

## 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 Oct. 21 at 7:30 pm

*Bnai Brith presents a community rally in support of Israel with keynote speaker Joseph Farah, Editor and CEO of WorldNetDaily.com, Inc. who will speak on "The Hard Truth about the Middle East" at Shaarei Shomayim.*

### Commentary...

#### Unity Without Direction Jerusalem Post Editorial

Prime Minister Ariel Sharon opened the Knesset session Monday with a ringing defense of his unity government, which he pointed out has lasted much longer than anyone predicted. Opposition leader Yossi Sarid retorted that the government has zero accomplishments to its credit and is a complete failure.

The truth is somewhere in between: The unity government is both an accomplishment and a disappointment.

Sharon said, "I intend to maintain unity with all my strength, but national unity cannot be devoid of content. Our unity must have purpose, path, and action." But this is exactly what the unity government has failed to do.

The government is defined by what it has avoided.

On the political-diplomatic front, Sharon is right that keeping such a broad government standing has been a frustration to Yasser Arafat, who must have expected that continued war would end up toppling his nemesis and dividing the Israeli people. But this a negative accomplishment - an avoidance of disaster - not a real victory.

On the economic front, Sharon strongly defended his budget and the need to stay within the deficit targets. But here too the accomplishment is defined as avoiding steps that would drive a limping economy into more dire straits, not a recipe for recovery.

Sharon's unity government is like a boxer who prides himself on taking a beating round after round and remaining standing, undefeated.

To this Sharon would respond that he has not lost sight of victory. In the Knesset, he predicted that a turning point has been reached on the Palestinian side, and that by next year things will be different. Sharon still claims that the peace and security he promised will be delivered.

To this end, he called on the Palestinian people to "root out the regime of murder and replace it with the rule of peace." But why should Palestinians take such a call seriously when the Israeli government has just decided to finance the very regime Sharon demands they overthrow?

Incredibly, the Prime Minister's Office confirmed that it had reached an agreement with US Ambassador Dan Kurtzer and PA Finance Minister Salaam Fayad on a mechanism to release NIS 2 billion in withheld tax monies to the PA. Under the agreement, American officials will reportedly ensure the money is going to pay the salaries of people who are not engaged in terrorism.

News of this decision came the day after Maj.-Gen. Amos Gilad, coordinator of government activities in the territories, told the Knesset Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee that some of the funds Israel has already released were used to finance terrorism. "There is a contradiction between an establishment that organizes terror and a desire to help the population," Gilad told the committee.

He further stated that the Palestinian economy is in a desperate condition, but that corruption is on the rise and there is no chance that funds given to the PA will ameliorate the suffering of the people.

It is impossible to fathom why the prime minister - the government was not even asked - would ignore Gilad's testimony and overrule his opposition to releasing further funds. Half-hearted pressure from the US State Department is hardly an explanation.

Housing Minister Natan Sharansky, who knows a thing or two about the

importance of withholding money from rotten regimes, is livid. "Irrespective of any agreement on 'supervision' by American observers, it is inconceivable that we will conspire in the payment of monies to the very people killing and maiming our citizens," he fumed. "No amount of 'oversight' will change this. Only a change of regime, as President Bush so resolutely demanded, with a real oversight system in place within an entirely restructured temporary administration, run by Western and democratic technocrats completely unaffiliated with the Palestinian Authority, would justify the gift of such sums."

The release of this money indicates that neither the Bush or Sharon administrations have learned much from a cardinal failure of the Oslo Accords, the failure to hold the PA to any reasonable standards. If the PA can enjoy direct infusions of money from Israel without fighting terrorism, what reason does it have to take on Hamas and Islamic Jihad?

Sharon's decision to fund the regime he is calling on the Palestinian people to remove is an example of the government's perennial muddling with no clear path or destination. At a time of immense opportunity and change, such rudderlessness is unacceptable. The alternatives represented by the opposition or by a breakup of the unity government may be even less appealing, but this does not excuse the government's lack of a coherent diplomatic or economic strategy. (Jerusalem Post Oct 15)

#### The Sheer Good Sense of Solidarity By Roland S. Süßmann

The Arab house painter who liked to joke with the students while he worked on a building site near the Frank Sinatra Café at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem is an Israeli Arab, a "good guy," a citizen. He is also the cold-blooded murderer who laid and set off the bomb that killed 11 people at the university. He chose his target based on where he worked, reopening the difficult debate on the loyalty of Israeli Arabs to the Jewish state.

The attack at the university was highly significant in that it took place in an environment friendly to the PLO. But the Arabs do not discriminate. As far as they are concerned, Israel must disappear and all Jews are enemies, even those who take up their cause. Their approach is inspired by Nazi Germany, whose primary objective was to kill as many Jews as possible while selecting out those whom they could exploit.

Despite their profound wish for peace, Israelis have recognized that the struggle against the Arabs who are trying to destroy Israel with terror must be fought to the bitter end. Neither the brutal deaths of more than 600 people nor the thousands of injured, or the family tragedies that have arisen from all this have succeeded in shaking the endurance and morale of the Israeli population. Its stoicism and courage are like the bravery of the British in the London Blitz during World War Two.

All Israelis agree that if the army had not gone back into Arab-controlled areas in the territories, had not systematically eliminated terrorist leaders and captured more than 150 would-be suicide bombers, the number of victims would have skyrocketed.

Thanks to Prime Minister Ariel Sharon's determination, this bloodbath has been avoided, though the series of Arab crimes committed against Jews is far from over. The bill for Oslo has still not been paid. Only uncompromising action -- without political negotiation -- against the PLO and criminal activities of Arafat and his cohorts will gradually bring peace back to the country.

Another strategic imperative is to strengthen the Jewish population centers in Judea, Samaria and Gaza and allow them to flourish.

The steadfastness of the Jewish state is unacceptable to the "enlightened" world, with the exception of a part of the Bush administration, which was forced by events to become more clear-sighted.

Straight after September 11, when 15 Saudi terrorists killed thousands of Americans, the US's first reaction was to ask for Saudi Arabia's support in the fight against terrorism. They might just as well have asked Al Capone to

**Yasher Koach and thank you to our supporters. Thank you also to Continental Press for their ongoing support.**  
**Readers are requested to please mail contributions to: BAYT - re: Israel News, 613 Clark Avenue West, Thornhill, Ontario. L4J 5V3**  
**Annual Rates: Friend - \$36, Supporter - \$50, Benefactor - \$180. Dedications are welcome at \$120/week.**  
**Call (905) 886-3810 for further info. Israel News can be viewed on the internet at [www.bayt.org](http://www.bayt.org)**

fight organized crime. Gradually a better understanding of the truth about the Saudis seeped into the administration.

Ever since the former Soviet Union opened up its vast oilfields to the West, Saudi Arabia has known that its power, based on the 25% of the world's oil resources it holds, is wobbly and its stability in danger. Threatened with the loss of this source of extortion against the West, the Saudi kingdom has founded and financed thousands of mosques and Islamic colleges (madrasas) around the world, where the fanaticism in the Koran is taught and the cultural and religious destruction of the West preached daily. It was graduates from these institutions who carried out the September 11 attacks and wait, ready to be activated at a moment's notice.

To succeed in its war against terrorism it is this double blackmail -- economic and terrorist -- that America must fight.

What should be done? In his latest work *Does America need a foreign policy?* Henry Kissinger pleads the case for a clear, unemotional concept of the national interest, for an America true to itself, ready to act alone, without the support of an international consensus, whatever painful means need to be employed.

The fact that President George W. Bush has adopted these ideas is an example, a breath of fresh air for the free world. Moreover, the struggle of the Jewish state has become the struggle of the most powerful nation on earth.

In this war the Jews are once again on the front line, because the leaders of Arab terrorism in Israel are working hand-in-glove with those in the Islamic world and at the heart of anti-Semitic movements which want to put an end to the democracies that guarantee individual liberties.

The struggle for the survival of these supreme values will only succeed if America continues unceasingly to support Israel, particularly if it decides to attack Iraq alone or exclude Saudi Arabia from a future coalition. If he fights the good fight to the finish, Bush will be included, like Winston Churchill and like Sharon, in that line of men across history who have had the courage to say no.

Despite everything Israel has suffered since its creation, it continues on the path to success. During a conversation with the prime minister, Sharon told me: "We share a common responsibility: the State of Israel. We Israelis have taken on the major share, but we expect the Jews of the Diaspora to play their part."

More than ever we must prove our solidarity with Israel, first and foremost by visiting as often as possible, and by investing in the economy in order to create jobs.

*The writer is editor-in-chief of SHALOM -- The European Jewish Times based in Geneva, Switzerland. This article was adapted from the September issue. (Jerusalem Post Oct 13)*

---

## Does it Really Matter Why Christians Support Israel?

By Jonah Goldberg

What's got so many folks upset is that the evangelicals support Israel for religious reasons. And sure, it'd be nice - **from a Jewish perspective** - if Revelations envisioned a happier ending for Jews. But, first of all, if you are Jewish (as I am), why should you care what Christian prophesy holds if you don't expect it to happen? And, if it does happen, and Jesus returns to Earth to establish his kingdom, who's to say a few Jews won't listen to him? And if it turns out the Jews are right and the Messiah will show up for his first visit, isn't it possible that he'll have an explanation handy for everyone?

No one can say their biblical interpretation will actually bind G-d's hands at the end of the day, because man is not more powerful than G-d. In short, leave the details of the end of the world up to G-d because he's the one calling all the shots.

But let's come back to Earth for a moment. Other peoples' religions say all sorts of unpleasant things about non-believers in general or Jews in particular; the only relevant question for us humans is how people translate their theology into moral action because morality is the only thing we can objectively judge.

In the past, supposedly authentic Christian readings of the Bible justified all sorts of terrible things be done to the Jews. Call me crazy, but the fact that evangelicals believe the Bible commands them to love and respect the Jews seems like a huge win for the tribe, historically speaking. Only a fool would complain, "Oh, you're just being kind to people because the Bible tells you to!"

"60 Minutes," because of its ongoing mission to show Christian conservatives as the downfall of human civilization, portrayed evangelical supporters of Israel as caricatures, incapable of multidimensional thought. But I've discussed this with dozens of evangelicals, and I didn't recognize the people shown on "60 Minutes."

Yes, the evangelicals I've heard from believe that Israel has an important place in G-d's plan and that Jews are G-d's chosen people. But that's a backdrop for them, a theological context that allows them to see the plight of Jews in a sympathetic light. Most of the ones I hear from are much quicker to talk about Israel as a democracy or an ally - not as the tripwire for Armageddon.

And, let's point out there's no shortage of Israelis who believe Israel exists

because G-d intended it to. They only disagree with the evangelicals over what G-d's intentions are. And that argument is only going to be settled on G-d's timetable. (Jewish World Review Oct. 9)

---

## Let Israelis Protect Themselves

By Gabriel Danzig

Most Israelis heaved a sigh of relief when it became known that the suicide bomber who blew himself up near Bar-Ilan University on Thursday had failed to enter the bus he intended to destroy, and wound up blowing himself up outside where only a few people were standing.

But relatives of Sa'ada Aharon, the 71-year-old woman he succeeded in killing, and the other victims of his blast, do not have anything to rejoice over. We have become inured to death if we view the death of only one woman, and the wounding - in some cases serious wounding - of only a handful of others as a great success.

How did it happen? How did a captured terrorist manage to kill? One cannot blame those who initially apprehended him for releasing him and bolting. What else could they do? Neither of them had a weapon, and the terrorist might have exploded at any moment. These people, one of them the bus driver, are heroes who prevented a much greater tragedy and saved the lives of many passengers.

But with the proper preparation, they could have been able to do more. For years, residents of Judea and Samaria have carried personal weapons.

This was the case long before the present intifada broke out, at a time when life in those areas was relatively calm. It was certainly not as dangerous then as it is today within the borders of pre-1967 Israel. But still, the government recognized that weapons were appropriate.

In the current state of conflict all citizens deserve the right to be able to defend themselves if necessary. We cannot place a security guard in every section of the country, but we can allow qualified citizens to bear arms. At the very least, we can allow, even demand, that citizens involved in particularly sensitive occupations bear arms. Buses, for example, remain a prime target of terrorist attacks.

If we cannot afford to place security guards on all the buses, at the very least we can allow bus drivers to take precautions. These drivers are on the front line of the battle every day. They should be offered the opportunity to be trained to shoot, and receive a pistol for use in emergencies.

Steps should be taken to identify other sensitive areas where individuals such as shop-owners, students, restaurateurs and others can be issued defensive weaponry.

No one wants Israel to become the kind of society that existed in the Western part of the United States in the 19th century and earlier, where every adult male (and a great many females) had to learn to fight with a pistol. But if circumstances demand, we have to allow more self-protection.

With the threat of suicide bombings showing no sign of disappearing, more citizens deserve the right to take measures to protect themselves.

*The writer is a classicist at Bar-Ilan University, specializing in political thought. (Jerusalem Post Oct 14)*

---

## A Washington Agenda

Jerusalem Post Editorial

It is widely assumed that Prime Minister Ariel Sharon is being summoned to the White House on Wednesday to ensure Israeli restraint in the shadow of, and during, the expected American action in Iraq. The meeting is indeed a necessary one, but one objective of it should be dispel the notion that our self-defense disrupts the war against terrorism.

On Thursday, a suicide bomber almost succeeded in blowing himself up on a crowded bus, but due to the courageous action of the driver and a passenger "only" managed to kill one person and wound 30 others. On Friday night, another suicide bomber was kept out of a crowded cafe, chased by an unarmed guard, and subdued by US Embassy guards.

In both cases, attacks that could have killed a dozen people or more were narrowly averted. And these are but the tip of the iceberg of the many attempted bombings thwarted by the IDF.

Under such circumstances, and given America's own struggle against terrorism, one might think that US would show complete understanding for our restrained military efforts. After all, we have not just refrained from evicting or arresting Yasser Arafat, despite the shared US-Israeli assessment that he is not lifting a finger to prevent terrorism. We have gone a step further and heeded the US request to end the siege on Arafat's headquarters, which allowed some 20 terrorists he was harboring to escape.

Since then, the terrorists have been emboldened. This is not surprising, because the sight of President George W. Bush protecting Arafat has at least temporarily reversed the positive impact of his speech of June 24 calling for a new Palestinian leadership.

This is not all. The US has reportedly been pressing us to ease up on Palestinian cities, to dismantle unauthorized civilian outposts, and to release up to NIS 2 billion in withheld Palestinian tax revenue. Further rounding the picture, we are being pressed hard not to act against the diversion of some of the Jordan's source waters by Lebanon and not to "get involved" (in the words of Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld) if attacked by Iraq.

This is dead wrong. The same hand of Arab terrorism, belligerency, and aggression that America is about to confront in Iraq is busy killing Israelis. Bush understands that appeasement would be reckless in the case of Iraq, but it is no less foolhardy with respect to aggression against us.

It is difficult to fathom why Bush, who seems to understand that the struggle against terrorism must be a seamless and total one, seems to think he will score points with Arab regimes by restraining us. On the contrary, the experience with Afghanistan, and even now with Iraq, proves that Arab opposition to the US is diminished, not increased, by powerful demonstrations of resolve.

The Arab states are only minimally opposing the prospective US action not because the US has been sensitive to their concerns, but because they understand the US is playing to win. The same is true with respect to Arab aggression against us: The more the US demonstrates that attacking us brings only more support for us, the less we will be attacked.

Accordingly, the goal of Wednesday's meeting in the White House should be complete understanding between the two leaders and the deliberate reversal of the impression that Israeli self-defense is part of the problem, rather than the solution.

The model here should be the relationship between the US and Britain. There are often differences of opinion, even between close allies, but each nation has an interest in settling those differences quietly and showing a united front.

Bush's great breakthrough is the realization that tolerating despotisms in the Middle East is a direct threat to the US. A primary hallmark of that tolerance has been the de facto acceptance of implacable Islamic enmity toward us. It is not too soon to demonstrate that part of the new order will be an end to the delegitimization of Israel. But if even the US is uncomfortable with minimal Israeli measures of self-defense, how can the Arab world be expected to change its ways? (Jerusalem Post Oct 14)

---

#### **Afraid of Christians or Far Left?** By Jonathan Tobin

A "peace protest" in New York's Central Park was the scene of vicious anti-Israel epithets uttered from both the podium and the Palestinian flag-waving audience.

It was organized by a group called "Not in Our Name," which previously sponsored a full-page ad in The New York Times opposing war with Iraq, and also denouncing Israeli policies but not Arab terrorism. It was supported by Hollywood leftists like Susan Sarandon, Ed Asner, feminist guru Gloria Steinem and the Jewish far-left's Tikkun Community impresario Michael Lerner.

Last Friday, Oct. 11, the Christian Coalition rallied for Israel and voice its support for the Jewish state in front of the White House. There were speeches from American and Israeli political leaders, including the Rev. Pat Robertson, U.S. House Majority Whip Tom DeLay (R-Tex.) and Jerusalem Mayor Ehud Olmert.

Guess which of these events is setting off alarm bells for many mainstream liberal American Jews?

You got it - the latter one.

Yes, the prospect of American Christians gathering in Washington to express their devotion to Israel and to demand that the administration do nothing to harm its interests is very scary to many Jews.

It is so scary that according to the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, a feminist Jewish group called Jewish Women Watching has launched a mailing in which prospective funders will be sent an envelope with a condom. The appeal asks why the Jewish community is "in bed" with leaders of the Christian right, such as Robertson, Jerry Falwell and Ralph Reed.

For such people, Christian support for Israel is not nearly as important as the fact that most Jews disagree with them about issues like abortion or school prayer. Fearing Jewish gratitude will spill over into other issues, some liberals are doing their best to discredit the evangelical Zionists.

An example of this was on display on Oct. 7, when the CBS "Sixty Minutes" program did a feature on the issue. Yossi Alpher, the American Jewish Committee's representative in Israel, and Jerusalem Report editor Gershon Gorenberg used the show to urge American Jews to repudiate Christian Zionists.

The piece claimed the reason for Christian support for Israel was their apocalyptic belief in a coming battle of Armageddon, which will leave two-thirds of the world's Jews dead, with the remaining third converting to Christianity. All this would, of course, take place after Jesus' second coming.

The mere mention of such ideas is enough to give some American Jews the creeps. The experience of pre-Hitler Europe, where anti-Semites were more

likely to be found among religious Christians than among nonbelievers, has conditioned many of us to see any religious Christian as a potential foe.

But this is no longer the case. Religious Christians have been the Jewish people's No. 1 ally on issues affecting the survival of Israel. Nothing better illustrated this fact than what happened last spring when the Bush administration debated how harshly it would respond to Israel's post-Passover massacre response to Palestinian terrorism.

When the administration appeared to be tilting against Israel, it was overwhelmed with criticism from President Bush's political base: conservative Christians. Most observers credit the full court press from this group with having a far greater impact on Bush's ultimate tilt back toward Israel than anything that the divided American Jewish community did.

Surprisingly, it was Abe Foxman, the national head of the Anti-Defamation League, who was the one Jewish voice of reason on the "Sixty Minutes" segment. He rightly explained that agreement on Israel Wouldn't mean that Jewish groups will roll over on other issues where they disagree.

Foxman's stand is significant because it was the ADL that issued an over-the-top, book-length report denouncing Christian conservatives in 1994. At the time, he was criticized by some Jewish observers (including this writer), who thought ADL was making a strategic mistake. But give Foxman credit for understanding that when the chips are down, Jews need to embrace all available allies, whether or not they support abortion rights.

As for the motives of the Christians, Foxman explained that there were a variety of motives at play, including a genuine affection for the Jewish people and the State of Israel on the part of many Evangelicals. He also took a philosophical tone, saying that while Christians were expecting the second coming of the Messiah, he, as an observant Jew, was still waiting for the first. Without explicitly saying so, Foxman seemed to be telling us that post-Messianic era questions should be sorted out then, not now.

He's right. Indeed, even if all Christian support for Israel were based on the expectation that after the second coming, Jews will convert, why should Jews who don't believe Jesus is coming back at any time worry much about the eventuality?

As Foxman appears to have learned, the notion that American Jews can do without Christian conservative support on Israel makes little sense today. After two years of a Palestinian terror war that followed a generous Israeli peace offer, anti-Semitism disguised as anti-Zionism is on the rise in Europe and on American college campuses. Anti-Israel rhetoric seems to have increased in direct proportion to the growing toll of Jewish casualties from Arab terrorism.

While most rank-and-file American Jews have rallied around an embattled Jewish state, some of our liberal elite have not found their voice on the issue. Most conspicuous by their silence on the issue have been the Jews of Hollywood. Few of the numerous Jews who sit in positions of power in the entertainment industry have used their bully pulpit or their access to political power to voice their support for Israel during the current crisis. Iconic Hollywood Jews, such as Rob Reiner or Barbra Streisand, can be found beating the drums for a host of liberal causes, but not an Israel that is under attack.

The juxtaposition of their silence with the vocal support for Israel coming from Evangelicals whom many American Jews still wrongly assume are Jew-haters sounds more like science fiction than political reality, but it is true nevertheless. But rather than getting angry about the anti-Israel rhetoric from the left, there are still too many Jews who are more worried about right-wing Christians.

Do feminists really think Jews have more to fear from Falwell than Yasser Arafat? If so, they need to take a moment to read the list of Jewish women and children who were murdered by Arafat's henchmen and their allies this year. Disagree all you want with Robertson, but how many Jews have the Christian Coalition killed lately? They have been better friends to Israel than many Jews.

If the main source of anti-Semitism in this country is currently located on the political left, why are some of us foolishly still fixated on the pro-Israel right? Telling our friends from our foes isn't really so hard. Though the answer may still surprise some of us, just look at who is demonstrating for Israel and who is against it these days. (JewishWorldReview.com Oct 14)

---

#### **Baseless Comparisons: UN Security Council Resolutions on Iraq and Israel** By Dore Gold

Since Iraq's August 1990 invasion of Kuwait and the 1991 Gulf War that followed, Arab diplomats at the United Nations have charged the international community with a policy of "double standards" regarding UN actions against Iraq for failing to comply with UN Security Council resolutions. Thus, in the debate leading up to the adoption of UN Security

Council Resolution 1435, concerning Israel's presence in Ramallah, the representative of the Arab League charged on September 23, that the UN was pressing Iraq while ignoring Israeli violations of UN resolutions. Last May, Iraqi Deputy Prime Minister Tariq Aziz complained that sanctions were imposed on Iraq for non-compliance but not on Israel.

The effort by some Arab diplomats to draw comparisons between UN action on Israel and Iraq misses the fundamental differences between the different kinds of resolutions in the UN organization. First of all, there are UN General Assembly resolutions, non-binding recommendations that reflect the political currents in the world body. Then there are UN Security Council resolutions, which have their own hierarchy.

Two chapters of the UN Charter clarify the powers of the UN Security Council and its resolutions. Resolutions adopted under Chapter VI of the UN Charter - that deal with "Pacific Resolution of Disputes" - are implemented through a process of negotiation, conciliation, or arbitration between the parties to a dispute. UN Security Council Resolution 242 from November 1967 is a Chapter VI resolution which, when taken together with Resolution 338, leads to an Israeli withdrawal from territories (not all the territories) that Israel entered in the 1967 Six-Day War, <b>by means of a negotiated settlement</b> between Israel and its Arab neighbors. The resolution is not self-enforced by Israel alone; it requires a negotiating process.

The most severe resolutions of the UN Security Council are those specifically adopted under Chapter VII of the UN Charter - that deal with "Threats to Peace, Breaches of the Peace and Acts of Aggression." When Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990, the UN Security Council adopted all its resolutions against Iraq under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. The implementation of those resolutions was not contingent on Iraqi-Kuwaiti negotiations, for Iraq engaged in a clear-cut act of aggression. Moreover, UN resolutions on Iraq are self-enforcing, requiring Iraq alone to comply with their terms. However, the UN recognized, under Article 42 of the UN Charter, the need for <b>special military measures to be taken if a Chapter VII resolution is ignored by an aggressor.</b>

It is noteworthy that in 1967, no UN body adopted a resolution branding Israel as the aggressor in the Six-Day War, despite Soviet efforts, for it was commonly accepted that Israeli actions were the result of a war of self-defense.

The debate over compliance with UN resolutions, however, has called attention to flagrant violations of Chapter VII resolutions on Iraq by Syria, which is ironically a member of the UN Security Council. Currently, all of Iraq's oil trade is under UN sanctions. UN Security Council Resolution 661 provided that no state was to trade in Iraqi oil; subsequently, the UN created, for humanitarian reasons, the oil-for-food program, which permitted Iraqi oil sales as long as the UN could strictly control the expenditure of any resulting oil revenues for food and medicine.

However, in the last two years, Syria has agreed to illegally pump Iraqi oil through its pipeline to the Mediterranean in violation of UN Chapter VII sanctions on Iraq. Syria is earning approximately \$1 billion per year from this illegal trade that circumvents the UN oil-for-food program. Additionally by harboring known international terrorist organizations, like Hamas, Hizballah, and the Islamic Jihad, Syria is violating the specific terms of UN Security Council Resolution 1373, adopted under Chapter VII of the UN Charter after the September 11, 2001, attacks on the United States.

The present effort to draw comparisons between Iraqi non-compliance with Chapter VII UN Security Council resolutions and UN Security Council resolutions on Israel under Chapter VI is baseless. This campaign may have been launched to divert attention away from other states like Syria, violating Chapter VII resolutions with respect to Iraq or with respect to the current American-led campaign against international terrorism. (Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs) *The writer, Israel's former UN Ambassador, is President of the Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs. He was the eleventh Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations (1997-1999). Previously he served as Foreign Policy Advisor to the former Prime Minister of Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu.*

---

### **The United Nations Vs. The Rights of Children** By Anne Bayefsky

On October 4, in Geneva, the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child decided that Israelis and Palestinians were engaged in "terror on both sides." The committee thereby joined a long list of UN entities incapable of recognizing terrorism, and which use every Palestinian civilian casualty to thwart Israel's right of self-defense.

Today's UN is a long way from the moral clarity of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child is the most widely ratified international human-rights treaty in the world today. In reaching its conclusions, the committee charged with monitoring the convention's implementation, had before it the following facts.

On May 9, 2001, Israeli boys Kobi Mandell and Yossi Ish-Ran, aged 13 and 14, who had gone hiking, were stoned to death and their bodies mutilated in a

cave south of Jerusalem.

On April 27, 2002, after breaking into a home west of Hebron, armed men found Danielle Shefi, aged five, hiding under her parents' bed and killed her with a shot to the head. The Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine claimed responsibility.

On July 22, an Israeli Air Force plane targeted and killed Salah Shehadeh with a bomb dropped on his Gaza City building. Along with Shehadeh nine children were killed. They were close by in the residential neighborhood in which Shehadeh, the commander of the military wing of Hamas, chose to locate himself. Shehadeh was known to be in the midst of planning an unprecedented wave of terrorist attacks, having already directed attacks killing dozens of Israelis and injuring hundreds more.

The UN committee couldn't tell the difference between the first two cases and the third. Fortunately, the moral distinction between targeting a five-year-old hiding under a bed and targeting a suicide-bombing operations chief who used children as his human shields, is not likely to be as complicated for the average person as it is for the UN.

Furthermore, international law does not prohibit targeting terrorists who use children and other civilians as human shields. International law insists on proportionality between the harm the terrorist posed and the harm to civilians which was anticipated - a calculation which is never allowed by UN protagonists in Israel's case.

The UN committee's conclusion, however, was not merely a consequence of moral or legal ineptitude. Like most UN exercises, the veil of moral superiority masks baser political interests. The committee is meant to be composed of 10 "independent experts." Currently, three of the 10 are from Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Qatar.

In an oral exchange with Israeli government representatives prior to adopting their conclusions, committee members said: the Israeli Law of Return which allows Jews to immigrate to Israel, but does not grant an equal right to Palestinians, is unacceptable discrimination; the fact that the education system includes Zionist goals is disrespectful of other cultures; institutional discrimination against Arabs began with the Israeli Declaration of Independence since Israel was established as a Jewish state.

The human-rights cover for a contrary political agenda has become something of a UN art form. The convention on the rights of the child required the committee to focus on the most basic convention right of all, namely, the child's inherent right to life, and the obligation to ensure that children do not take a direct part in hostilities.

Yet the committee expressed no concern with the massive evidence of the widespread encouragement given to Palestinian children to put themselves in harm's way, to seek death by killing Israelis, and to glorify as martyrs those who have gone before them.

The convention required its monitoring body to insist that the right of the child to education was directed to respect for human rights, and the preparation for responsible life in the spirit of tolerance among ethnic, national and religious groups. But the UN committee expressed no concern with the evidence of systemic incitement to racial hatred of Jews across the Palestinian education system, despite its devastating consequences for future coexistence.

Apparently, the UN committee was far more concerned with the demonization of Israel than with the welfare of Palestinian children. The problematic of a fact-situation at odds with the popular fiction of Palestinian victimhood, however, is shared by others.

Timed to coincide with the committee's consideration of Israel was a report Amnesty International released on October 1. With great drama, Amnesty reported on Palestinian children killed "in the line of fire" - without bothering to deal with how they got there. There is not one mention of fomenting violence through summer camps, the education system, monetary rewards for children and their families, and media blitzes directed at children by the Palestinian Authority, or the inconvenient human-shield phenomenon - all of which violate the basic rights of Palestinian children. This is the same Amnesty International which supported the NGO forum at last year's UN Durban Racism Conference. The forum resulted in a declaration calling Israel an apartheid state deserving of total isolation from the world community, and deleted an account of anti-Semitism by Jewish NGOs, while Amnesty's Secretary-General Irene Khan stood silently by.

A major group of UN experts could not identify a terrorist, serious human-rights violations, or define treaty obligations which excluded the political bias of NGOs - good reason to doubt the UN's ability to lead us into a post-terrorism world order. (Jerusalem Post Oct 15)

---