



Jerusalem 6:20; Toronto 7:31

## Commentary...

### Jewish Neutrality on Israel

By Barbara Sofer

Living in Israel, I have naively believed that whether or not a president of the United States supported the State of Israel would make a significant difference to my voting Diaspora brethren. That was particularly true after these four painful years of terror. I imagined the awkwardness of Democrats voting Republican for the first time because of President George W. Bush's closeness to us during these times. I was wrong.

This isn't a question of Republican or Democrat. According to a recent poll, for only one of the seven Jews who step into a voting booth for the presidential election will the candidate's attitude towards Israel prove crucial. Most don't care. This revelation comes from a survey conducted on July 26-28 by Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research for the National Jewish Democratic Council. Forty-two percent of those polled do worry about terrorism and national security. Three percent will vote for Ralph Nader, the candidate who suggests that the Bush administration is a puppet of the Israeli government. A mere 15% of Jewish voters see Israel as the lynchpin of their voting decision.

Remember that American Jewish support of candidates at the polling booth and in campaign fundraising – not our estimable democracy or our biblical promise—are the most important factors in the American government's support of Israel, according to Uzi Dayan, the former head of Israel's National Security Council. But according to this poll, President Bush's support of Israel did nothing for him in the Jewish community. So whoever wins the race may easily conclude: Why bother?

Explaining the lack of zeal about Israel, the New York Jewish Week, a distinguished newspaper with a Zionist editor, suggests that "the suicide war has taken its toll on American Jewish support. [resulting in] a sense of fatigue in the effort to keep Israel at the highest levels of concern through four years of bloodshed. The longer the war drags on, one fears, the more observers tend to equate the Palestinians and Israelis as combatants who refuse to make peace."

Among the factors that Brandeis University historian Jonathan Sarna blames for the low priority placed on Israel are "the growing emotional detachment of younger Jews from Israel" and the "increasing discomfort many liberal Jews feel with Israel."

Ouch. In addition to having had to face an attack on our very existence – 25% of Israel's population have been close enough to hear at least one bomb go off – we are being patronized and punished as irredeemable warmongers. Once again, we bemoan the failure of our flaccid national public relations campaign, which has failed to prevent this new equivalency of bellicosity among our own Jews. Once again we are assailed by a sense of unfairness.

But – even more important – what consequence does the indifference to Israel have within the world of the Jewish people? American Jewish Committee Executive Director David Harris sees the poll as good news. He told the JTA that the real winner was the Jewish community, courted by both sides: "The key for me is that the Jewish vote is still very much in play. Both parties are making a concerted effort to go after [it]."

Sorry, but this Zionist can't share Harris's optimism. I'm deeply disappointed that so few of my fellow Jews feel love or family affiliation with the Jewish state. At the very least, I'd expect them to care out of self-interest. My version of Zionism includes the notion that Israel's continued existence and prosperity are important to all Jewish voters.

What can we do? It's so easy and pointless to cast blame. The survey demands a drastic awakening among those cherished brethren who do care. What a daunting challenge: How do we get our own community to love Zion? There's no time to lose. I suggest that all rabbis focus their High Holiday sermons on the need to support Israel and then announce the immediate reinstatement of bar/bat-Mitzva programs that bring high school students and their families to Israel. Absence doesn't make the heart grow fonder. 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*

requirement for leadership in Jewish organizations to study in Israel must be renewed.

Don't wait for birthright Israel to mold your offspring's Jewish identity. Every family should set up an Israel Travel Fund. I have friends that took home improvement loans to travel to Israel. They felt they couldn't think of anything that would improve their home more. Every Jewish parent should insist on Jewish pre-school and

Jewish summer camp, encourage kids to apply to colleges that have large Jewish populations, and boycott universities fermenting with anti-Israel activism.

Philanthropists, hold back checks and pledges from universities until you are sure Israel isn't vilified in the Middle East departments. Instead, redirect those checks to support Jewish day schools and summer camps. And Jewish students, don't hesitate to cross campus wearing Jewish stars and kippot.

Grandparents, take on the traditional role as an unflagging resource of Judaism and Zionism. Get educated yourself, and bestow Jewish books, Jewish games, theater tickets to Jewish plays, Jewish jewelry, and Jewish trips. Having Jewish grandchildren is a privilege and a responsibility.

Indifference shouldn't be confused with commendable neutrality.

The Greenberg survey was conducted on Tisha Be'av. Let it be a wake-up call that leads us to rethink and rebuild. (Jerusalem Post Sep 2)

### As the Torch Goes out Jerusalem Post Editorial

Twenty years ago, despite fielding its largest Olympic team until that time, Israel performed dismally at the 1984 games in Los Angeles. The crowning achievement was Aviram Mizrahi's fourth place in the kayaking semifinals, missing the final by 40 hundredths of a second.

For its first 44 years of existence, the defining Olympic moment for Israel was the Olympic flag at half-mast in the 1972 Munich games, marking the murder of 11 members of the Israeli team by Palestinian terrorists. The refusal of the Iranian judoist to fight an Israeli competitor at the start of these games was a somber reminder of the anti-Semitic hatred that mars an event that is supposed to unite all nations.

After the Los Angeles debacle, the Israeli Olympic committee formed a special unit for achievements in sports, with the express purpose of putting an Israeli on the podium one day. The unit was supposed to scout out the best athletes in all fields, and provide them with professional support, trainers, facilities, scholarships, medical treatment, and decide whether they should be given a place on the national team. At the time, sports officials tried to lower expectations and predicted a first Israeli medal in at the least 20 years. In the end it took eight years for Israel to win a silver and bronze in Barcelona. Since then, four games have passed, and at least one Israeli has stood in each on the podium. Indeed, 20 years later, Hatikva was played for the first time in honor of Gal Fridman's gold medal in Mistral windsurfing.

The string of successes can be attributed to better preparation, greater affluence, new immigrants, or just sheer luck, but that doesn't take anything away from the excitement. Few of us know the first thing about windsurfing but it didn't stop Israelis in offices and holiday places around the country from taking a break at one in the afternoon to watch the last 40-minute race on Wednesday, and many went home to see the historic final with their children.

After winning, Fridman said he "felt the whole nation pushing me on." There was little exaggeration in those words, and he graciously dedicated the medal to the 11 martyrs of Munich, killed three years before he was born.

For Israelis so used to being glued to their TV screens at times of tragedy, it was a golden moment that moved all but the most steadfast cynics.

There was no shortage of those, of course. They ranged from the haredi daily Yated Ne'eman, which upbraided Israeli society for caring so much about empty Hellenistic ideals, to Yahad MK Yossi Sarid, who asked in the Knesset who paid for Education, Culture, and Sports Minister Limor Livnat's second trip in a week to Athens.

**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)**

We shouldn't let these spoilsports ruin it for us, however. Despite the rhetoric, it's a safe bet that many haredim took the trouble to be close to a television on Wednesday and were as happy at the rest of us. As for Livnat, her jumping up on the podium even before the medalists had their traditional photo taken was a bit ridiculous, but why should we begrudge her the moment of triumph that united us all. We have so few of them.

We know that Israel is not about to become an Olympic power. We may not see another gold medal for some time. But this is all the more reason to savor this moment, which shows that even a tiny, embattled country can shine if given some good will and a level playing field, two commodities which for us do not always seem to be in sufficient supply.

So tonight, as the Olympic torch is put out, let's try and hold on a bit longer to those rare glorious moments on Wednesday when a whole nation felt it was also struggling there on the waves of the Aegean Sea and standing proud with the flag, singing Hatikva. (Jerusalem Post Aug 29)

---

### **Solana's Solicitude** Jerusalem Post Editorial

The tragic fact of yesterday's double suicide bus bombings in Beersheba is that 16 people lost their lives, and another 15 nearly did. The significant fact is that this is the first suicide bombing since March. If the bombing marks the end of a remarkably long quiet spell, it also indicates the progress we have achieved.

Let's remind ourselves – or rather, the wider world – of where we were 30 months ago, on the eve of Operation Defensive Shield: terrorist attacks nearly every day, sometimes twice a day. Yet when Israel launched its invasion of the West Bank, the sage men of the world assured us it would fail. "For Mr. Sharon," sniffed New York Times columnist Nicholas Kristof, "tanks seem to work no better in the West Bank than they did in Lebanon."

As it turned out, however, the tanks did work, as did the targeted assassinations and all the other counter-terror and counter-insurgency tactics developed by the IDF and Shin Bet. So too did the security fence: The telling fact about yesterday's attack is that the attackers arrived in Beersheba from Hebron, unimpeded by the fence. Had the fence been there, it's doubtful they would have penetrated.

By now, it's too late for the International Court of Justice to take this fact into consideration – not that they would have done so anyway. It's also too late for the European Union, which instead offered Israel a five-sentence condolence note via EU representative Javier Solana.

"I condemn in the strongest terms the terrorist attacks in Beersheba today," he wrote. "I want first of all to express my sympathy and deepest condolences to the families of the victims and to the Israeli authorities. Violence must stop. It seriously undermines all efforts to find a solution to the Middle East conflict. The implementation of the road map is the only way ahead."

Note well: Solana condemns "terrorist attacks," but does not name its perpetrators. He says "violence must stop," without addressing the source of this particular violence. He offers sympathy for Israeli victims and authorities, then prescribes the road map as "the only way ahead." But the road map has not saved a single Israeli life. The security fence has saved dozens of lives, perhaps hundreds. What kind of sympathy is it that would deny victims the means to defend themselves? This is more than a rhetorical question. Solana, no doubt, would answer that he approves of all means provided they are "legitimate." But we search our minds in vain for "legitimate" means to stop terrorism that are also effective. In his recently published memoir, former foreign minister Shlomo Ben-Ami relates a conversation he had with German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer in late October 2000, after the outbreak of hostilities.

"I asked in a harsh tone, for the first time since our talks began, to cease to give us advice and to try to enter into Israel's skin. 'Please ask your country's military experts, what can be done in such a situation? Send your military attache in Tel Aviv to join the OC Central Command; maybe he will have a proposal about which we did not know,' I said. 'What do you want us to do? Should we evacuate the residents of Jerusalem's outlying neighborhoods and send them northwards, so that we will not have to respond to Palestinian shooting?'"

Ben-Ami does not relate Fischer's response. We wonder if he had one. For the plain fact is that Europe's idea of friendship comes down to offering Israel simplistic platitudes about the advantages of cooperation over conflict (as if this had not occurred to us), not practical advice about how a democracy at war ought to operate.

There is something profoundly amiss about a species of condolence that offers itself in lieu of the kind of help that might have made the condolence unnecessary in the first place. We are perfectly aware that, ultimately, the "solution" is peace. The question is, will the European Union allow us to defend ourselves in the meantime? Or in defending ourselves, do we put the ultimate peace further out of reach? The fact that this is presented as a "choice" demonstrates how false it really is. (Jerusalem Post Sep 1)

### **Shadow on the Alliance** By Jonathan Tobin

*A bizarre allegation with sinister overtones overshadows the real fight against terror*

One of the major foreign-policy themes of this week's news cycle should have been the strength of the alliance between Israel and the United States.

Remarks made Monday night at the Republican National Convention by former New York City Mayor Rudy Giuliani linked terrorist attacks on Israel down through the years. He rightly cited the 1972 Munich Olympic massacre and the continued perfidy of Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat and linked them to the Sept. 11 assault on America.

These words should have resonated even more after the following day's carnage in Beersheva, Israel, when a double terrorist bus bombing took the lives of at least 16 innocent Israeli men, women and children, and wounded 100 more.

But instead of focusing on the common fight against Islamic terrorists and the common threat to both countries from a terror sponsor, such as Iran acquiring nuclear weapons, something else seemed to dominate conversations in Washington and elsewhere: Accusations that an Israeli "mole" - as some headlines put it - was operating in the Department of Defense.

The shocking allegations were leaked first to CBS News on Friday night and then spread across the media. By Sunday, the alleged "mole" was revealed to be a non-Jewish, low-level official who had also worked as a defense attaché at the American embassy in Israel. The alleged middleman was supposedly someone at the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, the pre-eminent pro-Israel lobby.

But even as the charges echoed throughout the country, serious questions about the credibility of the charges and their seriousness were being raised.

If the Feds were really hot on the trail of an Israeli "spy" and had the goods on him, why would they run to Leslie Stahl of CBS (and, subsequently, journalists at Newsweek, The New York Times, etc.) instead of acting quietly, getting an indictment and arresting the miscreants?

Was the case about to fizzle for lack of proof or substance, and was a media splash the best way to keep a specious charge alive?

Why would so many characterize the case as one involving "spying" when what was supposedly involved was not intelligence material, but merely the discussion of a draft of a rejected policy paper urging stronger action against Iran?

Why would Israel need to spy on the United States to get information on Iran policy when it is well-known that a large percentage of Washington's intelligence on Iran comes from Israel? The initial CBS report claimed that the "mole" got Israel "inside the decision-making loop." But the Israelis already have access to this discussion at the very top of the Washington food chain.

Why would Israel do anything that might undermine the Bush administration's extremely supportive posture toward the Jewish state? And why would AIPAC be a party to anything that might tarnish its standing in Washington?

There may be good answers to all these questions. We'll have to see if the subsequent leaks, which promised imminent charges and arrests, prove to be more than hot air.

But the bottom line here is that all of this remains extremely suspicious, especially at a time when relations between some in the intelligence apparatus and the Department of Defense are so shaky. And considering the smears that have been put about against the office of Undersecretary of Defense Douglas Feith - and other "neo-conservatives" who advocated for the ouster of Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein and a tougher policy toward Iran - one has to wonder. The coming weeks may reveal that someone did something wrong and deserves to be punished for breaking the law. But if what we are talking about is little more than the routine sharing of opinions (over lunch, no less) about policy that goes on everywhere in Washington, is this worthy of a yearlong investigation?

Doesn't this story, based solely on anonymous sources, sound more like the canards about the Jews in the administration manipulating America into a war that were pushed by extremists, rather than a solid story that journalists can back up on their own?

None of it makes much sense except for the subsequent anonymous claims from those close to the investigation that the publicity will hurt their ability to follow through on the case. That seems like a convenient way to alibi their way out of pursuing a case that may be much ado about almost nothing.

What also makes sense is that there are many people in Washington who want desperately to cut AIPAC down to size, and wouldn't flinch from smearing them, and a possibly innocent public servant, to do that.

For years, the great "power" of AIPAC to help Israel in the capital has been a legend, but the truth is their power is a function of nothing more than

an efficient organization, hard work and a good cause that has the overwhelming bipartisan support of both the Congress and the American people.

Another plain fact is that there are some in the intelligence apparatus, the State Department and the media who would like to separate Israel and the United States. They are uncomfortable with the willingness of the Bush administration to tell the truth about Arafat and to go farther toward supporting Israel than their predecessors.

And there's another point that must be raised here. A terrible mistake committed by Israel 20 years ago lends some credibility to even a wild story like this tale - the Jonathan Pollard affair.

The saga of Pollard has gone on so long that it has assumed almost mythic proportions among his supporters and detractors. But no matter how you approach it, the mere fact that an American Jewish employee of the U.S. Navy was paid by Israel to hand over vast stores of intelligence materials will always make Israel guilty until proven innocent in the eyes of some.

Pollard's life sentence may have been excessive, and no purpose may be served by keeping him in jail after 19 years in prison, but the damage he and his feckless Israeli handlers did to the alliance lives on.

In spite of all this, the bottom line remains that, whether some in Washington want to admit it or not, America and Israel are fighting a common war against common foes. As Guiliani said, "terrorism did not start on Sept. 11, 2001."

Both Israel and the United States need to stay, as Guiliani said, "on offense," against the murderers, and anything anyone does that distracts from that task is a grave disservice to the dead and to those who will pay with their lives for our failure to continue to act aggressively against a determined enemy.

(Jewish World Review Sep 1)

*The writer is executive editor of the Philadelphia Jewish Exponent.*

---

### **Bad Advice from the Justice Ministry** By Evelyn Gordon

Two weeks ago, I believed that nobody could make a worse botch of Israel's public relations than the Foreign Ministry has. I now know that I was wrong: Were the Justice Ministry in charge, Israel's international position would be infinitely worse.

After the International Court of Justice issued its advisory opinion on the separation fence, Attorney-General Menahem Mazuz appointed a team of senior ministry officials to analyze the opinion's implications. The team's recommendations would be devastating for Israel's foreign and security policy.

But the authors were not thinking about future negotiations or fighting terrorism; they were trying to counter what they viewed as a mortal threat to Israel's international standing: the danger that the court's opinion would "be used to expedite actions against Israel in international forums."

And that is what makes their conclusions so remarkable - because the policies they advocate would make this danger far greater.

According to Haaretz, the team's first recommendation was for Israel "to announce that it respects the court's decision, even though it was based on partial and outdated information." Yet the court's main conclusions were not based on "partial and outdated information" at all.

The court, for instance, was fully aware that its own charter forbids it to arbitrate bilateral disputes without the parties' consent; it simply argued that the Palestinian cause justified ignoring this provision.

It was equally aware that the UN Charter grants member states the right to self-defense: It merely declared that Israel should not be allowed to invoke this right against Palestinian bombers.

Nor were the judges ignorant of the 1922 League of Nations Mandate for Palestine, which they explicitly cited as a key element of the legal framework governing Israel and the territories: They simply neglected to mention that the Mandate assigned all of what is now Israel, the West Bank and Gaza to a "Jewish national home," as that would have hindered their assertion that the West Bank and Gaza are "occupied Palestinian territory."

In short, on every major issue the court's opinion was not based on ignorance; it was based on deliberate distortions of known facts and accepted legal principles in order to reach a predetermined conclusion.

Yet rather than advocating that Israel disseminate this message at every opportunity, the Justice Ministry wants Israel to legitimize the court's opinion by saying that it "respects" it.

That is rather like saying Israel should have "respected" the UN's infamous "Zionism equals racism" resolution rather than denouncing it as illegitimate. Or that Soviet Jews should have "respected" their government's refusal to let them emigrate, rather than campaigning against it.

Or that the world should have "respected" the Nazis' extermination campaign - which was, after all, based on "partial and outdated information" about the Jews' detrimental effect on Germany.

Gross injustice should never be "respected"; it should be uncompromisingly fought. And it is hard to imagine a grosser injustice than the ICJ's opinion on the fence.

The same error underlies the Justice Ministry's other key recommendation: that Israel formally apply the Fourth Geneva Convention to the West Bank and Gaza, thereby declaring them "occupied Palestinian territory," simply because that is what the ICJ says they are.

The ICJ's finding on this matter has no legal basis whatsoever.

The Geneva Convention explicitly defines "occupied territory" as territory seized from another sovereign state that is party to the convention. Yet the territories that Israel captured in 1967 belonged to no sovereign state: Jordan and Egypt had controlled the West Bank and Gaza, respectively, since 1948, but these annexations were never internationally recognized.

And before 1948, the territories were part of the Mandate - which explicitly assigned them to the Jewish state. Thus not only are these lands not "occupied territory," Israel has a strong legal claim to them.

But aside from the fact that the Justice Ministry's proposal would require Israel to perpetuate a lie (and also undermine its claim to retain parts of the territories under any agreement with the Palestinians), the implications for Israel's international standing are devastating - because if the West Bank and Gaza are indeed occupied Palestinian territory, then the settlements, including Jewish neighborhoods in east Jerusalem, are in fact illegal.

Thus by applying the convention Israel would turn perhaps half its citizens into war criminals by its own definition: the 200,000 Jewish residents of east Jerusalem, the 200,000 Jewish residents of the territories, every soldier or policeman who ever helped to protect them, every contractor or technician involved in building or servicing their houses, every member of every Israeli government since 1967, every member of every Jerusalem city council since 1967.

Granted, most of the world already believes this, which makes Israel's position difficult. But however difficult it is to keep insisting that Israel has a valid claim to this land, it is a piece of cake compared to the "defense" proposed by the Justice Ministry: We plead guilty, but intend to continue our crimes nonetheless. We admit that east Jerusalem is occupied territory, but will continue treating it as part of Israel.

We admit that Jews have no right to live in Ma'aleh Adumim, but will allow them to do so anyway. Try selling that argument overseas!

Indeed, the Justice Ministry's proposal would make the sanctions it claims to be trying to avert inevitable. Even Israel's best friends could not overlook an Israeli decision to openly flout the Geneva Convention rather than simply disputing its proper interpretation.

Countries often sacrifice truth and justice for self-interest - but to sacrifice truth and justice in order to undermine national self-interest is surely a new innovation. Yet that is precisely what the Justice Ministry advocates with regard to the ICJ. (Jerusalem Post Aug 31)

---

### **Terrorism Is Not a Crime!** By Jeff Dunetz

*Confessions of a one-issue voter*

America has always been a safe haven for Jews and a friend of Israel. Jews have bravely fought for this country, served in its government, and contributed to its society in so many ways. The US was the first country to recognize Israel, and has supported it with aid ever since - in an attempt to nurture what is still the region's only democracy.

Since being attacked on its own turf almost three years ago, America has joined the war against terrorists, the same enemy that Israel has been fighting for the last 40 years. The ironic thing is that since the US joined the war on terror, American Jews have felt threatened by accusations of a duality that doesn't exist. Many of us have struggled within ourselves to reconcile with this supposed duality that began to rear its ugly head in September of 2001. Certainly the recent allegations of Israel's spying on the US have not helped this struggle, even though the latest accounts seem to suggest that the charges may have been overblown.

Everyone remembers where they were when they found out about the attacks on 9/11. I was sitting in my office when I received an IM from my brother telling me of the first crash and urging me to turn on the TV. I remember surreal visions from my car as I drove home later in the day: the shocked people who were crowding the streets, struggling to get off that tiny island as soon as possible. The impenetrable curtain of black over the East River I saw out the car window as I went over the 59th Street Bridge was accompanied by a noxious smell of burning seeping in through the car vents.

Perhaps my most vivid of personal memories of that day came over the car radio. Tuned in to my usual fare WFAN a sports radio station, I listened in shock as two afternoon sports hosts, Mike Francesca and Chris Russo blamed the tragedy on the United States' support of Israel. They went even further suggesting that Jews in the U.S. needed to take a loyalty oath to decide between America and Israel. I do not know if they ever apologized

or tried to explain their insensitivity. After two weeks of waiting, I stopped listening to the station.

As we go through the campaigning season, those small-minded words resonate in my consciousness louder and louder. In just a few short months, we will be casting our votes for president and as that date approaches, it becomes increasingly clear that it is wrong for Jews to separate their love of Israel from their selection of the next leader of the free world.

When that curtain closes behind me in November, I will be voting based on one issue - which candidate will be best for Israel. And with all due respect to Messrs. Francesca and Russo (and based on their comments very little respect is due) there is no paradox created by a loyalty to both Israel and the United States. The best candidate for Israel is also the best one for the United States.

There are some very important issues being discussed by the Presidential candidates. The economy for instance, it has been in tough shape since early 2001. Also important are the social welfare issues, such as education and affordable medicine for our seniors. But each time I try to focus on those issues, I see the panic of people trying to get out of Manhattan and that impenetrable black cloud that changed the entire world as it was still hovering over the East River.

The number one issue facing the United States and Israel is the war against terrorism. Everything else pales by comparison. Before we get to work on the economy and social issues, we need to make sure that our children and grand children won't have their flesh splattered on the walls of an ice cream parlor by a homicide bomber motivated by a religious cleric intent on killing as many civilians as possible.

Recently France went on high alert because of the fear that they were going to be the target of a major terror attack, in Iraq they have had two of their journalists kidnapped and threatened with beheading. It is ironic that even though it is the nation that lead the diplomatic fight against the invasion of Iraq - even though its government has nursed Palestinian terror to adulthood with its support of Arafat, France needs to worry about terror. Still the French government does not understand the issue. But we Americans must! The Islamic terrorists believe that France and French culture is evil. America is the great Satan and Israel is the little Satan vilified by the Islamic world not because of the West Bank and Gaza, but because it is a beachhead of western culture in their "Neighborhood".

Very few countries understand this. That is one of the reasons why the US and Israel are just a few of a small group of nations locked into this battle to protect our children against the terrorist world. If (G-d forbid) there was no Israel, there would still be terrorists, they would just be concentrating more of their energy in North America, Western Europe and Russia.

Terrorists learn fast. When Arafat was rewarded for all his years of murder with Oslo, the PLO learned that terror worked and it brought about this present wave of terror in Israel. The withdrawal from Lebanon was another positive learning experience for terror.

September 11 was not the first terrorist attack on the United States. That attack was foreshadowed by incidents such as the first trade center bombing and the attack on the USS Cole in Yemen. Those earlier acts were treated by the United States as crimes, each perpetuated by small group of terrorist operators. It was only after 9/11 that this country realized that there was a worldwide network of people willing to kill themselves to bring down our way of life. Only after 9/11 did we stop searching for "criminals" and begin a war against terrorism.

There is a clear distinction between the two candidates on this issue. John Kerry tends to talk about terrorism as a crime. In an appearance on Fox news, Kerry quoted what he wrote in the book *The New War*: He said, "In that book, I wrote about how we needed to strengthen our ability to be able to fight international criminal crime, including terror." In another selection of the book, which he did not cite on Fox, the senator claimed, "The damage done by international crime is rarely as specific and dramatic as that of a terrorist attack, but in fact it is greater."

Thus when he said in his book that Yassir Arafat was a role model for other terrorists, (because he has made a transformation from outlaw to statesman) it was in the context of jurisprudence, prisoners being able to be rehabilitated.

While history has shown this viewpoint as naïve, Kerry's suggestion that Arafat has been rehabilitated is not an indication of support of the PLO leader. It is an indication of something scarier, belief in the ability for terrorists to rehabilitate.

I can't tell you if Mr. Kerry views have changed since his nomination. But I can tell you that recently he has missed key votes in congress designed to support Israel's war against terrorism. This may be an indication that does not want to show his true hand until after the election.

Even his views on nuclear proliferation into Iran show his naiveté on the ability of terrorist supporting regimes to change. At the beginning of July Kerry said; "We should call their (Iran's) bluff, and organize a group of states that will offer the nuclear fuel they need for peaceful purposes and take back the spent fuel so they can't divert it to build a weapon." That's right the good senator

believes the terrorist supporting government of Iran will change their policy regarding building nuclear weapons, all you have do is give them nuclear fuel and threaten to call them liars if they siphon off some to build a bomb.

Less than a week after his nomination, Kerry argued that the Bush administration is encouraging the recruitment of terrorism. He continues to claim that Bush should do more to reach out to other countries; especially the European nations who through their quiet acquiescence, support Palestinian terrorism. The Democratic nominee seems to forget that just two weeks before his statement, in a vote spearheaded by France and the EU, the United Nations General Assembly completely ignored terrorism as the reason behind the security fence that Israel is building.

Kerry would prefer that we reach out to France, whose government has hindered the war against terror at every opportunity, hoping that they will win greater support of the Arab world; and ultimately supplant the US as the leader in the free world. The only problem is if we do not eradicate the Islamic terror threat; there may not be a free world to support.

On the other hand, President Bush for all of his failings in the way the Iraqi is being executed; war sees terror for what it is. In a speech he made on March 19th he said, "The war on terror is not a figure of speech. It is an inescapable calling of our generation. The terrorists are offended not merely by our policies - they are offended by our existence as free nations. No concession will appease their hatred. No accommodation will satisfy their endless demands. Their ultimate ambitions are to control the peoples of the Middle East, and to blackmail the rest of the world with weapons of mass terror. There can be no separate peace with the terrorist enemy. Any sign of weakness or retreat simply validates terrorist violence, and invites more violence for all nations. The only certain way to protect our people is by early, united, and decisive action."

That is the issue facing the United States and Israel, and the World. That is the issue facing much of the world even though nations such as France (and since being attacked earlier in the year, Spain) are still convinced that if they keep their heads in the sand long enough the problem will just go away. Terrorism should not be treated as a mere crime as Mr. Kerry suggests - it is a fight for our lives. That is a fact obvious to anybody who commutes into the city this week. There have been NY State police on every Long Island Rail Road train. Penn Station is filled with soldiers in full combat gear with their fingers chillingly close to the triggers of the machine guns they are holding the ready position. It is obvious in Russia where over 100 people have been killed in terrorist bombings in just the past week. It is obvious in Beersheba where Palestinian murderers blew up two busses this week killing 16 people.

In the hearings before the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks, Condoleezza Rice said, "I think that that's actually where we've had the biggest change [since 9/11]. The President doesn't think of this as law enforcement. He thinks of this as war."

US Senator Hollings has claimed that the war against terror has been waged so that the Hebrews will vote Republican in the next election. At the same time much of Europe has continued its support of terrorism by vilifying Israel for trying to destroy the tunnels that have long represented the terrorist supply lines.

We are all bracing to find out what the terrorist learn from the World Court in The Hague, their recent decision has said that terrorism is not a crime or an act of war, but building a barrier to protect yourself against terror is.

A MONEY/ICR poll taken in July reported that 36% of the registered voters in the US felt that the war on terror is the most important issue in the upcoming election. While the fight against terrorism was the number one choice, the percentage (36%) was surprisingly low.

With the UN, World Court, EU and much of the international media all giving tacit or complete approval to some terrorism, as both Jews and Americans we must fight for what is right. We cannot as Mr. Kerry feels, take a cue from world's majority opinion. This coming November, we must vote to continue the fight against the Islamic terrorists, so that our children and grand children never have to see that black cloud in their own back yard. So our cousins in Tel Aviv and Haifa and Jerusalem will be able to send their kids to school on buses without having to worry if they will be coming home in one piece, and even for the people in Spain and France whose governments have nursed terrorism to maturity with their double standards and appeasement of Palestinian terror.

Once we defeat those who would blow up our families, we can work on the other issues, the economy, unemployment, and of course bigoted sports jocks. (Jewish World Review Sep 1)