



ISRAEL NEWS

*A collection of the week's news from Israel
From the Bet El Twinning / Israel Action Committee
of Beth Avraham Yoseph of Toronto Congregation*

communities in the areas.

Most of the communities that depend on IDF protection are located in the Jordan Valley, along the international border with Jordan. The rest of the forces in Judea and Samaria are stationed there in order to protect Israel's major cities - Tel Aviv, Haifa, Jerusalem, Afula, Netanya and Beersheba - from attacks by terror forces operating in Judea and Samaria.

Events...

Wednesday May 24, 5:30pm

Thornhill Jewish Chamber of Commerce members' event with **Paul Godfrey** at the Rogers Centre, followed by Blue Jays game. Call 416-366-6743 for membership information.

Quote of the Week...

"One must not ignore the feeling that a prize for terror is created as a result of such processes. The question is how one neutralizes it. Some viewpoints on the Palestinian side consider such unilateral actions as a prize for terror and this is problematic. This is exactly what the President of Iran was talking about when he compared Israel to a rotting tree that can collapse in one fell swoop. We must find the balance between the need to preserve a Jewish majority and that it is forbidden to encourage terror. Today it is already clear that one of the reasons for the victory of Hams in the elections was the interpretation of part of the Moslem world of the disengagement. This is the reason that I have serious doubts about this matter. I don't hide it. To all this one must add the fact that the State prepared the disengagement in a boorish manner and set inhuman standards with extreme bureaucratic requirements on the families." - Minister of Tourism Yitzhak Herzog (Labor). (IMRA / Maariv May 12)

Commentary...

Olmert's Mythological Settlements By Caroline Glick

Last week, as he presented his new government to the Knesset, Prime Minister Ehud Olmert proclaimed that the scattered Israeli communities in Judea and Samaria present a threat to the country and so they must be destroyed.

If what Olmert says is true, then no patriotic Israeli or friend of the Jewish state can countenance the continued existence of these communities. Doing so would be tantamount to providing aid and comfort to Israel's enemies.

A central question for those who care about Israel and believe that its national security is crucial in the global war against Islamofascism thus becomes: Is Olmert correct when he states that scattered Israeli communities in Judea and Samaria are a threat to Israel's existence?

Olmert and his political associates provide two justifications for this assertion. First, they claim that protecting these communities is a drag on the resources of the IDF. They argue that the military would be able to significantly cut back on its operations and troop levels in the areas if it didn't have to protect them.

Second, they claim that the Israeli communities in Judea and Samaria create friction with the Palestinians, and that this alleged friction is the root of Palestinian and Arab resentment of Israel that motivates them to wage war against the Jewish state.

According to this reasoning, if these communities were destroyed the Palestinians would lose interest in fighting Israel and so, more than terrorism, these communities are the reason that peace has eluded the region.

Yet when one examines these twin justifications, it becomes apparent that Olmert's claims are incorrect. Far from being a drag on IDF resources, the isolated Israeli communities in Judea and Samaria are a tactical and strategic asset for the IDF. Today, of all the thousands of IDF forces stationed in Judea and Samaria, only some 300 troops are dedicated to protecting the Israeli

always recognized the necessity of defeating Israel's enemies before they are able to reach Israel's population centers. Israel is such a small country, and its urban areas are so densely populated that it has always been understood that our enemies must not be allowed to operate in our cities.

This view was vindicated between 1994 and 2002, when Israel transferred its control over Judea and Samaria to the Palestinian Authority.

Throughout those years the IDF drastically curtailed its operations in the areas. As a result, for the first time since the 1950s Israel's enemies were able to consistently attack its civilian population centers, causing an unprecedented civilian death toll. This trend was reversed only after Israel's counter-terrorist offensive in Judea and Samaria in April-May 2002, when, during Operation Defensive Shield, the IDF reasserted its control over the Palestinian towns and villages in Judea and Samaria.

The drop in the Israeli urban civilian casualty rate since then is the direct result of the IDF's maintenance of that control in a manner that enables it to continuously curtail the seeding and growth of terror cells in the areas.

In Operation Defensive Shield, the IDF reached the city of Nablus in one day. It was able to do so because it launched its operations against the city from the isolated Israeli communities of Elon Moreh, Yizhar and Itamar - all of which Olmert intends to destroy. The communities, and all others like them, constituted friendly, fortified and stable forward operating bases for the IDF.

If the IDF had not had these communities, it could easily have taken seven to 10 days of heavy fighting for the IDF to have been in a position to launch its offensive against Nablus. That fighting would have been over control of the highways.

In Lebanon in the 1990s and in Gaza from 2000 on, the IDF surrendered control of the highways to Hizbullah and the Palestinian terror units. Once it lost control of the highways, it garrisoned its forces in static, fortified locations and so surrendered the initiative to its enemies. In both Lebanon and Gaza the IDF suffered its highest casualties from roadside bombs and attacks on convoys.

The IDF has not suffered a similar fate in Judea and Samaria since 2000 because of the isolated communities in the areas. When Israeli families are driving in unarmored cars, the IDF cannot very well limit itself to armored convoy traffic. To a degree, it is the presence of the Israeli civilians in the areas that has forced the IDF to maintain control of the roads. And it is this IDF control of the roads that is most responsible for keeping suicide bombers out of Israel's major cities.

EVERY MONTH IDF forces intercept dozens of Palestinian terrorists at roadblocks. The Hawara checkpoint outside Nablus on the road to Itamar, for instance, has been the site of hundreds of such intercepts. By stopping them at Hawara and in other isolated spots in close proximity to isolated Israeli communities, the IDF saves the police the need of trying to find the terrorists in Jerusalem or Netanya and has saved the lives of countless Israelis who would otherwise have been murdered.

Proponents of destroying the Israeli communities in Gaza argued that by removing them Israel would gain the tactical benefit of shorter defensive lines. Yet far from conferring a tactical advantage, the shortening of the lines caused by the destruction of the communities of Gush Katif gave the tactical advantage to Israel's enemies.

Israel's chief advantages over the Palestinian forces is its superior technology and firepower. But these advantages are neutralized by our enemies' ability to carry out its attacks from among a civilian population that Israel is unwilling to target.

Gush Katif constituted an irresistible target for the Palestinians. In attempting to attack its communities, the terrorists were forced to separate themselves from the protective shield of their civilian populations and so exposed themselves to IDF guns. In most cases, they were killed.

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.

Now that Israel has no communities in Gaza it is unable to effectively separate terrorists from the population, and so its operations against terror cells are both ineffective and open the IDF to condemnation by the Israeli and international Left.

IN THE SAME manner, the isolated communities in Judea and Samaria have been the site of countless terrorist operations. Some, like the massacres of the Shebo family in Itamar and the Gavish family in Elon Moreh in 2002, have been murderously successful. Most have failed at great cost to the terrorists.

In all cases, the Israelis who live in these communities have demonstrated a heroic willingness to place themselves at risk and accept losses to ensure the security and well-being of the country as a whole.

Last Friday the PA's Hamas Prime Minister Ismail Haniyeh said, "From Lebanon to the West Bank, the Zionist enterprise is in retreat." Haniyeh contrasted this perceived retreat with what he views as the rise of the Palestinians on all fronts. He singled out Arab Israelis for special commendation for refusing to accept the existence of Israel within the 1949 armistice lines.

Against statements like Haniyeh's, Olmert's assertion that the existence of isolated Israeli communities in Judea and Samaria is a root cause of the Palestinian and Arab war against Israel today is exposed in all its strategic blindness. Far from moderating the Palestinians, Israel's retreat from Gaza last summer radicalized them and their allies throughout the Islamic world by fanning their faith that Israel will one day disappear completely.

At the end of the day, Israel will achieve peace only when the Palestinians and the Arab world in general accept the fact that Israel will never be wiped off the map and so agree to peacefully coexist with the Jewish state. By asserting that the commingling of Jews and Arabs in Judea and Samaria is a cause of the war, Olmert is saying that there is no chance of ever coexisting with the Arabs. In so doing, he is effectively telling Israel's worst enemies that they are right - that the Jews are retreating and will eventually disappear if they keep fighting.

In light of all of this, it is terrifyingly clear that Israel's new prime minister has placed as the centerpiece of his government's goals the implementation of a policy that is based on mythology and will lead not to the enhancement of Israel's national security and the strengthening of the forces fighting the global jihad, but to the destabilization of Israel's national security and a strategic defeat for the nations, led by the US, that are fighting the war against Islamofascism.

The Day of the Rift By Israel Harel

On May 15, the Arabs of Israel and Judea and Samaria, like their brothers in Arab countries, marked the "disaster," the Nakba, which many of them call the "Palestinian Holocaust." In Israel, memorial rallies were held in almost every Arab community. A central, mass rally was held in Lod, and the phrase "we will neither forget nor forgive" was frequently heard there.

The cameras photographed the keys, symbolic and real, to the abandoned homes, and the microphones picked up the pledge to return to the cities, the villages and the lands. At 11 A.M., when the commemorative sirens in the Palestinian Authority wailed, not a small number of Arab Israelis stood still.

The Hebrew media highlighted a number of events that day, in particular the expansion of the economy by 7 percent. The events of the Nakba were modestly and somewhat empathetically covered, certainly not judgmentally or critically.

After all, a humanist - and every Israeli member of the media is such - must judge events not only on the basis of the visible, but mainly against their background and their reasons. And this information, as historians have proven in recent decades, does not necessarily support the Jewish narrative regarding the creation of the Palestinian problem.

The media knows full well, of course, that beyond lip service there is no emotional, educational or, perish the thought, nationalistic feeling in what was said and presented in these Nakba ceremonies. If this were not the case, the media would certainly have raised the alarm.

The Nakba rituals are so expected and natural that no one stops to ask where the processions - whose marchers carry pictures of villages that today are cities, kibbutzim and moshavim - are leading. To reconciliation between peoples? To narrowing the rifts, expressed by an opinion poll that revealed that 62 percent of Jews believe (perhaps as a reaction to processions with such messages?) that the government must encourage emigration of Arabs? Do organized commemoration visits of Arabs to today's Jewish neighborhoods in Jerusalem dispel the concerns of the Jews that the Arabs really want - as the Palestinian covenant says - for the Jews to return to where they came from? What do the leaders expect from posters calling for the right of return to Jaffa, Haifa and Acre?

And if today when the Israeli Arabs are only one-fifth of the population of the country, this Nakba Day is their Israeli identity card, what will happen - and the day is not far off - when they are a quarter of the population, a third

or maybe more? How can the Jewish majority in the Jewish nation-state accept in its midst a considerable minority that has adopted a special day in the year in which it presents a collective question mark, to put it mildly, over the right of the majority to the country?

There are a few reasons, other than the steamroller of political correctness, why the discussion of these questions is rare and superficial. A considerable number of Jews, especially those who set the public agenda, do not regard as important the nationalistic emotions that are at the foundation of Arab statements and rituals. Perhaps this is because their own nationalistic feelings are dulled, and therefore they cannot sense how deep and powerful those of the Arabs are.

Thus, for example, the Or Commission believed that the main reason for the October 2000 riots was the lack of equality from which the Arab sector suffers. And groups full of good intentions, like Sikkuy, believe that correcting daily injustices - and they exist - is the main key to reconciliation between the peoples. But discrimination is the outcome, not the reason.

Clearly, efforts to put an end to the phenomenon must continue. But the thought that assuaging injustice will dull Arab nationalistic feeling or the expectations of "correcting the injustice of 1948" is arrogantly paternalistic and belittles the Arabs' nationalistic sensibilities. The age in which the Arabs made do, declaratively at least, with equality - the age in which most of the Jewish organizations working for them still live - is behind us. And not only because the Arabs did not win the desired equality.

The statements of MK Ahmed Tibi, a well-spoken representative of a significant portion of the Arab intelligentsia in Israel, illustrate the upgrading of Arab nationalistic demands. Two decades ago Tibi was their determined spokesman demanding equal rights. Eventually he began demanding cultural autonomy. Other Arab public figures, including his personal and political rivals, echoed the call. Then Tibi came with the demand for "autonomy of land," which is a roundabout way of demanding political autonomy. And there is no need for a wild imagination to envision what his next demand will be.

Unless a dramatic reversal of consciousness takes place, the rift will continue to widen, not contract. The success of Avigdor Lieberman's party in the last elections is part of the response of Jews who are concerned about the future. And the louder the Tibi-like demands become, the greater Jewish opposition will grow. (Haaretz May 18)

Noam Chomsky's Love Affair with Nazis

By David Horowitz and Jacob Laksin

Rarely has the world been afforded such a clear glimpse into the unholy alliance between Islamic extremists and secular radicals in the West. That's exactly what it got last week when the foremost Imam of the radical Left, Noam Chomsky, bestowed his blessings on the world's largest terrorist army, the Shiite jihad outfit sponsored by Iran and known as Hezbollah ("Party of God.")

Following a meeting with Hassan Nasrallah, the Lebanese terrorist group's "secretary general," Chomsky announced his support for Hezbollah's refusal to disarm. Then, in an echo of Nasrallah's recent declaration that President Bush is the world's top "terrorist," Chomsky pronounced his own fatwa on the United States calling it one of the "leading terrorist states." It was a meeting of murderous radical minds.

In many ways, Chomsky's newly forged friendship with Hezbollah -- the most recent entry in a lifetime befriending America's most deadly enemies -- is the logical continuation of the professor's longstanding admiration for global terrorists and Jew-haters. In fact, Chomsky devoted most of the nineties to touting Hezbollah as a "resistance" movement (which occasionally committed misguided acts against civilians) while singing its praises as a crusader for peace and social justice.

Typical was Chomsky's 1996 book, *World Orders Old and New*. Citing with approval a journalist's observation that Hezbollah "is not a terror organization," Chomsky explained that the terrorist who blew up 243 U.S. Marines in Lebanon and murdered untold citizens of Israel was only engaging in "legitimate resistance" against an oppressor and "avoids striking civilians except in retaliation for Israeli attacks on Lebanese civilians."

Elsewhere in his book Chomsky claims that, in launching its attacks against Israel Hezbollah "carefully avoided civilian areas" and assured his readers that Hezbollah attacks were always "retaliatory." Israel through Chomsky eyes presented quite a different story. Dispensing altogether with the studied euphemisms that marked his descriptions of Hezbollah, Chomsky unequivocally denounced Israel for using "terror weapons" to commit "atrocities" such as targeting "civilians" with "no provocation".

The resulting effort bore little resemblance to fact. Rather than consider well-documented reports of Hezbollah's repeated shelling (at its Iranian master's prompting) of Northern Israel, killing women and children in the process, Chomsky rejected the reports as so much American and Israeli propaganda. How after all, could the Great and Little Satans be telling the

truth?

Rather than reflect on the fact that Hezbollah terrorists deliberately entrenched themselves among Arab civilians to cause the casualties so that Chomsky could protest, Chomsky falsely charged, that the Israeli military targeted the civilians, a claim which no reasonable human being could make. Even the anti-Israel UN felt compelled to acknowledge that "Hezbollah had resorted to using civilian areas to provide a human shield for its terrorist activity."

In Chomsky's version of the Elders of Zion, Israel is always the instigator, while the attacks of terrorists whose declared objective is the establishment of an Islamic state on Israel's grave, are invariably "defensive." Chomsky blames an upsurge in Hezbollah terror, for example, on Israel's 1992 assassination of Hezbollah leader (and mass murderer) Sheikh Abbas Mussawi. Yet Chomsky neglected to mention that Mussawi, speaking in behalf of Hezbollah openly proclaimed his genocidal goal: "We are not fighting so that the enemy recognizes us and offers us something. "We are fighting to wipe out the enemy."

In Chomsky's writings about Hitler's heirs, the genocidal roles are always reversed. When Hezbollah broke an informal 1995 agreement to suspend attacks against civilian targets, Chomsky condemned Israeli military strikes, again omitting the fact that the complete annihilation of the Jewish state was Hezbollah's stated goal.

In his 2000 book *Fateful Triangle*, Chomsky complained about media coverage that described Hezbollah's shelling of the so-called Israeli "security zone" in Southern Lebanon as "terrorism," Chomsky insisted that it was instead an act of "indigenous resistance to the rule of Israel and its proxies." As usual, Chomsky was lying. Hezbollah's attacks were against civilians inside the security zone not military targets. In a typical projection, Chomsky maintained in the face of the facts that it was Israel who was killing civilians, and (another lie) that Israel's official policy was to attack "villages and civilians" in Lebanon.

Today as its Iranian patron calls on the Muslim world to exterminate the Jews and finish Hitler's job, Hezbollah is blessed by the embassy of America's most prominent leftist, and better still, a self-hating Jew. While the international community and even the United Nations (whose resolutions Chomsky has repeatedly used as a sledge hammer against Israel), demands that the terrorist Party of God -- which is an occupying army in Lebanon -- lay down its weapons, Chomsky provides the occupiers with a moral defense. According to Professor Chomsky there is a "persuasive argument" that the weapons "should be in the hands of Hezbollah as a deterrent to potential aggression and there is plenty of background and reasons for that." (Many Lebanese are not persuaded. Commenting on Chomsky's visit, a Lebanese observer pointed to the professor's ignorance of the fact "that the Hezbollah arms scare the Lebanese people more than the Israelis.")

In fact, of course, the only "potential aggression" comes from Chomsky's friends. In 2004, Hezbollah inked an agreement with Hamas -- similarly dedicated to the extermination of Israel -- to continue their joint terrorist attacks against Israel. Hezbollah has also provided political support and weapons training to Hamas and al-Qaeda. In 2004, Hezbollah also launched an unmanned aerial vehicle that crossed Israeli airspace before crashing.

Hitler concealed his genocidal agendas from the German people and from his Chomsky-apologists. Hezbollah is more fortunate. In pursuing a second Holocaust of the Jews, it can count on Muslim support and apparently the support of American radicals as well. Therefore it makes no secret of what it intends. Its 1985 manifesto contains a section titled "The Necessity for the Destruction of Israel" that spells out the evil it seeks: "Our struggle will end only when this entity is obliterated. We recognize no treaty with it, no cease-fire, no peace agreements." Like true jihadists, Hezbollah's genocidal plans are not reserved for the Little Satan only but are its agenda for the Great Satan too. In 1993, Chomsky's host Nasrallah declared: "Death to America was, is, and will stay our slogan."

As his pilgrimage to Hezbollah's mecca confirms, it is Noam Chomsky's life-dream as well. (FrontPageMagazine.com May 15)

The Judd Factor By Sol Stern

Tony Judd is the Erich Maria Remarque Professor of European Studies at New York University and "one of our most dazzling public intellectuals." At least that's what David Halberstam, one of our most dazzling sportswriters, says in a blurb for Judd's new book, *Postwar: A History of Europe Since 1945*.

If you're curious about the credentials needed to be certified as a true public intellectual by arbiters such as Halberstam, the Judd case could be instructive. Certainly his recent writings suggest that displaying abysmally poor political judgment is no impediment for entry into the PI club.

In *Postwar*, for instance, Judd devotes no more than three or four pages out of his almost 900 page book to the subject of Muslim immigration to Europe. That's about the same amount of space he allows for recent developments in European soccer. But while David Beckham's transfer from Manchester

United to Real Madrid in 2003 gets Judd's rapt attention, Tariq Ramadan, the most influential Islamist in Europe, receives no mention. And as to why Muslim immigrants to Europe seem to be behaving so badly in their new lands -- for example, indiscriminately assaulting Jews on the streets of Paris -- Judd has a one line explanation: "The transmigration of passions and frustrations from persecuted Arabs in Palestine to their angry, dispirited brethren in Paris should not have come as a surprise -- it was, after all, another legacy of empire."

Empire: This is Judd's equivalent of comedian Flip Wilson's old claim that "the Devil made me do it."

Judd's free pass for Islam is the other side of the coin of his recent obsession with the sins of Israel and Zionism, areas which make the personal oh so political for Judd. Raised in London's Jewish East End, as a teenager he became the national secretary of the Labor Zionist youth movement, spent time on an Israeli kibbutz, and served as a non-combatant volunteer for the Israel Defense Forces immediately after the Six Day War. Then, after taking his PhD in European Studies at Cambridge University, Judd not only grew disenchanted with his youthful vision of a socialist, peace seeking Israel but also became convinced that "the rule of law, the power of Western states and international diplomacy" were better guarantors of Jewish security than the Jewish state.

There's nothing particularly earth shaking or newsworthy about one more progressive Jewish intellectual announcing that he has personally had it with Israel. The path Professor Judd is following is well worn, having previously been taken by the likes of I.F Stone, Noam Chomsky, Amos Elon and many other public intellectuals of lesser renown. All had dreams, or so they said, of a pure socialist, secular Israel that, through its good works, would be able to make peace with its Muslim neighbors and integrate itself into the Middle Eastern family of nations. But in their view the possible dream was sullied by the ugly reality of the new Israel emerging after the Six Day War, the Israel of religious nationalism and insensitivity to the suffering of the colonized Palestinians. Like Judd, they too all turned a blind eye to militant Islam while continuing to hold Israel to ever more exacting moral standards.

Despite his biography of engagement and disenchantment, Judd had actually written very little about the Israel/Palestine conflict until he emerged in October 2003 to publish his second thoughts about Zionism in the *New York Review of Books*. (Where better might a public intellectual announce his divorce from Israel?) In a piece called "Israel: The Alternative," he repeated many of the standard anti-Israel tropes. But he also moved to distinguish himself from the herd of common, run of the mill Israel bashers by declaring that the entire Zionist project was all a colossal mistake. Israel, Judd proclaimed, has "imported a characteristically late --nineteenth-century separatist project into a world that has moved on, a world of individual rights, open frontiers, and international law." Thus the very idea of a Jewish State is "an anachronism" and must be transformed, sooner rather than later, into "a single integrated, binational state of Jews and Arabs, Israelis and Palestinians."

Judd called his essay an attempt to "think the unthinkable" and invited readers to undergo the same agonizing reevaluation. (After all, isn't that what we pay our public intellectuals to do?) But Judd's bi-national proposal is not only "unthinkable" -- as in unworkable -- but it is based on a misapplication of the European experience to the Middle East. This is stunning because Judd comes to us as a European expert. In fact, Judd might do a little more "thinking the unthinkable" about one of the countries he supposedly knows so much about, France. La Belle Republique is now buckling -- some would say disintegrating -- under a 10% Muslim population introduced by Judd's recommended mix of "individual rights [and] open frontiers." France is also a country that many Jews are now running from. So how could any reasonable person propose that the Jews of Israel try to live with a 40% radical Islamist population?

The answer is that public intellectuals are not necessarily reasonable. Sometimes, under the illusion that they are bravely "thinking the unthinkable" they become attracted to dumb and harmful ideas. In the case of Tony Judd the harm is now compounded by a stance of embattled victimhood. Unable to respond substantively to legitimate criticism of his unworkable bi-national idea, he has taken refuge in the big lie about how, because of pernicious Zionist influence, it's not possible in America to have a rationale debate about Israel. Thus he told the *Jewish Forward* that he was dismayed that so few American Jews would even consider his proposal, whereas Europeans and even Israelis were more open to discussion.

Caught up in his *idée fixe*, in April of this year Judd took to the *New York Times* op-ed page to defend the argument advanced by Stephen Walt and John Mearsheimer that the "Israel Lobby" prevents open and unfettered debate in America of Israel's policies. Incredibly, Israel's liberal daily, *Haaretz*, also opened up its pages to Judd for an Independence Day jeremiad on how dismaying it was that at the age of 58 Israel was still so "uniquely" immature compared to all the other Western-style democracies, so unwilling to acknowledge its many errors and failings, so "full of wounded self-

esteem" that it was unable to see that the day of reckoning is coming for all of its sins against another people -- a reckoning, of course, that could only be averted by adopting the Jewish bi-national state. The title of the essay was "The Country That Wouldn't Grow Up."

By coincidence Tony Judt was born in the same year as the state of Israel. I leave it to others to judge how grown up it is for a reputed scholar of Europe, who missed the story of the unraveling of the European model of integration, to continue on an obsessive quest to find failure on the one tiny island of sanity and democracy trying to survive in a sea of Muslim barbarism. (FrontPageMagazine.com May 16)

'I Never Met Daniel Wultz' By Linda Maurice

It's been a really long, terrible day. I didn't know Daniel Wultz. Our daughter Meira went to school with him, and since it was a small school everyone pretty much knew everyone else, at least a little bit.

My husband Charles had sat on a school committee a few years back with Tuly, Daniel's father. So we had a connection, and we went to the funeral. But we would have gone anyway.

Friends have sent their condolences to us, as if we were in mourning too. And I suppose we all have been.

Aside from the obvious mourning of a young, vibrant life, violently taken from everyone, we have also been mourning the fact of terrorism hitting too close to home; something Charles and I came to understand from our years in Israel, and recent years of hearing firsthand accounts from our friends still there, or knowing people like our brother-in-law Simon's own family grief, having also lost two relatives in attacks.

But we didn't quite expect that it would affect a family from nearby Weston, Florida.

SO, AS I sat in Chabad of Weston today and listened to all the eulogies, grief and anger overwhelmed me. Grief was obvious as I heard about this beautiful 16-year-old boy, the believer, the questioner, the one who volunteered with our special needs camp at the Posnack JCC last summer, the one who sat with lonely kids on the school bus, the one who ultimately died because he was inadvertently shielding his father and thus saved him from the bomber's shrapnel.

The anger is a bit more complicated to explain, and it didn't just start today - although I could recognize the anger in me from having to watch my eldest daughter and her classmates cry because the horrible conflict, usually far away, had come to visit their school and made them confront reality, albeit at too young an age.

Are children from David Posnack Hebrew Day School supposed to get blown up at shwarma restaurants in Tel Aviv because they want to be with Israeli family over Pessah break?

Of course, no child should be blown up anywhere for wanting to have a meal.

SINCE THE attack on April 17 I have also been fuming at something more professionally related. At the press coverage, or lack of it in certain areas.

The Israeli press, of course, has been all over this story. More so, in some ways I am told, than before with similar bombing victims. Even though many other Americans have been killed and wounded over the years in terror attacks, maybe Daniel's story struck a different chord this time.

The local (South Florida) media has obviously been all over this from the very beginning.

But while I was not surprised, I began to boil over recently that no one in the national media had done anything. Instead, we've had daily stories of the Duke Rape Case, Alligators Eating Floridians, both of which I suppose are true local stories with their own importance.

But a story that could inform and teach Americans about an ongoing conflict and how it can affect them at home? Nope, that hasn't been deemed worthwhile.

And it's not only about Daniel, his family and their personal tragedy. It's about how the terrorists rejoiced in killing, not only Israelis but Americans too, because doing so doubly fulfills their mission of hate. Shouldn't the American viewing public hear about that?

My good friend Linda Scherzer says her take on it is that the media (and the public) are tired of Mideast violence, even when it affects their own citizens.

Very, very sad.

So, that is how things are here in Florida. A lovely family is now one less because they buried their son this week. A beautiful boy who died only because he was a Jew and wanted a kosher for Pessah shwarma while on vacation in Israel. (Jerusalem Post May 17)

The writer, an Israeli-American citizen, is a former journalist and currently teaches media education and works in public relations. She lives in Hollywood, Florida.

Bush: Say No to Olmert By Daniel Pipes

It's a grand occasion when a new Israeli prime minister makes an inaugural visit to Washington. He typically meets with the president, addresses a joint meeting of Congress, appears on plum television shows, talks to influential audiences and consults privately with a range of leading figures.

Personality, pomp and substance mix together as the two heads of government establish a working relationship, the US-Israel bond is reconfirmed, and issues relating to the Arab-Israeli conflict are reviewed.

When Ehud Olmert arrives in a few days, the key policy issue will concern what he refers to as the "convergence plan," a follow-up to the Gaza withdrawal of mid-2005, with a comparable but larger removal of Israeli soldiers and residents from the West Bank.

David Makovsky has pulled together the several components of this far-reaching plan in a recent Washington Institute for Near East Policy study, Olmert's Unilateral Option: An Early Assessment.

These include:

- Israel's security fence will serve as the baseline for a boundary with the West Bank, 92 percent of which will come under Palestinian Authority control. Israel will retain three residential blocs (Gush Etzion, Ma'aleh Adumim, Ariel) with an estimated 193,000 Israeli civilians, but at least 60,000 Israeli civilians will be evacuated by 2010 from the West Bank, using force if necessary.

- Arab neighborhoods in Jerusalem will be incorporated in the West Bank, reducing that city's Arab population by 140,000. Conspicuously, the plan does not address the future of Israel's military presence.

The Israeli plan may be unilateral in nature, but Makovsky notes that even unilateralism requires negotiations. Accordingly, Olmert will seek US diplomatic and financial support for withdrawal during his forthcoming Washington visit. That support appears inevitable, for the US government never opposes Israeli withdrawal from territory.

But before the president and congress rubber-stamp Olmert's initiative, they might consider some of its negative implications for American security, as spelled out in an important report by Caroline Glick for the Center for Security Policy. In Ehud Olmert's "Convergence" Plan for the West Bank and U.S. Middle East Policy, Glick cautions that Olmert's plan will likely harm US security interests by destabilizing Israel and Jordan.

IN PAINSTAKING detail she documents how the 2005 Israeli retreat from Gaza radicalized Palestinian society, caused Gaza to descend into anarchy, opened it to global terror forces, jeopardized Israel's national infrastructure, tied down Israeli troops, permitted the build-up of a substantial Palestinian arsenal, and created a range of new Israeli problems with Egypt.

She predicts that, in similar fashion, handing territory to the Palestinian Authority will destabilize the West Bank, harm Israel and "directly threaten the survivability of the Hashemites" in Jordan. This damage will have many negative implications for the United States, she argues, by:

- endangering US military assets warehoused in Israel and Jordan;
- enhancing the prestige of states that sponsor Palestinian terrorists;
- strengthening the Hamas-run Palestinian Authority which, with its Syrian, Iranian and Hizbullah allies, will provide what Glick calls "a training, logistics and information warfare base" for terrorist groups at war with the United States;
- threatening the land routes through Israel and Jordan that supply US forces in Iraq;
- enabling terrorists fighting American forces in Iraq to establish training bases in the West Bank;
- creating a perception of US weakness, given that Israel is so widely seen as an agent of Washington;
- gratuitously handing a victory to Islamists and jihadists.

THE US government has since the 1950s invariably encouraged Israeli governments to withdraw from territory, and I expect that pattern to continue. But it bears notice that several members of Congress - including Charles Schumer and Jesse Helms - have voiced their concerns when they see Jerusalem endangering its security by giving up too much land. Could such caution not conceivably take hold within the executive branch too?

Against all hope, in December 2000 I appealed to the Clinton administration to buck up its faltering ally by adopting several measures, in particular the discouragement of further Israeli territorial concessions. Today I appeal to the Bush administration to recognize how wretchedly the Gaza withdrawal is turning out; to look beyond the easy attractions of another Israeli retreat, and to be aware of the dangers of a unilateral retreat by Israel on the West Bank for it, for Jordan, and for the United States. (Jerusalem Post May 16)

The writer, based in Philadelphia, is director of the Middle East Forum.
