



Jerusalem 5:03 Toronto 5:59

Quote of the Week...

Arab-American Psychologist Wafa Sultan: There Is No Clash of Civilizations but a Clash between the Mentality of the Middle Ages and That of the 21st Century

Following are excerpts from an interview with Arab-American psychologist Wafa Sultan. The interview was aired on Al-Jazeera TV on February 21, 2006

Wafa Sultan: The clash we are witnessing around the world is not a clash of religions, or a clash of civilizations. It is a clash between two opposites, between two eras. It is a clash between a mentality that belongs to the Middle Ages and another mentality that belongs to the 21st century. It is a clash between civilization and backwardness, between the civilized and the primitive, between barbarity and rationality. It is a clash between freedom and oppression, between democracy and dictatorship. It is a clash between human rights, on the one hand, and the violation of these rights, on the other hand. It is a clash between those who treat women like beasts, and those who treat them like human beings. What we see today is not a clash of civilizations. Civilizations do not clash, but compete.

Host: I understand from your words that what is happening today is a clash between the culture of the West, and the backwardness and ignorance of the Muslims?

Wafa Sultan: Yes, that is what I mean.

[...]

Host: Who came up with the concept of a clash of civilizations? Was it not Samuel Huntington? It was not Bin Laden. I would like to discuss this issue, if you don't mind...

Wafa Sultan: The Muslims are the ones who began using this expression. The Muslims are the ones who began the clash of civilizations. The Prophet of Islam said: "I was ordered to fight the people until they believe in Allah and His Messenger." When the Muslims divided the people into Muslims and non-Muslims, and called to fight the others until they believe in what they themselves believe, they started this clash, and began this war. In order to start this war, they must reexamine their Islamic books and curricula, which are full of calls for takfir and fighting the infidels.

My colleague has said that he never offends other people's beliefs. What civilization on the face of this earth allows him to call other people by names that they did not choose for themselves? Once, he calls them Ahl Al-Dhimma, another time he calls them the "People of the Book," and yet another time he compares them to apes and pigs, or he calls the Christians "those who incur Allah's wrath." Who told you that they are "People of the Book"? They are not the People of the Book, they are people of many books. All the useful scientific books that you have today are theirs, the fruit of their free and creative thinking. What gives you the right to call them "those who incur Allah's wrath," or "those who have gone astray," and then come here and say that your religion commands you to refrain from offending the beliefs of others?

I am not a Christian, a Muslim, or a Jew. I am a secular human being. I do not believe in the supernatural, but I respect others' right to believe in it.

Dr. Ibrahim Al-Khouli: Are you a heretic?

Wafa Sultan: You can say whatever you like. I am a secular human being who does not believe in the supernatural...

Dr. Ibrahim Al-Khouli: If you are a heretic, there is no point in rebuking you, since you have blasphemed against Islam, the Prophet, and the Koran...

Wafa Sultan: These are personal matters that do not concern you.

[...]

Wafa Sultan: Brother, you can believe in stones, as long as you don't throw them at me. You are free to worship whoever you want, but other people's beliefs are not your concern, whether they believe that the Messiah is God, son of Mary, or that Satan is God, son of Mary. Let people have their beliefs.

[...]

Wafa Sultan: The Jews have come from the tragedy (of the Holocaust), 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*

בס"ט

forced the world to respect them, with their knowledge, not with their terror, with their work, not their crying and yelling. Humanity owes most of the discoveries and science of the 19th and 20th centuries to Jewish scientists. 15 million people, scattered throughout the world, united and won their rights through work and knowledge. We have not seen a single Jew blow himself up in a German restaurant. We have not seen a single

Jew destroy a church. We have not seen a single Jew protest by killing people. The Muslims have turned three Buddha statues into rubble. We have not seen a single Buddhist burn down a Mosque, kill a Muslim, or burn down an embassy. Only the Muslims defend their beliefs by burning down churches, killing people, and destroying embassies. This path will not yield any results. The Muslims must ask themselves what they can do for humankind, before they demand that humankind respect them. (MEMRI/NaomiRagen.com Mar 6)

In the PA Media...

Child's Song Echoes Distorted Adult Values

By Itamar Marcus and Barbara Crook

A recent interview with a child musician on Palestinian Authority Television features a performance by the child that illustrates the hateful and distorted values that Palestinian children have learned and internalized.

The child, who appears to be about 13, is interviewed about a CD he has produced, and sings one of the songs from the CD. The short song repeats hate motifs that have appeared repeatedly in formal and informal education in Palestinian society for many years, such as the liberation of Palestine, which is the Palestinian Authority term for Israel's destruction, the "return" of the "refugees" to the liberated land, and finally the aspiration to die as a shahid (martyr).

It is also noteworthy that the adults in the studio clap and cheer "Bravo!" after the song, which concludes with the words: "Allah Akbar, we will die as martyrs!" Aspiring to die for Allah continues to be presented as a high value to children in Palestinian society.

A Palestinian child, Mahmoud Marish, singing a song from his CD, PA TV February 28, 2006:

"I am your mother, I am Palestine
I have been calling you for years
This is our day, this is our holiday
Your liberation day, O our country

The return of the refugees to their homes safe and sound
Allah Akbar, (God is Great) how sweet is the self-sacrifice!
Allah Akbar, (God is Great) we will die as shahids (martyrs)!
Allah Akbar, (God is Great) how sweet is the self-sacrifice!
Allah Akbar, (God is Great) we will die as shahids (martyrs)!"

Moderators: "Bravo! Applause!" [PA TV, February 28, 2006] (Palestinian Media Watch Mar 6)

Commentary...

Does Democracy End Tyranny? By Natan Sharansky

Can the skeptics be right? Is it simply too dangerous to promote freedom in the Arab world? Must the United States give up on promoting democracy and go back to supporting authoritarian governments that do its bidding?

The U.S. agenda to promote democracy in the Middle East appears fatally wounded. The results of recent elections in Iraq, Egypt and especially Gaza and the West Bank have led many to conclude that this agenda is terribly misguided: wonderful in theory but disastrous in practice, enabling the most dangerous and antidemocratic elements in the region to gain power through democratic means.

If true, this is certainly a worrisome turn of events. Can the skeptics be right? Is it simply too dangerous to promote freedom in the Arab world? Must

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 and www.frumtoronto.com Visit the *Israel News Blog* at 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 United States give up on promoting democracy and go back to supporting authoritarian governments that do its bidding?

That was the old policy. But foreign policy "realism" - the notion that the free world could buy security by supporting repressive dictators who would act in American national interests - collapsed on 9/11. That was when it became clear to many policymakers that regimes that repressed their subjects were creating breeding grounds of fanaticism and terror.

Today, many people believe that the antidote to fanaticism is to open these societies to dissent, to the free exchange of ideas, to the opportunities offered by a free market and to the hope that comes with democratic life.

Based on this diagnosis, President Bush launched a bold policy that promised to give democracy a central place in American statecraft. In terms of rhetoric, the change was indeed dramatic. In his second inaugural address, Bush promised to support democratic movements everywhere with the goal of "ending tyranny" in our world. By declaring terrorists to be our enemies and democrats to be our partners, Bush injected an indispensable dose of moral clarity into U.S. policy.

But, despite what I believe to be the president's genuine commitment to promote sweeping change, the policy shift hasn't matched the rhetoric, with one glaring exception: an intense focus on holding elections everywhere as quickly as possible. This has been a mistake because, although elections are part of the democratic process, they are never a substitute for it.

I believed this when I submitted a plan to Ariel Sharon in April 2002 for a political process that would culminate in the creation of a peaceful, democratic Palestinian state alongside Israel. At the time, no one was thinking seriously about peace because, after the worst month of terror attacks in Israel's history, we had launched a large-scale military operation to root out the infrastructure of terrorism in the West Bank.

I believed, however, that the crisis presented an opportunity to begin a different kind of political process, one that would link the peace process to the development of a free society for Palestinians. I had argued for many years that peace and security could be achieved only by linking international legitimacy, territorial concessions and financial assistance for a new Palestinian regime to its commitment to building a free society.

Despite my faith in "democracy," I was under no illusion that elections should be held immediately. Over the previous decade, Palestinian society had become one of the most poisoned and fanatical on Earth. Day after day, on television and radio, in newspapers and schools, a generation of Palestinians had been subjected to the most vicious incitement by their own leaders. The only "right" that seemed to be upheld within Palestinian areas was the right of everyone to bear arms.

In such conditions of fear, intimidation and indoctrination, holding snap elections would have been an act of the utmost irresponsibility. That is why I proposed a plan calling for elections to be held no earlier than three years after the implementation of a series of democratic reforms. Three years, I believed, was the absolute minimum for democratic reforms to begin to change the atmosphere in which free elections could be held. Unfortunately, the plan was never implemented.

The recent election of Hamas is the fruit of a policy that focused on the form of democracy (elections) rather than its substance (building and protecting a free society). Rather than push for quick elections, the democratic world must use its considerable moral, political and economic leverage to help build free societies in the Middle East. We should tie trade privileges to economic freedoms, encourage foreign diplomats to meet openly with dissidents and link aid to the protection of dissidents (as Bush did when he helped force the release of Egyptian democracy advocate Saad Eddin Ibrahim).

Any regime, elected or not, that works to build a free society should be seen as a partner, if not a friend. Likewise, any regime, elected or not, that chokes freedom should be seen as an adversary, if not an enemy. Obviously, any regime that supports terrorism is hostile to the most fundamental principles of a free society and should therefore be treated as an enemy.

Helping democracy take root in the Arab world will take time and persistence. Most Arab governments will try to stamp out any spark of liberty. But the democrats within these societies are our partners. We can help them by refusing to support those who repress them, and by making clear through both our statements and our policies that the efforts to expand freedom within their societies will benefit their countries as much as ours. The alternative is to return to the pre-9/11 delusion that a tyrant's repression of his own subjects has no consequences for us. (Jewish World Review Mar 7)

The writer, a distinguished fellow at the Shalem Center in Israel, is a former Soviet dissident who spent nine years in a KGB prison. Later, he served as a member of the Israeli government. He is the author of "Case for Democracy: The Power of Freedom to Overcome Tyranny and Terror".

Who Will Deter Whom? By Ze'ev Schiff 2006

Israel should not scoff at Iran's growing power as a regional force and the dangers of the worldview of its radical regime. Iran may have made some mistakes, but it has achieved some outstanding accomplishments. While the

world is busy only with its efforts to acquire nuclear arms, it has managed over the years, through a sophisticated move in cooperation with the Syrians and Hezbollah, to build an array of rockets in southern Lebanon that could harm Israel over long ranges.

There are recent reports that a weans convoy, apparently Iranian, made its way through Syria through the Lebanese Bekaa and received a transit permit with the Lebanese government openly confirming that it knew the convoy's goal was Hezbollah. Therefore, the Lebanese government is an indirect partner in the establishment of the rocket array aimed against Israel. It has already been published that this includes some 12,000 Katyushas and rockets of various types. Militarily, it makes no difference if there were only 5,000 Katyushas, for example. The important factor is the range, which Iran makes sure to constantly improve. The Fajr-3 and Fajr-5 rockets have increased their ranges to some 70 kilometers. This means Hezbollah and, in effect, Iran can shoot at targets south of Haifa, and not only in the area of Haifa Bay.

There are various approaches to this threat to Israel. The former chief of staff, Moshe Ya'alon, used to say that the Hezbollah rocketry array will rust on its own without being used. Maybe. But what if there are reasons found for its use before it rusts? Other say that this is not an Iranian threat, because the same targets could be hit by terror actions. That's strange to say. Is the danger of putting two million people into shelters and a cessation of schooling and work in all the regional enterprises within the rockets' aim not a strategic blow? Past experience with artillery fire from southern Lebanon and the experience of primitive Qassam rockets make it difficult to come up with calming conclusions.

A few months ago there was a one-day conference at Haifa University on dealing with a sudden multi-victim disaster in the Haifa Bay area. Dr. Ephraim Dvir, head of the geography department for disaster areas and the chairman of the national steering committee for preparations for an earthquake, spoke of the "disaster triangle" in the Haifa area. The bay, he said, is the most dangerous of all the sensitive areas in Israel because of the ammonia and bromide facilities, the oil refineries and the heavy industry. Add to that the population density and the flawed local infrastructure for dealing with the population during a surprise disaster.

The experts remember that the state comptroller devoted three reports to the subject, as did two Knesset subcommittees. After much foot-dragging, the Home Front command announced that the huge ammonia tank in the bay area does not meet its standards. Safeguarding the tanks would require a most enormous expenditure, so Haifa municipality ordered Haifa Chemicals to immediately cease use of the tank. However, the sensitivity of the area, within range of Hezbollah rockets, remains.

Clearly, Israel has failed from every aspect in preventing the establishment of the Iranian-backed rocket array. No arms convoy or plane carrying weapons or warehouse of rockets in Lebanon has been struck. The rockets are deployed out of harm's way, and Iranian representatives in Lebanon help plan and produce conclusions from Hezbollah operations. This does not mean that Israel cannot deal with the threat; but it decided to base itself on a strategy of bed-and-breakfasts and skiing, according to which it is best not to really respond to harm, kidnappings and provocations lest it endanger the tourism. In recent years, that strategy has been paramount and that is what enabled the Iranians to establish their deterrent arm against Israel. (Haaretz Mar 3)

Beware: Al-Qaeda is Targeting Israel By Michael Freund

The writing is on the wall: Al-Qaeda is gearing up to attack the Jewish state, yet no one seems to be paying very much attention.

Like a shark honing in on its prey, Osama Bin-Laden's henchmen are progressively encircling the Jewish state, creating bases of operation in areas bordering Israel. They are forging alliances with local radicals, hurling invective against the Zionists, and spreading their ideology of hate throughout the region.

The latest indication of this worrisome development came in an interview given by Palestinian Authority Chairman Mahmoud Abbas, who told the London-based Al-Hayat on March 2 that, "We have signs about the presence of al-Qaeda in Gaza and the West Bank".

Essentially, Abbas was confirming what Israeli intelligence has been saying for the past six months.

Back on September 28, Major-General Aharon (Zeevi) Farkash, head of IDF Military Intelligence, told a Tel Aviv University audience that Al-Qaeda had exploited the chaos along the Egyptian-Gaza border after Israel's retreat to move operatives into the area. "Al-Qaeda is in Gaza," he said (Yediot Aharonot, Sept. 29, 2005).

Indeed, as the Jerusalem Post reported last week, several members of Al-Qaeda have been identified in Gaza, and at least one was recently arrested.

And last September, Mahmoud Waridat, a Palestinian from Judea and Samaria, was indicted and charged with having undergone terrorist training at a camp run by Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan in 2001 (Reuters, Sept. 8).

Presumably, if Al-Qaeda is going to the trouble of investing funds,

manpower and resources in order to set up shop in Gaza, it is not because they are looking for inexpensive beach-front properties along the sea. With Hamas now in control of the area, Gaza will serve as a relatively safe, and convenient, launching pad for attacks against Jews.

Moreover, if Osama Bin-Laden's official representative in Iraq is to be believed, Gaza is not the only place adjoining Israel where the international terrorist group is active.

In an audio tape posted on an Islamist website two months ago, terror chieftain Abu Musab al-Zarqawi claimed that 4 Katyusha rockets fired from southern Lebanon into northern Israel on December 27 were the work of al-Qaeda and had come at the instructions of none other than bin Laden himself.

"The rocket firing at the ancestors of monkeys and pigs from the south of Lebanon was only the start of a blessed in-depth strike against the Zionist enemy", al-Zarqawi declared, adding that "All that was on the instructions of the sheikh of the mujahedeen, Osama bin Laden" (AFP, January 9).

The incident came just a month after reports surfaced of an alliance being formed between Al-Qaeda and Hizbullah terrorists in Lebanon with the aim of coordinating attacks against the Jewish state (UPI, December 7).

Al-Qaeda's presence in Gaza and Lebanon is extremely significant, because it means that the terror group has a foothold in all the countries and territories bordering Israel.

Don't forget that Al-Qaeda has carried out bombings in Amman, Jordan (in November 2005), and in the Egyptian-controlled Sinai (in October 2004 and July 2005) at Western and Israeli targets. And just last week, Jordanian officials announced that they had foiled a planned suicide attack by the extremist group in the kingdom (BBC, March 1).

This means that the terror group has managed to penetrate these two countries neighboring Israel and establish enough of an infrastructure with which to scout out, plan, prepare and carry out attacks.

Hence, as ominous as it sounds, Al-Qaeda now has the ability to target Israel from the west, the east and the north. This fits in precisely with what we know to be the group's ultimate objective: to wage war against the Jewish state.

As the Washington Post reported on October 7, US officials last summer succeeded in intercepting a 13-page letter sent by Al-Qaeda's number two man, Ayman al-Zawahiri, to Abu Musab al-Zarqawi in Iraq in which he outlined the group's strategy. The letter outlined a four-stage plan, with the final and definitive goal being to confront Israel.

And just this past weekend, Zawahiri reiterated his call for attacks against Israel. In a videotape aired by Al-Jazeera on Saturday, he urged Hamas "to fight on", waving his right hand in the air for emphasis.

All this underlines just how much Israel is on the front-lines of the global war on terror - and how essential it is that we stand firm and confront it. The jihadists and Islamists may be focusing much of their efforts on the "Great Satan" (i.e. the United States), but it is clear that they are training their sights on the "Little Satan" too.

That, at least, is what Israeli security officials believe. In a report leaked last month to the Israeli media, they said they had concluded that 2006 is the "target year" during which Al-Qaeda would attempt to carry out a "mega-attack" against the Jewish state (Ynet, Feb.23).

That would certainly explain the group's moves to establish forward bases alongside Israel's borders, as well as its stepped-up rhetoric about the need to confront the Zionists.

But what is patently less clear is to what extent Israel's decision-makers are taking this into account, as they ponder making future unilateral withdrawals in Judea and Samaria.

As the Gaza experience clearly demonstrates, pulling out of the territories only creates a vacuum that groups such as Hamas and Al-Qaeda will gladly, and rapidly, fill.

And because of the growing Al-Qaeda link, it is essential that Israel's government start to view its policies in the context of the global confrontation of terror, rather than merely through the narrow lens of internal politics.

Likewise, we need to start making it abundantly clear to friends and allies in the West that they can not expect Israel to carry out further retreats when the threat posed by Islamist fundamentalism is already within striking distance of all our major towns and cities.

Most importantly, though, Israel must start taking the danger of a possible Al-Qaeda attack much more seriously, and adopt an aggressive pre-emptive posture to eliminate their infrastructure in places such as Gaza.

It is not too late to stop a Middle Eastern 9/11 from taking place, but if Israel doesn't act soon, and decisively, that is just where we may all end up. The writer served as an aide in the Israeli Prime Minister's Office to former premier Binyamin Netanyahu. (Jerusalem Post Mar 8)

Bulldozing Caterpillar By Elwood Mcquaid

By now it's an old story, but a destructive one nevertheless. On February 6, the Church of England's highest decision-making body, the General Synod, heeded "the call from our sister church, the Episcopal Church in Jerusalem and

the Middle East, for morally responsible investment in the Palestinian occupied territories and, in particular, to disinvest from companies profiting from the illegal occupation, such as Caterpillar Inc., until they change their policies."

To smooth the waters and decipher the gobbledygook of the decision, the archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams, who supported the motion, wrote to British Chief Rabbi Jonathan Sacks to express "deep regret" that "distress has been caused, especially to our Jewish friends.... The synod has not, by its action, resolved to disinvest," but rather, he wrote, "to register our concern."

The day after the synod vote, former archbishop of Canterbury George Carey told The Jerusalem Post he was "ashamed to be an Anglican" and that the decision was "a most regrettable and one-sided statement" that "ignores the trauma of ordinary Jewish people" in Israel who endure terrorist attacks.

The rap on Caterpillar, a responsible and legitimate heavy-equipment manufacturer, is that their bulldozers have been used to level the homes of some Palestinians. Never mind that this same machinery was also used by Israelis to knock down Israeli settlements in the Gaza Strip, northern Samaria and Amona on the West Bank. What is at issue here has little to do with moral justice; but it has much to do with radical, liberal, leftist obsession.

For leftist zealots of instability and chaos, the matter is not based on the facts of the case, but rather on a predisposition to denigrate the State of Israel and its people for their simple desire to stay alive.

The reason Israel demolished the homes of suicidal Islamist radicals is well documented. In the Gaza Strip, Israel destroyed homes having tunnels that were used as conduits for weapons. Elsewhere, the homes of Palestinian suicide bombers responsible for slaughtering innumerable civilians - Israeli, Muslim, and others - fell to the blades of the dozers. The question is, "What civilized country under attack would not have done the same?"

Attacking Caterpillar and others doing legitimate business with a sovereign state is nothing more than a diversionary attempt to mask a true agenda and violently held prejudices.

LET IT be understood that the entire left wing of the Protestant mainline establishment is hostile to the very idea of a literal fulfillment of the biblical promises to Israel. It contests Israel's future restoration, as well as the promises of the Millennial Kingdom and a reigning Messiah.

In fact, a literal, resurrected Jewish Kingdom is wholly beyond mainline Protestantism's concept of what new world theology is all about. It considers the Scriptures antiquated, unacceptable and pass , and contends that those who believe and accept the Scriptures as written are ignorant, uninformed, and far removed from contemporary realities.

For such Protestants, the biblical promises, themes, pronouncements and mandates are old and irrelevant. Biblical revelation for them is an aberration - particularly when it touches Israel and the Promised Land.

Logically speaking, it doesn't make sense for objectively sane people to portray little Israel as a militant, "apartheid state" panting to commit genocide against innocent Palestinians. Consequently, the bottom line must be something else. In my opinion, it is what I term theological anti-Semitism. Israel's very existence is an intolerable offense to people who allegorize and spiritualize God's Word and attempt to impose on it the theology that the church has replaced Israel as the true heir of Abraham.

This school of thought has drawn an increasing number of gullible, uninformed people to its side. It has abandoned the literal, historical, grammatical interpretation of Scripture and forsaken Scripture's clear dictates regarding end-times events and the glorious future of the Jewish people and nation of Israel.

TO SAY it plainly, we Gentiles are not the be-all and end-all in the plan of God. And to infer as much is to assume a degree of self-induced arrogance and self-esteem wholly inconsistent with anything the Bible has ever taught. Israel's very existence is a glaring contradiction to everything left-wing, theological pretenders believe and endorse. In fact, I believe the entire liberal school of rejectionist thinkers would suffer no angst or disappointment if the State of Israel passed off the scene.

What is perhaps most distressing in the entire episode of bashing Caterpillar, the United States, and, in the process, evangelicals is the aid and comfort passed along to the enemies of, in essence, you and me.

Here we are in a time of war. And whether you believe it or not, it is a very real and protracted conflict. Islamists affirm continually that they are waging an all-out jihadist war that will end in triumph over the democracies of the West and in the establishment of an Islamist, global caliphate.

The first step in realizing their dream is Israel's destruction. Why? Because Israel represents the only true, viable democracy in the Middle East. It is a democracy imbued with all of the attributes of a functionally free state. To Arab demagogues, its existence is an insufferable anomaly - one they cannot tolerate. Thus we witness the invasion of Islamist fanatics from other Muslim countries to wage war against the forces of freedom and democracy in Iraq. From their point of view, freedom for their people is simply out of the question.

All of which raises a serious question. Why would Americans side with an avowed enemy that is determined to subjugate and destroy everything we

hold dear as a free people? It is indeed strange that those campaigning to destroy Israel, a democracy attempting to survive in a hostile area, would themselves be the first on the chopping block of those whose cause they champion. No, it doesn't make sense. Sanity and legitimacy belong to those who stand with Israel and the establishment of democracy, freedom of religion, and the rights and privileges of the individual everywhere in the world.

Unfortunately, today we live in a world of "posts" - the post-Christian era, the post-Zionist era, etc. Strange, isn't it, that the "post" definition being popularized by secular and liberal religious elitists repudiates everything positive in the history of Judaism and biblical Christianity? But it is, after all, merely the evidence of the chaotic, confused state of the world we live in.

What does it mean to be a Christian Zionist? Simply this: It means to believe the Jewish people have an inherent, God-given right to possess a homeland sanctioned under international law in the land divinely given in perpetuity to the Jewish descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

Such a belief is not radical or subversive; it simply accepts what the Scriptures have declared about the rights and legitimate possessions of the Jewish people. It's as simple as that. In so saying, we do not diminish any of the rights or privileges of believing Gentiles during this interim Age of Grace in which the gospel is extended to all people everywhere - Jewish and Gentile.

Having said that, we have nothing to apologize for in declaring ourselves, based on biblical dictates, to be Christian Zionists.

Yes, I am aware that the Presbyterian (PCUSA) hierarchy, in its infamous decision to disinvest from companies operating for profit in Israel, took a swipe at those "ill-informed" evangelicals who identify themselves as Christian Zionists and are so woefully out of step with reality. However, we ill-informed Christian Zionists have the light of biblical revelation and historical reality on our side. It is, rather, the deserters from biblical truth who should declare what they really are and retreat from the field.

WHEN FORMER archbishop Carey told the Post that the General Synod's decision made him "ashamed to be an Anglican," he spoke for many thousands of Anglicans, Presbyterians, Lutherans, Disciples of Christ, and others who felt utterly betrayed by leaders who do not in any sense share their sentiments on the issue.

The beneficial aspect of the synod's vote was that, for the first time, it definitively unveiled to the people in the pews the anti-Semitic proclivities of its corrupted leaders.

Their agenda is radical and political. If you doubt this fact, study the decisions they have made over the last few decades. They have made themselves clear. Now they have officially gone on record, and members can see the true commitment of their leaders and those who control the expenditures of the believing laity.

For thousands of people, there is an awakening to the realities of what is taking place. Israel is a tiny entity in a sea of militant nations devoted to its destruction. American and coalition forces are fighting and dying to create conditions conducive to the spread of freedom and democracy in the Middle East.

The forces that defame the efforts and sacrifices of people who are paying the ultimate price for our survival and freedom are not the friends of liberty. In fact, they are quite the opposite. They are giving aid and comfort to enemies who are out to destroy not only tiny Israel but all free people in the Western world.

I cannot forget the poignant words of humorist Art Buchwald who commented on the September 11, 2001, attacks in New York and Washington. Although he had served on the European front in World War II, Buchwald said that, on that morning, for the first time in his life, he realized there were people out there who wanted, above all else, to kill him.

That's the fact of life in our times, friend. There are people out there who are enemies of everything we represent, and they want to see us dead. We must not give them any encouragement to accomplish their objective.

The writer, a pastor, is a leader of the Christian Zionist movement in the United States. (Jerusalem Post Mar. 8)

Farewell to Arms Control By Frank J. Gaffney, Jr.

The deal struck last week by President Bush and his Indian counterpart, Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, effectively recognizes reality: The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) is dead.

The demise of that 1968 accord was, of course, not caused by the U.S.-India agreement to provide American nuclear power technology to a country that had become a nuclear weapons state despite the NPT's effort to prevent such developments. India never signed the treaty and was, therefore, not bound by its non-proliferation restrictions.

Rather, the NPT was killed by the cynical actions of North Korea and Iran, two states that did sign it - and then proceeded systematically, if covertly, to violate their promises to remain non-nuclear states, in exchange for access to reactors and technology for peaceful research and energy generation. Those who abetted these nuclear wannabe states - notably, the Soviet Union/Russia, Communist China and Pakistan's Nukes-R-Us impresario, A.Q. Khan - also

bear responsibility for arming two of the world's most dangerous regimes.

Issuing a death certificate for the Non-proliferation Treaty may seem untimely at a moment when the organization charged with monitoring the treaty, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), is expected finally to report Iran's nuclear transgressions to the UN Security Council. Arms control advocates would have us believe this referral is, to the contrary, proof of the accord's continuing viability.

Drawing upon his unprecedented access to the White House, Bill Sammon gives you an inside look at everything from the ferocious 2004 campaign to the disaster of Hurricane Katrina.

In fact, even before the U.S.-India deal was inked, there was no likelihood that Tehran's veto-wielding patrons, Vladimir Putin's Russia and the People's Republic of China, would allow the Security Council to impose economic sanctions on Iran. Still less probable is a Security Council authorization of the use of force to prevent the Iranian regime from getting the Bomb.

Instead, the IAEA and the Security Council can be counted upon to do more of what they have been doing for several years now: Kick the proverbial can down the road.

The Iranians are making ever less effort to conceal the benefits they derive from such fecklessness. According to the London Daily Telegraph, Hassan Rowhani, Tehran's chief negotiator in two years of talks with, among others, British, French and German diplomats, recently told a closed session of his country's Supreme Council of Cultural Revolution how he used diplomacy to buy time to complete key nuclear weapons-related facilities at Isfahan, Iran.

Citing a report of the Rowhani speech published in a "regime journal that circulates among the ruling elite," the Telegraph recounts a "quandary" the mullahs confronted in September 2003.

At the time, the IAEA had begun to insist that Iran provide a "complete picture" of its nuclear program. Rowhani recounted that, "The dilemma was if we offered a complete picture, the picture itself could lead us to the UN Security Council. And not providing a complete picture would also be a violation of the resolution and we could have been referred to the Security Council for not implementing the resolution."

The solution lay in a diplomatic smokescreen. Rowhani reportedly declared, "When we were negotiating with the Europeans in Tehran, we were still installing some of the equipment at the Isfahan site. There was plenty of work to be done to complete the site and finish the work there. In reality, by creating a tame situation, we could finish Isfahan."

Unfortunately, the further diplomacy entailed in pretending that the NPT process is still capable of constraining rogue governments like Iran's will simply translate into the further time Tehran needs fully to realize its nuclear weapons ambitions. Congressional efforts to kill the India deal in the misplaced hope of keeping the NPT on life-support and, thereby, restraining Iran will do neither.

In fact, a veto by Capitol Hill will not keep India from having the nuclear weapons it deems necessary, sandwiched as it is between a Communist China that is become ever more powerful and strategically assertive and the proxy Beijing armed with nuclear weapons years ago, Islamist Pakistan.

It would, however, foreclose the U.S.-India pact's promise of sales of American reactors that will resuscitate our nuclear power industrial base - something we need to do for our own reasons. It may also impede closer alignment between the planet's two greatest democracies, a potentially vital factor in winning the War for the Free World.

Just as the Dubai Ports World bid for U.S. seaport facilities has triggered a long-overdue debate about port and homeland security, the Bush-Singh nuclear deal may precipitate a similarly excessively deferred national conversation about the need for a new approach to arms control.

Defective treaties, violated with impunity by one or more of the parties, do not protect freedom-loving nations that honor their obligations. There are real dangers associated with ignoring that reality and propping up accords that have lost their utility by continuing to negotiate with, and otherwise legitimate, governments that cynically exploit such behavior to increase the threat they pose.

It is now clear that that threat emanates not from the weapons but from the regime that wields them. The alternative arms control approach that needs to be adopted is a strategy of regime change. The Iranian people yearn for it there as much as we do. The U.S. government should be working with them to bring about the downfall of the mullahocracy in Tehran, and thereby minimize the threat its nuclear program is beginning to constitute.

The other option is not maintaining the fiction of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Rather, it is military action aimed at disrupting a future Iranian threat that is simply intolerable. (Townhall.com Mar 6)

The writer is President of the Center for Security Policy and lead-author of War Footing: 10 Steps America Must Take to Prevail in the War for the Free World.
