

Commentary...

We'll Buy That Bridge

Jerusalem Post Editorial

Headlines: Pullout will begin in terror-free towns (April 8, 2002); Peres: West Bank pullout to be completed within a few days (November 9, 2001); PA: International effort to secure IDF withdrawal under way (October 26, 2001); Official: Beit Jala cease-fire could serve as model for wider agreement (August 30, 2001).

As these old headlines illustrate, the idea of trading an IDF pullback for Palestinian promises to fight terrorism is not new. In fact, the past two years are riddled with the refuse of cease-fires that were not worth the paper they were not printed on.

The precedents for what Israel seems to be doing come from the realm of comedy: Charlie Brown running to kick the football held by Lucy, believing that this time she won't yank it away at the last second; Yogi Berra's expression, "It's deja vu, all over again," and the multiple resellings of the Brooklyn Bridge. But comedy becomes tragedy when applied to matters of life and death.

We cannot have it both ways. Either the IDF's presence in the territories has a security impact or it does not. If it does, it is not possible to claim that pulling back is risk free. Indeed, in the past, terrorist attacks have followed pullbacks with great specificity – the moment the IDF eased its presence around a city, attacks would emanate from that city.

When this happened, Israel would sanctimoniously say, in effect, "We trusted the Palestinians and look what happened." But being right is not enough – the victims of those attacks are still dead.

In this case, the office of Defense Minister Binyamin Ben-Eliezer claims that there is no "agreement," only an "understanding," and the IDF is not moving a centimeter before the Palestinians prove that terrorism has actually been substantially reduced. If so, this arrangement would indeed be unusual – essentially a unilateral Palestinian cease-fire dressed up as an agreement.

But the Palestinian Authority, or its representatives, agreeing to stop trying to kill Israelis is not enough. Hamas has already announced that it is not a party to this arrangement and will continue to attack. For this to work, the Palestinian "generals" Israel has been sitting down with must actually force the entire rogues gallery – the Tanzim, Hamas, and Islamic Jihad – to stop terrorism. They must be more effective than Israel's own military measures, or else the result will be more terrorism, not less.

There is another problem here, one that did not apply to all previous cease-fire attempts. This particular arrangement was brokered after US President George W. Bush tagged the Palestinian Authority for regime change in his landmark speech of June 24. We can pretend as much as we want that the Palestinians we met with have nothing to do with Yasser Arafat, but who are we fooling?

We wish it were otherwise, but the most likely result of what Israel is doing is temporary quiet – at the price of saving the PA and its allies to fight us another day. We should have learned from Oslo that the PA model of convincing terrorists to stand down, while leaving them armed and ready to resume attacks at any time, is a recipe for continued bloodshed.

The hard truth is that terrorism must be militarily defeated, either by Israel, or by the Palestinians themselves. The fact that the Palestinians may be exhausted now and ready for a cease-fire does not mean they are ready to finish the job. If we allow the terrorists to regroup, we are doing no one any favors – not ourselves, the Palestinians, nor the cause of peace and security. (Jerusalem Post Aug 20)

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

This issue is dedicated in honour of
the upcoming Aug 25th marriage of
Jeremy, son of Irwin & Ruth Diamond to
Dorothy Ann, daughter of George & Judy Zafir.
Mazel Tov!

וַעֲוִיטָא: *Rummy to*
Palestinians. By John Derbyshire

I am coming under considerable pressure from my reader base to lighten up. My last few columns have been too gloomy, they tell me. Don't I know that this is the land of hope and opportunity? As a new-minted citizen, I should shuck off the cynicism and pessimism of the Old World and lift my eyes to the Radiant Future. Well, fiddlesticks. Before proceeding further,

I order you to go here and read why you should listen with patient attention when I give you the bad news about human life.

Done that? Good. Now, having firmly laid down my general principles, I shall throw you a bone. I shall make some small amends by seeking out news items that I, personally, find cheering. There must surely be a few such? Yep, here's one.

Speaking to Pentagon employees about the Middle East the other day, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld said the following thing: "My feelings about the so-called occupied territories are that there was a war. Israel urged neighboring countries not to get involved in it once it started. They all jumped in and they lost a lot of real estate to Israel because Israel prevailed in the conflict."

Well, that made me smile. Not only was I smiling at the spectacle of a senior Cabinet officer speaking plain truth < not something that happens all that often < I was also recalling one of the better stories in classical literature. This one can be found in Book Five of Livy's History of Rome.

The events of the story occurred in 390 B.C. At that time, Rome was little more than a city-state rising to dominance in west-central Italy. Most of Europe was dominated by the Gauls, a Celtic people. In the year in question, these Gauls crossed the Alps, ravaged the valley of the Po, then marched over the Appenines to sack Rome. They actually burned a large part of the city, and the Romans were besieged at last on their one remaining hill, the Capitoline. However, "the Gallic race," says Livy, "was accustomed to dampness and cold," and could not stand the hot, dry climate of Rome, aggravated by smoke from the burning parts of the city. They were smitten with plague, until they could no longer bury their dead properly but had to cremate them in heaps. The Gaulish leaders were therefore willing to cut a deal with the Romans. The Romans, for their part, were hoping for the siege to be lifted by an allied army that had been away on campaign; but

when the relievers didn't show up and food ran low, the Romans were willing to deal, too.

Negotiations were undertaken. The leader of the Gauls, a man named Brennus, agreed that for payment of a thousand pounds of gold, he would withdraw his army. A table was set up with a set of scales to weigh out the gold. Now, the Gauls were a rough crowd, with an easygoing approach to accounting principles: You can think of them as the WorldCom execs of the early fourth century B.C. They brought their own sets of weights for weighing out the gold. When the Romans complained that these weights were too heavy, one of the Gaulish warriors tossed his sword into the balance pan, uttering the words: *Vae victis!* < "Woe to the vanquished!" *

Clearly Donald Rumsfeld was in a *vae victis* frame of mind when he made his speech the other day. There was a war. You lost. Suck it up. Of course, this doesn't play very well with the Arabs. It would have played even worse if Rummy had spelled out the full truth: There were in fact four wars, and the Arabs got whipped in every one of them. *Vae victis*, guys < to the fourth power.

When you write anything about the Middle East you get a flood of e-mails arguing the two sides of the matter at great length and with much passion. I've read a million of the darn things. It's been a while since I encountered anything new on this topic, and I don't have anything new to say here. What I have to say is something old and basic, though neither as old nor as basic as *Vae victis*.

Reasonable people (a category from which I would exclude practically all Arabs) agree that the Jews are entitled to an ethno-state in Palestine, simply

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

on long < very long < historical grounds. The U.N. agreed in 1948, and suggested a tiny statelet covering mainly Jewish areas.

The Arabs refused to contemplate the possibility of any Jewish state at all. They fought, and lost, the aforementioned four wars on this point.

They still refuse to contemplate the possibility, and this refusal is the sole and entire source of all the trouble in that region. Even when, as with Egypt, an Arab nation has acknowledged Israel's right to exist, the acknowledgment has been so grudging, so cold, and hedged around with so many qualifications, that normal state-to-state relations have not been possible.

I have mooted before in these columns my suspicion that the Arabs are suffering from a mass psychosis, with the corollary that our < the civilized world's < best course of action is to: "Do what you do when you find yourself in a roomful of glittering-eyed lunatics down at the local funny farm. Keep smiling, talk softly, don't make any sudden moves, keep nodding and smiling, and keep a tight hand on the stun-gun in your pocket."

After Rummy's little outburst of honesty, I'm not so sure about this. Perhaps we should try yelling in their ears. Perhaps that might be more effective, by way of opening their eyes to plain reality. "YOU LOST FOUR WARS! GET OVER IT!" Though we should still, of course, keep a tight hand on the stun gun.

* Pronounced "WHY WEEK-tis," at least since German classicists overhauled the pronunciation of Latin in the 1890s. I note, by the way, for those who like to see hubris brought low, that Brennus never actually got his gold. The Roman relief army showed up before the ransom could be handed over, and the Gauls were massacred. The Romans went on to build their tremendous empire; the Celts got some rain-swept moorland in the north and west of Britain, a boggy republic in the eastern Atlantic, and a few seedy bars in Boston and the South Bronx. *Vae victis.*

The writer is an NR contributing editor. (National Review Aug 15)

Arafat's Stash: The guy's a billionaire. Where does his money come from?

By Rachel Ehrenfeld

Yesterday's news that Yasser Arafat has a \$1.3 billion personal slush fund is no surprise. The information disclosed by Israel's military-intelligence chief emphasized that the stash was not skimmed from aid intended for the Palestinian people (donated by the likes of USAID and the EU), but he refrained from identifying the actual sources.

So questions abound: Is that the sum of all the money Arafat controls? Is it actually stolen from international aid money? How long have we known about it?

A member of the Palestinian Legislative Council from Nablus, Muawiya Al-Masri, was interviewed earlier this month by a Jordanian publication about Arafat's regime. When Al-Masri went public about PA corruption back in 1999 he was nearly killed in retaliation. Undeterred, he again spoke at length about the endemic corruption of the PA and Arafat. "No minister can appoint a driver or a delivery boy in his ministry without the president's consent," said Al-Masri. "There is no institutional process. There is only one institution - the presidency, which has no law and order and is based on bribing top officials."

Following the Oslo Accords, Arafat overtook even PEDCAR (the Palestinian Economic Council for Development and Reconstruction), founded under strict European conditions, as soon as it began operating. "His [Arafat's] became the authorized signature. Today, no amount, no matter how small, leaves the PEDCAR funds without the president's signature."

Experts estimate that the \$1.3 billion Arafat controls could feed three million Palestinians for a year, buy 1,000 mobile intensive-care units, fund ten hospitals for a decade, and still leave \$585 million to fund other social projects.

But firsthand testimonies by disaffected Palestinians, and volumes of documents found in his headquarters in Ramallah, leave no doubt that Arafat controls all PA money. And since this goes back to the 1960s, the amount of money that passed through his hands is staggering.

Over the years, the PA has had multiple funding sources. Every Palestinian "contributes" taxes. Arab nations send money. International organizations donate with poor Palestinians in mind. At the time the PA was created in 1993-4, the British National Crime Intelligence Service estimated that the PLO's ill-gotten gains totaled \$8-10 billion. In addition, the PLO enjoyed an annual income of about \$1.5-2 billion from "nations, extortion, payoffs, illegal arms dealing, drug trafficking, money laundering, fraud, etc." Since then, they've gotten even more. So where is that money?

Only Arafat, his wife Suha, and his "economic adviser" Mohammed Rashid know where the loot is hidden. Few others are in the know, but all of Arafat's 34 ministers have managed to get very wealthy over a short period of time, thanks to monopolies, gifts, and tens of thousands of dollars in regular payments from Arafat.

How much money is under Arafat's control? In addition to the \$1.3 billion that he keeps to himself, he also controls all the money that is in the PA budget, money intended for development, businesses, education, health, etc. He decides who gets what and when - and that's how he controls his gang.

Arafat also controls a growing criminal industry - a booming counterfeit industry that includes hundreds of thousands of CDs and DVDs, movies,

designer cloths, schoolbooks, and even cosmetics. It's a cash cow for funding terrorist activities - but not before Arafat and his gang get their cut.

Arafat is not unusual. His corruption is similar to that of his neighbors in a region full of autocratic regimes. Expecting him to fight corruption is like ridding the Vatican of Catholicism, Abd Al-Wahhab Al-Effendi, a Sudanese scholar, said in a recent article about corruption in the Arab regimes published in the London-based Arabic daily Al Hayat. And somehow the U.S. and EU expect Arafat and his cronies to lead reform in the region. I wonder: Will they ask him to return all their money?

The writer is director of the New York-based Center for the Study of Corruption and the Rule of Law, and the author of the forthcoming book Funding Evil. (National Review August 15)

Dueling Citizenships By Shlomo Avineri

The recent almost comic mini-clash between Spain and Morocco over a tiny islet claimed by both countries brings into focus some difficult dilemmas faced by Spanish foreign policy. At a time when Spain presses its claim for the end of British colonial rule over Gibraltar, it appears that Spanish foreign policy is still plagued by some of the nationalist legacies of the Franco dictatorship. Spain has made a remarkable transition to democracy and an open society in the last decades; but on this issue, which is embedded in concepts of national honor and sacred soil, some Francoist echoes still linger.

Spain has a good case against Britain regarding Gibraltar, which Spain lost in the 1713 Peace of Utrecht. It is indeed slightly absurd that one of the few remnants of the British Empire still exists - and on European soil. Yet it is the case that over the almost 300 years of British rule on the Rock, a population has evolved there which is mainly not of Spanish descent, does not speak Spanish, and does not view itself as part of the Spanish nation. Incidentally, not a small number of Gibraltarians are Jewish, having been for centuries the only Jews allowed to live, under British protection, in a corner of the Iberian Peninsula after the 15th-century expulsions from Spain and Portugal.

The elected chief minister of Gibraltar, Peter Caruana, certainly speaks for a universally accepted principle of European and democratic politics when he says that it is inconceivable that Britain and Spain decide on the future of Gibraltar without consulting with its population. After all, this is not a Russian 19th-century estate, when the land was sold along with the serfs. Nor do we now live in an era in which the US could buy Alaska, with its inhabitants, from Czarist Russia.

Spain, however, utterly denies the right of the population of Gibraltar to decide on its future through a plebiscite, referendum, or any other means.

It appears that Spanish political thinking still maintains that a claim to territory overrides the right of a population for self-determination. Spain calls for the right of self-determination for the Palestinians, regardless of Jewish historical claims to the West Bank or even Jerusalem; but when it comes to its own claims, territory appears to be sacred and historical rights seem to take precedence over self-determination.

There is a further, even more troubling aspect, in Spain's position: Spain still controls two enclaves, Ceuta and Melilla, on the northern coast of Morocco, occupied by Spain several centuries ago. By all universally accepted criteria, these two cities should be part of Morocco - Spain's right of conquest surely cannot hold in the 21st century. Yet Spain finds no problem in claiming Gibraltar while denying the same right to Morocco over Ceuta and Melilla. This gives hypocrisy a bad name.

The issue is not just Spain's - it is a European issue. If the EU cannot enforce principles of self-determination and equal justice in international law on its own members, how can it preach to others, let alone influence their behavior? Nobody wants a war or crisis on these issues - and after the first bombastic statements from Morocco and Spain over the islet, tempers have cooled down. But the twin issues - Gibraltar on one hand, and Ceuta and Melilla on the other - are serious ones dealing with basic rights and issues of sovereignty. It is in the EU's interest to try, ever so gently, to wean Spain from memories of its colonial past and to convince its leaders that what they demand from London cannot be denied vis-à-vis Rabat. Nor can the rights of Gibraltarians for self-determination be denied by a democratic member of the European Union.

The writer is director of the Institute for European Studies at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Jerusalem Post Aug 18)

"It Gets Hard When They Cheer" By Larry Miller

In an Israeli hospital, signs of hardship, hope, and horror. (And a shameful look at the L.A. Lakers' civic mindedness.)

NO ONE likes hospitals. Of course, when we need them, we thank God they're there, and we hope we, or our loved ones, are in a good one. My mother-in-law, God bless her, is in a hospital now down in Orange County, and it's as beautiful a facility as you're ever going to run into, I guess. But I noticed several things there, and I think these are universal. First, as you walk

from the parking lot into the hospital you see people who've just checked out, heading home with their families. Obviously, they are very happy. But look closer, next time. The happiness they have, especially the ex-patients, is deep, glowing, radiating. As we all know, when it comes to the hospital, many check in, but not so many check out, and the ones that do are left, even temporarily, with a reflective mien. Grateful. Thoughtful. "Didn't get me this time. Let's get out of here. Quickly. Guy in the next room won't make it. I did. Why? I don't know. Come on. Faster. I need to start forgetting."

Lucky people. Another observation is how quickly we learn our way around the hospital. Going out for coffee, or to make a call, we all know, very soon, where we're going, don't we? Down here, turn left, past the oncology lab, not those elevators, they're too slow, the back ones, around the corner, are faster. We learn the paths easily, and the place begins to feel familiar. We can even spot newcomers, and we smirk a little, inwardly, as they pass us, tentatively looking around. Go on, we silently urge, a little further, check at the nurses' station. They'll tell you where Uncle Pete is. I'm going to the commissary. Easy to find. You'll know soon.

After even only a couple of hours, I find myself, weirdly, so familiar with the surroundings I almost feel like strolling into one of the other rooms on "my" floor and checking the clipboard at the end of the bed. I don't know why, I couldn't possibly help anyone, and unless that clipboard has a crossword puzzle on it, I wouldn't even know what the hell I was looking at anyway.

The third thought I had was how, for all of us, it is not possible to empathize, really, with the person in the bed if that person isn't you. I think we all have a natural defense mechanism. And even if the patient is someone we care about, at the moment of standing somberly around the room, whether the loved one is out cold, or tremendously uncomfortable, or even close to passing on, it's hard not to think, "Soon I'll be back in the hotel room. I wonder if they serve late? Something other than trail mix would be nice. Hit that mini-bar, too." No, the only time we, each of us, will understand is when we're the ones in the bed. Soon enough, God knows. Soon enough. Then we'll get it. As we labor with each breath through the plastic nose-piece, we'll look around, focus with effort, and see, through their concern, everyone thinking, "Soon I'll be back in the hotel room." My mother had a long illness. My father went in a flash, and was sitting next to God before he even hit the floor. God willing, we'll all have the grace to take whatever we're supposed to take.

I was in two other hospitals recently, just a week ago, in Israel. It was part of my trip, to meet some victims of the terror bombings and their families. As an aside to this, you might like to hear something good and something not so good.

First, something good. Since I knew I was going to be seeing a lot of kids, I thought maybe they would like some videos. A couple of the recent Disney movies I've been in struck me as possible, "The Princess Diaries," and "Max Keeble's Big Move." I called my publicist, Michael Hansen, and he called Adam Jordon, Director of National Publicity, Buena Vista Pictures Marketing. (That's a heckuva title, isn't it? One more promotion, and he's going to need double-doors on his office to hold all the words.) Anyway, Adam stepped right up and said, essentially, "Whatever you want." They're sending so much stuff, we decided to ship it after I got back: Shirts, hats, posters, movies, photos. Good for you, Disney.

Second, something not so good. Before leaving, I asked one of the doctors over there if there was anything he thought the kids seemed to want more than anything else. He instantly answered, "Lakers. Anything from the Los Angeles Lakers." Well, okay, great, let's get them some Lakers stuff. So Michael Hansen called the Head of Consumer Relations and Merchandizing for the Lakers (I'm not even going to say her name) and he told her what I was doing and where I was going, and she said, "We're out." I beg your pardon? Did you say *out*? What does that mean? "Well, there was a big rush after the season, and we're out." Out of everything? No shirts, no hats, no banners, no stickers, no, I don't know, bunny ears in gold and purple? "Nothing. We have nothing." Well, that's quite a run you had. You're just . . . out. No big deal, why, it could happen to anyone. So my wife and I took the kids the day before I left and went to a store and bought as much as they had. And we filled a pretty big duffle bag. And when I got to Israel, and the guy at the hospital saw the stuff, he thanked me, and said what a nice team the Lakers were for sending it all. And with the best acting I could muster, I smiled and said, "They sure are. Couldn't do enough for the kids. Anytime, they said." Yay, Disney, boo, Lakers.

All right, back to the story. As I said, I went to two places to meet the terror victims. One was in Tel Aviv. I met an emergency room doctor, a woman, whose husband was killed a year ago in a bombing. She has two children. Had. Now she has one. She was on duty, weeks ago, in the middle of the night (Don't they call that the graveyard shift?), the night a disco was bombed. Maybe you heard about it. The victims were brought to her hospital. To her. Her daughter was one of them. Now the mother is a patient. "It was good of you to let her tell you her story," the head of the place told me. "It's therapeutic." Good of *me*? What do you say to that? "I'm glad I could help so much. Gotta go now. Soon I'll be back in the hotel room."

Then we went to Hadassah Hospital, in Jerusalem. This is the hospital where they brought the victims of the bombing at Hebrew University. I met a woman who had been having lunch that day, in the Frank Sinatra Commissary (really)

with her daughter, a student. An "A" student, the mother told me. It wasn't possible for the daughter to tell me, since they were still trying to put her back together. At this writing she's still alive, thank God. Just. An "A" student, the mother kept saying. She was the lucky one, whatever that means. Hey, what's that on the table? Oh, it's a cup with the nails they took out of me. Some are still inside. They can't take them out yet. Oh. Okay. Gotta go. Wait, go in there, here's someone else, the brother of someone else, the fiancée of someone else, the father of someone else. Thank you for letting them tell their stories. Yes, I know, it's therapeutic.

Downstairs, before we left, the head of the hospital, an Israeli named Audrey, was showing me the children's waiting room. I couldn't help but notice, all around, an Arab woman with her son, an Arab family over there checking in, Arab children playing with the toys while waiting. The doctor saw the look on my face and laughed. "Oh, yes, we treat everyone." I guess I was astonished. She just shrugged. "We're Jews. This is how we live. It's also for the future. They're not going anywhere, and we're not going anywhere. There will eventually be peace. There has to be." When? A month? A year? A hundred years? More? She didn't know. I had to say it. You're incredible. You take everyone, you treat everyone, no one goes first, no one goes last, you just go in order of who needs help. That's, like, Mother Teresa stuff. "We're not saints, we're just doing our jobs. It's not easy, I admit. And it gets hard when they cheer when the bodies are brought in." I looked at her. What did you say? She sighed. "Yes, it gets hard when they cheer." This was one of the times during my trip when I held up my hands and said, "Stop. Wait." I turned and walked away to breathe deeply for a minute. I wonder if they've restocked that mini-bar. Yeah, probably. It's a good hotel.

I didn't meet one Jew the whole trip who didn't think there would be peace, not one. "We can work it out. We have to. They're not going anywhere. Neither are we."

Of course, it gets hard when they cheer. I guess it does.
The writer is a contributing humorist to The Daily Standard and a writer, actor, and comedian living in Los Angeles. (Weekly Standard.com Aug 19)

Saudis Preach Terror in the Name of Religion By Ezra Levant

As every Calgarian knows, Canada is one of the world's great energy-producing nations. But, Canada still imports nearly a million barrels of crude oil each day -- much of it from the kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Oil is not the only thing the Saudis quietly pump into Canada.

Each year, the Saudi government spends millions of dollars on religious and political action in Canada, too, a little published fact here. The government-controlled Saudi media are proud of it, though. According to Ain Al Yaqeen, a Saudi weekly, the Saudis spend millions each year on mosques in Canada. In Toronto alone, \$7 million went to build the Islamic Centre, which receives another \$2 million a year for operating expenses.

Mosques in Calgary, Toronto and Montreal also receive Saudi dollars. The magazine boasts that the kingdom spends "billions" globally -- even more astonishing given the country's burgeoning debt.

Evangelism is central to the Muslim faith -- as it is for Christianity. But, Saudi Arabia's evangelism in Canada is materially different from the Pope's World Youth Day or a Billy Graham crusade.

Like the Pope and Graham, the Saudi religious leadership has a theological agenda. Unlike the Pope and Graham, the Saudis also have geopolitical and military interests. The chief religious officer of Saudi Arabia's theocracy -- the "Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques" as he is called -- is King Fahd himself, the Saudi head of state. In the Saudi theocracy, totalitarianism works both ways. The imams exert significant control over Saudi politics -- governing everything from banking laws to driving licences. The Qur'an is the kingdom's official constitution.

But, the Saudi royal family has reciprocal control over the type of Islam being propagated. Like medieval Henry VIII, the Saudi royals often have very earthly goals in mind when they issue religious rulings.

The strain of Islam favoured by the Saud family is called Wahhabism -- a militant theology preached by Osama bin Laden.

Adherence to Wahhabi fundamentalism is the key criterion the Saudis use to determine whether or not foreign mosques receive funding.

More moderate denominations of Islam are not just ignored -- they are denounced as infidels. The Muslim World League -- Saudi Arabia's theological foreign affairs office -- recently published a brochure in Etobicoke, Ont., denouncing rival sects, including liberal Ismaili Muslims.

Ismailis "are not considered Muslims even though they call themselves Muslims to falsify things and lead others astray," reads the brochure.

Religious strictness is one thing, but Wahhabi Islam is about militant politics, too. In another brochure, sponsored by the Saudi Muslim World League, Canadian readers are told that Jews have "massacred" and "butchered" Arab women and children and "desecrated" Muslim holy sites throughout the ages. Arab wars against Israel are praised; PLO terrorism is renamed "resistance."

This sort of incitement and anti-Semitism is nothing new for Saudi Arabia. This summer, for example, Sheikh Abd-al-Rahman al-Sudays, the government-appointed imam of the Mosque of Mecca, denounced "idol-worshipping Hindus," called Jews "pigs and monkeys" and labelled Christians "worshippers of the Cross" who believe in "rotten ideas and poisonous culture."

Those remarks were mild compared to the Saudi government telethon in April, which raised more than \$150 million for Palestinian suicide bombers. The host of that telethon, Sheikh Saad Al-Buraik, waxed poetic about the West: "I am against America even if the stone liquifies. My hatred of America, if part of it was contained in the universe, it would collapse. She is the root of all evils, and wickedness on Earth." Al-Buraik had a special message for Muslims around the world: "Oh, Muslim Ummah, don't take the Jews and Christians as allies." And to Palestinians: "Do not have any mercy neither compassion on the Jews, their blood, their money, their flesh. Their women are yours to take, legitimately. God made them yours. Why don't you enslave their women? Why don't you wage jihad? Why don't you pillage them?"

This is not a message of peace. It despises other Islamic sects, it countenances war and terrorism against Jews and Hindus. And it denounces Christians as arrogant libertines deserving of plunder.

Not since the Second World War has such vitriol been propagated on this scale, with the imprimatur of a national government. This is not religious evangelism, Pope John Paul-style. This is hate speech at least, incitement to terrorism at worst. And it is paid for by a sitting government.

And it is working -- in Canada. Four months ago, a small group of militants chanting "death to the Jews" joined a march through Calgary. The march organizers later apologized.

When the march infiltrators were not allowed to enter a federal government office, several tried to break down a door. Police videotaped the incident, and are trying to identify the perpetrators. No doubt Sheikh Al-Buraik is interested, too.

Was it a spontaneous event? Or can the Saudi Sheikh claim credit for it -- the result of his country's multi-million-dollar Canadian incitement campaign? *The writer is a Calgary lawyer. (The Calgary Herald Aug 17)*

Suicide Terrorism Can Be Broken By Lise Korson

IDF intelligence's most recent briefing to the cabinet shows that the IDF is well aware of Hamas's vulnerable point. However, as it so often does in Israel, the justice system, enabled by a government policy of backsliding, is now serving its enemies. In seeking to prevent the government from deporting terrorists' family members to the Gaza Strip, the justice system is seeking to nullify the most promising tactic for breaking Hamas the government has yet devised.

Hopefully, a clearer understanding of what makes Hamas tick will encourage Israelis to get a handle on their government and the justice system. It is particularly important to reach this understanding now. Since most Palestinian groups have thrown in their lot with Hamas, breaking Hamas increasingly comes to mean breaking an entire society's pattern of violent behavior.

This has application far beyond Israel.

Over the past year, the world has increasingly come to acknowledge that Islam-sanctioned terrorism among Palestinians is part of a larger Arab and Muslim problem. Consequently, breaking Hamas can be a breakthrough in changing the behavior of Muslim society itself.

In its briefing, the IDF correctly noted that measures aimed at making families of terrorists pay a price for terrorists' actions will be very effective tactics against Hamas. However, this formulation is purposely general enough to cover a range of actions including deportations, stripping them of citizenship, and demolition of houses. The formulation thereby leaves IDF and government leadership covered against charges of supporting any particular tactic world opinion finds objectionable.

In focusing on making the families suffer, the IDF accurately identifies the vulnerability, but it misplaces the emphasis. In doing so, it leaves the way free for the government to fail to press its advantage. Hamas wriggles free and is allowed to operate again.

This is the sequence that played out between July 31 and August 4.

Choosing the illusion that it can gain greater support from world opinion over the reality of a proven avenue through which to crush Hamas, the government distanced itself from its initial statement about deporting families of suicide bombers from the West Bank to Gaza. Subsequent statements included so many qualifications that they effectively diluted the tactic to the point where Hamas felt emboldened to use terror again.

In its July 31 attack against the Hebrew University's Mount Scopus campus, Hamas clearly stated that it had abandoned suicide bombings because the Israeli government had said it would deport the families of suicide bombers. In its next attack on August 4 on the No. 361 Egged bus on its way to Safed, Hamas sent a suicide bomber. The interval coincides with the government's dilution of its policy of deportations.

As a grass-roots organization, Hamas depends for its existence upon the support of the community it purports to serve. Hamas is also an Islamic organization, dedicated to the core Islamic belief in expanding Islamism by creating Islamic states ruled by Shari'a wherever possible. Consequently,

Hamas's legitimacy depends on increasing the territory under its sway. Therefore, the most effective tactics against Hamas are those that reduce its community support and that reduce the amount of territory under its control. Deportations do both simultaneously and more effectively than any other measure because of the pre-Islamic Arab cultural value of possession of land. This concept centers around right of access for habitation. If Arab families -- and larger family groups of clan, village, and tribe -- could live on the land and use it for grazing and raising crops, then the families possessed the land. No deed or written authorization was required. Conversely, if they were denied access to land, the Arab families no longer possessed it. Deportation would certainly deny a family's access to land. It would be delivering a death blow to Hamas's central program of recovering "Arab" lands. Less occupation of land by Arabs means less "Arab" land.

Tracing the development of Arab beliefs through language suggests that, for Arabs, land also has a pre-Islamic spiritual significance.

During the Ottoman period, Arabs in what is now Israel referred to fertile land as being owned by spirits which were responsible for making the land fertile. The idea was similar to that of the Canaanite "ba'alim," which were regional gods. In modern Hebrew, ba'al means "owner." In Arab belief, the spirits owned the land and gave it to the families in return for correct behavior. No human could take it away. Trying was punishable by death.

History, cultural syncretism, and the contemporary Arab and Muslim belief in jinn (spirits) suggest that similar concepts inform contemporary Arab behavior.

Arabs came to Israel from the Saudi Arabian peninsula in waves of migration that may have started as early as 2700 BCE, although the earliest documentation of their presence was the ninth century BCE. Arabs certainly adopted some of the practices of earlier inhabitants of the land, including those of the Canaanites.

All this gives us an even better appreciation of why Hamas so suddenly surrendered its prized suicide-bombing tactic. If the consequence was dispossession of the land, then the foundation of Hamas's legitimacy was destroyed. The people would conclude that, obviously, Allah thought Hamas's behavior -- i.e., suicide bombings -- was incorrect, so the penalty was that He allowed the Israelis to take members of the Arab community from the land, which is identical to dispossession.

Consequently, Hamas had to drop the behavior Allah found unacceptable or the people would drop their patronage of Hamas. In backing away from its tough policy on deportation, the Israeli government handed Hamas a victory. It allowed Hamas leaders to make the argument that Allah approves of suicide bombings, and so they continue.

Recent incidents among Palestinians and Pashtuns suggest that other tactics aimed at challenging family support for radical Islam can be highly effective. The Israelis broadcast a PA tape of the wife of Hamas political leader Dr. Abdel Aziz Rantissi refusing to allow her son to become a martyr. In addition to any doubts about Rantissi's legitimacy that the broadcast may or may not have sown, Umm Muhammad's private refusal to allow her child to die for the cause conforms to other Palestinian mothers' similar private repudiation of their public support for sending their children to die as martyrs.

Rantissi's efforts at damage control in reaction to the broadcast point to another weak point for Hamas in its efforts to maintain community support: age of the combatant. Rantissi claimed that the tape was 10 years old and his son was young at the time. Therefore, his wife was justified in denying him to Hamas activists.

Similarly, parents in a Gaza refugee camp this past April were so horrified by the death of three 14-year-old martyrs that they forced Hamas to do an immediate about-face. Within two days of the 14-year-olds' deaths, Hamas had put up posters in neighborhood mosques declaring that youths under a certain age should not participate in martyrdom "operations."

Palestinian parents accomplished instantaneously what outside forces had failed for years to achieve: a crucial change in Hamas behavior. They held Hamas accountable.

This past winter, in the Pashtun region of Pakistan, following Kandahar's fall, local communities also began holding their Muslim leaders accountable. They discredited scores of their imams. These men had sent the people's sons off to die in neighboring Afghanistan. Thousands failed to return. The families' well-being, the communities' well-being, the Pashtuns' well-being had all been adversely affected by the failed policy. Events had created a toehold for developing accountability in that community as they have among Palestinians now.

In sum, the road to a world free of Islamic terrorism goes through tactics that affect Islamic communities' well-being, sometimes family by family. Some of these tactics include deportation, having the communities themselves require accountability from their Islamic leaders, and public humiliation. Radical Islam claims to better Muslims' lives and their afterlife. Clearly deportation, decimation of the population's youth, and public embarrassment do not. (Jerusalem Post Aug 20)

The writer is an independent scholar specializing in the Middle East.