



Jerusalem 6:08; Toronto 7:14

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*

Events...

Monday, September 23, 8pm

Joan Peters, author of the prize winning book, "From Time Immemorial: The origins of the Arab-Jewish conflict over Palestine" will speak at Beth Sholom Synagogue, 1445 Eglinton Avenue West (at Allen Road).

Toronto One Israel Missions

With Aish Hatorah October 12-20:

Visits throughout Yeshu, Shabbat in Hevron, For info: 905-764-1818 x228.

With BAYT Brotherhood November 3-10:

Visits throughout Yeshu, Shabbat in Jerusalem, For info: 905-896-4451.

Quote of the Week...

Being Thankful

"From the beginning of April until the end of August, the Palestinians in Gaza carried out 1,452 attacks against IDF and civilian targets: 682 shootings, 320 grenade attacks, 284 mortar attacks, 52 anti-tank missile attacks, 23 rocket attacks, 47 attempted infiltrations, five of which were successful, 64 roadside bombs, and three booby-trapped vehicles. But in all these attacks the terrorists caused no civilian casualties." - From the Conference of Presidents COP/J newsletter.

Commentary...

Freedom Ultimately Prevails Over Terror

By Uri Dromi

The Sep. 11 anniversary undoubtedly will bring back the terrible memories of that fateful morning when America was hit by terror in the symbol of its power. The gruesome scenes will be shown again on TV screens, and eyewitnesses will retell their stories.

Israel, too, is approaching an anniversary this month. Two years ago, the Palestinians decided that what had been offered to them on the negotiation table (95 percent of their demands) was not enough and launched a well-orchestrated attack of suicide bombing and other means of terror, hoping to bring Israel on its knees. Although the two anniversaries mark the shock of democracies when attacked by terror, there is a difference: The attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, while horrible in their audacity and grim results, were a one-time event; for Israelis, the onslaught on their way of life has become a routine. Hardly a week passes by without a suicide bomber blowing himself up or himself, or a car bomb being stopped just before exploding in the midst of our cities.

Can one get used to such conditions? It seems that one can. Israelis have adapted to the new situation by keeping an extra watchful eye, by taxing the already busy police, by hiring legions of guards who check clients at cafes and restaurants, and most of all, by showing resilience. "Life must go on" is not just an empty line used by camera-happy politicians; it is what Israelis tell themselves when they board a bus, go to a mall or send their kids to school. Israelis simply refuse to surrender to the terrorists.

No doubt the Palestinians took a heavy blow of surprise when they realized that, contrary to their expectations, the Israelis did not mellow down but instead seem tougher than ever.

No doubt the Palestinians made a big blunder when they believed that the good life in a developed country -- or the openness of the Israeli society, with its free press and vocal anti-establishment groups -- would spoil the Israelis to the

גמר חתימה טובה

point that they would be unable to stand up and fight.

With the second anniversary of the intifada approaching, the Palestinians should better ask themselves two main questions: What have we gained with our intransigence? Are we better off than they were two years ago?

There are some lessons that Americans could learn from the Israelis: ! There is far greater willpower and resilience in a democracy than most

people imagine.

! It is much harder for a democracy to fight terror, because of self-imposed restraints, but eventually, it works.

! By carrying on with their precious way of life, democracies slowly but surely are defeating their enemies. (IsraelNationalNews.com Sep 11)

The writer is publications director of the Israel Democracy Institute in Jerusalem.

Words Are Cheap Jerusalem Post Editorial

Yasser Arafat on Monday wished us, in Hebrew, a happy New Year. He also -- before someone alerted him that he was reading from the wrong text -- said, "Each of us wants to be a holy martyr in our struggle for independence." Perhaps he should have combined these messages and wished us and the entire region a happy year of martyrdom.

Now the international media are dutifully reporting that Arafat, in his speech Monday to the Palestinian legislators who convened in his Ramallah office, called for an end to terrorism against Israel. As Arafat himself is wont to say, "Why not?" Martyrdom, peace, terrorism, negotiations -- it is all the same to him. Words are cheap.

In the meantime, the IDF is in a daily battle to prevent the next horrific attack. This week's variation on the theme was a foiled plot to poison food in an Israeli restaurant. Last week it was a car stuffed with 600 kilos -- perhaps a record amount -- of explosives that was caught by Border Police volunteers.

But this is reality, and reality is but a distraction from the words of Yasser Arafat. Alongside this reality, we are supposed to take seriously the truly pitiable efforts of Palestinian legislators to wrest power from their anointed leader. They are no match for Arafat the politician -- offering to step aside, nodding to reform, and even showing solidarity with one of his putative successors, Marwan Barghouti.

The latter, whose murder trial started last week in Israel, is being billed as everything Arafat is not: a man of integrity, youth, and local legitimacy. Yet Barghouti has the same fundamental problem with doublespeak that ails his discredited mentor. The languages of peace and terrorism are, for Barghouti and Arafat, inextricably intertwined.

Representing himself in court, Barghouti said repeatedly: "You, the judges, represent the government that is destroying my people. The government of Israel must be put on trial. I am a fighter for independence of my people on the basis of two states for two peoples." Like Arafat Monday, Barghouti maintains that it is Israel that is the terrorist state, and the Palestinians who are lovers of peace.

It is not clear how long Barghouti will be able to maintain that he is a "fighter" at the forefront of his nation's struggle, while at the same time denying any involvement in the dozens of terrorist acts that his indictment says he had a direct hand in. One might think that the inconsistency of taking pride in something one is denying would eventually catch up with him. But this is Barghouti's legal dilemma.

The more fundamental problem is shared by Arafat, Barghouti, and indeed, the international willingness to play along with their claim to be warriors for peace. It is a definitional one. The Barghouti defense, and Arafat's latest quasi-renunciation of terror, are part of the continuing Arab attempt to define themselves a right to continue terrorism against Israel.

How else can Arafat say, as he did Monday, "Our Palestinian people stands firm against all acts of terrorism whether from individuals, groups, or states." Is he disassociating himself from the last two years of Palestinians

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

blowing themselves up in Israeli restaurants, buses, universities, and religious celebrations? Or is he, like Barghouti, accusing Israelis of being the real terrorists?

Arafat said, "I say it's enough of the struggle and bloodshed and let's sit with open hearts around the negotiating table." But before we can open our hearts and negotiate, he, or his successors, have to fight terrorism. And before they can fight terrorism, they have to admit – to themselves at least – that terrorism is not heroic and that the fact that its victims are Israeli does not make terrorism a legitimate form of "struggle."

Nor is coming to grips with the unacceptability of terrorism enough. Barghouti, for example, speaks constantly of "two states for two peoples," which was the solution Arafat supposedly embraced when he signed the Oslo Accords. Yet the last two years of barbaric Palestinian attacks have convinced Israelis that such talk of accepting Israel is about as sincere as the talk of renouncing terrorism.

It seems that the only real cures for the continuing Palestinian infatuation with jihad will be the IDF's successes in destroying terrorists on the ground, the steadfastness of the people of Israel, and the upcoming body-blow to Arab radicalism that will be delivered by the United States in Baghdad. Only after all three factors have been allowed to take their course will there be a real Palestinian readiness for peace, a readiness that will be enthusiastically reciprocated by Israel. (Jerusalem Post Sep 10)

The New Bush Doctrine - Son Shine By Martin Peretz

I am not one of those who believes democracy will come soon either to Iraq or to the entity to be called Palestine (when--and if--the Palestinians finally grasp that they cannot have both a state and a warrant to kill Israelis). There is no reason to believe either of these polities will succeed in the democratic experiment that has failed or, to be more precise, has not been seriously tried in the Arab world. But there are improvements short of democracy: police who are not routinely brutal, government that isn't routinely corrupt, and courts that are not satraps of politics. And the Bush administration deserves credit for making clear that it will not merely enable friendlier but just as murderous successor regimes in Baghdad and Ramallah.

It is not the pursuit of good government, however, that has put this country on a collision course with the leadership in Palestine and Iraq. Our motives are more fundamental than that: The U.S. government has made a decision that it will not permit either mass terror by Baghdad or random terror by the many Palestinian militias to set the norms of how others, in the region and beyond, live or die. This is the critical principle underlying our Iraqi policy and our Palestinian policy. It is, at root, a statement about how we define civilization and how we defend it from its unconventionally armed discontents.

And how exactly has this prerogative come to the United States? Iraq has been in violation of the international weapons-inspection regime for four years. Baghdad has again and again engaged in farcical negotiations about the inspectors' return, and many of our allies have willingly participated in the farce. But in reality, such offers are simply a ruse to buy Saddam Hussein time to do what inspections are supposed to prevent: building weapons of mass death. And since no international body is willing to accept the consequences of this fraud, the responsibility falls to the United States. Our obligation is an extension of the one we assumed at the end of the Gulf war, when the United States guaranteed the lives of the Kurds and Shia, whose kin Saddam had murdered in large numbers. Before World War II no one, neither the Jews nor the Czechs nor the Chinese, were protected from their tormentors. But, had their lives mattered to the Allies, the United States and Britain might not have waited so long to take up arms and, thus, would have begun the war on a stronger footing. Morally, at least, the analogy holds for today. By defending the Kurds, who have experienced Saddam's gas firsthand, we are also defending ourselves.

As for the Palestinians, their leaders (and those of the Arab states) have been entreating us for decades to press the Israelis on their behalf, and we have done so. But not until this summer has an American president set even minimal conditions on our mediation. What President Bush has decided is that the United States cannot be an honest mediator so long as one of the parties to the conflict consists of mendacious murderers. If they want the United States to be their facilitator, they must abide by American terms. Otherwise, they're on their own.

It is impossible not to contrast America's new determination to incapacitate Saddam Hussein and Yasir Arafat with Bill Clinton's failed stewardship of these two dockets. Before he even entered the Oval Office, Clinton mused that it wouldn't take much to welcome the regime in Baghdad back into the family of nations. It was a colossal blunder, and then-Vice President Al Gore was quickly dispatched to explain that the president hadn't really meant what he said. But it wasn't just Clinton. At the State Department there was Warren Christopher, a languid gentleman easily persuaded that the ruthless foreign leaders with which he dealt were as languid as he. The National Security Council (NSC) was run by Anthony Lake, the Berkshire farmer who believed everyone was as well-intentioned as he thought himself to be. He was succeeded at the NSC by Sandy Berger, a trade lawyer who saw every conflict as an opportunity to devise

another purchase-and-sale agreement. Christopher's successor at Foggy Bottom, Madeleine Albright, proved little better, dramatically failing to establish her intellectual authority even over a crowd filled with undergraduates at Ohio State.

This was prelapsarian foreign policy. When it came to Israel and its abutters, the Clintonites uttered the words "peace process" sanctimoniously, as if in some lordly benediction. But in the end, the peace process came to embody a highly ironic strategy. The more hideous the instances of Palestinian terror, the more Israel was expected to make truly perilous accommodations--until Ehud Barak, under Clintonite pressure, offered the most perilous accommodations of all, and they were still not enough.

George W. Bush has been far shrewder. But the more interesting and more salient contrast is not with his predecessor but with his father. This is a true filial drama. The son, once depicted by even some of his own supporters as a patsy for his father, is actually rebuffing the elder's abundant biases about the Middle East. And, in now making Saddam his target, George W. is in effect conceding that George H.W. allowed decisive victory to slip from our hands eleven years ago.

The justification, you'll remember, was that Saddam--and his tiny minority of Tikriti Sunnis--must remain in power to preserve the stability of Iraq. Almost no one asked then, and almost no one asks now, why Iraq's stability is such an obvious good. It certainly does little for the Kurds or the majority Shia. (The West's false equation of Iraqi stability with Sunni domination is an old story that dates back to British plenipotentiary Gertrude Bell's establishment of the Hashemite Sunni monarchy 80 years ago.) And who in the region has a desperate interest in seeing the Iraqi Shia kept down? The Saudis, who fear the example they may set for their Shia brethren across the border. James Baker served as paladin for the Saudi royals while Poppy's secretary of state and with The Carlyle Group as transfer agent, and he now serves as banker and counselor to Riyadh. Baker, more than any American not on the Supreme Court, put W. in the White House. And so for the president now to defy him and the Saudis is a kind of declaration of independence.

Baker's New York Times op-ed last week, then, can be read as a public throwing-in of the towel. Yes, he wants a Security Council resolution warranting military action and is willing to tarry to get one. Yes, he'd prefer Arab governments to join an international coalition like the one that prevented a march on Baghdad in 1991. But, costly though he thinks it will be in blood and treasure, Baker nonetheless declared for all to see, "The only realistic way to effect regime change in Iraq is through the application of military force, including sufficient ground troops." Baker's apostasy from the Republican establishment's "go easy on Iraq" faction is devastating to them.

And devastating in particular to Brent Scowcroft, who has been trying hard to convene a reunion of Bushies who opposed going to war against Iraq the first time. Scowcroft has the distinction of having been wrong about virtually everything important in foreign policy over the last decade and a half. He was wrong about Mikhail Gorbachev and his resilience. He was wrong about Bosnia and the former Yugoslavia, generally. And now he is wrong, once again, about Iraq. The New York Sun recently performed a valuable service by reminding us of the tawdry details of Scowcroft's career that color his present effort: He runs a big business that deals with, among others, shortsighted countries and companies that prefer Saddam to whatever might come next.

Scowcroft's pivotal ally within the administration is Secretary of State Colin Powell, who also has a less-than-stellar track record on the major conflicts of the post-cold-war age. (After Scowcroft made his anti-war comments on CBS's "Face the Nation" on August 4, Powell called to thank him.) Within the Bush administration, Powell is where the "do little to Saddam Hussein" and the "do a lot for Yasir Arafat" positions meet. Were he not so valuable domestically, and would his departure not so rattle our allies, my guess is that his job would be little more secure than Harvey Pitt's.

The Democratic Party, needless to say, is no better. In fact, it's far worse. Almost to a person its leaders opposed the Gulf war and, were Gore not an exception, I suspect that he and Clinton would not have won the White House in 1992. And today's Democrats are showing that bad habits die hard. So, although not openly opposing the next Gulf war, they are calling for "national dialogue"--a dialogue in which, truth be told, they have precious little to say.

The party is little better when it comes to the Palestinians. It's true that only Jesse Jackson has visited Arafat recently. (Jackson was also on his way to Gaza for an audience with Sheik Yassin, the Hamas headman, but even he felt the need to turn back once Hamas claimed credit for the Hebrew University bombing.) But the Democrats have institutional bonds to the Arafat crowd. Clinton had more meetings with the Palestinian chairman than with any other foreign leader, and many top Democrats probably still have delicatessen pictures with Yasir hanging in their offices. At first the Bush administration seemed to be pursuing the same dangerous liaison. Until, that

is, the president and the advisers to whom he listens changed the plot. The Democrats then faulted Bush for distancing himself from the conflict, as if the sheer frequency of presidential statements about ending the cycle of violence would actually stop it. This was, in fact, the theme of virtually every potential Democratic presidential candidate. Only Joe Lieberman has produced a concrete new suggestion. He proposes that the United States admit more Palestinian refugees to siphon off the pressure of want in the West Bank and Gaza. But that would merely add magnitudes to the anti-Americanism that already resides within this country's shores. And so no other prominent Democrat seconded the motion.

The pro-Democratic press is equally dismissive of the president's new policy. In *The New Yorker*, former TNR Editor Hendrik Hertzberg wrote, "The Bush administration still seems unwilling to exert itself to deflect the two sides from their headlong rush toward the abyss." In the same week, Martin Indyk, a key part of the Middle East apparatus during the Clinton years, asked on *The New York Times*' op-ed page, "Does the Bush administration know what it's doing in the Middle East?" He answered his own question: No, of course not. Their policy is "erratic," full of "contradictions" and "mixed messages." But better a slightly erratic policy than a consistently wrong one.

What the Democrats and much of the press refuse to admit is that the Bush administration has fundamentally changed the assumptions underlying American policy toward Israel and the Palestinians. The first and most basic change is that Palestinian terrorism will not be rewarded with forced Israeli concessions. This puts an end to the incentive system that encouraged atrocity after atrocity. The second change is that, to secure U.S. help of any kind, the Palestinian Authority (P.A.) will be obliged to practice financial transparency--which will either end its corruption and links to terrorism or make them plain for all to see. The third is that cease-fires must bind all the Palestinians and not just Israel. Even the militias close to the P.A. are balking at this last burden. So if the P.A. cannot produce a comprehensive end to the killing, it must pursue and incarcerate those many militiamen and women, pious and secular, intent on maintaining murder as a political instrument. And if it can't, or won't, the conclusion will be obvious: that the P.A., under whatever leadership, is not a vehicle that can assure its own constituents and Israel reasonable security.

Bush has countenanced the Ariel Sharon hard-line strategy: No quarter for terror. And though it is difficult for the peace processors to concede, the first real signs of Palestinian accommodation to the simple reality of Israel's existence have come in the wake of Sharon's pummeling. Almost every certified wise head proclaimed that Sharon's obsession with Arafat would only strengthen the terrorist's hand. This cliché is now proven nonsense.

But related clichés are alive and well. And so last Saturday, Bill Keller wrote in *The New York Times*, "Some months ago I suggested that the road to Baghdad leads through Jerusalem, meaning that a more evenhanded good-faith American effort to get peace on track there would help our credibility with the Arab world when we take on Iraq." The assumptions behind this platitude governed American policy for close to a decade, and they have proven false, since American good-faith efforts produced ever-more violent and rejectionist Palestinians. The road to Jerusalem more likely leads through Baghdad than the reverse. Once the Palestinians see that the United States will no longer tolerate their hero Saddam Hussein, depressed though they may be, they may also come finally to grasp that Israel is here to stay and that accommodating to this reality is the one thing that can bring them the generous peace they require.

The writer is editor-in-chief and chairman of The New Republic.
(*The New Republic* Sep 9)

'As it Goes with Israel...'

By Mordechai Nisan

In my 1999 book *Identity and Civilization: Essays on Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, I examined the connection between religion and war in ideological and historical terms. While the logo of Christianity is love, with Pope John Paul II urging young people this past July "to build a civilization of love," Islam offers a different sensibility. The Koran impels Muslims to "fight the infidels" for Allah; holy war is considered a religious duty designed to convert everybody by force or persuasion -- and to dominate the world.

Judaism, restricting its political scope to the Land of Israel alone, and devoid of any missionary purpose, commends neither love nor war in particular, but life as the pertinent doctrinal value.

The religious origins of the Muslim attack against Christian America on September 11 are not in the mountains of Afghanistan, or the immigrant neighborhoods of Hamburg or Bradford, nor even the mosques of Arabia, but in the belief that jihad is a permanent Islamic obligation against the infidels. Islam catalogs Jews and Christians together as dhimmis, allegedly protected and tolerated non-Muslim "peoples of the book," but more pertinently demeaned and fundamentally enslaved communities under the rule of the "book and sword" of Muhammad's faithful.

The political origins of the Muslim attack against targets perceived as symbols of Christian power are of a piece with the religious crux of the matter.

The Muslim-Arab war against Israel, the assault upon Zionism and the wanton murder of Jews, is where it all began. This is because Islam's war against Christianity is part of the overall war against Judaism. In a mosque sermon in Doha, Qatar, on June 7, the imam prayed to Allah "to humiliate the infidels...to destroy the Jews, the Christians, and their supporters... make their wives widows, make their children orphans, and make them a prey for Muslims."

Yet the West turned a political blind eye to the incessant barbaric Arab campaign against Israel from 1948. The Arab world sought to eradicate Israel from the map of the Middle East, and Europe and America adopted a stance of tacit assent to this goal of politicide-genocide.

Cultivating economic and diplomatic interests in the Middle East was the overwhelming Western priority. Palestinian hordes killed babies at Avivim in 1970, children at Ma'alot in 1974, and adults on a tour bus near Tel Aviv in March 1978; then Europe recognized the PLO in 1980. Later, the Palestinian intifada insurgence beginning in 1987 took a toll of Jewish civilian deaths; then America in 1989 recognized the PLO.

Despite the West virtually accommodating both the Arabs' rejection of Israel's right to exist and Palestinian terrorism which lent barbaric vitality to their position, the Islamic Koranic linking of Jews and Christians would inevitably be applied in the interminable Muslim jihad against both Israel and the West. Israel is the first line of Western defense in the battle for non-Muslim survival and prosperity in the world.

Western collusion would not prevent the Arabs from cutting a pound of Christian fair flesh many times over, but rather prompt it.

Jerusalem, the internationally unrecognized capital of Israel, remains a critical political benchmark of Western infidelity to principles of right and wrong in the Middle Eastern quagmire. Stubbornly bound to antiquated United Nations resolutions that deny Israel its rightful affirmation of Jerusalem, and succumbing to an assortment of explicit or implicit Arab oil and political threats, the West goads Arab-Muslim-Palestinian perseverance to demand the city as the capital of a future Palestinian state.

Islam first conquered Jerusalem in 636 from Greek Byzantium, later reconquering the city from the Crusader Latin Christians in 1187. With Israeli rule extending throughout Jerusalem as of 1967, the Muslims felt outraged and therefore obligated to try and recover the city for themselves.

Jerusalem is, of course, not just an urban terrain of conflict but a sweeping religious symbol of historical significance. Were the Palestinians to acquire Jerusalem as a capital city, this would signal a great triumph for Islam that would reverberate around the world. Muslims would pursue their global goals with the assurance that incessantly and incrementally Islamicizing the Christian West, their erstwhile and foolish collaborators, will be consummated too.

A recent article by al-Qaida "activist" Ubeid al-Qurashi drew an analogy between the Munich massacre of Israeli athletes in 1972 and the al-Qaida attack against Americans in New York in 2001. Both were great Muslim-Arab victories, he wrote, with tremendous media coverage that conveyed the struggle and tragedy of the Palestinians in the one case, and Islam's bold assault on the industrialized, though vulnerable, West in the other.

Nonetheless, two years after Arafat's Black September gang murdered Israelis in Munich, he was invited to address the General Assembly at the United Nations. While Osama bin Laden is unlikely to be invited to address the international body (though it may be too early to be sure of this!), he has however succeeded in arousing global Muslim enthusiasm, compelling European submission, dividing the Western World, and threatening the fabric of freedom and security in the United States.

The sagacious American author Eric Hoffer, longshoreman-philosopher from San Francisco, gave voice to a profound Holocaust-related 20th-century truth, whose implication in the aftermath of the 1967 Six Day War evoked a prophetic insight: "I have a premonition that will not leave me, as it goes with Israel so will it go with all of us."

Undoubtedly, Hoffer sensed the primacy and mystery of the Jewish people's place in world history.

The writer teaches Middle East Studies at the Rothberg International School of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. (*Jerusalem Post* Sep 10)

My Name Is Adolf

By Ann Coulter

Among the patriotic lesson plans for 9-11 was one proposed by the National Council for Social Studies, which recommends a short story titled "My Name is Osama." Calculatedly inciting hatred toward white American boys, the story is about a nasty little boy, "Todd," who taunts an Iraqi immigrant named "Osama."

This is the lesson to commemorate the biggest hate crime in history - committed by someone named "Osama" against people with names like "Todd." How about a 1942 lesson plan titled "My name is Adolf"? Might the 9-11 lesson plan inquire into what little "Osama" thinks about the

terrorist attack? May we ask? (Question from the actual lesson plan: "Why, do you think, did Osama's family leave Iraq?") Incorrect answer: Because his father wanted to go to flight school in America.)

Since the horrific attack by practitioners of the "Religion of Peace," there have been a slew of hate crimes - committed by Muslims against Americans. Hesham Mohamed Hadayet murdered two and wounded many more at Los Angeles International Airport. Suleyman al-Faris, aka "John Walker Lindh," joined an attack in Afghanistan that left Michael Spann dead. Abdel Rahim, aka "Richard Reid," tried but failed to murder a plane-load of people on an American Airlines jet headed to Miami.

The only backlash by actual Americans - not imaginary characters named "Todd" - consists of precisely one confirmed hate crime. Some nut in Arizona murdered a Sikh thinking he was a Muslim. Current hate crime tally: Muslims: 3,000 (and counting); White Guys: 1.

In the spirit of specifically targeting only the worrisome Muslims, I note that the media have inadvertently identified several of them with blinding clarity. In case you missed these stories, I bring them to your attention so you will be forewarned: Do not fly with any of these kids.

Soon after the terrorist attack, the New York Times chatted with students at the Al Noor School, a private Islamic academy in Brooklyn - evidently the Arab equivalent of the Horace Mann High School (Anthony Lewis, '44). None of the students said they had experienced any harassment since Sept. 11. To the contrary, their school had been deluged with support from local Catholic schools, hospitals, state education officials and political leaders.

But the love was entirely one-sided. The students stated point-blank that they would not fight for America against a fellow Muslim, denied that Osama bin Laden was behind the attacks, and criticized the United States for always opposing Muslims.

"Isn't it ironic," one student sneered, "that the interests of America are always against what Muslims want?" (That's why the last several major American interventions abroad - in Kuwait, Somalia, the Balkans - were all conducted in defense of Muslims.) Though uniformly refusing to believe bin Laden was behind the terrorist attack, the students showed a remarkable lack of curiosity about who was.

Students from the Al Noor School were interviewed again a few weeks ago, this time by CBS' "60 Minutes." The students instantly and enthusiastically agreed with the proposition that a "Muslim who becomes a suicide bomber goes to Paradise for that action." "Definitely," one student said, calling a female suicide bomber "very brave."

"Do you believe they are martyrs? Holy martyrs?" Again, without hesitation, the students affirmed: "Yes" and "of course."

As to whether suicide bombers would go to Paradise, the students said they earnestly hoped so. "I mean, they're doing it for a good cause," one boy explained. "I pray that they go to Paradise," another said. Not only that, but one student said, "I think we'd all probably do the same."

Weeks later, at the urging of the principal, the students modified their answers slightly. But according to CBS, "None of them changed their view that suicide bombers in Israel would go to Paradise." The Islamic studies teacher at Al Noor claimed the students misunderstood true Islam: "If you go to chapter 4, verse 29, it says so clear, 'Do not kill yourself.'"

It's always so comforting when Muslims cite the precise verse from the Quran that tells them killing is wrong. Don't all empathetic human beings understand that instinctively? What if they lost their Quran that day and couldn't remember?

In any event, and more to the point, the Quran does not strictly inveigh against killing and dying for Allah. In the eye-opening book "Unveiling Islam," Christian-convert authors Ergun Mehmet Caner and Emir Fethi Caner say the Quran "promises Paradise to those who die in battle for Islam more certainly than it promises salvation to anyone else."

The Quran instructs: "Fight those who believe not in Allah nor the Last Day ... until they pay compensation with willing submission, and feel themselves subdued." It promises that "if you are slain or die in the way of Allah, forgiveness and mercy from Allah are far better than all they could amass." Muhammad says: "Fighting is prescribed upon you. ... Tumult and oppression are worse than slaughter."

The real "Todd" of Sept. 11 prayed to a different God. Realizing the Muslim hijackers were on a mission of death, Todd Beamer and the other men decided to fight back.

He did not shout "God is great!" before ripping out an innocent man's entrails. He prayed: "The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures: He leadeth me beside the still waters. He restoreth my soul: He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake. Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for Thou art with me." (FrontPageMagazine.com | Sep 12)

The Principles of a Piecemeal Israel By Ari Shavit

The principles of peace that Ami Ayalon and Sari Nusseibeh drafted is an interesting document. Unlike most Israeli-Palestinian documents formulated in recent years, it includes two concrete achievements for Israel.

One is its recognition of the Jewish people, its right to the country, and the fact that it is the legitimate state of the Jewish people. The second seems like a genuine Palestinian concession on their demands to implement their right of return within the Green Line.

If Yair Hirshfeld and Ron Pundak had presented these two fundamental principles as a basic Israeli condition when they came to Oslo in early 1993, it is quite possible we would now be living in a very different reality. It is possible the accords crafted in Oslo would not have turned into the tragic and bloody grotesquerie we now live in.

However, in practical terms the Ayalon-Nusseibeh agreement is also defective. By relating to the June 4, 1967 lines as a basis for a future frontier and by stating that not a single settler will remain behind that border, the agreement creates a dynamic that could lead to the uprooting of close to 400,000 Israelis from their homes (210,000 in the West Bank and Gaza and 170,000 Jews in East Jerusalem).

This translates into a humanitarian catastrophe with no moral justification and no realistic chance. Since the agreement guarantees that the two geographic regions of the Palestinian state will be linked, without the proviso that Israeli sovereignty will not be adversely affected the agreement produces a dynamic that could lead to the partition of Israel into one Jewish Bantustan north of the Gaza-Hebron line and another Jewish Bantustan south of the line. Since the agreement also makes mention of the Saudi initiative, which refers to the right of return, to UN General Assembly Resolutions 181 (Partition Plan) and 194, it opens the door to eroding the fundamental principles that are its main achievements. The solution the agreement proposes on Jerusalem is utterly utopian, so the dynamic it could produce in the most sensitive place in the world is one of chaos.

Beyond its inherent specific problems, the Ayalon-Nusseibeh document has a fundamental problem. In September 2000, the Palestinian state-in-the-making launched a premeditated attack on the State of Israel. Even before its birth, the diplomatic entity of the Palestinian people chose to employ violence against its Siamese twin to unsettle it, wound it, block off its airways.

The object of this violent campaign strategic - to forcibly pry from Israel territorial and other concessions that sooner or later would lead to undermining its foundations. Therefore, any present-day Israeli move that extends beyond the line along which the diplomatic process was positioned on the eve of Rosh Hashanah 2000 is tantamount to capitulating to terror. That would translate into a Palestinian victory in the war now being fought.

In an unforgettable television interview given by Ami Ayalon to Ilana Dayan about six months ago, he raised an original argument - Israel must not win, the former Shin Bet director said. The agreement of understandings Ayalon has formulated with Nusseibeh ensures that this abstract provision will be realized in full. The agreement ensures Israel will lose the war.

If in the wake of the suicide attacks of 2001 and 2002 the Palestinians can still succeed in bringing about Israel's full withdrawal to the June 4, 1967 lines, and win a concession of sovereignty over the Western Wall, it is not hard to guess what they will manage to achieve in the next round of terrorist attacks.

If in the wake of the killing, the anguish and the demoralization that our neighbors have rained down upon us in the past two years, they can succeed in gaining Israel's willingness to divide itself in two and uproot hundreds and thousands of people from their homes, then there is no limit to what they will manage to achieve when they attack us again - immediately after the signing and implementation of the agreement.

After all, based on Ayalon-Nusseibeh, the reward for terror is enormous. The ability to bring Israel to its knees is within reach. Evidently, Ami Ayalon is not a man of the center. Through his astounding declarations and his unreasonable actions, he has transformed from someone who had been an outstanding commander of the navy into a somewhat eccentric political figure.

However, Ayalon's moves require that mainstream Israeli society must draw up a consensus definition of its diplomatic objectives in the current war. This objective must be clear - to ensure that when the violence ebbs, the Palestinians receive less than they were about to receive on the eve of the outbreak of violence.

We can go back to the Camp David program as Ehud Barak suggests; we can talk about the Clinton plan-minus, as others have proposed. Nevertheless, in one way or another Israel must make sure that the lesson the Palestinians learn from their aggression is that aggression does not pay.

If the lesson is otherwise, any peace agreement signed with them will not hold up. Any peace agreement will be nothing but a preface to another round of killing, terror and bloodshed. (Ha'aretz Sep 5)