



Commentary...

The Taxi Driver By Naomi Ragen

I had a lecture to give in Haifa the other day. My usual driver wasn't available, so I called a local cab company to arrange a ride. Call it instinct, but when the cab arrived and I looked at the driver, he just didn't look the part.

For one thing, he was in amazing shape: handsome, young, with an athlete's lean body. Not what I usually find in the men who sit behind the wheel all day. Something about his face, the way he spoke, too, struck me as unusual.

"It's a long ride to Haifa," I finally said. "How do you like being on the road so much?"

"Oh, it's fine. I like driving. Actually, I haven't been in the business long. Just a few months," he said smiling. "And before this....?" "I worked for the Ministry of Defense. I was a security guard."

We spoke a little more, and I began to realize that I was in the presence of one of the men from those elite units who protect the lives of our most elite citizens, including our former Prime Minister.

"You didn't like the work?"

"No, actually...."

This is what happened. A yeshiva graduate, he had served in the army's most elite units. He had been trained in advanced counter-terrorism techniques, and had been asked to lead men into battle in some of the most dangerous missions possible. He had spent 3.5 years in Lebanon. It was no wonder that the leaders of the country had put him on staff to protect their lives.

And then came the disengagement. They asked him to be responsible for leading soldiers to attack the residents of Gush Katif should trouble ensue. He knew Gush Katif well. He had been stationed there.

"The people there treated us so well," he said. "They made sure we had enough to eat and drink. They invited us over on Shabbat and holidays. They were the most wonderful people in the world. How could I now go into their communities and treat them like enemies? How?"

So, he walked into Sharon's office (which should give you an idea of who this person is, and what kind of job he had). I said: "I'll do anything you want. If you want me to wipe out a terrorist cell. Fine. That's what I'm trained to do. But please don't ask me to do this. Please."

Sharon didn't budge. Wasn't interested.

He also didn't budge. Despite the years he had spent risking his life to defend his country, and the people who run it, he was not only fired, he was thrown into jail for more than a month! When he got out, he married his girlfriend. He wasn't worried about getting another job. "The security companies were lining up to hire me. But when I went to get a weapon's license, I found I'd been blackballed. It was pure revenge. So it was impossible for me to work."

He bought a taxi, and now he drives. His wife is expecting. He's not making anywhere near what he used to make.

You've paid quite a price, I told him.

"I'm not sorry for a minute. I got my medal when my father told me he was proud of me. In the end, I have to live with myself. I have to face my little nephews. What would they think of me if I treated my own people like the enemy?" Instead, he went to visit the people of Gush Katif, in their hotel rooms and dormitories. He hugged them, and they hugged him. "I don't have a single regret," he shrugged.

He has a court case against the government for denying him a license. I wished him well. And I thought of the men in power, those complacent, greying old men whose lives he had risked his young one for so many times. And I was glad he wasn't protecting them anymore. Glad that he wasn't being sent on dangerous missions anymore. Not for these men anyhow. And I thought of what he had sown, and what he had reaped. And how much we were all losing because he couldn't use his skills.

And once again, the reality of living in a country with wonderful people

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*

and terrible leadership ד"ר
struck me full force, making me want to punch somebody in the nose; somebody really high up; somebody fat, complacent, and careless, who makes all the wrong decisions and makes others pay the price.
(NaomiRagen.com May 30)

Abbas's Newest Big Lie By Caroline Glick

Fresh from her tete-a-tete with PA leader Mahmoud Abbas last week, Foreign Minister Tzipi Livni instructed her press flack to tell her fellow cabinet ministers to remain mum on Abbas's latest "diplomatic" gambit. In the words of her communications director Shai Ben Maor, Abbas's decision to turn a document written by convicted Palestinian murderers and attempted murderers sitting in Israeli prisons into the centerpiece of his diplomatic policy is "an internal Palestinian issue" and so Israel should not be weighing in on it.

What is the context of Abbas's new initiative regarding which Israel is supposed to have no official position?

After receiving the Bush Administration's full-throated endorsement during Prime Minister Ehud Olmert's visit to Washington, DC last week, Abbas sprang into action. Following Bush's characterization of Abbas as a man who "favors and speaks for peace and negotiations," Abbas - who has never lifted a finger and indeed pledged never to lift a finger to fight Hamas, Fatah or any other terrorist organization - announced that he has a new plan.

Abbas's plan has two central components. First, he wants to get the PA's Hamas government to accept the document authored by convicted murderers and attempted murderers. Second, Abbas wants Israel to allow him to raise, arm and field a new militia with 10,000 soldiers to supplement the 20,000 soldiers Abbas already hired in the lead-up to the Palestinian elections in January.

Both the Israeli and the international media have referred to the convicted terrorists' declaration as a "peace plan." London's Daily Telegraph's summation of what its editors considered the main points of the declaration represents more or less what all the mass media organs in Israel and abroad have been saying.

The Telegraph's report claims that the plan has six main components. In its words, those components are: "A negotiated settlement with Israel if the Jewish state withdraws from land occupied since the 1967 Middle East war; continued resistance, focusing on peaceful means, on land occupied since 1967 - the Gaza Strip, the West Bank and Arab East Jerusalem; an independent Palestinian state on all land occupied since 1967, with Jerusalem as its capital; a unity Palestinian government uniting all factions, including Hamas and Fatah; guarantee the right of return of Palestinian refugees to their former homes inside Israel and the release of all Palestinian prisoners in Israel; speeding up efforts to incorporate Hamas and Islamic Jihad into the umbrella Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), which has negotiated past interim peace accords."

IF ONE were to take these terms at face value, perhaps this could be seen as a step forward. But just the barest scrutiny shows that what the jailed terrorists announced was nothing more than a new restatement of their declaration of war against Israel and a recommitment to their goal of destroying the Jewish State.

It is true that the document speaks specifically of Israel's retreat from Judea and Samaria as well as Jerusalem. Yet led by convicted mass murderer, Fatah head and darling of the Israeli Left, Marwan Barghouti, the terrorists reiterated the "liberation of the land," that is, all of Israel, as their real objective.

The Telegraph's assertion that the "resistance" to Israel is supposed to be largely by "peaceful means" leads a reader to assume this means that the terrorists are calling for an end to terrorism. Nothing could be further from the truth. In six separate clauses of the declaration, the terrorists make clear their continued commitment to carrying out acts of terrorism against Israel as part of their strategy for destroying the Jewish state. Those acts of terrorism are supposed to be conducted in conjunction with civil disturbances, negotiations with Israel run by Abbas (something that Iran and its client the Palestinian Islamic Jihad does not accept), as well as an international

diplomatic campaign in cooperation with NGO allies intended to delegitimize and demonize Israel.

Far from calling for an end to terrorism, the terrorists called for the establishment of a new joint terrorist organization called the "Popular Resistance Front" that is to be composed of Hamas, Islamic Jihad and Fatah terrorists. As they put it in their declaration, this new group's job will be "to lead and engage in resistance against the occupation and to unify and coordinate action and resistance and to form a unified political reference for the front."

It is unclear what the difference will be between this proposed terrorist organization and the Popular Resistance Committees that Barghouti and his Hamas and Islamic Jihad colleagues formed in the months that preceded the outbreak of their terror war in September 2000.

The Telegraph notes that the imprisoned terrorists insist that Israel accept the so-called "right of return" of the so-called "refugees," but the newspaper, like its Israeli media counterparts, fails to recognize the true significance of this repeated demand. These murderers are demanding that in exchange for a temporary cessation of terror attacks against its citizens, Israel agree to its national destruction. The so-called "right of return" is a demand that Israel accept the unimpeded immigration of millions of hostile, foreign-born Arabs to its sovereign territory.

THESE MURDERERS devote an inordinate amount of attention in their declaration to detailing their desire to incorporate Hamas and Islamic Jihad into the Abbas-led PLO. They repeatedly call for unity between the "nationalist and Islamic" factions. That is, they call for unity in their ranks for the purpose of advancing their war for the destruction of Israel.

Finally, in a decidedly self-serving fashion, the convicted murderers emphatically call for their own release from Israeli jails and see their release as "a sacred national duty."

In short, much as one would expect, convicted Palestinian mass murderers from various terrorist organizations met in an Israeli prison yard to recommit themselves and their followers to their war for the destruction of Israel. And, much as one would expect, the international and Israeli press presented this declaration of war as a peace plan.

ABBAS TOOK the media by storm with his bold declaration last Thursday that if Hamas does not accept the prisoners' declaration within 10 days he will bring it before the Palestinian public as a referendum. "What a bold effort!" the press exclaimed excitedly. Buoyed by his success, Abbas announced the second half of his plan. In order to ensure Hamas realizes that he means business, Abbas renewed his demand that Israel allow him to receive arms and ammunition for his loyal troops. He further announced his intention to increase the size of his current personal army - Force 17 - from 2,500-3,000 men to 10,000 men.

There is very little new in the convicted terrorists' declaration or in Abbas's embrace of their declaration. Abbas has been embracing declarations of war against Israel since he joined Fatah as Yasser Arafat's deputy in 1959. There is also nothing new about Abbas's demand that Israel either supply him with arms or enable others to supply him with arms even though such arms and ammunition have been directly involved in the murder of scores of Israeli citizens since 1996. What is new is the response of Israel's government.

Since 2000, the government has refused Palestinian requests for guns and ammunition. Yet, last week, Olmert's government allowed Abbas to receive arms and ammunition for Force 17 from Jordan and Egypt. Not only did the government allow forces committed to Israel's destruction to receive arms and ammunition, well placed sources claim that Defense Minister Amir Peretz's office was the source of the misinformation campaign that has dubbed the prisoners' declaration of war a peace plan.

In misleading Israel's citizenry about the content of the murderers' war declaration and in enabling the rearmament and quadrupling of the size of Abbas's personal army, the Israeli government and the Israeli and international media have also been egged on by the Bush Administration. US military envoy to the Hamas-led PA, General Keith Dayton has reportedly been a major supporter of Peretz's desire to arm Abbas's men. The Americans have been pushing to have this militia deployed in northern Gaza where its members will purportedly stop Kassam missiles from being fired at Israel even though Abbas, their commander has adopted a plan that calls for continued attacks against Israel.

It is hard to find polite words to describe an Israeli government that embraces enthusiastically a declaration of war against its country and enables its enemy to arm and field armies that have been trained to kill its citizens. It is hard not to view US support for the so-called "peace plan" as a repudiation of the Bush Doctrine. (Jerusalem Post May 29)

The folly of Israeli disengagement.

What does one say to a good ally who seems determined to reinforce failure? That the U.S. will pay for the undertaking?

Israel's Prime Minister Ehud Olmert was in Washington last week, where he asked for advice and assistance in financing the withdrawal of 50,000 to 100,000 Israeli settlers from 90% to 95% of the West Bank and major portions of Jerusalem, and for the Israel Defense Forces to be repositioned largely near the security barrier Israel is constructing. Most Americans are inclined to believe that such disengagement may be a reasonable step toward a two-state solution, even if some territorial disputes remain to be negotiated. It is also widely assumed that Palestinian hostility to Israel is fueled by despair that can only be reduced by Israeli concessions. Both assumptions, however, may be fundamentally flawed.

The approach Israel is preparing to take in the West Bank was tried in Gaza and has failed utterly. The Israeli withdrawal of last year has produced the worst set of results imaginable: a heavy presence by al Qaeda, Hezbollah and even some Iranian Revolutionary Guard units; street fighting between Hamas and Fatah, and now Hamas assassination attempts against Fatah's intelligence chief and Jordan's ambassador; rocket and mortar attacks against nearby towns inside Israel; and a perceived vindication for Hamas, which took credit for the withdrawal. This latter almost certainly contributed substantially to Hamas's victory in the Palestinian elections.

The world now needs to figure out how to keep Palestinians from starving without giving funds to a Hamas government in Gaza resolutely focused on destroying Israel. Before his massive stroke last year, Ariel Sharon repeatedly said he would not replay the Gaza retreat in the West Bank. With good reason: Creating a West Bank that looks like today's Gaza would be many times the nightmare. How would one deal with continuing launches of rockets and mortars from the West Bank into virtually all of Israel? (Israel's Arrow missile defense will probably work against Iranian medium-range ballistic missiles but not against the much shorter-range Katyushas.) A security barrier does no good against such bombardment. The experience in Gaza, further, has shown the difficulty of defending against such attacks after the IDF boots on the ground have departed. Effective, prompt retaliation from the air is hard to imagine if the mortar rounds and Katyushas are being launched, as they will be, from schools, hospitals and mosques.

Israel is not the only pro-Western country that would be threatened. How does moderate Jordan, with its Palestinian majority, survive if bordered by a West Bank terrorist state? Israeli concessions will also make the U.S. look weak, because it will be inferred that we have urged them, and will suggest that we are reverting to earlier behavior patterns--fleeing Lebanon in 1983, acquiescing in Saddam's destruction of the Kurdish and Shiite rebels in 1991, fleeing Somalia in 1993, etc.

Three major Israeli efforts at accommodation in the last 13 years have not worked. Oslo and the 1993 handshake in the Rose Garden between Yitzhak Rabin and Yasser Arafat produced only Arafat's rejection in 2000 of Ehud Barak's extremely generous settlement offer and the beginning of the second intifada. The Israeli withdrawal from southern Lebanon in 2000 has enhanced Hezbollah's prestige and control there; and the withdrawal from Gaza has unleashed madness. These three accommodations have been based on the premise that only Israeli concessions can displace Palestinian despair. But it seems increasingly clear that the Palestinian cause is fueled by hatred and contempt.

Israeli concessions indeed enhance Palestinian hope, but not of a reasonable two-state solution--rather a hope that they will actually be able to destroy Israel. The Iranian-Syrian-Hezbollah-Hamas axis is quite explicit about a genocidal objective. When they speak of "ending Israeli occupation" they mean of Tel Aviv. Under these circumstances it is time to recognize that, sadly, the Israeli-Palestinian issue will likely not be the first matter settled in the decades-long war that radical Islam has declared on the U.S., Israel, the West and moderate Muslims. It will more likely be one of the last.

Someday a two-state solution may become possible, but it is naive in the extreme to believe that this can occur while the centerpiece of the radical Islamic and Palestinian agendas is maximizing Jewish deaths. A durable compromise will be achievable only when we no longer, to borrow from Daniel Patrick Moynihan, "define deviancy down" for the Palestinians.

Today we cannot envision the 250,000 Jewish settlers who live outside Israel's pre-1967 borders being permitted to live at all, much less live free and unmolested, in a West-Bank-Gaza Palestinian state. But some 1.2 million Arabs, almost all Muslim, today live in Israel in peace among some five million Jews--about double the percentage of Jews now in the West Bank as a share of the Muslim population there. Israel's Arab citizens worship freely--one hears muezzins calling the faithful to prayer as one walks around Tel Aviv. They vote in free elections for their own representatives in a real legislature, the Knesset. They give every evidence that they prefer being Arab Israelis to living in the chaos and uncertainty of a West Bank after Israeli withdrawal.

A two-state solution can become a reality when the Palestinians are held to the same standards as Israelis--to the requirement that Jewish settlers in a West Bank-Gaza Palestinian state would be treated with the same decency that Israel treats its Arab citizens. Until then, three failures in 13 years should permit us to evaluate the wisdom of further concessions.

The writer, a former director of Central Intelligence, is co-chairman of the Committee on the Present Danger. (Wall Street Journal May 29)

A Convergence of Terror By Tashbih Sayyed

Good news appears to be on the horizon for the global jihad. Israel's Prime Minister Ehud Olmert is ready to throw in the towel. He is determined to relinquish the historical Jewish lands of Judea and Samaria in order to appease those who are faith-bound to destroy the Jewish state of Israel. Of great significance, the Arabs are achieving their long-awaited goal of gradually reducing Israel to nonexistence. It is remarkable that they are accomplishing this without as much as a promise of formally ending terrorist activities in addition to their continued refusal to even recognize the state of Israel. Moreover, they will be able to keep their primary goal alive, the destruction of the "Zionist entity" and the acquisition of all the land from the Jordan River to the Mediterranean Sea.

The convergence plan involves an Israeli pullout from 90 to 95 percent of the West Bank and from several neighborhoods in Jerusalem by the end of 2007. Under this plan, almost 100,000 Israeli civilians will be expelled from their homes in the West Bank, 50 to 100 Israeli towns and villages in the area will be destroyed. Israeli military forces will be withdrawn to garrisoned locations in proximity to Israel's security barrier which will encompass the remaining 5 to 10 percent of the West Bank territory located along the 1949 armistice lines that constituted Israel's national boundaries until 1967. This will be a disaster for Israel in security terms. The removal of Jews from the West Bank will certainly expose the heart of the country to many future enemy attacks.

The Olmert plan could not have come at a better time for the Hamas and their ilk. It has confirmed the belief reigning supreme in the Muslim Street that Judeo-Christianity is on the retreat. The global jihad is riding a crest of successes on all fronts of their war against the Zionists and the Crusaders.

The Taliban insurgency in Afghanistan has gained significant momentum and territory; they are now confident of recapturing the capital, Kabul in the very near future. Schools are being attacked, women are being harassed and government authorities are being murdered on a daily basis.

Al Qaeda, its allies in Pakistan and the Jihadis have already succeeded in establishing a Khilafah (Caliphate) in the North Waziristan region of Pakistan where they have imposed very rigid and strict Wahhabi laws. Anybody who dares to disagree with the Wahhabi clerical establishment is lynched publicly. Dead bodies of those who have challenged the Wahhabi clerical domination have been dragged through the streets and then left to rot.

In Bangladesh, radical Islamists are in full control of the Administration and the Judiciary. In the capital city of Dhaka, the government finds it very difficult to function without the cooperation of the Islamist political parties.

Iran has unequivocally become the ultimate symbol of anti-Semitism and a source of power and inspiration to the global jihad. President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has become the supreme provocateur of the global jihad.

Recent developments in Turkey - the murder of a secular judge by a soldier of Allah and the Islamist Prime Minister of Turkey's open support for Islamist activism -- has accentuated the duplicitous grasp and depth of jihad.

With Aiyan Hirsi Ali's departure from the Netherlands, the march of radical Islam in continental Europe and the United Kingdom has conquered new ground.

These Islamist gains in the global jihad have helped establish the creation of a psychological environment of invincibility in the radical Islamist world. Arabs in Palestine have never been so confident of their success. Olmert's "Convergence" plan, which is in reality is an expulsion plan, has further consolidated the belief that their campaign to destroy Israel is moving in the right direction. There is a feeling of euphoria among the radical Islamists that terrorism, which they call legitimate resistance against the "occupation" has clearly succeeded in achieving its intended goal -- breaking the Israeli will.

Firstly, Olmert's Convergence plan will, without doubt, help Arabs and radical Islamists in a myriad of ways. In my view, the most significant consequence of this plan will be the emergence of the Arab fifth column inside Israel. Convinced that their brothers on the other side of the fence are winning, many Arabs in Israel will work fearlessly to subvert the Israeli society. Such a conviction will serve to encourage and facilitate an escalation of terrorism against all Israelis.

Secondly, the plan will sow the seeds of discord within the Israeli society. The Israelis uprooted from the lands that were rightfully theirs, will form a very powerful block of citizens who will be distrustful of any peace plan. Such distrust will remain the cause of destabilization for a very long time.

Thirdly, giving away the Jewish lands which were regained after thousands of years of Jewish sacrifices will dishearten Israeli citizens, officers and soldiers of the IDF. It will amount to the dishonor of the many Israelis who perished as a result of years of Arab aggression and terrorism. It will demoralize the core of the Israeli defense forces, discouraging them from offering themselves for elite duties. In fact, many in the IDF have requested not be a part of the latest expulsion plan.

Olmert's plan ignores the fact that not a single inch of Israeli territory has been regained without extraordinarily painful concessions. Jews have paid in blood to control what was rightfully theirs to begin with. To relinquish this hard-earned land to the enemy is a betrayal of the highest level. It creates the perception that the Israelis themselves, do not consider Judea, Samaria and Jerusalem Jewish enough to hold on to it.

Most people realize that the Arabs do not want peace with Israel; they want Israel's complete and utter destruction. This is the only explanation as to why they launched an unrelenting campaign of terror against the Jewish state instead of accepting the Camp David summit in 2000, which promised them the entire Gaza Strip and 91 percent of the West Bank in exchange for full recognition of Israel and an end to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Anyone with knowledge of the Islamist mindset would acknowledge that Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert's Convergence plan will only serve to empower the Islamist terrorists. The Arabs will gain control over the entire Gaza Strip, the West Bank and a portion of Jerusalem without recognizing Israel, and without putting an end to the ongoing terrorist attacks.

Olmert's Convergence plan will be a victory for Hamas's strategy of waging a war of terror. It will allow Hamas to obtain a full strategic resolution against the state of Israel. The radical Arabs will view this plan as an invitation to continue their work toward the elimination of the Jewish State.

The consequence of Sharon's plan that gave the Arabs a chance to prove to the world that they sincerely wanted to live in peace, side by side with Israel resulted in destruction, anarchy, weapons smuggling, a porous Egyptian border, massive infiltration and daily rockets into Israel. The Gaza and northern Samaria disengagement was seen by the Arabs as a reward for their terrorist campaign and resulted in the Hamas victory in the elections. Olmert's Convergence plan will also reinforce the radical belief that homicide bombings work. A Palestinian state established on the foundation that terror wins will be an armed and militant anti-Semitic state. With Olmert's Convergence plan, Palestinians have not been asked to give up any of their demands -- Right of return for refugees, acceptance of the right of the Jewish people to their historical lands and the recognition of the state of Israel -- The Palestinian leadership will be able to recruit many more homicide bombers to realize the radical Islamist goal of wiping the Jewish State off the map totally and completely.

Olmert's plan will further undermine U.S. efforts to establish democracy in the region by laying the foundation for an undemocratic, fascist Islamist state that will devote itself to the destruction of the only working democracy in the Middle East -- Israel. A Palestinian state will destroy all chances of a permanent regional stability. An Islamist state that causes the subjugation of Zionism will naturally become an inspiration for the radical Islamists in countries like Iran, Syria, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Tunis, Morocco and Algeria. Olmert's plan will lead to a destabilization of the Middle East, pose a serious threat to Jordan and threaten US interests throughout the Arab world. It will, without doubt, create a large, terrorist infrastructure in a region where we are trying to achieve peace.

It is exceedingly difficult to view this plan as a convergence, since the definition of convergence is the process of coming together, or the state of having come together toward a common point. Based on the underlying concepts of this plan, it is likely that the only convergence will be one of terror, not one of coming together in peace. Appeasement didn't work in Gaza and it will not work in the West Bank. (FrontPageMagazine.com May 25)

The writer is the publisher of Muslim World Today.

Separate Anti-Zionism from Anti-Semitism? By Dennis Prager

Imagine someone saying that he seeks the destruction of Italy because he regards Italian national identity as racist. Further, imagine that this person constantly denies being anti-Italian, because he does not hate all Italians, only Italy and all those who believe Italy should exist.

Now substitute "Jewish" for "Italian" and "Israel" for "Italy" and you understand the absurdity of the argument that one can be anti-Zionist but not anti-Jewish.

Among the many lies that permeate the modern world, none is greater - or easier to refute - than the claim that Zionism is not an integral part of Judaism or the claim that anti-Zionism is unrelated to anti-Semitism.

In order to understand why, it is first necessary to explain Zionism and anti-Zionism.

A modern secular movement called Zionism was founded in the 19th century, but the belief that Jews belong in Zion (the biblical term for Jerusalem) is as old as the Jewish people. (See "So many types of Jews, so little clarity" for a discussion of why Jews are a people and not only a religion.)

Starting with the destruction of the first Jewish state, Jews were already Zionists in that they fervently prayed to return to Zion. While the movement known by the specific name "Zionism" is modern, the movement of Jews returning to Zion is more than 2,500 years old. That is why the claim that Zionism - the return of the Jewish people to Zion - is not part of Judaism is a theological and historical lie.

Judaism has always consisted of three components: G-d, Torah and Israel, roughly translated as faith, practice and peoplehood. And this Jewish people was conceived of as living in the Jewish country called Israel. One can argue that the modern state of Israel was founded at the expense of Arabs living in the geographic area known as Palestine (there was never a country or a nation called Palestine); but that in no way negates the indisputable fact that Zionism is an integral part of Judaism. Nor does the fact that some Jews who have abandoned Judaism are opposed to Zionism, nor that a tiny sect of ultra-Orthodox Jews (Neturei Karta) believe that only the Messiah can found a Jewish state in Israel.

When anti-Israel Muslim students demonstrate on campus chanting, "Yes to Judaism, No to Zionism," they are inventing a new Judaism out of their hatred for Israel. It would be as if anti-Muslims marched around chanting, "Yes to Allah, No to the Quran." Just as Allah, Muhammad and the Quran are inextricable components of Islam, so G-d, Torah and Israel are of Judaism.

But, one might argue, even if Zionism is as much a part of Judaism as any other part of the Hebrew Bible, the modern Jewish state of Israel has no right to exist because it displaced many indigenous Arabs, known later as Palestinians.

Before responding to this, it is crucial to understand that this argument - that Israel's founding was illegitimate - is completely unrelated to anti-Zionism. An intellectually honest person who believes Israel's founding is illegitimate would still have to acknowledge that Zionism is an inseparable part of Judaism.

But the argument that Israel is illegitimate because its founding led to 600,000 to 700,000 Arab refugees is as anti-Jewish as is anti-Zionism. Virtually every country in the world was founded by displacing some of the people who had lived there, and many of those countries did far worse to far more people than Israel did. Therefore, anyone who calls only for Israel's destruction had better explain why, of all the states on earth whose founding was accompanied by the displacement of others, only the Jewish state is illegitimate.

Take Pakistan, for example. Unlike the Jewish state of Israel, which had existed twice before in history, there was never a country called Pakistan, nor was there ever any other independent Muslim country in the part of India that was carved out to create Pakistan. Moreover, if the Jewish state of Israel is illegitimate because it created 700,000 Arab refugees, why isn't the Muslim state of Pakistan, which created more than eight million Hindu refugees, illegitimate?

The answer is obvious. When people isolate the one Jewish state in the world for sanctions, opprobrium and delegitimizing, they are doing so because it is the Jewish state. And that, quite simply, is why anti-Zionism is simply another form of Jew-hatred.

You can criticize Israel all you want. That does not make you an antisemite. But if you are an anti-Zionist or advocate the destruction of the Jewish state, then let's be clear: You are an enemy of the Jews and of Judaism, and the word for such a person is anti-Semite. (Jewish World Review May 30)

Academic Anti-Semitism By Phyllis Chesler *Boycotting Israeli scholars in Britain's universities.*

This weekend, as expected, and despite an international petition drive launched by Scholars for Peace in the Middle East, Britain's National Association of Teachers in Higher and Further Education (NATHFE) voted to boycott Israeli academics. There is a kinder, gentler boycott, because it exempts those Israeli academics who, McCarthy style, are willing to publicly disavow their government's (nonexistent) "apartheid" policies. This is the third time since 2002 that British academics have gone on record to censure and isolate Israeli academics.

The British have a marred history in their relations with the Jews. They murdered and expelled them from their island in the 13th century, and they refused to allow ships filled with Jews in flight from Hitler to land in British "Palestine" in the 20th century.

Although Britain once colonized the entire Arab world, British poets and adventurers romanticized Arab men as nobly and sexily savage. British diplomats and businessmen overlooked Arab barbarism for the sake of oil.

Politically correct British intellectuals romanticized Arabs in another way, as the "victims" of European colonialism-for which they blamed, you guessed it, the Jews and the Jewish state. Sometimes, such Stalinized and Palestinianized British thinkers managed to note that Arabs were ruled by cruel despots who impoverished and terrorized their own people-but they blamed it on the American CIA.

In 2000, the Arab League, Iran, and the Palestinians unleashed a savage and lethal intifada against Israeli civilians, 80 percent of whom are Jews whose parents and grand-parents survived pogroms, the Holocaust, mass expulsion from Arab lands and at least five or six wars of self-defense in Israel. From the fall of 2000 until the late spring of 2003, Israelis experienced something akin to 9/11 almost every month, sometimes every other week. This is why they built the security fence, called by some the "apartheid wall." Allegedly civilized "chatterers" characterized Israelis under siege as "worse than Nazis" whose "genocidal policies" justified the rash of Palestinian serial suicide killings. Such academics did not condemn the exterminationist Islamist propaganda which turned countless adolescents into brainwashed, brutal killers.

British academics responded to the military, terrorist, and propaganda war against the Jews by launching divestment and boycott campaigns against Israel in general and against Israeli academics in particular. Thus, in 2002, 123 British academics published an Open Letter in the London Guardian calling for a "moratorium" on all cultural and research links with Israel. In 2004-2005, the British Association of University Teachers (AUT)-which has never moved to boycott academics from countries such as China, Iran, or Sudan-voted to boycott two Israeli universities for their alleged complicity in their government's military policies. After a tremendous struggle, that vote was overturned.

Similar divestment and boycott campaigns against Israel-and only against Israel-were launched elsewhere. Ford Foundation-funded organizations took part in conferences that demonized Israel and America from the Palestinian point of view. In 2005, the Association of American University Professors (AAUP) found that "the Zionist lobby" exerted a "pernicious" influence against Arabs and Muslims on American campuses. Early in 2006, two professors, Harvard's Stephen Walt and the University of Chicago's Charles Mearsheimer heartily agreed. Their shoddy position paper was comprehensively and effectively critiqued, which, in the view of their supporters, proved that the "Zionist lobby" really does rule the world.

The American Association for the Advancement of Science, a group founded in 1848 which publishes Science magazine, condemned the NATHFE boycott as did British and Scottish church groups. A group of British scholars, through an organization called Engage, gathered 600 British academic signatures against the boycott. Scholars for Peace in the Middle East, together with the Israeli-based International Advisory Board for Academic Freedom, gathered more than 5,000 signatures from academics on every continent who teach at more than 250 universities. Some knights of the British realm, and many who teach at Cambridge, Oxford, and at 28 other British universities, also signed. Interestingly, many signers are professors of physics, medicine, math, and computer science, who, unlike professors of social science and the humanities, are not politicized. They take their disciplines seriously and obviously respect the work of Israeli scientists who often lead the field.

A "silent" boycott has already begun in which some British academics have refused to write for Israeli journals and refused to publish or review the work of Israeli academics and creative artists in British journals. In my view, those who do so have effectively cut themselves off from the international community of scholars. According to the president of SPME, Ed Beck, "this boycott offends tolerant and fair-minded people from across the political spectrum."

The NATHFE boycott motion passed by a vote of 106 to 71 with 21 abstentions. This is a very small number, and it may be that they speak for a minority of obsessively like-minded academics. In addition, next week, NATHFE will dissolve and merge with another British union (AUT). At that point, this boycott may no longer legally "count."

It counts as a propaganda victory for intolerance nonetheless. And it appeases Islamism and bring Europe one step closer to becoming Eurabia-which endangers both America and Israel.

The writer is an emerita professor of psychology and women's studies and the author of 13 books including The Death of Feminism, Woman's Inhumanity to Woman and The New Anti-Semitism. Her forthcoming book is titled The Islamization of America. She is on the board of Scholars for Peace in the Middle East. She may be reached through her website www.phyllis-chesler.com. (National Review May 30)
