



Jerusalem 4:12 Toronto 5:54

## Events...

Thursday, November 4, 8:00pm

Naomi Ragen speaks at the Toronto Jewish Book Fair, at Leah Posluns Theatre, Bathurst JCC. \$18.

Saturday, November 13, 8:00pm

Stewart Bell speaks on "Our National Security and Terrorists who live amongst us" at the Jewish Book Fair, Leah Posluns Theatre, Bathurst JCC. Sponsored by Bnai Brith Canada. \$10.

### December 12-21

BAYT Third Annual Mission to Israel. Seven nights accommodation in five star hotels in Jerusalem and Tzfat. Visits to Hebron, Kever Rachel, Bet El, Shilo, Galil, Golan, and more. For information call Moishe Posner at 416-896-4451 or Larry Zeifman at 416-256-4000.

## Commentary...

### Prevent a Rift - Referendum By Binyamin Netanyahu

The rift is growing, we can see that. The warning signs are flashing. The only way to prevent the rift from widening is a referendum.

This process may be explosive.

This plan is problematic, I've said that from day one. [To minimize the damages that might ensue from implementing the pullout, a referendum] will enable me to support the plan, though not with great enthusiasm.

My goal, and the goal of my friends in the Likud, was to find a formula that will prevent a rift. We succeeded in creating that formula, which is brought today to the Knesset [to support the plan in the Knesset in exchange for Sharon promising to hold a national referendum].

The only thing that cannot eliminate all the dangers - but lower them significantly - is a national referendum.

This is also the custom in other countries. It won't take more time to implement the plan if we go for a referendum. Sharon is speaking about implementing the plan in May. This will actually lower the flames, and allow an argument.

Kach might not accept the results, but the majority of settlers will.

The above is an edited excerpt from the finance minister's speech on Tuesday in the Knesset. (Jerusalem Post Oct 27)

### Preacher of Death By Ezra Levant

Hatemongering Muslims must be prosecuted

Years ago, Jim Keegstra was charged with and convicted of the crime of spreading hatred. It was a seemingly endless case, working its way up to the Supreme Court.

It cost millions of tax dollars, and more than that, was an energetic expression of the government's opposition to racial and religious discord. Libertarians were rightly upset that speech -- no matter how vile -- could be criminalized. But a precedent was set, along with a message.

Fast forward to the present: News out of Vancouver is the imam of the major mosque there, one Younus Kathrada, has been whipping up his congregants each week with anti-Semitic hatred that would make Keegstra sound positively like a Zionist.

Like Keegstra, Kathrada called Jews names -- "we are dealing with a people ... the brothers of the monkeys and the swine ... whose treachery is well known." Calling Jews brothers of monkeys and swine sounds like a schoolyard taunt more than high argument, but his point was clear. And just in case it wasn't, Kathrada made it clearer still: His sermons repeatedly called for the killing of Jews.

Poor old Keegstra. All he ever did was call the Jews power-hungry money-grubbers, and he was convicted of a crime. Kathrada whips up his congregants into a Jew-baiting frenzy -- and tells them to go and actually kill someone -- and

# 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

he remains free. T 01

There's some evidence that his Muslim acolytes actually followed his instructions, too. Rudwan Khalil Abubaker, who attended Kathrada's mosque, was in a fire-fight with Russian troops in Chechnya earlier this year. At least he took his violence outside of Vancouver.

The question remains: Why was Keegstra's offensive but non-violent anti-Semitism taken to the Supreme Court, but Kathrada's is tolerated with

impunity?

Kathrada doesn't just call for the death of Jews. He slams Muslims who dare to believe in peaceful co-existence -- you know, Ottawa's dream of multiculturalism. Kathrada claims such Muslims aren't real Muslims, and no truce with Jews can ever be had.

Kathrada also uses his tax-exempt mosque to trumpet the cause of Hamas, a notorious terrorist group responsible for countless suicide bombings.

Why hasn't Kathrada been charged with a hate crime? Why haven't he and his mosque been charged under Canada's new anti-terrorism laws for promoting and aiding terrorist groups like Hamas? (To date, not a single charge has been laid under this law.)

The answer is obvious. It's easy to pick on a politically incorrect country bumpkin like Jim Keegstra. Some dumb white guy making dumb remarks about Jews -- go get 'em. There's not a well-funded, politically correct Dumb Guy Defence Committee ready to roll for his defence.

But ever since 9/11, liberals throughout the West have decided an anti-Arab backlash would be worse than Arab terrorism itself. So true risks like Kathrada are ignored, in the name of not making a fuss. The liberal thinking is that charging someone like Kathrada would only give a bad name to all Muslims.

Of course, it would do the opposite -- it would point out that not all Muslims are in league with such terror tactics, and that the few who are will be rooted out.

Not charging the handful of Muslims who are haters is like not charging the handful of Italians who are part of the Mafia -- it is a misguided act of political correctness. The majority of Muslims -- we hope -- do not support Kathrada. He should be made an example of, not have excuses made for him. Justice calls for it. (Calgary Sun Oct 25)

This issue is dedicated in honour  
of the birth in Yerushalayim of  
Shlomit Romema Deutsch

### Punishing the Victim and Rewarding the

Belligerent By Yoram Ettinger

The proposed Disengagement is a hybrid of the Oslo Process and the Land-For-Peace mentality, which have been flawed logically, strategically and morally.

The Land-For-Peace (LFP) school of thoughts expects Israel to disengage from its scarcest asset - territory, which is 0.2% (11,000sqm) of Arab territory (5.56 million sqm), which is 50% and 30% larger than the US and Europe respectively (not including Iran's 643,000sqm). In return, LFP expects Arab countries to accord Israel that which they have yet to share with one another - comprehensive peace, compliance and an end to violence and terrorism.

The logical/moral justification for LFP has been its, supposed, parity: The deeper the peace the deeper the territorial disengagement, full peace for full withdrawal, partial peace for partial withdrawal. Can one expect such a parity to be sustained during crisis time? Would the promoters of LFP demand that full non-compliance by the Palestinians would be matched by full retrieval of land conceded by Israel, and that partial non-compliance would trigger a partial retrieval?!

LFP has been rarely employed in the international arena, and then under circumstances which are at variance with the Arab-Israeli conflict. LFP is, ostensibly, designed to advance the cause of justice and peace, to weaken and deter belligerent regimes, to bolster moderate elements in a belligerent society and to compensate intended victims. For example, Germany was forced to dismantle its Nazi regime, to cede land to its intended victims (France, Poland and Czechoslovakia), which were then willing to reciprocate by extending peace. However, when applied to the Jewish State, LFPeacenicks aim at punishing the intended victim (Israel) and compensating the belligerent (Palestinian Authority). Thus, they reward a rogue Palestinian regime, undermine moderate Palestinians who yearn for

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

the demise of the "Tunisian PA", fueling - rather than extinguishing - the fire of Palestinian terrorism. If such a version of LFP were applied to Nazi Germany, the entire Sudeten Mountains would still be under German sovereignty.

LFP has ignored a fundamental tenet of Mideast - and especially interArab - politics: Deterrence in face of threat advances security and peace, while restraint and concessions nurture violence and war. In fact, the only attainable (interArab) peace has been based on deterrence, which is severely undermined when belligerence is rewarded by territory. Would it be logical to expect Arab countries to treat Israel more gently than they do one another?! Disengagement has been perceived by Mideast residents as an expression of battle fatigue, cut & run and cave-in, which have further eroded Israel's posture of deterrence, adrenalizing the veins of Palestinian terrorists.

While the disengagement from Sinai has yielded a peace agreement with Egypt, one should not delude oneself:

\*Egyptian school books are employed by the anti-Jewish PA hate-education system;

\*Egypt is using Palestinian terrorism, in order to wear down Israel's resolve;

\*Egypt has facilitated the smuggling of explosives, missiles, weaponry and ammunition to Gaza terrorists, and has poisoned Israel's relations with Africa, the Persian Gulf and the UN.

\*Notwithstanding its deepening poverty and its weak Muslim neighbors, Cairo has been involved in a major campaign of military acquisitions, in order to establish itself as a credible threat to Israel. One should note that while the demilitarization of Sinai - contiguous to the sparsely populated Negev - provides Israel with some 50 hours early warning time (in case of another Egyptian violation of agreement), a disengagement from Judea and Samaria - contiguous to Israel's Soft Belly - would accord Israel some 5 hours early warning time.

LFP assumes that the Arab/Palestinian-Israeli conflict is territorial in nature, and that Palestinian terrorism has been driven by despair. However, Arab/Palestinian attitudes toward Israel have been annihilationalist (as demonstrated by their official anti-Jewish education, media and clergy systems) and the unprecedented Palestinian terrorism (since Oslo 1993) has been driven by the hope for the deterioration of Israel's tenacity. For example, the PLO was established before the 1967 War, in order to do away with the "1948 Occupation" (Jerusalem, Galilee, Negev, Tel Aviv, etc.) and not with the "1967 Occupation" (Judea, Samaria and Gaza). In fact, Palestinian terrorism has reached its climax as a result of the 1993 Oslo Accord, when Israel snatched the PLO from oblivion in terrorist camps in Yemen, Iraq, Sudan, Lebanon and Syria, providing the PLO with territorial base (at the heart of Israel), with weaponry, with legitimacy at the White House and with unprecedented hope. Further Israeli disengagement from territory would ignore the lessons of the last 11 years, would inflame Palestinian hope, and would therefore add more fuel to the fire of Palestinian terror, driving the region farther from peace. (Yediot Achronot Oct 22)

---

### It is Time to Split the Likud By Steven Plaut

The Likud party in Israel is clearly in crisis. While presuming to be a "broad tent" for a gamut of political opinion, the Likud is increasingly split along the tectonic lines defined by the Gaza Disengagement plan of Ariel Sharon. While there are many other divisions within the Likud - over personalities (the Sharon camp vs. the Netanyahu camp vs. the Olmert people), economic policy (market oriented vs. the old-style socialists and central planners), coalition strategies (those favoring national unity coalitions with the Left vs. those opposed), and military-security issues (such as the "Security Wall") - nothing has been so polarizing as the Gaza Disengagement plan being promoted by Ariel Sharon.

The internal divisions became most glaring when the Likud held its party referendum on the Sharon plan several months ago and it was defeated by a margin of about three-to-two. This was widely regarded as a sort of no-confidence vote in Sharon himself. Since then, the Likud's "left wing" (if it may be called that), led by such people as Ehud Olmert, Tzipi Livni, Gideon Ezra and Meir Sheerit, have followed Sharon's lead or even gone beyond it in their embrace of certain components of the "Oslo Approach", and specifically, unilateral Israeli "disengagement" from the Gaza Strip. This wing of the Likud might be labeled the camp of "Oslo Lite", because it reluctantly embraces most of the principles of the "Oslo peace process" introduced by the Israeli Labor Party and the Left, including the desirability of Palestinian statehood. The Sharon disengagement plan for Gaza supported by them is essentially the Amram Mitzna plan, comprising the main plank in the Labor Party's election platform last election. They are opposed by the Likud "Right", which opposes unilateral disengagement in Gaza or at least insists that the plan be submitted to a national ballot referendum before implementation.

The widening split increasingly complicates other political decisions by the Likud leadership. For example, there has been talk of inviting the Labor Party to join the Likud in a new "national unity government." Such a move would likely exacerbate the internal divisions within the Likud, pitting those opposing such a move from the party "Right" against those endorsing it from the party "Left". These same divisions are evident in preferences regarding coalition partners for the Likud, with the party's "Right" preferring the small parties of the militant Right and the National Religious Party, while the Likud "Left" prefers a coalition based primarily upon Shinui and the Labor Party.

As these internal party divisions have grown in their ferocity in recent weeks, the press and others have been asking in ever louder voices whether the crisis in the Likud may end up splitting the entire party itself down the middle,

leading to the emergence of a separate Likud-Left and Likud-Right.

Within the party, all talk of such a split is generally dismissed as something of a disaster scenario by those insisting that any such split be prevented at all costs. But should it be? Would Israeli voters and Israel as a whole not be far better off should such a split take place?

The Likud has been attempting to be all things in all seasons for all people, and especially to be the Other Labor Party, for many years. Over and over, the Likud has run for election seemingly as the anti-Oslo party. Without exception, after elections where the Likud took office, it immediately jettisoned its election platform and proceeded to implement what were quintessentially the policies of the Israeli Labor Party.

The pattern certainly goes back to Binyamin Netanyahu's election victory of 1996, but in some ways, goes back as far as Menachem Begin's election in 1977. Having run on a policy of retaining all "occupied territories" and converting Israeli economic socialism into free-market capitalism, Begin quickly abandoned all of the Sinai Peninsula while preserving the monopoly socialism and dirigiste central control of the economy. (Begin's only significant changes in economic policy were floating the exchange rate and enormous printing of money.) The Camp David Agreement signed by Begin included a seemingly innocent pledge to grant the Palestinians of the West Bank and Gaza "limited autonomy", which in retrospect was the capitulation that formed the precedent for the universal demands for the erection of a terrorist Palestinian state.

Under Yitzchak Shamir, the government dug in its heels over some security matters, played tougher with the Palestinians, but at the same time, Shamir cabinets embraced dirigiste socialism even more fiercely, with Minister of Agriculture and of Housing Ariel Sharon serving as the most passionate advocate of central planning of all. Shamir also sat with the Labor Party in a series of national unity government coalitions.

When Netanyahu was elected in 1996, there seemed little doubt in anyone's mind that he was elected by voters to halt the Oslo "peace process". But it became quickly evident that Prime Minister Netanyahu would continue the Oslo "process" and even accelerate it via the Wye capitulations, agreeing to things that even Shimon Peres had refused to implement. Despite his free-market campaign rhetoric, Prime Minister Netanyahu did almost nothing to reform the economy.

After the fiasco of the government of Ehud Barak, Ariel Sharon entered office in 2000, once again as the Likud's reigning anti-Oslo crusader. And once again, a Likud leader elected to stop Oslo turned around, abandoned his campaign platform and continued the Oslo "process". Within months, Sharon was reiterating his personal commitment to Palestinian statehood. Netanyahu, consigned by Sharon to the Ministry of Finance, perhaps because of its infamous ability to break promising careers, has been doing a remarkably good job there in initiating many of the same economic structural reforms he had earlier refused to promote while Prime Minister. Netanyahu meanwhile morphed into leader of the hawkish internal opposition to Sharon within the Likud. In one of the Likud government's most Byzantine and most cynical moments, Sharon conditioned support for the economic structural reforms being pushed by Netanyahu on the latter's capitulation and endorsement of Sharon's Gaza Disengagement Plan.

The main argument by Likud loyalists against any split of the Likud into two parties is that such a cleavage could allow the Labor Party to return to office. This is more than a little ironic, because the main thing that Likud-led governments have done since 1996 has been to implement Labor Party political programs. If the Likud is going to implement Labor Party ideas anyway, if Sharon is going to adopt each proposal coming from the Labor Party, starting with the "Security Wall" and ending with the Mitzna plan for unilateral disengagement in Gaza, then what difference does it make if the Likud is split and in opposition or not?

But the main reason for splitting the Likud is to create true political pluralism and real democracy in Israel at long last. Until 1977, Israel was essentially a one-party state, where the Labor Party (nee MAPAI) exercised quasi-totalitarian (albeit ballot-selected) control over the country. By 1977, the Likud had emerged as a plausible alternative for voters, but by 1996, it was clear that it was an "alternative" only in the sense of the roster of names and personnel running for office, not in terms of the policies being pursued. The two main parties in Israel, the only two serious contenders for leadership of any government coalitions, have increasingly resembled political clones of one another, pursuing the same flawed sets of visions. Both parties endorse a "two-state solution" with a Palestinian state arising in virtually the entire West Bank and Gaza and with Israel being forced back to borders not significantly different from those of 1949. Both parties now endorse unilateral "disengagement" in Gaza, which will clearly serve as precedent for the West Bank no matter how many times Sharon denies it, and both endorse the expulsion of thousands of Jewish "settlers" from their homes to accommodate Palestinian ambitions.

Splitting the Likud would at long last offer Israeli voters a real choice. The Likud-Left would run openly as the "Other Labor Party", endorsing continuation of Oslo and generally seeking accords with the PLO by way of Israeli concessions and goodwill measures. The Likud-Right would oppose all negotiations with the PLO, would run on a "Peace Through Victory" platform, would vehemently oppose Palestinian statehood and would increase settlement construction. The Likud-Left could promote dirigiste state planning, while the Likud-Right would promote free-market capitalism.

Israeli voters would have a clear choice, and Israeli elections would at last serve as clear legitimizing procedures, rewarding parties clearly proposing alternatives just as clearly opposed by other parties, with the voter making a determination of the direction for the country. Ironically, the total votes awarded to one of the emerging Likud halves could well exceed those of the two Siamese halves currently joined at the hips in the current Likud party. The Likud that represents everything and nothing at the same time, that is, the Likud of the current Sharon-led coalition, has driven away large numbers of voters. A Likud half clearly representing something may discover that it has enormous electoral appeal. (IsraelNationalNews.com Oct 26)

*The writer teaches at the University of Haifa and is author of The Scout.*

---

### **PA Head Start: Early Childhood Indoctrination** By David Bedein

Well, Palestinian Arab children are in the midst of their seventh week of the school year. These school children are learning from new Palestinian Authority school books, made possible through grants by USAID, CIDA of Canada, and special grants from EU countries made available for educational institutions that operate in the Palestinian Authority.

Last week, the Center for Monitoring the Impact of Peace, an agency that monitors expressions of peace and reconciliation in all educational systems of the Middle East, acting under the mandate of UNESCO, which encourages education for peace and reconciliation, provided translations of the new Palestinian Authority school books at a press conference in Jerusalem. Their findings are published at [www.edume.org](http://www.edume.org).

In the new schoolbooks of the Palestinian Authority, no Jewish connection to the Holy Land is mentioned whatsoever. Indeed, Jews are only referred to in the context of their wars with Prophet Muhammad, where they are depicted in an unfavorable light, as violators of a treaty they had signed with him and as "employers of trickery". And the 5.5 million Jewish citizens of Israel are not even counted in the population figures of the new Palestinian geography schoolbook that covers all of the Holy Land, from the Jordan River to the Mediterranean Sea.

There is a single historic reference in the new Palestinian school books to the role of Jews in "early Palestinian history" - as the people who killed Christ.

At the same time, the new Palestinian Authority textbooks somehow transform the Canaanites and Jebusites of Biblical times into Palestinian Arabs, generations before Ishmael, the primordial ancestor of the Arabs was born, and many more generations before the Muslim conquest ever occurred.

In terms of how the new Palestinian school books define the state of Israel, the Jewish state appears nowhere on the maps in the new PA school books. However, Palestinian children learn from their new schoolbooks that the Palestinian Arab entity is the sovereign state in the region, encompassing Israeli regions, cities and sites, which are presented as part of the Palestinian Arab State. Israeli territory is referred to as "the lands of 1948" or "the Green Line".

The new Palestinian school books describe the Middle East conflict as "a confrontation between Zionism backed by Imperialism" and its victims, the Palestinians. Not one word is mentioned in these new textbooks about the UN Partition Resolution of 1947, or about the invasion of the nascent state of Israel by seven Arab nations on the day of Israel's declaration of independence in 1948.

And how do the new textbooks of the Palestinian Authority explain the creation of the Palestinian refugee problem in 1948 to a new generation of Palestinian youth? As nothing less than the "outcome of a premeditated plan by Zionism and British Imperialism to expel the Palestinian Arabs from their land". The new Palestinian textbooks suggest only one solution to their plight: the return of the refugees (or, rather, their descendants) to their former homes inside today's Israel.

Jerusalem is presented by the new Palestinian Authority as an Arab city from time immemorial. Its Jebusite founders are Arabized and the Israelite or Jewish historical ties to this city, both national and religious, are not mentioned. Jerusalem is declared to be the capital of Palestine.

Jihad and martyrdom are still exalted as ideals, though to some lesser extent than in the earlier books. Individual Palestinian terrorists who were killed or captured in the act of terror are defined as martyrs or prisoners-of-war, and praised in the new Palestinian textbooks as role models for the Palestinian youngster to emulate.

Perhaps what is most worrisome about the new textbooks of the Palestinian Authority is that the Western democracies are funding them - the first school system since the Third Reich to inculcate children to make war on the Jews.

Not only are Western democracies funding the new Palestinian school system, but Jewish organizations in the US and Canada and throughout Western Europe encourage their respective countries to aid Palestinian Authority education. Despite wishful thinking that the Palestinian education would change for the better, the brand new Palestinian school books convey another impression entirely. (IsraelNationalNews.com Oct 26)

---

### **The Principled President** By Anne Bayefsky

*Bush has taken the heat in ways that American Jews can appreciate.*

Jews, as a group, tend to worry, and right up there on the current angst chart is the American election. Unfortunately, the visceral distress is justified.

President George W. Bush's foreign-policy record is plain. He was the first American president to sideline Yasser Arafat and to state unequivocally that support for terrorism could no longer coexist with the status of peace partner

and entitlement to American largess. In a speech on June 24, 2002, the president said: "Peace requires a new and different Palestinian leadership, so that a Palestinian state can be born. I call on the Palestinian people to elect new leaders, leaders not compromised by terror."

President Bush made it clear that the Israeli fight against terrorism is not a localized dilemma but rather part of the same war being waged by Americans against global terrorism. On March 27, 2002, the State Department's list of foreign terrorist organizations was made to include for the first time the Al-Aqsa Martyr's Brigade, the generic name for all of Arafat's Fatah field operatives, including Tanzim.

The greatest threat to Israel's security, Iran, was named by President Bush in his 2002 State of the Union Address as part of an "axis of evil" and hence a central enemy of the United States and world peace.

On May 6, 2002, President Bush withdrew President Clinton's signature from the treaty establishing an International Criminal Court. The court's statute takes direct aim at Israelis by omitting terrorism but including settlements in its definition of the world's most egregious crimes, and by grabbing jurisdiction over nationals of countries that are not party to the treaty.

In his speech to the U.N. General Assembly on September 21, 2004, the president looked leaders from all Arab and Muslim states directly in the eye and said: "Arab states should end incitement in their own media, cut off public and private funding for terrorism, and establish normal relations with Israel."

Throughout his tenure, President Bush has been under serious pressure to cede greater control over the Middle East peace process to the European Union and the U.N., and to buy into their familiar refrain that the Israeli occupation is the root cause of anti-Israel terrorism. The EU and U.N. seek American support for the view that the "Israeli-Palestinian conflict" is the greatest challenge to international order (as British foreign minister Jack Straw told the Labour party's recent annual conference), and American help in pushing Israel into major concessions while under fire.

President Bush has responded by telling the U.N. and EU members that they've got it backwards. The greatest challenge to international order is the absence of democracy, and the breeding grounds for terrorism that result. Moving forward means - in the words of the president's recent U.N. speech - that "we must take a different approach" from that of tolerating and excusing "oppression in the Middle East in the name of stability.... Commitment to democratic reform is essential to resolving the Arab-Israeli conflict. Peace will not be achieved by Palestinian rulers who intimidate opposition, tolerate corruption, and maintain ties to terrorist groups."

President Bush's stand has not been without political costs. As he pointed out in the second presidential debate: "You know, I've made some decisions on Israel that are unpopular. I wouldn't deal with Arafat, because I felt like he had let the former president down, and I don't think he's the kind of person that can lead toward a Palestinian state. And people in Europe didn't like that decision. And that was unpopular, but it was the right thing to do."

It is not surprising, therefore, that Israelis prefer President Bush to Senator Kerry 50 to 24 percent, according to a Haaretz poll released October 15, 2004.

On the other hand, a Pew Research Center survey released in March of this year showed large majorities of Pakistanis (67 percent), Jordanians (96 percent), and Moroccans (90 percent) hold unfavorable opinions of the president. A poll released by the Arab American Institute in May shows that the vast majority of Arabs in Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates view American policy on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict unfavorably. The Iranian Tehran Times proclaimed in June, "Kerry is exactly what the U.S. needs right now." Israeli military intelligence chief Maj.-Gen. Aharon Zeevi told Israeli cabinet ministers in July that "Arafat is waiting for the month of November in the hope that President Bush will be defeated. At the same time, the Pew and Zogby data show that sizeable portions of the Arab populations surveyed are favorably disposed to Osama bin Laden.

Where does all this leave American Jews who have traditionally voted overwhelmingly for Democrats? Some are primarily guided by one part of the Jewish sage Hillel's teaching that "If I am only for myself, what am I?" They reason that a Democratic president would better serve the interests of minorities and the little guy, and that there is something inherently wrong about thinking of their own well-being first. Others think, "I'm a minority too and we little guys need to stick together." Still others don't care about Israel, or at least not enough to make it a deciding factor; other issues, such as the state of the ozone layer and the Kyoto protocol, top their agenda.

One might think 9/11 should have been a turning point for the 1.5 million Jews in New York City, along with the rest of American Jews, even if they hadn't noticed that Israel has been on the front lines of the war against terror for a lot longer than they have. Now that America and Israel more clearly face a common enemy, American Jews might feel less guilt-ridden about the other element of Hillel's admonition: "If I am not for myself, who will be for me?"

In a world in which the future of freedom-loving little guys everywhere depends on whether America understands the fight against terrorism to be a global war, violent Islamic fundamentalism and a nuclear Iran to be global threats, and winning European and U.N. friends by serving up Israel to be pouring fuel on the fire, one presidential candidate has a courageous and

principled record. The other scores debating points.

So the question for American Jews deciding whether to vote for a Republican president, in Hillel's words, is, "If not now when?" If the answer for most American Jews is never, then make no mistake about it: No Democratic president will ever feel that protecting the state of Israel is necessary to win Jewish votes - and no future Republican president will ever take the heat as President Bush has done. (National Review Oct 21)

*The writer is an international lawyer and a senior fellow at the Hudson Institute.*

### **The Company They Keep** By Sarah Honig

Though remarkably unremarkable as America's 29th president, Warren Gamaliel Harding had an uncommonly tough time in office. "My God, this is a hell of a job," he was overheard railing desperately. "I have no trouble with my enemies, but my damn friends, they're the ones that keep me walking the floor nights."

With friends like ours, we Israelis should also get no shut-eye. On the face of it, we have almost no enemies - apart from Hamas, Hizbullah, Iran, and assorted al-Aksa martyrs. Everyone else professes effusive goodwill. If things go awry, it's our fault for not accepting helpful advice heaped upon us.

Foes parading as friends have our best interests at heart and nothing against us, just against policies that might improve our odds to survive in our unfriendly milieu. With talk of genocide and ethnic cleansing no longer de rigueur, would-be destroyers and dubious friends alike band righteously to recommend whatever weakens us.

Take the incessant political meddling of friend Mona Juul, Norway's ambassador and wife of another friend-who knows-best, UN special envoy Terje Roed-Larsen. The couple - driving forces behind the Oslo conspiracy, supporters of Israel's Left, and beneficiaries of \$100,000 from the Peres Center for Peace - had earlier this year facilitated a clandestine meeting between Peres and Ahmed Qurei. The latter was secretly chauffeured to Tel Aviv by Larsen, while Juul hosted the talks behind her host government's back, in cahoots with its opposition.

After her attempted subversion was exposed, she became a tad more circumspect but hardly chastened. Her bosom bud Yossi Beilin recently requested she help remove from an Oslo square a sculpted obscenity that features the Star of David dripping blood, surrounded by dollar signs and embellished with inscriptions like "Holocaust," "murder," and "Sabra and Shatilla."

Israel's formal complaint was rejected on the grounds of the sanctity of artistic freedom. But after Beilin's intervention, Juul opined that the matter merits reconsideration, since not only Israel's government is offended but also Israel's opposition.

Get it? Beilin's displeasure is respectable. Official Israel, however, is tainted with illegitimacy. Juul and like-minded broadminded Nordics know which Jews deserve their sanctimonious sanction.

LET'S STAY in Oslo a bit longer. The Courage to Refuse bunch and its founder David Zonshein, who actively encourage soldiers to refuse to serve in the territories, have been nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize. They were sponsored by laureates Rigoberta Menchu of Guatemala and Carlos Belo of East Timor.

What makes the duo Mideast experts? Nothing. As the world proletarian revolution expired with a whimper, well-heeled Western radicals discovered the Third World, and their stylish mythology conferred upon it assumed spiritual superiority. Among other indigenous icons, they promoted Menchu and Belo. The latter subscribe to their patrons' outlook, which evinces no sympathy for Jewish suffering.

Trendy Israeli left-wingers eagerly seek to luxuriate in the ambiance of universalist enlightenment, win coveted kudos and Nobel nominations from chic friends. If their own country is denigrated as uncool and oppressive, then local leftists dissociate themselves from its cause, thereby proving they aren't aligned with the forces of darkness - like the IDF (which keeps us, including the post-Zionists in our midst, alive).

By the progressive yardstick, anyone who weakens the IDF is good; anyone who won't, isn't. Even new pal Samir Kuntar says so.

Remember him? He's the freedom fighter who, along with intrepid comrades, invaded the Haran family's Nahariya apartment in 1979. At gunpoint they led Danny and his four-year-old daughter Einat to the seashore. Before the horrified father, Kuntar held the child upside down by her ankles, swung her hard, and bashed her brains against the rocks. He then shot Danny.

He's the one Hizbullah wants to spring in the follow-up to the deal in which terrorists were exchanged for three corpses and a middle-aged drug trafficker.

During a recent visit from his fan, Hadash Knesset member Issam Mahoul, Kuntar presumed to preach to us as an enthusiastic peace advocate. He charged that "Israel's right wing prevents peace and paralyzes the country. Israeli society must come to its senses, back the opposition, and replace the present government."

Like Juul, Menchu, and Belo, Kuntar too doesn't dislike all Israelis, only some - the ones who won't play into his hands and weaken Israel. He too advises us to ally ourselves with his friends - if we know what's good for us.

Surprisingly, most of us still do. Which is why we must tell the Juuls, Menchus, Belos, and Kuntars of this world to butt out. Their endorsements only discredit those they champion.

We know our friends by the company they keep. Friends of "friends" like Juul or Kuntar can't be good for us. With friends like them, it's better to lose

sleep than lose vigilance. Better pace the floor nights than be sorry. (Jerusalem Post Oct 24)

### **The Foxes' Language** By Israel Harel

Of all the places in Judea and Samaria, Ariel Sharon was magically drawn to the view and history of the Jebel Kabir region. He used to bring many visitors to the top of Mount Kabir, among them foreign diplomats and army officers, to show them how narrow Israel's waist is, how beautiful the biblical landscape and how many hilltops empty of man there were on which settlements could be established.

And of all the members of Gush Emunim (Block of the Faithful), he particularly liked the first residents of Elon Moreh, who settled at the foot of Mount Kabir. Because they were the most authentic, determined and dynamic of the new members of the tribe of the bold; they were the ones - and how he liked this - who put "we will do" before "we will listen." And he personally accompanied them, on his own two feet, when they ascended the rise to locate the site for their permanent settlement on the slopes of Mount Kabir.

Last Shabbat, which was the Torah portion of Lech Lecha, or "Go" ("... to Elon Moreh"), the community celebrated the 25th anniversary of its establishment, following struggles, hardships and temporary way stations, as a permanent settlement. And many who were connected to the early days of the faith-based revolution came to celebrate with them. Sharon, of course, was not there. And Menachem Felix said: What is more important than listening to history is making history. The audience responded with wild applause.

The Knesset's decision on Tuesday brings the uprooting to the threshold of Elon Moreh, which is located in northern Samaria. A single generation after its founding, and at the initiative of a man who played a key role in its establishment, the Knesset voted, with an absolute (Jewish!) majority, to uproot some of the fruits of this faith-based revolution. And this is the essence of the revolution that Sharon underwent: During the Elon Moreh days, when the public, after the trauma of the Yom Kippur War, was gripped by pessimism, Sharon joined the sector that was - and remains - optimistic and goal-oriented. Now, after 31 years in which the pessimism has merely increased - not least because of the four-year war of attrition that Sharon did not manage to end - he has chosen to stand at the head of the pessimistic camp. If in the past, he was engaged in construction and creation, now, in his distress - and apparently for personal reasons, as well - he is setting out to show that he is also strong in uprooting, destruction and ruin.

And standing at his side during the vote on uprooting, in addition to those among the Likud who lack connections and roots, were also the leaders of the camp that once contained the foremost builders: the Labor Party. And one of those who is trying to claim this camp's leadership, Matan Vilnai, even said: We support Sharon because the act of disengagement is a beacon. Today, it is uprooting rather than sinking roots that constitutes the beacon of the Labor movement, which voted unanimously for Sharon's initiative.

No event that has taken place since the founding of Elon Moreh, which swept a large movement of actualizers after it, truly proves that the faith-based camp was wrong. I am convinced that had there been such an event, this camp would have admitted its mistake and joined the majority of the nation. In practice, virtually everything this camp foresaw - and which Sharon agreed with and proclaimed - has happened. Gush Emunim claimed that the answer to the failure of the Yom Kippur War was not to wallow in melancholy, but to emerge from it via construction and creation - and it was right. The results of the years of terrorist warfare, which began after Israel was ready to concede virtually the entire heart of its homeland, prove this.

But those who wallowed in melancholy, instead of trying to pull themselves out, continued to dig themselves deeper in and dragged additional sections of society, including many of those who were born or grew up after the Yom Kippur War, into a mood that suited their own.

Oslo, the central initiative of this mood - which Yitzhak Rabin followed almost against his will - has proven to be a total and calamitous failure of pessimism. But because people do not tend to admit their mistakes, instead of trying the opposite approach, they dug themselves even deeper in the wrong direction and brought upon us the madness of flight and uprooting. The obligation to oppose this madness is not only in order to save the settlement enterprise, but primarily to open the nation's eyes so that it will abandon the well-tested path of despair and once again take the Zionist high road, the road of faith in the correctness of Zionism and in our ability to reach safe harbor at the end of the struggle.

At the gathering in Elon Moreh, Geula Cohen, a close friend for many years, mourned Sharon's about-face with a poem written by Uri Zvi Greenberg, which is chilling in its timeliness: "I dreamed a dream, and in the dream: Lions / came down from the glorious high places / hungry for sour grapes / following in the footsteps of / red foxes / and the moon looked down as they lined up / after the foxes - / and I went after them and cried aloud / in the lions' language: / Lions, lions! / But they no longer understood the lions' language / and then, I wept sorely..."

Great emotion gripped the listeners. And despite the festive atmosphere of that Shabbat, there were those who wiped away tears. (Haaretz Oct 28)