



Jerusalem 4:11; Toronto 4:52

## From the PA Media...

### PA Daily: America Must Be Fought in Iraq - Israel Must Be Destroyed

By Itamar Marcus

The two burning tasks of the Arab world today are the total destruction of Israel and the fight against the US in Iraq, according to the official Palestinian Authority [PA] daily, Al Hayat Al Jadida. The call for Israel's destruction, a basic and widespread Arab view, was to have been rejected by the PA after the Oslo Accords, yet it continues to be promoted in the tightly controlled PA media. It should be noted that the refusal to recognize Israel's existence is expressed in the article by the rejection of the name Israel, as well, as references to Israel are placed in quotation marks as follows - "Israel" - implying - "so called Israel".

The article depicts Israel and the US as parallel and prime enemies of the Arab world and this is consistent with the opinions of the general Palestinian population according to the poll PMW released last week in Washington. That poll found that 87% of Palestinians thought either the US or Israel "is the single greatest threat to world peace". [51% answered Israel, 36% answered the US]. The article's call to fight Americans in Iraq is likewise consistent with PA opinions as the poll found that 42% of the Palestinians support the Iraqi attacks on Americans and 74% of Palestinians supported Saddam Hussein in the war.

The following is from the article in the PA daily:

"During these moments in history it is extremely important to adopt a direct and decisive position regarding imperialism, and especially regarding the Zionist entity. There is no option but resistance to imperialism... There is a need to crystallize a position regarding the imperialist-Zionist project in the Arab region. The resistance - that is meant to bring the expulsion of the American occupation in Iraq - should be supported by all means. The same applies to the struggle against the Zionist entity until the Zionist project is defeated, it's entity is eliminated, and a free and Arab Palestine is established as a first step towards uniting the Arab homeland and striving towards independent development and socialism. There are no other fundamental solutions to the Arab problem, but this one.....The two state solution, a binational state, or even one democratic state outside the Arab dimension, will not be capable of getting rid of the contrast between the Arab masses and the Zionist-imperialist project in the Arab region ...[There is] another issue, that the world movement should decide and take a standpoint: There are no "progressive Israelis". Every person, who is part of the Zionist-imperialist project, even if he is "opposed" to Zionist policy, is part of the structure of "Israel" ... A person cannot be simultaneously both progressive and part of the Zionist entity - Zionist project...Israel is an illegitimate state. This definition applies to organizations and individuals that represent [Israel] or recognize it. Therefore, in order to emphasize this illegitimacy, all ties with the "Israelis" should be canceled, and in other words: normalization with Zionists should be opposed on a world level, not only in the Arab homeland... There is no option other than the elimination of the imperialist-Zionist project... The meaning of resisting Israel is resisting Globalization, and vice versa..."

[Op. Ed. by Dr. Hisham Al-Bustani, a Jordanian columnist, in Al-Hayat Al-Jadida, official PA daily, Oct. 25, 2003] (PMW Oct 27)

## Commentary...

### The Fine Print By Evelyn Gordon

When the "Geneva Initiative" was first unveiled two weeks ago, it was immediately clear that it constituted a gross violation of democratic norms: A small band of opposition figures, acting without the elected government's knowledge or consent, had negotiated a draft "peace agreement" with an enemy, with the explicit aim of generating international pressure on future governments to endorse the concessions contained therein.

The full extent of the damage, however, became evident only last Friday, with publication of the document's full text - because a close reading makes it clear that this is an agreement to which no sane government could ever consent.

## 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*

Even before last Friday's publication, it was known that the Israeli negotiators had conceded almost completely on territorial issues, granting the Palestinians most of east Jerusalem, including Judaism's holiest site, the Temple Mount; most of the West Bank, including major settlements, such as Efrat and Ariel, that even the most dovish Israeli governments have always insisted on keeping; and part of the Negev, as compensation for border adjustments

on the West Bank.

It was also evident that the agreement would create a security nightmare in Jerusalem (among other places), subjecting every neighborhood of the city to the fate suffered by Gilo during the current intifada - that of being within easy shooting range of sovereign Palestinian territory.

But the territorial concessions are only the tip of the iceberg. There is also, for instance, the fact that all disputes over implementation of the agreement would be resolved by an Implementation and Verification Group composed of the United States, the United Nations, the European Union, Russia and various other countries.

While the IVG's exact mechanism is unclear - the details are contained in an annex that has not yet been completed - Article 16 clearly states that if attempts at mediation fail, either side may submit the dispute to an arbitration panel, whose decisions will be binding. In short, this agreement would require Israel to accept the dictates of international arbitrators on even the most sensitive security issues.

Furthermore, the document would mortgage the country's economic future by committing it in advance to pay reparations in an amount that Israel would have little voice in determining. Specifically, it establishes an International Commission composed of Israel, the Palestinian state, the UN, the US, UNRWA, all of Israel's Arab neighbors, the EU, Switzerland, Canada, Norway, Japan, the World Bank and Russia - in short, a commission on which Israel is overwhelmingly outnumbered - and instructs it to appoint a panel of experts to estimate the value of Palestinian property lost in 1948.

That estimate would then be multiplied by some factor to create a "fair aggregate value," and Israel would be required to pay the Palestinians the entirety of that sum. The document does give Israel a voice in determining the multiplier, but determination of the base sum would be the exclusive prerogative of the panel of experts. And this sum, of course, would be on top of the costs of resettling more than 100,000 Israelis expelled from the territories - a cost that Israel would bear alone.

What is perhaps most astonishing, however, is just how little the Israeli team obtained in exchange for all its concessions.

According to chief negotiator Yossi Beilin, the agreement provides Israel with three major achievements.

The first relates to security. The Palestinian state will be demilitarized, and it will fight terror by disarming militias and arresting terrorists. Considering that the Palestinians have made identical pledges on demilitarization and terror in no less than five previous signed agreements - and that these pledges have been massively violated every time - why another such pledge should be considered an achievement is an enigma.

Second, claims Beilin, the agreement includes Palestinian recognition of Israel as a Jewish state. This, it turns out, is simply false: The agreement merely "recognize(s) Palestine and Israel as the homelands of their respective peoples." Beilin can assert that Israel's "respective people" is the Jewish people, but the plain meaning of the text is that Israel is the homeland of its inhabitants, Jewish and Arab alike - in short, a binational state.

Finally, Beilin boasts of a Palestinian concession on the refugees' "right of return." The agreement states that Israel, and Israel alone, will decide how many Palestinian refugees it is willing to accept. This, however, is no concession at all - because as long as Israel remains a sovereign country with control over its own borders, the "right of return" could never be implemented without its consent in any case.

In short, what the Palestinians conceded - the "right" to flood Israel with hundreds of thousands of refugees - was something they never had the power to carry out in the first place. Yet Israel would pay for this nonexistent concession with real territory, real money and real security risks. That may be Beilin's idea of a good deal. But it is hard to imagine a majority of Israelis agreeing with him. (Jerusalem Post Oct 28)

**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)**

## Tour of U.S. Schools Reveals Why Zionism Is Flunking on Campus

By Natan Sharansky

When I got to Rutgers University in New Jersey last month, I almost forgot I was on a college campus. The atmosphere was far from the cool, button-down academic reserve typical of such institutions. It was more reminiscent of a battlefield.

My arrival was greeted by a noisy demonstration of Palestinian and Jewish students holding signs reading "Racist Israel" and "War Criminals," together with black-coated Neturei Karta members calling for the destruction of the blasphemous Zionist entity. Faculty members, predictably led by a former Israeli professor, had sent out e-mails protesting the granting of a platform to a representative of the "Nazi, war-criminal" state. Of course, there was the famous pie incident in which a member of a campus Jewish anti-occupation group made his way past my security guards and plastered me in the face with a cream pie while shouting "End the Occupation."

Opposed to them were hundreds of no less rowdy Jewish students, full of motivation to defend Israel and give the protesters back as good as they got. After the pie incident, when I returned to the hall and mounted the stage, the atmosphere was so electric, so full of adrenalin, that the Palestinians and their supporters who had come to disrupt the event had no choice but to abandon their plans for provocation.

Things were not much calmer at Boston University: An anonymous bomb threat brought swarms of police to the lecture hall and almost forced a cancellation of my appearance. But here, too, some good resulted when the bomb threat caused the lecture to be moved to a larger hall, which was quickly filled with some 600 listeners who were unwilling to accept the violent silencing of pro-Israel views.

These moments — the pie throwing, the bomb threat, the demonstration — as raucous, threatening and contentious as they were, are among the more pleasant memories from my 13-campus tour of the United States. Perhaps it is because at these moments I felt that there was some point to my trip, perhaps because the violent hostility had stirred the students and motivated them to want to fight and win — which I, of course, was delighted to see.

There were other moments during my tour, difficult moments when I felt fear, sadness and worry. During a frank and friendly conversation with a group of Jewish students at Harvard University, one student admitted to me that she was afraid — afraid to express support for Israel, afraid to take part in pro-Israel organizations, afraid to be identified. The mood on campus had turned so anti-Israel that she was afraid that her open identification could cost her, damaging her grades and her academic future. That her professors, who control her final grades, were likely to view such activism unkindly, and that the risk was too great.

Having grown up in the communist Soviet Union, I am very familiar with this fear to express one's opinions, with the need to hold the "correct opinions" in order to get ahead, with the reality that expressing support for Israel is a blot on one's resume. But to find all these things at Harvard Business School? In a place that was supposed to be open, liberal, professional? At first I thought this must be an individual case, particular to this student. I thought her fears were exaggerated. But my conversations with other students at various universities made it clear that her feelings are widespread, that the situation on campuses in the United States and Canada is more serious than we think. And this is truly frightening.

To most Israelis, what happens on the world's campuses hardly seems a life-and-death concern. The world is against us in any case. And as for Jewish students, why should we care? They've got troubles? Let them move to Israel. In my own view, however, this is a fateful issue for the State of Israel and the Jewish people.

Israel has few strategic assets as critical as American Jewry. The fact that the world's leading superpower is a steadfast ally of Israel is due in large measure to this proud and activist community. But nobody can guarantee that the current state of affairs will continue indefinitely. I have been in close contact with the American Jewish community for more than 30 years, and its leadership is largely unchanged. I entered a Russian prison, I got out, I moved to Israel, I became a Cabinet minister and the people I work with are mostly the same people. The leadership is getting old, and the younger generation is not stepping forward.

The continuing support of American Jewry depends on this younger generation. If it chooses to affiliate actively with the Jewish people, if it supports Israel and acts on its behalf, then we will continue to have a strong backbone of support in a world that is turning more and more hostile. But if this younger generation were to disappear — whether through assimilation or an unwillingness to be identified — Israel would find within a very few years that it faces an entirely different United States.

This younger generation is growing up on the university campus. That is where the core of future administrations is taking shape. The students I met at Princeton, Columbia and Harvard will be the decision-makers of the coming decades. Will they be as pro-Israel as today's decision-makers? Will they stand up fearlessly for Israel? Given the level of anti-Israel sentiment on today's campuses, where being "in" means being hostile or at least apathetic toward Israel, I have grave doubts.

The transformation of campuses into hothouses of anti-Israel opinion did not happen by itself, nor did it occur overnight. In the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s, the mood on campus was completely different. Jewish students then were at the center of student activism, leading movements for human rights, including the Soviet Jewry freedom movement. Demonstrations, hunger strikes, mass rallies — all this combined to form a massive army that was largely made up, as the

Soviet secret police used to put it sneeringly, of "students and housewives." These struggles were an inseparable part of the Jewish identities of those young people. They were certain of themselves, certain of the justice of their cause and certain that they were on the side of the angels. The goal was clear, the enemy was defined and their pride in themselves, their Jewishness and Israel was boundless.

When I sat for Sabbath dinner with 300 Jewish students at Columbia University in New York — together with Glenn Richter, who in 1964 at the university launched the Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry — and I told them about those days, the events seemed to them all but unimaginable. Today, when Jewish activity on campus is directed almost entirely inward, when Jewish student organizations feel like walled fortresses in enemy territory, when pro-Israel students hardly dream of taking leadership positions in campus struggles for human rights, those days seem like a distant dream.

Years of massive investments of money and effort by Arab states and the Palestinians have changed the picture. One after the other, departments of Middle Eastern studies have been set up on university campuses, with generous Saudi funding — departments that worked to establish pseudo-scientific theories, presenting Israel as the last colonial state, a state whose very existence is immoral regardless of borders, a state that should not exist. Differing views are as a matter of course not tolerated. When Jewish community leaders decided in the last few years to begin investing funds to create chairs in Israel studies, they discovered there is no one to teach them. There are no experts, no writers. The field has been abandoned.

Not only in the intellectual arena have we abandoned the field. In the public relations field, too, the Palestinians have learned, unlike the Israelis, to appreciate the importance of the university as the shaper of the next generation, and to concentrate their efforts there. Articulate, effective speakers have been dispatched to campuses to mobilize the idealistic students for their own political interests.

They have been sent to explain that despite the fact that in the Arab nations, as in the autonomous areas of the Palestinian Authority, there are no rights for women, minorities, gays or nearly anyone else, that despite all this they are the true bearers of the banner of human rights; that all true seekers of justice should act on their behalf, and against Israel's.

The absurdity cries out to the heavens, but no one seems to notice. The banner of human rights, once identified to a great degree with Jews, has become a weapon against them. Liberal and democratic discourse on human rights serves mainly as a vehicle for attacks against Israel, and increasingly against Jews.

In the last three years the process has greatly intensified. Students, young, idealistic and naturally tending to see the world in black and white, have been greatly influenced by daily media reports about "human rights violations" carried out by Israel, by pictures of Palestinian children, by unbalanced reportage. Lacking a serious "other side," lacking any real information about the roots of the conflict, lacking any serious Israeli public relations effort, the campuses have become more and more hostile.

When I assumed my current position as minister for Jerusalem and Diaspora affairs, it was clear to me that this issue of campuses as centers of anti-Israelism and their influence on the young Jews of the world must be at the center of my agenda. It is a matter of critical importance for the State of Israel and the Jewish people. And so I decided to travel, to learn the facts first-hand and to try to begin a process of change.

Before I left Israel my daughter said to me, "Dad, if they throw eggs at you, duck." My other daughter countered: "Why duck? Catch them and throw them back." You may laugh, but that is how I felt. After ducking for so long, while Israel was under constant attack for supposedly being a "war criminal," a "Nazi state" and the "embodiment of evil," I felt the time had come to throw back a few eggs. Especially on campuses, especially on the topic of human rights. Not to apologize, but to try to show the true picture — who is the only democracy in the Middle East and who are the dictatorships, where are human rights honored and where are they trampled.

I wanted to show that even during a cruel war against terrorism, Israel was showing great sensitivity to human rights — certainly in comparison to other democracies at war: the United States in Afghanistan, NATO in Yugoslavia, Russia in Chechnya. I talked about the battle of Jenin, when we decided not to use airplanes that could hurt the Palestinian civilian population, and instead sent our soldiers hunting house to house for weapons and terrorists.

I wanted, as someone who had spent a considerable part of his life struggling for human rights, to bring the human rights struggle back to its proper context. To return it to its true owners. To explain that support for terrorists and dictators like Yasser Arafat and his gang cannot be considered support for human rights.

For six days I traveled across the United States. I did not meet with administration officials or do any politicking. Just campuses. Meeting students, instructors, Jewish and non-Jewish activists. A marathon of 13 campuses in six days. I discovered an enormous thirst for knowledge, for straight answers about these supposed "human rights violations" and "war crimes." I learned that combining human rights, a popular, burning issue among students, and Israel, a very unpopular issue, works to Israel's advantage, because even the most pro-Palestinian students, including Arab students, had to back down when the discussion centered squarely and

honestly on human rights and democracy.

But I also learned that every such victory was a limited one, like capturing a single hill in enemy territory. The overall picture is deeply worrying. On every campus I visited, Jewish students make up between 10% and 20% of the population, but no more than a tenth of them, by my estimate, take part in Jewish or pro-Israel activity. Another tiny but outspoken fraction serves as the spearhead of anti-Israel activity, for there is no better cover for hiding the racist nature of causes like an anti-Israel boycott than a Jewish professor or student eager to prove that he is holier than the pope. And the rest? The rest are simply silent. They are not identified, not active, not risk-takers. Nearly 90% of our students are Jews of silence.

To the credit of the activists, it must be said that they do impressive work. But they are few, and many are tired and discouraged. One student who was active in pro-Israel organizations told us that at a certain point he could no longer stand the peer pressure of those around him who viewed him as a pro-Israel obsessive. He now pours his idealistic energies into an organic farm he started. Now that he is involved in environmental activism everyone is happy with him. Having myself grown up in a place where those around me barely tolerated my Jewish involvements, I know that this sort of peer pressure will drive most people to flee, just as we — most of us — in Russia tried to run away from our Jewishness to the ivory towers of science or the arts. We thought that scientific excellence would save us from the mark of Cain on our foreheads.

Can the trends be reversed? Can we recapture the campus? I believe we can. But it will require a concentrated effort and a genuine change of consciousness and direction in Israel's informational efforts. We in Israel and in Jewish communities around the world must combine our efforts and work together. In the United States things have begun to stir, and various organizations are active on campus. Now it is time for Israel to do its share. (Forward Oct 24)

### **Deadly Denial [of Muslim Anti-Semitism]** By Daniel Pipes

The prime minister of Malaysia, Mahathir Mohamad, informed the world this month, among other things, that "Jews rule this world by proxy. They get others to fight and die for them." Condoleezza Rice, the U.S. national security adviser, described Mahathir's comments as "hateful, they are outrageous."

But she then added, "I don't think they are emblematic of the Muslim world." If only she were right about that.

In fact, Mahathir's views are precisely emblematic of current Muslim discourse about Jews - symbolized by the standing ovation his speech received from an all-Muslim audience of leaders representing 57 states. Then, a Saudi newspaper reports, when Western leaders criticized Mahathir, "Muslim leaders closed ranks" around him with words of praise ("very correct," "a very, very wise assessment").

Although anti-Jewish sentiments among Muslims go back centuries, today's hostility results from two main developments: Jewish success in modern times and the establishment of Israel. Until about 1970, however, Muslim resentment remained relatively quiet.

But in the 1970s, political radicalization combined with an oil boom gave states like Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia and Libya the will and the means to sponsor anti-Jewish ideas worldwide. With barely a Muslim voice to counter ever-more-outlandish theories, these multiplied and deepened. For the first time, the Muslim world became the main locus of anti-Jewish theories.

By now, notes Morton Klein of the Zionist Organization of America, "Hatred of Jews is widespread throughout the Muslim world. It is taught in the schools and preached in the mosques. Cartoons in Muslim newspapers routinely portray Jews in blatantly anti-Semitic terms."

Indeed, Mahathir is hardly the only Muslim ruler to make anti-Jewish statements. President Bashar al-Assad of Syria said in 2001 that Israelis try "to kill the principles of all religions with the same mentality in which they betrayed Jesus Christ." The Iranian ayatollahs and Saudi princes have a rich history of anti-Jewish venom, as of course do Egyptian television and Palestinian textbooks.

Of the myriad examples, one stands out for me: a June 2002 interview on Saudi TV with a 3-year-old girl named Basmallah, made available by the Middle East Media and Research Institute:

Anchor: Basmallah, are you familiar with the Jews?

Basmallah: Yes.

Anchor: Do you like them?

Basmallah: No.

Anchor: Why don't you like them?

Basmallah: Because . . .

Anchor: Because they are what?

Basmallah: They're apes and pigs.

Anchor: Because they are apes and pigs. Who said they are so?

Basmallah: Our God.

Anchor: Where did he say this?

Basmallah: In the Koran.

The little girl is wrong about the Koran, but her words show that, contrary to Rice's analysis, Muslim anti-Semitism extends even to the youngest children. That Mahathir himself is no Islamist but (in the words of New York Times columnist Paul Krugman) "about as forward-looking a Muslim leader as we're likely to find" also points to the pervasiveness of anti-Jewish bias.

In its attitudes toward Jews, the Muslim world today resembles Germany of the 1930s - a time when state-sponsored insults, caricatures, conspiracy theories

and sporadic violence prepared Germans for the mass murder that followed.

The same might be happening today. Wild accusatory comments like Mahathir's have become banal. Against Israelis, violence has already reached a rate approaching one death per day over the past three years. Outside Israel, violence against Jews is also persistent: a Jewish building blown up in Argentina, Daniel Pearl's murder in Pakistan, stabbings in France, the Brooklyn Bridge and LAX killings in the United States.

These episodes, plus calling Jews "apes and pigs," could serve as the psychological preparation that one day leads to assaulting Israel with weapons of mass destruction. Armaments chemical, biological and nuclear would be the successors of Auschwitz, Buchenwald and Dachau. Millions of Jews would perish in another Holocaust.

As in the 1930s, the world at large - including the U.S. government - again seems not to note the deadliness of processes now underway. Anti-Jewish rhetoric and violence are decrying, to be sure, but with little sense of urgency and even less of their cumulative impact.

Condoleezza Rice and other top-ranking officials need to recognize the power and reach of the anti-Jewish ideology inculcated among Muslims, then develop active ways to fight it. This evil has already taken innocent lives; unless combated it could take many more. (New York Post Oct 26)

### **The Mideast Crisis Can Be Solved by — Hollyweird?**

By Soraya Sarhaddi Nelson

*Have Jason Alexander, Rhea Perlman, Danny Devito, Brad Pitt and Jennifer Aniston spent a tad too much time in the fantasy factory?*

After honing his skills as a vampire, international spy and the Grim Reaper, sex symbol Brad Pitt is joining a cadre of other Hollywood stars to tackle a project that no one has ever pulled off: making peace between Israelis and Palestinians.

Their goal is to promote a peace plan dreamed up by average Israelis and Palestinians in an unofficial referendum planned for early next year, the initiative's local organizers say. Using issues raised in myriad proposals that have floated between the warring sides over the past decade, voters will be asked to develop a template for their leaders to reach a peace agreement, said Mohammad Darawshe, a prominent Arab-Israeli civic leader who helped found the initiative.

"This is not just an intellectual exercise, it's a grassroots effort," he said.

Pitt's wife, "Friends" star Jennifer Aniston, grouchy fireplug Danny DeVito and his wife, "Cheers" waitress Rhea Perlman, and "Seinfeld" sidekick Jason Alexander are among the celebrities promoting the initiative, which is to be completed within two years.

The actors serve on the board of an organization called OneVoice that was established with private and corporate donations following the failed Camp David Israeli-Palestinian negotiations in 2000.

Top regional academics and analysts will use feedback from public focus groups to craft the wording of 20 topics. Israelis and Palestinians will then be asked to vote on those issues via computer and telephone starting in January, Darawshe said. The referendum will be carried door-to-door in technologically isolated Israeli and Palestinian areas.

People will be asked to consider so far unsolvable problems such as the fate of Palestinian refugees, sovereignty over Jerusalem and the control of borders and water supplies.

"This document will hopefully be owned by a million Israelis and a million Palestinians when we're finished. They will have crafted it," he said.

Whether the actors will actually travel to the region to promote the initiative remains up in the air, although Pitt and actor Edward Norton expressed an interest in coming earlier this year during a fundraiser at DeVito's and Perlman's house.

Violence during the start of the uprising forced Pitt and fellow heartthrob Robert Redford to abandon plans to shoot scenes for their espionage thriller "Spy Game" in Tel Aviv in the fall of 2000.

"The last few years of conflict mean that yet another generation of Israelis and Palestinians will grow up in hatred," Pitt and Aniston are quoted as saying on the OneVoice Web site. "We cannot allow that to happen."

The OneVoice plan is the third unofficial blueprint to peace unveiled since the summer by prominent Israelis and Arabs who say they are frustrated by their governments' inability to end the bloodshed. But this proposal thus far has been spared biting criticism by Prime Minister Ariel Sharon's government, probably because it's perceived as a public relations exercise rather than a political one, Israeli analysts say.

Israeli officials and media have lambasted former peace negotiator Yossi Beilin and former Palestinian Cabinet member Yasser Abed Rabbo.

One Israeli radio anchor, Yael Dan, on Wednesday reduced it to a fashion statement: "Yossi Beilin is 'out,' and Brad Pitt, 'in.'"

Some Israeli public opinion experts dismiss the Hollywood involvement as gimmickry. "Women and girls will scream and yell at the airport and throw their panties at him (Pitt)," said Uri Dromi of the Israel Democracy Institute. But "like everything else, when it comes to real things people don't really buy this sh-t."

"These guests coming from abroad, what do they know about life here?" Dromi asked. (Jewish World Review Oct 27)

### **What Right to Know?** By Eli Pollak and Yisrael Medad

The media justifies its profession on a sacred principle: the public's right to know. This right was first espoused by Associated Press executive editor Kent Cooper in a January 23, 1945, speech. Journalists are supposed to be the eyes and ears of society, sifting and communicating information on our behalf.

Silence – one would think – is the antithesis of press freedom.

The right-to-know concept is ostensibly also a government obligation. To that end, government must avoid unnecessary secrecy and ensure maximum press freedom. Limor Livnat, communications minister in Binyamin Netanyahu's government, adapted recommendations of the Peled Commission which argued in June 1997 that the tight regulatory grip government holds on radio and television broadcasting should be loosened. Livnat agreed to set a new open-airwaves norm.

Thus opening a radio station would become like publishing a new newspaper. The only requirement would be a license which would be readily available.

The Peled Commission also explicitly delineated the steps which would allow Arutz 7 to become a fully legal countrywide radio broadcast network. Nevertheless, the governments of Netanyahu, Ehud Barak and Ariel Sharon conspicuously failed to implement the Peled recommendations.

In contrast, when TV Channel 10 ran into trouble this past year, the Sharon government voided the decision of the Second Radio and TV Authority (SRATA) to close the channel. It removed Mosko Alkalai, the acting chairman of SRATA, and promptly enacted an amendment that allowed the millionaires backing Channel 10 to continue its operation.

One of us (E.P.) pointed out this anomaly during deliberations of the Knesset Economics Committee on the Channel 10 amendment.

But lawmakers did not – though they could have – use the opportunity afforded by the Channel 10 debacle to open up Israel's airwaves.

In stark contrast to TV Channel 10, Arutz 7 is funded largely by public donations. It serves hundreds of thousands of listeners in Israel and was the only voice to be heard over the Israeli airwaves which consistently provided alternative news and commentary. For instance, Arutz 7 – early on and unceasingly – warned that the consequences of the Oslo Accords would be catastrophic. Nor was Arutz 7 silent in its criticism of leaders and parties across the political spectrum.

We wonder if this helps explain why the Peled Commission proposals were never championed by any Knesset parties.

Last week, a Jerusalem Magistrate's Court upheld a complaint brought by left-wing politicians asserting that Arutz-7 was broadcasting illegally. The court found the heads of Arutz 7 guilty of violating the telegraph law which dates back to the British Mandate.

This law is at least as archaic as an election law which ostensibly prevented media appearances by politicians during the weeks preceding Election Day.

During the past few election campaigns, Israel's Media Watch documented, time and again, explicit violations of this electioneering law. But the Supreme Court justices who chaired the Central Elections Committee hearing on the law used Talmudic arguments to prevent the law's application.

WHY DID the judge presiding in the Arutz 7 case not follow the same methodology as the Central Elections Committee in order to prevent the application of this archaic law?

Out of well over 100 pirate radio stations, only Arutz 7 was singled out for litigation by the State Prosecutor's Office.

Among other archaic laws once on the books was one that gave the interior minister power to close down a newspaper. The Israel Democracy Institute and the Association for Civil Rights championed revision of this law, and it was indeed revised. But when it comes to the Arutz 7 case the silence of the Israel Democracy Institute and the Association for Civil Rights deafening.

Is not democracy served by broadcasting pluralism? Moreover, though dozens of media personnel may lose their jobs if Arutz 7 closes, the Israel Journalists Association – whose primary task is to assure employment for journalists – is also silent.

Israeli Press Association chairman Mordechai Kremnitzer – who decried IAF bombing of the PA's Voice of Palestine in Ramallah – seems gratified that Arutz 7 is silenced. He wrongly argued that legal radio stations provide an adequate platform for the views championed by Arutz 7.

And then there was Justice Minister Yosef Lapid, who opined that civilian aircraft approaching Ben-Gurion Airport were endangered by illegal radio broadcasting because it jammed the aviation network.

But Israel Broadcasting Authority radio expert Mickey Gurdis has documented repeatedly that the airwaves are similarly jammed by Israel's legal radio stations.

Technically, it is relatively easy to redirect a pilot to a different wavelength. But Lapid chose instead to attack Arutz 7 and other broadcasters who have nothing to do with this interference.

Another myth is that the radio spectrum is too limited to provide bandwidth for all those wishing to broadcast. In fact, digital broadcasting technology can allow 150 radio stations to operate simultaneously. Israel has fewer than a dozen.

Moreover, why is it that our cash-starved government does not take advantage of this to fill its coffers with license fees? Rather than embracing the public's right to know, the government seems enamored of the sounds of silence. Pollak and Medad are, respectively, chairman and member of the board of Israel's Media Watch. (Jerusalem Post Oct 27)

### **A Palestinian Declaration of War** By Michael Freund

Two weeks have now passed since Palestinian terrorists attacked an American diplomatic convoy in Gaza on October 15, deliberately killing three US citizens in a wanton act of murder.

The attack, of course, was astonishing, if only because it marked the first time in years in which the Palestinians have singled out Americans as their target.

But what is even more startling is what took place back in Washington on that very same day, when US President George W. Bush signed a six-month waiver of the 1987 Anti-Terrorism Act, allowing the PLO's offices in America to remain open. In a short letter addressed to Secretary of State Colin Powell, Bush declared, "I hereby determine and certify that it is important to the national security interests of the United States" that the PLO offices continue to function as usual. So, even as Palestinian terrorists were brazenly killing Americans, the White House was generously rewarding them with a six-month extension of their lease.

To be fair, Bush did condemn the Gaza attack, and went so far as to publicly blame "Palestinian authorities" for their failure to combat terror, a lapse, he noted, which "continues to cost lives". Nevertheless, in the time which has elapsed since the assault, there have been no indications that the Palestinians will be made to pay a price for their actions. And that is where the Bush Administration is making a very big mistake.

By all accounts, the Gaza attack left America's emissaries in the area in a state of shock, and rightly so.

The evidence clearly indicates that this was no case of mistaken identity. The perpetrators are said to have used a remote-controlled device, allowing them to set off the explosion only once a Palestinian police vehicle accompanying the Americans had safely passed by.

The vehicles targeted all bore diplomatic plates, and they were traveling on a road that is closed to Israeli cars. Hence, there can be no doubt that this was a calculated and premeditated assault on Uncle Sam.

In effect, it was a Palestinian declaration of war against America.

Indeed, on October 10, just five days before the attack, the official Palestinian television station broadcast a Friday prayer sermon delivered at the Sheikh Zaid Bin-Sultan mosque in Gaza, where the preacher exhorted his listeners as follows, "We hear statements by the little US President. We hear unfair and tyrannical statements in which he says Israel has the right to defend itself. These statements carry destruction for the United States itself. From this place," he continued, "we warn the American people that this President is dragging them to the abyss."

Remember, this sermon was delivered in Gaza, where the attack itself took place, and those words of warning were uttered before it had occurred.

Similarly, on September 10, Yasser Arafat's official TV station broadcast yet another fiery anti-American sermon delivered, once again, in Gaza, in which the preacher vowed that, "We will defeat America as long as it supports our enemy... we consider America to be our No. 1 enemy."

Thus, even if Arafat and the Palestinian Authority are not directly behind the attack, they most certainly bear responsibility for stirring up anti-American sentiment and inciting and encouraging the terrorists to strike against the United States and its representatives. The Bush Administration's response, or lack thereof, to Arafat's latest outrage is quite simply a recipe for further attacks, because the terrorists now see that they can act with virtual impunity, even against America and its diplomats.

To set the record straight in this regard, and send a strong message to the terrorists, it is time for Washington to adopt a series of steps aimed at punishing the Palestinian Authority.

To begin with, Bush should waive the waiver he signed on October 15, and order PLO offices in America shut down permanently. There is simply no excuse for allowing an organization involved in killing Americans to continue to operate freely on American soil.

In addition, all PLO assets, and those of its leadership, should be frozen forthwith, to prevent the flow of funds to an entity that harbors, encourages and engages in terrorism. Likewise, Palestinian officials should be declared persona non grata, and barred entry to the United States.

Secondly, the Administration can work towards implementing the Koby Mandell Act of 2003, a bill before Congress that would create a special office in the US Justice Department to ensure that firmer measures are taken against killers of Americans. For most of the past decade, Washington has done little to bring Palestinian terrorists to justice for their crimes. In the wake of September 11, it is time for that to change.

Finally, if America truly wishes to see justice served, it can once and for all remove the constraints it has placed on Israel, and give Prime Minister Ariel Sharon the "green light" he needs to do some "regime-changing" of his own in the Palestinian-controlled areas.

For over a decade, the PA has been in the business of killing Jews and Israelis. The October 15 attack indicates it may now be looking to expand its franchise and take out Americans as well. Better to shut down this menace now, and free us all from the danger which it continues to pose.

The Palestinians have declared war on Israel and the West. If America, for whatever reason, is unwilling to fight it, the least they can do is allow Israel to finish the job. (Jerusalem Post Oct 29)

*The writer served as Deputy Director of Communications & Policy Planning in the Prime Minister's Office under former premier Binyamin Netanyahu.*