



Jerusalem 4:10; Toronto 4:50

Events...

Saturday, Nov 2, 8:00 pm

John Loftus, author of *The Secret War Against the Jews*, will speak at the Leah Posluns Theatre.

Saturday November 9, 8:00pm

Professor **Irwin Cotler**, MP will speak on "Echoes of Kristallnacht in our time" at Beth Tikvah.

Tuesday November 12, 8:00pm

George Will will speak on "The Middle East: A view from Washington" at Holy Blossom.

Thursday, November 14, 8:00 pm

Activist lawyer **Nitsana Darshan-Leitner** will speak at Shaarei Shomayim.

Commentary...

Friends in Deed By Yechiel Eckstein

Most evangelical Christians support Israel, but not from the motives that many Jews suspect.

On October 20, more than five million people across America stood in solidarity with the beleaguered State of Israel and prayed for peace in the Holy Land. Most remarkably, this massive show of support was made not by Jews, but by Christians.

I led prayers for Israel at Mount Paran church in suburban Atlanta, together with thousands of Christians who chose to dedicate their Sunday prayers to this lofty - and I believe, most noble - cause.

The good people of Mount Paran were far from alone. There was one of nearly 20,000 churches across the United States that joined in this very special Day of Prayer and Solidarity with Israel, sponsored by the Stand for Israel project of the International Fellowship of Christians and Jews.

These Christians heeded the biblical injunction to "pray for the peace of Jerusalem." They also heard the stirring words of Israel's prime minister, who sent greetings to the American Christian Community on this auspicious and groundbreaking occasion.

This remarkable national effort, slated to be an annual event on the American Christian calendar, came on the heels of a new poll we commissioned that sought to understand Evangelicals' motivation for supporting Israel. Many Jews have long feared what they presumed to be the Evangelicals' main reason for supporting Israel - their hope that it would usher in Jesus' second coming and the conversion of the Jews to Christianity. But the poll found a very different agenda.

Among Evangelicals who expressed support for Israel, well over half attributed their support to non-theological factors such as Israel's democratic system of government and the value it places on freedom, the country's status as a long-standing ally of the US in the war against terror, or the fact that Jews have been persecuted for centuries and need a homeland.

Even when pressed to cite the top theological reason for supporting Israel, 54 percent of Evangelicals cited Hebrew Bible passages that God promised the land to the Jewish people and that those who bless the Jews will themselves be blessed.

A minority of 30% cited New Testament passages related to the prophesied Second Coming.

These findings deserve attention, especially for Jewish skeptics who reject and often scorn evangelical support. Far more Evangelicals support Israel because of its role in advancing freedom and democracy in the world today than

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*

ט"ב

because of any theological reasons. And even when they cite the chief theological basis for supporting Israel, nearly twice as many cited the book of Genesis as opposed to the book of Revelation. Incidentally, those same Genesis passages were cited by 62% of Jews surveyed.

Thankfully, the support of pro-Israel Christians is enthusiastically supported by the government of Israel, as well as by most American Jews who

feel encouraged by it.

It is heartening to see increasing Jewish readiness to cultivate this relationship, though it is frankly distressing that it took a crisis of epic proportions in Israel to bring us to this point.

The message sent to the world from this month's Day of Prayer and Solidarity with Israel should be loud and clear: Evangelical Christians care deeply about Israel, are concerned for the safety of her citizens, and are ready to take action.

Today America and Israel, Christians and Jews, find ourselves allies in a struggle for the very soul and survival of our civilization. It is time to bury old suspicions and fears, and unite in a new move toward cooperation and solidarity.

I do not mean to suggest that we gloss over or compromise the integrity of our very real theological differences. But American Jews must realize that we share a common moral inheritance with our Christian friends - an inheritance, that like their support for Israel, is rooted in God's covenant with Abraham in Genesis.

After my 25 years of working closely with American Evangelicals, I am more convinced than ever that the overwhelming majority of Christian support for Israel is based on the simple admonition of Psalms: "Pray for the peace of Jerusalem: May those who love you be secure."

The writer is founder and president of the International Fellowship of Christians and Jews and Stand for Israel. (Jerusalem Post Oct 30)

New Strategies in Israel By Ben Shapiro

With the latest attack on Israel by Palestinian terrorists, it is time to re-evaluate Israel's current strategy with regard to the intifada. And it is time for America to re-evaluate its plan for peace in the Middle East.

Israel's strategy under Ariel Sharon has been one of defensive retaliation. Mass movement of Israeli troops into Palestinian controlled areas has occurred only after Palestinian suicide attacks against Israelis. It has not been completely unsuccessful. With each incursion, Israeli troops have been able to target and either arrest or kill Palestinian terrorists and scatter others from their comfortable nests.

Still, it hasn't been enough. Sharon, like other Israeli prime ministers before him, returns to the illusion that he can negotiate with the current Palestinian regime. Each time Sharon makes diplomatic overtures to the Palestinians, terrorist groups are immediately given the go-ahead to attack Israelis. It is a never-ending cycle: Israeli incursions followed by a period of calm, Israeli attempts to negotiate followed by a wave of terrorist attacks.

The Israeli government has also made the mistake of naming Yasser Arafat as the sole personage behind the terror. The United States has accepted this idea, calling for the Palestinian people to replace Arafat in a free and open election. Unfortunately, the situation is not as simple as one man. Polls of Palestinians show that the plurality supports the destruction of the state of Israel and continued suicide bombings against Israeli civilians. The Palestinian problem is not one of individuals but of collective support for terror. Terrorism is not a perversion of the Palestinian ideal but an integral part of the Palestinian end game.

It is very clear that the actions taken by Israel and America have not procured any peace beyond the intermittent. If America wants an end to the Israeli-Arab conflict, it must support Israel in the implementation of a tough new anti-terror campaign. Here are three practical measures that can and must be taken to end the violence.

Exile Arafat. This plan has been on the table since Sharon came into

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

office, and it is time that it was used. Israel has consistently targeted the Palestinian leadership but, due to international pressure, has not taken out the kingpin of terror, Arafat himself. Without a leader, terrorist groups like Fatah, Force-17, Hamas and Hizbullah will begin internecine warfare, fighting amongst themselves for control of the Palestinian-controlled territories. Let them kill each other off.

Turn off the water and electricity. Israel has been supplying water and electricity to its enemies since the start of the intifada, free of charge. The Palestinian Authority owes Israel millions in utility bills, yet Israel forgives the debt. If Israel stops supplying water and electricity, the PA will fall. The groundswell of support for terrorist groups among the Palestinian people will dissolve once they realize that their support means they can no longer flush their toilets.

Institute a new land-for-peace deal. Since the Oslo Accords in 1993, Israel has forked over land in return for violence. It is time that Israel changed the equation back to what it was supposed to be: land for peace -- if there is no peace, Israel will take back land. After each attack on Israel, Israel should catch the culprits and find their place of origin. The Israeli Defense Force should then broadcast to the residents of that city that they have 48 hours to evacuate their homes and take whatever belongings they need and that after that the Israeli Air Force will destroy the city. Israel should then annex the territory, and take it off the negotiating table -- permanently. Some would call this collective punishment, but the Oslo Accord was a collective treaty giving collective benefits -- if the Palestinians fail to uphold their side of the bargain, they must be collectively punished. Either the Palestinians will realize that violence reaps no reward and return to the negotiating table, or Israel will have its land back and the terrorists will have no bases.

The above measures are hardly extreme. Just listen to the founder of the Oslo Accord, Yitzhak Rabin: "(T)hey know very well that if they use these guns against us once, at that moment the Oslo Accord will be annulled and the IDF will return to all the places that have been given to them. The Oslo Accord, despite what the opposition claims, is not irrevocable." It is time that Oslo is revoked. (townhall.com Oct 24)

A Road Map That Leads Straight Back to Oslo By Natan Sharansky

This week Israelis got to look at the "Road Map to a Permanent Two-State Solution to the Israeli Palestinian Conflict" that was formulated by the diplomatic Quartet (US, EU, UN and Russia). Even a cursory reading of this road map shows that the only place to which it will lead is straight back to Oslo.

When I heard President Bush's speech on June 24, I thought that Oslo's flawed approach to peacemaking would be buried once and for all and that a genuine hope for peace was kindled. The president spoke then about the inextricable link between democracy and peace. He told the Palestinian people that America would support an independent Palestinian state if the Palestinians reformed their society and chose a new leadership not compromised by terror.

But unfortunately, the "road map" unveiled this week is a far cry from the vision of peace Bush articulated four months ago. For what he did is place the hope for peace squarely on the shoulders of the Palestinian people. The Quartet's road map, in other words, has returned to the illusion of peace with dictators.

The primary mistake of the Oslo peace process was that it implicitly assumed that a Palestinian dictatorship would advance the cause of peace. Arafat, the logic went, was to be strengthened as much as possible so that he would fight terror and provide security for the people of Israel.

Any measure that was deemed to weaken Arafat was to be conspicuously avoided for fear of undermining our "peace partner." This logic created a climate in which the pressure to preserve the "momentum" of the peace process and to adhere to fixed timetables had a far more powerful hold on world public opinion than did the need for Arafat and the PA to fulfill their commitments.

Arafat and the PA quickly realized that merely by paying lip service to peace in the outside world, they could build a terrorist autonomy inside Palestinian-controlled territory with nary a protest.

For nearly a decade, the international community failed to force Arafat and the PA to confront terror. The Palestinian regime was free to mobilize all the means at its disposal to incite the Palestinians against Israel in order to divert attention from their own corrupt and repressive rule. Even though some tried to point out the dangers, the momentum of peacemaking proved too difficult to overcome. By the time the Oslo illusion collapsed, Arafat and the PA had succeeded in creating a climate in which Hamas, Islamic Jihad, Fatah and Tanzim could all compete with each other to see who could kill more Israelis.

DESPITE ITS good intentions, the road map unveiled this week is bound to yield the same results. Its call for a game of musical chairs among the current Palestinian leadership, the appointment of an "empowered" Palestinian prime minister, the enactment of a Palestinian constitution, and statements reiterating Israel's right to exist misses the point. These measures will not truly reform

Palestinian society because they are being implemented from the top down, not from the bottom up.

Instead, this road map will only result in a new illusion whereby a new Palestinian dictatorship will be called upon to protect Israel's security and advance the cause of peace. Judging from this map, the Quartet believes that a Palestinian society poisoned for the last decade to hate Israel and Jews will be ready to freely choose a new leadership in a matter of months and be ready to peaceably join the community of nations in less than a year.

Once again, we are told, all that is needed to make peace a reality is resumed security cooperation, some money, and a little good will.

Rather than strengthening the Palestinian people and investing in their freedom, the Quartet document returns to the Oslo formula by placing its faith in a "reformed" Palestinian dictatorship. Such a dictatorship will be no more interested in the welfare of its people than any other.

Six months ago, I sent a plan to Prime Minister Sharon that I believe outlines the broad steps that must be taken to ensure that Israelis and Palestinians embark on a genuine path to peace.

It calls for a temporary administration to be established for the next two to three years so that Palestinian society can be "detoxified" and democratic institutions can be developed. Rather than call for elections at the beginning of the process of reform, elections must come only after that process is well under way.

After all, only when Palestinians are not afraid to speak freely will they have a real opportunity to freely choose a leadership that is not compromised by terror. And only with such a leadership can Israel hope to engage in constructive negotiations for an Israeli-Palestinian peace agreement.

Last summer, Bush crossed a peacemaking Rubicon in his historic speech. But alas, the Quartet's road map takes us back to the other side. Rigid timetables, confidence building measures, and new Palestinian strongmen will bring us no closer to peace today than they did for the last decade.

The only hope for an Israeli-Palestinian peace remains investing in a free Palestinian society that will want to join Israel in building a common future. (Jerusalem Post Oct 25)

Back to the Cave By Rabbi Berel Wein

The long and painful struggle of human society to civilize itself, to make life livable and bearable for all, suffered great reverses in the 20th century. The calamity of World War I, coupled with the murderous social engineering of the Russian Revolution, undid all the norms of civilized behavior - even the rules of war - that had been put into place in the 19th century. Whatever veneer of civilized behavior that remained after the Versailles treaty was torn to shreds by World War II and the Holocaust.

Slowly and painfully, in the years following that bloodbath, society attempted to regroup and resume progress toward a more stable world. Even the Cold War that dominated the second half of the 20th century was conducted in a "civilized" manner. Though there was constant confrontation between the Soviet Union and the West, sometimes even bordering on nuclear war, the two parties always sought to accommodate each other and not to force the other into public humiliation and desperate behavior.

It is interesting to note that "terrorism" as we understand it today was not used as a weapon in the Cold War. It was not civilized behavior. It violated the accepted norms of human society.

It is enormously ironic that the peaceful conclusion of the Cold War ushered in our age of mass terrorism. Of course, Israel has always known Arab terrorism. And the "troubles" in Northern Ireland now go back 30 years. But intifadas, suicide bombers, open disregard for peace agreements, deranged leaders of rogue states acquiring weapons of mass destruction, have become commonplace only over the past 15 years. In effect, the current use of terror as a weapon, almost as an end in itself, is a regression to tribal warfare, never-ending blood feuds and the murderous religious wars of the Middle Ages. And make no mistake, religion is unfortunately the catalyst in this mix of cruelty and violence.

The IRA does not want a true peace settlement, more civil rights or better economic opportunities for the Catholics in Northern Ireland. It wants the eventual destruction of the Protestant community living there. The fact that the Protestants have lived there for almost four centuries makes no difference in a war that is being fought on religious and ethnic bases. The Mitchell (why does that name sound familiar?) Good Friday agreement lies in tatters, England has been forced to again suspend Home Rule for Northern Ireland, and it is obvious to all that the IRA has no intention of disarming itself or forswearing terror as its main weapon against the Protestants.

Gerry Adams is a much smoother and more appealing spokesman for the IRA than is Yasser Arafat for the PLO, but at heart, he is the same hater that Arafat is.

Much of the Muslim world has also retreated back into the religious wars

of the Middle Ages. Bosnia, Chechnya, Afghanistan, Iraq, Kashmir, Lebanon and our own security situation here in the Land of Israel are examples of Muslim violence against the infidel. Violent interpretation of religious doctrine puts mankind back into the cave. No sham peace agreements or painful concessions will change this strategic truth.

Overlooking the reality of agreements not kept, commitments not honored, the substitution of wishful thinking for honest conclusions, is a sure recipe for disaster. This is what happened in Northern Ireland and it is what happened to us here in Israel. It is what happened in the UN's decade-long appeasement of Iraq, and Bill Clinton's appeasement of North Korea.

It is painful to think that we will have to live with terrorism for some time. It is even more painful to contemplate living in the cave and not attempting to crawl out into the sunlight again. The beast of terrorism must be tamed. Nations must deal with their inevitable disagreements according to some norms that exclude the use of terrorism as a state-sponsored activity. Instead of always accommodating the terrorists and their sponsors, which much of Europe seems willing to do, the terrorists must be destroyed. That is why the stand that Israel is making against terrorism here in our homeland is so vital, not only for our survival but for that of civilization itself.

It is slowly dawning on many in the Western world that our bell is tolling for them as well. Our struggle should therefore not be judged in isolation from the world challenge of terrorism and religiously inspired violence.

We are what stands between mankind and a return to the cave. (Jerusalem Post Oct 25)

A Personal Commitment for the Coming Year By David M. Weinberg
Reb Shlomo Carlebach's response to all adversity and challenge was to love his fellow Jew even more.

Clearly, we Israelis love each other. You can tell from the way we speak about each other.

Over the last week alone, Nissim Zeev of Shas called new MK Uzi Even - a homosexual - "repellent" and a "disgrace."

Yossi Sarid compared settlements to "Sodom" and settlers to "cancerous growths."

A senior rabbinical figure reiterated that the Reform Movement was "worse than the Nazis."

A leading women's group called a rabbinical judge a "blood sucker."

Senior figures in Binyamin Netanyahu's camp labeled Ariel Sharon a "trickster" and a "cheat." And Shulamit Aloni piped up with her usual pearls about all religious Jews bearing the burden of Rabin's assassination.

Once upon a time we used to chalk up the rough talk to Israeli "character" and shrug it off. But the disgraceful level to which our mainstream politicians have sunk is alarming. Society as a whole is affected; it becomes increasingly vulgarized.

Moderation, nuance and restraint have become orphan concepts in this country's political and social landscape. The prevailing culture is *kasah* - unbridled, untamed confrontation.

Previous Jewish commonwealths, we are taught, disintegrated because of *sinat hinam* - everybody hated each other. And even if they didn't - the norm was to harshly judge and stereotype one another.

And so, we all could do with a dose of *teshuva*, repentance for our inflammatory, intemperate, seditious demagoguery.

I AM prompted to these thoughts not only by the anniversary this week of prime minister Yitzhak Rabin's murder - a tragic event provoked by incitement and hatred. Even more so, I am driven to mourn our ignoble situation by the eighth yartzeit that falls this week of Rabbi Shlomo Carlebach, the saintly singer and composer, storyteller, scholar and savior of souls, who exemplified and taught *ahavat hinam* (boundless love).

Reb Shlomo was an *ahavat hinam* extremist. He loved all Jews to the fullest and was prepared to go to extreme lengths in order to bring them back to tradition.

Who else was prepared to foray into the ashrams, hippie villages and pubs of the 1960s flower-child generation, showering love and acceptance of all?

Who else was prepared to take the beauty of Jewish mystical teachings and *nigunim* (melodies) to the Berkeley Folk Festival, to "Holy Man Jamborees" and "Whole Earth Expos" - which were packed with wandering Jewish youth searching for love and spiritual meaning? Only Reb Shlomo.

Reb Shlomo reclaimed thousands upon thousands of "holy hippiech," from Haight-Ashbury to Metulla to Bombay, offering personal redemption through ecstatic song, meditative prayer, and most of all, simple *menchlechkeit* - moral, decent living.

I don't know anyone on the face of this earth who can recall hearing Reb Shlomo raise his voice in anger. I know of no instance in which he hit back verbally at his many detractors, even when these misguided critics insulted him to the core, even in front of his closest friends.

Reb Shlomo's response to all adversity and challenge, no matter how spiteful or nasty, was to love his fellow Jew even more. The redemption of Israel, the saving grace of the State of Israel, he taught, could only come through limitless love. Of all the thousands of songs that he composed, his favorite was *Lema'an Ahai Verei'ai*, "For the Sake of My Brothers and Friends, I Will Sing for You Peace."

It was "the highest of high," the "deepest of deep of songs," he was wont to say.

"Holy life," Reb Shlomo taught, was a life that increased peace and love, and that shunned strife and rancor. Very few things were worth hating for. To his assailants he would say "hate is a poison that corrodes the soul" and then kiss them on the forehead. Men and women, secular and religious, Jew and non-Jew alike.

At first glance, perhaps all this sounds a bit naive when talking in terms of national politics, defense and social policy. There are real, unbridgeable differences of opinion among Israelis in these matters. Yet Reb Shlomo's legacy is still relevant, I think. Everything depends on how you approach the person who disagrees with you.

A policy advocate whose position is arrogantly tinged with *schaudenfreud* for the downfall of his political opponent is automatically suspect, Reb Shlomo would contend. Legislation motivated by hate for another or by a desire to hurt another camp ought to be ruled out of order. Believe me, each and every one of us knows how to differentiate between laws meant to better the greater good and those meant to punish or penalize a rival camp.

So, as you step in to dance at one of the many concerts to be held this coming Tuesday evening (17 Heshvan) to mark the passing of the great Rabbi Shlomo Carlebach, consider making this personal commitment for the coming year: "I undertake to avoid making quick judgments out of ignorance or antagonism, for these are intellectually-flawed shortcuts designed to serve weak, fearful and hate-filled minds. Instead I commit myself to the patience necessary to withhold harsh judgment of my friends and colleagues, out of an abiding, overriding concern for *klal yisrael*." (Jerusalem Post Oct 21)

B'tselem on Trial Jerusalem Post Editorial

At a session held in Gaza City on Monday, the Palestinian Authority's State Security Court sentenced Haidar Ghanem, a human rights worker and journalist, to death by firing squad after finding him guilty of collaborating with Israel. As a field researcher for B'tselem in Rafah, it appears that Ghanem's real crime was his habit of asking local Palestinians the types of questions PA officials find potentially embarrassing. Though Ghanem did admit in court to having served as an informer, there is reason to believe that his confession was forced.

Indeed, shortly after his arrest, B'tselem issued a statement saying it was "deeply concerned that Ghanem was arrested because of his work with the organization. B'tselem also fears that the purpose of his arrest is to deter human rights workers from carrying out their work honestly and with the intention of uncovering the truth." The group further noted that the PA often tries suspected collaborators before "kangaroo" courts, and expressed its concern "that torture is being used in Ghanem's interrogation."

That an organization such as B'tselem would make such allegations against the PA is a sure sign of just how severe the situation in the areas it controls has become. The group has a long record of sharply criticizing Israel, while turning a blind eye to systematic Palestinian violations of human rights.

In the past few months alone, B'tselem has alleged that Israel "willfully adopts the tactics of terrorists," accused IDF soldiers of being "trigger happy," and bemoaned what it termed the "IDF's loss of any moral compass." Its press releases, too, often parrot Palestinian propaganda.

Interestingly, though, B'tselem and other like-minded groups have been largely silent about the PA's habit of trampling on the most basic of civil liberties - that is, until it affects them directly. In the past two weeks, the PA sentenced three other Palestinians to death for "collaborating," while another received a life sentence. But it is only now, when one of its own employees is the victim of the PA's version of jurisprudence, that B'tselem sees fit to come out in full force against the PA's record on human rights. Perhaps, if B'tselem had devoted its energies over the past decade to highlighting the PA's dismal record, many of the abuses now taking place under PA auspices might have been avoided.

Indeed, if Arafat's speech Tuesday in Ramallah is any indication, PA violations of human rights seem destined to continue. Speaking to the Palestinian Legislative Council, he again insisted that he plans to hold elections in January. The election scheme, together with the approval of a new PA cabinet, are designed to project the image of a new, sleeker PA, one that has reformed its ways and abandoned the corruption and malfeasance that have come to typify its rule.

As Ghanem's lightning trial and all-but-predetermined conviction make

clear, though, Arafat's reforms are little more than window dressing. His new cabinet is a Palestinian version of the Soviet-era Potemkin village, which was built primarily to fool foreigners into believing the Russians had really created a workers' paradise.

Likewise, Arafat is hoping that the "international community" will be taken in by his reshuffling of various ministerial posts, thereby deflecting the mounting pressure upon him from Israel and the US.

But democracy is far more than just a matter of who holds which position. It is, at its core, about the values of freedom that guide a society and the protections put in place to safeguard those freedoms from tyranny and abuse. With the Ghanem trial, and those of the other "collaborators," Arafat and the PA have demonstrated once again that rather than laying the groundwork for democratic reform, they would much rather serve as obstacles in its path. Maybe if the Palestinians had a B'tselem of their own, better progress might be made. (Jerusalem Post Oct 30)

The Big New Lie By Alan M. Dershowitz

Tyrants have always understood that if you repeat a big lie often enough people will begin to believe it. The big lie that's being repeated all around the United States, and especially on university campuses, is that anyone who is critical of Israeli policies or the Sharon government will automatically be labeled an anti-Semite. It would be terrible if that were true, since criticism of Israel is important, as is criticism of any imperfect democracy.

But the reality is that in the many years that I have been speaking about the Arab-Israeli conflict, I have never heard anyone ever actually label a mere critic of Israel or Sharon as anti-Semitic. Nor have I ever heard mere criticism of Israel described as anti-Semitism.

Yet the big lie persists. Holocaust scholar Susannah Heschel has made the following charge: "We often hear that criticism of Israel is equivalent to anti-Semitism."

Tikkun editor Michael Lerner has made a similar charge, as has Harvard professor Paul Hanson.

I hereby challenge anyone who claims that mere criticism of Israel is "often" labeled anti-Semitism to document that charge with actual quotations, in context, with the source of the statements identified. I am not talking about the occasional kook who writes an anonymous postcard or e-mail. I am talking about mainstream supporters of Israel who, it is claimed, have "often" equated criticism of Israel with anti-Semitism.

Surely that is not what President Lawrence Summers of Harvard did when he made the following statement: "And certainly there is much to be debated about the Middle East and much in Israel's foreign and defense policy that can be and should be vigorously challenged. But where anti-Semitism and views that are profoundly anti-Israeli have traditionally been the primary preserve of poorly educated right-wing populists, profoundly anti-Israel views are increasingly finding support in progressive intellectual communities. Serious and thoughtful people are advocating and taking actions that are anti-Semitic in their effect if not their intent."

Summers then referred specifically to those who have called for a boycott of, and divestiture from, Israel alone.

Surely that is not what Thomas Friedman of the New York Times did when he wrote the following: "Criticizing Israel is not anti-Semitic, and saying so is vile. But singling out Israel for opprobrium and international sanction - out of all proportion to any other party in the Middle East - is anti-Semitic, and not saying so is dishonest."

Surely it is not what I have done when I have welcomed criticism of Israel, while accusing of bigotry those who would single out Israel for economic capital punishment, despite the reality that Israel's human-rights record is far better than that of any other country in the region and at least as good as any other country that has faced comparable dangers.

Indeed, I have often myself been critical of particular Israeli policies, such as Sharon's foolish efforts to isolate Yasser Arafat in his compound. Yet, I have never been accused of anti-Semitism, nor have the government's many critics in the Israeli media.

IT IS important to understand that although criticism of Israel is not, by itself, anti-Semitism, there are certain kinds of criticism of Israel which are clearly anti-Semitic, even if the word Jew is never mentioned.

An obvious instance is that of activist and poet Amiri Baraka who has claimed that Israel and Sharon knew about the attack on the World Trade Center before it happened and warned 4,000 Israelis to stay away.

Can anyone doubt that this variation on the blood libel is anti-Semitic to the core? So, too, is any attempt to demonize, isolate, and delegitimize the Jewish nation for imperfections that are far worse among other nations. A good working definition of anti-Semitism is to take a characteristic that is universal and to single out only the Jews for exhibiting it.

For example, in the 1920s Harvard's racist president, A. Lawrence Lowell,

tried to impose a quota on Jews admitted to Harvard because, as he put it, "Jews cheat." When a distinguished alumnus reminded him that non-Jews also cheat, he replied, "You're changing the subject. We're talking about Jews."

Can anyone doubt that Lowell's statements were anti-Semitic? So, too, is the singling out of the Jewish state for faults that are far worse among other states.

Even those who believe that singling out Israel for criticism is not anti-Semitic, must surely acknowledge that there is a difference between mere criticism of Israel and singling it out for unique sanctions, such as divestiture or boycott. It is true that those who advocate the latter have been accused of anti-Semitism, but it is false that those who fit into the former category have been so labeled. Yet the recent big lie lumps these distinct categories together.

The time has come for those who are spreading this big lie either to put up, by documenting their charge, or shut up. (Jerusalem Post Oct 24)

Ransom by Any Other Name By Joseph Farah

Living in the greater Washington, D.C., area for the last three weeks, I hardly need any reminders about the terror residents have experienced as a result of the sniper attacks.

It was the first thing everyone in the area talked about. It was on the front page of the local newspapers. It was covered wall to wall by the cable news channels. And it was the subject of news and talk radio all day long.

Last week, I had to take a trip to Canada for a few days. Much to my surprise, I couldn't escape the talk about the D.C. sniper or snipers.

It was front-page news every day in Toronto and Montreal. This was not just a big local story. It was not just a huge national story. It was a huge international story.

There were 13 single-shot attacks on people in Maryland, Washington and Virginia over the last three weeks. Ten of those attacks resulted in deaths.

That's a lot of death. That's a lot of fear.

Yet, last Monday, more people died in one suicide bomb attack in Israel than in all of these murderous attacks combined. And Monday's attack in Israel wasn't even one of the largest and deadliest of nearly daily suicide terror attacks in the Jewish state over the last year or so.

We now have reason to suspect the sniping attacks on Americans in the Washington, D.C., area were, in part, motivated by the same kind of hate that prompts suicide bombings in Israel.

It's part of a war against Western civilization.

That's what motivates the terrorists in Israel. It's not about creating a Palestinian state. It's about ending a Jewish state - a Jewish state that represents freedom in a sea of totalitarianism.

Yet Israel is still told by the world - even by many in the United States - to negotiate a settlement, to compromise with the terrorists, to meet the bombers half-way.

Fortunately, I have heard no suggestions that the FBI or Montgomery County Police Chief Charles Moose cut a deal with the snipers. Nor did I expect law enforcement authorities to pay a ransom demand - whether it was \$10 million or \$1 million. It was not going to happen.

Why?

Wouldn't it be worth ensuring there were no more sniper attacks to pay \$10 million? After all, taxpayers were probably paying more than \$10 million a day to catch him. The economy in the Washington area was suffering. Tourism was way down. People were not going out to stores. Some were even cutting down on driving because they fear going to gas stations.

Yes, indeed, it would be worth the price. But it won't be paid because there is a principle at work. We were not going to negotiate a deal with the sniper because if we cut one, we would be creating a market for more snipers. There would be no end to the violence. We would be rewarding it and other would-be millionaires who can hit a target at 100 yards would be tempted to take his place.

For precisely the same reason, we must stop asking Israel to cut a deal with the suicide bombers.

There is no compromising with killers. Killers kill. They must be caught and punished - preferably with death. Anything less than that encourages other would-be killers. Anything less provides incentive to kill. If we ever needed a laboratory to test this theory, we have one in Israel today.

Talking to the killers - people like Yasser Arafat who have killed hundreds of Israelis and at least 100 Americans since 1968 - empowers them. Why should they stop doing the very thing that provided them with rewards, the very thing that made them famous, the very thing that paralyzed their enemies, the only thing they are good at doing?

Why is it that we are able to see things so clearly in our own back yard, but not in Israel's? (WorldNetDaily.com Oct 28)