

## Quotes of the Week...

"Israel must have the most activist, and from my point of view, the worst court in the Western world. They have developed an intrusive, pervasive constitutional law without really having a Constitution. Now that's hard to do, but they've managed it and they have managed to get themselves in a position where they, in effect, control the membership of their own court." - Robert Bork, this week. Mr Bork is a distinguished jurist who was nominated to the Supreme Court by United States President Ronald Reagan in 1987. He has also served as Solicitor General and has been a distinguished professor at Yale University. He is now a Senior Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute and he has written a book on judicial activism called, *Coercing Virtue: The Worldwide Rule of Judges*.

"The subject we are dealing with is very painful, perhaps the most painful in the history of the State of Israel: the uprooting of thousands of Jews from their homes and the land on which they built their lives and families over the course of decades. How symbolic it is that this session is taking place as we begin the "Three Weeks" mourning period during which we grieve over the Destruction of the Temple and the onset of the Exile... Fellow Knesset Members, it is only natural that a tense argument also rages around the question of who will carry out this dreadful evacuation [- the police, or the army]? Who will be the ones to enter the homes and remove their inhabitants?"

Who will lift up the three Cohen family children - those heroic youngsters from Kfar Darom who lost legs [in a murderous Palestinian terror attack on a school bus - ed.] - and take them out of their house, the house to which they returned after the attack when they made a courageous decision to show that terrorism had not won?

Who will knock on the door of Chana Bart - that gentle but determined woman who defeated terrorism, who managed to give birth even after she was so seriously wounded - and ask her to wheel herself over in her wheelchair to the special bus waiting for her outside?

Who will help David Hatuel [whose pregnant wife and four children were murdered by Palestinian terrorists] to fold up all his memories into his suitcases? And who will pile on to the evacuation trucks all those men, women and children, our brothers and sisters, the flesh of our flesh? This will be an impossible psychological burden, one that is liable, Heaven forbid, to be the lot of both the evacuees and the evacuators!

I shake as I imagine the unit that will come to remove the dead from their graves, including the victims of murderous Arab terrorism. On whom is it possible to place such a terrible mission, accompanied by its psychological tensions and eternal scars?

I'm unable to find an answer to this question: On whom can the mission of emptying the homes be placed? Of taking the pictures down from the walls, and of removing the mezuzot from the doorposts? What about the Torah scrolls and the synagogues? Who will make the final check to ensure that nothing was left behind, before the bulldozers come in and turn the life and vitality that was there into a pile of ruins?

The Defense Minister says that the soldiers are unable to bear such a burden. He is right! The job of IDF soldiers is to wage war against the country's enemies, and to maintain security and peace for Israel's citizens.

How can we give them the job of evacuating and removing pioneer settlers? The Minister of Public Security declares: The police are also unable to bear this load. And he too is right! Policemen are not made of different human material than anyone else. They too will not be able to withstand the emotional and psychological pressure.

Both of them are right! Because neither the soldiers, nor the police, nor any Israeli could stand up to this job without having its sights and sound pursuing him for the rest of his life!

I have been informed that a special unit is being established for this evacuation mission. The hidden and not-hidden assumption is that if we train a special force, and provide it with "mental preparation," and guide and train it for a few months - in the end, this unit will be able to carry out this mission without batting an eyelash. These soldiers or police will be able to separate

## 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*

absolutely between their emotions and the beliefs on which they were raised, and the mission they must carry out.

To this naive and problematic idea, I say the following, as one who has been involved in education for many years: Do not destroy the souls of our youth! Don't destroy the souls of our soldiers and our policemen, don't try to turn them into unfeeling robots, and don't teach them how to evacuate Jews from their homes without emotion.

If you do this, you will destroy their souls from within - the souls of the soldiers and policemen, and the soul of the entire society.

I am sure that my words are not foreign to those on the Left. They have said... countless times, "The occupation corrupts." ... I would like to say, "The expulsion corrupts," at least to the same extent, if not more.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I propose that the task of evacuating the residents be placed neither on the police nor on the soldiers. It should instead be buried altogether. We must not forget that the government has not yet decided to evacuate Jewish communities. The opposite is true: the decision specifically states that it does not include the evacuation of communities. I therefore propose that these towns not be evacuated, that blossoming locations not be turned into ruins, and that our security forces not be turned into a force of destruction." - from a speech delivered by MK Gila Finkelstein (National Religious Party) in the Knesset, on July 7, 2004 (Arutz-7 July 15)

## Commentary...

**No to Civil War among Jews** By Ellen W. Horowitz

Hold your fire. Things need not spiral out of control. There is broad consensus that Oslo and everything it wrought was a disaster. There is a broad consensus also that the Jewish people do not want to entertain thoughts of, conceive, or engage in a civil war. And there are many of us who think that Prime Minister Ariel Sharon needs to step down immediately.

Here is something else we should be able to agree upon. The prospect of civil strife is not something that any Jew should savor. Yet there are those among us who are champing at the bit. The purported messianism and zealotry of the settlers pales in comparison with the zealousness of the Shin Bet, the "peace" camp, and the media.

Rather than attempt to diffuse tensions, Sharon has embarked on a campaign to delegitimize citizens residing in Judea, Samaria, and Gaza. This is irresponsible.

Sharon's strategy is a deliberate attempt to upset the equilibrium and push sensitive people to the brink. The government is playing with fire because it's toying with the lives, homes, values, and essence of those citizens who have been the most dedicated and devoted to the state.

I believe this constitutes incitement on the part of the government. And yet no sane person among us wants to see a replay of Tiananmen Square, Rabin Square, or the Altalena.

We've turned on ourselves, and fingers are pointing at the only segment of the population that consistently steered clear of Oslo and refused to engage in the philandering.

That a highly respected spiritual leader like Rabbi Avigdor Nebenzahl of the Old City in Jerusalem raised an explosive halachic concept like *din rodef* to the fore is distressing. But he may have done us all a favor. Betrayal and treason are highly disturbing concepts, but they must be addressed.

Less than a month ago we witnessed Justice Minister Yosef Lapid call Foreign Minister Silvan Shalom "an anti-Semite." Shalom responded, "An anti-Semite? You are a racist and a clown..."

Consider that a few weeks ago, the IDF chief accused the Knesset Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee of leaking secrets.

Ariel Sharon is the second prime minister in a decade who has brought the Jewish nation to the brink by employing questionable, undemocratic, and callous means to push forth a contentious agenda. The opportunity for civil debate has been frustrated due to corruption, lies, and betrayal within the system.

The prime minister has chosen to use the security apparatus and media

**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)**

to orchestrate a direct confrontation with those adhering to Zionist values.

So how do we ride this out?

The residents of Judea, Samaria, and Gaza need to temper their zealotry with wisdom. That revolutionary change is necessary is a given. But revolutions can be fought in the courtrooms, in the heavens, and through legitimate protest. We can use general strikes, boycotts, and even non-violent civil disobedience. Every Israeli who cares about truth and justice should stop what they're doing and dedicate whatever talents and skills they have to stopping the Gaza disengagement plan.

Consider these Three Weeks before Tisha Be'av as a countdown to diffuse the situation and divert disaster.

The spiritual viewpoint is not to give one inch of our precious Land. Not everyone is at a place where they can absorb that concept.

So let's put a more earthy and "logical" spin on this. We should confront these chaotic and leaderless times by doing everything we can to hold our ground, both mentally and physically. That means we should act wisely and responsibly without compromising our principles.

We should hang on to our kids, our spouses, our beliefs, and our land. A very big storm is brewing; and as much as we hope that it blows over, if it does hit, those of us who are connected to our roots will remain in place, while the wind will drive the chaff away. (Jerusalem Post July 7)

The writer lives in the Golan Heights.

---

## A News Agency That Will Not Call a Terrorist a Terrorist.

By Tom Gross

Many people still think of Reuters as the Rolls-Royce of news agencies. Just as the House of Morgan was once synonymous with good banking, Reuters has long been synonymous with good news-gathering. In 1940, there was even a Hollywood film about Paul Julius Reuter, the German-Jewish immigrant to London who as early as 1851 began transmitting stock-market quotes between London and Paris via the new Calais-Dover cable. (Two years earlier he had ingeniously used pigeons to fly stock prices between Aachen and Brussels.)

His agency quickly established a reputation in Europe for being the first to report scoops from abroad, such as news of Abraham Lincoln's assassination. Today, almost every major news outlet in the world subscribes. Operating in 200 cities in 94 countries, Reuters produces text in 19 languages, as well as photos and television footage from around the world.

Though it may report in a largely neutral way on many issues, Reuters's coverage of the Middle East is deeply flawed. It is symptomatic, for instance, that Reuters's global head of news, Stephen Jukes, banned the use of the word "terrorist" to describe the perpetrators of the September 11 attacks. Even so, such is the aura still surrounding Reuters that news editors from Los Angeles to Auckland automatically assume that text, photos, and film footage provided by Reuters will be fair and objective. Reuters and Associated Press copy is simply inserted into many correspondents' reports — even in papers such as the New York Times and Washington Post — without, it often seems, so much as a second thought given to its accuracy.

This has led to some misleading reporting from Iraq, and still worse coverage of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The newswires are much more influential in setting the news (and hence diplomatic) agenda of that struggle than most people realize.

One veteran American newspaper correspondent in Jerusalem, eager to maintain anonymity so as not to jeopardize relations with his anti-Israel colleagues, points out that "whereas foreign correspondents still write features, they rarely cover the actual breaking news that dominates the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. In terms of written copy on the conflict, I would estimate that 50 percent of all reporting, and 90 percent of the attitude, is formed by these news agencies. The important thing about Reuters is that it sets the tone, and here spin is everything."

"If, for example, a Reuters headline and introduction say that Israelis killed a Palestinian, instead of saying that a Palestinian gunman was killed as he opened fire on Israeli civilians, this inevitably leaves a different impression of who was attacking, and who defending."

In a study last year, the media watchdog HonestReporting found that in "100 percent of headlines" when Reuters wrote about Israeli acts of violence, Israel was emphasized as the first word; also, an active voice was used, often without explaining that the "victim" may have been a gunman. A typical headline was: "Israeli Troops Shoot Dead Palestinian in W. Bank" (July 3, 2003). By contrast, when Palestinians attacked Israelis (almost always civilians), Reuters usually avoided naming the perpetrator. For example: "New West Bank Shooting Mars Truce" (July 1, 2003). In many cases, the headline was also couched in a passive voice.

Often it is a question of emphasis: Important and relevant information is actually contained in Reuters text, but buried deep down in the story. Many newspaper readers, however, never get beyond the headlines, and for space reasons many papers carry only the first few paragraphs of a report — often inserted into their own correspondents' stories. When the TV networks run only brief headlines, or Reuters news ribbon at the foot of the screen, the full text is never shown.

Sometimes, Reuters presents unreliable information as though it were undoubtedly true. Most people are unlikely to notice this. For example, Reuters will note that "a doctor at the hospital said the injured Palestinian was

unarmed" — when in fact the doctor couldn't possibly have known this, since he wasn't present at the gunfight. But because he is a doctor, Reuters is suggesting to readers that his word is necessarily authoritative. Yet, Reuters headlines and text are used unchanged by newspaper editors because they assume it is professional, balanced copy, which doesn't need any further editing.

Reporters of course can't be everywhere at once. The increased speed of the Internet and the demand for instant, 24-hour TV news coverage means that the world's news outlets rely heavily on Reuters and the AP, which in turn rely on a network of local Palestinian "stringers." Virtually all breaking news (and much of the non-breaking news) on CNN, the BBC, Fox, and other networks comes from these stringers.

Such stringers are hired for speed, to save money (there is no need to pay drivers and translators), and for their local knowledge. But in many cases, in hiring them, their connections to Arafat's regime and Hamas count for more than their journalistic abilities. All too often the information they provide, and the supposed eyewitnesses they interview, are undependable. Yet, because of Reuters's prestige, American and international news outlets simply take their copy as fact. Thus non-massacres become massacres; death tolls are exaggerated; and gunmen are written about as if they were civilians.

As Ehud Ya'ari, Israeli television's foremost expert on Palestinian affairs, put it: "The vast majority of information of every type coming out of the area is being filtered through Palestinian eyes. Cameras are angled to show a tainted view of the Israeli army's actions and never focus on Palestinian gunmen. Written reports focus on the Palestinian version of events. And even those Palestinians who don't support the intifada dare not show or describe anything embarrassing to the Palestinian Authority, for fear they may provoke the wrath of Arafat's security forces."

One Palestinian journalist told me that "the worst the Israelis can do is take away our press cards. But if we irritate Arafat, or Hamas, you don't know who might be waiting in your kitchen when you come home at night."

Some of Reuters's Palestinian stringers are honest and courageous. But, according to several ex-Reuters staffers, they feel the intimidating presence of Wafa Amr, Reuters's "Senior Palestinian Correspondent." Amr — who is a cousin of former Palestinian minister Nabil Amr, and whose father is said to be close to Arafat — had this title specially created for her (there is no "Senior Israeli Correspondent," or the equivalent in any other Arab country) so that her close ties to the Palestinian Authority could be exploited.

As one former Reuters journalist put it: "She occupies this position in spite of lacking a basic command of English grammar. The information passed through her is controlled, orchestrated. Reuters would never allow Israeli government propaganda to be fed into its reports in this way. Indeed, stories exposing Israeli misdeeds are a favorite of Reuters. Amr has never had an expose on Arafat, or his Al-Aqsa Brigades terror group."

But things may well be improving. Lately, with a new Jerusalem bureau chief, Reuters has taken some steps to ensure greater balance. For example, it no longer claims Hamas's goal is merely "to set up an independent state in the West Bank and Gaza" (which it is not), but instead writes that Hamas is "sworn to Israel's destruction" (which it is).

Reuters no longer carries the highly misleading "death tolls" at the end of each story that lumped together Palestinian civilians, gunmen, and suicide bombers. (Agence France-Presse continues to do this.) And, apparently, there are plans to relocate Wafa Amr by next year. Is it too much to hope that one day soon Reuters might actually call terrorism terrorism?

*The writer is a former Jerusalem correspondent of the Sunday Telegraph of London.* (National Review Jul 26)

---

## ICJ to Israel: Drop Dead

By Saul Singer

Consequently, the Court concludes that Article 51 of the Charter has no relevance in this case." No relevance. I see the words, but even knowing that the International Court of Justice would rule against Israel, I cannot fully believe they were written. With these words, the ICJ decision joins the parade of anti-Semitic infamy, along with such milestones as the Dreyfus trial, the UN's repealed "Zionism is racism" resolution, and the 2001 Durban hatefest.

"Nothing in the present Charter," says Article 51, "shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations." To deprive Israel of this right, the ICJ was forced to read a new phrase into the charter limiting Article 51 to attacks "by one State against another State." Why? No reason is given for this invention, which also logically implies that 9/11 did not trigger America's right to self-defense.

This is the essence of the decision, not the court's "humanitarian" objections to the fence. If Israel has no right to defend itself against Palestinian terrorism, then of course the fence should be torn down. It also follows that "humanitarian" considerations flow only one way. There is no need to balance Palestinian well-being against Israeli lives; the former is relevant, the latter are not.

The ICJ's second major contortion is defining the West Bank as foreign

land with respect to the fence, but then claiming that attacks from the same land are not "international," and therefore don't trigger Article 51.

All of this makes a mockery of the UN Charter, international law, and any notion of simple justice. The idea that an international body could so explicitly ignore years of vicious attacks, which are obviously the whole reason for building the fence, should not lose its ability to shock, even against the background of the general refusal to see Israel as the victim of assault.

IN A strange way, however, the decision may be helpful to Israel, but not in the way usually supposed. Some have pointed out the advantage of the decision being so biased against Israel that it undermines itself. By this logic, a decision that rejected the fence but seemed to recognize Israel's security needs and the illegality of terrorism would have been harder to ignore.

Perhaps this is so, but the more significant result is to amplify not only the necessity of the fence but of the decision not to build it on the Green Line. Even if Israel could have likely avoided the ICJ's black eye entirely by defending itself on what had become a quasi-border, that would have been a mistake.

The reason is that the objective of the fence had to be not just defending Israelis, but imposing a territorial price for the almost four years of unprovoked aggression the Palestinians have unleashed against us. Roughly speaking and as harsh as it may sound to say it, the more Palestinians feel that the fence is a "land grab," the more we are doing the right thing. This is particularly true in the context of a disengagement plan which, we must admit, is susceptible to portrayal as a withdrawal under fire. The fence, and particularly where it is built, are the key antidotes to the sense that the disengagement plan is a net Palestinian victory.

It is therefore somewhat, but not completely, disingenuous for Israel to argue that the fence is only a security device and has no political significance. It is true that the fence is not a permanent border and does not close the border chapter of a future final-status negotiation. But it does help Israel ensure that the ultimate border will be somewhere east of the Green Line, winding around several "settlement blocs."

When the Palestinians look back at their fruitless and unnecessary war, they will see that the route of the fence imposes the only diplomatic price they had to pay for their choice of terror and rejectionism. It is this payment, added to the other territorial payments they have made every time they have chosen a war of annihilation over partition and peace, that will be a critical guarantor of an eventual agreement.

Israel has already decided for itself, at the world's urging, that it cannot diplomatically afford to impose on the Palestinians the kind of utter defeat that the US dealt the regimes of the Taliban and Saddam Hussein. The ICJ attempts to go further, denying Israel not just the right to victory, but to self defense.

Our defiance of the fence verdict and all that it represents is an opportunity to achieve a lesser form of victory; a literal drawing of the line representing our right to exist. The global jihad, including its anti-Israeli branch, is ultimately more a test of will than of power.

Israel, following its own ample moral and legal lights, may well adjust the fence here and there. In the main, however, the fence and the shameful decision against it, create a wide rampart on which all Israelis, and anyone who is proud to side with the democracies against terrorism, can proudly stand. (Jerusalem Post July 15)

---

### **In Defence of Hilltop Youth** By Moshe Dann

Settling on empty hilltops in Judea and Samaria has upset the Israeli government, sent shock waves through society and even touched a raw nerve in the settlement movement itself.

Hilltop settlement raises critical questions: Where is it legitimate for Jews to live? If the hilltops and outposts are illegal, what makes anything legal?

The government contends that this is a matter of "respect for the law." What law? If the outposts are illegal, why not prosecute the government ministries and local councils that assisted building them? And Bezek for providing phone lines? And companies that built roads, and banks that financed them?

To whom does this land belong?

As part of the road map Israel agreed to dismantle illegal outposts built after 2001, on condition that Palestinian terrorism stopped. The terror continued; but under heavy international pressure the Sharon government began the eviction process anyway.

The hilltop communities are considered illegal because they have not received government approval. They have received assistance, however, from local community councils and various ministries for infrastructure and development, including water, electricity, roads and telephone lines. They are protected by the IDF and by the residents themselves. And each hilltop/outpost protects the core settlement.

Adjacent to or extensions of already well-established communities, these outposts are all built on uninhabited state-owned land or on privately-owned Jewish property. No Arab-owned lands are involved.

Meanwhile, according to government statistics, Arabs have built tens of thousands of homes illegally and cultivated land they don't legally own throughout Judea, Samaria, the Galilee and the Negev. The government has largely ignored this Arab building and, instead, focused on removing Jews from their homes.

In reality, there is little difference between building on hilltops and the process of settlement in other areas throughout Israel.

Before the establishment of the state, Jews often built settlements illegally, without British approval. After the war many kibbutzim and moshavim were given state land (unclaimed) and sometimes even land that was claimed by Arabs. After 1967 many Jewish communities in Judea, Samaria and Gaza were initiated and expanded without (and sometimes against) government authorization.

Despite the renewed Palestinian war of terror, Jews continued to build.

A PRIME example is Migron, the largest hilltop community, a 10-minute drive north of Jerusalem, home to 42 families (and over 200 children). Established four years ago it received assistance from many ministries and, because of its strategic location, from the IDF as well – but it did not get official government permission.

Despite attempts by the media to portray the hilltop people as a bunch of wild youths, they are in fact, mostly young families. A small number of teenagers who live in these communities are simply looking for a place to make a meaningful contribution to Israeli society and the Zionist dream, and – like youth anywhere – to discover themselves.

But that search isn't easy. Many have lived through the murder of friends and relatives by Arab terrorists. Some have dropped out of school. Most have adopted a deeply religious life style. No drugs or TV. No playing around. They're not hanging out at malls and discos; they are learning how to make a positive contribution to their society and community.

These young people are serious and, despite being harassed, beaten up and falsely arrested by the police and vilified by the media, their numbers are growing.

It's difficult to estimate exactly how many hilltop youth there are because they usually integrate into the larger community and eventually marry.

Pioneers, messianic idealists, or adolescent rebels – they are the cutting edge of a revolution in Israeli society, living out the dream and commitment of their more established parents. Having rejected the affluence, self-indulgence, and perverse hatred of things Jewish that has infected Israeli society, they are idealists who represent a renewed religious Zionism.

Rooted in a love for the Land of Israel and Torah, these young people have revived a spirit of dedication and self-sacrifice that characterized earlier Zionism and nation-building.

What makes them different from their predecessors (and perhaps problematic) is that they are challenging the Israeli government, not a foreign power.

While many Israelis of their age are going to Asia and South America, taking drugs or going to trance parties, the hilltop youth are building homes and families, working the land, and studying Torah.

For them, "Hatikva" has real meaning. They have bolstered the Jewish claim to our homeland, often at great personal risk. Every outpost is a political obstacle to the creation of a Palestinian state which threatens all of us.

The government can destroy a hilltop outpost, but it can't crush the vision behind it, for ultimately that's why all of us are here.

*The writer is a journalist living in Jerusalem.* (Jerusalem Post Jul 15)

---

### **Cure Anti-Semitism (And Crush Palestinian Terrorism – Permanently)** By Michael Freund

In the past few weeks, a number of chilling anti-Semitic incidents have taken place on both sides of the Atlantic.

In the otherwise serene Canadian capital of Ottawa a synagogue was vandalized, with swastikas and anti-Semitic graffiti scrawled on one of its walls shortly before a bar mitzva celebration was scheduled to begin.

The town of Markham outside Toronto was also targeted when unknown perpetrators sprayed Nazi slogans on a number of homes, businesses and vehicles.

In Belgium two Jews were physically assaulted on the streets of Antwerp, including a cyclist who was attacked by a group of 15 people hurling stones and bottles.

And then, in Paris, came last Friday's attack on a commuter train against a young mother and her infant, mistaken by their assailants for Jews. According to the French police, the attackers drew three swastikas on the mother's stomach before overturning the stroller, with the baby inside, and fleeing the scene.

The natural response to these incidents is a mixture of revulsion and fear. How is it possible that the world has so quickly forgotten how it tormented us over the centuries? The rebirth of the age-old demon of anti-Semitism is taking place before our very eyes; the phantom we thought had been vanquished is now returning to haunt us.

The reality of the situation, however, is far more complex. Indeed, it is time that Israel and its supporters finally acknowledge the unpleasant, if somewhat awkward, truth: that there is a direct connection between the resurgence of anti-Semitism and Israel's policies in the territories.

On this point, at least, our critics are correct. What Israel does or does not do clearly has implications far beyond its borders.

But as much as our detractors may be right about the existence of a connection between Israel's actions and global anti-Semitism, they are

absolutely wrong when it comes to the underlying nature of that connection.

While they might believe it is Israel's alleged use of too much force that lies behind the renewal of Jew-hatred around the world, just the opposite is true. It is precisely because Israel has reacted to Palestinian terror with a slap on the wrist rather than an iron fist that haters of Jews worldwide have become so emboldened.

To put it even more bluntly: It is Israel's perceived weakness that invites greater manifestations of anti-Semitism across the globe.

That's right – it is not the construction of a security fence, or restrictions on Palestinian workers, or even the assassination of Hamas leaders that is fueling the fire of anti-Semitic hatred, but Israel's ongoing failure to crush Palestinian terror once and for all.

Anti-Semites, like bullies everywhere, prey on those they perceive to be vulnerable and defenseless. A weak and conciliatory Jewish state is seen as representing Jews everywhere, no less than a strong and assertive Israel once did in the wake of the 1967 Six Day War.

WHEN PEOPLE see an Israel taking blow after blow from Palestinian terrorists over the past decade, and yet responding with proposals of retreat and surrender, the message is clear and unequivocal: Jews are feeble and fainthearted, so feel free to take your best shot at us, wherever we might be.

Indeed, by seeking to withdraw under fire from parts of the territories, Prime Minister Ariel Sharon has transformed Israel and the Jewish people into the equivalent of a high-school wimp, one who wanders the hallways wearing a sign that reads, "Kick me."

The image this projects only serves to inspire contempt, prompting bigots everywhere to vent their hatred at the easiest and most readily available target – the neighborhood Jew.

This is not to say the Jews are to blame for anti-Semitism. But if Israel is unable, or unwilling, to use the sovereign powers at its disposal to protect its own people against its foes, what is there to deter Jew-haters everywhere from picking on Jews?

Obviously, we must still be humane and never lose sight of our universal mission to spread morality and justice, even when confronting our foes.

But the best answer to anti-Semitism remains an infusion of Jewish pride and the application of Jewish power. The rescue at Entebbe in 1976, the bombing of the Iraqi nuclear reactor at Osirak in 1981, are two illustrations of how a proud and self-confident people was once able to set such an example, dazzling the rest of the world in the process.

Of course we must continue educating, protesting and petitioning against anti-Semitism. All that is important. But the bottom line is that if we want the world to respect us, rather than disparage us, we have to work a little harder at it.

A good place to begin would be to stand up for ourselves, and for our Land, and start fighting back against those who would destroy us.

*The writer served as Deputy Director of Communications & Policy Planning under former Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu.* (Jerusalem Post Jul 14)

---

## **Pride and Dissent in the Israeli Military**

By Brig.-Gen. Gershon HaCohen

As a commander of IDF combat units, I have never met with even one incidence of refusal to obey orders or lack of motivation. The main problem is sometimes exactly the opposite - my troops suffer from overmotivation.

Today, regular units do not devote the same amount of time to training as they did five or ten years ago. They are too busy getting experience in the Gaza Strip and in Judea and Samaria on daily missions. However, when tested in battalion exercises, they achieve the same results as when they were training for longer.

The challenges of being involved in a very dramatic and very intensive routine of engagements create an esprit de corps atmosphere. This new situation has created the feeling in the military units that they are relevant, and that they are succeeding in every engagement.

One of the main achievements of Operation Defensive Shield was within the consciousness of Israeli society. The basic achievements in the toughest venues - the refugee camps - were carried out by reservist infantry brigades, confirming the continuing cohesiveness of Israeli society - that we can still succeed in carrying out this kind of operation with victory.

There is also a change in the approach of reservists to their service in the IDF. While only one in ten serves as a reservist combat soldier, these ten percent are carefully selected, which creates a sense of being in the elite of society.

In my experience, the only problematic soldiers are those with socioeconomic problems, not ideological ones. The percentage of those who ideologically refuse to obey orders is so low that many commanders have no such soldiers in their units.

In my own experience as commander of the IDF's "Gaash" Formation, which includes combat units such as the Golani Brigade, I have never met with even one incidence of refusal to obey orders or lack of motivation. The main problem is sometimes exactly the opposite - my troops suffer from overmotivation.

Most of the soldiers enjoy serving in their units and want to stay. Most of the missions of the IDF are carried out by regular units, and this high motivation is the main reason behind Israeli society's ability to carry on with this ongoing struggle.

The Conflict Provides Extensive On-the-Job Training Today, the regular units do not devote the same amount of time to training in comparison to the situation five or ten years ago. They are too busy getting experience in the Gaza Strip and in Judea and Samaria on daily missions. However, when the battalions are tested in battalion exercises, they achieve the same results they achieved when they were training for a longer period of time.

The young soldiers prefer to be engaged with different missions every day. When I was a young officer after the 1973 war, I remember suffering from absolute boredom. During the mid-1970s I was stationed on the Golan Heights, maintaining routine readiness for a threat that never came. The challenges of being involved in a very dramatic and very intensive routine of engagements create an esprit de corps atmosphere greater than anything I've known since 1973.

During the first intifada in 1987 the main debate within the IDF was about our relevancy, whether we were carrying out appropriate missions for a military force or were we acting like a police force. This debate is now over because the basic form of warfare has changed.

In a way, the wars of 1967 and 1973 were similar to World War II. We and the Arabs engaged with the same type of tactical forces - but that is not the situation today.

Our infantry units operate differently today, as do our armored units. Both must operate in areas where civilians are present. Every day we are tested on the basic issue of whether we are harming those who are innocent or killing those whose roles in this struggle are known. We can still ask, "are we policemen?" but today, the answer is, "if this is the way we can defend our country, why not be policemen?"

In addition, the situation today is basically different from the first intifada. This is a war. Here we don't fight local citizens but terrorists. Unlike the first intifada where the challenge was the mass of people on the streets, here the main challenge is how to kill the terrorist. In a way it is not as complicated, because we are confronting fewer people.

This new situation has created the feeling in the military units that they are relevant, and that they are succeeding in every engagement - a kind of victory.

After Operation Defensive Shield in April 2002, the question was asked, "Okay, we succeeded in penetrating Jenin refugee camp, Nablus, and everywhere else we wanted to, but there are still all these terrorist activities, so maybe it did not succeed?" Yet one of the main achievements of Operation Defensive Shield was within the consciousness of Israeli society. We succeeded in responding to the challenge, recruiting Israeli reservist soldiers from their homes, sending them to carry out their mission - even to die for their mission - and being proud of their achievements. It was vitally important that the basic achievements in the toughest venues - the refugee camps - were carried out by reservist infantry brigades because this brought a kind of confirmation of the continuing cohesiveness of Israeli society - that we can still succeed in carrying out this kind of operation with victory.

Israeli society has also undergone a change in its basic approach to the concept of peace. It is not enough to make love, not war, and that if we want peace enough, it will come. People in America and in Israel understand today that peace is something that comes only if society is ready to fight to keep it, to defend it. Fighting for peace is an ongoing struggle.

As a result, the Israeli army today does not suffer at all from lack of motivation. On the contrary, in the last few years the IDF has built more and more new infantry battalions that are dedicated uniquely to engagement in Judea and Samaria and Gaza. Many soldiers are joining these units with a passion because they get the feeling that they are doing something very important. These changes have also created a change in the approach of reservists to their service in the IDF. On the one hand, questions have been raised as to why only one in ten serves as a reservist combat soldier. On the other hand, these ten percent are carefully selected, which creates a sense of being in the elite of society, giving them an identity of which they are proud.

While Israeli society consists of many different voices, as is appropriate in a genuine, open society, the free discussions about everything have not damaged the willingness of the soldiers that I meet every day. While there are some that do not take the challenge and who decide to refuse to serve, this has had little effect on the overall trend.

In my experience, the only problematic soldiers are those with socioeconomic problems, not ideological ones. We help those soldiers who cannot afford to serve in a combat unit because of economic difficulties to do so.

Out of hundreds of thousands of reserve soldiers, less than 500 were declared to have refused service. Only twelve pilots declared they would disobey orders and only one of those has taken part in combat operations in the last ten years. The percentage of those who ideologically refuse to obey orders is so low that many commanders have no such soldiers in their units. (Jerusalem Issue Brief July 12)

*The writer is commander of the "Gaash" Formation of the Israel Defense Forces. This Jerusalem Issue Brief is based on his presentation at the Institute for Contemporary Affairs in Jerusalem on April 29, 2004.*

---