



Quote of the Week...

"The time has come for the Council which adopted resolution 1373, and which has been at the forefront of the global counter-terrorism campaign, to hold to account a brutal dictatorship that is world-renowned for adopting terrorism as its primary tool. The world is watching. And today, more than on any other day, God is watching too!" - Israel Ambassador to the UN Dan Gillerman to the Security Council, in defense of Israel's attack on a terrorist camp in Syria, moments before his departure to mark Yom Kippur. (IMRA Oct 7)

Commentary...

Neither Safe Nor a Haven By James S. Robbins
Israel strikes at terror — in Syria.

One of the blind spots in the global war on terrorism is the unwillingness of the United States to integrate the Palestinian terrorist organizations into the matrix of groups with which we are at war. This is explained by way of definition — the conflict we are engaged in with our Coalition partners is against the global terrorist network. The cluster of terror groups targeting Israel — Hamas, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP), Hezbollah, and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad (PIJ) among others — are not globally networked. They are a local or regional problem, and not part of the fundamentalist threat aimed at the United States. Thus, they are not on the radar screen. So goes the explanation.

This reasoning is a fig leaf at best — and I direct readers to Michael Ledeen's invaluable *The War Against the Terror Masters* for a full explanation why. Some of these groups have active networks that reach every continent, and into the United States. And almost all of them receive support in one fashion or another from Syria and Iran. In fact, they have for decades. And while the United States may choose not to involve itself overtly in cutting these strands of the international terrorism web, the recent suicide bombing in Haifa, which killed and wounded around 70 people, demonstrates that this is a threat Israel cannot afford to ignore.

The Israeli attack on the Ayn al-Sahib terrorist training camp in Syria was the first of what the Israeli government has called "expanded military operations" against terrorism. Sharon spokesman Raanan Gissin said that Israel "will take whatever measure is necessary to defend our citizens regardless of the geographic location of these training camps," including strikes in Syria and Iran. Syrian officials claimed that the Ayn al-Sahib camp had been previously used by the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) but had been abandoned for the last seven years. The Associated Press reported that "for the past decades the valley of olive and fig groves has only been used by picnickers and walkers." (It is strange that the Mossad, which is blamed for masterminding every event in the Mideast, if not the world, cannot figure out the difference between a terrorist base and an olive garden.) Most press reports are marking the location of the terrorist camp as "deep within Syria." The tone would be much different if the stories described the camp as being close to the Syrian border with Lebanon, along the main access road between Damascus and the Bekka Valley. A 1997 report described Ayn al-Sahib as "the most important base of [the PFLP] and ranks as one of the preeminent training camps where it houses extreme fundamentalists from Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, and Algeria. The training is run by officers from the Iranian Revolutionary Guard. They are instructed in street fighting, plane hijacking, hostage taking, and blowing up specific targets — Israeli, American, European, and other targets in certain Arab countries." Clearly, this was no place for a picnic.

But let's say the PFLP had closed down that facility. Their spokesmen seemed to know immediately exactly how much damage had been done in the

ISRAEL NEWS

*A collection of the week's news from Israel
A service of the Bet El Twinning Committee of
Beth Avraham Yoseph of Toronto Congregation*

This week's issue is dedicated in
memory of a great and proud Zionist
ישראל הרש בן עליעזר ז"ל
Israel H. Asper ז"ל

attack, but that aside. The Israeli strike was aimed at the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, the group that carried out the Haifa bombing. The PIJ is rumored to be planning to relocate their headquarters operations out of the Palestinian Authority, in response to the very effective Israeli tactic of targeting their leadership in retaliation for attacks on Israeli civilians. The PIJ may recently have set up new quarters in Ayn al-Saheb, and this was Israel's way of telling them they can run but

they cannot hide. Whether any PIJ members died in the attack has yet to be revealed.

The attack was also a message to Syria, and to other countries who use terrorism as an instrument in executing their international strategy. The old paradigm of state sovereignty will not deter military or other action taken in pursuit of violent non-state actors. Terrorists can no longer exploit the rules of the international system established to govern relations between states. In this, Israel is following the U.S. lead. Syrian sovereignty is not worth any more than Taliban Afghan or Hussein Iraqi sovereignty was when those regimes chose to facilitate international terrorism. Any other state pondering whether to allow Islamic Jihad or other terror groups to find safe haven must know that it will neither be safe nor a haven. Israel's new policy — called "escalation" by some, but "expansion" is a more accurate term — places countries that harbor terrorists in a position either to deplore the presence of terrorists on their soil and thank Israel for helping out; to acknowledge their support for terrorism; or to pretend that the problem doesn't exist, complain to the U.N., and keep on supporting violence against innocents, which seems to be the Syrian approach.

On a related note: When the Israelis bombed the French-built Iraqi "Osirak" nuclear reactor in 1981, the U.S. official response was critical but privately there was a sense of relief. Had Israel not taken that farsighted action, the "imminent threat" that the president's critics believe is required before decisive action can be taken against rogue states would have been well evident even by 1991. And rather than reviewing evidence of Saddam's WMD program last week, Congress might be looking at the results of a WMD strike, and asking, Why didn't somebody do something before the threat was imminent? Rogue states and terrorists don't play by the rules. The international system was set up to maintain the peace, not facilitate terror, and no civilized country under siege should feel constrained by the norms its deadly enemies despise. (National Review Oct 7)
The writer is a National Review contributing editor.

From Damascus to Ramallah By Michael Freund
What a difference an airstrike can make.

Israel's daring attack this past Sunday against a Palestinian terrorist training camp on the outskirts of Damascus was one of the most encouraging signs to emerge from the Middle East in a good, long time.

After years of ineffectual and unimaginative efforts to counter anti-Israeli terror, the government chose to hit the terrorists where they least expected it: in the suburbs of the Syrian capital, right under the nose of Bashar al-Assad and his dictatorial regime.

The attack was a slap in the face to the Syrian autocrat, and a well-deserved one at that, underlining his regime's continued support for an array of terrorist groups, such as Hamas and Islamic Jihad.

Coming at a time when the US Congress is considering the Syria Accountability Act, a bill that would empower the president to impose sanctions on Damascus for its sponsorship of terror, the Israeli airstrike is bound to reinforce the need for this important piece of legislation.

Sunday's raid also laid bare the failure of US Secretary of State Colin Powell's Syria policy, which has thus far relied on diplomacy to persuade Assad to desist from harboring terrorist groups. It was less than 5 months ago, in May 2003, that Powell visited Syria and politely asked Assad to close down the terrorist network operating in his country.

That request, as Sunday's attack made clear, was about as effective as asking the Taliban in Afghanistan to turn over Osama Bin-Laden. It fell on deaf ears, for the simple reason that Bashar Assad is not someone who can

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

be reasoned with.

As Deputy Defense Minister Zev Boim told Israel Radio on Sunday, Damascus remains the headquarters for Islamic Jihad and Hamas, where the two groups plan their strategy and issue instructions to their members in the territories to carry out terrorist acts.

And, Boim noted, the Islamic Jihad cell in Jenin, which was responsible for this past Saturday's massacre of 19 Israelis in Haifa, maintains regular and ongoing contact with the leadership in Damascus. Hence, for all intents and purposes, Powell's approach has proven entirely unsuccessful.

More importantly, though, the airstrike demonstrated that Israel is prepared to cross an international frontier, infringing upon its neighbor's sovereignty when the safety and security of its citizens is at stake.

In other words, it showed that Israel has not forsaken the will to live, and that it is ready to put aside concerns over international condemnation, and strike hard at those who seek its destruction.

But the attack outside Damascus was not the only one which Israel carried out that day. A second operation, which took place in Gaza, showed that the old, outmoded way of thinking is still very much alive in Israel's defense establishment.

Hours after the suicide bombing in Haifa, Israeli airforce jets reportedly targeted a house in Gaza, firing missiles at a compound that Yasser Arafat is said to use when he visits the city. But that house was as empty as the thinking behind its destruction, because Arafat is safely holed up in Ramallah, and is not known to have visited the Gaza compound in nearly two years.

According to the media, the house was likely targeted to "send a signal" to Arafat, as though such a course of action has never been tried before.

But the time for signals is over. Arafat and his minions are beyond signals, far beyond. If anything, the targeting of one of their empty compounds sends precisely the wrong message, suggesting that Israel is unwilling or unable to hit them directly, so it does the next best thing by taking out their weekend retreat.

But the message Israel needs to be sending Arafat and the entire leadership of the Palestinian Authority is the same as the one which it sent to Islamic Jihad on Sunday, namely that they are not safe anywhere.

There is no "out of bounds" in this war, and there can be no sanctuaries for terror, regardless of whether they are in Ramallah, Damascus or Gaza.

The only way to get rid of terrorism is not to "isolate" it, or ostensibly make it "irrelevant", but to eliminate its practitioners, the terrorists themselves. And that includes Yasser Arafat too.

If Sunday's air raid near Damascus turns out to have been a one time occurrence, or a blip on the counter-terror radar screen, then its impact will last only as long as the smoke billowing over the terrorists' training camp.

But if it heralds a new strategy in Israel's war on terror, one in which it adopts bolder and more forceful measures which ultimately result in the elimination of the Palestinian Authority itself, then it just might prove to be the turning point we have all been hoping, and praying, for. (Jerusalem Post, Oct 8) *The writer served as Deputy Director of Communications & Policy Planning in the Prime Minister's Office under former premier Benjamin Netanyahu.*

Israel's Retaliation on Syrian Base Sends Strong Message:

Terrorists, guardian states are never out of reach By Lorne Gunter

On Saturday, a young female Palestinian law student, a supporter of the extremist Shiite terror group Islamic Jihad, entered a crowded restaurant on the beach in Haifa, Israel, and blew herself up. She killed 19 others, including three children, an infant, and five Israeli Arabs.

Haifa, you see, is known as a model of Arab-Jewish co-operation. So such co-operation must not be permitted to light the way to peaceful co-existence. Such co-operation must be snuffed out, even if for terrorists it means killing people they claim to be defending.

In retaliation, Israel sent jets low over the desert in the predawn dark of Sunday morning and bombed the Ein Tzahab terrorist base just 22 kilometres from the Syrian capital, Damascus. Israel did not target innocent families sitting down to dinner. It struck back at a known Islamic Jihad staging post.

Israel was right, militarily and legally. International law and national sovereignty are not protective skirts behind which combatants may hide when it suits them, then sneak out from at will to commit their carnage.

Israel and its terrorist tormenters are not playing a deadly game of "Tag, you're it!" The bloodthirsty murderers cannot "tag" Israel, then scurry back to Syria -- or the West Bank, Gaza, South Lebanon or anywhere else -- and claim safe sanctuary by crying "Home free!"

International conventions on armed conflict clearly permit cross-border reprisals when a nation's national security is jeopardized. Those conventions also authorize direct attacks on any third-party state that knowingly harbours soldiers or terrorists committing acts of war from its territory on another country.

And since Syria gives protection to 19 different terrorist organizations, permitting them to stockpile their weapons, plan strikes on Israel and other nations, and train their soldiers there, Syria itself is a legitimate target, and not just the terrorists' bases there.

Militarily the attack was wise, too. It damaged the terrorist infrastructure, and therefore made further terror attacks less likely for a while. But it also sent a

strong message both to the terrorists and the governments that sponsor them.

Israel's air raid reminded terrorists: We can locate you wherever you operate, attack you, and withdraw without suffering significant casualties of our own. Moreover, both you and your guardian states are powerless to do much about it because you both know that if you try we will do the same again, or worse.

In April 2002, in response to an equally horrific suicide bombing at a Passover Seder in the Israeli seaside resort of Netanya -- that one killed 29 -- the Israel Defense Forces sent tens of thousands of troops to reoccupy much of the West Bank in a mission called Operation Defensive Shield.

The world squawked then, too, but for more than three months after that incursion, terror attacks on Israel were reduced by one-half to three-quarters. (Edmonton journal Oct 8)

The writer is a columnist with the Edmonton Journal

The 'Military Solution' Works By Evelyn Gordon

Last week marked three years since the outbreak of the intifada and 18 months since Israel started fighting back (in Operation Defensive Shield). Yet people are still being blown up in our streets. The unavoidable conclusion, proclaimed various media commentators, is that the Left was right all along: There is no military solution to terror.

The hard data, however, tell a very different story: that while the war on terror is still far from over, it has actually been making impressive progress.

In the intifada's grim second year, from October 2001 through September 2002, Palestinians killed 449 Israelis and foreigners present on Israeli soil, including both civilians and soldiers. Yet for the year that ended last week, this figure was down 47 percent, to 240.

On a monthly basis, the comparison is even more dramatic. Never again has there been a month even approaching the horror of March 2002, the month before Operation Defensive Shield. The 134 Israelis killed that month is more than three times the death toll during the worst month of the past year, and almost 2.5 times the 58 people killed in the second-worst month of the intifada (June 2002, the month after the army withdrew from Palestinian territory following Defensive Shield. It was this renewed surge of killing that persuaded the government to send the troops back and this time, to keep them there).

Furthermore, two of the worst months of the past year were months in which military activity was drastically curtailed: June 2003, with 32 deaths, and August 2003, with 29. June was the month of the road map "peace process," during which Israel largely suspended military operations so as not to disrupt the "momentum toward peace." August was the month of the famous Palestinian cease-fire, to which Israel responded by restricting its own military activity. (In fact, the death toll that August was higher than in 22 of the 34 months without a truce!) One could thus reasonably assume that had Israel maintained the military pressure over the summer, the year's death toll would have been even lower.

But while a 47 percent drop in the number of victims is undeniably impressive, an annual death toll of 240 people is clearly unacceptable. The question, therefore, is whether we can expect the downward trend to continue in the future, or whether this is indeed the maximum that military activity can achieve.

THOUGH ONLY time can provide a definitive answer, there are several reasons for believing that a resolute continuation of the war will produce additional benefits.

First, eight years of bad policy cannot be reversed overnight. During the seven years of Palestinian self-rule that preceded the intifada, terrorist organizations such as Hamas, Fatah and Islamic Jihad were allowed to operate virtually without interference, and all the organizations took advantage of this time to recruit and train members, stockpile arms and otherwise improve their ability to commit murder. After the intifada erupted, they enjoyed a further 18 months of grace, since Israel's military activity during this time was confined to the utterly pointless exercise of sending "signals" to the Palestinian Authority by bombing empty buildings; the organizations used this time to further upgrade their resources.

Israel, in contrast, allowed its capabilities to deteriorate drastically during those eight years. After it pulled out of what became the PA in 1994, its vital network of Palestinian informants was almost completely destroyed, and this network had to be painstakingly rebuilt over the past 18 months.

Since Operation Defensive Shield, however, the trend has been reversed: Israel has steadily improved its capabilities, particularly in the intelligence field, while the terrorist organizations have seen their supplies of arms, money and trained personnel shrink under Israel's onslaught. As long as Israel maintains the military pressure, this positive trend can be expected to continue.

Second, Israel has repeatedly made the mistake of agreeing to "give peace a chance" by temporarily suspending its military activity and the terrorist organizations have exploited every such respite to regroup. There is, however, reason to hope that the lesson has finally been learned: Not only did Israel reject the most recent Palestinian cease-fire offer out of hand, but the United States, which pressured Israel into most of the previous truces,

fully supported this stand. In fact, even Britain, hitherto a staunch Palestinian supporter, admitted that another truce is a "non-starter" (to quote its new ambassador, Simon McDonald) absent serious anti-terror activity by the PA. If Israel can refrain from falling into the truce trap again, its war on terror is likely to be even more successful.

Finally, it is clear that Israel has not been prosecuting the war as intensively as it could. It was only in August, for instance, that it began targeting senior Hamas personnel, and it stopped again after a mere few weeks. Were Israel to stop exercising such misguided restraint, this would almost certainly produce improved results in the long run.

Far from proving a failure, the "military solution" has proven its efficacy over the last year. What is needed now is for the government to finally make up its mind to finish the job. (Jerusalem Post Oct 7)

Arafat's 'Investments'

New York Post Editorial

The next time you hear the Palestinians and their supporters bemoaning how Israel's determination to defend itself against terror has "crippled" the Palestinian economy, consider a new report from the International Monetary Fund.

The IMF recently disclosed that its own audit uncovered the fact that Palestinian Authority President Yasser Arafat between 1995 and 2000 diverted fully \$591 million from the PA budget into a special bank account under his personal control.

That's nearly \$100 million a year!

Talking about hitting the lottery.

According to the IMF's Karim Nashashibi, the money - which came from tax revenues collected by Israel and turned over to Arafat - was used to invest in 69 domestic and foreign commercial companies, whose actual owners were not disclosed.

(Arafat's investments, by the way, returned a profit of \$300 million. Not bad for a Marxist revolutionary.)

This at a time when, as one member of the Palestinian Legislative Council complains, "the Palestinian people are starving and the universities are bankrupt."

But while Arafat has never used such funds for a personally luxurious lifestyle, neither has he allowed them to be used as originally intended - to create a viable Palestinian social-welfare infrastructure.

Indeed, Arafat has long allowed Hamas to build and maintain such institutions - which are then used as recruiting stations for suicide bombers and other terrorist murderers.

Actually, the IMF report is hardly surprising - it merely confirms what has long been known about the corrupt nature of Arafat's would-be state.

Back in 1998, a European Union audit disclosed that \$20 million in Egyptian funds meant to build low-income housing was instead turned into a luxury apartment complex that was given over to top PA officials and Arafat acolytes.

Last year, a former Arafat treasurer charged that Arafat had taken more than a half-billion dollars in international aid and transferred it to his personal accounts; an Israeli intelligence report estimated Arafat's assets at \$1.3 billion spread across the world.

Forbes magazine, in a more conservative estimate, placed Arafat's net worth at \$300 million, making him one of the richest world leaders.

In fact, Arafat is little more than a greedy vulture preying on his own people.

Every industry in the PA is a monopoly controlled by Arafat henchman; these concerns, 27 in all, set inflated prices for the average Palestinian and require kickbacks from anyone looking to do business in the West Bank and Gaza.

Little wonder, then, that prices for basic consumer goods in Arafat-controlled territories have quickly tripled and small-business owners have found it impossible to operate.

The IMF pronounced itself "concerned" by its auditors' report and has asked the Palestinian Authority for an explanation.

But the G7, meeting last week in Dubai, called on world nations to "increase and accelerate their assistance provided to the Palestinian Authority."

Yet with the PA totally under Arafat's thumb - following his successful ouster of Prime Minister Mahmoud Abbas - that would do little more than pump billions more into a cesspool of corruption.

Enough, already. (New York Post Oct 2)

The Case Against Jordan

 By Alan M. Dershowitz

Jordan is the West's favorite Arab nation. And for good reason, since it is the best of a generally bad lot. Most westerners admired King Hussein, adore his best-selling widow Queen Noor, and respect his son, King Abdullah. US President George W. Bush recently, and appropriately, praised King Abdullah for his devotion to peace in the region. No one has to write "The Case for Jordan," as I have had to write *The Case for Israel*.

But any fair comparison between the Middle East's most reviled and condemned nation, Israel, and its most praised nation, Jordan, starkly reveals the invidious double standard applied to Israel.

A few largely unknown facts about Jordan: Jordan has a law on its books explicitly prohibiting any Jew from becoming a

citizen, or any Jordanian from selling land to a Jew. It has refused to amend this law despite repeated demands.

Jordan has perfected the art of torture and uses it routinely against dissidents, suspected terrorists and perceived opponents of the monarchy. I'm talking about real torture here, not the kind of rough interrogation occasionally employed by the US and Israel. Jordan even threatens to torture and tortures the entirely innocent relatives of suspected terrorists, as it did with Abu Nidal's mother.

The United States is fully aware of Jordan's proficiency in torture, having "subcontracted" some of its own difficult cases to Jordanian "experts" (along with Egyptian and Philippine torture experts). Yet the UN has never condemned Jordan for its use of torture.

Jordan killed more Palestinians in one month September 1970, known as Black September than Israel has killed during the three years of suicide bombings that began in the fall of 2000. The brutality of the Jordanian Army toward Palestinian dissidents and terrorists was far more egregious than anything Israel has ever done.

The Jordanian Army has deliberately bombed civilian areas of Israeli cities in clear violation of international law. In 1967, before Israel fired a single shot at Jordan, the Jordanian Army fired 1,600 missiles into west Jerusalem, targeting apartment buildings, shops and other non-military targets. Israel did not respond by bombing Amman, which it easily could have done. It responded by attacking Jordanian military targets and then offering a cease-fire, which Jordan rejected.

JORDAN IS not a democracy. It is a hereditary monarchy which stifles dissent, freedom of speech and freedom of the press. Its democratic facades a legislature, cabinet, judiciary are all subject to control by the Hashemite minority rulers who were placed in charge of the majority Palestinian population by a colonial decision.

Why do Americans not know the case against Jordan? Because it is in no one's interest to make it. Jordan is an ally of the United States (at least some of the time). It is a peace partner with Israel (at least now). It is the best of the Arab states in the Middle East, but "best" is a comparative term with a relatively low basis for comparison.

Why then am I making the case against Jordan? Simply to demonstrate the double standard so widely employed in judging Israel. Nothing justifies this double standard. Yes, Israel receives American aid, but so does Jordan (as well as Egypt, the Palestinian Authority and other Arab states). Indeed Jordan receives, on a per capita basis, more actual aid than Israel, if aid is defined as receiving assistance in return for nothing. Israel earns its aid by giving back an enormous amount especially in the area of military intelligence and technology. The aid given to Jordan is entirely a one-way street that goes primarily into propping up its minority monarchy and preventing its Palestinian majority from taking over. Israel, as a democracy, needs no aid to prevent internal upheaval.

So this case against Jordan is really part of the case for Israel. It invites fair-minded people to ask why Jordan which by any standard of fair judgment is less democratic, more oppressive, and far more racist gets a pass while Israel is subject to so much vilification.

Having made the case against Jordan, let me add that I, too, admired King Hussein, whom I had the pleasure of meeting. I, too, respect his son King Abdullah, who recently met with Bush and restated his commitment to a peaceful two-state solution. But I must insist and the world must insist on a single standard of judgment and criticism with regard to all nations. By any such standard, Israel deserves less criticism and more praise than Jordan.

The writer is a professor of law at Harvard. His latest book is The Case for Israel. (Jerusalem Post Oct 7)

A Confident Arafat

 By Ze'ev Schiff,

"For the past three days, the statements on the Middle East from U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell have focused on the "negative" actions of Israel. On the other hand, there is no criticism of repeated statements made by Qureia that the Palestinian Authority did not intend to take any steps against the radical Islamic organizations. No wonder Arafat is riding a wave of self-confidence."

A discussion about the fate of Yasser Arafat will almost automatically begin in the cabinet following the suicide bombing Saturday in Haifa that wiped out entire families. The attack, on the eve of Yom Kippur, is greatly reminiscent of the one at the Park Hotel in Netanya during Passover, April 2002. That attack was followed by Operation Defensive Shield, an extensive Israel Defense Forces operation in the West Bank.

Even if Arafat had no connection to the attack carried out by Islamic Jihad, the various intelligence branches of the security services in Israel are sure that his role in recent terrorism has intensified. While Israel's possible courses of action are limited, even if there is a decision not to remove "the obstacle," as Arafat has been termed, it is expected that the noose around his office in the Muqata will be further tightened, leaving him in near isolation - meaning, he will not be allowed any visits, not from foreign dignitaries, diplomats, the media, or even his own ministers, including the new Palestinian Prime Minister Ahmed Qureia.

For nearly four weeks, there was calm. No suicide bombings were carried out, nor were any Qassam rockets fired from the Gaza Strip. But the Shin Bet security service analysts were not convinced that the quiet was here to stay. During the past month, there were 22 interceptions of suicide bombing attempts from the West Bank alone. The number of intelligence warnings was even greater. It was clear that it was only a matter of time before a suicide bomber would successfully penetrate the defenses.

It turns out that following the United Nations General Assembly's call on Israel not to harm Arafat, his self-confidence has been on the rise. Arafat had managed to shift the attention onto Israel's actions. This was the case with the security fence and with the plans for new construction in the settlements.

For the past three days, the statements on the Middle East from U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell have focused on the "negative" actions of Israel. On the other hand, there is no criticism of repeated statements made by Qureia that the Palestinian Authority did not intend to take any steps against the radical Islamic organizations. No wonder Arafat is riding a wave of self-confidence.

Thanks to his self-confidence, Arafat continues to oppose and prevent any attempt to take control over the Palestinian security organizations out of his hands. Arafat got rid of Mahmoud Abbas and Mohammed Dahlan from the previous government.

In the mean time, major terrorist attacks against Israel are claiming more victims than Palestinians. This does not seem to prevent ministers and senior officers to declare, with exaggerated confidence, that Israel continues to win. (Haaretz Oct 5)

Only Those with Beliefs Can Defeat Those with Beliefs

By Dennis Prager

As both supporters and opponents of President Bush acknowledge, America is largely going it alone in the war against Islamic terror and tyranny. Until a month ago – yes, one month ago – the European Union would not even label Hamas a terrorist group.

There are many explanations for the lack of support for America in this war, a war of civilizations just as much as the wars against communism and Nazism were wars of civilizations. But the overriding reason is that America has far more believers – in religion and in their country – than any other nation in the industrialized world.

Faith in religion and in America also explains much of the ideological division within America itself. President Bush, Vice President Cheney and Condoleezza Rice are deeply religious, and the vast majority of deeply religious Americans support this administration and its foreign policy.

Of course, some of the president's supporters aren't religious and some of his opponents claim to be religious, but these phenomena can be also explained by the question of faith. Virtually all the non-religious supporters of President Bush's war on the Islamist threat to liberty have a deep faith in the United States and in its mission to preserve liberty. Religion is by no means the only form faith can take. Fervent believers have existed among communists and Nazis. They exist today among animal-rights advocates, environmentalists and countless other ideologies.

But in the modern West, hundreds of millions of people have no such faith in anything. They do not passionately believe in their country or in religion. Their highest values are tolerance, health, pleasure and not judging good and evil. They are deeply afraid of fervent believers in anything. And they especially fear American believers – i.e., believers in the Bible and in America. That is why they commonly equate fundamentalist Christians with fundamentalist Muslims and that is why they so hate George W. Bush, the believer in the biblical God and in an American mission.

As for the religious opponents of the president and his war against Islamic terror, they themselves will tell you that they do not share the true believers' faith. The Christian supporters of the president overwhelmingly believe that the Bible is the word of God, while the religious opponents of the president generally regard the Bible as a human document. Faith is therefore the dividing line even among believers in the same religion. That explains why most Christians who believe in the divinity of Scripture are closer on almost every moral and social position with Jews who believe in the divinity of Scripture than they are with theologically and politically liberal Christians.

We cannot defeat the Islamist threat without the same degree of faith fanatical Muslims have. That is why most Europeans have capitulated to the anti-liberty Muslims in their midst and to the Muslims in the Middle East who seek to annihilate Israel, the state in their midst that venerates liberty.

But in Israel, the Islamists have come upon an enemy many of whose people believe in their religion as deeply as the Islamists do in theirs. This is a major reason Israel is isolated along with America as the Islamists' main enemy. America and Israel have believers. The defeat of one or the other will render the Islamists' goal – a Muslim world governed by Islamic laws – probable, if not inevitable.

That is why this battle is a battle of civilizations. One civilization believes in liberty and one does not. The problem is that the civilization that has liberty has not produced anywhere the depth of belief in liberty that the opponents of liberty have produced. That is why most Europeans (and their supporters in America on the Left) see dying or killing for almost anything as pointless. When

you don't believe in anything except not dying, you don't really believe in anything. For this reason, European civilization is in peril.

The great question mark is America. America is already in the midst of a civil war, thankfully still non-violent. It is between those who fervently believe in America and in Judeo-Christian revelation and those who fervently believe in neither.

If the former win, the Islamic totalitarian threat, like the totalitarian threats before it, will be vanquished. If the latter win – as represented by the Left, many Democratic Party leaders, pacifists, the cultural elite and academia – liberty will have been nothing more than an aberration that lasted a few hundred years. (WorldNetDaily.com Oct 7)

The writer, one of America's most respected and popular nationally syndicated radio talk-show hosts, is the author of several books and a frequent guest on television shows such as Larry King Live, Politically Incorrect, The Late Late Show on CBS, Rivera Live, The Early Show on CBS, Fox Family Network, The O'Reilly Factor and Hannity & Colmes.

'Unequivocal Condemnation' Jerusalem Post Editorial

On Sunday, as Israelis prepared themselves for Yom Kippur, the holiest day of the year, the names of the 19 dead from the massacre in Haifa's Maxim restaurant were being read on the radio, as were the times of their funerals. Two families were all but wiped out, including grandparents, parents, and children in the attack, carried out by a woman suicide bomber from Jenin.

Also on Sunday, European Union Ambassador Giancarlo Chevallard laid a wreath at the site of the bombing. Yasser Arafat and a slew of Palestinian officials condemned the attack, which, as Arafat put it, "subjects the higher interests of the Palestinian people to the most serious dangers and labels our people with the stain of terror."

Let us state at the outset that we take the horror of European officials in response to terrorism at face value. Yet if hypocrisy is, as the dictionary says, "an expression of agreement that is not supported by real conviction," the European and Palestinian reactions to this latest atrocity belong, to different degrees, in the same category.

It is by now well established that the Palestinian Authority with all its men under arms and multiple security forces that efficiently quash dissent is not lifting a finger to prevent terrorism. But this is just the beginning. The PA, in the same breath that it condemns terrorism in English and Hebrew, continues to encourage it with abandon in Arabic to the Palestinian people.

On September 21, Al-Ayam reported on a soccer tournament an event that in a normal society might be a welcome opportunity to provide a semblance of normality for a people living under harsh circumstances. Yet no less than 13 PA officials, led by close Arafat adviser and media figure Saeb Erekat, used the event to deliver a powerful political message: We honor suicide bombers.

The event was given the sporty title, "The Shahids [Martyrs] Tournament, of the Path of the Palestinian National Struggle for Palestinian Institutions, 2003." Each of the 24 competing teams was named for another leader in the PA's pantheon of terrorism, including: Yihiye Ayash ("the Engineer"), Hamas's most prominent mastermind of suicide bombings; Dalal Mughrabi, a woman terrorist who hijacked a bus killing 36 in 1978; Raid Carmi, chief of Fatah's suicide bomber wing, the Al Aqsa Brigades, and so on.

The trophy was presented by Erekat on behalf of Arafat, after the officials led the crowd in standing for a "moment of pride in memory of the spirit of the martyrs," the newspaper reported.

At the same time, official PA television continues to broadcast the message that Israel all of Israel will be destroyed through the terrorist offensive that it continues to glorify. Last week, the PA began to rebroadcast a clip produced last October showing a beating heart, dripping with blood, which is suspended from a map of Israel. The evocative graphics are accompanied by the refrain: "Allah is Great / Oh, the young ones / Shake the earth, raise the stones / You will not be saved, Oh Zionist / From the volcano of my county's stones. / You are the target of my eyes" (see Palestinian Media Watch, for full translations and video clips).

To call what the "moderate" Palestinian leadership is doing hypocrisy is to understate, since that term implies greater effort to hide the truth. In this case, the truth is broadcast through print media and airwaves, hidden only behind the thin barrier of the Arab language.

In Europe's case, however, there is only so much that can be explained away as willful ignorance or naivete. European governments know two things full well. First, that Arafat and his government are not only failing to fight terrorism, but are providing a diplomatic cover and propaganda encouragement for it. Second, that Europe is Arafat's last and only important friend in the world, and if key European capitals suddenly decided to expose Arafat's ruse and end all contact with him, the path of support for terrorism would no longer be a viable one.

Arafat provides an umbrella for terrorism, Europe an umbrella for Arafat. It's time to put an end to both charades. (Jerusalem Post Oct 7)