

עש"ק פרשת קדשים  
27 Nisan 5765  
May 6, 2005  
Issue number 528



Jerusalem 6:42 Toronto 8:07

**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...**

**Wednesday May 11, 7:15pm**  
*Community Yom Ha'Zikaron*  
*commemoration and Yom Ha'Atzmaut celebration at Shaarei Shomayim.*

**Thursday May 12, 6:30pm - 9:00pm**  
*Community Yom Ha'Atzmaut celebration at the Lipa Green Building.*

**Wednesday May 18, 8:30pm**  
*"Fighting Terror With Kindness" featuring terror victim Shmuel*  
*Greenbaum at Westmount Collegiate (corner Bathurst and Atkinson).*

**Commentary...**

**Sharansky's Resignation Letter**

May 2, 2005 Dear Mr. Prime Minister,  
I am writing to inform you of my decision to resign as Minister of Diaspora Affairs and Jerusalem.

As you know, I have opposed the disengagement plan from the beginning on the grounds that I believe any concessions in the peace process must be linked to democratic reforms within Palestinian society. Not only does the disengagement plan ignore such reforms, it will in fact weaken the prospects for building a free Palestinian society and at the same time strengthen the forces of terror.

Will our departure from Gaza encourage building a society where freedom of speech is protected, where independent courts protect individual rights and where free market enable Palestinians to build an independent economic life beyond government control? Will our departure from Gaza end incitement in the Palestinian media or hate-filled indoctrination in Palestinian schools? Will our departure from Gaza result in the dismantling of terror groups or the dismantling of the refugee camps in which four generations of Palestinians have lived in miserable conditions?

Clearly, the answer to all these questions is no.

The guiding principle behind the disengagement plan is based on the illusion that by leaving Gaza we will leave the problems of Gaza behind us. As the familiar mantra goes "we will be here, and they will be there". Once again, we are repeating the mistakes of the past by not understanding that the key to building a stable and lasting peace with our Palestinian neighbors lies in encouraging and supporting their efforts to build a democratic society. Obviously, these changes surely will take time, but Israel is not even linking its departure from Gaza upon the initiation of the first steps in this direction.

In my view, the disengagement plan is a tragic mistake that will exacerbate the conflict with the Palestinians, increase terrorism, and dim the prospects of forging a genuine peace. Yet what turns this tragic mistake into a missed opportunity of historic proportions is the fact that as a result of changes in the Palestinian leadership and the firm conviction of the leader of the free world that democracy is essential to stability and peace - a conviction that is guiding America's actions in other places around the world - an unprecedented window of opportunity has opened. Recent events across the globe, whether in former Soviet republics like Ukraine or Kyrgyzstan, or in Arab states like Lebanon and Egypt, prove again and again the ability of democratic forces to induce dramatic change. How absurd that Israel, the sole democracy in the Middle East, still refuses to believe in the power of freedom to transform the world.

Alongside my concerns, about the danger entailed in a unilateral disengagement from Gaza, I am even more concerned about how the government's approach to disengagement is dividing Israeli society. We are heading towards a terrible rift in the nation and to my great chagrin; I feel that the government is making no serious effort to prevent it.

As Minister I share collective responsibility for every government decision. Now when the disengagement plan is in the beginning of its implementation stages and all government institutions are exclusively focused on this process, I no longer feel that I can faithfully serve in a government whose central policy - indeed, sole raison d'etre - has become one to which I am so adamantly opposed.

I would like to thank you for our productive cooperation over the last four

years. In particular, your sensitivity toward issues of concern to the Jewish People and the strong backing you gave to my efforts to combat anti-Semitism and to strengthen Israel's connection with the Diaspora made possible for the State of Israel to forge the many successes which we achieved together in these areas.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank you for the central role you played in integrating Israel B'aliya into the Likud, a historic step of

great national importance.

As in the past, I will continue my lifelong efforts to contribute to the unity and strength of the Jewish People both in Israel and in the Diaspora. I will also continue to advocate and promote the idea that freedom and democracy are essential to peace and security. Sincerely, Natan Sharansky

**Brainless in Gaza** By David Warren

The idea that Israel can promote peace by unilaterally withdrawing Jewish settlements from occupied territories is one of the world's great "no-brainers". Like other no-brainers, it shows no brains. The Israeli cabinet is now losing its most intelligent and impressive member -- Natan Sharansky -- thanks finally to Prime Minister Ariel Sharon's policy of unilaterally pulling the few Israeli settlements out of Gaza.

As usual, the headlines are captured by the superficial and irrelevant details. The Israeli newspapers were vexing themselves yesterday over whether the IAF should demolish the settlements after moving their inhabitants (many of the adults now becoming refugees within Israel for a second or third time).

It is typical of the non-meeting of minds, that the Palestinians mostly want the buildings demolished and their sites cleared, while most Israelis want to hand over the buildings to the Palestinians rather than wasting them. The Israeli authorities are also aware that if the buildings are demolished, the international media will have an anti-Israeli field day showing the scene. Which is in turn why many Palestinians want the demolition to happen: they would rather see that TV show, than have the use of buildings better constructed and serviced than most they now own.

So much for red herrings. The real issue, as Mr Sharansky correctly grasps, is how will the Palestinians respond to this Israeli gift of withdrawal? Will they note that the Israelis have made an overture for peace, and now it is their turn to reply, in equally good faith? Or will they dance in the streets to celebrate another assumed victory over Zionism by Hamas, Hezbollah, Islamic Jihad, et al. -- the way they did when the Israelis unilaterally withdrew from southern Lebanon? See if you can guess.

In Mr. Sharansky's view, the only possible secure future for Israel requires the democratization of her Arab neighbours. Nothing short of this will bring peace for long. And the most important democratization is for the Palestinians. Israel, in his view, has a vested interest in advancing democracy in the West Bank and Gaza.

This happens also to be the view taken by the U.S. administration in Washington -- though not consistently, for no matter how many times President Bush says it, or Condoleezza Rice repeats it, the diplomatists and bureaucrats of the State Department have difficulty hearing. Their minds remain locked in headspaces defined in the generation prior to the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan; they think only in terms of balances of power among governments they assume must be permanently authoritarian.

Mr. Sharansky, whose book, *The Case for Democracy: The Power of Freedom to Overcome Tyranny and Terror*, has been explicitly endorsed by President Bush as an explanation of his own point of view, knows that this democratization will only be achieved by a Palestinian Administration that is prodded every step of the way. It follows that the Israelis should prod with every bargaining chip at their disposal. What is given gratis is not merely a missed opportunity: it reinforces tyranny and terror on the other side.

Meanwhile, the spinelessness of the Palestinian Administration was put on display again yesterday, when they released three Hamas "activists" from prison. These gentleman had been caught after a gunfight, apparently fresh from firing off a few Qassam rockets in the general direction of the Israeli town of Sderot. They were paraded before the international media as examples of PA President Mahmoud Abbas's new "iron fist" stance against terrorism.

But Hamas, which claims to have been observing the ceasefire Mr. Abbas negotiated with them in March, threatened violence against the PA Monday afternoon. The "activists" were then quietly released Tuesday morning -- only the latest of several thousand serious malefactors who have passed

**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)**

through the revolving doors of Palestinian prisons.

The attitude among the anti-Israeli legions in the West seems to be, that since Mr. Abbas takes so much heat for giving lip-service to the security agreements he signs with Israel and the U.S., it would be outrageous to expect him to actually keep them. Surely we should be content with his nice words alone; and why can't the Israelis get used to all the rockets and suicide bombs?

This is the kind of thinking to which the thinking of Mr. Sharansky is opposed. He insists upon "linkage" between words and deeds. And he clanks the chain of reasoning all the way to PA headquarters. The Palestinians are supposed to be getting a democracy. This is not a single event, like the overturning of a public statue, but rather a long and even arduous process of societal reform. It involves big public things like constitutions and elections, but also little things -- such as eliminating roving bands of terrorist hitmen. And sometimes, the little things are the hardest to achieve.

Well, Mr. Sharansky is now gone, and we are back to watching the blind leading the blind towards the usual Armageddon. (Ottawa Citizen May 4)

---

### Retreat from Gaza By Daniel Mandel

Since December 2003, Ariel Sharon has astonished friend and foe alike, embracing the very idea he opposed in the elections that confirmed him in power in January 2003.

The idea is "unilateral disengagement," whereby Israel, without a peace agreement, withdraws its military and civilians from the territories administered by Israel since the 1967 war -- in this case, the Gaza Strip. The Labor opposition's Amram Mitzna lost badly campaigning on this very platform, coming in for incisive criticism from not a few figures, not just among the governing Likud, but from a bevy of informed Israeli observers. To cite just two:

Historian Michael Oren: "The minute you pull out of Gaza you signal to the Arabs that you're in retreat. It's a huge victory for the Palestinians. Palestinians will have huge celebrations in Gaza. You think they'll sit down and talk after that?"

Respected centrist journalist, Yossi Klein Halevi: "If unilateral withdrawal could happen in a void, it would be the right decision. But it is not happening in a void . . . The psychological implications are to reinforce the post-Lebanon withdrawal perception in the Arab world that we are a defeatist society and with enough pressure we'll simply withdraw."

Indeed, Ariel Sharon himself could not have been clearer at the time: "A unilateral withdrawal is not a recipe for peace. It is a recipe for war."

If these criticisms are correct, then unilaterally withdrawing from Gaza is a victory for terrorism; bloodshed is likely to flow from it, and Sharon of all people must know it.

What, then, is Sharon's rationale? According to his supporters, both right and left, the withdrawal represents Israel seizing the initiative, setting its own lines of defense, and preempting noxious diplomatic initiatives from Israel's ill-wishers. But all this looks doubtful. True, the Israel Defense Forces will be relieved of the onerous duty of defending isolated Jewish communities in a sea of enemies, but its absence from Gaza will also afford Palestinian terrorist groups a freer hand for mounting further attacks. And an initiative that stimulates the aggression of terrorists will not be altered by its originating in Jerusalem, as the terrorists themselves make clear.

Thus, Sami Abu Zuhri, a Hamas spokesman, has opined, "all the Israeli statements about a withdrawal from Gaza Strip are due to the Palestinian resistance operations. We are completely confident that as the Hezbollah Organization managed to kick the Israeli forces out of Lebanon, the Palestinian resistance will kick them out of the Palestinian territories, and we will continue our resistance."

A top Hamas leader in Gaza, Mahmoud al-Zahar, concurs: "Very simply, nobody can deny that if Israel is going to leave the Gaza Strip and part of the West Bank, that was because of the intifadah, because of the armed struggle, because of the big sacrifices of Hamas for this goal."

Add to this that the current cease-fire is giving terrorists a breather from ducking into bunkers and dodging Israeli drones, all the while recouping for another round.

All indications, then, are that the terrorists will be the leading beneficiaries of a unilateral Israeli withdrawal, appearing vindicated in asserting that terrorism first and foremost is the way. When the cease-fire collapses, as it must, foreign offices the world over will be clamoring for still more diplomatic motion and will take a dim view of resumed Israeli counter-terrorism measures. If setting the agenda, securing one's own, and preempting dangerous diplomacy is the idea behind the Gaza withdrawal, Israelis are likely to be disappointed.

Indeed, it could be said that Sharon is pursuing this doomed initiative as a result of diplomatic defeat. The "road map" peace plan was always going to serve as a guarantor of Palestinian malfeasance. Devised by the European Union, United Nations, the Russians, and the US State Department, the road map is to lead to a Palestinian state regardless of what Palestinians do.

Ingenious explanations can be offered for Israel's actions, but only one fits all the facts -- the Israelis are punting, grasping for a solution that is all the more enticing for looking like what in other circumstances might be sound policy. Instead, it has the savor of panic and defeat, made worse by delusive rationalization.

The Israelis are in the unpleasant position of making do with policies they opposed at the ballot box. But the United States is in no such position. Americans are fighting the same Islamist terrorist groups. The Bush

administration, which looks like it's rewarding the unreconstructed Palestinian Authority with levels of aid not even contemplated by Bill Clinton in his more expansive moments, should think twice about supporting policies that weaken its best Middle Eastern ally while emboldening the terrorists it is also fighting. It is not too late for a dose of good sense. (Boston Globe May 2)

*The writer is associate director of the Middle East Forum and author of "H.V. Evatt and the Establishment of Israel: The Undercover Zionist."*

---

### The Holocaust Fetish By Caroline Glick

The war made it clear that almost everybody agreed that the Jews had no right to live.

That goes straight to the bone.

Other people have some choice of options - their attention is solicited by this issue or that, and being besieged by issues they make their choices according to their inclinations. But for "the chosen" there is no choice. Such a volume of hatred and denial of the right to live has never been heard or felt, and the will that willed their death was confirmed and justified by a vast collective agreement that the world would be improved by their disappearance and their extinction. - Saul Bellow, *Ravelstein*, 2000

Yom Hashoah is a day of collective Jewish mourning. We have other days when we mourn - most prominently Tisha Be'av, when we mourn the loss of the First and Second Temples and of our sovereignty.

As a day of mourning, Holocaust Martyrs and Heroes Remembrance Day is distinct in that it is not a fast day. We don't deny ourselves things on Yom Hashoah. We eat. We drink. We go to work.

There are explanations - handed to us by generations of rabbis - for the destruction of the ancient Kingdoms of Israel. We were persecuted back then by the Greeks and the Assyrians and the Romans, but we too played a role in our own destruction. We had some power over our fate.

The Holocaust was unique from those other catastrophes that befell us in just how little it had to do with the Jews. We were not actors in the Holocaust. We were objects acted upon by the nations of Europe which, as Bellow wrote did in fact agree that it would not be too objectionable to anyone if the Germans were to go ahead and exterminate the Jewish people.

In March a dispute between Holocaust survivors and Yad Vashem generated a modicum of domestic media attention. It seems that Jews who saved other Jews want to be recognized by Yad Vashem in some way. These Jewish heroes - now approaching death - argued that since the non-Jews who saved Jews are recognized as Righteous Gentiles, they, who at much greater peril saved far more Jewish lives should also be distinguished officially for their valor.

Yad Vashem rejected their request explaining that from its perspective, a Jew acting heroically to save another Jew is obeying an existential imperative. The murder of one Jew is a wound that every other Jew absorbs. In contrast, the Christians who saved Jews in the Holocaust were exercising a choice. Therefore, said the officials at Yad Vashem, those Christians should be specifically and individually acknowledged for their efforts.

There is something telling in Yad Vashem's argument. It cuts to the heart of something that has nothing at all to do with the Holocaust. It speaks about what it means to be a Jew. We have a responsibility to our fellow Jews because the fortunes of all of us are connected inextricably with the fortunes of each individual Jew. Try as we might, there is nothing we can do to escape this reality.

BUT AGAIN, the Holocaust, in and of itself, tells us nothing about Jewish identity. It only tells us about the rest of the world. The Jews of Europe did not decide to die. They neither seized territory nor did they plant bombs in German cafes. The Holocaust was a German initiative, carried out by Germans and millions of collaborators from France to Greece to Poland to Lithuania. The decision to prevent the Jews' escape from Europe to the Land of Israel belonged to Britain.

The group that really ought to be taking the Holocaust to heart is not the Jews, but the Europeans who two generations ago descended to the depths of human depravity by either conducting the extermination of European Jewry or enabling it.

Sadly, Europe has avoided serious self-examination and instead has turned the Holocaust into a fetish. Holocaust memorials spring up like mushrooms after the rainfall throughout the continent. But what do they signify? A sop to Holocaust-obsessed Jews, they are used to teach Europeans that nationalism is bad. Speaking in 2000, German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer said, "The core of the concept of Europe after 1945 was and still is a rejection of the European balance of power principle and the hegemonic ambitions of individual states."

But this has nothing to do with the causes for the liquidation of European Jewry. It was not Polish or American nationalism that led to the Holocaust. The balance of power between Britain and France had nothing to do with the Holocaust. It was genocidal anti-Semitism, nurtured by 2000 years of Christian mythology, embraced by a post-Nietzschean Germany, and accepted relatively enthusiastically by the overwhelming majority of the rest of Europe that caused the Holocaust.

There is something deeply distasteful and viscerally disturbing about the spectacle of dozens of leaders of anti-Zionist, pro-Palestinian governments coming together at Auschwitz or the UN General Assembly or Westminster Cathedral and self-righteously bowing their heads for our exterminated

brothers and sisters. It is particularly odious given that the nihilistic moral relativism that played such a role in enabling the Holocaust remains the order of the day in the societies these leaders now govern.

Israel exists and Jewish communal organizations in the Diaspora exist both to cultivate Jewish life for the benefit of Jews, and to protect Jewish existence from manifestations of anti-Semitism. Jews cannot convince anti-Semites not to hate us anymore than a deer can convince a wolf not to hunt it. That work must be done by the societies that committed and enabled the Holocaust.

Israel has a duty to recall the Holocaust for what it means to the Jewish people to have lost a third of our members. But we have nothing to gain from joining the Europeans in their bizarre Holocaust rituals. It is neither our right nor our responsibility to wash Europe's hands of our brothers' blood.

Indeed, what that blood tells us most of all is that in the postwar world, we cannot allow ourselves to be enchanted by odes to brotherly love or utopian dreams. We can only defend ourselves, in our land, with our military and with our economic creativity, because the notion of trust perished at Auschwitz. (Jerusalem Post May 2)

---

### Sharansky's Message Jerusalem Post Editorial

Mysterious are the ways of Israeli politics.

It might reasonably be expected that the policy critique that Natan Sharansky offered in resigning his cabinet post would have precipitated at least a ripple of discussion, even among those who disagree with his conclusion.

That no such debate has taken place does not reflect well on our political culture. Granted, Sharansky is not your garden-variety political protagonist. He isn't brash, loud, insulting, sharp-tongued or exaggeratedly self-seeking. He doesn't change his opinions with the shifting of political winds and doesn't promise instant solutions.

And while mediocre yes-men are rewarded with portfolios, in costly, superfluous expansions of government, here is Sharansky, admirably (no matter that we differ with his implacable rejection of disengagement) bucking Israeli political norms and resigning his ministerial office on a point of principle.

Evidently, this renders him somewhat inscrutable to a narrow-minded system consumed by tactical maneuverings and short-term gains and losses. Indeed, he seems to get more of a respectful hearing overseas than at home. Just recently, Time magazine named him among its 100 most influential world personalities and the American president seemed to use Sharansky's book on democracy as a blueprint for his recent inaugural address.

The inattention here is most unfortunate. What Sharansky had to say in his resignation letter cuts across the usual stale debate and goes to the heart of our unending struggle for security and peace. Sharansky's basic argument is that disengagement ought to be linked to democratization among the Palestinians and that failure to hinge it on fundamental reforms in fact undermines the likelihood of change and underpins terror.

While we do not endorse the absolute conditioning of Israeli policies and actions on Palestinian change, that's no reason to ignore Sharansky's fundamental orientation – the same thinking that he personally outlined to Bush six months ago, to great presidential interest and sympathy. Israel ought to be no less interested than the American president.

"How absurd," laments Sharansky in his letter, "that Israel, the sole democracy in the Mideast, still refuses to believe in the power of freedom to transform our world." And this at a time, as he rightly points out, when "as a result of changes in the Palestinian leadership and the firm conviction of the leader of the free world that democracy is essential to stability and peace – a conviction that guides America's actions in other places worldwide – an unprecedented window of opportunity has opened."

We further accept Sharansky's premise that "recent events across the globe, whether in the former Soviet republics or in Arab states, prove again and again the ability of democratic forces to induce dramatic change."

There is every reason to assert that Israel, the US and other democracies still can pressure the Palestinians to clean up their act. So far we've had a surfeit of lip service but inordinate readiness to fall for what palpably are PA ploys and a facade of freedom.

What's needed is a profound overhaul. As Sharansky concedes, "such changes surely take time." But, sadly, the departing minister is not far wrong in asserting that, so far, we haven't even seen "the initiation of first steps in this direction." True democracy, as Sharansky often stresses, requires more than merely holding elections. The Arab world has plenty of elections – often with a single candidate, sometimes with a puppet challenger – but precious little true people-power. Saddam Hussein was "elected" by whopping landslides.

Democracy must be inculcated as a sociocultural mind-set, accompanied by a genuinely free press, independent judiciary, incitement-free education and a free market. Above all, there must be freedom from fear. All that is absent from the PA's ambit, where executions of those accused of helping Israel thwart terror atrocities were recently approved.

Crucially for Israel's interests, only a truly free society can make a truly lasting peace. And so, as Sharansky is rightly saying, in order to give peace a chance, the cause of freedom next door mustn't become a vacuous mantra but, rather, should be placed high on our national agenda and pursued in earnest.

We owe it to someone of Sharansky's international stature to pay attention to his message. We also owe it to ourselves. (Jerusalem Post May 4)

### Environments of Hate By Brigitte Gabriel *Indoctrination in the Arab World and Propaganda Advocacy in Americas University Classrooms*

I'm honored to bring Columbia a unique perspective concerning the academic freedom issue. I see similarities between the issue and my personal experiences growing up. I was raised in an Arabic society in Lebanon that took impressionable young minds and filled them with propaganda. Minds that were young and didn't know any better. I am an eyewitness and a victim of the indoctrination of hate education, racism, intolerance, intimidation and fabricated lies by my government and religious influences.

This indoctrination was for one purpose: To eradicate the newborn state of Israel; To foment hatred and wipe out Jewish presence in an Arab dominated world. For Arabs, the simple existence of Israel was viewed as a catastrophe...al nakbah! This pan Arab hate indoctrination was a reaction to Jews returning to their homeland after Arabic and Islamic belief for 1400 years that the Yahuds were vanquished and subjugated as Dhimmis.

I believe hate motivated indoctrination fosters irrational thinking and faulty reasoning whether it influenced my education as a child in Lebanon or the "advocacy education" that roils the classrooms here at Columbia. This is the root cause, for the controversy swirling around several members of the Middle East Asia Languages Arts and Culture (MEALAC) faculty and their alleged intimidation of students and other faculty!

What is at stake is our future, the students of today who will become tomorrow's leaders. If their minds are poisoned with irrational hatred and the hate is not combatted and eliminated, then academic freedom and free speech in an open marketplace of competitive ideas is dead.

But let me begin by talking about my experience growing up in Lebanon where doctrinal hatred of Jews and Israel was ever present.

From Television programs, to national songs, hourly radio newscasts and newspapers, our citizens were fed a steady diet of lies poisoning our attitudes towards the Jews. Israel - Aesrael, Israel is the devil. Al-Yahud shayateen, The Jews are evil. Sarakou Al-Ard Al Arabiyah. They stole Arab land. Al Wakt al wahid allazi yassir endana salam huwa lamma naqtul kul al yahud wa narmihom bil bahr, The only time we'll have peace in the Middle East is when we kill all the Jews and drive them into the sea. Every time Israel was mentioned it was attached to the phrase, Al adew al Israeli. The Israeli enemy.

My country and others saw nothing wrong with practising this form of mind abuse. Of taking a generation hostage, molding them into misguided weapons; some willing to be martyred in the name of Islam or Palestinian nationalism. It's a form of mental child abuse taking place in every Arab country.

As a Maronite Lebanese I went to a Christian private school. The pervasive national animosity toward the Jews affected us there to the extent that our Bibles did not include nor did we study the Old Testament. We didn't even know it was a part of the bible. We were told that the Torah is the enemy's book. We were young. We didn't know any better. These were our teachers. We respected them and trusted them.

Had I not had the opportunity for an up-close and personal experience with the Israelis, I would have had nothing by which to judge or compare what I was being told by my society.

My eyes were opened when I spent 22 days in a hospital in northern Israel in the early 1980's. I watched unbelievably as Israeli doctors treated my mother wounded by an artillery shell before he treated the wounded Israeli soldier lying next to her. They treated Lebanese Muslims and Palestinian militia fighters on a par with wounded IDF soldiers. I was shocked that this enemy, hated by the Arabs, treated us all with utmost courtesy, compassion, and respect. It was a transforming experience countering the lies and all the propaganda that I had been indoctrinated in as a child.

Ultimately, I made a commitment to leave my home country and move to Israel to be with these people whose values I respected.

I ended up working in Israel as a television news anchor. I never felt like a second class citizen in Israel. To solidify my commitment to Israel I buried my beloved parents remains in the same Mount Zion cemetery in Jerusalem where the grave of a "ger tzeddik" or righteous gentile-Oscar Shindler would one day be. I was tired of the lies, exaggerations and manipulations of Arabic society, which brings me to another parallel concerning academic freedom and objectivity.

Where is objectivity in the Arab world when they claim that the destruction of the World Trade Center was a CIA/Mossad plot? Where is objectivity on campuses when similar claims and distortions are made? Can there be objectivity when advocacy and hatred is involved? Professor Richard Bulet was right when he coined the term "advocacy education". How can a student get the facts by which to make a decision when professors advocate in their courses using ideological distortions to force form opinion instead of providing objective information for students to form their own opinions?

The lies that Arab society tried to teach me as a child in Lebanon are the same as those spread under the guise of academic freedom on the Morningside campus of Columbia. During a recent speech at a Columbia Law school forum, Professor Massad repeated 24 times in a half-hour that, "Israel is a racist Jewish apartheid oppressive state." His exercise in academic freedom ignores the facts. As a Middle Easterner brought up on this patent "Israel is a racist state" propaganda, I discovered it is total hate inspired nonsense. I've seen with my own eyes what kind of society Israel is.

I consider Israel to be one of the most multi-racial and multi-cultural countries in the world. There are no racial restrictions on becoming a citizen of Israel like there are in many Arab countries. Remember, Jews can't live in the neighboring Arab Kingdom of Jordan or in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Israel's multi-racial society belies the charge of Racism. More than 100 different countries of the world are represented in the population of Israel. Consider how the Israeli government spent tens of millions of dollars airlifting more than 40,000 black Ethiopian Jews to Israel in 1984 and 1991. Since 2001 Israel has reached out to help others taking in non-Jewish refugees from Lebanon, the Ivory Coast, Sierra Leone, Vietnam, Liberia, Congo and even Bosnian Muslims. How many such refugees have the 22 states in the Arab league taken in? The Arab world won't even give Palestinian refugees citizenship in their host countries.

Over one million Arabs are full Israel citizens. An Arab sits on the Supreme Court of Israel. There are Arab political parties expressing views inimical to the State of Israel sitting in the Knesset, Israel's parliament. Women are equal partners in Israel and have complete human rights. Professor Massad... show me an Arab nation with a Jew in their government. Show me an Arab country with half as many Jewish citizens as Israel has Arab citizens. I'll borrow some of your academic freedom now and say that Arab nations are the real racist and oppressive states.

In the David Project film, "Columbia Unbecoming," you hear a word familiar to us in the Arab world mentioned by these brave students and Rabbi Charles Sheer, the emeritus executive director of Barnard/Columbia Hillel. The word is: intimidation.

And people here at Columbia are up in arms that intimidation is mentioned? Let me tell you about intimidation. I know what using fear to deny freedom of thought is. In parts of the Arab world freely expressing your thoughts can get you killed. I said things as a news anchor that the Arabs did not like and it got my picture published in Hezbollah and PLO newspapers and magazines saying I should be killed.

What sort of academic atmosphere do you think that would foster here on American campuses? I'd like to think the ACLU would be up in arms and coming to my defense. As one who escaped repression and came to America I'm shocked that such elitists as the ACLU are the enemy to the pursuit of freedom. That people in America support the oppressive actions that I left in the Middle East simply astounds me.

Here at Columbia or DePaul I find more irony. When you speak out as a student you are told by some of the MEALAC faculty to leave the classroom. In the case of Professor Thomas Klocek at DePaul University you are suspended without due process for challenging lies about Israelis being Nazi occupiers by a Students for Justice in Palestine campus group. These are matters to be addressed by the Columbia administration, the ACLU and the AAUP now. What we're getting is people hiding behind psychobabble about academic freedom and free speech." What we see is freedom being used to spread lies, bar the facts, bend the truth and poison the minds of future leaders.

Speaking for millions who suffered and those still suffering under tyranny and oppression... we don't understand how people in American universities, who have enjoyed freedom for so long, can abuse that very freedom by doing things that hinder the spread of freedom throughout the world.

I see another parallel involving history that is happening here at Columbia and on other campuses. Anti Semites and anti Israelis have tapped into that part of the DNA of most Jews that paralyzes them from being confrontational when attacked. It's as if the Arabs studied Krystallnacht...the night of broken glass November 9th, 1938 in Nazi Germany. Scare Jews off and they will not respond or won't come back. Turning academic freedom into academic intimidation is the tactic being used here at Columbia and other campuses across the nation.

These ideologues know that they are teaching students who have no background or prior knowledge of the Middle East situation. What they are doing is an extension of what is taking place in schools in Palestinian and Muslim madrasahs across the Islamic crescent. Repeat a lie enough and it becomes truth. You listen to what we say. If you don't there will be consequences.

I have heard that a graduate student at the School of International and Public Affairs here at Columbia approached a professor about holding programs on global anti-Semitism. The tenured faculty member said that he would be "blacklisted." Blacklisted by other Columbia faculty for even raising the topic. Further, this young graduate student was told not to even think of bringing up the subject of Genocide in the Sudan! Sounds like intellectual fascism to me.

This brings me to something I was surprised to discover. I have always known that Jews are into studying and debating and being informed people. I knew about the Bar and Bat Mitzvah preparation and really thought that American Jewish children were prepared for life. What shocked me, really confounded me was how totally unprepared teenage Jews are when it comes to understanding the history of the Middle East conflict. The Jewish community has let freshmen down in preparing them to face what biased or hate filled college environments are throwing at them today.

Let me tell you something else about hate in the Arabic environment. Arab children are taught hatred of the Jew from their mother's milk. They are constantly bombarded with stories and information presenting the Jew as barbaric, conniving, manipulative, warmongering people. You name it. While the Jew is taught patience, humility, service and charity to all: Olam tikkun olam-to repair the world. No wonder professors with an agenda of hate propaganda can intimidate and belittle young Jewish students. It is time for the

Jewish community to wake up. It is time that Jewish youths are prepared to do battle in the open cockpit of debate in college classrooms.

It is also time for tenured faculty at Columbia, Carnegie Mellon, DePaul, Duke, the University of California at Irvine to find their moral compasses and rise up with their colleagues and administrations to reclaim their campuses from the poisonous indoctrination of hate. Reclaim it and return the classroom to an intimidation free environment for young minds to learn the truth through open debate and give them, us and the world a better future.

Thank you. (NaomiRagen.com May 4)

---

### Book Review By Atara Beck

*God's Covenant with Israel* By Binyamin Elon

*The book is hardcover, published by Heartland to Heartland, an organization dedicated to bringing together Christians and Jews, in an alliance based on Biblical values, to keep the heartland of Israel, including Judea and Samaria, under the sovereignty of the State of Israel and to prevent the creation of an Arab terrorist state in the heart of the Holy Land. Heartland to Heartland believes that the Judeo-Christian values are the foundation of the friendship and alliance between America and Israel. It is jointly managed from offices in Jerusalem and Washington D.C.*

Perhaps the greatest misfortune that has ever befallen the Jewish state is the lack of understanding among many Israelis, as well as internationally, of the basic right of the Jewish people to the Holy Land. It is this failure to recognize the inherent right to that land that has eroded Jewish dignity and the resolve to hold on to the biblical territories of Judea and Samaria.

In *God's Covenant with Israel: Establishing Biblical Boundaries in Today's World*, author Binyamin Elon, Member of the Knesset, defines the return of the Jewish people to the Land of Israel as "the most significant historic drama of our age." Elon, an ordained rabbi and seventh-generation Jerusalemite on his mother's side, served two terms as Israel's minister of tourism. He is chairman of the Moledet party and a member of the Christian Allies Caucus.

Elon movingly points out the biblical significance of several places. "Abraham purchased Hebron as a burial place for his wife, Sarah. Jacob purchased the field of Shechem. Jerusalem was purchased by King David from the Jebusites. These are the three cities at the heart of the conflict in Israel today," he says. "I believe that we cannot deal with this conflict without exploring God's covenant with the land and what that covenant means for all those we affectionately call the 'People of the Book.' Christians and Jews who take God at His Word in Scripture and believe wholeheartedly that God's covenant with Israel is everlasting have a responsibility to know, understand and honour that covenant."

Elon discusses the question of Jerusalem, and maintains that radical Islam has been targeting sites representing the covenant between God and Israel. He describes in detail the "systematic destruction of the Temple site by Islamic leaders." The Muslim Waqf, which was given the task to supervise the Temple Mount after the creation of the Palestinian Authority in 1993, has been destroying Jewish artifacts with the goal to erase all traces of Jewish history on the Mount. It is astounding that this organized, methodical ravaging of antiquities has been all but ignored by the Israeli government. In January 2000, he continues, the Committee for the Prevention of the Destruction of Antiquities on the Temple Mount, a non-political volunteer group that includes many prominent Israelis - archaeologists, writers, lawyers, etc. - was founded to address this indifference. (Today, at the time of this writing, reports from Israel describe this ongoing devastation.)

One particularly interesting chapter is titled "The Right Road to Peace." Contrary to popular misconception, those who oppose a retreat to the 1967 borders are not warmongers; rather, they believe that efforts such as the Oslo agreement and the forcing of Jews out of their homes certainly do not promote peace. Although Elon focuses on the spiritual issues, he presents the political and practical situation very well. "While the Biblical covenant serves as our inspiration," he states, "those who possess belief must propose a real alternative. A political strategy that addresses all issues involved in the conflict in the Middle East, and that is based on accepted principles of international law, is essential." He suggests an approach that takes into account not only the threats to the Jewish population in the region, but also the suffering of the Palestinian refugees and their right to "national expression." He asserts that "the continued existence of these [refugee] camps more than 50 years after they were established is a humanitarian disgrace, as well as a threat to the security and peace of the Middle East."

Elon's plan includes "the recognition and development of Jordan as the Palestinian state." He provides historical facts to support his stance and reminds the reader that the generous territorial offers made by Israel in 2000 and its support of the Palestinian Authority only increased terror. He explains his conviction that Jordan should be established "once again" as the "exclusive representative of the Palestinian Arabs," and suggests a logical, step-by-step process towards a permanent, peaceful solution according to which the entire region - Jews and Arabs - would thrive.

The book includes a comprehensive view of God's covenant by Dr. Larry Keefauver. Keefauver, a Christian author and pastor, explains his belief, supported by scripture, that the Land of Israel belongs to the Jews.

This unique work is worthwhile reading, if only to counter the distortion of basic history that has taken place during the vicious war against the integrity of the State of Israel and civilized society in general.