

 Jerusalem 6:27; Toronto 7:41

## Events...

Shabbat, September 6, 5:45 p.m.

David Zev Harris, Bureau Chief for News Services, The Media Line, Jerusalem, Former Knesset and Diplomatic correspondent for The Jerusalem Post, speaks on "The Final Nail in the Road Map: Now What?" at Shaarei Shomayim.

## Commentary...

### To Achieve Peace, All-out War on Terrorism Is Only Path in Middle East

By Nolan Finley

With the blood of its children running through the streets of Jerusalem, Israel has no choice but to crumple the road map to peace and instead draft a battle plan for combatting terrorism.

Any hope for a political solution to the violence in the Middle East vanished in the bus bombing Tuesday, which killed 20 and maimed scores of others, many of them children.

Television cameras showed the surviving youngsters, screaming and blood-smeared, stumbling away from the horrific carnage.

Terrorist groups Hamas and Islamic Jihad competed for credit. There's only one way to deal with those who find glory in slaughtering children: Kill them. The bomber's wife said her husband died fulfilling his dream of martyrdom. The man had two kids of his own, and yet his life's dream was to die killing other people's children.

You can't negotiate with that level of ignorance, hatred and religious insanity.

Yet Israel, at the insistence of the United States, has come to the bargaining table. It has offered extraordinary concessions in the name of peace and taken good faith steps, including dismantling settlements and pulling back troops.

But the peace process has failed again, for the same reason it always fails. The Palestinians are wed to terrorism, and real peace can not be bargained with a terrorist state.

So Israel has no choice but to seek a military solution, to roll its tanks again across the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

Palestinians blame their violence on Israel's oppression and brutality. But the truth is that Israel has not been brutal enough in the face of terror. Its answer is surgical strikes, targeted assassinations and a catch-and-release prisoner policy.

Meanwhile, terrorist chieftain Yasser Arafat sits unmolested in Ramallah, and the leaders of the terrorist networks hold press conferences and rally crowds in village streets.

Always, Israel's fist is restrained by the United States.

But to end the violence, Israel must strike with terrible force. To be blunt, the Palestinians must be brought to their knees, made to feel the pain of allowing terrorists to act in their name. The path taken in President George W. Bush's road map to peace did just the opposite. It started the Palestinians toward statehood without forcing them to unstrap their bombs. Prime Minister Mahmoud Abbas, Arafat's puppet, says he risks civil war by disarming the terrorists. He must be warned that war is coming for certain if he doesn't.

In past Middle East wars, Israel was reined in before it could achieve its final objectives. The conditions are different today. Egypt is a mess. Iraq is gone. Jordan and Saudi Arabia are in America's pocket. And there's no Soviet Union to pressure the United States to intervene.

So Israel has a golden opportunity to launch its own version of a shock and awe campaign. It can drive the terrorists out of the territories, eliminate the threat from the Syrian-hosted Hezbollah along the Lebanon border and, if Iran chooses to join the fight, good -- another problem checked off the list.

Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon has played Washington's game. He's reached across the table, spoken words of conciliation, restrained his fury in the

## 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

face of horrible נב"ד  
provocation.

It's time to let Sharon be Sharon. He's a warrior. And bringing peace to the Middle East is now a warrior's job. (The Detroit News Aug 24)  
The writer is editorial page editor of The Detroit News.

### De-Palestinize the Palestinians

By Efraim Inbar

Mahmoud Abbas (Abu Mazen), the Prime Minister of the Palestinian Authority, had the temerity to announce before his trip to Washington that the PA -- in flagrant violation of his own commitment to the US -- has no intention to dismantle the terrorist infrastructure. Nabil Shaath, the Foreign Minister of the PA, has announced that the PA intends to demand the right of the Palestinian refugees to settle in the "Palestinian cities" in Israel. Nabil Abu Rudaineh, a senior advisor to Yasser Arafat, said Israel's planned pullout from four additional Palestinian cities in the West Bank is insufficient.

The Palestinians will continue to: desist from preventing terrorist activities against Israel; cling to maximalist unrealistic demands; and be dissatisfied with Israeli concessions up to the dismantlement of the Zionist entity.

Israel lives in a bad neighborhood and our worst neighbors are the Palestinians. They are young, fanatic and poor - a highly combustible mix. Moreover, they hate the Jews, who are portrayed as the main source of their misery.

It is extremely unlikely that the Palestinians would be able to extricate themselves, even with generous outside support, from their tragic predicament. So far they have missed the opportunities to build an enlightened state, succeeding only in establishing a lawless, ineffective, authoritarian and corrupt political entity united by a narrative that generates continuous hostility to the Jews.

Unfortunately, the Palestinians usually shy away from any introspective and have the tendency to blame outsiders, particularly Israelis, for all their misfortunes. This handicaps the slim potential for reform. Indeed, Abu Mazen's half-hearted attempts to reform the PA have truly failed.

The efforts to establish a Palestinian state that will behave at least like Egypt or Jordan are doomed to failure. It is questionable whether a Palestinian state is what Arafat and his colleagues are really after. At this historic

junction, the Palestinian society, under the spell of the Palestinian nationalist ethos, is simply unable to bring itself to a historic compromise with the Zionist movement and to end the conflict.

Palestinian rejectionism won the day whenever a concrete partition was on the agenda -- the 2000 Camp David proposals being the most recent example. The tragedy is that with the progression of history, Israel has less territory to offer to the Palestinians, only increasing their bitterness and despair. The hope that history can be rolled back is an illusion.

Therefore, the road map will probably end like the Oslo Process, with a large outburst of Palestinian violence -- an expression of profound widespread dissatisfaction. There is good reason to believe that a part of the Israeli government, led by Ariel Sharon, understands the dynamics of the situation. Nevertheless, Sharon decided to go along with the road map and to ignore the basic Palestinian violations of the agreement.

He probably wants to allow the Palestinians to become the clear culprits in Washington's eyes for the process to breakdown. Moreover, he prefers to reduce the amount of political ammunition his leftist opposition in Israel can use against him by continuing to pay lip service to the attempts for coexistence. In any case, most Israelis prefer to disengage from the Palestinian cities unless security imperatives indicate the need for the IDF presence there. Social cohesion in the protracted struggle against the Palestinians has always been an important goal for Sharon. Yet, the Palestinians will not change their mode of behavior and Israel will continue to be subject to waves of violence.

Then, the nagging question is what should Israel do in the long run about these neighbors?

First, one must call a spade a spade. Peacespeak has an addictive

This week's issue is dedicated  
in commemoration of the ninth yarzeit for  
Jean Nussbaum צ'רנה בת צבי ע"ה

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)

influence, blurring the judgment of good people. The world must learn that the Palestinians cannot bring themselves to utter the simple sentence: "The Jews returned to their homeland." Israelis, in particular, need strategic clairvoyance because they bear the brunt of the struggle.

Getting rid of the Palestinians is not a real option, despite the fact that the literature on ethnic conflict indicates separation of ethnic populations being conducive to stability (this is the rationale of partition). Israelis are afraid of the demographic expansion of the Palestinians. Yet, the historic record suggests that continued conflict was the main factor for limiting the Palestinian territorial presence in the Land of Israel and for Palestinian emigration.

Probably, the only long-term way to stabilize the situation is to de-Palestinize the Palestinians. This young national movement is a failing one, opening the possibility for manipulation of this ethnic identity by threatened Arab neighbors. Despite their misgivings, the Egyptians might come to the conclusion that their return to rule Gaza would be a lesser evil than the emergence of a Hamas-led entity there. Similarly, the Jordanians may decide that the revisionist Palestinian identity nourished in the West Bank is too dangerous to their state to be left unattended. Such a strategy requires an Israeli decision to present the Palestinian national movement as it is: a calamity for the Arabs in Palestine and for their neighbors as well. (Jerusalem Post Aug 24)

*The author is Professor of Political Science at Bar-Ilan University and Director of the Begin-Sadat (BESA) Center for Strategic Studies.*

---

### **For an Honest Arafat Policy** Jerusalem Post Editorial

For some time now, Israeli policy has been built on the principle, perhaps the wish, that Yasser Arafat is "irrelevant." At the same time, our officialdom is increasingly arguing that he is the key obstacle to any meaningful fight against terrorism. These two ideas are irreconcilable.

There is another tension in our current policy. When it comes to Hamas and Islamic Jihad, Defense Minister Shaul Mofaz says that no leader, whether "political" or "military," has immunity. This is a new policy and, if carried out, certainly overdue. But again, if there are elements of the Palestinian Authority leadership that are currently preventing a crackdown against terrorism, why are they being held immune?

On Israel Radio yesterday, former OC Southern Command Maj.-Gen. (res.) Yomtov Samia said that either Israel should eliminate Arafat, who is "preventing Abu Mazen from operating," or end its practice of targeted killings completely. Samia argues that Israel must choose between depending on the PA to fight terror and doing so itself. What makes little sense, he argues, is to attempt to straddle both options. Similarly, Knesset Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee chairman Yuval Steinitz argues that the PA leadership, including Arafat and Mahmoud Abbas, should be shipped back to Tunisia, with an eye toward holding new internationally supervised elections in a year.

In response to such pressures, including from government ministers who advocate getting rid of Arafat now, Prime Minister Ariel Sharon's inner circle reportedly suggests that such measures will be considered if there is another major suicide bombing.

There is a certain air of surrealism to this discussion. Is Arafat responsible for the continuation of terrorism or is he not? If he is, do we have to wait for another bus attack to address the problem? If last week's slaughter and maiming of so many children is not enough, what would be? Every day that we argue that Arafat is responsible for terrorism and do nothing about it, we are saying one of two things: either that we are lying, or that the terrorism against us is acceptable. Hints that we are being restrained because of American pressure do not help make this picture more intelligible. Avoiding what sort of American pressure, if it really exists, would be worth sacrificing Israeli lives? It would not be surprising if elements of the American government were in fact urging Israel to give the PA one "last" chance. Ultimately, however, the US cannot be more concerned for and a better judge of our security needs than we are.

The more likely scenario is not that Israel is under American pressure, but that our political/security leadership believes that the time is not ripe for choosing between eliminating the leaders for terrorism and pretending that someone else will. There never will be a moment in which the world will say to Israel: Yes, we agree, you have suffered enough and given the PA every possible chance to redeem itself. Or: Yes, we agree, this attack is so horrific that you have no choice but to attack not just the foot soldiers, but those who give the orders and fan the flames of hate.

On Sunday, PA television broadcast a music video intended for children. It opens with a young girl rushing home to her mother with flowers, but as she approaches, an Israeli rifle appears at the corner of the screen and murders her mother in front of her eyes. In the next scene, the girl places the flowers intended for her mother on her mother's grave. The rest of the five-minute music video is the girl's song of mourning and longing for her mother, which she sings over the grave. This video, according to Palestinian Media Watch ([www.pmw.org.il](http://www.pmw.org.il)) was broadcast almost daily from January to July, and stopped being broadcast two weeks ago. Now it is back to incitement as usual. This, we must remember, is not coming from Hamas or Islamic Jihad, but directly from the PA. It is time we adopt a policy that reflects our declarations. If, as the government claims, the PA has failed to meet its primary commitments under the road map an end to terrorism and incitement then it has not only ceased to be a "partner," it has

become an enemy. And if, as the government again claims, it holds Arafat responsible for harboring terrorists, then he is a terrorist and must be treated accordingly. Anything short of that means our policy is a charade. And we can be certain the international community, not to mention to PA itself, will draw the appropriate conclusions and act accordingly. (Jerusalem Post Aug 26)

---

### **Time for a Reality Check** By Barry Rubin

The cease-fire and Performance-Based Road Map have proven to be a mere reenactment of the failed 1990s Oslo peace process.

Oslo, initiated in 1993, was a step-by-step, five-year plan in which each stage was to build confidence and move the two sides toward a full peace agreement. The improvement made by the more recent plan was to ensure that we would know at the beginning if it was working. We now know it is not.

During the seven years of the Oslo process there were reasons for both hope and doubt. But the problems along the way were not supposed to matter. Everything was staked on the end of the process, the moment of truth, when the leaders met and Yasser Arafat had the opportunity to choose. And thus came the year 2000, in which Arafat rejected good peace offers at the Camp David summit and in the Clinton plan, deciding instead to wage a new war on Israel. In all three cases, Arafat rejected peace and embraced violence and terrorism, as he had so often done before.

Why? The reasons are complex, involving his character and ideology, the nature of Palestinian and Arab politics, and many other factors. But one reason stands out above the others: Arafat was not willing to give up his goal of destroying Israel and getting all the territory between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean. Many Palestinians agreed with him, though some did not and others would have accepted either direction.

There were two ways in which Arafat hoped (and still hopes) to win this war:

By terrorizing the Israelis into surrender, forcing a unilateral withdrawal from the territories. Terror was not some marginal aspect of his campaign, waged by extremist groups beyond his control, but the very core of his strategy. By creating a crisis, portraying his side as the victim, and inspiring an international intervention that would hand the territories over to him without his having to make full peace or concessions.

In either case, he could then carry the struggle into the next phase, aided by the subversive efforts of hundreds of thousands of Palestinian refugees who had been given a "right of return" to live in Israel.

Of course, his war failed miserably. Almost 3,000 people lost their lives, the Israeli army showed its military superiority, and the Palestinians became bankrupt, their infrastructure in ruins, their lives miserable.

Arafat himself faced a polite revolt by moderates led by Mahmoud Abbas (Abu Mazen). It was necessary to make an alteration of course, though not of intended destination.

In dealing with the road map and the cease-fire Arafat, following his traditional fashion, tried to have everything, believing - with good reason - that the world would let him get away with it.

The truce, limited by the Palestinians to three months, in fact hardly endured a day. Arafat did not implement a real cease-fire but a pretend one, reducing terrorist attacks just enough to escape the world's notice and censure. He did not dismantle the terror groups or tell even his own Fatah people to stop attacking; he didn't stop teaching his children that the highest achievement in life is to be a suicide bomber, or arrest anyone planning or carrying out attacks on Israelis.

Simultaneously, then, he tried to enjoy the benefits of peace and the benefits of war. He could continue pursuing victory through terror, while any Israeli retaliation or preventive efforts could be portrayed as aggression. Thus, ironically, the more terror he carried out, the more international support he could mobilize.

Many Western governments and newspapers were happy to blame Israel and ignore Palestinian violations. Actual Palestinian commitments - stopping terrorism and incitement - were forgotten while Israel was criticized over prisoner releases and building a defensive fence, things not mentioned in the road map.

Most remarkably of all, this strategy turned upside down the US effort to promote Palestinian moderates, notably Abu Mazen. Rather than him posing a threat to Arafat's power, he was totally subverted and turned into a cover for advancing the radicals' aims. Thus the Western states gave money and demanded Israeli concessions to help Abu Mazen while Arafat pocketed all the gains. Palestinians were left in no doubt by their leadership that Arafat was their leader and that they owed any benefits to him.

What is the basic solution? There is no hope to even begin negotiating a peace agreement. We can, however, strive for a real cease-fire and continue - albeit with all due skepticism - to try helping those Palestinians who want peace and a peaceful state of their own alongside Israel.

This requires neutralizing Arafat's two efforts. Terrorism must be foiled by Israeli military action and building a defensive fence.

But the big change must be in dealing with Arafat's second tactic. It is

time for the world to wake up and understand that Arafat and his followers are behaving like the equivalent of Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein. The world should be on Israel's side. It should understand that the terrorism aimed at Israel is no different from what took place in Bali and Baghdad, in New York and Washington on September 11, or in Algeria and Saudi Arabia.

To portray the situation in a false light, to provide aid and sympathy for Arafat's movement, is to justify that terrorism, make peace harder to achieve, and be responsible for the continued death and suffering on both sides.

The sponsors of the road map should declare that the Palestinian side has destroyed any chance of progress. Otherwise, they will be rewarding the strategy of terrorism and encouraging more in future, not only against Israel but also against themselves. (Jerusalem Post Aug 26)

*The writer is director of the Global Research in International Affairs (GLORIA) Center and editor of the Middle East Review of International Affairs (MERIA) Journal, part of the Interdisciplinary Center Herzliya (IDC).*

### **The Protagoras Principle** By Sarah Honig

We justifiably resent illusionist abuse of reason, falsification of truth and cynical twisting of words in public discourse. But these aren't modern phenomena. Distortive dialectics were being expertly practiced already in ancient Greece. It was the finely-honed specialty of thinkers known collectively as the Old Sophists. First and foremost among them was Protagoras, after whom Plato named one of his most famous dialogues.

So great was Protagoras's reputation for guile that he was eagerly sought as a teacher of shifty polemics. His tutorials didn't come cheap. According to Plato, Protagoras made more than Phidias and 10 other sculptors put together.

This spurred one of Protagoras's students to elude exorbitant tuition fees by contracting an agreement that exempted him from payment until he won his first legal case. Since the student never took up litigation, Protagoras sued him, confident of victory no matter how the trial went. If the ruling favored Protagoras, he'd collect the debt owed him. If Protagoras lost, his student would pay up by virtue of having won a legal case. The student felt equally self-assured. A favorable ruling meant he was not delinquent, while losing his case freed him from having to fork anything over.

Utterly bewildered, the judges decided to adjourn for 100 years. Such shenanigans, of course, would hardly wow anyone in our region. We regularly witness far more outrageous flip-flops of logic and scruples.

Take the hudna, for example. This hocus-pocus, conjured up by Arabs, hinges on submitting the bill to Israel. The cease-fire protects terrorists despite Palestinian Authority undertakings to fire on said terrorists. Immune from attack, these terrorists can carry on terrorizing Israelis.

Low-key Israeli self-defense is decreed as a violation of the hudna, to which Israel was never a party. Ongoing terror isn't a violation thereof.

Bloodshed doesn't invalidate a cease-fire. Palestinian Authority Premier Mahmoud Abbas says the hudna lives on, and the State Department insists its road map to peace is intact.

So much for common sense.

Baffled? Protagoras would be too. Even if he and his artful dodger student put both their cunning heads together, they couldn't unsnarl the above tangle of deception and misrepresentation. But they would recognize Abbas as one of their own and salute him as the craftiest of sophists.

Abbas probably never heard of Protagoras, but he might as well have taken lessons from the old master on how to outsmart an adversary.

It's hard to imagine a greater virtuoso practitioner of the Protagoras principle of having it both ways. Win - you win. Lose - you also win.

Abbas welches on his undeniable road map commitments, yet maintains that he fulfills them to the letter. If he gets away with that - as the international community is quite content to let him - then he is a local hero. If Israel, however, doesn't fully acquiesce in his equivocations, then he becomes the harassed, piteously pleading weakling. Vocal locals would avidly corroborate his assertions of helplessness, while the international community would offer unstinting succor. Abbas can't lose.

If Israel swallows the hudna ruse, fine. If it gets edgy, then anything that goes awry becomes its fault. It's airtight.

The continued existence of bomb factories may be indefensible, but Abbas needn't be overwrought. The international community obligingly turns a blind eye. If Israel insists on hindering explosives manufacture, then he emits his woeful victim wail and points to Israel as the wicked villain.

While he allowed Islamic Jihad's Hebron chief Muhammad Sider to stay at large, Abbas came off as the guardian of patriotic Palestinian solidarity. When Israel finally ended Sider's bloody career, it was accused of criminally disturbing the non-peace, for which Sider's sidekicks vowed to exact bloody retribution.

According to Washington's road map, Sider's confederates should have been rounded up. Abbas's excuses are varied, as befits any self-respecting sophist.

First off, he doesn't control Hebron (yet). Granted, his intelligence sources are superior to Israel's, but cooperating would compromise his patriotic credentials. Citing his famous weakness, Abbas deferred to a terrorist veto against Israel's offer to avoid confrontation by moving wanted murderers (like Sider) to a Jericho refuge.

But what of terrorists in his own Gaza stronghold? Surely he can place these

miscreants in custody, as per his road map promises to combat terror, which he effusively offered at the Aqaba summit to please the beaming US president. Ah, but these were "clarified" post-summit, when we were informed that the intifada isn't terror but a struggle for freedom.

Thus Abdel-Aziz Rantisi can rant on with impunity, advise Israelis, as he did last week, to return whence they came and pledge to liberate Haifa and Jaffa. Abbas won't touch him. Neither will he target Gaza's hardly-clandestine Kassam production. Rockets and mortars are openly tested there daily, which doesn't perturb Abbas. Neither does the subterranean smuggling of weaponry via tunnels under the Egyptian border. Since these aren't mentioned in the hudna, they don't concern Abbas, who, like any true-blue sophist, is a stickler for any detail advantageous to himself.

No one can accuse him of reneging on anything. Didn't he recognize Israel, as required? Admittedly, he did refrain from legitimizing it as a Jewish state, but that was for fear of waiving the right to Arabize it. Still, it's okay by Abbas if the third Arab state in original Mandate territory (after Jordan and Palestine) is called Israel. This doesn't preclude overrunning it with millions of "repatriated" Arab refugees. The name will be changed later by the Arab majority. No need to quibble about it prematurely.

Abbas is in no rush. If he needs anything it's time - time for Israel to grow accustomed to a somewhat fiery cease-fire, with gradually escalating doses of terrorism. Since for all their rhetoric, Israelis lap up the hudna, they won't want to be seen as scuttling it. While they compulsively perform the role of the classic dupe scripted for them, he can get away with anything. He's safe as long as no one gets wise to his sophist wiles and looks up Aristotle's warnings against the Protagoras pattern of "making the weaker arguments sound stronger" and the false sound true. (Jerusalem Post Aug 27)

### **America Turns its Back on '242'** By Shmuel Katz

Does the administration really want Israel to return to the 1949 armistice lines? If not, why the threats?

Early in August 1939 - just a month before Hitler invaded Poland - British prime minister Neville Chamberlain was still hoping that the Polish government could be persuaded to make concessions to Hitler and thus "avert" war. Chamberlain realized that the Poles, remembering only too well how he had sold out the Czechs, would not listen to him, so he asked US president Franklin Roosevelt to pressure the Poles; but Roosevelt politely declined. Winston Churchill, as a member of parliament, approached foreign secretary Lord Halifax and told him that "he had no wish to be more Polish than the Poles, but he was anxious that the government should not put pressure on the Polish government to take action which in their view would be destructive of their state."

President George W. Bush evidently does not have such wise counselors. It is bad enough that the Bush administration joined some of Israel's worst ill-wishers - not to mention outright enemies - and behind our back dictated a road map mortally affecting our future. But now the US is trying to dictate to Israel what amounts to a weakening of our defense mechanism against Arab terror. Secretary of State Colin Powell threatened that loan guarantees recently accorded Israel would be cut if the government did not amend its plan for a security fence designed by experts to block Arab terror - and to adjust the line to Bush's dream for the Arab state. What the administration wants is that Israel should return to the 1949 Armistice lines, as demanded by the Arabs, or even to the original 1947 partition plan, and to put up a Palestinian state on the other side of these lines.

Bush seems to want to forget that the very idea of a security fence arose as a result of the latest Arab terror campaign against our civilian population. In that campaign they killed 800 - adults, youths and infants in arms. In the US that would mean, proportionate to population, 40,000 dead, more than 10 times the number murdered on 9/11 in New York.

That campaign moreover brought down on Israel an unprecedentedly serious economic crisis, and severe economic constraints. Hence Israel's request for American aid - hence America's loan guarantees.

But nobody would have believed that the US government would want to use the loan guarantees as a means of pressure to get Israel to take action which would weaken its defenses against Arab terror.

The threat pronounced by Powell, however, carries a deeper connotation. Those lines of 1949 are seen by the Arabs as marking the phase leading to Israel's annihilation. This is no secret. It has been drummed into us for decades through every Arab channel of public information and clerical admonition. It has served as the motto for the Arab wars on us. Let me bring here the words written in 1964 - three years before the Arab aggression of 1967 - by the world's foremost Islamic scholar, Professor Bernard Lewis:

"The official Arab demand," (he wrote in his *The Middle East and the West*) "is no longer for the immediate destruction of Israel but for its reduction to the frontier laid down in the 1947 partition proposal, obviously as a first step towards its ultimate disappearance. Since Israel, clearly, would not submit voluntarily to such a truncation, and since the Arab states alone are unable to enforce it, this amounts in effect to a demand for an imposed settlement by the great powers."

Bernard Lewis only did not foresee that the imposed settlement

contemplated by the US, with Britain, Saudi Arabia, et al, would be called a road map.

This is not all. The administration thus comes into stark conflict with the one legally binding resolution on the dispute by the UN Security Council, Resolution 242 of November 1967. That resolution, the outcome of a lengthy debate in the council, specifically rules out an Israeli withdrawal to the armistice lines of 1949. The resolution required Israel's "withdrawal from territories captured" in the Six Day War to "secure and recognized borders."

It rejected a pro-Arab French proposal for an Israeli withdrawal from all the territories captured in that war.

Resolution 242 was far from providing Israel's security needs, let alone assuring Jewish historical rights as projected in the League of Nations Mandate of 1922. Indeed, an official survey commissioned by president Lyndon Johnson and carried out at that very time by the Chiefs of Staff Committee headed by General Earle G. Wheeler, found that Israel's "minimum security" required it to hold on to practically the whole of the lands retrieved in the Six Day War, in Palestine (Judea, Samaria, the Gaza Strip) as well as the Golan Heights and a small corner of Sinai.

Significantly, that report was kept secret and was at once suppressed by Washington (no doubt because of cross-currents between the Pentagon and the State Department). It saw the light of day only 11 years later.

Meantime Israel, the victim of repeated aggression by the Arab states, did not at once accept the concept of withdrawal contained in Resolution 242. Only after a protracted debate in the Israeli cabinet, and because that resolution did at least make it clear that there would be no return to the 1949 lines, did Israel accept the resolution in May 1968.

It was, let it be recalled, the American and British delegates on the Security Council who fought hard in the council for what became the official text of Resolution 242. Now the US disavows that UN Resolution, embraces the counter-resolution (threatening the existence of Israel)—and, through its secretary of state, threatens Israel with sanctions for not conforming.

*The writer, a co-founder with Menachem Begin of the Herut Party and member of the first Knesset, is a biographer and essayist. (Jerusalem Post Aug 27)*

## The Future of the Miraculous State of Israel

By Rabbi Dr. Nathan Lopes Cardozo

*In memory of the victims of last week's terrorist attack in Yerushalayim*

On the words: "In the beginning God created heaven and earth" (Bereshith 1:1), Rashi quotes the famous observation by Rabbi Yitzchak\*:

"If the nations of the world accuse Israel of banditry by conquering the land of Israel? then the people of Israel will answer and say: "In the beginning God created heaven and earth. The entire universe belongs to Him. He created it and He gave it to whomever He deemed fit. It was His desire to give [the land] to the Caananites first and it was His desire to take it from them and to grant it to us."

Chatam Sofer in his drashoth (sermons) on the festival of Simchath Torah gives the observation of Rabbi Yitzchak a most dramatic bend. In his opinion the objection of the nations of the world is not that the people of Israel should not be the owners of the land of Israel but that they could never inhabit the land lawfully if it was not given to them through the occurrence of open miracles. The people of Israel are a nation that typifies the concept of miracles. If they would have conquered the land by banditry, i.e. by physical force, and not through the miraculous intervention of God then their occupation of the land would have had no validity. Only when it is clear that God gave the land to the Israelites through miracles can there be a lawful claim.

This, after all, is what the people of Israel are all about since the miraculous Exodus from Egypt.

This observation is not only daring but, above all, of great profundity.

Chatam Sofer explains that the Jewish response to this objection of the nations of the world is reflected in Rashi's insistence to use Rabbi Yitzchak's observation in relationship to the creation of the universe. His point is that the creation chapter teaches us that all existence is miraculous. All of the creation is ultimately unexplainable, and therefore all that happens within creation is "supernatural." Even the laws of nature are nothing else than a frequency of miracles. As such the conquest of the land was indeed miraculous and not just the result of banditry.

This, however, needs some explanation. After all, if "all is miracle" what then is there special about Israel's miraculous nature? There can only be one answer. Within the "frequency of miracles" Israel stands out as a nation which experiences miracles which normally do not happen as part of the laws of nature and which have no universal applications. These are the "unnatural" miracles such as the splitting of the Red Sea and the open miracles mentioned in other parts of Tanach and later Jewish history.

It is especially in our days that we should take Rabbi Yitzchak's observation as understood by Chatam Sofer utmost serious: The nations of the world are absolutely correct. The people of Israel are only able to hold onto the land because of miracles. Otherwise they would not be able to inhabit this land for even one day. The mistake of the gentile nations, however, is that they are not prepared to see the multitude of miracles which made it possible for the people of Israel to "conquer" the land. Instead they are convinced that it was conventional warfare which gave the Jews the land.

When one carefully studies Jewish history from the early Biblical days till our

own times, one can only conclude that Jews were constantly accompanied by miracles, large and small. This was true when they entered the land in the days of Yehoshua, and when they established the State of Israel in 1948. It was especially the Six Day War which made this abundantly clear.

Even after the downfall of the Jewish Commonwealth nearly two thousand years ago, Jews, while living in the Diaspora, experienced an ongoing supernatural protection despite the many inquisitions, pogroms and even holocausts. Jews survived six empires, exile to all the corners of the earth, ridicule, murder and torture, and incarceration in ghettos without any defense or money. And after all this, Jews stood at the tombstones of their enemies, outlived them all and returned to their homeland 2000 years later as lively as ever. All this is sui generis, unprecedented, and, for many, too much to bear.

It was Nicholas Berdyaev (1874-1948), the famous Russian author and philosopher who, in his book "The Meaning of History," asked his readers to take proper notice of this fact:

And according to the materialistic and positivistic criterion, this people ought to have perished long ago. Its survival is a mysterious and wonderful phenomenon demonstrating that the life of this people is governed by a special predetermination, transcending the process of adaptation expounded by the materialistic interpretation of history. The survival of the Jews, their resistance to destruction, their endurance under absolutely peculiar conditions and the fateful role played by them in history; all these point to the particular and mysterious foundations of their destiny.

For over 50 years the Israeli State has been surrounded by more than a hundred million human beings living in numerous Arab countries occupying more land than the United States. All of them, even those who have made peace with the Jewish State, consider Israel as a cancerous growth in their midst. Israel has fought war after war to defend itself against these nations. Logically speaking the Israeli State should never have survived. That it did is completely beyond human comprehension and openly alludes to the protection of a Higher Power.

It is this Power which again at this hour can clearly be noted. One of the most astonishing facts of the present situation in Israel is that while the Israeli State finds itself in the middle of a most serious guerrilla war with the PLO and other terrorist organizations, day-to-day life, although hampered, continues. While terrorist attacks could, God forbid take place every day and bombs could explode by the hundreds in any street in the land of Israel, nothing close to this actually happens. While we would never, God forbid, underestimate or deny the tragedy of the loss of many of our people who have fallen victim to terrorist attacks, or the fear of those brave Jews in the settlements who try to defend themselves under the most difficult of circumstances, we must admit that at this moment the people of Israel are once more experiencing a great amount of miracles. Not only do we hear of daily miracles in which people in astonishing ways are spared from actual terrorist attacks but also the realization that our children and grandchildren still walk freely around in our neighborhoods astonishes us not a little. Such a luxury is not even possible in cities like New York and Los Angeles

While nearly every night Palestinian terrorists fire hundreds of bullets on homes and people in the Jerusalem suburb of Gilo, it is incomprehensible and nearly ironic that a few hundreds meters away people gather for the evening prayers in the synagogues, study Talmud, drink coffee and sing zemirot at the Shabbath table. An uninformed outsider would not know that a war is taking place only a few hundreds meters away from there. Would something like this happen anywhere in the world, all normal life would have come to a standstill and pandemonium would have broken out.

This indeed reflects the nature of the people of Israel. It should, however, not encourage a fatalistic attitude. There is no way of predicting the future. Neither would it be right to just rely on a continuation of these miracles. Miracles are not to be taken for granted. One needs to merit them and to recognize them as such. Israelis have become used to miracles, and that is exactly where the problem starts.

The question at this crucial moment in Jewish history is not if the nations of the world understand the miraculous existence of the State of Israel, but if the Jews themselves are prepared to see this reality. It should be realized that miracles have only been part of Israel's history as long as Jews in and outside the land have done everything to merit such Divine intervention. Secularizing the Jewish State, adopting anti-Jewish values, uprooting Jewish education and love for the Jewish Tradition will slowly but surely empty the land of miracles. This is suicidal. But if Jews are proud of their Jewish Tradition, committed to Jewish values, miracles will continue as before. This is not wishful thinking but the realistic lesson learned from 4000 years of Jewish History.

If Jews will realize that and act accordingly, we can be sure that the State of Israel will overcome whatever its enemies may have in mind. But if Jews, in and outside Israel, become blind to this reality, nothing will stop the deterioration of this beautiful state.

\*It is not clear who this Rabbi Yitzchak was. People are accustomed to believe that it was the father of Rashi. This view is also stated by Divrei David by Taz. However this statement is also found in Yalkuth Shimoni, Parashath Bo, Remez 177, quoting Midrash Tanchuma in the name of an anonymous source.

*The writer is the dean of the David Cardozo Academy Machon Ohr Aaron*