



**Commentary...**

**Don Quixote Diplomacy**  
 Jerusalem Post Editorial

Today the faces stare out at us from our front page and ask: What are you waiting for? How many more of us must die? How long will you postpone the inevitable?

To Yossi Beilin, the Arab world, Europe, and the US State Department, the inevitable is the hurried formation of a Palestinian state more or less along the 1967 boundaries, a notion that also goes by the name "political horizon." To the rest of us, including most of the government and people, the leaders of the security services, perhaps President George W. Bush, and certainly most Americans, the inevitable is the application of the Bush Doctrine to Yasser Arafat.

The clash between these two inevitabilities must be resolved if the current carnage is to be stopped. The way to resolve the clash is to recognize that the "political horizon" is just that: an ever-receding target, not a fixed destination. There is much work to be done before we should try to embark on that journey.

The urgent task is not to define the political horizon but the opposite: All talk of horizons, all conference preparations, all envoy missions, all time line preparations should simply stop. Because if they do not stop, the message is that the more Israelis are murdered, the more the world will run around looking for something to give the Palestinians so that they will stop. The lesson of the failure of the 2000 Camp David summit and the subsequent Palestinian terror offensive is that peace cannot be achieved by satisfying Palestinian grievances. Camp David was the ultimate experiment in providing a political horizon. It failed. It failed because there is no fixed set of Palestinian demands short of Israel's destruction.

This does not mean there can never be peace with the Palestinians. Egypt and Jordan also had unlimited grievances, and potentially still do, but they made peace for lack of better alternative. In the pivotal case of Egypt, peace came not, as many argue, because Egypt was able to restore its honor from the trouncing it received in 1967, but because the 1973 war was once again a massive military defeat. In other words, the real "political horizon" is the elimination of an alternative to making peace. This is what the current war with the Palestinians is about, and the sooner we win it, the sooner the clouds blocking the political horizon will disappear.

The other reason it is backwards to be searching for a political horizon now is that the manipulation of this search is the main weapon of terrorist states to protect themselves. The group that claimed credit for yesterday's Megiddo massacre is Islamic Jihad, a group that is beholden to Hizbullah, which is beholden to Iran and Syria. Iran, Syria, and Iraq desperately want to derail the American war on terrorism, and they think they have discovered the way to do so: keep killing Israelis.

The terrorists understand what it seemed that President Bush does: If terrorism succeeds anywhere, it can succeed everywhere. They have discovered that Arafat has carved out the world's only regime-change free zone. No one talked about reforming the Taliban. No one talks about reforming Saddam Hussein. But Arafat is supposed to preside over a new regime ostensibly controlled by his equally tainted colleagues. This shell game will fool no one, least of all the shells themselves.

So what is to be done? Shin Bet chief Avi Dichter had it right when he said this week that the IDF must go back into Palestinian areas and stay there until the security barrier Israel is building is completed. But there must be another condition to ending the coming Defensive Shield II: a joint US-Israeli decision to send Arafat into exile.

There is a political destination, if not a "horizon." It lies in a world that need not be far off, a world in which Arafat and Saddam are no longer relevant parts of the landscape. The main thing obscuring that political solution is the attempt to create a political horizon before ousting Saddam and without ousting Arafat. (Jerusalem Post Jun 6)

**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*

**The Real Conflict** By Naomi Ragen

Like most people in the world, for years I assumed that the conflict between Arabs and Israelis was a conflict about land. I assumed that this conflict had something to do with people losing land, wanting land, feeling disenfranchised, deprived of rights...

Recently, I began research into terrorism, Saudi Arabia, and Islam which has given me some startling

evidence that everything I've believed in the past couldn't have been farther from the truth.

The fact is, the conflict between Arab and Israeli is a conflict between Muslim and Jew. Moreover, it is only a tiny part of a much wider conflict between Muslim and all other religions, and those countries that treasure freedom of religion. It is the conflict between fanatical and intolerant and ignorant hordes bent on converting the world to their vision of the one and only true faith: Islam.

The first inkling that this was the case were in the books I read on Saudi Arabia. Did you know that it is a crime to own a Bible in Saudi Arabia, and that people have been jailed for it? Did you know that no one is allowed to celebrate Christmas or Easter there, and that no churches of any denomination can be built there (let's not even talk about synagogues...)? Did you know that Jews are not allowed into Saudi Arabia, and that all things Jewish are a crime? Did you know that even those who practice Islam according to the Shia tradition are also considered criminals and are persecuted?

On the other hand, Saudi Arabia has been using its American-provided oil wealth to build elaborate mosques in places all over the world which have very few Muslims. This is what Peter Theroux (certainly no friend of Israel) wrote in his book Sandstorms: "Even the least observant Muslim in Saudi Arabia measured power and influence in religious terms—why else did the kingdom spend vast fortunes on palatial mosques in places where there were almost no Muslims? It was a subtle and informal way of marking territory. When the city of Rome decided in 1984 to grant a building permit for a mosque near the Holy See, the reaction of the Riyadh press [was] jeering articles [that] applauded this "tanazul", relinquishing or surrender, on the part of Rome and the Vatican... Europe and all Christendom were gloatingly shown to have caved in to Islamic machismo."

Unlike the shrines of almost all other religions who welcome visitors of other faiths, the Islamic cities of Mecca and Medina are forbidden to anyone who does not practice Islam.

The desire of the Islamic world to take over Jerusalem has one reason and only one: Islamic intolerance. Before Israel took over the Old City in 1967, it was closed to Jewish worshippers. The outbreak of violence in Pakistan, Indonesia, and parts of Africa are also being portrayed as territorial disputes by the press. But anyone with eyes in his head can see they too are Muslims against Hindus, Muslims against Christians. Muslims against anyone who isn't Muslim.

Of all the freedoms we hold dear in the West, none is more precious than freedom of religion. Muslim immigrants are using that freedom and Saudi petrodollars to build an Islamic empire that will threaten religious tolerance in the West. We can already see the results with the rise of anti-Semitism in Europe, led by Muslims who attack Jews, burn synagogues, and target religious schools. In Israel, the turnover of Christian Bethlehem to Muslims led directly to the destruction of the Christian community and the desecration of one of its holiest shrines, the Church of the Nativity, which was defiled by Palestinian gunmen, raped of precious artifacts, and then trashed.

When the West urges Israel to allow Muslim fanatics to mark more territory, it is rewarding Muslims for their crimes against humanity. Already, Muslims have lowered the standards of decency and brought all of the civilized world to new lows, convincing so-called intelligent and moral people to accept the outrages of supermarket killings, playground bombings, school bus bombings, flying baby carriages, murdered grandmothers, blown up Seder nights as a legitimate part of some moral equation in which the Muslims are always the ones with the understandable

**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)**

grievance that one can accept. "The Israelis murdered my brother," they'll explain after killing the baby, forgetting to mention that their sibling belonged to Fatah, or Islamic Jihad, or Hamas. And that is the way the press will present it. The Israeli or settler (baby in the carriage) against the idealistic young freedom fighter willing to risk his life for...you name it...any word that falls easily on Western ears and sensibilities. By allowing this propaganda to succeed, barbarous acts become palatable with the help of their journalistic apologists, helping the West to engage in its own brand of moral suicide, preparing itself for the day when the norms of Saudi Arabia will soon be the norms of us all.

Every inch of land Israel surrenders, gives that Muslim vision a new victory, infusing new strength into its megalomania. Every compromise Israel is forced to make by the world, or its own foolish leadership, strengthens the cynical resolve of the Muslims to expand the theatre of their conquests, and to turn the world into the hateful prison that is Riyadh and Jeddah, places where women walk like black ghosts, unable to work, or drive, or go out without permission from their husbands and fathers; a place where music is outlawed, and movies, and theatres; and where the worship of Jehovah or Jesus is a jailable crime.

Should Israel cease to exist, there would be no peace. It would simply whet the Muslim appetite to gobble up the next country and the next and the next, until they achieve their vision of one God, One Prophet; that is the Muslim God, Allah, and the one Muslim prophet, Mohammad.

Those of you urging Israel to compromise, should look out your own windows and think of the morning after. (NaomiRagen.com May 30)

---

### Sharp Vision Jerusalem Post Editorial

The most significant things in life are often those taken most for granted. So too in Israel's life as a nation, technological achievements barely warrant a moment's notice, particularly at a time when political, security, and economic crises seem to be almost daily fare. The launch of the Ofek-5 reconnaissance satellite does not deserve to be lost in this shuffle, and points to something the Arab world may actually appreciate more than Israelis.

Though satellites in general have become commonplace, it is less widely known that the Ofek-5 is advanced enough to place Israel in a club with only three other members: the United States, Russia, and China. The actual satellite is tiny - only 2.3 meters long, 1.2 meters wide, and weighing 300 kilograms. Yet it reportedly can take pictures of almost any spot on earth to a resolution of less than one meter. This means it not only can monitor countless military facilities as it whips around the globe every 90 minutes, but could conceivably spot Saddam Hussein eating on his back porch from an altitude of 450 kilometers.

Ofek-5 was built entirely in Israel, and was launched by an Israeli rocket, the Shavit. The launching itself should not be considered a trivial achievement, as indicated by the fact that a fair number of launches (including that of the Ofek-4 in 1998) end in failure. It was also launched, contrary to almost every other satellite, to the west, in the opposite direction of the earth's rotation, so as to avoid the danger of its capture by an Arab country in the event of a malfunction.

Again, we take all this for granted. But so did Americans when Ronald Reagan announced his plan to build a global defense against ballistic missiles. The US could and should have built missile defenses long ago, but the remarkable thing is that even the prospect of their construction did much to hasten the Soviet Union's collapse. For the USSR, America's unmatched technological prowess was the handwriting on the wall.

The same, to some extent, can be said about the Arab-Israeli conflict. The Arab world has witnessed the opening of unbridgeable technological gap between it and Israel that renders a repetition of the onslaughts attempted in 1948, 1967, and 1973 increasingly unthinkable. This is not to say that Israel has become militarily impregnable. Arab strategy has moved on to non-conventional forms of attack - from terrorism on one end of the spectrum, to the dream of weapons of mass destruction on the other.

September 11 is sometimes taken as proof that the West is vulnerable to even relatively primitive examples of its own technology turned against it.

Suicide bombings and other forms of terrorism are hardly hi-tech. But high technology is not as impotent as it is made out to be against low technology and unconventional threats.

In Afghanistan, the United States showed how smart weapons, dumb bombs, modern communications systems, and even cavalry can be combined to great effect. The barriers contemplated between Israel and the Palestinians are combinations of measures as low-tech as a ditch with sophisticated surveillance technology. And technology could allow Israel and the United States to render ballistic missiles obsolete, if only the political constraints to building such defenses were overcome.

Technology is not a panacea, but it is a great handicap to be without it. No Arab state can dream of doing what Israel did this week until the Arab world is politically and economically transformed. This transformation, as a handful of mostly Western-based Arab intellectuals have pointed out, has been blocked by the Arab obsession with Israel. The launching of the Ofek-5 symbolizes not only

Israel's technological prowess, but how badly the Arab world needs peace. (Jerusalem Post May 30)

---

### What Is George Tenet Doing Anyway? By Michael Ledeen

Perhaps the most astonishing thing about recent Middle East diplomacy is that the director of Central Intelligence has become a member of the Foreign Service and also a technical adviser to the Palestinian terrorists, and nobody seems to think there's anything unusual or objectionable about it.

And yet this is an enormous mistake, and not just because the very idea of the United States working for the creation of an "integrated security force" for Yasser Arafat is one of those seemingly clever ideas that falls apart upon close examination. It is breathtakingly stupid for any American official to let alone the director of Central Intelligence to work to improve the discipline and power of a terrorist force that has already murdered several Americans. You can easily imagine the lawsuits, can't you?

But that is only the beginning of the stupidity. Tenet's mission throws his own reliability into serious doubt, and undermines the credibility of anything on the Middle East coming out of the Intelligence Community. The director of Central Intelligence is supposed to guarantee our policymakers reliable, bias-free information so that they can make policy. But once the DCI is engaged on behalf of a particular policy, anything the Agency says about that policy, or related subjects, is automatically suspect, since he has a personal stake in the assessment.

If somebody else - say, someone from the uniformed services - worked with Arafat, then we might have some confidence in, say, the CIA's ability to tell us what was actually going on. But not this way.

The whole idea is terrible, and it should never have been proposed to Tenet in the first place. But even so, he should have had the courage to reject it. He should have told the president that if he were ordered to do this thing, he would resign from the intelligence position and simply become a special emissary or an NSC consultant, or a member of the Foreign Service. The DCI must not do it if he wants the intelligence community to be believable.

It's hard to tell the origin of this very bad idea. A friend of mine thinks it's actually an Israeli idea, which makes sense since in recent years the Israelis have specialized in ideas that are too clever by half. It might also be a State Department idea, since our diplomats are quite capable of such thoughts. Whatever the source, it's profoundly alarming to see that the president, the secretary of state, and the DCI have all found it attractive, when its main consequences will surely be to strengthen Arafat's ability to kill innocent civilians, intimidate his Palestinian opponents, and gravely weaken the stature of the DCI.

As with so much of the current confusion, all of this derives from a fundamental misunderstanding of the current situation. Unable or unwilling to recognize that it is impossible to bring about a serious peace between Israel and the Palestinians unless Iran, Iraq, Syria, and Saudi Arabia support it (and the current leaders of those countries will never support it, which is why they are the targets of the war against terrorism), the Bush administration, egged on by the Saudis, the Egyptians, and the Europeans, is desperately looking for a magic formula. They have bought into the big lie that we can't wage war against the terror states until there is peace between Israel and the Palestinians.

They have it backwards. If we destroy the terror masters in Baghdad, Damascus, Tehran, and Riyadh, we might have a chance of brokering a durable peace. Without that, it's hopeless. The terror now afflicting Israel is not a purely Palestinian operation. Iran, Iraq, and Syria are all deeply involved, and Saudi Arabia foots many of the bills. Therefore there can be no "peace" until and unless we win the war...first.

So let's get on with the war. Faster, please. (National Review June 4)

---

### Tourism and Terrorism By Rabbi Stewart Weiss

Last week, walking by the Park Hotel in Netanya, I happened to see a friend of mine, a tour guide. Assuming he was just hanging around - after all, he hasn't been overwhelmed with work over the last year and a half - I stopped to talk with him.

He informed me that he actually was leading a group, and that they were inside the Park viewing the scene of the Pesach bombing and hearing Netanya's mayor recount all the grisly details of that horrible night. He told me that the group - eighteen Rabbis on a "mission" from the States - had come directly from their arrival at Ben Gurion airport to Netanya. This has now become de rigueur, I am told: Whereas for many years arriving dignitaries and missions were taken directly to the Western Wall, the Knesset and Yad Vashem, now their first day consists of pilgrimages to the Park, Sbarro restaurant and the Moment Cafe.

Something is wrong with this picture. While I can understand foreign

fascination with terrorism in Israel - after all, that's about the sum total of what they see on TV - and I can appreciate the desire of visitors to empathize with our suffering, we are doing a major disservice to Israel's image and psyche by continually accentuating the negative. By whisking tourists straight from their plane to the sites of terrorist bombings, we are sending the message that Israel is one large war zone, a nation under siege where normal life no longer exists and citizens cower in dark corners afraid to see the light of day.

It's time for a reality check, folks. Yes, we are facing an unprecedented wave of terror perpetrated by despicable villains. Yes, we have indeed suffered immensely, enduring hardships and grief that would bring most nations to its knees. And yes, we have guards at coffee shops and body-searches at shopping malls. But we most definitely have not retreated to some subterranean hole & put our lives on hold. We go to work, our kids go to school, we shop, we even eat out occasionally at a restaurant, or take in a movie. Our hotels miss their foreign visitors, but occupancy by Israelis - who prefer to give their money to local compatriots rather than anti-Semitic Euro-trash - is more than respectable. Having been in Herzliya for Shavuot, I can report that every hotel in the area was sold out, the beaches were full, and there was not a trace of hysteria in the air. This, I am convinced, is more the REAL Israel than the false image insidiously portrayed by CNN and its cohorts.

The tendency to portray Israel in a negative light is nothing new, nor is it a phenomenon practiced solely by our antagonists. For years, Jewish organizations around the world have tried to paint Israel in rather dark hues. Presumably, they felt that an Israel under siege would elicit a more sympathetic response from potential donors and a greater inclination to show solidarity with Israeli cousins.

As a pulpit Rabbi in the States, I conducted an annual High Holiday appeal each Yom Kippur on behalf of Israeli Bonds. The Bonds people ("bondsmen," I called them) pleaded with me to paint the gloomiest picture I could of the Jewish State, highlighting our economic woes, our security crisis, our isolation in the world at large, etc.

Always, I politely refused, for two primary reasons. First, while casting Israel as a pathetic little (ital)nebuch might have short-term benefits as far as raising funds, the (ital)long-term ramifications were frightening. If we continually promoted an overwhelmingly-negative image of life here, I argued, who would ever want to emigrate and actually LIVE here? Indeed, I am convinced that the dismal rate of Aliyah from the West can at least partially be attributed to the horrible picture purposely painted over the years by Israel's "advocates" abroad.

Moreover, I maintained then - as I do now - that the negative image of Israel is a patently false one. We live in a fantastic country with a high standard of living, beautiful neighborhoods, a delightful combination of the modern and ancient. While terrorism is a problem, crime is relatively mild, certainly nothing like the violent streets of Johannesburg or Washington, D.C. We are a vibrant democracy, lacking for virtually nothing, where children play freely and each day is a new adventure. Therefore, I told my synagogue, support Israel not because you PITY her, but because you wish to be, at the very least, a "junior partner" in her miraculous achievements.

There is nothing wrong with seeing the "whole" Israel, the good and the bad, the warts as well as the wonders. But rushing to see the places of our debasement, the scenes of our suffering, only plays into the hands of the terrorists, who would like nothing better than to convince the outside world that they have brought us to a state of siege and disrupted the flow of normal life.

So I urge you, good visitors to our country, adjust your itinerary. Don't be in such a hurry to see terror sites; there will be ample opportunity for that along the way. First, stop at an outdoor cafe, and sip some espresso; stroll in one of our lush parks, or walk a sandy beach along our expansive seafront. And most of all, send a postcard back home to friends and family: "Wish you were here!" (Jerusalem Post Jun 4)

*The writer is director of the Jewish Outreach Center of Ra'anana.*

---

### **Dialogue of the Deaf in Dallas** By Daniel Doron

Recently what was planned as a pleasant Dallas dinner for several prominent American Jewish professionals and their Israeli guest turned into a bitter altercation. The dispute arose when the Israeli defended Israel's actions against Palestinian terrorism. Two of the guests - a prominent journalist and his ex-Israeli wife - retorted that Israel's actions were unjust and repugnant. The other guests, a bit out of their element, tried throughout the argument to observe polite neutrality, like the State Department, even-handedly allotting blame between parties to a "cycle of violence."

Since similar scenes are frequently enacted around dinner tables in the US and Europe, the Dallas dinner can illuminate how opinions about the Middle East conflict are formed, and why they are mostly unfavorable to Israel.

It started with the two neutral but caring professionals asking why Israel was not being more attentive to world public opinion by obeying, for example, State Department directives to immediately withdraw out of Palestinian

territory; or why Israelis engage in provocative settlement activity in occupied Palestinian lands. Don't you see, they pleaded in anguish, that such intransigence sets the whole world against you? You will finally have to stop your incursions into Palestinian territory and return their land. So why not do it now and save so much unnecessary bloodshed and aggravation?

The aggravation so keenly felt by our sympathetic American cousins was mostly provoked, of course, by their having to watch the daily bashing of Israel on in the media, and by having to confront questions by polite associates suggesting that Jews shared the guilt for Israeli "intransigence." No doubt Diaspora Jews, successful and confident in their remarkable achievements, found it more congenial to identify with Israel when it meant basking in the glory of its dramatic Six-Day War victory or sharing in the universal praise heaped on the daring Entebbe mission.

So, in Dallas, it was important to first clarify that part of the cost of achieving Jewish independence was not only forgoing some of the obvious advantages of Diaspora life, but being willing to defend Israel's independence from the mandarins of world public opinion. This is particularly true liberal sensibilities clash with the messy realities involved in exercising a nation's right to self defense.

Complicating matters further, our good American cousins have also swallowed the two big lies of Arab propaganda that the media promotes: first, that the recent terrorist war against Israel was launched to liberate the Palestinians from Israeli "occupation"; and second, that the Arabs are merely trying to retrieve "stolen Arab lands." It did little good to point out that since Oslo II, most Palestinians are no longer under Israeli occupation, or that the disputed lands of the West Bank and Gaza were never in any legal sense either national or private "Palestinian Lands" that could be "stolen."

But what really infuriated the articulate newspaperman and his leftist Israeli wife was the heresy that not everything about the pre-Oslo Israeli occupation was bad for the Palestinian Arabs if you consider them human beings rather than merely political animals. The Israeli visitor suggested that if we measure basic human rights not only by political status but also by what standards of living, health and education prevail in a society, and how the rule of law is applied, then without question the Palestinian Arabs were much better off even under an admittedly oppressive Israeli occupation than under a corrupt Tunisian PLO dictatorship. This claim was immediately dismissed as colonialism, and drove one participant to end the dialogue by leaving the room in a huff.

What was striking about this exchange was the proclivity of liberals to think of other human beings only as abstract entities possessing abstract rights, chiefly political. As if politics exhausted all human reality and were the sole guarantee of happiness and well being, while all other "rights," especially the satisfaction of basic needs, did not matter at all. When informed that hundreds of thousands of Palestinians who worked in Israel for nearly three decades seldom engaged in warlike acts against it; or that the overwhelming majority of east Jerusalem Arabs chose Israeli rather than Palestinian identity papers - the American couple dismissed the suggestion that the satisfaction of basic human rights seemed more important to most people than abstract political rights. It was easy to dismiss on a full Dallas stomach the need of most Arabs to first feed their families before sacrificing themselves for the glory of their nation and their gangster political rulers. Even an appeal to the womanly solidarity of our feminist guest did not avail. She was unmoved by the plight of Arab women who are treated by their political leaders as wombs producing cannon fodder for the revolution, and by many of their husbands as beasts of burden, at best.

It is such blind faith in the sacred abstract articles of political correctness that has made otherwise decent folk perversely support the most oppressive dictatorships and the worse forms of jingoistic nationalism from Stalin's to Arafat's. Unfortunately, Jews who have lost their concrete moorings in Judaism are especially prone to such utopian messianic fever, as this dinner in Dallas and the many Jewish, even Israeli, signatories to appeals defaming Israel so amply prove. (Jerusalem Post Jun 6)

---

### **A Mother's Protest** By Frimet Roth

Last month, three US Congressmen flew to Israel on a morale-boosting mission. Among their encounters was an evening spent with several Israeli parents of terror victims. My husband and I told them about Malki, our 15-year-old daughter who was murdered in the Sbarro bombing last August. "Americans support you and feel your pain," they assured us, and I wanted to be convinced.

But it wasn't easy. Back at home, a recent New Yorker article about the Palestinian Authority's Sari Nusseiba referred to him as a "voice of restraint." It related his view of suicide bombings: "People are so desperate, so crazy, so resentful, that it is natural to expect more of this." This is restraint?

On television, I heard American journalists stoking the ebbing Jenin fire.

Arafat had already back-tracked on the massacre claim and reduced the death toll from 500 to 56. But he was now crying "war crimes" and the media gamely joined him. Of course, with Israel's losses at 23, it looked most like a straight-out battle. But, sssh... Using that term would mean apologizing.

Israelis have grown accustomed to biased news reports. I have even become inured to coverage that minimizes the tragedy of Malki's death.

Yet reading the latest issue of New York Magazine my armor cracked. I learned of American Jews who took to the streets with Palestinians; Jews who claim to care about Israel and embrace Judaism. I saw their "End the Occupation" and "Sharon = Hitler" placards.

I realize how easy it must be to judge a cause by its supporters, rather than on its own merits. After all, many pro-Palestinians happen also to be committed to fighting a myriad of worthy battles: globalization, child labor, domestic violence, animal abuse, sexual and racial discrimination, environmental pollution. Could they be so wrong on this one?

Well, simply put: yes. Many of them have been deprived of information that is readily accessible to us here. For instance, are they aware that the Jenin accusations are just the latest in a long line of libels? A previous case arose in 1983 when droves of Palestinian schoolgirls fainted in class and were rushed to hospital. The Israelis stood accused of having poisoned and thereby sterilized them in order to stem the Palestinian demographic growth. After its investigation disclosed no evidence whatever of poisoning Israel concluded that this was an episode of mass hysteria, something not unheard of among teen girls. By then, all of the nearly 1,000 "victims" had been released from hospital, healthy and well.

Nevertheless, the uproar persisted. Palestinian doctors echoed the diagnosis of poisoning. The US ambassador to the UN even leveled similar accusations on her government's behalf. International organizations entered the fray from the start and proved unstoppable. Red Cross representatives conducted their own investigation. They unearthed no evidence of poisoning either, but an ambiguous report was the best they could produce. While it raised no anti-Israel allegations, it also failed to declare Israel innocent.

Fifteen years later, Yasser Arafat's wife, Suha, concocted a fresh libel of her own, which she unveiled at a ceremony in Hillary Clinton's honor. Israeli poisoning by depleted uranium was causing cancer among her people, she claimed. While the speech won Suha a kiss from the First Lady, the libel never really took off. But in damaging Israel's image, it achieved its goal.

Libels are an adjunct weapon intended to clear the way for terrorist attacks. They grab headlines and depict Israel as evil. Their eventual disproof, on the other hand, goes unnoted. The Palestinians rely on them in order to practice their barbarism with impunity. And little wonder. The hundreds of Israeli intifada victims are evidence that the strategy works.

Today I received a new book published by Israel's Ministry of Education. It is entitled Target: Israeli Children - Scores of Israeli Children Have Been Deliberately Murdered by Palestinian Terrorists. The booklet includes my own Malki's photo and a few lines about her. But with a toll of 70 children killed and 720 wounded in this war so far, space was limited. "Malki was filled with joie de vivre and was liked by all her friends," it says. But it fails to mention her passion for classical music and the magical way she played the flute. Nor does it note that she taught herself to play guitar and lugged one everywhere. Her friends tell us that she loved to pull it out and initiate folk-singing anytime and anyplace.

Malki's murder has been vividly re-enacted by Palestinian children. A videotape, repeatedly aired on television, shows them enthusiastically destroying a Sbarro replica emblazoned with the words "Sbarro" and "Kosher" in Hebrew.

Until the Palestinian school system undergoes fundamental change, there can be no peace. As long as their theater of terror, like the Sbarro reenactment, is an encouraged activity for youth, my own children will not be safe. The steady supply of suicide bombers - many of them mere teenagers - will continue so long as Palestinian Arab leaders offer their people nothing but empty promises.

But positive change is nowhere on the horizon. The old priorities seem more entrenched than ever. A case in point: the Palestinian Authority wish-list submitted this month to the European Union. According to a report in the German weekly Die Welt, high on the list was the sum of \$ 20 million (out of a total of nearly two billion) to purchase weapons for the Palestinian police. Funds for health and education, the article pointed out, were low priority items.

Suicide bombers are being nurtured by the more than 50 percent of Palestinians who still support this tactic. They do not sprout "naturally" as Sari Nusseiba would have us believe. Only after the Palestinians decide to channel more money into instruments of music instead of into weapons of war will we see progress - and that grant they are about to receive from the Europeans would be a good place to start.

To those protesting Jews, let me say this: Much is in your hands. The Palestinians need your support to continue their reign of terror. They are relying on you to believe their libels. Your empathy with the Palestinian-Arab cause gives them carte blanche to murder more civilian Israelis. Please pause and

consider this before you next reach for your placards and head for another anti-Israel rally. Then perhaps, one day, children on both sides will devote themselves to music and friendship the way my precious Malki once did. (Jerusalem Post Jun 6)

*The New York-born writer is a freelance writer and mother residing in Jerusalem. Her oldest daughter was murdered in the Sbarro terror attack in the center of Jerusalem in August 2001.*

---

### **What Did You Do While Israel Was Destroyed?** By David D. Perlmutter

When I was in college, an Armenian American acquaintance told me about his grandfather's obsession with the Turkish genocide against his people in the early part of the 20th century. To a comment of "nice weather, today," the old man habitually replied "What does it matter since our people were slaughtered?"

I wonder if I will be like him in forty years. Marcel Ophuls, creator of the "The Sorrow and the Pity," once said, "It's time to stop talking about the Holocaust and do something about it." I presume he meant doing a better job of uncovering and prosecuting war criminals--but what about the next Holocaust?

For the first time in my life I see the shadows of Israel's destruction, if not by Arab armies all at once, but by suicide bombers one Jewish child and mother at a time. I see an anti-Jewish European press sadistically attacking Israel's defensive measures. I see a clownishly hypocritical United Nations condemning Israel's bulldozing of a building while millions die in the Sudan or Tibet. I see my fellow academics musing and posturing in praise of demons who would cut their throats merely for being non-Muslims.

Small items, too, prick hard. I find myself getting irritated at a Jewish social organization I belong to raising its dues: why don't we send all the money to buy Israeli war bonds instead? I am furious when I read that some Jewish Hollywood Mogul just gave seven million dollars to the democratic party. Where is the opposition of our good friends in the Democratic party to President's Bush's persistent coddling of Arafat and the House of Saud?

So I simmer when I see Jews fighting everybody's battles--from the Civil Rights movement to the salvation of Bosnian Muslims--but when the hangman comes for us, we find ourselves standing alone. (Why, for example, does the Hebrew Union College use a picture of "Jews Oppose Police Brutality" in its advertising--isn't "Islamic Fascist Brutality" a most clear and present danger?)

Mostly, I cannot stand watching the news--with its tired cliches of "cycles" of violence. Today I see Arafat, sitting in his bunker, talking to "international activists" and proclaiming that the Israelis are just like Nazis. I wonder: did Hitler allow his enemies press conferences? I daydream--if only! If in 1948, 1956, 1967 or 1973 Israel had acted like the Third Reich then today Israelis today would shop, marry, eat pizza and play unmolested. And of course Jews, not sheiks, would have that Gulf Oil. In contrast, if the Arabs had conquered Israel does anyone think a single Jew would today be alive between the Jordan and the Mediterranean?

This is what I'm reduced to: thinking like a Nazi when an Arab accuses Jews of acting like Nazis.

I'm unhappy as well--especially since I teach political communication--at Israel's unsophisticated, unplanned mediapolicy. Since the Lebanon War, the seven squabbling Israeli ministries that claim to control press relations have been notorious for either ignoring or failing to understand the needs of modern journalism. One journalist noted to me: "The Palestinians will go to the news bureaus each day and pitch stories, and go out of their way to help arrange interviews, suggest places to shoot. From the Israeli government, all you get is statements, silence or red tape."

A more ominous reason that the evening news is so laden with images favorable to the Palestinians is that they are chosen and shot by Palestinians. Israeli reporters are banned from working in Palestine areas; foreign journalists are subtly or violently pressured to either keep out or report with a pro-Palestinian bias. The result is that most networks and news bureaus use Palestinian stringers for spot news coverage and also for translations. So Yassir and his brown shirts are allowed to make statements like, "We are the only occupied people in the world" without an accompanying laugh track.

These are my dark thoughts and quiet desperations. Who will dissolve them? Who will silence the madness? Will I even be allowed to become an old, bitter man? Will any of us have chance to look back on these days beyond the mushroom clouds of the tomorrow?

*The writer is an associate professor of mass communication at Louisiana State University. He is the author of, Visions of War : Picturing Warfare from the Stone Age to the Cyber Age. (JewishWorldReview May 30)*

---