



Jerusalem 6:05; Toronto 7:09

From the PA Media...

Hate Music Video on PA TV: Israeli Soldiers Shoot at Kids

By Itamar Marcus & Barbara Crook

Music videos around the world are intended for children's entertainment. But the Palestinian Authority (PA) uses music videos as a tool to promote hatred and violence among Palestinian children. In recent months, PA TV has increased the frequency of hate broadcasting aimed at children.

One example of this escalation is the repeated broadcast this month of a 30-second music video depicting Israeli soldiers as cold-blooded murderers.

In this fictitious scene, children are seen playing soccer, while actors portraying Israeli soldiers wearing yarmulkes (skullcaps) watch them from the side. Suddenly one of the soldiers moves over to the children and, after attempting to steal the ball, hits one of the children. The other children turn against the soldier and chase him away. He then grabs his automatic rifle, takes careful aim and fires at the children. Other fictitious PA hate videos directed at children include:

- Scenes of children playing soccer when the ball explodes in their faces;
- A girl on a swing who turns into a burning inferno;
- Soldiers throwing an old man to the ground and then shooting him in the head;
- A blind infant carried by his mother; when she is murdered by Israeli soldiers, they fall to the ground together;
- and many others.

The result of all this hate indoctrination is a generation of Palestinian children who have been convinced by the PA leadership that Israel is intentionally murdering civilians, especially children. The PA is creating for its children a moral equivalence between PA terror, which deliberately targets civilians in buses and cafes, and Israel's defensive war, in which some civilians have been inadvertently killed. This hate promotion is creating a generation of children who are filled with hatred for Israelis, and who see killing Israelis as legitimate because they are convinced that Israel is also targeting civilians.

The more this hate promotion continues, the more entrenched the Palestinian children's hatred becomes, and the bleaker the prospects for peace in the next generation. (Palestinian Media Watch Sep 10)

Commentary...

The Real 'Root Cause' of Global Terror By Evelyn Gordon

Apologists for terrorism like to seek its "root causes." And they have a point: The terror now sweeping Russia and Iraq was not born in a vacuum. Where they err is in identifying these "root causes" as the military campaigns in Iraq and Chechnya, when thousands of similar campaigns have not sparked similar terrorist responses. If today's campaigns do, it is primarily because the world – and Russia and America above all – has taught the terrorists that murdering women and children is an effective way to advance political goals.

Most of the tactics now being used by Iraqis and Chechens were invented by the Palestinians. It was the PLO that invented airline terrorism, with a wave of hijackings in the 1970s; it was Hamas that turned suicide bombings into standard practice; even the grisly Chechen takeover of a school in Beslan this month aped the PLO's takeover of a school in Ma'alot in 1974. But such acts, far from discrediting either the perpetrators or their cause, turned Palestinian statehood into an international cause celebre.

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

When the PLO was founded in 1964 – with the goal, incidentally, of a Palestinian state instead of Israel, which did not yet have the territories – no one was talking about such a state. Even after Israel captured the West Bank and Gaza from Jordan and Egypt, nobody advocated a Palestinian state in those territories; the world expected Israel to keep part of this land (that is why, according to its drafters, UN

Resolution 242 demands the return of "territories" rather than "the territories") and return the rest to Jordan and Egypt.

Forty years later, a Palestinian state in every inch of the West Bank and Gaza has become an international consensus. And this achievement was not in spite of Palestinian terror but because of it: Many peoples with equal or better claims to statehood, from Tibetans to Iraqi Kurds, have sought independence without resorting to terror; yet their aspirations at best elicit lip-service support from the world, and often outright opposition. The Palestinians' success lay in persuading the international community that peace depends on meeting their demands.

Not only did the world adopt the terrorists' cause, but it also adopted the terrorists themselves. The PLO has official observer status at the UN and diplomatic legations worldwide. And Hamas, which does not even pretend to aspire to peaceful coexistence with Israel, is banned by only a handful of states.

Russia's responsibility for the success of Palestinian terror is obvious: In its former incarnation as the Soviet Union, it was the terrorists' main sponsor and financier. It supplied money and arms to states such as Syria and Egypt in full knowledge that some would be given to the PLO. It also used its superpower status to push the Palestinians' demands in forums such as the UN, thereby granting them successes they could never have achieved on their own. Today, the material aid has halted, but the knee-jerk diplomatic backing continues.

America, in contrast, never openly abetted terror. Yet as the world's second – and today, only – superpower, it determined the success or failure of Palestinian terror in a way that far greater panderers, such as Europe, never could. And it chose to crown it with success.

In 1988, America formally recognized the PLO as "the official representative of the Palestinian people" and allowed it to open a diplomatic legation in Washington. True, the

PLO said it would "renounce terror" – but it was headed by the same people responsible for the Ma'alot school massacre, the Munich Olympics massacre, numerous airplane and bus hijackings, and other atrocities. Nor had the Palestinians ever democratically chosen the PLO as their representative. It was Washington's choice to reward the perpetrators of 24 years of murder and mayhem with diplomatic recognition and backing for a state instead of declaring them beyond the pale.

Five years later, after the Oslo Accords created the Palestinian Authority – headed by that same PLO leadership – Palestinian terror against Israel reached new heights. Most, admittedly, was perpetrated by Hamas, but it was the PA that refused to arrest the perpetrators, crack down on their funding, or even stop lauding the suicide bombers as "martyrs." But the US, rather than withdrawing diplomatic recognition or halting funding, instead pressed Israel to offer further and faster concessions.

Nor did this policy cease even in 2000, when the Palestinians responded to Israel's offer of a state in more than 90% of the territories with a full-blown terrorist war. Bill Clinton rewarded the terror by pressuring Israel to raise its offer yet again (to 97%, including the Temple Mount). And his successor, George W. Bush, rewarded it further by making Palestinian statehood, for the first time, an explicit US foreign policy goal.

Even today, while the Bush administration boycotts Yasser Arafat, it holds talks with PA officials who answer directly to him. The PA and PLO still have diplomatic legations in Washington, even though a major terrorist group, the Aksa Martyrs Brigades, is openly affiliated with Fatah, the

This week's issue is sponsored by
an anonymous member of the
Boca Raton Synagogue
wishing all his fellow *Israel News* readers a
כתיבה וחתימה טובה

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

ruling movement in both. And Washington continues to back the PA's territorial demands through the road map, while condemning Israeli efforts to fight terror in the PA's stead.

Iraqi and Chechen terrorists both have clear political aims: The Chechens want Russia out so they can establish an Islamic dictatorship in Chechnya; the Iraqis want America out so they can establish either a Ba'athist or Islamic (there are two competing groups) dictatorship in Iraq. And in an age of global communications, neither Iraqis nor Chechens can help noticing that each new round of Palestinian terror has led to greater international pressure on Israel to accede to Palestinian demands. The conclusion is obvious: To succeed, they should adopt Palestinian tactics.

Only by proving that terrorism does not pay can the US and Russia reverse this eminently logical conclusion. And they can do this only by finally penalizing Palestinian terror rather than rewarding it. Otherwise, expect to see ever more terrorism worldwide – because that has proven to be the winning tactic. (Jerusalem Post Sep 14)

While the World Sleeps By Frank Dimant

Staring out from my Jerusalem window, I reflect upon events of the past few days, which serve as a vivid reminder of what it means to turn a blind eye to the growing phenomenon of Islamist terrorism. The suicide bombing attacks in Beersheba. The murder of Nepalese hostages in Iraq. The downed planes in Russia. The suicide bombing at a Moscow subway station. And the siege at Beslan. These are just the latest casualties in the ongoing global terrorist war launched by anti-Western Islamist extremists.

History consists of watershed moments that define us as a people, and that have the power to change our destiny - for better or for worse. I am reminded of one such incident, if only then we had possessed the collective wisdom to follow what in our hearts we knew to be true.

Several days after the signing of the Oslo accords 11 years ago, in the presence of the president of the United States and witnessed by the world, Yasser Arafat, speaking in a mosque in South Africa, declared that this document could be torn up and disregarded as soon as the Palestinian Authority was strong enough to move against Israel. There were those in Israel and in the Jewish community throughout the world who immediately stated that the Palestinian leader was merely reassuring his supporters that he had not sold out their cause, and that these specific words were not to be taken seriously in the Western world.

Instead, the political alarm clock that should have awakened the slumbering democracies was reset for an extra few years of pacifism. As Israel snoozed and naive democracies demanded that Israel adhere to the Oslo accords come what may, Yasser Arafat and the terrorist infrastructure he controls, joined by Hamas and Islamic Jihad, consistently violated the agreement. The alarm clock that should have jolted the world to the reality that agreements with terrorists and Islamist radical fundamentalists simply do not have any value was, regrettably, put back into the sleep mode.

On Sept. 11, 2001, an alarm clock shattered the silence once again. Its meaning could not have been clearer; the world as we knew it was shaken to its core. The American people and the Western world, so we believed, were finally awakened to a new sense of reality. The time for inaction had surely passed. Sept. 11, or so we thought, would harden our resolve, and dictate our future course of action. Terrorism, it was widely held, knew no geographical boundaries. It was understood that religious terrorism had emerged as a key threat to Western civilization.

Thousands were killed in New York City. The Pentagon, in the heart of the American capital, was attacked, and yet today, most Americans do not recognize the reality that 9/11 was just another manifestation of an all-out attack against Judeo-Christian values by radical Islamist forces. Just as in the 1930s we failed to believe Mein Kampf and Hitler's predictions of what he would do with the Jewish people, so today the political correctness found in democratic societies precludes the ability of those who want to warn their countrymen of the dangers that loom and ensure their protection.

So desperate are those liberal and left-wing forces within Western society that they make every excuse not to believe the pronouncements of the enemies of Western civilization as we know it. Ludicrous theories are developed: If only the Palestinian problem could be solved, for example, it would mean an end to Islamist fundamentalism. There are some who say that, if only America would not intervene on behalf of the oppressed in war-torn areas, then terrorists would put down their arms. Sadly, such delusional ideas are even nurtured by those European and North American parliamentarians too afraid to confront today's reality - a post-9/11 environment that ill affords us the luxury of such platitudes, however comforting they may be.

Yasser Arafat has clearly told the West through his declarations in Arabic to his own people that agreements with infidels may be discarded. And infidels include not only Christians, but Jews, Hindus and any other non-Islamic religion. Events of the past few weeks should dramatically serve as the 11th-hour alarm to awaken those elected officials and bureaucrats who continue to turn a blind eye to atrocities by Islamists who have hijacked

their religion for their own murderous ends.

If history is to be our guide, then another defining moment is upon us. Let us hope that we are awake at last, and that the next time we hear the alarm ringing, it will be drowned out not by those who are content to lull us into complacency and inaction, but by our united voices insisting that our democratic values are those that must carry the day.

The writer, a BAYT founding member, is Executive Vice-President of B'nai Brith Canada. (Globe and Mail Sep 9)

The Warnings of Sinai Jerusalem Post Editorial

Vacationing Israelis continue to flock to Sinai, despite repeated and increasingly dire official warnings of terrorist attacks. Because nothing has happened since previous warnings were issued, the public seems to be treating advisories from counter-terrorism experts and the Foreign Ministry as akin to the boy who cried wolf.

Israelis already vacationing on Sinai's beaches did not pack their bags and head back when the latest warning was issued. Thousands, who were still on Israel's side of the border when the advisory was broadcast, crossed to Egypt nevertheless. Travel agencies did not report mass cancellations.

Over the past summer alone, an estimated 300,000 Israelis are said to have sought rest and recreation south of the border. The Sinai thus replaces Turkey as Israelis' most popular tourist destination.

Complacency reigns supreme, despite Foreign Ministry emphasis on the particularly acute nature of its latest warning, based on "specific, concrete information of plans by terrorist groups to attack Israelis in the Sinai." The previous advisory, not quite as severe, was issued 10 months ago.

But safety is not the only issue. Even if Sinai were the safest place on earth, it is somewhat disconcerting that self-respecting Israelis seem to view Egypt as a natural and unexceptional vacation destination.

Theoretically, tourism can cement peace and encourage friendly contact between previously warring peoples. But tourist traffic had for over two decades been strictly one-way. Egyptians shun Israel, while Israelis flock enthusiastically to Egypt, providing much-needed income.

Not only is the Egypt so favored by Israelis not friendly, it is in fact hostile. The peace Israel expected was reduced to a very cold truce.

Egypt sponsors anti-Israeli resolutions in international forums and is a routine proponent of any available outrageous initiative. It has long been leading a campaign against Israel's nuclear capability, a campaign the motive of which is not clearly that of a friendly nation.

Egypt withdrew its ambassador from Tel Aviv and refuses to reinstate him, in flagrant violation of its peace treaty undertakings.

Perhaps the most serious breach involves the refusal to take sustained and effective action against the subterranean arms smuggling from Sinai into Gaza. Egypt generally turns a blind eye to the Palestinian tunneling, save for occasional showy "discoveries" of a tunnel or two.

Less than two weeks ago, Foreign Minister Silvan Shalom charged that Egypt "no longer prevents gun running into Gaza. We perceive a significant lowering of Egypt's profile in comparison to what we knew in the past" – and that past wasn't overly encouraging to begin with. Then there is the fact that Egypt is one of the world's chief disseminators of anti-Jewish hate. It's the source of hit TV fare unabashedly based on the "classics" of anti-Semitism, such as the Protocols of the Elders of Zion.

Its controlled media vie for the distinction of most anti-Israel. The mass-circulation government daily Al-Akhbar published an editorial on August 24 calling for sanctions against "the Nazi aggressor Israel.... It and its supporters should be boycotted and ostracized in the international community." A month earlier, the ruling National-Democratic Party's newspaper printed an "in-depth investigation" in which it disputed the existence of Nazi gas chambers and quoted in detail a rogue's gallery of international Holocaust-deniers.

Americans are staying away from France for much less provocation. If Israelis are not offended by the constant anti-Jewish and anti-Israeli drumbeat produced by Egypt, how can we expect other nations to be appalled? We understand that Israelis almost regard Sinai as its own entity, as if it were not part of Egypt. Many, indeed, were introduced to its natural beauty during the years when it was under Israeli control. Our tourists do not flock to Cairo in the same way, even though one can imagine that if it were a more friendly place it might have some of the allure of the many offbeat destinations Israelis often frequent.

Israelis have amply demonstrated to the Arab nations which have signed peace treaties with us that the goodwill is there if only there were a modicum of willingness to reciprocate. Perhaps our overeagerness has actually reduced the incentive for these nations to act in ways that befit nations at peace. Maybe we should let the splendors of Sinai wait for a day when they are not only safer, but when the nation they belong to stops fomenting hatred against us. (Jerusalem Post Sep 12)

The Lessons of 9/11 By Robert S. Wistrich

It was three years ago – September 11, 2001 – that the burning towers of the World Trade Center came to symbolize a new escalation in the deadly, worldwide jihad against Western civilization.

The perpetrators, driven by a demented religious self-intoxication, saw themselves as messengers of Allah sent to wipe out the modern towers of Babel erected by the Great Satan. The bloody deed signaled that its executors were bent on total confrontation, on pursuing an either-or politics of victory or death.

This declaration of civilizational war had nothing to do with specific grievances such as the Palestinian question, let alone territorial conflicts between states. The young Saudis who carried out the Manhattan massacre were hardly poverty-stricken; nor had they ever experienced foreign occupation. What dominated their mind-set was a potent mixture of anti-American hatred, anti-Semitism, the cult of death, a nihilist will-to-power and the radical political theology of jihadism.

As the recent US commission examining the circumstances preceding 9/11 observed, this slaughter was carried out by Islamic terrorists. It was publicly proclaimed in the name of Allah, his Prophet and the Koran.

The Hamas weekly, *Al-Ris'la* in Gaza, summed it up very succinctly on September 13, 2001: "Allah has answered our prayers."

Since then America has found itself at war not only with a highly amorphous, international jihadist network, but with an ideology that allows indiscriminate murder to be perversely transformed into martyrdom and revolutionary virtue.

The aim of Islamist terrorists is to sow systemic economic disorder, panic, fear and physical destruction in the heart of the West. The goal is to demoralize Israel and destabilize the Arab regimes – regarded as Muslim lackeys of the "crusaders" and Zionists.

The subsequent bombings in Baghdad, Bali, Bombay, Riyadh, Casablanca, Istanbul and Madrid underlined the global dimensions of this threat.

The last three years have amply illustrated the difficulties in confronting such a ruthless enemy whose nihilist credo might best be defined as "I kill, therefore I am."

The fact remains that Osama bin Laden is considered a hero by millions of Muslims. The American-led invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq, while an essential deterrent to Islamist hubris, cannot of themselves solve the problem. Indeed, military action has provided a new rallying cause for jihadists in their war against the West.

Iraq, in particular, offers the promise of immortality and revenge for imagined humiliations to a new generation of holy warriors.

For Israelis this is an all-too-familiar experience. The Palestinian jihad against Israel began long before 9/11. It has been able, for decades, to hide behind a mask of legitimate "resistance to occupation," escaping the opprobrium al-Qaida incurs outside the Muslim world.

The 9/11 attacks did not change this basic situation or bring Western Europe to regard the defense of Israel as an integral part of its war against Islamist terror. Terrorist atrocities against Israelis actually increased international solidarity with the Palestinians in certain quarters.

The demonization of Israel and the new wave of anti-Semitism did not decline. Instead they have steadily gathered pace since 9/11. Even the security fence – Israel's most effective measure to date against the Palestinian jihad – was declared illegal by the International Court of Justice. In the UN General Assembly, this travesty was supported by the European Union.

Worse still, in the wake of 9/11 the trend in Europe and elsewhere to question the historic legitimacy of Israel, as to condemn American policies in the Middle East, has only increased. September 11 was interpreted in these circles not as an unprovoked act of mass murder by Islamist fanatics but as the price that "the West" was paying for American backing of Israel.

Three years later, the outcome of the American-British intervention in Iraq is still unclear. The need to persist in ensuring the establishment of a stable constitutional regime is, however, stronger than ever.

The looming specter of a nuclear-armed, fundamentalist anti-Western Iran which threatens Israel's existence as well as some of its Arab neighbors is a reminder that we are only at the beginning of a very dangerous period in world history.

In this battle there are no short cuts, easy military solutions, or political quick fixes. Nor, as long as the Islamist threat is alive, can Israel expect that territorial concessions (unilateral or otherwise) will provide anything more than temporary relief.

What is required is a comprehensive Israeli strategy for the post-9/11 world which can combine effective military deterrence, increased intelligence cooperation with other threatened states, greater internal unity, and patience combined with a renewed battle of ideas that reasserts the integrity of the Zionist ideal.

More innovative ways must also be sought to achieve dialogue with the sane but largely silent moderate elements in the Muslim world; they are surely aware that radical Islam is their enemy too.

Finally, we have to leave the door open to those Palestinians who genuinely

want to extricate themselves from the blind alley of a bankrupt Arafatism and finally join the modern world. (Jerusalem Post Sep 12)

The writer is professor of European history at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Risen and Fallen Angels - the Israel-hating Left By Bret Stephens

A couple of months ago, the Associated Press published a series of pictures taken in the village of Kabatiya, near Jenin. They showed a Palestinian man being marched down a street by armed guards, then shot like a dog in the village square. Were the executioners Israeli? No. They were members of the Aqsa Martyrs Brigade, the military wing of Fatah, Yasser Arafat's political movement.

The victim was 45-year-old Muhammed Daraghmeh, accused of molesting his two daughters and collaborating with Israel. Was the accusation true? Who knows. Had the charge been proved by some kind of normal judicial procedure? It had not. Instead, the crowd chanted "death, death," the gunmen obliged, and the crowd cheered. More astonishing was that the gunmen invited the foreign press to record the scene. They were pleased with themselves, not ashamed.

Now consider the plight of Palestinian homosexuals. In August 2002, Yossi Klein Halevi wrote a piece in *The New Republic* which told the story of "Tayseer," a 21-year-old Gazan homosexual, who was lured to a tryst in an orange grove near his refugee camp. The next day he was summoned to the Palestinian police and told his partner of the day before was an informant. If Tayseer wanted to avoid prison, he had to become an informant. Tayseer refused.

What happened next was this: Tayseer was arrested "and hung by his arms from the ceiling. A high-ranking officer he didn't know arranged for his release and then demanded sex as payback. Tayseer fled Gaza to Tulkarm on the West Bank, but there too he was eventually arrested. He was forced to stand in sewage water up to his neck.... During one interrogation, police stripped him and forced him to sit on a Coke bottle. Through the entire ordeal he was taunted by interrogators, jailers, and fellow prisoners for being a homosexual."

I take note of these stories for two reasons. First, because Tayseer and Muhammed were victims not of the Israelis but of other Palestinians, and the context of their victimization was not the occupation but the style of rule established by the PLO from the moment it arrived in Gaza in 1994.

The second reason is that the abolition of capital punishment, and the promotion of gay rights, are two great causes of the "engaged" Left. A third great cause, of course, is Palestine. How is it that the three causes can travel together? How can the Left treat with veneration a movement that, in basic respects, is the antithesis of the very values it claims to champion? Conversely, how can it view with venomous hatred the one country in the Middle East that attempts to live by those values?

There are several plausible answers to this question, which fall into one of two categories: First, that whatever Israel's virtues or Palestine's vices, Israel's crimes against the Palestinians are such that they command the Left's attention above and beyond other international conflicts. Second, that there is something deeply wrong with the Left's moral and political vision. It will come as no surprise to readers that I subscribe to the second view. But let's try to do justice to the first.

There is, of course, the usual charge sheet: Occupation, settlement, land seizures, indiscriminate use of force, extrajudicial killing, house demolitions, and so on.

Yet none of these accusations constitutes the real core of the Left's complaint about Israel. After all, Israel is not the only country denying an angry minority its state: the Sinhalese in Sri Lanka are doing the same to the Tamils. Nor is Israel the only country building a wall – Morocco built one in Western Sahara, which it illegally occupies, against the Polisario Front. Nor, certainly, has Israel been uniquely heavy-handed in its tactics: Whatever Sharon did in Jenin or Sabra and Shatilla, it's as nothing next to what Putin did in Grozny.

A more serious argument would begin by pointing out that however Israel treats its own citizens is not material to the question of how it treats Palestinians. France, too, was a liberal democracy in 1957, when General Aussarresses was torturing Algerian militants. Nor, to extend the analogy further, does the misrule of the Palestinian Authority necessarily delegitimize the cause it represents, any more than the actions of the FLN delegitimize the cause of Free Algeria.

Furthermore, one might say that precisely because Israel is a democracy, the standards the West applies to it must be higher than the standards the West applies to the Palestinians. Israelis, says Giancarlo Chevillard, the outgoing EU ambassador to Tel Aviv, "are one of us... We expect more from Israel than from Cambodia or Colombia."

Finally, it can be argued that Israel, on account of its superior power, is in a position to make political and territorial concessions whereas Palestinians are not. Thus, Israel's failure to make such concessions can

only be attributed to greed – for land – or religious fanaticism – for The Land.

For the Left, then, what it boils down to is this: Israel is a country that could do better, morally speaking, but chooses not to. It could safely withdraw to the 1967 borders, but chooses not to. It could hold itself to the highest legal and ethical standards, but chooses not to. It could have peace at the cost of a little land, but chooses not to.

This, indeed, would seem to justify special opprobrium, if true. For true evil – the Satanic paradigm, the paradigm of God's fallen angel – is contingent on knowledge of good. Hutus in Rwanda and Arab militias in the Sudan may murder by the hundreds of thousands – but that is what Africans and Arabs do, isn't it? It may be dreadful, but it's not surprising.

As moral theories go, this is a defensible one: defensible in the way that judgments of guilt or innocence require a prior determination of mental and moral fitness. Did the defendant know he was committing a crime when he committed it? If the answer is yes – as it is assumed to be in the case of the Israelis – then the crime is damnable; if the answer is no – as it is assumed to be in the case of the Palestinians – then the crime is forgivable.

The problem here is that rendering a "yes" or "no" answer in the cases of Israel and Palestine is not simple. Take Israel: Can it really be said that Israel's conduct against the Palestinians is markedly worse than the conduct of other Western democracies at war? Furthermore, how does one go about determining whether Israel's alleged failure "to do better" is willful and malicious, or circumstantial and excusable?

Neither question is easy to answer. It is one thing to judge Israel's actions in light of relevant international legal covenants. But the strong case against Israel should not be proved normatively but comparatively: That is, not by the extent to which Israel departs from a given legal standard, but rather by how Israeli standards compare with the standards of Israel's Western peers. If, for example, France and the United States have employed a policy of targeted assassination against select enemies of state (as they have and do) then Israel must be held to that same standard (even if it continues to be held to a different standard vis-a-vis the Palestinians).

On the second point – could Israel have done better on the peace front? – one may equally ask: Could Germany do better on the economic front? I mention Germany because it presents a case in which almost all economists and policy makers are agreed on what needs to be done (mainly, reducing high labor costs), but the actual doing of it is not so simple. Germany is a democracy; there are competing sectoral interests, some quite obstructionist; there is a delicate political balance; and it is not enough for the chancellor to give his orders and be done with it.

The same goes for Israel. If Israel's tougher critics are going to demand that it comport itself in a way that befits a democracy, then they must also accept that democratic outcomes will often be imperfect and not to their liking.

There is another logical difficulty with ascribing to Israel willful malice toward Palestinians, and the problem is this: Why hasn't Israel acted worse? Israel, say its critics, is the powerful party; therefore it is morally incumbent on it to make the bulk of concessions. But if Israel fails to make those concessions, and if it fails to make them precisely because it's greedy and fanatical, why has it not proceeded to the next steps? If you're capable of one Sabra and Shatilla, you're capable of dozens of them. It is difficult to square the image of a murderous Ariel Sharon with the fact that 2,500 Palestinians have been killed in four years of fighting, and not 25,000, or 250,000.

In other words, the only way Israel can credibly be alleged to have chosen not to do good when it could have done good is if it had gone on to commit the most heinous crimes, in the style of Nazi Germany. Satanic evil – chosen evil – is never half-hearted.

Now to the Palestinians. This column began by asking how a movement that is in so many respects violent and illiberal should have such an overwhelming claim on the sympathy of the pacifist and progressive Left. Part of the answer, of course, is that the pacifist and progressive Left often has a secret fondness for violence and illiberality – remember the Red Brigades and the Weathermen. Part of the answer, too, is that the Western media has tended to magnify Israeli violence and minimize Palestinian violence, leading to a generally distorted picture of events. But these are not the deepest reasons.

Rather, the Palestinian cause has benefited from a certain kind of mirror-imaging or inverse correlation. To the extent that Israel is seen as powerful, the Palestinians are seen as powerless. To the extent that Israel is seen to be guilty, the Palestinians are seen to be innocent. To the extent that Israel is seen as having deliberately chosen its course, the Palestinians are seen as having been stripped of the ability to choose. And to the extent that Israel is seen to represent a unique kind of evil – the evil of the fallen angel – the Palestinians represent a unique kind of good – the good of the lost little puppy.

It is easy to see that in this role the Palestinians perform a real function for their champions in the West: as the fetishized "other" and as receptacles for their compassion. Yet here too there are problems with the Left's vision. Does the Left really want to suggest that Palestinians are unfit to be judged by the same standards used to judge Israelis? And if the Palestinians are not quite "innocent" of such crimes as suicide bombing, can it still be said that they are innocents in a more general sense, as people who have been deprived of

individual moral agency by the all-encompassing reality of Israeli occupation?

There is also the problem of whether the Left's vision of the Palestinians as emblems of powerlessness coincides with the Palestinians' vision of themselves. My impression is that it does not. On the contrary, I am repeatedly struck by how confident Palestinians are of ultimate and total victory over Israel. At a private conference last year in London, one Palestinian embassy official put it bluntly: "The '67 borders were your last hope," he said.

For the Israel-hating Left, Palestine has become a religious destination, not a political question; a world of fallen and risen angels, in which facts conform to molds and evidence yields to faith. At some point, however, it will become increasingly difficult to bridge the chasm between their faith and their values. If they're not careful, it is a chasm into which they will, eventually, fall. (Jerusalem Post Sep 12)

The Clash of Civilizations By Moshe Arens

In 1993 Samuel Huntington published his landmark book "The Clash of Civilizations." Not all of his predictions are likely to come true, but there is no doubt that we already are in the throes of a war between Islamic Fundamentalism and Western Civilization. Suicide bombing of innocent civilians and the beheading of civilian hostages has become the trademark of Islamic terror. If these acts can be considered the mark of a civilization, it is certainly the anti-thesis of Western civilization, and bears no resemblance to the great civilization of Islam as it has been known through the centuries.

The announced aim of many of the acts of terror is the destruction of Western civilization, while others are depicted as the desperate acts of "freedom fighters" battling for the cause of the Chechens, the Iraqis, or the Palestinians. But they have the same common denominator – total disregard for human life. It is barbarism pure and simple, and the barbarians are now at our gates. In the age of modern technology, they can attain destructive power completely out of proportion to their relatively small numbers, and thus represent a real danger to even the most powerful of nations.

For years Israel seemed to be the sole target of Islamic terrorists. In September 1972, 11 Israeli athletes were massacred at the Munich Olympic games. In May 1974, 21 children and five adults were murdered at the schoolhouse in Ma'alot. During those years, punctuated by many acts of Palestinian terror, most of the world stood by, believing that Israel would remain the only target of such horrible acts.

Even with the advent of the Palestinian suicide bombers Israel found itself alone, with many excuses being offered for these murderous acts. Some European countries made "deals" with the terrorists, believing that they could buy themselves "immunity" from terror. But it was not long before the wave of terror spread like a plague over much of the world. The Twin Towers in New York, the attack in Bali and then in Madrid demonstrated how vulnerable was the world. When hundreds of children were taken hostage and murdered in Beslan two weeks ago, Israelis could not but be reminded of the tragedy in Ma'alot 30 years ago.

France, which had spearheaded the opposition to the US-British operation to depose Saddam Hussein, was under the illusion that it had gained a degree of popularity even among the crazies of the Islamic terror, but found to its chagrin that it was as exposed as all the rest. Two French journalists, Christian Chesnot and Georges Malbrunot, were kidnapped on August 20 in Iraq, then sold to a group of Islamic fanatics, and are now being held hostage, to be released only if France revokes the recent law prohibiting the wearing of Islamic head scarves in French schools. They are the latest journalists to be taken hostage, some of whom, like Daniel Pearl, the Wall Street Journal correspondent in Pakistan, and Enzo Baldoni, the Italian reporter in Iraq, have already been executed by their captors.

On September 11, 2001, the president of the U.S., George Bush, realized that he was facing a full-scale war. Slowly, other world leaders – as their countries are hit by terrorist attacks – are arriving at the same conclusion. Hopefully, this will bring about the degree of international cooperation that is required if this war in defense of Western Civilization is going to be pursued effectively.

Deliberately or unintentionally, acts of terror affect the domestic politics of democratic countries. On more than one occasion, Israel has experienced this as election time approached, as terrorist incidents have a tendency to sweep away all other issues before an election. In their wake, the electorate tends to measure the candidates in terms of their perceived ability to lead the war against terror. Something like this seems to be happening right now in the U.S., as the November election approaches. The murder of hundred of children in the school in Beslan has refocused the concern of many on the danger of Islamic terrorism, and the need to pursue the war against it. The two candidates for the presidency will be measured by many in terms of their perceived ability to lead the country in this war. This phenomenon may explain the sudden jump of Bush in the polls after what happened two weeks ago in North Ossetia, thousands of miles away. (Ha'aretz Sep 14)