



Jerusalem 3:55 Toronto 4:26

**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*

At precisely 2 P.M., Sharansky and Dermer were ushered into the Oval Office for a private meeting with the president. They were scheduled for 45 minutes. They stayed for more than an hour. What the president told Sharansky was off the record. What Sharansky told the president was not.

"I told the president, 'There is a great difference between politicians and dissidents. Politicians are focused on polls and the press. They are constantly making compromises. But dissidents

focus on ideas. They have a message burning inside of them. They would stand up for their convictions no matter what the consequences.'

"I told the president, 'In spite of all the polls warning you that talking about spreading democracy in the Middle East might be a losing issue - despite all the critics and the resistance you faced - you kept talking about the importance of free societies and free elections. You kept explaining that democracy is for everybody. You kept saying that only democracy will truly pave the way to peace and security. You, Mr. President, are a dissident among the leaders of the free world.'"

From one of the most famous dissidents of era of the Evil Empire, such is not faint praise.

Early in The Case for Democracy, Sharansky, 56, recalls another Soviet-era dissident named Andrei Amalrik, who in 1969 wrote, Will The Soviet Union Survive Until 1984? Predicting the Communist empire's inevitable collapse, Amalrik, who was imprisoned by the KGB for his observations (and whom Sharansky later had the privilege of teaching English), explained that "any state forced to devote so much of its energies to physically and psychologically controlling millions of its own subjects could not survive indefinitely."

Sharansky writes: "The unforgettable image he left the reader with was that of a soldier who must always point a gun at his enemy. His arms begin to tire until their weight becomes unbearable. Exhausted, he lowers his weapon and the prisoner escapes."

At the time, many so-called "democrats" in the West dismissed Amalrik as downright delusional. But his prediction proved to be off by only a few years.

"How was one Soviet dissident able to see what legions of analysts and policymakers in the West were blind to?" asks Sharansky. "Did Amalrik have access to more information than they did? Was he smarter than all the Sovietologists put together? Of course not.... But unlike them, he understood the awesome power of freedom."

For Sharansky, this is the critical line of demarcation in the war on terror, dividing the naysayers from those who both believe in and are willing to fight for the notion that freedom is a universal human right.

He is convinced that democratic institutions can take hold throughout the Middle East. He concedes it will not be easy, but argues the key is bold moral leadership from the West of the kind that Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher demonstrated in the 1980s.

"Everybody knows that weapons of mass destruction are very dangerous in the hands of terrorists," says Sharansky, his passion as strong as his accent. "But very few people understand how powerful weapons of mass construction can be in the hands the free world. There are so many skeptics, so many people who doubt whether Iraqis and Palestinians really want to live in freedom, or whether democracy in the Middle East is really such a good idea. But I lived under a totalitarian regime. I know the horrors of these regimes from the inside. I know they can be transformed. They won't be perfect, and they won't agree with us on every issue. But it is better to have a democracy that hates you than a dictatorship that loves you."

Sharansky cites the example of post-World War II Germany. Many doubted a true democracy could ever take root amidst the ashes of the Third Reich. But it has. True, most Germans opposed the recent war in Iraq and increasingly side against the U.S. in international policy debates. But so what? Sharansky asks. At least they are not carpet-bombing the whole of Europe.

Toward the end of the book, Sharansky quotes current Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon as having once told him, "I understand that in the Soviet Union your ideas were important, but unfortunately they have no place in the Middle East."

Sharansky respectfully disagrees. With the fall of Saddam Hussein's regime, and the passing of Yasser Arafat, Sharansky calls himself "an optimist." Never before in human history has the moment been more ripe for Iraqis and Palestinians to hear and embrace the case for democracy. The

## Events...

**Friday December 3, 9:00pm**  
Oneg Shabbat with **David Wilder**  
of **Hevron** at 152 Franklin, Thornhill.

**Saturday December 4, 8:00pm**  
Rabbi **Shalom Gold** will speak on "The Jewish Imperative: Clarity of Vision" at Bnai Torah.

**Sunday December 5, 9:00am**  
Israel Trade Breakfast at BAYT. For tickets, call the Shul office.

**Tuesday December 14th, 7:30 pm**  
Rosh Yeshiva of Yeshivat HaKotel Rav **Mordechai Elon's Parshat Hashavua shiur** in Hebrew, via satellite, at Clanton Park Synagogue.

**March 26 - April 6**  
One Israel Fund/Westmount Community Shul Mission to Israel. Visiting the Golan, Yeshu, Yerushalayim, Dead Sea; Shabbat in Chevron. For details call 905-482-9488.

## Quote of the Week...

**Jordanian MP and PNC Member Hamada Farwana: Now I Have the Courage to Admit that Sharon was Right, Arafat was Responsible for Violence**

An excerpt: "First and foremost, although I hate Sharon, I have to admit, after the Arafat's death, that Sharon's position towards Arafat was correct: True, Yasser Arafat was responsible for the armed operations. Perhaps I wasn't brave enough to say so before - because I feared for Yasser Arafat's life - but the smuggling of the Karyn A weapons ship by Fuwad Al-Shobaki, who is still languishing unjustly in the Jericho prison, establishing the Al-Aqsa brigades, firing Jibril Rajoub and Muhammad Dahlan for disagreeing with him on the armed struggle, his alliance with Hamas, have all justified Sharon's logic and his hostility to President Yasser Arafat. Yes, Yasser Arafat supported the armed struggle and the armed Intifada." (www.memritv.org)

## Commentary...

**Two Great Dissidents** By Joel C. Rosenberg  
*Natan Sharansky's vision, and President Bush's.*

When Natan Sharansky stepped into Condoleezza Rice's West Wing office at 11:15 last Thursday morning, he had no idea the national security advisor would soon be named the next secretary of state. He was just glad to see her holding a copy of his newly published book, The Case for Democracy.

"I'm already half-way through your book," Rice said. "Do you know why I'm reading it?"

Sharansky, a self-effacing man who spent nine years in KGB prisons (often in solitary confinement) before becoming the first political prisoner released by Mikhail Gorbachev, hoped it had to do with his brilliant analysis and polished prose.

Rice smiled. "I'm reading it because the president is reading it, and it's my job to know what the president is thinking."

A close friend of the president had sent over a copy several weeks earlier with a note urging him to take a close look. The president nearly polished it off during a weekend at Camp David, then suggested to Rice that she read it as well.

For nearly 40 minutes, Rice engaged Sharansky (now an Israeli cabinet member) and co-author Ron Dermer, a former columnist with the Jerusalem Post, in a discussion over how best to help democracy take root in such hard soils as Iraq, Iran, and the West Bank and Gaza.

**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**

transitions for both will be difficult. But Sharansky is not daunted.

"When given a real opportunity to choose between living in a free society or a fear society, the vast majority of people will choose a free society. And a free society - a society where people feel safe to argue and dissent - will always be a stable society."

This is what Sharansky is working for, and he has just earned the ear of the president of the United States and the new secretary of state.

*The writer is the author of The Last Jihad (about the fall of Saddam Hussein) and The Last Days (about the death of Yasser Arafat). He briefly served as a senior advisor to Natan Sharansky in the year 2000. (National Review Nov 19)*

---

### **O Canada - How Could You?** By E. Joan O'Callaghan

The political dust is settling. George Bush has won a clear mandate for another four years in the White House. Yasser Arafat has departed this world.

Now, goaded by Britain's Tony Blair, Bush has proclaimed that settling the Palestinian-Israeli conflict will be a priority during his second term.

Everyone is sensing some sort of opportunity - although nobody is sure what kind of opportunity - in the power vacuum left by Arafat. Various interested parties are jumping on board the peace train.

The latest comer is Canada's Prime Minister Paul Martin, himself recently elected although not with the clear majority accorded his American counterpart.

But is Canada's involvement in any peace process really in Israel's best interests?

Although Canada claims to be a friend of Israel, an examination of Canada's actions both internationally and domestically should raise a few eyebrows and generate some hard questions.

Let's begin with the United Nations. Here Israel's friend, Canada, has voted against Israel 78 times, abstained 38 times, and voted in support of Israel, by its own admission, only once - although a phone call to Israel's UN delegation in New York was unable to confirm even that.

In spite of evidence that Hamas and other terrorist organizations are on UNRWA's payroll and have taken full advantage of UNRWA funds and facilities to further their own unholy agenda, Canada continues to contribute \$10 million annually to UNRWA.

When asked directly whether he can state categorically that Canadian dollars are not being used to finance terror attacks against Israelis, a spokesperson for the Department of Foreign Affairs was unable to do so.

Canada has also given a quarter of a billion dollars to the Palestinian Authority, a goodly percentage of which, no doubt, has been used to subsidize Suha Arafat's opulent Paris lifestyle; or perhaps found its way into the coffers of the terror networks.

Yet, when pressured, Foreign Affairs refuses not only to produce an accounting of how its funds are being used, but also to demand an accounting from UNRWA and the PA.

While mouthing platitudes about Israel's right to defend itself, Canada has managed to condemn just about everything Israel does in its own defense.

Canada condemned the targeted killings of Sheikh Ahmed Yassin and Abdel-Aziz Rantisi. Canadian Minister of Foreign Affairs Pierre Pettigrew condemned Israel's security barrier, even though it has significantly reduced terror attacks where it has been completed.

Canada also failed to support Israel at the UN when a resolution was tabled demanding that Israel dismantle the fence in accordance with the ruling of the International Court of Justice. Canada has come out in favor of the "right of return" for Palestinian refugees, with the disclaimer that Palestinians may return only if they are willing to live in peace.

Such a specious position is as ludicrous as it is unenforceable.

On the domestic side, when Concordia University in Montreal, cowed by threats of violence from Arab students and their supporters, refused permission to former prime minister Ehud Barak to speak at the university, Premier Martin said nothing.

Martin's deafening silence continued when Mohammed Elmasry, president of the Canadian Islamic Congress, reportedly said recently that all Israelis over the age of 18 are legitimate targets for Palestinian terror, a statement that clearly violates Canada's hate laws.

Martin appointed Yvon Charbonneau, a member of parliament from Montreal, to the post of Canadian ambassador to UNESCO in spite of Charbonneau's long and well-documented history of anti-Israel pronouncements. He has so far refused to recall Charbonneau in spite of an outcry from his constituents.

Canada's porous refugee and immigration laws have allowed PFLP terrorist Mahmoud Mohammed Issa Mohammed, convicted in the hijacking of an El AL plane and subsequent killing of one person at Athens Airport in 1968, to live comfortably in Brantford, Ontario, while enjoying refugee status.

More recently Martin lauded Yasser Arafat, on hearing of his death, as "personifying the Palestinian people's struggle" and offered "on behalf of Canada condolences and sympathy to the family of chairman Arafat, as well as to all Palestinians."

Martin even dispatched his foreign affairs minister to attend Arafat's funeral, a greater honor than was accorded former president Ronald Reagan on the recent occasion of his death.

By such words and actions, Martin has legitimized terrorism and dishonored

both himself and his country.

Canada hasn't conducted itself as an honest broker. It has attempted to equate the struggle of a fellow democracy to defend itself with the efforts of a terrorist regime to destroy its neighbor.

Canada has not earned the privilege of participating in any peace negotiations involving Israel, and Israelis should think long and hard before welcoming Canada to the negotiating table. (Jerusalem Post Nov 23)  
*The writer is Associate Director of Communications for the Canadian Coalition for Democracies.*

---

### **The Trouble with Barghouti** Jerusalem Post Editorial

On Monday, Fatah chose Mahmoud Abbas (Abu Mazen) as its candidate in the upcoming Palestinian Authority election. Someone else, however, seems to have captured the imagination of some Palestinian, American, and even Israeli opinion makers. His name is Marwan Barghouti.

"The Barghouti problem is a complex one," Secretary of State Colin Powell said in an interview on Channel 1 this week. "I am not sure what he is planning to do, but I think we will just have to wait and see." While noting that Barghouti did not appear to be leaving his Israeli jail cell soon, Powell concluded, "This is something that the Palestinians will have to work out among themselves - who they offer for candidacy."

We do not want to be too harsh with the outgoing Powell, who by and large stuck with US President George W. Bush's themes of the need for Palestinians to fight terrorism and build a democracy. Yet he missed an opportunity. He might have reminded the world of the considerable distance between Barghouti and the "new leadership, not compromised by terror" that the US president has been calling for.

If there is anyone more responsible than Yasser Arafat for the needless terror war that has cost thousands of Israelis and Palestinians their lives, it is Barghouti, who proudly claims to be that war's architect. As Barghouti explained in an interview with the London-based Al-Hayat exactly one year after the attacks began: "I knew that the end of the month of September [2000] would be the last opportunity before the explosion, but when [opposition leader Ariel] Sharon arrived at Al-Aksa Mosque it was the most suitable moment for the breakout of the intifada.... The meaning of this [was an opportunity for] setting fire to the entire region, since the issue of Al-Aksa inflames and ignites the sensibilities of the masses."

"There were those who were opposed to the conflict," Barghouti continued. "At the same time, I saw within the situation a historic opportunity to ignite the conflict... After Sharon left, I stayed in the area for two hours with other well-known people and we spoke... of how people should react in all the towns and villages and not only in Jerusalem. We made contact with all the factions [emphasis added]."

The "intifada," in other words, did not just "break out." It was broken out through considerable and premeditated effort, in large part by Barghouti.

Though now, after his death, it is beginning to be alleged that Arafat himself founded the Aksa Martyrs Brigades, which competed with other groups over how many suicide bombers it could set off in Israeli cities, little evidence has emerged directly connecting Arafat to specific terror attacks. Not so with Barghouti.

Barghouti's indictment before an Israeli civilian court accused him of direct involvement in 33 separate attacks, including suicide bombings, oadside shootings, and other attempted murders. The court found sufficient evidence to convict him of five murders in three separate attacks, for which he was sentenced to five consecutive life terms in prison. Indeed, Barghouti accepted responsibility in court for at least some of the attacks.

To some, all of this is a non sequitur, since it is not up to Israel, after all, to choose a new Palestinian leader. If a majority of Palestinians want Barghouti to lead them, why should Israelis, particularly those who believe in democracy, stand in the way? Why should Israel insist on keeping him in jail?

The reason is a matter of both national dignity and the rule of law.

If Palestinians want to elect terrorist leaders from Hamas or Fatah, it is their right to do so. There is no shortage of such people, despite Israel's effective campaign to eliminate them. But it is quite another matter for Israel to actively facilitate such a choice by ignoring the judgment of its own legal system and any elementary notion of justice.

It is ironic that many of the people who say we should not choose Palestinian leaders are ready to anoint Barghouti as the only legitimate leader, especially when that "legitimacy" is based mainly on slaughtering Israelis. Should our highest aspiration for the post-Arafat era be someone who tried to out-Arafat Arafat? We should hope that Palestinians would aspire to more, but we should not help them aspire to less. (Jerusalem Post Nov 24)

---

### **Weapon of the Weak?** By Evelyn Gordon

In his column in last Friday's Jerusalem Post, Hillel Halkin argued persuasively that the plethora of laudatory obituaries for Yasser Arafat was due not to global amnesia about Arafat's career as an international terrorist, but rather to tacit global acceptance of an argument that few people as yet dare to make openly: that terrorism, being the only weapon available to the

weak, is legitimate in the service of a just cause.

But Halkin then claimed that "there is a serious case to be made" for this position – and there I disagree.

Because the case for terrorism rests on two fundamental premises: that terror is an effective means of achieving a goal, and that it is the only means available to the weaker side.

Both premises are demonstrably false. Far from being efficacious, the vast majority of terrorist movements have been utter failures.

The PKK's decades-long terrorist campaign in Turkey failed even to dent the unanimous global opposition to a Kurdish state. Lengthy terrorist campaigns by the Tamil Tigers in Sri Lanka and the ETA in Spain similarly failed to win independence for either Tamils or Basques. Various leftist terrorist groups – France's Action Directe, Italy's Red Brigades, Germany's Bader-Meinhof group – failed to effect desired domestic revolutions.

And even the IRA, one of the more successful terrorist organizations, achieved far less than it desired: It eventually settled for Northern Ireland's autonomy as part of the United Kingdom, under a joint Catholic-Protestant government, instead of the full British withdrawal, annexation to Ireland and Catholic domination of the province it had wanted.

Nor is it true that terrorist groups adopt such tactics because they are incapable of challenging their opponents' superior militaries. In fact, lightly armed guerrilla movements have inflicted devastating defeats on some of the world's strongest armies, including those of the US and the former Soviet Union.

In Vietnam, for instance, it was the enormous casualties suffered by US troops – some 55,000 deaths – that caused America to withdraw.

Admittedly, Viet Cong guerrillas had help from North Vietnam's army. Yet the vast majority of American casualties were caused by small-arms fire and explosive devices – the low-tech tools with which the Viet Cong challenged US tanks, fighter jets and heavy artillery.

And in Afghanistan the mujahedeen had no regular army at all: They drove the Soviet war machine from their country with rifles and shoulder-launched missiles.

BUT IF THE case for terrorism is fallacious in general, it is doubly so with regard to the Palestinians.

To start with, the idea that Palestinians had to target civilians because they were too weak to tackle Israel's army holds no water.

Unlike many groups whose weapons supply is limited, the PLO for decades enjoyed the same advantage as the Viet Cong and the mujahedeen: an unending flow of arms. (The USSR supplied the Palestinians and Vietnamese; America supplied the Afghans.)

It was Arafat's choice to turn these arms mainly on civilians rather than soldiers.

Moreover, Palestinians racked up impressive military successes on those rare occasions when they tried – from the 1968 battle of Karamah (when Israeli troops not only retreated, but were forced to abandon tanks and other materiel) to the guerrilla attacks of the last four years: Sniper attacks on two military checkpoints in 2002, for instance, killed 16 Israelis (including 13 soldiers) without a single Palestinian casualty; roadside bombs in Gaza have destroyed four Israeli tanks and their crews, also without any Palestinian casualties.

Yet for 40 years Palestinian organizations have largely preferred to aim at civilians.

Aside from the guerrilla option, the Palestinians had another alternative unavailable to any other "national resistance movement" in history: that of acquiring a state peacefully, just by stretching out their hand.

They were first offered a state in 1937, when the British proposed creating two states in Mandatory Palestine, one Arab and one Jewish. But the Palestinians refused, preferring to wage a terrorist campaign against the Mandate's Jews in the hope of acquiring the entire territory.

Then, in 1947, the UN offered them a state. But they refused again, preferring to join a war to annihilate the nascent State of Israel. That war ended with Jordan and Egypt seizing the land earmarked for the Palestinians.

Then, when Israel captured these territories from Jordan and Egypt in 1967, the ruling Labor Party announced that it would return this land to any Arab leader willing to sign a piece of paper promising peace. The Likud Party, which officially opposed this policy, proved equally eager to do the same: Menachem Begin returned every inch of Sinai to Anwar Sadat.

But for more than 20 years, Arafat (and other Arab leaders) clung to the goal of Israel's destruction and continued his vicious campaign of terror against Israeli civilians. Thus only in 1993 was Yitzhak Rabin able to launch the Oslo process.

That led to the Palestinians' fourth chance at statehood: Israel's offer, in 2000, of a Palestinian state on 97 percent of the territories. But, just as in 1937, 1947 and 1967, they rejected the offer in favor of renewed terror against Israeli civilians – thereby sparking Israel's reoccupation of the territories.

Thus for the Palestinians, terror has not been a means of achieving independence; it has been an end that they repeatedly chose instead of independence.

That the only terrorist movement in the world to have repeatedly rejected peaceful offers of statehood is also virtually the only one to command wall-to-wall international support speaks volumes about the international community's morals.

But it does nothing to change the fact that, even for an underdog, terror is neither necessary nor effective.

Nothing proves this better than the case of the Palestinians, whose devotion to terrorism has repeatedly caused them to let statehood slip through their grasp. (Jerusalem Post Nov 23)

---

### **How Not to Promote Democracy** By Meyrav Wurmser

*Palestinian elections shouldn't come before a free society has been built.*

Since the death of Yasser Arafat, many in European capitals and within various circles of Washington have called on the Palestinians to hold elections. Former special Middle East coordinator Dennis Ross, for example, recently asserted that to avoid a violent competition for power, elections can become "the mechanism for shaping the Palestinians' future and determining Palestinian leadership." Palestinian basic law requires that elections be held 60 days after the death of a Palestinian president. On the surface, elections appear to be a step that will further Palestinian democracy and President Bush's vision of a free and democratic Palestinian society. In reality, however, the election, scheduled for January 9, 2005, would be part of the smoke and mirrors that is Palestinian politics. It would merely dress an enduring dictatorship with democratic robes.

Even before Arafat's demise, Palestinian Prime Minister Ahmed Queria (Abu Ala) and the new chairman of the PLO, Mahmoud Abbas (Abu Mazen), had divvied up the chairman's powers amongst themselves. Abu Mazen's appointment as the central figure of the PLO puts him in control of the most powerful body in Palestinian society. The PLO's powers remain superior to the institutions of the PA. In his capacity as the chairman of the PLO, Abu Mazen is responsible for all Palestinian foreign affairs and negotiations with Israel. His associate, Abu Ala, continues to be the Palestinian prime minister, a position he held prior to Arafat's death. Since then, however, his powers have been redefined: He now controls all internal affairs of the PA and the multiplicity of unruly security services. Rawhi Fatooh, a junior political player and the speaker of the parliament, replaced Arafat as the temporary president of the Palestinian Authority until elections are held.

When Arafat was alive, he controlled the powers — and more — now shared by the new triumvirate. He was chairman of the PLO, president of the Palestinian Authority, and head of the largest faction of the PLO, Fatah. It took many years of international pressure to force him to appoint a prime minister. Even when he did, Arafat made certain that his prime minister would remain weak and unable to control any of the security services. A typical example of Arafat's treatment of his revolving prime ministers is the rumor that he slapped Abu Ala across the face several weeks ago. In response, Abu Ala threatened resignation until it became clear that Arafat's health was deteriorating. But the multi-tentacled style of Arafat's reign could not have been maintained by any one of his successors, because they all lack his gravitas. Realizing their unpopularity, they opted to divide and rule.

But the division is not between equals. Abu Mazen and Abu Ala remain the senior partners. They have taken all substantial powers, leaving the position of the president virtually void of real authority. Taking away from the president control over the guns of the security services and the money held in the PA's entangled accounts has reduced his position to that of a glorified debate-club leader. Elections, now deemed by many in Europe and the State Department as the flood gate for Palestinian democracy (and by extension the renewal of the peace-process), only serve to legitimize Abu Ala's and Abu Mazen's unelected and unchecked grip on power.

One could argue that Abu Ala and Abu Mazen could not control the results of an election, that a challenger to their power could win. But these two are attempting to stack the cards in their favor. Even if relatively orderly elections occurred in 60 days, they would not be free and democratic. Abu Mazen, who recently announced his candidacy, is trying to make sure that no one of any real influence will compete against him. Not wishing to look undemocratic, he might find — as Arafat did in the elections of 1996 — a single, unknown, and unpopular candidate to "oppose" him. Even if there is a strong opposing candidate, the lack of a free press, the existence of bodies (such as the PLO) that are more powerful than the elected institution, and an insufficient period for the oppositional candidates to organize, these elections will not accurately reflect the will of the people.

The Bush administration, which remains committed to a vision of a free and democratic Middle East, must be certain not to legitimize oppression by endorsing Palestinian elections now. In the process of building a free and democratic society, elections are the last — not the first — step. Elections should come after limits on governmental institutions are in place and the basic freedoms of individuals have been guaranteed. Western recognition of this masquerade of freedom would only serve to strengthen the undemocratic nature of Palestinian society.

Even if elections will renew hopes for an Israeli-Palestinian dialogue, peace must not come at the price of liberty. Only a free Palestinian society can confront Arafat's legacy of terror, chaos, corruption, and poverty. The writer is the director of the Center for Middle East Policy at the Hudson Institute. (National Review Nov 22)

---

## **A Maudlin Mania** By Steven Plaut

Observers have been at a loss to explain the outpouring of affection, devotion, admiration and warmth for arguably the worst Middle East terrorist, plane hijacker and mass murderer of the past century. The only good thing one could really say about Yasser Arafat is that he was really not as bad as Adolph Hitler and Josef Stalin.

The Vatican issued eulogies for the dead Islamofascist that seemed to exceed the Vatican's words issued in eulogy for canonized saints. French towns are knocking one another aside in the race to name streets after Arafat. The UN flags were at half-mast. The international media were beside themselves in admiration, giving Arafat's funeral far greater coverage than that of Ronald Reagan. Media commentators on the BBC and elsewhere literally broke into tears. States sent official representatives to the funeral, as if Arafat had been a head of state. Only time will tell if they will be as generous with their representations when the funeral for Osama Bin-Laden is at last conducted.

All this maudlin mourning for a mass murderer of children and other civilians, for a plane hijacker who paved the way for 9/11, for an Islamofascist who organized terrorist movements whose *raison d'être* was a Second Holocaust of Jews.

Or perhaps that was precisely the point?

The media circus and the proclamations of Arafat's greatness did serve one useful function. And that is that they illustrated as well as anything what the true nature is of worldwide solidarity with Palestinians and support for Palestinian national goals.

The simple fact of the matter is that there is no such thing on the planet as sympathy for and identification with Palestinians. There is no such thing as pro-Palestinianism. Period. When Palestinians, or when Arabs in general, are mistreated, repressed and tormented by any Arab regime, no one cares. When Palestinians were mass murdered by Syria and Jordan, no one cared. When more than 100,000 Arab civilians are massacred in Algeria, it does not even make the evening news. When Asad or Saddam Hussein carried out mass murders of Arabs, the Human Rights lobby never looked up from its cinnamon latte.

The pro-Palestinian movement is nothing more than the 21st century's reincarnation of medieval anti-Semitism, complete with medieval anti-Jewish blood libels. People who claim to feel empathy for Palestinians are typically motivated by hatred of Jews. The reason the pro-Palestinian movement wants the Palestinians to have a state is because it understands that such a state will operate as an instrument to attack Israel, murder Jews and seek the annihilation of the Jewish state.

Once one understands this fundamental fact of life about the Middle East and about world political motivations, everything else makes sense. The mind-numbing stupidity of the world media mourning Arafat in great cries of anguish, the fawning toadying of political leaders, the maudlin outpouring of love for the cause of the fallen terrorist Nazi - all are understandable. There is nothing at all confusing about it. These people are not broadcasting their undying love of Palestinians, but rather their undying hatred of Jews.

The world actually understands that there is no such thing as a Palestinian nation. Palestinians are just Arabs who happen to live in the western section of Palestine, differing little from Syrians or Lebanese. Most of them are from families who migrated into Palestine from the time of the beginning of modern Zionism, when Jewish capital and human skills were making western Palestine a much more comfortable place to live for Arabs from the neighboring lands. To describe them as a nation is as persuasive as describing Michigan's Arab community as a new Detroitian nation in need of self-determination.

In 1948, the entire West Bank and the Gaza Strip were seized by Arab states, (illegally) occupied by Jordan and Egypt, in their war to extinguish the newly created state of Israel. The Arab countries could have unilaterally erected a Palestinian state any time between 1948 and 1967 had they wished to do so, and Israel could have had nothing to say about it. There was no Palestinian national movement at all demanding statehood in these areas. In the entire world, there was no demand for a right of the Palestinian people to erect a state in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

Neither was there any demand for Palestinian self-determination east of the Jordan river. Transjordan was always as much Palestine as was the land west of the river, and the Palestinians have always been a demographic majority in Jordan (since its independence after World War I). So why have these East Bank Palestinians never felt the need for self-determination? Why have none of the caring supporters of Palestinians ever come out for a Palestinian state at least partly east of the Jordan River? Surely, establishing a state there, at least initially, must be much easier than doing so west of the Jordan; there are no pesky Israelis around.

The problem cannot be ignored and demands a clear and unambiguous answer. Why were there no demands for Palestinian self-determination before 1967 in the West Bank and Gaza? Why were there never any such demands for the Palestinians of the East Bank? Why hardly a word from the world's Palestinian advocates when their beloved Palestinians are brutalized and repressed by the corrupt, kleptomaniacal Palestinian Authority? The answers are the same for all of these mysteries. In all these cases, promoting Palestinian self-determination and national interests would have done nothing to advance the destruction of Israel.

Palestinian nationalism has long been led in large part by non-Palestinians. Many of the leaders of the anti-Jewish and anti-British Palestinian Revolt in the

1930s were not Palestinian at all, but Syrians, Lebanese or Iraqi Arabs. The Palestine Liberation Organization was launched in 1964 in Egypt, with close ties to the Egyptian Islamofascist fundamentalist movement, the Moslem Brotherhood. It was initially headed by one Ahmed Shukhairy, best known for his speech before the Six Day War, in which he announced that there would be no Jewish survivors in the coming battle to liberate Palestine. Meanwhile, a young Egyptian student named Yasser Arafat set up a rival Palestinian organization in 1965 named Al-Fatah, a term connoting Islamic conquest. Yes, Arafat, like Edward Said, was not a Palestinian but an Egyptian. Other Palestinian terrorist organizations were also led by Syrians and Iraqis.

What exactly were the Fatah and the PLO (taken over by the Fatah faction in 1967) supposed to be liberating? After all, this was back before Israel's victories in the 1967 Six Day War, during which Israel seized the West Bank and Gaza in its counterattack. The West Bank and the Gaza Strip were there for the Palestinian plucking, had they wished to have their own state. There were no Palestinian occupied territories at all to liberate. The West Bank and Gaza were not occupied, at least not by Israel.

The answer is that these Palestinian liberation movements were launched in the mid-1960s to liberate the Middle East from Israel's existence. From Arafat's viewpoint and that of his apologists, Tel Aviv and Haifa were and are just as much illegal settlements on Palestinian soil as anything later constructed by Israel in the Gaza Strip.

On the day before the outbreak of the 1967 Six Day War, no one on earth, and certainly no Palestinians, were expressing the belief that Palestinians needed self-determination in the West Bank, on the East Bank, or in Gaza. Yet, six days later, according to decades of historic revisionism ever since, the Palestinians are supposed to have morphed into a nation, desperately in need of their own state, unlike say, the Kurds or Berbers, whose statelessness has never raised an eyebrow among the world's compassionate classes.

Indeed, Palestinian statelessness was pronounced the nucleus of the entire Middle East conflict. But was it? Just what was the nucleus during the 20 years of conflict before 1967? The fact that any creation of such a newly needed state just happened to represent an existential and genocidal threat to Israel was, of course, pure coincidence.

The Palestinian lobby is an anti-Jewish lobby and little else. The pro-Palestinians like to denounce their critics as fawning yes-men for Israel, while posturing their own compassion for Palestinian suffering. The same people who never heard of the massacres in Sudan or Algeria, scream in outrage at the genocide and war crimes Israel supposedly conducted in Jenin, in which perhaps 20 Palestinians died in a battle against entrenched terrorist squads. The pro-Palestinians dismiss their critics by insisting that "criticism of Israel is not anti-Semitism."

Yet such a defense is entirely disingenuous. Anti-Zionists cheering Palestinians who blow up buses full of Jewish children and who mechanically denounce each and every effort by Israel to protect those children from bombers are simply anti-Semites. The Solidarity Movement hoodlums vandalizing Israel's security fence are designer-jeans pogromchiks. The issue is not whether Israel and its policies are legitimate targets for fair criticism. Israel is an imperfect democracy, with all the shortcomings of other democracies, augmented by decades of nonstop warfare and siege. The real issue is the pro-Palestinian agenda of anti-Semitism and genocide.

"But, but, but...." scream the Israel-bashers, "what about Jewish anti-Zionists?" If anti-Zionism is today, in fact, virtually always anti-Semitism, what about Jewish anti-Zionists? The answer is that Jewish anti-Zionists are also, by and large, anti-Semites. Jewish self-hatred and anti-Semitism have been around for many centuries, despite the delight and the serendipity expressed by Israel-bashers every time they find one more to put up on their websites. Some of these Jewish anti-Semites have tenure at Israeli universities.

Creation of a Palestinian state will not result in any relaxation of tensions, regardless of its borders. Its creation will result in the greatest terrorist bloodbath in the history of the conflict, with countless rockets and missiles raining down upon Israeli civilians from the State of Palestine with thousands of Jews murdered by infiltrating terrorists, who are cheered on by the European intelligentsia; where Palestinian use of Weapons of Mass Destruction is a real possibility; where Palestine will serve as the launching base for Arab armies from neighboring countries entering Palestine much like German troops entered the Rheinland in 1936.

And when the final showdown comes, then all those compassionate supporters of Palestinians, those whose hearts always cried so passionately for Palestinian suffering, all those protesters of Israeli violations of Palestinian human rights, all the ISM demonstrators vandalizing Israel's security wall, all those who could not control their tears at the funeral of the arch-terrorist mass murderer, all those media bimboes who saluted the noble cause Arafat promoted - will have nary a word to say about the final Armageddon unleashed against the Jews.

([www.IsraelNationalNews.com](http://www.IsraelNationalNews.com) Nov 19)

*The writer teaches at the University of Haifa.*