



Jerusalem 5:15; Toronto 6:20

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*

Events...

Tuesday, April 1, 7:00 pm.

Stockwell Day, MP, Jason Kenney, MP and others will speak on Canada's disgraceful Foreign Policy at York University, Curtis Lecture Hall L (main complex, second floor). Call Yaakov Roth at 416-841-7684 for tickets.

Friday, April 4, Noon

Rally for America by Friends of America at Nathan Phillips Square.

Commentary...

A Little Advice on Peace and War from an Israeli By Naomi Ragen

For all those of you who think that only war poses risks for innocent people, I would like to tell you of our experiences here in Israel.

Nine years ago, we in Israel, encouraged by our own Peace-Nowers, signed a Peace Accord with a known terrorist, pulled our army out, handed him land and then sat around singing songs and painting doves because we were tired of fighting. And this is what happened: he brought in thousands of weapons, taught children to kill and be killed, set up bomb factories, and encouraged religious leaders to preach suicide bombing as a way to reach paradise. And we looked on and said: He doesn't mean it. It's just talk. And anyone who said out loud: 'There is no peace, just preparation for war from one side,' was drowned out and vilified, called a war-monger and a traitor, told they had killed Yitzchak Rabin and told to shut up and let the party continue.

And then our buses started blowing up, and our discos, and our wedding halls, and our Seder nights, and our Bar Mitzvahs and restaurants. Babies were blown up or shot in their carriages along with their grandmothers. Our country dug hundreds of graves. Thousands wound up injured, crippled for life, sitting in wheelchairs, and burn units, brain damaged on life-support; their lives destroyed.

And still the peace-nowers continued to preach: War is not the answer. There is no military solution.

At that point, we understood we'd been had. We started to speak out against them, to vote them out, to pick up our guns, and retake the areas we'd left, uproot the arms caches, the bomb factories, hunt down the terrorists...And then the bombings got less...and less...and less. Every day, our soldiers fought the war, and every single day, new innocent lives were saved.

But because we didn't have courage to speak out at the beginning, our lives were forever changed. Every place we go is now under armed guards. Half our restaurants closed down. The center of Jerusalem is like a ghost town. Our people are unemployed. No tourists come. Our children live with fears no child should have to endure. Thousands of families are in mourning. All because we listened to the appeasers, the peace-nowers. All because we let ourselves be intimidated.

We let them make us think we were wrong, and they were right, because we let them hijack the word 'Peace' until it became meaningless. Ten million British citizens signed a petition for 'peace' in 1941. As a result Neville Chamberlain signed a pact with Hitler. He declared it meant "Peace in our time." And ten million people turned out to be wrongheaded idiots. And these ten million idiots brought disaster down not only on the heads of their own children but also on the heads of children whose parents understood the truth, but had lacked the courage to fight for it.

And this is what I learned from living in Israel and I would like to share with you, to prevent your countries from suffering as mine has:

Anyone who tries to prevent a just war against terrorism, is on the side of the terrorists, an accomplice. No, they don't have an opinion that needs to be respected. No, they don't have an equally valuable point of view. No, no, no. They are as dangerous as the terrorists themselves, and will get you and your children killed just as fast.

As for the morality of war, the Bible tells us when someone comes to kill you, rise up and kill him first. As King Solomon said: "To every thing, there is a season, a time for peace, and a time for war."

And one more piece of wisdom. Those who condemn the war against terror aren't in favor of peace. They are in favor of a one-sided war in which the innocent can't defend themselves cleverly enough to win.

The writer is a well-known author and playwright.

(The Jewish Press Mar 21)

The Ugly Truth By Frimet Roth

Occasionally, as in these perverse times, the "victim" may be the bully. He may also be a liar -- or even a murderer.

Anyone with a conscience chooses a side. You don't just sit on the bleachers watching two fellows beat the living daylight out of each other.

Who can argue with the Red Cross slogan "The worst tragedy is indifference"? You've got to get involved and root for someone: preferably, for the victim.

So you trot out your trusty litmus test for victimhood and the familiar jargon of days gone by: Civil rights, Jim Crow laws, racism, apartheid, Bantustans, colonialism, freedom-fighters.

Then you apply them to current conflicts - like the Palestinian - Israeli one. And voila - you have your victim.

Or do you?

Occasionally, as in these perverse times, the "victim" may be the bully. He may also be a liar - or even a murderer.

My daughter Malki's murderers are often mistaken for victims. A book called *Shahidas* was recently published in French by an American writer, Barbara Victor. In it, she profiles the Palestinian woman - now incarcerated in an Israeli jail - who planned and executed the murder of my daughter and of the other innocent victims in the Sbarro pizza store. Victor's book includes profiles of other female Palestinian terrorists. It has snapshots of their parents and their babies and descriptions of their childhoods and their aspirations. All this alongside an account of my Malki's last day in this world. One large grab-bag of victims.

The truth is far more complex and elusive. But it is out there and it surfaces occasionally. If only it weren't buried so quickly by those who find it disconcerting.

Take, for example, these overlooked facts. Palestinian Authority Chairman Yasser Arafat made Forbes magazine's rich 500 list in its current issue. This revelation might have stopped Israel-bashers in their tracks once upon a time. Yet these days, when those activists are hailing Saddam Hussein - an uncontested mass murderer - as a victim, it is understandable that a mere \$300 million in stolen money fails to move them.

But let's leave the leaders to their antics. What about the Palestinians, the victimized masses yearning for peace? Do we know the truth about them?

Probably not, if you haven't heard about Ichlas Chuli. She is a 35-year-old Palestinian mother of seven from Tulkarm, and the first woman murdered by Al Aqsa Martyr activists for the alleged crime of collaboration with Israel. Her 17-year-old son, Harim Bachir, maintains that he concocted the story of her involvement with Israelis after members of that terror group captured and tortured him with electrical cords. And has the scars to prove it.

Haaretz journalist, Amira Hass, is a pro-Palestinian Jewish Israeli who has lived in Ramallah for several years. The fact that she is still alive and writing attests to her staunch pro-Palestinian stand. Nevertheless, in November, 2002 she reported that the Al Aqsa Martyrs' Brigades in Tulkarm had killed no fewer than 15 alleged collaborators in their town. The brother of one of those victims, a doctor of internal medicine, told Hass: "There is no law here." The killers, he said, "are the real collaborators... They are the real criminals."

The murderers themselves, as Haas wrote "...have no regrets and do not think that there was anything wrong in their acting as judge, jury and executioner."

Photos of Palestinian women, planted in front of a pile of rubble and with

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

arms outstretched to the heavens, have become a familiar newspaper item. But how many are aware that those houses served as shelters for terrorists? About two dozen members of the Al Aqsa Martyr's Brigades, for example, live in Tulkarm "in underground-like conditions," writes Amira Haas, "staying over in other people's homes... people willingly put themselves at risk to host them and see this as natural, as something to be taken for granted."

At what point, then, does an innocent, peace-loving neighbor become an accomplice to terror? Perhaps when he voluntarily offers a known terrorist shelter?

Critics of Israel swallow the notion that the terrorists are fringe elements in their society and that the Palestinian Authority has done its utmost to rein them in and that it condemns their activities. But they seem to have missed the disconcerting truth about the PA, a truth that even Hass acknowledges: After the failure of the Oslo accords, Arafat and his apparatchiks stood to lose their grip on power. Dreading the prospect of relinquishing "the benefits of being a ruling movement," as Hass puts it, they opted to allow armed groups to employ "popular but disastrous" methods in their name. She interviewed one such Arafat lackey, a senior Fatah man in Gaza, who "personally benefited from the creature comforts devolving to him and his entire class through their support of the Oslo agreements. Thanks to the Al Aqsa martyrs, they don't kill us," he admitted with frank honesty in her interview with him. "Thanks to their existence, we stay alive."

So which is it? "Thanks" or "condemn"? Or has someone been having us on?

Some of the foreign "cheerleaders" have immunized themselves so thoroughly against the ugly truth they have actually jumped into the ring for their victim's sake. The so-called International Solidarity Movement primes young activists from all over the world to serve as human shields in Palestinian areas. In a three-day crash course, these idealistic volunteers are treated to a potpourri of propaganda:

First comes a lexicon of common expressions. "Settler" = "colonialist." "The Israel Defense Forces" = "Israeli Occupation Forces." And so on.

Then in another lecture, the volunteers are reminded of their legal rights in the event of arrest and are urged to remain silent until release. A Palestinian who addresses them on "Palestinian Culture" cautions: "Women should avoid shaking a man's hand. Women teach children; Men have control... Family is of central importance." On the final day, they are urged to hide their sentiments about suicide bombers. "Don't say 'It's stupid.' They are sacrificing their lives for their land and nation, and even if you and I disagree with this method, you must be sensitive and respectful."

The government of Israel has granted visas to hundreds of these blinkered dreamers. It has expelled only 48 of them to date. Considering the obvious hazard they pose to Israeli soldiers struggling to catch terrorists with a minimum of innocent casualties, one can only marvel at Israel's tolerance.

Fighting an enemy who hides among foreign human shields and behind his own women and children has pushed the restraint of Israeli soldiers to its limits. Proponents of the Palestinian case never tire of stories about their innocents dying in cross-fire or through occasional errors. But the compassion shown by Israeli soldiers' is one of those well-buried disconcerting truths that rarely emerges.

Residents of the Jerusalem street where I live are painfully aware of that compassion. In August 2001, it was rocked by the loss of my daughter and her best friend, who lived on this street as well, while both stood on line to buy a pizza for lunch. Last week, it was singled out again. Shachar, our neighbor from four buildings down, was the son of a quiet couple, a retired bus driver and a bookkeeper. At 24, he was an army officer serving in Shechem (Nablus). One evening, he oversaw the detonation of a suspected car-bomb in the center of Bethlehem. After the controlled explosion was carried out, he remained at the site to ensure that the fire had been fully extinguished and to prevent injury or damage to Palestinians and their property. He paid dearly for this concern, and his parents will go on paying for the rest of their lives. A Palestinian sniper killed him with a bullet to the neck.

My battered street, my tortured nation, have watched for two and half years as the truths about this war are systematically buried. Now we watch as the truth about Iraq suffers the same fate. Salima Kazim, an Iraqi grandmother enjoyed a brief audience with a popular "peace" advocate, the Reverend Jesse Jackson, at a recent anti-war rally. She tried to tell him how Saddam Hussein had murdered her three sons because they had been dissidents in the Ba'ath Party; about how one of her grandsons had died in the war Saddam had launched against Kuwait in 1990. She requested a chance to address the crowd. But the visibly displeased Jackson refused. "Today is not about Saddam Hussein," he snapped. "Today is about Bush and Blair and the massacre they plan in Iraq."

Reading her account, I was reminded of the day my husband and I, together with four other Israeli bereaved families, were invited by the Israeli foreign ministry to relate our painful experiences to Jackson in Jerusalem after his visit with Palestinians. His response was a sermon: Concentrate on what you have left; do not neglect your surviving children. Thank you, Mr. Jackson.

Perhaps, like the reverend, one can effectively spew platitudes and bury painful truths. But not indefinitely. I have no doubt that one day the ghosts of

those truths will rise up to haunt all who ignored them.

The writer's daughter was murdered in the Sbarro Pizzeria bombing in July 2001. (Jewsweek.com Mar 19)

The Road Map to Nowhere By Joshua Muravchik *Do we really need another doomed Mideast peace process?*

Three days before abandoning diplomatic activity about Iraq in the U.N. Security Council and delivering an ultimatum to Saddam Hussein, President Bush hastily invited reporters to the White House Rose Garden, where he announced a further initiative for ending the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The president said that immediately upon the confirmation of a Palestinian prime minister, his government would formally present to the two sides the "road map" for peace that it had "developed...in close cooperation" with Russia, the European Union, and the United Nations--the other members of the so-called "quartet" that the administration has chosen as its new vehicle for Israeli-Palestinian diplomacy.

The announcement, which news reports said had originally been planned to follow the resolution of the Iraq issue, apparently was moved forward in order to give succor to those, especially British prime minister Tony Blair, who had gone out on a limb to support American policy toward Iraq. "Mr. Blair and others have demanded publication of the peace plan to quell the anger throughout the Arab world over the Bush administration's perceived focus on Iraq to the exclusion of the creation of a Palestinian state, the cause the Arabs consider paramount," explained the New York Times. In careful coordination, Blair followed Bush's announcement with a press statement of his own in which he declared, "The most important thing we can do is show even-handedness towards the Middle East." This formula, which Blair repeated more than once, apparently meant giving the Israeli-Palestinian question as much attention as Iraq. It may also have been intended to imply an approach of neutrality between the Israelis and the Palestinians, in contrast to the pro-Israel stance that the Arabs say Washington has usually taken.

Although the timing of the announcement seemed to have been improvised, it had long been expected that an Iraq war would be linked in some way to renewed activity on the Israeli-Palestinian front. President Bush had said in his February 26 speech to the American Enterprise Institute that "success in Iraq could also begin a new stage for Middle Eastern peace and set in motion progress toward a truly democratic Palestinian state." From a rather different perspective, Arab and European commentators have claimed that after taking down Saddam, the United States would have to compensate the Muslim world for this intrusion by assuring progress toward Palestinian independence.

That is the destination to which the road map is supposed to lead. But what is in this road map? What are its underlying premises? And will it get us to peace?

Three early drafts of the road map have made their way into the public prints, and administration spokesmen say that the final draft will vary little from the last of these, circulated in December. To reach the president's declared objective of the birth of a Palestinian state within three years, the map lays out detailed sets of reciprocal obligations grouped into three phases. In the first phase, to be accomplished within a few months, the Palestinians would "undertake an unconditional cessation of violence" (to quote from the December draft) as well as "comprehensive political reform . . . including drafting a Palestinian constitution and free, fair and open elections." The Palestinians would also resume security cooperation with Israel. For its part, Israel would withdraw from all Palestinian areas it entered since the start of the intifada, freeze all settlement activity, dismantling the "settlement outposts" erected since Ariel Sharon came to office, and "take...all necessary steps to help normalize Palestinian life."

In the second phase, to last six months, "efforts are focused on . . . creating an independent Palestinian state with provisional borders and attributes of sovereignty . . . as a way station to a permanent status settlement." This would be blessed by an international conference convened by the quartet. And it would be accompanied by steps by the Arab states to "restore pre-intifada links to Israel." During this time, the quartet would "promote international recognition of [the] Palestinian state, including possible U.N. membership." In the third phase, lasting two years and featuring still another international conference convened by the quartet, a "final and comprehensive settlement" would be "negotiated between the parties . . . that ends the occupation that began in 1967" and "fulfills the vision of two states, Israel and the sovereign, independent, democratic and viable Palestine, living side-by-side in peace and security." This would be accompanied by "a comprehensive Arab-Israeli peace."

Two critical premises lie behind this plan. The first is that the shape of an ultimate settlement is clear. It will look like the terms discussed at Taba, Egypt, in January 2001, the last-ditch negotiation undertaken during the waning days of Bill Clinton's presidency and Ehud Barak's tenure as Israel's

prime minister. In this view, what is lacking is a choreography to get us to a final act the outcome of which is already known. The second premise is that this choreography requires an intermediary more balanced than the United States, whose seven-year mediation efforts under the Oslo accords were crowned with failure at Camp David in the summer of 2000. Hence, the primary role now assigned to the quartet, which is less reflexively pro-Israel than America.

The first thing one might say about the plan itself is that its pace is breathless. Comprehensive political reform, anew constitution, free elections--all within the first few months? Never mind that this seems unrealistic. (We are now 19 years past the deadline for Palestinian self-rule set in the Egypt-Israel peace agreement of 1979 and four years past the date for completing "final status" talks under the Oslo accords.) It is even undemocratic. Aren't the citizens of Palestine entitled to a little time to acquaint themselves with their new political system, not to mention to assent to it, to discover what the offices are for which they will vote, to form political parties, to debate the issues? From there, we press on frantically to sovereignty within a few more months and a complete laying to rest of the Arab-Israeli conflict by 2005. Inshallah. There is no disgrace in a rush to peace, provided one's hurry does not result in losing one's way.

There is, however, an important problem here. Postmortems of Oslo, notably by the chief U.S. negotiator, Dennis Ross, have focused on America's failure to insist on full compliance with the terms of the agreement, especially on the part of the Palestinians, a failure that was driven by the pressure to meet predetermined timetables. Precisely to avoid repetition of this mistake, the Bush administration has characterized the road map as "performance driven." But that is scarcely compatible with a breakneck dash around the map's multiple clover leaves.

The most penetrating analysis of this dizzying racecourse has been offered by Robert Satloff of the Washington Institute for Near East Policy. Satloff faults the plan's "sham, even indecent, parallelism between Palestinian and Israeli behavior." Not only does it call on each side, in virtually identical language, to "cease violence" against the other, as if acts of terror and counterterror are commensurable. It also balances a demand that "official Palestinian institutions end incitement against Israel" with one that "official Israeli institutions end incitement against Palestinians."

The issue of incitement is not about "mere words." It goes to the heart of prospects for peace. In trading land for peace, Israel wants to be sure it is getting what is promised, namely a Palestinian neighbor committed to respecting its existence. Nothing did more to sabotage Oslo than Arafat's ambiguity on this score, his own continued references to "jihad," and the hatred, denigration, and delegitimation of Israel that permeated the Palestinian Authority's state-controlled news media, textbooks, maps, and what-have-you. Nothing comparable ever issued from the Israeli government. The road map's designers apparently feared it would be insulting to the Palestinians to allude to their incitement without saying something equivalent toward Israel, however baseless. But to treat the issue of incitement in such a cavalier fashion bodes ill for the process.

Satloff also points out that there is something dangerously naive in the road map's assumption that the situation prior to the outbreak of violence can or should be readily restored. In fact, he points out, the status quo ante was itself deeply flawed, i.e., the infrastructure for illegal smuggling and manufacture of weaponry was well established; the commingling of terrorist organizations and Palestinian security forces was deeply entrenched; and the preparations for armed uprising were well advanced, as evidenced by the testimony of senior Palestinian officials. Rolling back the clock without addressing the organic problems at the heart of Oslo... is a surefire way to guarantee that the road map will share Oslo's fate.

One particularly notable aspect of the status quo ante was the primacy of Yasser Arafat. President Bush's landmark speech of June 24, 2002, called for "a new and different Palestinian leadership... not compromised by terror." But Blair, in his orchestrated echo of Bush's March 14 road map statement, also announced that he himself had just called Arafat to discuss the plan. Linking the official presentation of the road map to the appointment of a Palestinian prime minister is supposed to help erode Arafat's power. But it is Arafat who has appointed Mahmoud Abbas, and whether the latter will prove to be a lever for shunting Arafat aside or merely a pair of gloves to cover Arafat's terror-stained hands remains to be seen.

Beyond such flaws in specific provisions that could be amended in subsequent versions, the critical question is whether the plan's premises are sound. Is it true, for one thing, that the quartet makes a fairer broker of this quarrel than America? To be sure, U.S. policy is pro-Israel, in the sense of a strong commitment to Israel's survival and generous foreign aid. But Washington has often sided with the Arabs and clashed with Israel. It forced Israel to abandon its gains in the 1956 Sinai war, did nothing to break Egypt's blockade of Israeli shipping leading to the Six Day War, stayed Israel's hand in the Yom Kippur and Lebanon wars, rescued Arafat from Beirut, staunchly opposed Israeli settlements in the territories captured in 1967, refused to move its embassy to Israel's capital lest this offend the Arabs, voted for numerous anti-Israel resolutions in the Security Council such as one condemning the 1981

destruction of Iraq's nuclear reactor and another condemning only Israel's actions in the early days of the current intifada, intervened none too subtly in 1999 to encourage the election of the dovish Ehud Barak as prime minister over the hawkish Benjamin Netanyahu, and, under Clinton, hosted Yasser Arafat at the White House more often than any other foreign leader. In short, although linked strongly to Israel, the United States has gone to lengths to honor the interests and demands of the other side.

No such fair-mindedness can be ascribed to the other players in the quartet. Ironically, Russia, which has developed friendly relations with Israel despite oil interests in the Arab world and personal links that stretch back to Soviet days, may be the most neutral. But the E.U. is more one-sidedly pro-Palestinian than America is pro-Israel. Its copious aid to the Palestinian Authority, according to the German newspaper *Die Welt*, has made "Palestine" the world's largest per capita recipient of foreign aid. And during the Israeli incursion into the cities of the West Bank last spring, the European parliament voted for economic sanctions against Israel, as indeed had been applied by the E.U. (or its predecessor) on previous occasions, such as during the war in Lebanon in 1982 or the first intifada in the mid 1980s. These are the same European lawmakers who have denounced America's sanctions on Libya, Iran, and Cuba. In this instance, the European Commission declined to impose the sanctions, but individual E.U. countries applied some themselves, while Belgian courts indicted Israeli prime minister Ariel Sharon, all amidst a firestorm of anti-Israel invective in the European press that frequently crossed the line to outright anti-Semitism.

As for the U.N., its bias against Israel is notorious. Representation on the Security Council and other U.N. bodies is chosen by region. Israel, however, is the only U.N. state that has not been allowed membership in any regional body. Recently, U.S. pressure resulted in Israel's inclusion in the so-called Western Europe and Others Group that we belong to, but only on condition that Israel not be eligible for nomination to the Security Council. Israel has likewise never served on the U.N. Human Rights Commission, although it has scarcely been neglected by that body. On the contrary, during its most recent meeting, the UNHRC adopted no fewer than eight resolutions castigating Israel, while adopting no more than one on any other country and none whatsoever concerning the large majority of the world's dictators. Among the eight resolutions on Israel was one that endorsed the Palestinians' right to fight for their cause "by all available means, including armed struggle," which implicitly meant suicide bombings. (Six of the nine E.U. members of the body voted for this.) Meanwhile, in the General Assembly last year, no fewer than 40 percent of the few hundred resolutions put to a vote were also devoted to the denunciation of Israel. As if this were not enough, the U.N. maintains three permanent bodies devoted exclusively to Israel-bashing. They are the Division for Palestinian Rights of the U.N. Secretariat, the Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices in the Territories, and the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. A less suitable intermediary would be hard to invent.

The quartet itself, according to the *New York Times*, was the creation of Terje Roed-Larsen, the U.N. special envoy to the Middle East, who proclaimed last year that "the government of Israel has lost all moral ground in this conflict," by which statement, so one would have thought, he lost all moral ground as a negotiator.

The still deeper flaw in the road map's premises is the presumption that with the terms of settlement fairly apparent, all that is needed is a guide for getting there. In the final analysis, however, the missing ingredient for peace between Israel and the Palestinians is not a blueprint of the destination, nor is it the route. The missing ingredient is a decision by the Palestinians and the other Arabs to accept the existence of a Jewish state in their midst and to live in permanent peace with it. Despite all the Palestinians have suffered these two and a half years, public opinion polls show that a clear majority of them support continuing the intifada and suicide bombing and that about half say that the goal should be the "total liberation of Palestine," in other words, the elimination of Israel. The other half of the Palestinians say they want a two-state solution. When that half grows and becomes dominant, then and only then, will real peace be possible.

Since the Six Day War, the critical divide in international approaches to the Arab-Israeli broil has been between a negotiated settlement and an imposed one. Israel has insisted on the former precisely because it wants a settlement to be more than pro forma. In an imposed settlement, the Arab representatives might make some empty prescribed gestures in return for concessions that could facilitate future efforts to destroy Israel. An example of such a gesture was the statement that Joschka Fischer, the German foreign minister, wrote and induced Arafat to issue denouncing the suicide bombing of the Dolphinarium disco that killed two dozen Israeli teenagers in June 2001. A month later, the parents of the attacker proudly showed German television interviewers a letter from Arafat proclaiming their son a "martyr" and "a model of manhood and sacrifice for Allah and the homeland."

That an imposed settlement is precisely what our European partners in the quartet have in mind was made abundantly clear by their response to

Bush's announcement of the road map. The president said that upon its delivery to the parties "we will expect and welcome contributions from Israel and the Palestinians to this document." This evoked anguished reactions. The New York Times quoted one "Western diplomat" as complaining that "it's not meant to be a negotiated document," while the Washington Post cited "a senior European diplomat" who said: "When we negotiated it, the idea was to impose the road map, not to put it on the table." Who will prevail within the quartet remains to be seen, but the road map itself, with its dozens of sequenced prescribed steps, smacks more of an imposed than a negotiated settlement.

The simple reality is that the moment the Palestinians make a wholehearted turn toward peace, no road map will be necessary. Sadat had no such guide. His historic trip to Jerusalem was a sequence of improvisations. But when he addressed the Knesset and demonstrated his acceptance of Israel with palpable sincerity, he got back every inch of the Sinai and other demands as well. The territorial issues in the West Bank are more complex, and the Palestinians are not likely to get every inch, but a dramatic demonstration of willingness to accept Israel and live in peace would elicit sweeping concessions. Sharon has said he is willing to make painful compromises, but in response to such a gesture from the Palestinians, the Israeli public would insist on going further than Sharon probably has in mind to do. What would such a gesture look like? There is no need for outsiders to write a script. When the feeling is sincere, it will be easy enough to convey. Until it comes, even the most carefully crafted road maps will lead nowhere. (Weekly Standard Mar 31)

The writer, a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, is the author of "Heaven on Earth: The Rise and Fall of Socialism."

The West's Future Depends on Us Now: *Small War Now, or World War Later.* By Kenneth Hart Green

The war with Iraq has begun, and I think it is no exaggeration to say that the West's entire future depends on this war. I believe President Bush sees this clearly, and has the resolve to carry through with what needs to be done. Indeed, I think the president has been using his time well and deliberately, and the delay has accorded nicely with his intention. The delay has allowed the president to look to attaining the main goal from several angles: It has allowed Colin Powell to persuade the hesitant, and has also allowed Donald Rumsfeld to rally the troops into a state of armed readiness. This strategy aims to scotch the snake's evil head, so as to neutralize its venom as quickly as possible.

Why is the war absolutely essential? There are a number of reasons. First, we can only preserve our way of life in the West if we're willing to be lions — if we're willing to fight our enemies when they threaten us. Second, we must recognize that if this war were not to be carried through, our enemies — both the Islamist terrorists and the Arab tyrants who sponsor them — would view the U.S. and its allies as windbags mouthing empty threats. Third, if we do not fight, our enemies would not only be emboldened, they would be determined to throw at us everything they've got, because they would see us as easy prey, unable to stand up for our own principles and unwilling to lay down our lives for them if necessary.

And we must not doubt that we have such implacable enemies. This has been proven sufficiently by the events of the year and a half since September 11. But what they had learned about us in the preceding 12 years was that we have been hesitant to fight them — even though they have been trying to kill us, and even though they proclaimed their eternal hatred for us. These lessons were taught them by the wobbly Bush, Sr., who snatched shameful defeat from the jaws of most impressive victory in order to appease the Arab and Muslim world (by supposedly impressing it with American mildness); and by the feckless, cowardly, and vain Clinton, who closed his eyes to the need to defend America from its declared and active enemies even despite the attacks on the World Trade Center (1993), on the African embassies, on the Cole, etc. (One could even draw these conclusions from the last 24 years — beginning with the Ayatollah Khomeini's seizure of power in Iran, as it was responded to by the perennially foolish Jimmy Carter; or from Ronald Reagan's decision to abandon Lebanon and run, following the murderous attack on the U.S. army barracks in Beirut.) Indeed, our enemies have been growing fiercer and crueler: The less we resist them by arms, the more we confirm our ostrich-like unwillingness to face the threat they pose. The moment for choice has arrived; it can no longer be dodged.

The lesson of recent events, though, should be a simpler one. We are experiencing a strange repetition of the 1930s, but with one big difference: We get the chance to do things differently — if we absorb the right lessons of history. In fact, I believe that had the U.S. and its allies not made war on Iraq, World War III would have been upon us in very short order. Yes, you read me right — and I'm not being rhetorical: The choice is war now with Iraq, or World War III later. This war has been long in preparation, and yet we've been trying not to acknowledge it. Only by eliminating Saddam and his nuclear weapons program (linked closely, as he clearly is, with Osama's al Qaeda and its secret army in the West) prior to its completion, can we hope to save ourselves from complete disaster.

This time, we get the chance to do things differently because the lesson of

history is right there before us. It is the Rhineland once again. As Churchill said during those dark days, and as he reiterated in the clearer light that followed the last war, had we in the West acted together and defeated Hitler then, there would not have been a Second World War. It would have been a relatively easy job if the Western powers had acted in concert, since Hitler and Nazi Germany were still quite weak. By halting or even killing the "guttersnipe" (as Churchill called Hitler) and vanquishing the Nazis early on, we would have been spared all the later bloodshed and horror of World War II. Again we face a similar choice: It's either a small war now, or a large, even massive, war later — but not much later, maybe two or at most three years (as it similarly was between Hitler's seizure and illegal re-occupation of the Rhineland, in 1936, and the Nazi conquest of Poland, in 1939). And the massive world war we face if we do not fight Saddam's Iraq will, it is almost certain, involve nuclear bombs — since historical experience with Saddam has shown us that he will not hesitate to use this or any type of weapon of mass destruction, if he thinks he can get away with it and if it will demoralize his enemy.

As for my Rhineland analogy, permit me to quote some of Churchill's comments from *The Gathering Storm* (p. 190), which show several striking parallels with our own time: "There was, perhaps, still time for an assertion of collective security, based upon the avowed readiness of all members concerned to enforce the decisions of the League of Nations by the sword. The democracies and their dependent states were still actually and potentially far stronger than the dictatorships, but their position relative to their opponents was less than half as good as it had been twelve months before. Virtuous motives, trammelled by inertia and timidity, are no match for armed and resolute wickedness. A sincere love of peace is no excuse for muddling hundreds of millions of humble folk into total war. The cheers of weak, well-meaning assemblies soon cease to echo, and their votes soon cease to count. Doom marches on."

By the way, the alliance of Saddam's secular nationalist Arabist-socialists with the fundamentalist Islamists of Osama (also known as the Islamofascists) is not so strange as it might at first appear. Consider again the history of the past century. Hitler's Nazi Germany made an alliance (the greater "Axis") with Tojo's militarist-imperialist Japan, even though the Japanese were by no stretch of the imagination of the correct race, namely, "Aryans." Yet race was supposedly the be-all and end-all of the Nazi ideological program, and of the Nazi state organized around it. How could it be? No difficulty: He solved the problem by sleight-of-hand. To get around the contradiction, Hitler simply made the Japanese "honorary" Aryans — just as Osama (or the dummy who fakes his voice and uses his slogans) has made Saddam a great servant of the Islamist cause — the veritable prophet of Allah. In other words, setting aside the fictions of propaganda (which are devised for the fools who will believe such stuff and nonsense), the "racially pure" Aryans of Nazi Germany and Tojo's militarist-imperialist Japan — suddenly racially redesigned as majestically tall, blond-haired, blue-eyed "Aryans" — were united by their mutual hatred of the West. That shared hatred was enough to make them join forces. The same thing is happening here.

The president has made the right choice for all of us — even for those of us like the majority of my fellow Canadians, who are in utter denial. But it is also for all of us — we who rely and who depend on the U.S. to preserve our way of life and to save us from the evil ones, from the likes of Osama's al Qaeda and Saddam's Iraq — to make a decision as to how we shall stand, whom we shall help, and in favor of which cause we shall speak in these troubled times: Do we stand with the evildoers, do we stand with the fools, or do we stand with the lions?

If we stand with, speak for, and lend aid to the lions, then we shall be justly gladdened by the victory, for we shall behold a righteous vision of the liberated people of Iraq waving U.S. flags in the streets of Baghdad, and singing and dancing for the joy of freedom. (National Review Mar 21)

The writer is a professor of religion at the University of Toronto and a member of BAYT.

Toronto Community Notice...

Keshar Employment Services is a free, not-for-profit employment service, that assists unemployed Jews find jobs in the corporate sector. If your company is looking for experienced, qualified personnel, or if you know of any job openings, please contact Keshar at (416) 635-0611 or e-mail hr1@kesharemployment.org
