

**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...**

Sunday, June 5, 6:00pm  
Yom Yerushalayim Celebration at BAYT, address by Rav Sholom Gold, followed by music and dancing.

**Commentary...**

**Hamas and the Rebirth of Illusion** By Jonathan Spyer  
A process of rethinking is currently taking place in British and American foreign policy establishments regarding Hamas. The movement's ability to command high levels of popular support is giving credence to formerly fringe opinions that have long advocated rapprochement between the Western democracies and militant Islamism.

The shift is currently most advanced in Britain, though it is present in the United States, too. The group around former MI6 officer and European Union envoy Alistair Crooke is finding that its long-held view of the Hamas as a "national Palestinian movement centered on mobilizing a community to resist an illegal occupation" is now swaying mainstream opinion in the Foreign and Commonwealth Office. Crooke and Co. see Hamas as reflecting "fundamental issues of justice and democratic reform" in Palestinian politics.

There have been reports of an imminent major shift in British policy, toward open engagement with Palestinian Islamism. In the U.S., too, a growing number of veteran advocates of a similar position are using the space provided by reports of the "Arab Spring" to advance their views. The argument now made is, well, if elections are the answer, and Islamists win elections, then Islamists must be welcomed as partners. Thus, Mark Perry, of the Washington-based Alliance for Security, describes Hamas as one of a number of movements that have made the "historic choice" to "build their societies on values we hold dear - of justice and peace, of accountability and transparency."

The trouble with this line of reasoning is that those using it are asking us to ignore the actual, openly proclaimed aims and practices of Hamas. This is a movement whose founding charter contains in its opening paragraph the following declaration: "Israel will rise and will remain until Islam eliminates it as it had eliminated its predecessors." This is followed, in article seven, with the exhortation that "the time will not come until Muslims will fight the Jews (and kill them); until the Jews hide behind rocks and trees, which will cry: O Muslim! There is a Jew hiding behind me, come on and kill him!"

The charter goes on to advocate the creation of an Islamic state, aiming "to raise the banner of Allah over every inch of Palestine." And declaring its ultimate goal as "Islam, the Prophet its model, the Koran its constitution."

The actions of the movement in support of its goals are well known. They include an ongoing commitment to the practice of terror that brought chaos to Israel's urban centers in the darkest days of the last five years. The list is long, and respect for the dead enjoins us occasionally to remind ourselves of it: The Park Hotel, Mike's Place, the Dolphinarium, Sbarro and Moment are but a few of the names to be remembered.

But Hamas, with its commitment to the imposition of "Islam as a way of life," is oppressive also to its own people. The movement has a long history of using violence to impose Islamic norms in areas where it holds sway. In particular, efforts to ensure the continued subjugation of women have characterized its activities. The recent murder of 20-year-old Yusra Azzami in Gaza by movement members is in line with this side of its activities. Azzami had been seen in the company of a young man (her fiance, it later became clear, which prompted a curious and half-hearted apology for her killing from Hamas spokesmen in the Strip).

In some ways, the atmosphere that Crooke, Perry and Co. wish to manufacture is redolent of the early days of the Oslo period. At that time, doubts raised regarding the willingness of Yasser Arafat's leadership to reach a compromise peace with Israel were airily brushed aside. Those who pointed to incendiary statements by the PLO leadership, such as Arafat's speech in a Johannesburg mosque in 1994 advocating continued holy war, were encouraged to develop greater political sophistication. One must differentiate the rhetoric

from the reality, we were told. And we will recall when rhetoric and reality finally came together at the end of that illusory process in the autumn of 2000.

There is no doubt that the popular support enjoyed by radical Islamism forces raises a serious question for advocates of regional democratization. Hamas' friends in the West wish to lever the confusion surrounding this matter to ensure a place for the movement at the table. But for progress on the Israeli-Palestinian issue, and indeed broader regional democratization to be possible, it is essential that this confusion be dispelled.

History is replete with examples of movements that sought to combine the use of the tools of democracy with the substantive rejection of its goals, and the desire eventually to subvert and destroy it. The totalitarian ideologies of the 20th century were examples of this type. The continued health and existence of democracies required that they identify those threats in good time, and did not lack the will to act against them. Such requirements also hold for the threat represented by the Hamas, which seeks both to destroy Israel and to enslave the Palestinians.

It is therefore essential to make clear that the continued ascendance of this movement means the termination of hope for progress toward improved relations between the two peoples. The disarming of Hamas and the defeat of its ideas is the common, urgent interest of Israelis, Westerners and Palestinians alike. (Haaretz May 27)

The writer is a senior research fellow at the Global Research in International Affairs Center at the Interdisciplinary Center, Herzliya.

**Arik and the Tooth Fairy** By Caroline Glick

MK Yuval Steinitz, the chairman of the Knesset's Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee, compares Prime Minister Ariel Sharon's decision to enable the Egyptian military to deploy its forces in the Sinai Peninsula to the decision by the ancient Greeks to allow the Trojan horse to enter their city. "The strategic blindness of both decisions is equally complete," Steinitz explains. "Here what is involved is an Israeli government enabling our most formidable enemy - Egypt - to deploy its forces at our borders within striking distance of all of our air force bases and other sensitive sites in southern Israel. It constitutes a strategic threat of the highest order to Israel's national security and survival."

According to the plan that Sharon and his advisers have been negotiating with Egypt over the past several months, after Israel's planned evacuation of the Gaza Strip, Egyptian forces will take control of the border between Gaza and Egypt. Both Deputy Prime Minister Ehud Olmert and Sharon said this week that in spite of the strenuous objections of the IDF and the Shin Bet security service, Israel will transfer control over the Philadephi Route, which separates Palestinian Rafah from Egyptian Rafah, to Egyptian control. According to Egyptian Foreign Minister Ahmed Aboul Gheit, Egypt will deploy 750 troops to the border with Gaza and another 1,500-2,000 troops to the border with Israel.

As Steinitz and Finance Minister Binyamin Netanyahu - another harsh critic of the plan - have made clear, this initiative constitutes nothing less than an Israeli invitation to the Egyptians to remilitarize the Sinai Peninsula, the demilitarization of which was the most important strategic accomplishment of the 1981 Camp David peace treaty.

Sharon and his advisers argue that the step is necessary to enable Egypt to stem weapon-smuggling from Egypt to Gaza. And yet, according to senior IDF commanders, the border guard presence that Egypt currently fields in the Sinai is more than sufficient to block the smuggling. What Egypt lacks, they say, is not the wherewithal, but the will, to act. And yet, in his negotiations with the Egyptians, Sharon has agreed to allow them to deploy heavy armored forces to the Sinai. Steinitz is working to block this move by insisting that any change in the status of forces agreement between Israel and Egypt must receive the approval of the Knesset before it is implemented.

As Steinitz has rightly argued, in spite of its presumptive peace with Israel, Egypt is in fact the Arab state most hostile to the Jewish state. Since the mid-1990s, the Egyptian military's annual joint forces exercise involves simulating a war against Israel. Egypt, which due to US military aid, boasts the most powerful army in the Arab world, is the epicenter of Arab anti-Semitic publications and incitement.

Egypt stands at the head of almost every political initiative launched against Israel in international forums. And, in hosting the continuous

**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)**

dialogue between Palestinian terror groups, the Egyptians have overseen the operational coordination between the PA, Fatah, Hamas and Islamic Jihad.

Israel's decision to invite the deployment of Egyptian forces to its borders is based on an increasingly common and exceedingly dangerous malady that has plagued Israel's leaders over the past decade. In working to defend itself against Arab aggression, Israel is presented with a number of difficult military options. In the case at hand, Israel faces a security challenge of contending with Palestinian weapon-smuggling from Egypt. Given that to date it has not wished to deploy its own forces in the Sinai to stem the flow, Israel has placed its forces on the narrow strip of land separating Gaza from Egypt and attempted to seize the weapons at the border. Now that the government has decided to vacate Gaza, it no longer wishes for the IDF to man this border.

The reason why weapons are smuggled from Egypt to Gaza is twofold. On the one hand, the Egyptians have an interest in continuing and escalating the Palestinian terror war against Israel, because they believe their position is enhanced through an erosion of Israeli strength. On the other, the Palestinians have an interest in bringing in the weapons because they wish to enhance their ability to wage war on Israel.

Israel's decision to vacate Gaza has done nothing to change the way the Egyptians and Palestinians perceive their interests. And yet, in order to leave Gaza with a good conscience, Sharon and his advisers apparently feel that they must at least pretend this is not the case. So in the absence of any palatable option for continuing to stem the flow of weapons from Egypt to the PA, Israel has made one up. In this imaginary option, Israel will leave and Egypt and the Palestinians will immediately redefine their interests to match those of Israel. The fact that there is no factual basis for this assessment is evidently of no interest to Sharon.

The same strategic blindness and petulance informed former prime minister Ehud Barak when he decided to pull Israeli forces out of southern Lebanon and when he offered to cede almost all of Judea and Samaria to Palestinian sovereignty. Israel was deployed in south Lebanon to provide a buffer zone between Israeli towns in the North and the terrorist forces operating in Lebanon under Syrian and Iranian sponsorship. Five years ago this week, responding to years of public pressure from EU-financed political groups, Barak decided to unilaterally withdraw from Lebanon without defeating Hizbullah and while betraying Israel's longtime ally, the Christian-dominated South Lebanese Army.

The results of this decision are mixed. On the one hand, the IDF has still managed to deter Hizbullah from attacking Israel - or at least from attacking Israel often - in spite of its absence in Lebanon. On the other hand, Israel's precipitous withdrawal gave a psychological victory to the forces of jihad worldwide and was one of the factors that led the Palestinians to launch their terror war against Israel four months later.

Speaking on Wednesday of Israel's retreat, Syrian-backed Lebanese President Emil Lahoud said, "Lebanon has been the only Arab territory to drive Israeli occupation forces out of its territory and the only Arab country to regain its legitimate territorial rights without making any compromise or concessions. Lebanon will continue its legitimate struggle with Israel until a global, comprehensive and just peace is reached in the Middle East."

Aside from that, in the IDF's absence, with Syrian and Iranian assistance, Hizbullah has massively expanded its arsenal, and as Hassan Nasrallah stated on Wednesday, it now has 12,000 rockets poised at the border capable of attacking all of northern Israel and has longer-range missiles capable of hitting targets in southern Israel.

Five years ago, Barak promised Israelis that after an IDF withdrawal, the "international community" would prevail on the Lebanese government to deploy the Lebanese Army along the border with Israel. He said that once Israel was gone, Hizbullah would stop being a terrorist organization dedicated to Israel's destruction and turn into a political party. Of course, none of this happened, but Barak then, like Sharon today, decided not to recognize the real options on the table, preferring instead to win popularity domestically by promising the public a perfect option that suffered only from the marginal deficit of being imaginary.

Barak tried to reenact this same security genius in his offer to the Palestinians at Camp David in July 2000. Setting aside Israel's legal claims to sovereignty over Judea and Samaria, Israel has justified its control of the areas from a security perspective on three main grounds: It is necessary for intelligence collection; for preventing an invasion from across the Jordan River; and for preventing terrorist attacks against Israeli population centers.

Although the threat of an eastern invasion has been at least temporarily mitigated by our peace treaty with Jordan and the US military occupation of Iraq, the other two rationales remain both valid and acute - and were five years ago. And yet, given his desire to cut a deal with the PLO, Barak claimed that as soon as the Palestinians signed an agreement with Israel, they would magically abandon their societal aggression toward Israel and act as allies. If Israel needed to enter the areas after they were ceded to Palestinian control, he argued, the Palestinians would, as allies, allow our forces to do so.

As the ensuing four and a half years of war have shown, there was no basis for Barak's view other than his fervent prayers to the Tooth Fairy and his own vanity. Still today, even as the US is launching a global war on terrorism, the Palestinian leadership has made no attempt to curb terrorism. As Brig.-Gen. Yossi Kuperwasser, head of Military Intelligence Analysis, told foreign diplomats this week, like his predecessor Yasser Arafat, PA leader Mahmoud

Abbas "relates to terrorists as though they were heroes, and therefore he is not interested in implementing arrests, disarming terrorist groups from their weapons, punishing terrorists, or stopping the smuggling of weaponry."

So today, as was the case with Barak five years ago, Sharon is basing his strategic policies not on the reality of Israel's security situation, but on what he wishes that security situation to be, and in so doing, as Steinitz argues, he is imperiling our national security.

Sharon has often said that what one sees when sitting in the prime minister's chair is different from what we little people see from down below. To judge from the strategic blindness that afflicts its current and past occupants, it might be in Israel's national security interest to replace all the chairs in the prime minister's office with new ones. And if that isn't practical, we will need to elect ourselves a new prime minister and hope that he isn't similarly afflicted by delusions of perfect choices that do not exist.

(Jerusalem Post May 26)

---

### Get Ready for the Hamas State By Uri Dan

The Gaza Strip is becoming the Hamas state, no doubt about it. Former Shin Bet (Israel Security Agency) director Avi Dichter publicly warned again this week that the Hamas is setting up in Gaza "an army of thousands of armed men based on the model of the Hizbullah in Lebanon."

There is, however, a difference between the two organizations. Hizbullah is only one of several armed organizations inside Lebanon, and the country has a government and an army that don't dare to dismantle them. In Gaza, Hamas continues to hold on to weapons and manpower to take control of the nascent Palestinian state.

Some politicians and naive experts in Jerusalem and Washington are consoling themselves with the thought that by participating in the elections Hamas will turn into a political body, just as Hizbullah is also a political party in Lebanon.

But such things don't exist in a democratic regime. Do political parties in Israel, the US or France possess private armies? Of course not. Hizbullah and Hamas have tremendous arsenals of weapons with which they can enforce a reign of terror. President George W. Bush obviously knows this while waging his historic campaign to democratize corrupt Arab regimes, including those in Lebanon, Syria and Saudi Arabia.

The intelligence agencies of the US and Israel are aware of the fact stated by Dichter and the outgoing IDF chief of staff, Moshe Ya'alon, that large quantities of weapons are being constantly smuggled to the Gaza Strip. In 2004 alone about 10,000 automatic rifles and a 1,000 RPG anti-tank weapons were smuggled in.

The dimensions of the smuggling have now reached a new peak since the IDF is hesitant to carry out military operations in the Gaza Strip. The Palestinians are digging additional tunnels both for smuggling weapons and for perpetrating terrorist attacks against IDF bases and the settlements that are about to be uprooted.

Prime Minister Mahmoud Abbas's 20,000 armed policemen are not even trying to oppose Hamas and the Islamic Jihad. Did Bush's special envoy, General Ward, demand that Abu Mazen give him a map of the tunnels used to smuggle arms from the Sinai Desert to the Gaza Strip?

No. Ward reported very carefully to Washington that there was progress in reforming the Palestinian security services. James Wolfensohn, Bush's representative designated to handle the economic rehabilitation of the Gaza Strip who will arrive in June, is deluding himself in the same way as Shimon Peres regarding the Palestinians.

So everyone is participating in the big game of make-believe. Bush talked about the chances of success of the peace negotiations with Abu Mazen in Washington, because he wants to give the road map a real chance in a final attempt to stop Hamas.

Egyptian President Mubarak talks about peace but makes no efforts to halt arms smuggling because he is the patron of Hamas, just as Iran is the boss of Hizbullah. Using Hamas, Mubarak wishes to exploit Israel's distress and pressure it into modifying the peace agreement, canceling the demilitarization of the Sinai Desert and thus permitting the deployment of thousands of Egyptian soldiers along the border with Israel.

What about Abu Mazen? "The difference between him and Yasser Arafat," Finance Minister Binyamin Netanyahu told me, is that "Arafat supported the terrorism with both hands and Abu Mazen doesn't lift a finger to prevent it."

Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, aware of this dangerous situation, last Tuesday told the AIPAC conference in Washington: "Until now terrorist activities have not ceased. The smuggling of weapons and arms production continues and there is no real prevention of terrorist actions."

Sharon apparently realizes that under the current political conditions Israel has no alternative but to join in the make-believe "peace process" game.

The major difference between Sharon and his predecessors Yitzhak Rabin, Shimon Peres and Ehud Barak: Sharon is aware that the Israeli finger must be ready on the trigger when Hamas's arsenal in Gaza explodes.

(Jerusalem Post May 31)

## **Liberty and Property** By Daniel Doron

On Israel's Independence Day we often ruminate on the values we share with our great friend and benefactor, the United States.

The framers of the US constitution considered the protection of individual liberty and man's "pursuit of happiness" the central task of an enlightened polity. They found inspiration in a verse from Leviticus, "Proclaim liberty throughout the land." They carved it on the Liberty Bell.

The verse, from the recent portion of Behar ("On The Mount") alludes to the Jubilee Year when the land not only lies fallow, but all titles to it revert to their original owners, while all its inhabitants, including slaves, must also go free.

It is not by accident that the founding fathers chose to express the sanctity of freedom with a quote from a chapter that relates man's liberty to property rights. They considered property rights a bedrock of human liberty, because without means a person cannot fulfill himself.

Most Israelis, on the other hand, would probably interpret the Jubilee Year as sanctifying a redistribution of property, an effort to curtail its imperatives.

In this difference regarding the sanctity of property lies the basic difference between the American ethos and the Israeli ethos, as shaped by a century of socialist Zionism, whose influence, whether conscious or not, is still predominant.

Surprisingly, the American ethos, sanctifying property, is closer to traditional, Halachic Judaism, while the Israeli ethos reflects a Christian viewpoint, adopted by socialism. The latter believed that profit results from exploitation and therefore property acquisition is sinful, and the life of commerce essentially immoral.

The institution of Jubilee was framed in a world where land, and the man and the climate that made it fertile, were major elements in the creation of wealth. Without wealth, a person would be considered dead. Without wealth a person is a slave to his needs. He is compelled to devote all his time and energy to survival. He has little time or energy left to develop the "superfluity that is man", the divine spark that elevated him above other living creatures.

God delegates his lordship over the land, its climate, its inhabitants, to man, not as a right but as a means for expressing his quintessential humanity. When man is commanded in Genesis to lord it over creation, it is not for the purpose of exploitation, but in order to impart to all creation some of the spark given to humanity shaped in the image of God.

JUBILEE WAS instituted to eternalize the sanctity of property, to ensure that no family or tribe lost its title to the land, which was the only means in those days for creating wealth. Property rights were deemed so basic to liberty because only property made people truly independent, masters of their fate.

A slave, the property of others, is not an autonomous actor. He cannot be held responsible for his actions, cannot be a significant participant in a community.

The straight-thinking Americans who framed the constitution must have known this because they were masters of their destiny. They were also men of action who, besides their deep learning, were also the creators of wealth who had little stomach for hairsplitting abstractions or for sterile disputations with which many academics are so enamored.

When he analyzed the framing of a constitution that would guarantee basic human rights, James Madison warned that factionalism, driven from a desire to promote special interests, might impel governments to put narrow special interests before the good of the commonwealth. And yet he insisted that "the protection of [the different] faculties [that exclude equality] is the first object of government. From the protection of different and unequal faculties of acquiring property, the possession of different degrees and kinds of property immediately result; and from the influence of these on the sentiments and views of the prospective proprietors ensue a division of the society into different interests and parties."

Madison believed then that it was not the business of a democratic system to achieve equality or the uniformity of interests, because those negate the need to protect the freedoms that encourage variety. A truly civil society that protects individual rights protects, in effect, inequality and this protection, Madison insisted, was "the first object of government."

For if we want to maintain the freedom to create and to choose, we must accept innate inequality. We must accept that though in the extreme inequality may lead to division and factionalism, it is primarily productive, the basis of all creative life, the same way that competition in sports motivates excellence in those who win while not diminishing the value of the losing team, as long as it did its best and contributed in this way to the achievements of the winners.

"Individuality was revealed as the main secret of creation, and what motivates it, and will always do so, is a basic individual drive to rise above the leveling nature of the collective. Creativity was revealed to be unattainable in a society in which this basic drive was extirpated. Creativity was made possible only in a society where hope smiles on private initiative and promises individual reward."

Thus wrote Ze'ev Jabotinsky in his prophetic 1929 essay, "We the Bourgeoisie," in which he foresaw the eventual demise of communism, both in the Soviet Union and in the kibbutzim because equality and collectivism run against human nature and neutralize its most creative impulses.

It does not mean, of course, that we have to accept also the extreme consequences of inequality, especially those that harm people who are for whatever reason economically unsuccessful. We must not allow extreme

inequality to bring about a dangerous polarity and division in society, even if most often this division is artificially fomented for gain by the promoters of the politics of envy.

Responsible people know that no man is an island unto himself, and that the well-being of every individual is interwoven in a social fabric, indeed, dependent on it. They would therefore search, and find ways, to mitigate the more extreme consequences of inequality. They can do so more successfully, however, in the voluntary framework of charity and good works that Judaism has fashioned. This is a more equitable, a more moral, more effective and more humane framework than the one that has become so popular nowadays: the framework of the welfare state that posits, against all evidence, that using the coercive force of government to "redistribute wealth" can be done efficiently and without forbidding costs, without great inequity, without huge waste and corruption.

How much misery, how many problems could have been avoided if Israelis, so full of talent and energy, had internalized the insights the founding fathers gleaned from the Bible and would have constructed a polity that promotes property rights and wealth creation, for the good of all. (Jerusalem Post May 30)

---

## **In Praise of Nationalism** By Yosef Goell

The Israeli planners who were in charge of the ceremony marking the 60th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz death camp at that Polish venue last month did not plan to include the singing of "Hatikva" at its conclusion. They were forced to do so by the grass-roots Israelis in the audience who burst out singing it in what seemed to them as a natural conclusion to such a ceremony.

There is no room to criticize the non-Jewish front-row dignitaries who took their cue from the Jewish VIPs who were already leaving their seats in the freezing cold without singing "Hatikva."

As one who watched the moving ceremony on television, a highlight for me was the unmistakable trace of embarrassment which stole over the faces of the VIPs as the other Jewish participants refused to desist from singing the anthem.

My guess is their embarrassment did not stem so much from any disdain of "national primitivism" in the presence of the prime ministers of Poland and Hungary. I can assure our own front-row Jews that in similar circumstances those East European leaders would have sung their own respective anthems with post-communist gusto. That fleeting expression of embarrassment was a reflection of the latest bon-ton in parts of elite Israeli society: discomfort with any expression of Jewish or Israeli nationalism. It is a latter-day reprise of century-old Jewish cosmopolitanism.

Sure enough, during the subsequent weeks a number of op-eds have appeared in Haaretz, the flagship of Israel's cosmopolitan high society, calling for greater Jewish sensitivity to demands for cultural, political and linguistic autonomy for Israeli Arabs. A main spokesman for this concept of a binational Israel (going beyond the apparently pass "Israel as the state of all its citizens") is Tel Aviv University sociologist Danny Rabinowitz.

In his May 26 column Rabinowitz called for the replacement of "Hatikva" and the Star of David flag – many Israeli Arabs have difficulty identifying with these – with new symbols. I would gladly join him in that proposal if a mere change in anthem and flag would guarantee not only Israeli Arab identification with the new symbols but with the State of Israel itself. Would Israeli Arabs then accept the state of the Jewish people, one in which they enjoy far-reaching equality as members of a respected minority?

I doubt very much whether the Jews of the United Kingdom identify with the crosses in Britain's national flag (or do the conquered Scots, Welsh and Irish for that matter), or that the hearts of millions of Muslim immigrants in France go pitter-patter over the blood-drenched "Marseillaise."

True, Canada did change its flag (from the Union Jack) and anthem ("God save the Queen") to the much more esthetic Maple Leaf and "O Canada" only four decades ago in a similar hope of advancing the cause of cross-ethnic amity. But there is not the slightest evidence that the change reduced demands for an independent Quebec which was conquered by the British on the Plains of Abraham only two and a half centuries ago.

One would have thought that as Israel made its peace with the idea of a far from entirely peace-loving independent Palestine alongside it, more and more Israeli Arabs would be ready to bury the hatchet and make their peace with the prospect of living as a respected minority in a Jewish state.

That, however, does not appear to be the intent of the overwhelming majority of the current generation of Israeli Arab leaders.

What is not fashionable is to emphasize the painful historical fact that Israeli Arabs are not simply another run-of-the-mill minority. They are the third-generation remnants of an indigenous people whose leaders took them into murderous war against their neighboring Jews only 57 years ago and lost.

The world of the 21st century is still organized around nation-states. There is no reason for Israelis to be ashamed of their own nationalism which has proven to be one of the most benign in two centuries of other bloodier and more xenophobic nationalisms.

It is important for Israel's democratic character that we go some distance

in extending real equality to those among our Arab minority who are ready to make their peace with the idea of living in a Jewish Israeli state.

It is equally essential that, in the interests of peaceful coexistence between the Jewish majority and the Arab minorities, our leaders resist any temptation to deal with expressions of Israeli Arab collective identity.

The recent insistence by local Arab leaders on marking Israel's Independence Day as nakba (catastrophe) day is not an innocent example of symbolic copy-cutting but a public declaration of hope that the Arabs – and not the Jews – should have won that war in 1948.

If that is what the Israeli Arab leadership considers the path of wisdom it should not be surprised at growing Jewish resistance to demands for Arab individual equality. (Jerusalem Post Jun 2)

---

### Senator Israel: Hillary Clinton Runs from Her Past

By Rachel Zabarkes Friedman

Watching Hillary Clinton's speech at the annual American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) policy conference on Tuesday was a chance to observe a political master in action. In her usual stone-faced way, the senator set out to present herself as a stalwart supporter of Israel and of America's alliance with Israel — and judging by the audience's reaction, she succeeded brilliantly. Many of the several thousand people gathered in Washington's Convention Center — AIPAC says there were over 5,000 participants at the conference overall — stood to applaud her at both the beginning and the end of her speech, and interrupted her several times in between. Hillary was a huge hit.

Her introducer set the stage by recalling Clinton's efforts as senator to press the International Committee of the Red Cross to admit Israel's Magen David Adom, and her defense of Israel's security fence after the International Court of Justice declared it illegal. And Clinton's speech hit exactly the right notes for the AIPAC crowd: She spoke about Israel as a "beacon of what democracy can and should mean." She said the United States must "demand that President Abbas dismantle the structures of terror." She condemned, at some length, "the barrage of hate and incitement that is still officially sanctioned by the Palestinian Authority." (She got particularly strong applause when she said that "using children as pawns in a political process is tantamount to child abuse.") Finally, she took on Iran, a topic of significant concern throughout the conference: "A nuclear-armed Iran is unacceptable, but it is not just unacceptable to Israel and the United States. It must be unacceptable to the entire world, starting with the European governments and people." That last bit brought her a standing ovation from many in the audience.

Unlike her fellow Democrat Nancy Pelosi, who spoke at AIPAC's gala dinner the night before, Clinton was hard on the Palestinians specifically. Where Pelosi talked impersonally about the "specter of violence" hanging over Israel, Hillary accused the Palestinians of inciting terror. Where Pelosi vaguely advocated "changes on the ground," Hillary placed responsibility on Abbas. Where Pelosi talked about a "moment of opportunity" not to be lost — but didn't say who's moment it was to lose — Hillary put the onus on the PA to reciprocate Israel's peace overtures.

All of this is well and good, but what does Clinton really think about the Arab-Israeli conflict? The truth is, it's nearly impossible to know. Her past tells a very different story from her statements and record as junior senator from New York.

Much of that past is already well known, if often willfully forgotten. In 1998, for example, Mrs. Clinton went far beyond official U.S. policy in declaring her support for the creation of a Palestinian state. Some today might call her prescient, but under the circumstances her remark amounted to significant pressure on Israel and a field day for unreformed Palestinians. Hillary also caused a stir in 1999 when she exchanged kisses with Yasser Arafat's wife after the latter gave a ridiculous speech accusing Israel of poisoning Palestinian women and children.

Then there's Hillary's past engagement with Muslim activist Abdurahman Alamoudi, among others shady characters. In October 2000, Candidate Clinton announced that she was returning contributions Alamoudi had made to her Senate campaign after he publicly declared, "We are all supporters of Hamas. ... I am also a supporter of Hezbollah." Clinton reportedly cited "serious disagreements" with Alamoudi's views, but defended her long-time involvement with him as part of the Clinton administration's peace efforts. For instance, Clinton had had Alamoudi draw up the guest list for the official White House celebration of Ramadan in 1996. Yet this was after he had protested President Clinton's decision to meet with author Salman Rushdie, and after he had denied that Hamas was a terrorist group. Last year Alamoudi pled guilty to charges of taking part in a plot to assassinate a Saudi prince and laundering money from Libya, allegedly to fund terrorist groups. In fairness, Clinton wasn't the only public figure duped by Alamoudi. But apparently he wasn't the only questionable activist she let into the White House. The New York Daily News reported that as First Lady Clinton "held several White House Muslim holiday receptions to which individuals opposed to the Mideast peace process and Israel's existence were invited."

Going back still further, we come to Clinton's embarrassing stint in the late '80s as chairman of the far-left New World Foundation. During that time she oversaw a grant of \$15,000 to an organization called Grassroots International, which funded two groups with close ties to the Palestine Liberation

Organization. When the incident came to light in 1992, Clinton responded by denying any knowledge that the money had been "diverted" to PLO-affiliated groups. But Clinton emphasized general-purpose grants during her chairmanship, meaning Grassroots may not have had to "divert" anything: She wrote in the board's biennial report that under her watch the foundation had made "mostly general support grants, rather than project grants, so as to prove core support to organizers and advocates." Even if the grant was project-specific, however, it probably would have just freed up other Grassroots money for the Palestinian groups.

Also among Clinton's New World grantees was the Communist-party-affiliated National Lawyers Guild, to which the foundation gave \$15,000 in 1987, according to Daniel Wattenberg. What was the Guild doing at the time? Well, for example, just a year earlier it had joined the November 29th Committee for Palestine — a reported front group for the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine — in protesting Israel's deportation of accused terrorists from the West Bank. And in 1987 it petitioned a U.S. court of appeals to declare unconstitutional a federal law allowing for the deportation of immigrants with subversive political beliefs. The case in question involved a group of illegal immigrants accused of membership in the PFLP. The National Lawyers Guild argued the law "would prevent anyone from giving any support to a liberation struggle in their own country." (The Supreme Court later ruled in favor of deportation.)

These causes are worlds away from yesterday's paean to Israeli democracy and condemnation of Palestinian violence. If today's Hillary Clinton has any regrets, she doesn't appear to have made them public. (Her office didn't return several phone calls and an e-mail requesting comment.) So far it hasn't mattered much for her political career. But will her past eventually catch up to her? With ambition and political acumen like hers, it probably won't. (National Review May 25)

*The writer is an associate editor of National Review.*

---

### A Ride to Gush Katif

By Naomi Ragen

I took a ride out to Gush Katif the other day. I wanted to speak to old friends, American immigrants, that like us, came to Israel in the early 70's. Roz has a degree in Latin from Barnard. Paul is an ordained Orthodox Rabbi, with two degrees from Yeshiva University. He used to be one of the editors of the Encyclopedia Judaica. They've been living in Netzar Chazani for 27 years, growing vegetables in sand.

They have eight kids, five of them boys who are in the army, holding high career officer positions vital to Israel's security. I've written an extensive article about them, taken photos. Hopefully, it will be published soon. I'll let you know where. Believe me, places like the New York Times have zero interest in an article about what will happen to the Jewish settlers in Gush Katif.

But what I wanted to tell you is this: All you have to do is go to Gush Katif and you'll understand what the real crux of the Arab-Israeli conflict is. The land in Gaza is sand. It is completely worthless. And yet, the Jews who were sent there by the Jewish Agency were given two dunams each. They were provided with an expert who taught them how to grow vegetables in sand in hothouses. And so the Barnard graduates and Rabbis learned to grow tomatoes and lettuce and mint. There are 56,000 head of lettuce in one hot house alone, and the entire Jewish settlement blooms with hothouses, hundreds of them. With the profits from their labors, the Jewish settlers added on to the little, simple houses built for them by the Jewish Agency thirty years ago. They planted gardens. Bikes lay out on the lawn. They have a beautiful synagogue and a community center, and a rich communal life: piano lessons, art lessons, exercise classes, Talmud classes.... There has never been a recorded case of any Jewish settler going into Gaza and harming an Arab. The contrary. Thousands of Gazan Arabs are employed in the hothouses of Gush Katif.

Just over the wall, put up to keep out sniper fire, the Gazan Arabs live in abject poverty. They have committed innumerable acts of murder, shootings, bombings, and terrorist acts against their Jewish neighbors, the peaceful farmers of Gush Katif.

Any reasonable person seeing the contrast must ask himself why? With all the millions and millions of dollars given to the Palestinian Authority, why didn't they build little houses for their people? Why didn't they give each one some land, and a hothouse, and teach them how to grow things? Why was it that the Jewish Agency paid Paul years ago to teach Palestinians in Gaza his growing methods( they repayed him by stealing his equipment)? Why was the money used for guns and bullets, instead of sophisticated watering systems? Why was it that Yasir Arafat was on Forbes Wealthiest Men in the World list? And how can the United States, a country built by pioneers, demand that the farmers of Gush Katif to hand over their life's work to the people on the other side of the fence, people who have done nothing, and will continue to do nothing, to help themselves? (NaomiRagen.com Jun 2)