them one by one, kill them all and don't leave anyone" – to refer to one as a "Yiddisher pixie." Or the members of Calgary's "Palestinian community" who marched through the streets carrying placards emblazoned "Death To The Jews."

Or the gangs who've been torching French synagogues, kosher butchers and schools in an ongoing mini-intifada.

Or Archbishop Desmond Tutu who says people should not be scared of America's Jewish lobby because other scary types like "Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin, Pinochet, Milosevic and Idi Amin were all powerful, but in the end they bit the dust."

Or the wife of European Central Banker Wim Duisenberg, who amuses herself by doing oven jokes in public.

Mel Gibson's movie won't kill anyone.

On the other hand, right now, at The Hague, the International Court of Justice is holding a show trial of Israel's security fence. At the very least, a European court sitting in judgment on the Jewish state is a staggering lapse of taste.

But it should also remind Jews of the current sources of "the world's oldest hatred" – not just the Islamic world, where talk of killing them all is part of the wallpaper, but modern-day secular Europe, where antipathy toward Ariel Sharon long ago crossed over into a broader contempt for the Jewish state and a benign indifference to those who use European Jewry as a substitute target.

If Jewish groups think Mel Gibson and evangelical Christians are the problem, more fool them. (Jerusalem Post Mar 3)

*The writer is senior contributing editor for Hollinger Inc.*

## Stop Terrorists' Vehicle of Choice By Alan M. Dershowitz

*BUSTED! Israelis capture an Arab 'ambulance bomb'*

How should democracies like the U.S. and Israel respond to terrorist attacks that use ambulances loaded with explosives?

Terrorists deliberately employ these protected vehicles for two reasons: to fool those whose job it is to prevent acts of terrorism and - the more long-range reason - to provoke the democracies into violating human rights laws by stopping real ambulances and people in medical need.

This pattern appears to be spreading. In October, an ambulance was used to blow up a Red Cross headquarters in Iraq. In January, an ambulance blew up a Baghdad hotel. Also in January, a woman feigning injury blew up four Israelis at a checkpoint. In several other instances, ambulances carrying explosives were stopped by Israeli officials before they could do any damage.

These ploys exploit the sympathy of decent security guards toward sick civilians. Equally cruel and cynical, the terrorists deliberately seek to increase the suffering of their own people by having them subjected to cumbersome security checks during real medical emergencies.

Human rights groups and international organizations play into the terrorists' hands by condemning democracies for violating international law whenever they delay real ambulances. In this so-called cycle of violence, the interference with medical care generates more resentment and more suicide bombings.

But in reality, it is anything but an actual cycle. It is a deliberate ploy. The terrorists increase the suffering of their own people and then exploit it to encourage more terrorists and more condemnation of the victims of terrorism. It is a cycle, but it is caused entirely by the calculated actions of the terrorists.

Some who sympathize with the terrorists are outraged (or at least pretend outrage) at the suggestion that terrorist leaders would deliberately devise a strategy that subjects their own people - especially sick people and children - to delays and searches. But that is the reality of terrorism.

Why then do the democracies fall into this trap? What else could they do but subject all suspicious ambulances, people seeking medical assistance and children to searches? Even when the net is cast narrowly, it will inevitably catch innocent people.

In 2002, the Supreme Court of Israel confronted the issue of how a democracy deals with terrorists who use ambulances and hospitals to facilitate

terrorism. It ruled that the Israeli military must abide by the letter of the law, even though it will increase Israel's casualties.

Terrorist leaders have exploited this humane ruling and similar ones by American authorities by increasing their use of ambulances. This exploitation will end only when human rights groups focus their criticism on terrorists rather than on democracies that properly stop ambulances that may well contain explosives.

Every weekday JewishWorldReview.com publishes what many in Washington and in the media consider "must reading." Sign up for the daily JWR update. It's free. Just click here. (Jewish World Review March 2)  
*The writer is a Harvard law professor whose most recent book is "The Case for Israel."*

## A Safe Place for What? By Jonathan Tobin

*If 'liberal politics' says it's not okay to be pro-Israel, then the problem is with liberal politics, not Israel*

A generation ago, Jewish students stormed the citadels of American Jewish power, intent on changing the way our institutions did business.

The focus of the Jewish students of the 1970s was on getting a tired and disengaged organizational world to speak up about the plight of Soviet Jewry, and to infuse more Jewish sensibilities and practice into the arid and elitist alphabet-soup groups that composed the establishment of that time. Jewish kids wanted action and bold leadership.

Though it was often hard to discern then, the protests were heard, and, over the course of time, had a tremendous impact on Jewish life in this country. What are Jewish students complaining about today?

To listen to some of the young people I met at the annual plenum of the Jewish Council for Public Affairs this week, you'd think their main problem is just the opposite - they believe the organized Jewish world is pressuring them for more activism than they find comfortable.

To be more specific, what they are uncomfortable with is what they perceive as a mandate to march in lockstep with the Israeli government and to be gung-ho supporters of anything undertaken by the Jewish state.

An unscientific poll of students who attended a session on how groups should deal with dissent on Israel seemed to indicate that they felt themselves particularly queasy about unapologetic advocacy for Israel. I'm not sure that these kids were that representative. Yet it was significant that many of those I talked with felt that Hillel, the main focus of Jewish life on campus, was too Israel-centric. As one young campus activist put it, students needed a "safe place" to be Jewish that didn't necessarily include support for, let alone advocacy for, Israel.

But even for those who didn't wish to divorce themselves from Israel, a distinct distaste for anything that smacked of allegiance to the position of the government led by Ariel Sharon rippled above the surface.

What they wanted was the freedom to express opposition to policies such as the security fence and settlements, and what they consider harsh treatment of Palestinians by Israel.

Their point was that American college campuses are places where hostility to Israel runs deep. So in order to influence those who are not already supportive of Israel - a group that may well include the majority of Jewish students - what they need to do is to soft-pedal advocacy and make it clear that they stand apart from the "hard-core" Jewish position.

Yet interestingly, the culprit for them was not the atmosphere of bias against Israel but what they consider an oppressively pro-Israel agenda that was being foisted upon them. As one participant in the panel on this topic put it, there was "a lot of pain" expressed by these students.

I can sympathize to a certain extent with their dilemma. But only to a point. Because if these kids think they are feeling pain, how would they characterize the emotions of an Israeli people that has undergone 31/2 years of a Palestinian terrorist war that has taken nearly 1,000 Jewish lives?

I don't doubt that advocacy for Israel can help isolate them at school.

Nobody wants to be considered hopelessly out of touch with the spirit of their own time. But my not-very-comforting response to these students is that sometimes, that's just what the situation requires.

As one young woman pointed out, the dominant "liberal politics" of the campus "dictates it's not okay to be pro-Israel." My response is that if that is true, then the fault lies with campus "liberal politics," and not with Israel. Even more to the point, I have to wonder why some of these students feel that the only way they can successfully engage the virulent opponents of Zionism at their schools is by joining in the chorus of criticism of Israeli policies.

Israel is an imperfect society, and its politics are rife with all of the usual corruptions and inefficiencies that bedevil any democracy. It has its own diverse political culture, and there is nothing said here about it that isn't a distant echo of some internal Israeli debate.

But none of those concerns have anything to do with the basic argument of the Arab-Israeli conflict: whether or not the Jews have a right to live in peace and sovereignty in their ancient homeland. And it is that point - and not the disputes about the legality of settlements and the location of a security fence - that are at stake here.

If the only kind of Jewish state that a student can support is one that is perfect - or at least in conformity with the sensibilities of the American political left - then what we are effectively saying is that it isn't possible to support any kind of Jewish state.

And why is it that Israel's campus foes are not similarly inclined to note the shortcomings of the Palestinians?

If a Jewish student wishes to engage in dialogue with a pro-Palestinian

group, then I say, by all means, speak out about all of your criticisms of Sharon and Israel. But do so only if your dialogue partners are willing to stipulate that the Palestinian Authority is a corrupt, terrorist mafia that routinely abuses the human rights of its own people.

If they are not willing to do that, and if, in fact, they take the position that Israel has no right to exist as a Jewish state, I have to ask why any Jewish student feels the need to establish common ground with them.

And the idea that Jewish organizations are pressuring these students is farcical. The truth is, groups like Hillel welcome anyone who wants to connect with other Jewish kids, with no Sharon loyalty pledges required. The real pressure being felt by some of these Jewish students is the need to conform to left-wing campus fashion.

Despite what I heard from some at the plenum, I still think most Jewish students want to embrace Israel and are willing to speak out in its defense. Those who are unafraid to speak out against the lies and invective of the anti-Israel crowd, even when this faction is led (as it is, more often than not) by faculty rather than other students deserve every bit of help we can give them. As for the pain felt by those whose views keep them on the sidelines of the debate, I say get over it.

Or even better, start questioning your own political assumptions.

(Jewish World Review March 1)

*The writer is the Executive Editor of the Philadelphia Jewish Exponent.*

---

## Why We Support Israeli Settlements

By Daniel Kaganovich and Michael Butler

An old joke tells of two men sitting together, complaining about the many problems in the world. Unable to contain the frustration any longer, one of them bursts out "It's all the fault of the Jews and the plumbers!" The other one looks at him, bewildered, and asks "Why the plumbers??"

So too today, the most striking aspect of the discourse on Israel and the Middle East is not the irrationality and malice of the accusations routinely leveled against the Jewish people, but the extent to which an absurd double standard towards Jews is so thoroughly taken for granted that accusing the Jews is seen as the normal course of things.

Consider the astonishing asymmetry that dominates the debate of Jewish versus Arab rights in the Middle East.

The right of Arabs to worship at the Muslim Holy site in Jerusalem, the Noble Sanctuary, is considered sacred (and perhaps rightly so). Yet an affirmation of the equally valid religious desire of a Jew to pray at the same site which also happens to be important to the Jewish faith is looked down upon as an outdated, almost infantile expression of religious backwardness. An Arab walking on the Temple Mount is religious freedom personified. A Jew walking on the Temple Mount is considered a dangerous provocation.

Nowhere is this asymmetry more profound than in the discourse on Israeli "settlements" in Judea and Samaria (the West Bank of the Jordan River).

The word "settlement" itself has acquired negative connotations and when used in the familiar formula "Israeli settlements on Arab land" automatically concedes the superiority of the Arab claim to the West Bank. We do not concede this claim; neither does the State of Israel. Thus, we would like to engage in the Middle Eastern debate by attempting to tackle one of its most contentious and serious aspects --- the issue of settlements.

The claim of the Jewish people to the entire land of Israel, including the West Bank, is certainly as strong, and arguably much stronger, than the corresponding Arab claim. That some Israeli governments have deemed it politically expedient to propose relinquishing the West Bank and Gaza does not change this.

The Jews have a historic claim to the land as there have been Jewish communities in much of Israel (including Hebron, Zfat, Jerusalem, and Shehem) for the past 3,300 years.

The land of Israel is also central to the Jewish religion - for the past two thousand years Jews face Jerusalem during prayer, and every year at Passover say: "next year in Jerusalem."

The Jews have a military claim as well to land they won in defensive war - the single most common justification of possession by any people of any land.

Yet, whereas Arab settlement in the West Bank is considered perfectly legitimate, Jewish communities there are slandered as a "threat to peace," "provocation to violence," "occupation," and many things worse. Often these accusations are constructed with a deliberately evasive or passive reference to the "violence" that the settlements "provoke," in order to deflect attention from the actual perpetrators of the violence.

Most Jewish communities in the West Bank are there to do nothing more than cultivate and reclaim the ancient land of the Jewish people. Why is this an affront to Arab dignity? Why is it permissible to advocate the removal of Jews living in the Judea and Samaria settlements? Would it be equally acceptable to call for the eviction of all Arabs living in areas of Jewish majority in Israel for solely ethnic reason?

Let us examine for a moment why "the settlements" are such a threat to peace and to their Arab neighbors. Surely the fact that Arabs lay claim to a particular piece of land is not reason enough to evict every non-Arab (the fact that many Middle Eastern Arabs and most of their leaders claim the entire world for Islam makes this approach difficult if not impossible). Furthermore, given that Arabs have 22 countries on 99.8% of the land in the Middle East while Jews only claim one very small slice of land, any Arab demands for land in Israel, even if they were legitimate, must necessarily be viewed in the context of this significant asymmetry.

Often the accusation is leveled against settlements (especially those in Gaza) that whole divisions of Israeli Defense Forces are needed to defend them. The presence of troops in any area obviously breeds tension - thus the settlements

are guilty by association. Yet, the only reason why such a thorough defense of Jewish communities in the West Bank and Gaza is even necessary is because these communities are constant targets of Arab terrorism.

What a shame that much of the world community and critics of Israel in particular have come to take for granted the fact that Jewish children in the West Bank have to be bused to school in bullet-proof vans. Settlements and Israel are routinely blamed for the violence perpetrated against them without even a cursory thought being given to its actual perpetrators and their motivations, as though Arab violence was some sort of natural law, akin to gravity, that one ignores at one's own peril.

It is amazing that in this day and age we consider it normal for the requirement of soldiers to protect Jews in cities with large Arab populations. Walking in Eastern Jerusalem or in Hebron should not be a life threatening endeavor for Jews, even if Israel was (to borrow a line from the French ambassador to London) the shittiest little country in the world. Imagine the public outcry if the tables were turned - if there was an Arab minority amidst a vast Jewish population that was so frequently subject to random attacks inspired by ethnic hatred that hundreds of soldiers were needed simply to prevent them from being slaughtered.

The reason why Jews must "understandably" fear for their lives when amidst a large Arab population while Arabs can walk around downtown Tel Aviv without the slightest care in the world has to do with the difference between the two cultures and what they stand for. Judaism and the Jewish State embody respect for individuality, freedom, and pluralism.

A core tenet of Judaism is the idea that Judaism is not the only culture worthy of admiration, that human beings exist in a variety of cultures each of which is worthy of its own dignity and respect. Large segments of Arab Muslim society have, on the other hand, internalized the ideology of totalitarianism -- the idea that Islamic faith and culture is the only one that deserves to exist.

Islamic fundamentalism in the Middle East has carefully eradicated pluralism, dissent, and freedom from within its midst, while its imperial aspirations have extended not only to Israel but to the entire planet. The incompatibility of this universal or imperial Islam with cultural and ideological diversity has made Israel, a small independent non-Muslim enclave in a region otherwise dominated by Muslims, its most bitter enemy.

The truth is as simple as it is unpopular to acknowledge. Jews and not settlements are offensive to Arabs. A tiny Jewish community on less than one percent of the land in the vastly under-populated Middle East is so abhorrent to surrounding Arab peoples that they have initiated five wars, starved themselves and their children, deprived their countries of even the very basic freedoms of expression and human rights, all this to destroy a tiny Jewish State.

While Israeli society is trying to train the next generation of doctors, scientists, and Nobel Laureates; Hamas, Fatah, and Yasser Arafat are training the next generation of suicide bombers.

Why are we so concerned with settlements? Because the settlements are a model for the Arab-Israeli conflict at large - only Arabs can end the violence because it is only their hatred of anything non-Muslim that perpetuates it.

Imperial expansionist Islam, an ideology that has for too long been sweeping through the Middle East unchecked and enjoying widespread popular support, must be recognized as a misanthropic ideology not unlike Nazism and Soviet Communism. Such ideologies are not contained by deferring to the malicious demands of their proponents.

Calling for an a priori removal of any trace of Jews in Judea and Samaria might seem like a practical solution that seeks to minimize violence by minimizing the "friction" between Arabs and Jews. However, in as much as this "friction" represents Arabs shooting any Jewish child not protected by a concrete wall and is caused by a demented hatred for Jews taught to Arab children from infancy, removing the source of the "friction" (Jews) will not make a dent in the ideology that causes it. It will only encourage its spread.

Suggesting that the proper response to Arab violence is the destruction, or as some euphemistically call it "dismantling," of Jewish communities in the West Bank (or anywhere for that matter) is analogous to a Harvard University president who, in the 1970s, decided to enact quotas that reduced the number of Jews at Harvard citing as justification the rise of anti-Semitic incidents there. It never crossed his mind to decrease the number of anti-Semites.

Imperial Islam is a threat not only to the message of Israel but to all ideologies of tolerance and pluralism, including our own in America. In this sense Israel is the test case for democracy in the Middle East, its last hope and its strongest catalyst.

Because imperial Islam is a threat to the very nations which have embraced it, poisoning the minds of their young generations, the success and security of Israel is also the last hope for moderate Muslims.

We hope that Jews and Muslims understand that there is no easy solution to the conflict, no Gaza settlement that, once gone, will bring peace.

The future depends on the ability of the Jewish State to continue forcefully resisting the ideology of hatred, while asserting its own positive message of Jewish empowerment and self-determination, tolerance for cultural diversity, and freedom. (Stanford Review Feb 12)

*Daniel Kaganovich, a doctoral student in Biological Sciences, and Michael Butler, a senior in Anthropological Science.*

---