



Jerusalem 6:10; Toronto 7:16

Quote of the Week...

"There is no moral equivalence between terrorists deliberately decimating children, and soldiers attacking other known combatants. The Canadian government should stop acting as if murderers of children and other innocents are on the same moral ground as soldiers fighting terrorists. The Canadian government must cut off aid funding to the Palestinian regime until its terror networks, which operate under Arafat's nose, are finally shut down. I am sure most Canadians would not want their hard-earned money supporting a regime which is refusing to take decisive action to shut down the agents of murder and terror that operate freely in its midst." - Canadian Foreign Affairs Opposition Critic Stockwell Day, MP (Canadian Alliance), in a statement in response to this week's terror attacks in Rishon Letzion and Jerusalem. Mr. Day also noted that since 1993, the Palestinian Authority has received over \$215 million in Canadian taxpayer support.

Commentary...

Enough Jerusalem Post Editorial

The world will not help us; we must help ourselves. We must kill as many of the Hamas and Islamic Jihad leaders as possible, as quickly possible, while minimizing collateral damage, but not letting that damage stop us. And we must kill Yasser Arafat, because the world leaves us no alternative.

No one seriously argues with the fact that Arafat was preventing Mahmoud Abbas, the prime minister he appointed, from combating terrorism, to the extent that was willing to do so. Almost no one seriously disputes that Abbas on whom Israel, the US, and Europe had placed all their bets failed primarily because Arafat retained control of much of the security apparatus, and that Arafat wanted him to fail.

The new prime minister, Ahmed Qurei, clearly will fare no better, since he, if anything, has been trying to garner more power for Arafat, not less. Under these circumstances, the idea of exiling Arafat is gaining currency, but the standard objection is that he will be as much or more of a problem when free to travel the world than he is locked up in Ramallah.

If only three countries Britain, France, and Germany joined the US in a total boycott of Arafat this would not be the case. If these countries did not speak with Arafat, it would not matter much who did, and however much a local Palestinian leader would claim to consult with Arafat, his power would be gone.

But such a boycott will not happen. Only now, after more than 800 Israelis have died in three years of suicide bombings and other terrorist attacks, has Europe finally decided that Hamas is a terrorist organization. How much longer will it take before it cuts off Arafat? Yet Israel cannot accept a situation in which Arafat blocks any Palestinian break with terrorism, whether from here or in exile. Therefore, we are at another point in our history at which the diplomatic risks of defending ourselves are exceeded by the risks of not doing so.

Such was the case in the Six Day War, when Israel was forced to launch a preemptive attack or accept destruction. And when Menachem Begin decided to bomb the Iraqi nuclear reactor in 1981. And when Israel launched Operation Defensive Shield in Palestinian cities after the Passover Massacre of 2002.

In each case, Israel tried every fashion of restraint, every plea to the international community to take action that would avoid the need for "extreme" measures, all to no avail. When the breaking point arrives, there is no point in taking half-measures. If we are going to be condemned in any case, we might as well do it right.

Arafat's death at Israel's hands would not radicalize Arab opposition to Israel;

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

ת"ב

just the opposite. The current jihad against us is being fueled by the perception that Israel is blocked from taking decisive action to defend itself.

Arafat's survival and power are a test of the proposition that it is possible to pursue a cause through terror and not have that cause rejected by the international community. Killing Arafat, more than any other act, would demonstrate that the tool of terror is

unacceptable, even against Israel, even in the name of a Palestinian state.

Arafat does not just stand for terror, he stands for the refusal to make peace with Israel under any circumstances and within any borders.

In this respect, there is no distinction, beyond the tactical, between him and Hamas. Europe's refusal to utterly reject him condemns Palestinians, no less than Israelis, to endless war and dooms the possibility of the two-state solution the world claims to seek.

While the prospect of a Palestinian power vacuum is feared by some, the worst of all worlds is what exists now: Terrorists attack Israel at will under the umbrella of legitimacy provided by Arafat. Hamas would not be able to fill a post-Arafat vacuum; on the contrary, Hamas would lose the cover it has today.

A word must be said here about the most common claim made by those who would not isolate Arafat, let alone kill him: that he is the elected leader of the Palestinian people. Even if Arafat was chosen in a truly free election (when does his term end?), which we would dispute, this does not close the question of his legitimacy.

Whom the Palestinians choose to lead them is none of our business, provided it is a free choice, and provided they do not opt for leaders who choose terror and aggression. So long as the Palestinians choose such a leadership, it should be held no more immune to counterattack by Israel than the Taliban and Saddam Hussein were by the United States.

We complain that a double standard is applied to us, and it is. But we cannot complain when we apply that double standard to ourselves. Arafat's survival, under our watchful eyes, is living testimony to our tolerance of that double standard. If we want another standard to be applied, we must begin by applying it ourselves. (Jerusalem Post Sep 11)

9/11 in 20/20 Hindsight By Clifford D. May
Straining to see through the fog of war.

September 11 will be remembered as the worst terrorist attack America ever suffered — if we're lucky. If not, if we're not extraordinarily successful in waging the war on terrorism, there remains this possibility: That years from now, Osama bin Laden and 9/11 will be to terrorism what the Wright Brothers and Kitty Hawk were to aviation — just a modest beginning.

Too many leading political figures and pundits either don't understand this or refuse to accept it. They view what's taking place today in Iraq, Afghanistan, Iran, Israel, India, the Philippines, and other places as separate skirmishes engendered by a variety of grievances. They don't grasp that a collection of extremist ideologies — all pathologically anti-democratic, anti-Western, and anti-modern — are utilizing terrorism as an arrow aimed at the Free World's vulnerable heel.

Sen. John Kerry, a Democrat running for president, has said that 9/11 is our generation's Pearl Harbor. But like so many others, Kerry hesitates to acknowledge what follows from that proposition. In the months and years following Dec. 7, 1941, America embarked on a great and terrible war, not just in the Pacific, but also in North Africa and Europe; not just against the Japanese militarists who bombed our ships at anchor, but also against German Nazis and Italian Fascists.

Had anyone asked President Roosevelt how much the war would cost, he would probably have answered: "However much it takes." Had anyone asked how long we'd be at war, he probably would have answered: "For the duration." But it's difficult to imagine anyone having the nerve to ask FDR such questions; difficult to imagine a 1940s version of Ted Kennedy or Pat Buchanan demanding an "exit strategy."

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

The hard truth is that we don't know when we'll win the war on terrorism. The harder truth is that we don't know if we'll win. We should at least acknowledge that this war is more perilous than any conflict America has ever fought. That's because terrorists, by definition, are people who abide by no rules and who count life as cheap — their own lives included. It's conceivable that before too long terrorists may obtain weapons of mass destruction that were unimaginable to terrorists of the past. That would allow them to kill not just thousands but hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions. This fact has not yet sunk in.

September 11 was not the day this conflict began. Rather, 9/11/01 was the day when Americans first began to seriously fight back. The order to do that was not given by any government official or military officer. It was a decision made by ordinary citizens, passengers aboard United Airlines Flight 93 as it flew over Shanksville, Pennsylvania. They grasped the reality of their situation and they determined to die free and fighting rather than allow themselves to be led meekly to slaughter.

Prior to that moment, most Americans had deluded themselves into believing that terrorism was merely a nuisance. Ignore it — it will go away. Washington's policy was inaction — and appeasement.

This war actually began more than 20 years ago. I was a reporter in Iran in 1979 when the Ayatollah Khomeini returned and took power. For the most part, my fellow journalists were sympathetic toward him and his mission. Publications of the Left, such as *The Nation*, put the most-flattering possible face on the mullahs. But so, too, did publications of the center such as *The New Yorker*.

Later that year, our diplomats were taken hostage in our own embassy. Americans tied yellow ribbons around trees, and President Carter launched "Desert One," a helicopter rescue attempt that turned into a disaster, and which spread the perception that the use of military force was not a serious option for the United States of America. That notion was reinforced when, in 1980, President Carter sent former attorney general Ramsey Clark to Iran — essentially to apologize to the mullahs.

In 1983, Hezbollah, a terrorist organization backed by Iran and Syria, attacked the U.S. embassy and the Marine barracks in Lebanon, slaughtering 241 Marines. In response: President Reagan ordered American officials in Beirut to pack up and leave.

Terrorists next murdered CIA Beirut station chief, William Buckley. Again, we did nothing and, as a result, Hezbollah and Iran were emboldened to take — and kill — additional American hostages.

In 1986, President Reagan did order a strike against Tripoli in reprisal for the bombing of a Berlin disco frequented by American military personnel. You'll recall that the French refused to let our military aircraft fly through their air space for that purpose. (*Le plus ca change, le plus c'est la meme chose.*)

But two years later, Pan Am 103 was blown up over the Scottish town of Lockerbie, killing 270 people. Our response was a prolonged investigation that resulted in the conviction of one low-level Libyan operative.

No group, no nation, no dictator, no terror master was ever held accountable for any of these acts of mass murder. We were dealing, as former Pentagon official Richard Perle has said "with people who understand strength and have only contempt for weakness." And we were pursuing a policy of weakness. We were inviting contempt.

The 1990s was the decade when terrorism truly began to metastasize. In 1993 alone there was the first attack on the World Trade towers, the bloody battle involving bin Laden-trained Somali guerillas and U.S. forces in Mogadishu, and the attempt by Saddam Hussein to assassinate former President Bush in Kuwait. In 1996, our troops in the Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia were bombed. Two years later came the bombing of our embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. Two years after that came the attack on the USS Cole.

During all this time, tens of thousands of terrorists were training in Afghanistan, in the Bekaa Valley of Syrian-occupied Lebanon, at Salman Pak south of Baghdad, and in other locations. Astonishingly, we made no attempt to shut down these camps. We didn't seriously try to penetrate the groups running them or to punish the regimes hosting them. Perhaps we thought these terrorists would only be dispatched to Chechnya, Bosnia, and Israel. Perhaps we thought all this need not concern us.

Whatever the rationale for our failure to act, Sept. 11 is the price we paid.

Most Americans today — though not the Left and the isolationist Right — understand that we must wage a war on terrorism. But they may not understand that this war isn't only against terrorism. As scholar Daniel Pipes points out, terrorism is a weapon, akin to poison gas. The question is: Who is deploying this weapon? The answer is: The followers of several closely related ideologies identified by such names as Jihadism, Islamism, Militant Islam, Muslim Totalitarianism, Islamo-fascism, Baathism, Wahhabism, and bin Ladenism.

These are all poisonous stews mixing Islamic flavors with ingredients from Nazism, Fascism, and Communism. They all believe in Arab and/or Islamic

supremacism. They all intend to unite the Arab and/or Islamic words against America, the Great Satan, and Israel, the Little Satan. They all want to prevent the liberalization of the Arab and Islamic worlds. They all seek to resurrect the Arab/Muslim empire. They all call for a jihad, a holy war, against the infidels — by which they mean Christians, Jews, Hindus, Buddhists, and moderate Muslims. They all want to humiliate and defeat America. They all despise those who believe in tolerance, democratic capitalism, and modernism. It was, after all, the World Trade Center they attacked — people from more than 80 nations and of all the great religions were in those two buildings and, yes, they were doing business.

While the terrorists would be pleased to accept concessions from us, surely we should be able to recognize that diplomacy and appeasement will not satisfy them. Withdraw our troops from Iraq, force India to give up Kashmir, break off an Islamic state from the Philippines, arm-twist Israel to make unilateral concessions — it won't matter.

In their view, it's them or us — there can be no peaceful coexistence. Their vision of what Islam once was and must be again are threatened by the very existence of a powerful and successful Free World, threatened by the seductiveness of the lifestyles of the rich and blasphemous.

As Americans began to grasp two years ago today, this is a fight we now have to fight, and one we must expect to continue fighting for many years to come. The alternative is to be led meekly to slaughter.

The writer, a former New York Times foreign correspondent, is president of the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies, a policy institute created after 9/11 and focusing on terrorism. (National Review Sep 11)

Why Oslo's Hopes Turned to Dust By Daniel Pipes

Ten years later, it is embarrassing to recall the elation and soaring expectations.

President Bill Clinton lauded it as a "great occasion of history." Secretary of State Warren Christopher ruminated on how "the impossible is within our reach." Yasser Arafat called it an "historic event, inaugurating a new epoch." Foreign Minister Shimon Peres of Israel discerned in it "the outline of peace in the Middle East." The press hyped it, providing saturation coverage on television and radio, in newspapers and magazines. Pundits like Anthony Lewis of *The New York Times* called it "ingeniously built" and "stunning."

The date was Sept. 13, 1993, and the occasion was the signing of the Oslo accords on the White House lawn. Yitzhak Rabin, Israel's prime minister, and Arafat, the Palestinian leader, stood by President Bill Clinton and shook hands. For years afterward, "The Handshake" (as it was known) served as the symbol of successful peacemaking. The agreement they signed, the "Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements" (to use its formal name) inspired widespread optimism that the Arab-Israeli conflict was at last about to be resolved. Other than a hardy band of skeptics, the world saw in the Oslo accords a brilliant solution whereby each side would achieve what it most wanted: dignity and autonomy for the Palestinians, recognition and security for the Israelis.

Instead, Oslo brought the Palestinians poverty, corruption, a cult of death, suicide factories and militant Islamic radicalization. The Israelis have mainly suffered from terrorism's toll of 854 murders and 5,051 injuries, plus assorted economic and diplomatic losses.

This Saturday marks the 10[th] anniversary of Sept. 13, 1993. By now, the name "Oslo" is mud among Palestinians and Israelis alike, with no one anymore seeing it "inaugurating a new epoch" — except for the worse.

What went wrong?

Many things, but most important was that the deal rested on a faulty Israeli premise that Palestinians had given up their hope of destroying the Jewish state. This led to the expectation that if Israel offered sufficient financial and political incentives, the Palestinians would formally recognize the Jewish state and close down the conflict.

Israelis therefore pushed themselves to make an array of concessions, in the futile hope that flexibility, restraint and generosity would win Palestinian goodwill. In fact, these steps made matters worse by sending signals of apparent demoralization and weakness. Each concession further reduced Palestinian awe of Israeli might, made Israel seem more vulnerable and incited irreverent dreams of annihilating it.

The result was a radicalized and mobilized Palestinian body politic. In speech and actions, via claims to the entire land of Israel and the murder of Israelis, the hope of destroying Israel acquired ever-more traction.

Thus did the muted Palestinian mood at Oslo's start in 1993 turn into the enraged ambition evident today.

When intermittent Palestinian violence turned in September 2000 into all-out war, Israelis finally awoke from seven years of wishful thinking and acknowledged Oslo's disastrous handiwork. But they have not yet figured

with what to replace it. Likewise, the U.S. government, with the collapse of its Mahmoud Abbas gambit last week, finds its "road map" diplomacy in disarray, and it now too needs new thinking.

In the spirit of Oslo's 10[th] anniversary, I propose a radically different approach for the next decade:

- * Acknowledge the faulty presumption that underlay both Oslo and the road map (Palestinian acceptance of Israel's existence).

- * Resolve not to repeat the same mistake.

- * Understand that diplomacy aiming to close down the Arab-Israeli conflict is premature until Palestinians give up their anti-Zionist fantasy.

- * Make Palestinian acceptance of Israel's existence the primary goal.

- * Impress on Palestinians that the sooner they accept Israel, the better off they will be. Conversely, so long they pursue their horrid goal of extermination, diplomacy will remain moribund and they will receive no financial aid, arms or recognition as a state.

- * Give Israel license not just to defend itself but to impress on the Palestinians the hopelessness of their cause.

When, over a long period of time and with complete consistency, the Palestinians prove they accept Israel, negotiations can be re-opened and the issues of the past decade - borders, resources, armaments, sanctities, residential rights - be taken up anew. The sooner we adopt the right policies, the sooner that will be. (New York Post Sep 9)

Time to Show That Jewish Blood Is Not Cheap and Those Who Shed it Will Pay a Tremendous Price By Martin Peretz

The defeat of terror takes overwhelming force, and only Israel itself can provide it. Indeed, only Israel should.

At the end of a century of unthinkable cruel and ultimately empty revolutions - Nazism, communism - Israel stands virtually alone in the right to assert that, after the crackup of empires and rage for popular sovereignties, it is a success, and a decent one at that.

Now envision Israel in its actual neighborhood - the tyrannical societies of the Middle East made even more twisted by corrupting and unproductive oil wealth - and you have a standing reproach to the Arab hubris that lies to itself.

From the western Sahara to the deserts abutting the Persian Gulf, not a single regime beyond Israel has so much as even embarked, or allowed its entrepreneurs to embark, on the exacting beginnings of industrial advance. This wide swath of terrain on which a quarter of a billion people live produces with all its hands and brains just about what little Finland or Spain does. Remind yourself also that not one ruler across the region governs by consent of the ruled. Evoke the phantoms of lost grandeur put in the heads of miserable boys and girls by dogma and dogmatics.

Mesh all this together and you have some sense of why the West is resented on the Arab street and why, moreover, Israel has not been able to reach, for all its accomplishments, the one quintessential and existential goal articulated by Theodor Herzl, the founder of modern Zionism, that "the Jew be able to die peacefully in his own bed." And maybe he never will.

It may be that Israel is doomed to live dangerously, even if a shooting, a stabbing, even a bombing on a bus or in a mall occurs only every few years. Maybe there is no enforceable peace treaty that can truly guarantee against crackpots and random fanatics.

Israel's longtime enemy, and its enemy today, is of the very same terror that was launched on us on Sept. 11, but, if less confounding, more routine and more tolerated. It is the world's acceptance of the routinization of this killing of Jews that has so affronted Israel and its allies.

One of the fundamental and actionable principles of Zionism is that Jewish blood is no longer cheap. It follows that the shedding of Jewish blood will not pass without an accounting, without being avenged. And not just for vengeance's sake. But to bring about the elimination of the organized blood sport in Jewish lives. The fact is that Israel has for years vacillated between responding to terror with exquisitely calibrated force and pacifying terrorists by giving them some of what they want - for example, the release of prisoners. The latter option is, of course, always the preferred path of the peace process interlocutors, even the American ones.

But, alas, despite the éclat, there had been no actual cease-fire in place since the end of June, although that was the absolute precondition of the "road map." Still, Israel had to pretend, not least of all to its own people, that there was. Otherwise it couldn't go on making concessions to the Palestinians, whether textually obligated or not. And if it didn't make concession after concession, everybody would know that the road map was a map to nowhere.

But no one could really pretend either that Hamas and Islamic Jihad had actually agreed to the famous hudna because day after day, week after week one or another of these groups (and sometimes two competing with each other and with the devil himself) would claim credit for some macabre death happening in

Israel.

The Palestinian Authority itself renounced its obligation to squelch these murderous militias, at once asserting its impotence and claiming that any attempt to fight them would lead to civil strife it could not win. So it seemed almost ungentlemanly for the Israelis to insist that the Palestinian Authority try. After all, if the Palestinian Authority lost, Israel would be without a partner at all in the cease-fire that, as it happens, ceased very little fire, indeed.

But the keeping up of pretenses does not advance the cause of peace. Yet it is precisely the keeping up of pretenses that the high-minded folk are always recommending.

When Israel sent a helicopter gunship to kill a top Hamas leader in retaliation for the latest Jerusalem atrocity that claimed 21 Israeli lives, a New York Times editorial criticized Israel for its hasty response: "It is far from clear what would have been lost by giving the Palestinians more time."

The United States is in great measure responsible for the moral ambiguity of peace-making between Israel and the Palestinians. The Palestinian strategy is terror, pure and simple, like the terror of Al Qaeda and whoever bombed the center of Bombay on Aug. 25. George W. Bush has not quite admitted this, but he has come close. Still, his diplomats behave as if there are two different categories of terror: one with which we can never compromise and another that we will reward with a state.

This is a bankrupt program, both morally and practically.

The reasonable solution to the Palestine question has always been a partition, and there have been various partition plans proposed since the first one enunciated by Winston Churchill in 1922. Each and every one of them has been rejected, by the surrounding Arab states and by the Palestinians.

History moves forward, but not the Arabs.

The fervor for Hamas and Islamic Jihad among the Palestinians is an expression of that rejectionism. The martyrology that attends it shows also that it is quite mad.

Israel has shown that it is willing to give up territories for a contiguous Palestinian state in the West Bank. It now must show that it will not tolerate a war of terror against the partition formula that, with caveats here and there, has been accepted since 1922.

The chief of staff of the Israel Defense Forces, Moshe Yaalon, warned recently that "every Hamas member must now be considered a candidate for liquidation." Coming in the middle of a declared cease-fire, the Jerusalem bombing that killed 21 civilians has changed the ground rules because the ground itself has changed.

It is now abundantly clear that the Palestinian leadership, lubricated into power by the United States, is either unable or unwilling to fight its own terrorists. Its pledge to do so, like its pledge to reform, is either a trick or a failure. It does not really matter which.

The defeat of terror takes overwhelming force, and only Israel itself can provide it. Indeed, only Israel should.

When Israel undertook to root out the terror network in Jenin last year, it suffered 23 of its own dead, more certainly than the U.S. military would have inflicted on itself in a similar circumstance. Despite this, Israel was pummeled, not least by the United Nations, for committing atrocities that it did not commit. Now everyone knows the truth, although some still perpetuate the falsehoods. But Israel succeeded in decapitating the head of the viper from its body.

The rocket attacks of recent days on Hamas leadership in Gaza are an augury of what is about to occur: first, the building of the fence that will secure Israel's population from their inveterate foes and, then, relentless attacks on the armed irreconcilables. These attacks will come from the air and also be fought on the streets, deftly and precisely.

There will be ululating mourners and grim-faced youth waving the bloody shirts of their martyrs. But, in the end, they will learn that Jewish blood is not cheap at all and that those who shed it will pay a tremendous price, too high a price to go on with the killing that will bring on their heads only reprisal and not, of course, the prize of a state. (Jewish World Review Sep 8)

Oslo and its Victims By Michael Freund

Israeli police are on high alert, Palestinian terrorists have been firing mortar rounds at Ashkelon and Gush Katif, people are afraid to ride the buses, and Hamas is promising more violence - welcome to this week's tenth anniversary of the signing of the Oslo Accords.

When Yitzhak Rabin and Yasser Arafat reached across the White House Lawn and shook hands back on September 13, 1993, guided toward each other by a beaming Bill Clinton, those in attendance burst into applause, their shouts of joy clearly audible on news footage of the event.

But the roar of the crowd has long since abated, replaced by the deafening

sound of explosions, terror and death. Oslo was quickly revealed to be a fool's bet, one in which the future of an entire country was placed into the hands of its unrepentant foe.

Never before has a country so strong yielded so much to an enemy so weak, and never before has a government so brazenly endangered the fate of its own people.

Behold the hard facts: in the ten years prior to Oslo, a total of 211 Israelis were killed by Palestinian terror, while in the ten years since the agreement, that number has risen to 1,110, an increase of over 426%.

Oslo failed to bring peace, and it failed to put an end to Palestinian terror. It did not unify the nation, nor did it give birth to economic prosperity. Instead, Oslo's legacy can be found in cemeteries throughout the country, in hospital wards and rehabilitation centers, in the scars and prosthetic devices that its victims will carry with them forever.

"History", the late historian Barbara Tuchman once said, "is the unfolding of miscalculation," and she might as well have been referring to Israel's dealings with the PLO. Although the Palestinians never lived up to their part of the bargain, Israel persisted in signing agreements with them. There was the 1994 Cairo Agreement, the 1995 Oslo 2 Accords, the 1997 Hebron deal and the 1998 Wye agreement.

Refusing to acknowledge its error, Israel dug itself ever deeper into the hole, turning over more land, only to receive more funerals in return.

The transcript of failure is extensive and heartbreaking, but it cannot be ignored. As far back as December 1994, Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin said, "Arafat is not taking enough action against Hamas. I would expect better results in... the fight against terrorism" (The Jerusalem Post, December 6, 1994).

And Shimon Peres, mastermind of Oslo, admitted back in March 1995 that, "Yasser Arafat must show more willpower, more character in his fight against terror. If he is too weak to do that or lacks the will, why should we negotiate with him at all?"

But negotiate with him is exactly what Israel continued to do, and here we are ten years later, with Arafat still in control and Jews still dying.

Yet even after the past decade's horrors, our government still doesn't get it. They now talk about expelling Arafat, but leaving the Palestinian Authority in place, as though installing a new "godfather" will make the Mafia any less of a criminal organization.

They still don't realize that the problem is not just Arafat or Abu Mazen or Abu Whoever, it is the existence of the Palestinian Authority itself, which is little more than a hothouse for terror, corruption and bloodshed.

Remember, this experiment of establishing a Palestinian entity has not been going on for a year or two or three. It has been going on for a decade, for ten long and painful years, years filled with unprecedented suffering and violence. It is time to call it quits, to say "enough is enough", and stop proceeding down a path that has failed again and again.

Oslo is an experiment whose time has passed. Only a "mad scientist" would be willing to press forward with it.

The only way out of the current morass is for Israel to reassert full control over Judea, Samaria and Gaza, dismantle the Palestinian Authority and destroy the infrastructure of terror. It won't be clean, and it won't be pretty, but a government's first priority is to protect its citizens, not to appease international public opinion.

At the root of Oslo lay a dangerous mix of defeatism, despair and gloom, which brought to power a government that was prepared to forsake our national patrimony. Oslo's practitioners were ready to withdraw from Jewish history, and undercut Jewish destiny, questioning our very right to be on this sacred soil.

If the past ten years teach us anything, it should be that forgoing our Divine and eternal right to this Land inevitably leads to an erosion in our security and well-being. The two are inextricably linked, and we must no longer shy away from making this clear to the world. The first step toward healing this nation is to heal the rift in the Land, and to reclaim what is rightfully ours. We spent the past decade trying to divide it, and look where that has gotten us.

The time for retreat is over. Now, let us move forward, and advance, and take back our Land, once and for all. (Jerusalem Post Sep 10)

The writer served as Deputy Director of Communications & Policy Planning in the Prime Minister's Office under former premier Benjamin Netanyahu.

Reject the Or Commission By Yosef Goell

The report by the Or Judicial Commission which primarily laid the blame for the widespread rioting in Israeli Arab areas in September-October of 2000 on long-term institutional discrimination against the Arab minority, and reprimanded the police for using lethal fire power which left 13 of the rioters dead is far from the final word on the subject.

The government, whose predecessor appointed the commission, is entitled to accept or reject the report or part of its findings. It should clearly reject them

and not pussyfoot about its reasons. The main reason for rejecting the report is the underlying assumption the commission chose to adopt: that long-term discrimination had finally led to a popular outburst and violent demonstrations among large parts of a long-suffering Arab population.

In my careers as an academic student of the Arab minority and its relations with the Jewish state, and as a long-time reporter and columnist reporting and commenting on that super-sensitive area, I frequently documented various aspects of that discrimination and offered proposals for ameliorating the relationship.

There can be no doubt that the Israeli Arab population has been and continues to be a victim of institutional and popular Jewish discrimination in Israel. Paradoxically, it is also the best-off Arab population in the Middle East.

But there is not the slightest connection between that sorry background and what happened during the last day of September and the first few days of October three years ago. The timing, the locales and the identity of the participants of those violent riots were the giveaways: They broke out in different parts of the Arab populated areas in the north within a day and in apparent coordination with the launching of the intifada in the territories by the Fatah Tanzim; they broke out nearly simultaneously in Umm el-Fahm, Sakhnin, and Nazareth, areas especially noted for the vitriolic anti-Israeli hatred spewed out for years by local leaders; and the participants were all teenage boys and young men in their 20s, who have been the main imbibers of that vitriol.

In short, what occurred three years ago had all the markings of a seditious uprising by rebellious local Arab supporters of the anti-Israel Palestinian terrorists who were simultaneously attacking Israeli forces in many parts of the territories.

As such, that seditious rebellion should have been put down with full force.

I don't know whether the outnumbered and threatened police should have used rubber-coated bullets in the worst cases in which they were being attacked by Arab mobs. But I assert that it was perfectly legitimate for them to resort to even more lethal live fire.

The fact that the simmering hostility between Arabs and Jews in the months and years since those tragic events did not break down into further violent rioting must be attributed to the shock of those deaths. There is a realization that Israel would not blanch at using deadly force to put down seditious uprisings.

Let me repeat what I wrote a few days after the end of those riots: "Vastly outnumbered police first tried normal riot-control methods, then tear gas and rubber bullets, and only then, in life-threatening situations, resorted to live fire. That police restraint is why there were "only" 10 (the figure known at the time) Arab rioters killed. "In connection with the worst rioting, in Islamic Movement-controlled Umm el-Fahm, it is critical to make the following tragic but unavoidable point: Umm el-Fahm lies on one of the most critical internal security roads in the country, the Wadi Ara road. Every mother and father in Umm el-Fahm should be aware that in the case of a future war, if there is the slightest attempt by 'innocent' Arab villagers to slow up Israeli reserves rushing to (an Eastern) front, their town will be razed to the ground, with a massive loss of life."

Several weeks later I assessed that the riots had put Arab-Jewish relations back an entire generation and more. An additional reason to reject the Or Commission report is that the basic imbalance in its findings have contributed even further to that reversal.

The irony is that the condition of Israeli Arabs had been improving albeit at a maddeningly slow pace for the previous three and a half decades. We now have to go on beyond the report, pick up the pieces and start again to work on improving relations.

All this could have been predicted when the commission was appointed, belatedly, by former prime minister Ehud Barak. He had originally appointed an internal fact-finding body to report on what had happened, and why. Then he succumbed to political pressures and his obvious need for Arab votes in the upcoming elections, and replaced it with the Or Judicial Commission of Inquiry.

Several weeks ago, the ever-arrogant Barak asserted that appointing the commission had been his only mistake in office. (Jerusalem Post Sep 8)

The writer is a retired lecturer in political science and a veteran journalist.
