

15 Tamuz 5765  
 July 22, 2005  
 Issue number 538



Jerusalem 7:02 Toronto 8:33

**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*

**Commentary...**

**Eyeless in Gaza** .By Barbara Lerner  
*What the terrorists know that we don't*

The Israeli retreat from Gaza — now scheduled for August 17 — wasn't George Bush's idea. It was Ariel Sharon's. Sharon didn't succeed in selling it to his military and intelligence chiefs or to the party and people who elected him, but he was very successful in selling it to national elites in Israel and America, and to the media in both countries. In time, President Bush decided to buy it too.

We can, perhaps, see why. The president has other things on his Middle Eastern plate: a stubborn, bloody war in Iraq; looming deadlines with regard to Iranian nukes; a deadly flow of international jihadists through Syria into Iraq and Lebanon; fanaticism and instability in oil-rich Saudi Arabia; and restless decay in populous Egypt, where the mass following of the Muslim Brotherhood is a looming danger. On the Palestinian front, the moment of hope when Arafat died quickly faded, and was replaced by a weary recognition that Abu Mazen's incredible weakness made real progress impossible and continuing Palestinian violence inevitable. What was George W. Bush to do? Confront Palestinian terrorism directly, drawing the red line he promised to draw in his bold, no-peace, no-state speech of June 24, 2002? That would send the Al Jazeera crowd into overdrive and bring down the combined wrath of the Democrats, Old Europe, and the U.N., echoed and amplified by our own media.

This didn't seem a propitious time to take all that on. And there was Ariel Sharon with his Gaza withdrawal plan, offering an out — offering the illusion of progress, and claiming that behind it he could establish a better Israeli defensive line and some temporary peace and stability. It was a tempting apple, and the president bit.

But Gaza isn't Eden, and this isn't the apple of knowledge. It's a Rohypnol-like apple of ignorance, and it is blinding us to the danger America faces — a danger our Islamofascist enemies see clearly and are primed to take advantage of. We think Gaza is all about Israel and the Palestinians; our enemies know it's mainly about us. We think we are encouraging Israel to hand Gaza over to Mahmoud Abbas and his Fatah party, local Palestinians with purely local ambitions — ambitions that encompass the whole of Israel, perhaps, but nothing beyond it — ambitions that have nothing to do with us. Our enemies know that behind a Fatah fig leaf, we are handing Gaza over to Hamas, an international terrorist organization of global reach and ambition that is one of America's deadliest enemies. We think Hamas only attacks Jews. They know that Hamas is a main recruiting agent for Arab jihadists, not just from among the 2.4 million Palestinians in Gaza and the West Bank and from the much larger numbers of Palestinians scattered in strategic enclaves throughout the region and the world, but for other Arabs too. We think Hamas sends all these jihadists only to Israel. They know Hamas sends a never-ending stream of them to Afghanistan, Chechnya, the Balkans, Kashmir, Lebanon and, most critically for us right now, to Iraq. And when our press insistently refers to Abu Musab al Zarqawi, the master terrorist who directs the foreign jihadists in Iraq, as "a Jordanian," our enemies laugh. They know Zarqawi has always called himself a Palestinian, and is recognized as such, in Jordan and throughout the Middle East.

To see what Hamas control of Gaza will mean for us in Iraq, we have to see it as our enemies do — not just Hamas, but its parent organization, the Brotherhood, and its longtime partners Hezbollah, al Qaeda, and the Wahhabi and Salafist movements. To do that, forget Israel entirely for a moment. Look only at the terror war against America, and at the geography of Islamofascism that supports it. Place Gaza in that context, and its strategic location jumps out at you. Control of Gaza gives Hamas and its partners direct access to the land border with Egypt, as well as access by sea to terrorist supply ports in Lebanon

and Syria, and from them, overland, to the terror training camps in Syria, Lebanon, and Iran and to the ratlines from Syria into Iraq.

This is the reality we face: The "Palestinian democracy" we rattle on about is a mirage no desert-dweller is seduced by. Abu Mazen is president of nothing; his Fatah party no longer exists. It never was anything but a collection of competing terrorist gangs, but Arafat was a master manipulator

who controlled them all by keeping the big carrots and sticks in his own hands and wielding them with ruthless cunning. With his death, Fatah splintered into a multitude of shifting groups and now they're not just competing — they're at war, regularly breaking up each others meetings with gunfire and shooting each other down in the streets, along with hapless bystanders. We pretend that with our help and a huge new infusion of Western cash the 58,000-man Palestinian security forces will be able to create order out of this internecine chaos, but this too is a mirage. It's the security forces that are doing most of the shooting, mostly at each other. As U.S. special envoy General William Ward, our no-nonsense military expert on the ground in Gaza told us last week, Palestinian security forces are "dysfunctional." Only about a third of them actually show up for work, and it doesn't make much difference when they do, because the chain of command that supposedly links them to their leaders is so broken that Abbas and his few remaining loyalists can barely get them to protect his headquarters in Ramallah, let alone the whole of Gaza and the West Bank.

What, then, of Abu Mazen's presumed popularity, you ask, the popularity that led to his easy victory in the first post-Arafat election, which so many American pundits of the right as well as the left praised as a birth of democracy, like the election in Iraq? That too is a mirage. The Palestinian election was nothing like the one in Iraq. Abu Mazen won the top job only because Hamas chose not to run, preferring to take control from the bottom up. Hamas ran in the subsequent municipal elections and swept to victory in almost every major Palestinian population center. It was poised to do the same in the parliamentary elections, until Abu Mazen postponed them indefinitely, and invited Hamas to join him without an election. It hardly matters. Hamas is taking over, with or without elections or invitations, and most Palestinians are glad. Hamas is a disciplined terrorist organization, and they are sick of chaos and corruption. Besides, like their Islamofascist brothers everywhere, they believe that it is Hamas that is forcing the Israelis to retreat in Gaza, and America with her. They see it as another terrorist victory, a harbinger of more to come. Meanwhile, they are enjoying the sight of the great American Samson, stumbling about, "eyeless in Gaza." They think our acquiescence in the once-mighty Sharon's appeasement plan puts us "at the mill with slaves," and they are jubilant.

The good news is that unlike the Biblical Samson, we are not irrevocably blind, only seduced and blindfolded by a mix of propaganda, ideology, and wishful thinking that prevent us from seeing reality. If we tear off our blindfold and call a halt to the Gaza retreat before August 17, we will save ourselves and our friends in Iraq much anguish, and save our Israeli friends and perhaps our Lebanese friends too. And if we do it boldly, proclaiming our determination to defeat Islamofascist terror in Gaza as we are defeating it in Iraq and Afghanistan, we will bring a final American victory much closer. (National Review Jul 19)

**On Second Thought** By Danny Rubinstein

The time has come for those who favor the unilateral disengagement from Gaza to think again, because it may be that the entire issue is not worthwhile - and not for the ideological reasons that it is forbidden to uproot settlements or to give up parts of the homeland. The argument for second thoughts stems from the events of recent days, which raise fears that a unilateral withdrawal from Gaza is causing serious security damage to Israel.

The fact that a majority of the Palestinian public sees Israel's decision to withdraw as a sign of the victory of the intifada has long been known. It is hard to argue with this. Years of a peace process and negotiations between

**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) and [www.frumtoronto.com](http://www.frumtoronto.com)**

the Palestinians and Israeli governments, including Likud governments, have not led to Israeli withdrawal from Gaza. The idea of withdrawal entered the mind of Prime Minister Ariel Sharon only after suicide attacks, Qassam rockets and mortars.

Even if these attacks were not the reason why Sharon came up with the idea of disengagement, the Palestinians are certain that that is the case, and this has reinforced their belief that Israel only understands the language of terror attacks and violence. This belief will now become an absolute certainty - if Israel withdraws unilaterally under fire.

Those who are taking credit for the great victory of the withdrawal from Gaza, and with a great degree of justification, are the members of Hamas, which led the attacks and the terror campaign against Israel. The withdrawal will transfer large land assets in Gaza to the Palestinians, since Israeli settlements and security installations take up about 30 percent of the narrow, crowded Strip, in which every meter is worth a fortune. What will happen to these important and expensive assets? Who will receive them and decide what will be done with them? Hamas wants to be a partner in the division of the spoils. "We were partners in blood, and we want to be partners to the decisions," say Hamas spokesmen.

Until recently, the leaders of Hamas were untroubled in this regard. They had an agreement with Palestinian Authority Chair Mahmoud Abbas (Abu Mazen), reached at the beginning of the year in Cairo, which included two main items: Hamas would join the cease-fire - the hudna or "calm" - and the PA would hold elections for the Palestinian parliament.

According to the results of the elections, which were supposed to take place yesterday, it will be possible to set a key to the balance of political power in the Palestinian community - and according to this key they will form a government, distribute jobs and, among other things, decide how the large land assets evacuated by Israel will be divided. In other words, which institutions and factories will be built on them, and for whose benefit: the Fatah faithful, the supporters of Hamas and others.

Hamas sees itself as having kept the agreement - having held its fire. Abu Mazen was the one who violated it. Fatah and its leadership under Abu Mazen decided to postpone the elections, without setting a new date. This means that the Palestinian government remains as it is, and that those who are currently in power - who are seen as corrupt by the Palestinian public - will do as they wish with the assets evacuated by Israel. They will not share with Hamas the fruits of the victory for which members of Hamas spilled their blood.

Hamas is by no means ready to accept this. For a brief moment, it seemed that they could reach a compromise. The leaders suggested that the handling of the Israeli withdrawal - i.e., the assets - would not be left to the hands of the Palestinian regime, but be the responsibility of a joint committee of Hamas and the PA. Abu Mazen and his people rejected this. "It would be like establishing another Palestinian government," they said.

This is the background to the violence that has erupted in Gaza. This is one of the reasons for the renewal of the attacks. There does not seem to be a solution for this at present, and the conclusion is that the embittered and angry Hamas members in Gaza will continue and even intensify terror attacks and firing at Israeli targets.

If all the fruits of the victory in Gaza fall into the hands of various corrupt PA leaders, Hamas doesn't mind making the Israeli withdrawal difficult, or even torpedoing it. (Haaretz Jul 18)

---

### **Don't Appease Terrorists** By Uri Dan

The nation must be told the truth - Palestinian terrorists will continue to attack Israel even as we make ready to leave the Gaza Strip. Meanwhile, the massacre perpetrated by Muslim terrorists in London last week was just another reminder of the grave danger democratic societies are currently facing.

The attack in London came as a complete surprise, showing that intelligence and security services are sometimes totally in the dark regarding the plans of terrorist organizations. Just as the massacres perpetrated by Muslims in the US, Madrid and London came as a thunderbolt, something of the kind may also happen in Israel. It must be remembered that the attacks by suicide bombers over the last four years are only a foretaste of what Israel's enemies are planning.

Total surprise is still the secret weapon of the Muslim terrorist organizations, and this was particularly evident in London. After the Muslim massacre in the US, President George W. Bush and Prime Minister Tony Blair opened a global war against terrorism, and called for international cooperation. The tremendous intelligence services of the US, Britain, Israel, Germany and France were called on to make an international effort to thwart additional terrorist attacks in other places.

The successful Islamist attack on the British capital thus represented not only a failure of what have long been regarded as the most professional intelligence and security services in the world, MI5 and MI6, but also of all

members of the international intelligence community who cooperated with it in total secrecy. No one should therefore be surprised if Palestinian-Muslim terrorists again attack Israel and totally surprise the Shin Bet (Israel Security Agency), army intelligence and the Mossad, at a time when politicians in Israel and virtually all the media are joyfully celebrating the uprooting of the settlements in Gush Katif and northern Samaria and calling for continuation of the retreat and the destruction of Jewish settlements.

IN THE winter of 2002, in Mombasa, Kenya, only a miracle saved an Arkia plane and its 250 passengers from a hit by Strella missiles launched by al-Qaida terrorists. The weapons the Palestinians are continuing to smuggle through tunnels to the Gaza Strip supply additional evidence that Israel must prepare for a continuation of the war.

It is ironic that Tony Blair's government made greater efforts than any other to persuade Israel of Hamas's good intentions. This didn't save London; Hamas identifies itself with the declarations of war by al-Qaida against the "Jewish crusaders" and its desire to destroy the Jewish state.

In order to reduce Arab-Muslim criticism of Britain's campaign against terrorism and terrorist regimes in Afghanistan and Iraq, Blair's government has always tried to pay in Israeli coin. Blair's personal envoy, a former MI6 officer, Alistair Crook, visited the heads of Hamas in Gaza and Yasser Arafat in Ramallah. He believed that Israel must accept Hamas as a partner for negotiations.

On Blair's behalf, Crook wandered around the corridors of the GSS, the Ministry of Defense and the IDF to improve the image of this terrorist organization. He even endeavored to have Israeli journalists help brainwash Israeli citizens.

More than any other, the Blair government tried to appease Hamas, at Israel's expense. Israel succeeded in killing, if somewhat belatedly, Sheikh Ahmed Yassin and Abdel Aziz Rantisi, the men behind Hamas terror, evoking criticism from Crook.

It was therefore very sad and worrying when Blair, after announcing his intention to hunt down the Muslim criminals, was reported to have linked the massacre in London with the need to solve the conflict in the Middle East. Blair ought to be aware that the Fascist-Muslim organizations of Osama bin Laden have declared urgent war on Christian "Crusaders" everywhere. They are top priority; the Jewish state comes at the bottom of the list.

All the signs indicate that the attack in London was planned by a satanic mind of bin Laden's ilk: Bin Laden boasted in a video clip to an agent of Saudi Arabian intelligence how he had planned to bring down the Twin Towers, the symbol of American superiority, and had succeeded. Therefore even if the terrorists were local British Muslims, the planning, recruitment and orders came from bin Laden's HQ.

Bin Laden and his close assistants, as well as his junior commanders in Iraq, Afghanistan and Europe, are alive and kicking - and still murdering.

After Yassin, Rantisi and others were killed by Israel, and the father of Palestinian fascism, Yasser Arafat, was buried deep in Ramallah, relative quiet was achieved on the terrorist front. Blair should learn from this instead of trying to approach Israel with a new call for appeasement.

Israel must be ready to prevent additional bitter surprises, not only of the kind seen in London, but also those it has already experienced in Jerusalem and Tel Aviv. (Jerusalem Post Jul 18)

---

### **Dahlan's Deadly Claims** Jerusalem Post Editorial

The fact that the rocket attack on Netiv Ha'asara last week came a short time after PA minister Muhammad Dahlan took Israeli disengagement coordinators by surprise when he seemingly casually raised demands for that village's land cannot be written off as a mere unfortunate coincidence.

Some seemed to dismiss the attack, which killed 22-year-old Dana Galkovitch, and to take Dahlan's retractions at face value. But the fact that Netiv Ha'asara was subsequently targeted with such deadly precision leaves too little room for comfort.

We may be witnessing nothing less than the germination of the next set of demands to fuel further conflict following the projected completion of the disengagement from Gaza. Netiv Ha'asara's shelling speaks louder than Dahlan's wan backtracking. It and neighboring kibbutzim, all essentially Ashkelon suburbs situated inside the Green Line, have much to fear from the approaching border if that means mortar fire from closer range.

Significantly Dahlan made his remarks in connection to the Taba precedent. After Israel handed Sinai over to Egypt, Taba remained disputed. International arbitration later awarded it to Egypt. "You don't want to repeat your Taba disgrace and humiliation," Dahlan told his Israeli interlocutors. "Why don't you withdraw from Netiv Ha'asara on your own accord already now? You know nobody in Gaza will relinquish territory that is part of the Strip."

Though Dahlan later declared that the PA isn't filing claims for lands within Israel proper, he and fellow PA higher-ups may simply disagree on the definition of what constitutes "Israel proper." The 1949 line he cited indeed passed two kilometers north of Netiv Ha'asara, but the 1950 Armistice Agreement awarded the area to Israel as part of a land swap in which Israel gave up holdings near Khan Yunis. Scrapping that 1950 deal would mean not only relinquishing the moshav established for Sinai evacuees in 1982, but also lands cultivated for decades by Yad Mordechai, Zikkim, Karmia, and Gvar'am. It would bring the border practically to Ashkelon.

Though government spokesmen branded this a non-starter, the very possibility that the strip north of the Erez Crossing could now conceivably become disputed is potentially explosive. We need only recall the epilogue to Israel's retreat from Lebanon to realize the inherent dangers. Hizbullah agitation regarding the Shaba Farms kept alive the contention that Israel continues to occupy Lebanese land, despite unequivocal UN determination to the contrary.

Dahlan may now be intimating, if not actually serving notice, that Gazans won't be satisfied even after Israel forfeits its settlements, removes 8,000 Jews from them and withdraws. It has been suggested that the PA is angling for another territorial exchange, aiming to trade the same Netiv Ha'asara site yet again, this time to win a Palestinian-controlled swath through the Negev, connecting Gaza overland to Judea.

Or it may be a ploy to persuade world opinion that Israel's occupation has not been eliminated. That would mesh well with the escalated rocket and mortar attacks on the western Negev, including Sderot.

The aim may be to tarnish Israel's image by compelling it to react militarily. The well-established pattern is that this leads to Israel's condemnation abroad. Thus on the eve of Israel's most painful and internally divisive concession ever, it would be denied credit for its very tangible sacrifices and made to look bad.

Such psychological warfare isn't new. Past experience amply demonstrates that it works. Whatever the rationale for putting new territorial grievances on the agenda, it would do well if our government didn't sweep these under the rug, politically embarrassing as additional pretexts for Palestinian belligerence may be at this specific turbulent juncture. Letting even artificially concocted complaints take hold and fester can only make matters worse.

Even a hint of a new *casus belli* must be faced head on now. Israel must explain its case articulately and unhesitatingly both at home and abroad, before a new issue is conjured and gets out of hand. (Jerusalem Post Jul 17)

---

### **The Beginning of the Reckoning** By Caroline Glick

Reacting to Neville Chamberlain's Munich Pact with Adolf Hitler in the British Parliament in October 1938, Winston Churchill warned, "You have to consider the character of the Nazi movement and the rule which it implies. There can never be friendship between the British democracy and the Nazi power, that power which spurns Christian ethics, which cheers its onward course by a barbarous paganism, which vaunts the spirit of aggression and conquest, which derives strength and perverted pleasure from persecution, and uses, as we have seen, with pitiless brutality the threat of murderous force. That power can never be a trusted friend of British democracy."

With the outbreak of World War II one year later, Churchill's warning that Munich was "the beginning of the reckoning" with an implacable foe was of course proved correct.

In the week since last Thursday's attacks in London we have repeatedly heard the analogy between those bombings and the Nazi bombing war against Britain. Most of these analogies have to do with the famous British stiff upper lip in the face of terror and carnage. Some of these parallels relate to the determination enunciated by Queen Elizabeth and Prime Minister Tony Blair never to surrender to the forces behind the bombings. Indeed, in most cases, the analogies drawn between the two circumstances have to do with the British response to the attacks and not to the parallel nature of the perpetrators.

In truth though, just as the British stoicism recalls the same from 65 years ago, so too, there is a deep and instructive similarity between the Nazis and the Islamic-fascist forces that attacked then and attack today. The fact of the matter is that even more important than invoking the famous British "stiff upper lip," to fight this current war to victory requires understanding and accepting the similarities between the Nazis and the Arab-Islamic terrorist armies.

On Tuesday The Wall Street Journal published an investigative report into the establishment and growth of the Islamic Center in Munich. As Stefan Meining, a German historian who studies the mosque, told the paper, "If you want to understand the structure of political Islam, you have to look at what happened in Munich."

According to the report, the Munich mosque was founded by Muslim Nazis who had settled in West Germany after the war. These men, who were among more than one million citizens of the Soviet republics who joined the Nazis

while they were under German occupation, were transferred by their Nazi commander to the Western front in the closing stages of the war to protect them from the advancing Red Army.

The Journal report explains that the first leader of the mosque was a native of Uzbekistan named Nurreddin Nakibhidscha Namangani. Namangani served as an imam in the SS and participated in the liquidation of the Warsaw ghetto and the putting down of the Jewish uprising in 1943.

According to the article, the exiled head of the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood, Said Ramadan, participated in a 1958 conference organized by Namangani and his fellow Muslim Nazis to raise money to build the mosque.

The article then outlines the subsequent takeover of the mosque by the Muslim Brotherhood in the 1960s and its transformation, with Saudi and Syrian funding, into a nexus for the spread of Islamic-fascist ideology and its call for jihad and world domination.

Ignored by the report is that there was no particular reason, other than perhaps turf warfare, for the Nazis to have had a problem with the Muslim Brotherhood. As German political scientist Matthias Kuntzel chronicled in his work "Islamic anti-Semitism and its Nazi Roots," the Muslim Brotherhood, which spawned the PLO's Fatah as well as al-Qaida, Hamas and the Egyptian Islamic Jihad, owes much of its ideological success and pseudo-philosophical roots to Nazism.

In the 1930s, the mufti of Jerusalem, Amin el-Husseini, rigorously courted the Nazis. When, in 1936, he launched his terror war against the Jewish Yishuv in the British controlled Palestine Mandate, he repeatedly asked the Nazis for financial backing, which began arriving in 1937.

From 1936-39 Husseini's terror army murdered 415 Jews. In later years, Husseini noted that were it not for Nazi money, his onslaught would have been defeated in 1937. His movement was imbued with Nazism. His men saluted one another with Nazi salutes and members of his youth movement sported Hitler Youth uniforms.

Husseini was allied with the new Muslim Brotherhood movement that was founded by Ramadan's father-in-law, Hassan al-Banna, in the 1920s. The impact of his terror war on the movement was profound. From a 1936 membership roster of 800, by 1938 the ranks of the Brotherhood had risen to 200,000 official members backed by perhaps an equal number of active sympathizers.

As Kuntzel argues, the notion of a violent holy war or jihad against non-Muslims was not a part of any active Islamic doctrine until the 1930s and, as he notes, "its concurrence with the arrival of a newly virulent anti-Semitism is verified in no uncertain terms." Husseini's gangs in the Palestine Mandate were joyously praised by the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, which held mass demonstrations with slogans like "Jews get out of Egypt and Palestine," and "Down with the Jews!"

For the Nazis, the Jews were seen as the principal force preventing them from achieving their goal of world domination. As Hitler put it, "You will see how little time we shall need in order to upset the ideas and the criteria for the whole world, simply and purely by attacking Judaism." In his view, once he destroyed the Jews, the rest of the world would lay before him for the taking. "The struggle for world domination will be fought entirely between Germans and Jews. All else is facade and illusion," he said.

Husseini, who became an active Nazi agent – fomenting a pro-Nazi coup in Baghdad in 1942 and then fleeing to Germany where he spent the rest of the war training a jihad army of Bosnian Muslims; exhorting the Arab world to rise up against the Allies; participating in the Holocaust and planning an Auschwitz-like death camp to be built in Nablus after the German victory – escaped with French assistance to Cairo after the war. There he was embraced as a war hero.

Hitler's obsession with the Jews as the source of all the evils in the world became so ingrained in both the Arab nationalist and Islamic psyche that it has become second nature. At the 2002 trial in Germany of Mounir el-Moutassadeq, who was accused of collaborating with the September 11 hijackers, witnesses described the world view of Muhammad Atta who led the attackers. One witness claimed, "Atta's [world view] was based on a National Socialist way of thinking. He was convinced that 'the Jews' are determined to achieve world domination. He considered New York City to be the center of world Jewry, which was, in his opinion, Enemy Number One."

In light of the wealth of historical documentation of the Nazi roots of Islamic fascism, it is absolutely apparent that the collaboration between Nazis and the Muslim Brotherhood in the building and developing of the Islamic Center in Munich was anything but coincidental or unique.

It is also hardly surprising that PA chieftain Mahmoud Abbas, whose predecessor, Yasser Arafat, was Husseini's follower, devoted his doctoral dissertation to a denial of the Holocaust and a justification of Nazism.

The thing of it is, just as with the Nazis, it is impossible to separate the Islamist ideological and military quest for world domination from its

genocidal anti-Semitism. As with the Nazis, they are two sides of the same coin. And, just as was the case from the Nazi ascent to power in 1933 through the end of World War II, the British and, to a lesser though increasing degree, the Americans refuse to acknowledge that the war against the Jews and Israel is the same as the war against them.

There are reasons for the attempts to separate the inseparable. The discovery that the London bombers were flowers of British immigrant youth – like the British-Pakistani al-Qaida-Hamas terror cell that committed the suicide bombing at Mike's Place in Tel-Aviv in April 2003, and Omar Sheikh, the British-Pakistani al-Qaida terrorist who kidnapped and murdered Wall Street Journal reporter Daniel Pearl in a Nazi-style execution in January 2002 – shows that the enemy today is largely homegrown.

One of the most difficult challenges for a democratic society is facing up to the presence of an enemy fifth column in its midst. Aside from this, the fact of the matter is that the global economy is fueled by oil, which is controlled by the same forces that stand at the foundations of the current war against the Jews and Western civilization.

Much easier than contending with these realities is to engage in the politics of denial. As the British and French blamed German anti-Semitism and warmongering in the 1930s on their impoverishment and humiliation by the Treaty of Versailles, so too, the British, like their European allies and large swathes of American society, blame Arab and Islamic anti-Semitism and aspirations for global domination on poverty and perceived humiliation at the hands of Western imperialists and by the establishment and continued viability of the State of Israel.

It is the duty of the State of Israel (much ignored by its own leadership today) to point out this inconvenient reality to the rest of the world. And it is the duty and responsibility of all who treasure freedom and the right to live without fear to accept this reality in spite of its inconvenience. Refusing to do so is not simply a matter of cowardice. It is a recipe for suicide. (Jerusalem Post Jul 15)

---

### **Britain's Fanatics** By Robert Wistrich

Thursday's carnage in London caught the world by surprise, but it shouldn't have. In the past decade, Britain's political, economic and cultural capital has also become a major world center of militant Islam.

Through its Arabic-language newspapers, magazines and publishing houses – not to mention its flourishing network of bookshops, mosques and community centers – radical Islam has taken full advantage of what British democracy has to offer.

Efforts have been made to mobilize Britain's 1.6 million Muslims to fight against Israel and America. Prominent cleric Sheikh Omar Bakri Muhammad's impassioned calls to "celebrate" the September 11 attacks as a great moment in history and to recruit Muslim youth for "holy war" in Afghanistan, Iraq and Palestine struck an emotional chord in Muslim neighborhoods: 40% of British Muslims surveyed after 9/11 believed that Osama bin Laden was "justified" in his war against America.

Meanwhile, Islamist organizations like al-Muhajiroun ("the Exiles") publicly deride Britain and the West as mere pawns, controlled by the "Zionists." Israel is invariably portrayed as a "cancer in the heart of the Muslim world" to be eliminated only by radical surgery. Al-Muhajiroun periodically combines calls for "the black flag of Islam to fly over Downing Street" with demands to liberate Palestine and "de-Judaize the West."

The highly inflammable Islamist cocktail embracing Palestine, jihad, the dream of a worldwide caliphate, Koranic indoctrination and classical Judeophobia was clearly exposed in the trial of Sheikh Abdallah el-Faisal in February 2003. The cleric, a Jamaican convert to Islam educated in Saudi Arabia, was found guilty of inciting to murder and racial hatred on the basis of his lectures and videocassettes, some of which are sold at bookshops in Britain. Overwhelming evidence was produced at the trial to demonstrate his encouragement for a violent jihad to kill non-believers. Particular venom was reserved for the "filthy Jews." In a spine-chilling speech that seemed to anticipate the May 2003 suicide bombing in Tel Aviv, el-Faisal ranted: "People with British passports. Fly into Israel and do whatever you can. If you die, you are up in Paradise. How do you fight a Jew? You kill a Jew."

ONLY LAST week, another radical cleric, Abu Hamza Al-Masri, was put on trial in London charged with encouraging the murder of Jews and other non-Muslims. The Egyptian-born preacher turned London's Finsbury Park mosque into a recruiting ground for British and European Muslims to carry out terrorist acts abroad. Those influenced by Abu Hamza included Zacarias Moussaoui (linked to the September 11 massacre), shoe bomber Richard Reid, and the young Anglo-Pakistani suicide bombers who blew themselves up at Mike's Place in Tel Aviv.

Perhaps most worrisome, stridently anti-Israel sentiments have long ceased to be limited to Muslims. Earlier this year, the city's mayor, Ken Livingstone

published a piece in *The Guardian* claiming that Ariel Sharon "is a war criminal who should be in prison, not in office," adding that "Israel's own expansion has included ethnic cleansing."

Since the election late this spring, things have only gotten worse. On May 21, a massive rally held in Trafalgar Square featured a crowd waving anti-Israel banners. In addition to Palestinian representatives and local Muslim leaders, several prominent non-Muslim public figures also spoke. Tony Benn, for instance, a former Labor MP and veteran Leftist, called George Bush and Sharon the "two most dangerous men in the world," while Andrew Birgin of the Stop the War coalition demanded the dismantling of the Jewish state.

"The South African apartheid state never inflicted the sort of repression that Israel is inflicting on the Palestinians," he said to cries of allahu akbar! from the audience. "When there is real democracy, there will be no more Israel."

The demonization of Israel has had a profoundly debilitating effect on British public opinion. It has helped to blind Britain to the true nature of the Holy War currently being waged against Western civilization. In reality, the motivations of the bombers have little to do with Palestine, with poverty or despair – the usual suspects evoked after every murderous terrorist assault in Europe or elsewhere. It has everything to do with religious fanaticism.

Slowly yet surely, the jihadist challenge is effecting a profound erosion of Britain's proud history of tolerance, moderation and multiculturalism. Unfortunately, until Britain acknowledges this growing cancer of terrorism, jihad and anti-Semitism in its midst – and acts to stamp it out – we can expect that Thursday's tragedy will not be the last London sees.

*The writer is a senior fellow at the Shalem Center and holds the Neuberger Chair in Modern European History at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. A longer version of this essay appears in the current issue of Azure [www.azure.org.il](http://www.azure.org.il) (Jerusalem Post Jul 15)*

---

### **Pulitzer Prize-winning Journalist Should Check His Facts**

By Atara Beck

I'm surprised that Thomas L. Friedman, a Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist, can get away with publishing statements that are inaccurate. In his article, "Israel's centre rising to settlers' challenge" (*Toronto Star*, July 17, 2005), he states: "Some settler boys got hold of a Palestinian teenager and pounded him with rocks, an act the Israeli army described as an attempted lynching." However, a retraction was issued in the Israeli press after it became clear that the Arab "victim" was not badly hurt and the perpetrators of the violence were not the settlers. Certainly a well-informed journalist like Friedman should have known this and acknowledged the facts, rather than spreading the rumours further.

Friedman says that the "resurgent Israeli centre" has "awakened to just what a danger the extremist settlers pose for Israel's future..." What about the danger posed by the people to whom this land is being given? Are we forgetting who danced on the rooftops after 9/11? A substantial number of secular members of Israeli society are also against the disengagement because the land is being handed over to political gangs, not to a democratic state interested in peace.

"The settlers...do not really respect the authority of the Israeli state," Friedman continues. Prime Minister Sharon refused to hold a referendum, and he fired cabinet ministers who voted against the disengagement. In fact, former IDF Chief of Staff Moshe Ya'alon lost his position after stating his opposition from a military, strategic point of view. Perhaps the "settlers" would have accepted the situation, albeit with great sadness and fear, had there been a democratic vote to decide the issue. And, as for Friedman's quote attributed to Sharon about "the settler youths...extremist gangs who are trying to terrorize Israeli society," are these the same youths who were prevented from praying at the Wailing Wall simply because their shirts were orange, the colour representing the anti-disengagement movement? Is there no room for opposition?

Yes, there is always the chance that an unstable personality from either side of the political spectrum will commit a deplorable act of violence. In fact, there have been reports on police brutality towards innocent, non-violent demonstrators.

"It's time the Arab-Muslim world talked to its Islamo-fascists, suicide 'martyrs' and hate-spewing preachers the same way [as Israel is treating its settlers]," the prize-winning journalist states. Of course, Friedman has the right to disagree with the settler position. But how dare he malign outstanding citizens by comparing the anti-disengagement protestors to suicide bombers? Friedman, an expert on the Middle East, should know better.

---