

 Jerusalem 7:05 Toronto 8:38

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

Dear Readers:

This week's issue is printed on orange paper in solidarity with our brothers and sisters in Gush Katif, Azza and the Northern Shomron who are threatened with eviction from their homes, businesses and communities. Orange is the official colour of the opposition to the disengagement. Let us pray for the welfare of these very fine people and their most special communities. - Ed.

Commentary...

The Jewish State-icide By Frank J. Gaffney, Jr.

Suddenly, the world is seized with the danger of ignoring the Islamofascists in our midst. Lengthy front-page articles in Sunday's New York Times and Washington Post describe how British authorities allowed this virulent ideology-masquerading-as-a-religion to establish - and metastasize - into a veritable "Londonistan" in the years preceding last week's murderous attacks on the host community.

The complacency shattered by the four bombs in London has been replaced with hard questions about the threat posed to other West societies. The French, Dutch, Germans and Italians are suddenly seized with the prospect that their own Londonistans are festering Islamist breeding grounds, sores that can at any time subject transportation and other soft targets in these democracies to the sort of bloodletting seen over the past fifteen months in Spain and Britain.

Here in America, political correctness still compels the conversation to focus mostly on the vulnerabilities of our infrastructure and what is - or is not - being done to mitigate them. There is, however, a growing appreciation post-London that we can no longer ignore the fact that Islamofascists are hard at work here as well, seeking to dominate their co-religionists as the prerequisite for forcing the rest of us to submit to a new, global Caliphate under an unforgiving religious law called Shari'a.

The one place we apparently are indifferent to the rising power of the Islamists is in the would-be state of "Palestine." There, the establishment of an Islamofascist Gazastan is not only being tolerated by the West. It is being enabled by the government of Israel, the G-8 and the Bush Administration.

To be sure, the government of Ariel Sharon (which is determined to unburden itself next month of Palestinian populations in Gaza and parts of the West Bank), the leaders of eight industrial nations (who last week pledged \$3 billion for Palestine) and President Bush (who has been a steadfast supporter of Israel and opponent of terror) have something different in mind. They envision a democratic Palestinian state living peaceably side-by-side with Israel.

Unfortunately, this prospect is no more likely at the moment than was that of an Islamofascist Londonistan living side-by-side in peace with its non-Islamist neighbors. If anything, it is less likely since the West's behavior can only be seen as a reward for Palestinian terror. Alan Dershowitz put it well in Front Page Magazine on July 8:

"The Palestinian Authority, and its leaders, are the godfathers of international terrorism. They developed airplane hijacking into a high art. They invented the high-profile murder of athletes and other prominent public figures. Were it not for their employment of terrorism, the Palestinian cause would today be regarded as the fifth-rate human rights issue that it rightfully is. But because the Palestinian leadership has always used terrorism (from the 1920's on) as the tactic of first resort, their cause has received worldwide recognition."

Now, that recognition will be extended to a Palestinian terrorist state. Such will be its character whether the Islamofascists' ally - Mahmoud Abbas, the Palestinian Authority's recently elected president - somehow manages to hold onto power or, as seems more likely, his ruling clique is soon replaced by the Islamists of Hamas. (Abbas celebrated the London bombings in Damascus, where he was the guest Thursday night at a festive meal hosted by Syrian dictator Bashar Assad, along with Hamas' Khaled Mashal, Islamic Jihad's Ramadan Abdullah Shallah and Ahmed Jibril, head of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, all designated as terrorist organizations by Britain and

the United States.)

The emergence of a new Arab state-sponsor of terror that is flush with Western cash and enjoys the protection of the international community will, of course, be a mortal threat to Israel. Having enhanced the stature of terrorists determined to destroy the Jewish State, Israelis will find the Islamists making a redoubled effort to do just that from their new safe-havens.

The existential threat to Israel is made all the greater by the deep domestic divisions now evident over Sharon's so-called "disengagement" plan. There is serious talk that a civil war may ensue over that initiative, which is now opposed by a majority of Israelis. Such a conflict is being fueled, in part, by secular Jews who seek to destroy the political power of their religious countrymen.

Should anything approaching a civil war eventuate, Israel's Arab enemies must be expected to exploit what would thus be afforded: the best chance ever to realize their unrequited ambition to "drive all the Jews into the sea" - especially if, as is now being proposed, Israel were to allow Egyptian and Jordanian/Palestinian armies to return to Gaza and the West Bank, respectively.

Gazastan will be a terrible menace for the United States, too. Such an Islamofascist state will not only threaten the very existence of Israel, our closest, democratic ally in the Middle East. Given the Palestinians' record of past treachery towards other Arabs, it should be expected to undermine the Bush strategy of bringing to power moderates elsewhere in the region.

The creation of a new Palestinian safe-haven for terrorist recruitment, training and planning will also endanger Americans and their interests in Iraq, Europe, Asia and here at home. The fact that such terrorists will benefit from the counter-terrorist training, funding and arms we are giving the Palestinian Authority will only exacerbate this threat.

For states as for individuals, the rule should be that friends don't let friends commit suicide. It's not too late for the U.S. to discourage Israel from doing just that by abandoning Gaza and parts of the West Bank under present circumstances - and the lessons of Londonistan make clear that we must. (Jewish World Review Jul 12)

The writer heads the Center for Security Policy.

The Israelification of Europe By Mark Steyn

To be honest, it was something of a relief, a few hours after the London bombs, to leave the US for Britain. American expressions of solidarity with plucky Britannia tended to the Churchillian, not to say Shakespearean: We shall fight them on the breaches, dear friend. On the radio, some talk-show hosts played bursts of Elgar and "Rule Britannia." On arrival in London, by contrast, I found the local reaction to the terrorists, as expressed by the lads down the pub, to be rather more to the point: "Sod off, tossers."

Indeed. The sodding off of the terrorist tossers is devoutly to be wished.

But what if they don't? If one wanted to fight them on the beaches, to which beaches would one go? Despite the urge among Britain's friends across the Atlantic to present 7/7 as "London's 9/11," the label doesn't quite fit. Within 24 hours after September 11, it was clear that, somewhere, some sovereign state was going to get invaded. America simply could not afford not to respond. There's no sense of that in Britain.

Some readers may disagree, of course. The dust had barely settled on Thursday's bombings before Derrick Green sent me a congratulatory e-mail: "I bet you Jewish supremacists think it is Christmas come early, don't you? Incredibly, you are now going to get your own way even more than you did before, and the British people are going to be dragged into more wars for Israel."

Ah, the Jew is so infinitely cunning, isn't he? The Muslim world has spent decades assiduously peddling the notion that the reason a vast, oil-rich region stretching thousands of miles is mired in political deformity and other grim psychoses is all because of a tiny strip of land barely wider than my New Hampshire township. But Mr. Green is evidence of the theory's rampant post-9/11 expansion to wilder shores yet: it seems a thin sliver of sinister Zionists is now destabilizing the whole of Europe, if not the entire world.

Whatever the attractions of anti-Semitism, it tends not to work out too well for those who over-invest in it - see the Third Reich, and the loopier parts of the Arab world today. And even among my own correspondents, suspicion of the dread Jew seems to be blinding them to what last week's

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 and www.frumtoronto.com

events may more plausibly portend: the Israelification of European life.

THURSDAY WAS an appalling act of savagery: the final death toll, in the heyday of the IRA terror campaign; hundreds more will bear the scars of that morning for as long as they live; and thousands of other Britons – the families and friends of the dead – have had a huge gaping hole blown in their lives. Had this happened in 1975 or 1985, it would have been an act of murder reverberating through British political life for weeks and months.

And yet and yet? In the post-New York, post-Bali, post-Madrid reconfiguration of terror, it was arithmetically small beer. It lacked the searing iconic precision of using airplanes to demolish the Manhattan skyline. It added up to a bad day in Iraq, or a couple of bad days in Thailand, where far from the gaze of CNN and the BBC some 800 people have been killed by Islamic terrorists in the first six months of this year.

The British and many Continental police forces have long experience of terrorism, and are good – within the political constraints they operate under – at dealing with it. In their glory days, the IRA blew up members of the Royal Family and the British government. By the end of their campaign they were reduced to splattering grannies and expectant mothers across shopping centers. Now, as then, prestige targets will be secured against terrorism, and that will leave soft targets – in a word, you, your morning bus ride, that little restaurant you like. And, as in Israel, Europeans will get used to the idea that every so often, entirely at random, there will be days when your husband or daughter or best friend sets off for work and doesn't come home.

I say "Europeans" because, granted that in the eyes of Western intellectuals this is all the fault of George W. Bush, there are significant differences between Europe's and America's relationship with Islam. It was the late Ayatollah Khomeini who popularized the idea that the United States is the Great Satan – a shrewd shorthand in that it acknowledges not merely that the hyperpower is evil, but that he is a great seducer too. And when one contrasts the vast number of British, European and Canadian jihadists who've turned up in the thick of it in Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, Iraq, Israel, Bosnia, Chechnya and beyond with the relatively insignificant number of American Muslims so embroiled, one begins to appreciate that the Great Satan is indeed a relatively effective seducer – at least to the extent that America seems to be doing a better job at assimilating Muslims than Europe or Canada. Of course, to assimilate you have to have something to assimilate with, and the yawning nullity of the European idea seems to be a wee bit deficient in that respect.

BUT THERE'S another difference, too, and this is what I mean by Israelification: the jihadists understand that Europe is up for grabs in a way that America isn't. Mandatory Palestine was, in the old joke, the twice promised land – hence, a Western democracy and a disaffected Muslim population exist in (for the most part) two solitudes but claim the same piece of real estate.

As it happens, that's also how more and more Muslims see Europe. And as their numbers grow it seems likely that wily Islamic leaders in the Middle East will embrace the cause of the rights of European Muslims in the same way that they claim solidarity with the Palestinians.

When France began contemplating its headscarf ban in schools, it dispatched government ministers to seek the advice of Egyptian imams, implicitly accepting the view of Islamic scholars that the Fifth Republic is now an outlying province of the dar al-Islam. As the Zionist Entity can testify, that's not a club you necessarily want to be signed up for.

Few European leaders have a clue what to do about this, but, as that French headscarf law and Britain's Incitement to Racial Hatred bill and Dutch responses to the murder of Theo van Gogh all underline, mediation between what Tony Blair called on Thursday our way of life and Muslim values has already become a central dynamic of European political culture – a remarkable achievement for a minority few Europeans were more than vaguely conscious of pre-9/11.

Meanwhile, across the borders pour not primarily suicide bombers or suitcase nukes, though they will come in the end, but ideology – fierce, glamorous and implacable.

That's the final irony of the Israelification of Europe: Distressing as it may be to Continental anti-Semites, in this scenario they're the Jews.

The writer is senior North American columnist for Britain's Telegraph Group. (Jerusalem Post Jul 13)

Scorched-Earth Kulturkampf By Caroline Glick

A district attorney in a Middle Eastern country last week indicted a citizen for writing a letter to a public servant accusing him of being a quisling. The remarkable thing about the episode is that it did not take place in Syria or in Egypt. It took place in the only democracy in the Middle East.

Last Thursday, the Jerusalem District Attorney's office indicted Nadia Matar, head of the right-wing, largely religious women's movement Women in Green for the crime of "insulting a public servant." The "insult" came in the form of a faxed letter to Yonatan Bassi, the head of the government's withdrawal authority, last September, in which she referred to him as "a modern version of the Judenrat." The Judenrat, of course, were the Jewish officials in the Nazi ghettos who were forced by the Gestapo to carry out eviction orders of their fellow Jews to death camps.

It was certainly not nice, and indeed not historically truthful for Matar to have used this analogy. The Jews of Gaza and northern Samaria are indeed set to be expelled from their homes and communities for no reason other than the fact that they are Jews. But they are not being sent to death camps. So to use the analogy of the Judenrat is both nasty and wrong.

As the analogy does not stand up to even the slightest scrutiny, it would have been easy enough for government spokesmen to refute her charge or ignore it as unworthy of a response. No one would have thought any worse of the government if it had taken either of these reasonable courses of action. But rather than do this, the police opened a criminal investigation against Matar and now the District Attorney has decided to indict her for the specious criminal charge of "insulting a public official."

Why would the state prosecutors do this? What are they trying to accomplish by criminalizing Matar?

The weekend papers provided an explanation of the reasoning behind the move. In Haaretz's Friday editorial the rationale for the Left's support of Sharon's plan was laid bare: "The disengagement of Israeli policy from its religious fuel is the real disengagement currently on the agenda. On the day after the disengagement, religious Zionism's status will be different," the paper explained. It then concluded: "The real question is not how many mortar shells will fall, or who will guard the Philadelphi route, or whether the Palestinians will dance on the roofs of Ganei Tal. The real question is who sets the national agenda."

Doron Rosenblum, one of the paper's chief columnists, spelled the message out even more bluntly on Sunday, fulminating, "There is an enemy on the Right. Anyone who behaves like an enemy, walks like an enemy and makes the sounds of an enemy – at least let him not complain about being treated like an enemy. And don't forget: Let the IDF win."

To Rosenblum and Haaretz's editorialists must be added Dan Margalit, the senior commentator at Ma'ariv. In his Friday column, Margalit argued in favor of placing quotas on the number of religious Jews allowed to serve as officers in the IDF. Referring to religious Jews serving in the IDF as "the dear brothers," Margalit invoked the Latin expression for quotas for Jews restricting their right to study in European and American universities in the early 20th century – the infamous *numerus clausus*. He warned religious Israelis that if they refuse to carry out the expulsion of Jews from Gaza and northern Samaria, "the reaction to their action is liable to be a "numerus clausus," this time in Hebrew, Jews against Jews. Hair-raising, but there is no choice."

WHAT WE see here unfolding is a situation where the anti-religious Left, the primary supporters of Ariel Sharon's policy to forcibly expel 10,000 Jews from their homes and communities, has given the policy their support – through its members' legal authority and public platforms – not because they see any security benefit arising from the move. In fact, they support the plan despite its security dangers because they see it as a culminating battle in their cultural war against religious Zionism.

Saying so much in an op-ed in The Jerusalem Post this past March, former Haaretz and Globes editor Mati Golan wrote, "Religion and democracy simply do not go together. Democracy requires an open mind, freedom of choice, the ability to criticize. Religion on the other hand is based on virtually blind obedience to its priests. What some in the religious settler population want is to eat their democratic cake and, as believers, have their anti-democratic one too."

The inanity of this view is matched only by its basic misunderstanding of both Jewish tradition and democracy. Anyone vaguely familiar with the former would know that blind obedience is the last thing Jewish faith endorses. As well, the basic values of democracy demand respect for all views in a society, even those that Golan and his colleagues reject.

There are multiple and weighty arguments against the withdrawal and expulsion plan. Some of them relate to the moral issue of expelling Jews from their homes and making areas of the Land of Israel – or any land for that matter – off-limits to all Jews. The main group of opponents to the withdrawal and expulsion plan who base their arguments against it on the plan's moral dimension are religious Jews, in Israel and abroad.

Aside from the moral questions, all Israelis who don't have a death wish are concerned with the security implications of handing land and strategic positions over to a junta of terrorists who have repeatedly stated their intention to use that land and those positions to advance their terror war against the State of Israel. Yet, to date, due to the negligence of the media and the courts, no government official – from the prime minister on down – has been called on to answer how Israel will be militarily better off without Gaza and northern Samaria. Indeed, no government spokesman from Sharon on down has been able to coherently explain how Israel will defend itself when Gaza and northern Samaria are under Hamas and Fatah control.

The security consequences of the plan have been systematically ignored while the full brunt of media scrutiny has been placed on its religious opponents. They are reviled as zealots, criminals and extremists. Rabbis are threatened with firings and the closing of their yeshivot if they do not toe the government line. Gaza residents are accused of being money-grubbing and wasteful of government resources for forcing the IDF to expel them rather than leaving their homes quietly and meekly. Religious Jews are being

intimidated with threats to keep them out of the army or prevent their promotion in the ranks, simply because it will be necessary to prevent what Margalit refers to as "difficulties with future operations."

There are ample reasons to be concerned about and, indeed, oppose a plan that involves no security opportunities – only expanding threats – for Israel. But at the end of the day what is even more debilitating are the plan's implications for the future of Israel as a democracy.

When the loudest voices favoring it are those espousing hatred and exclusion of religious Zionists, or what Haaretz refers to as "a Trojan horse that has infiltrated Zionism in order to destroy it from within," it becomes absolutely clear that for the plan's strongest advocates, capitulation to terror is a means of carrying out their culture war against religious Jews.

And just as security can be readily sacrificed, democracy and the rule of law become mere Pascal lambs on the altar of cultural supremacy – ignored, reviled and happily trounced on the path to victory in the culture war these priests of enlightenment instigated against their brethren years and years ago. (Jerusalem Post Jul 12)

New Allies Against Anti-Semitism By Michael Freund

In recent years, the streets of Europe have become an increasingly dangerous place for Jews. From Geneva to Rome and from Berlin to Madrid, the age-old hatred engendered by anti-Semitism has reared its ugly head once again, instilling fear into the hearts of many regarding what the future portends.

Dutch Jewish filmmaker Leon de Winter perhaps summed it up best when he told the *Suddeutsche Zeitung* last October: "The old poison of anti-Semitism is very much alive... I will remain a stranger on this continent... I fear that in Europe something will once more be done against the Jews."

Sadly, there is ample statistical data to back up this sentiment. A recent report issued by the Stephen Roth Institute for the Study of Contemporary Anti-Semitism and Racism at Tel Aviv University concluded that 2004 was "the most violent year in the past 15 years" in terms of anti-Jewish incidents, noting that "physical attacks on Jews were the most salient feature."

In France, for example, the number of anti-Semitic attacks soared by more than 60 percent compared with 2003. These included physical assaults on Jews, the fire-bombings of Jewish institutions and the desecration of Jewish cemeteries. Even the dead, it seems, are not being allowed to rest in peace.

And don't think the problem is confined to Paris. According to the UK's Jewish Community Security Trust, the group that monitors threats to British Jewry, there was a 42% increase last year in anti-Semitic attacks over 2003.

Many observers have begun to despair, sensing that despite all the efforts made throughout the years to combat Jew-hatred, Europe remains hopelessly mired in the prejudice of the past.

As British Chief Rabbi Jonathan Sacks put it: "After more than half a century of Holocaust education... What more could have been done? What more could and can we do to fight anti-Semitism?"

The answer, I think, may lie in marshalling one of the great untapped resources of philo-Semitism, one whose presence throughout Europe continues to grow in number: Bible-believing Christians.

Yes, that's right, Christians can and do have an important role to play in countering the growing intolerance toward Jews in much of Europe, for both moral and religious reasons.

OVER THE course of the past two millennia unprecedented acts of cruelty have been inflicted on the Jews in the name of Christianity. Massacres, expulsions, forced conversions and confiscation of property were repeated across the centuries, making Jewish life in Europe fragile and perilous.

What could be more fitting than for European Christians today to stand up and try to correct in some small way the horrors of the past? Moreover, from a biblical perspective there is ample reason to do so. As God told Abraham: "I will bless those that bless thee and curse those that curse thee" (Genesis 12). By choosing to side with the Jewish people against those who seek to do them harm, Christians will be acting in accordance with the Divine will.

Indeed, one of the most exciting initiatives launched in recent years is dedicated precisely to that goal: bringing together Christian groups and individuals to lobby on Israel's behalf and counter the growing threat posed by anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism.

It is called the European Coalition for Israel and it consists of four key partners: Bridges for Peace, Christian Friends of Israel, Christians for Israel and the International Christian Embassy in Jerusalem.

Based in Brussels, the coalition undertakes a range of activities to promote closer relations between the European Union and the Jewish state, including publishing a monthly newsletter, organizing conferences and seminars in European capitals and meeting with leading members of the European Parliament.

Several months ago, former European Parliament member Rijk Van Dam became director of the coalition, and he has been working hard to boost Israel's image on a hostile continent.

"Fighting anti-Semitism is the main priority for our coalition," Van Dam told me. "I think anti-Zionism is very close to anti-Semitism," he said.

An incident that inspired him to get involved occurred last year. He was walking down a street in the heart of a major European city and noticed a

building heavily guarded by police, with special precautions being taken to protect it from a terrorist attack. Upon further inspection he saw that the target was neither a foreign embassy nor a diplomatic residence, but a pre-school for Jewish children.

"So today, in the center of Europe, a Jewish kindergarten has to be behind a high concrete wall, like in a bunker. This is frightening," he said.

While acknowledging that the idea of Bible-believing Christians taking an active role in European politics is somewhat novel, Van Dam said it was particularly necessary in these hazardous times.

"In the past, many horrible things were done to the Jewish people in the name of Christianity and we want to repent for that," he said. "It is especially important that we as Christians speak out against the rising tide of anti-Semitism in Europe and make our voices heard."

While the challenge of confronting deep-seated European hostility to Jews is no easy task, groups such as the European Coalition for Israel can and will make a difference.

For the first time, the Jews of Europe may not have to worry about confronting home-grown anti-Semites on their own. If the work of the coalition bears fruit, as it hopefully will, they can look forward to having thousands of pro-Israel Christians standing at their side. (Jerusalem Post Jul 7)

The Jews: War and a sickness. By Michael Leeden

It was widely noted, most passionately by the Iraqi blogger Hammorabi, that when Tony Blair reminded the House of Commons that many countries had been scourged by the terrorists in recent years, he omitted Iraq from the list. His speechwriters had Iraq in a different part of their database; Iraqis weren't victims of terrorism in the same way as Brits, Americans, Kenyans, and Indonesians. One's instinct is to let it go as an oversight, but there was another country missing from the list, and this case was somewhat less widely noted: Israel. And at this point, one is forced to do some thinking. What do these two countries have in common, that they should both be ignored in the British government's response to the London attacks?

Iraq and Israel are arguably the two major victims of Islamic terrorism. Yet they did not come to Blair's mind. Or maybe they did, and maybe there was a reason they were omitted.

In the growing recent literature about Great Britain's appeasement of Islamic terrorists over the past decade and more, we've come to understand that London was, in many ways, the epicenter of the terror network. Terrorists wanted in other countries were given safe haven in the United Kingdom, and the most amazingly hateful language was spewed out, openly and proudly, by various sheikhs and imams, all left to incite the faithful to terrible acts against innocent people the world over. For all this, her majesty's government had its reasons. There was a reluctance to offend "the Arabs," the richest of whom had long used London as a home away from the sand, and as their financial and banking center of choice. Moreover, there was a traditional disdain of the Arabs, born out of long experience and expressed in open doubt that "those people" would ever constitute a serious threat, or indeed anything serious. Further, there was a long tradition of open and boisterous political speech, which reflexively protected even terrorist preachers from official rebuke or punishment. To these traditions, there was the usual deadly overlay of political correctness, what Mark Steyn calls the multiculti view, according to which people with traditions different from ours should be respected and certainly not silenced. To do that would not only be non-multiculti, it would risk the advantages of the special relationship with the Arab world.

Those of us who have had the frustrating experience of speaking with British diplomats (or journalists, especially those elegantly speaking fellows from the BBC) about the Middle East have invariably encountered a dismissive, slightly bemused, and firm conviction that anyone who worries greatly about "the Arabs" is at least ignorant and at worst malignant. And those of us who had the gall to argue — publicly, even — that the terror war is indeed serious and that appeasement of Saudis, Syrians, and Iranians would only lead to more and more terrible actions against us all, were relegated to the category of misguided souls, at best.

The final component of British blindness on the subject of the Middle East is one we are not supposed to talk about in good company: the Jews. Yet I don't know any country this side of the Levant in which there has been so much anti-Semitism, so many complaints that "Zionists," "Likudniks," "Jewish hawks," and — the single epithet that sums up all of the above — "neocons" had manipulated America and its poodle Blair into the ghastly blunder of Iraq. The BBC has devoted hours of radio and television to slanderous misrepresentations of places like the American Enterprise Institute, where I sit, and of such Jewish luminaries as Richard Perle, Douglas Feith, William Kristol, and Paul Wolfowitz. Sometimes it seemed one was reading translations from the Saudi or Egyptian or Iranian press, so total was the hatred of the Jews.

This fit nicely with the desire of the British establishment to carry on their special relationship with some Arab leaders, and many British elites often seemed a micro-step away from saying that the world would be a better place

if only Israel weren't there. The Middle East would be so much easier, you know. And when London was bombed, you can be sure — indeed you can read it — many of these people blamed Israel and the Jews, both those in the Middle East and those in New York and Washington. Indeed, within minutes of the attack, a story appeared according to which the Israelis had advance notice, and had instructed Finance Minister Netanyahu to stay put, instead of going to give a speech. The story was as false as the one according to which Israelis had stayed away from the World Trade Center on 9/11, but they both reflected a state of mind. An anti-Semitic mind.

All too many Brits (as some Americans, albeit far fewer) would prefer to devote their national energies to the elimination or "taming" of Israel, and, as they see it, the silencing of their own Jews, rather than fighting Islamic terrorism. Combined with the desire to keep Arab money in London and special access for British businessmen and diplomats and scholars in the Arab world, it explains why HMG gave sanctuary and indeed benevolent assistance to the jihadis in their HMG midst.

And so Israel was not on the prime minister's list. What about Iraq?

The Iraqis are viewed much the same way, and are at some risk of becoming the new Jews of the Middle East. In the enormous hate literature directed against the neocons, Ahmed Chalabi is part and parcel of the anti-Semites' hateful vision. No matter that he is a Shiite, and no matter that he was rudely dismissed by the Israeli government before Operation Iraqi Freedom. He was in cahoots with the Jewish cabal, and was therefore "one of them." And as Chalabi, so the rest of the lot. Anyone looking honestly at Iraq today would have to be filled with admiration for the enormous dignity and courage with which the Iraqis have reacted to the barbaric savagery to which they have been subjected. Ministers are killed, leaders of civil society are kidnapped and beheaded, independent thinkers are intimidated, yet others come forward to fight for their national independence and integrity. When is the last time you read anything, anywhere (with all too few exceptions — like Arthur Chrenkoff's "good news" beat), celebrating these rare qualities of spirit? And this question goes hand in hand with its twin: When is the last time you read anything about the incredible performance of the State of Israel, similarly under siege and similarly stressed by the crisis that surrounds it?

It is therefore not surprising that Iraq and Israel were omitted from Blair's list; it is a symptom of the corrupt and self-destructive patterns of emotion (I will not call it "thought") that led Great Britain to house a vast terrorist infrastructure.

This sickness is certainly not limited to Great Britain; we find it here as well, in such personages as Pat Buchanan and Juan Cole, along with their acolytes. But in America, by and large, such venom is relegated to the margins, probably because American Jews are a lot feistier than their British co-religionaries (think timid). We do, however, run a risk similar to the British: We, too, are unconsciously passive in the face of radical Muslim religious indoctrination that is designed to produce a new wave of terrorists. I wrote about this many years ago, as have, notably, Daniel Pipes and Steve Emerson, and predicted that of all the problems we faced in the war against the terror masters, this would prove the most intractable.

And so it is. The absolutist interpretation of the First Amendment — free speech extends even to license — stops us from taking proper steps to shut down the terror factories. Justice Holmes taught us that the Constitution is not a suicide pact, and that no one has the right to scream "fire" in a crowded theater. London taught us that these principles require vigorous application.

Faster, please. (National Review July 13)

The writer, an National Review contributing editor, is most recently the author of The War Against the Terror Masters. He is resident scholar in the Freedom Chair at the American Enterprise Institute.

European Media Elite Finally Discover Terrorism By Tom Gross

When it happens on your own doorstep, in very familiar settings like the London "tube" or on a traditional red double-decker bus, right alongside the site of a building where Charles Dickens once lived, terrorism seems very different than it does when innocent people are murdered elsewhere.

Britain's first bus bombing took place barely half a mile from the BBC's central London headquarters, and for a day or so after last Thursday's multiple bomb attacks, the BBC, the influential leftist daily the Guardian, and even the British-based global news agency Reuters, all seemed to suddenly discover the words "terrorism" and "terrorist." In Saturday's Guardian, for example, one or other of these words appeared on each of the first eleven pages.

In marked contrast to BBC reports on bombs on public transport in Israel - bombs which in some cases were even worse than those in London, since some were specifically aimed at children, and most were packed with nails, screws, glass and specially-sharpened metal shards in order to maximize injuries - terms like "guerrilla," "militant," "activist" or "fighter" were suddenly nowhere to be seen.

Nor - again in contrast to their coverage of Israel - did BBC correspondents, on either their domestic or international services, provide sympathetic accounts of the likely perpetrators, or explain to viewers that we must "understand" their "grievances". Instead they did what an objective news organization should do: just report on the attacks, and their atrocious nature, and on the sufferings of the

victims.

The world's premier broadcast network appeared to throw away its own ridiculous "BBC Producer's Guidelines". BBC online reports, for example, had headlines such as "Terror of passengers stuck on tube" and "London Rocked by Terror Attacks."

BBC executives had previously insisted that for the sake of what they call "even-handedness" terrorists should not be called terrorists. Their Guidelines state: "The word 'terrorist' itself can be a barrier to understanding... We should try to avoid the term, while we report the facts as we know them."

But the hope of many of the British taxpayers forced to fund the BBC that it had finally come to its senses and would henceforth call terror by its proper name, turned out to be short-lived. By Friday, the BBC's world service was slowly reverting to its old habits, both on air and on line. (Its domestic news broadcasts have for the time being continued using the word "terrorist.")

Presumably hoping that no one would notice, the BBC subtly and retroactively altered its initial texts about the bombs on both its British and international websites. Unfortunately for the BBC, however, previous versions of its webpages remained easily accessible to all on Google, and enterprising British bloggers, long-fed up with the BBC's bias, recorded the changes.

"Harry's Place" noted, for example, that on Thursday evening a BBC News webpage headlined "Bus man may have seen terrorist," began "A bus passenger says he may have seen one of those responsible for the terrorist bomb attacks in London. Richard Jones, from Binfield, had got a bus just before it was blown up..."

But on Friday at 10.14 am GMT, that webpage was suddenly changed. The headline now reads "Passenger believes he saw bomber", and the text begins "A bus passenger says he may have seen one of those responsible for the bomb attacks in London. Richard Jones, from Binfield, had got a bus just before it was blown up..."

Early on Friday morning another BBC webpage, headlined "Testing the underground mood," spoke of "the worst terrorist atrocity Britain has seen." But at 12.08 GMT, while the rest of the article was left untouched, those words were replaced by "the worst peacetime bomb attacks Britain has seen."

There are other examples of similar censorship occurring at the BBC. Stalin himself could hardly have done a better job of overseeing their award-winning website.

In its round-up of world reactions, BBC online was also quick to highlight the views of conspiracy theorists. The very first article listed by the BBC started by quoting Iranian cleric Ayatollah Mohammad Emami-Kashani saying Israel was behind the London attacks, followed by a commentary on Iranian state radio explicitly blaming the Mossad.

With its unprecedented worldwide news reach (its radio service alone, broadcasting in 43 languages, attracts over 150 million listeners), BBC coverage is important in formulating worldwide public opinion.

But even more influential - and in respect to the London terror attacks, far more irresponsible - was the Associated Press (AP).

The AP played into the hands of anti-Semites by irresponsibly running a bogus "Israel advance warning" story on its international newswire shortly after the London attacks. Although the story has since been retracted by the AP, the damage has been done. As was the case after 9/11, a thousand "Israel knew"-style conspiracy theories have already been spawned on extreme rightist and leftist websites worldwide.

The AP story headlined "Netanyahu Changed Plans Due to Warning," written by Amy Teibel of the AP Jerusalem bureau, and alleging that Benjamin Netanyahu, who was in London for an economic conference, was tipped off "minutes before Thursday's explosions," was put out by the AP on their worldwide news wires at 11.14 am GMT (7.14 am EST) on Thursday.

Fox News ran the AP story on air at 7:50 am New York time. AP's story also appeared on the websites of over 100 credible news outlets in the US, Canada, Ireland, India and elsewhere. More disturbingly it appeared on Al Jazeera and other Middle East media.

How could any serious editor or reporter not see that this was "black propaganda" and a replay of the post-9/11 libels? And how could the AP Jerusalem Bureau Chief not have checked before running it?

But despite the various shortcomings in the coverage of the London bombs, there was also much resolute and sensible commentary, not just from the right and center but from some on the left too.

While the usual suspects, such as the notorious Robert Fisk of the Independent (who was singled out as a journalist one could admire in Osama bin Laden's video message last October), immediately blamed Tony Blair and George Bush for bringing the bombs upon London, most commentators saw the atrocities for what they were.

"Face up to the truth," wrote Nick Cohen, a leading columnist for the Observer, the Sunday sister paper of the Guardian. Addressing what he called "my world of liberal London," Cohen said "We all know who was to blame for Thursday's murders... and it wasn't Bush and Blair."

The writer is a former Jerusalem correspondent for the London Sunday Telegraph and New York Daily News. (Jewish World Review Jul 12)
