

## Commentary...

### Not Just Anti-Semitic Lies!

By Ehud Ya'ari

*The essence of the message is that there is no possibility of making peace with the Jews*

"Horseman without a horse," the Egyptian TV hit series being broadcast by 14 Arab TV networks, is not the only anti-Semitic production to be galloping across the screens each evening this Ramadan. For viewers looking for more than the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" can offer, there's no shortage of alternatives. Anti-Semitism has become the last word in the Arab entertainment industry.

Al-Manar, the Hizballah TV station broadcast from Lebanon, features Dr. Ghazi Hussein, a veteran salaried PLO lackey and a former adviser to the late Syrian president Hafiz al-Asad. Hussein sits in the studio and knowledgeably defines the typical characteristics of the Jew, including "lying, treachery and greed" and goes on at length to describe Jewish baseness. The program, incidentally, is called "The Spider's House," a reference to the remark by Hizballah Secretary General Hassan Nasrallah that Israel is doomed to fall apart like a spider's web. The program's promo includes video clips promising that "Israel will be obliterated," with appropriate images for illustration.

Syrian TV is running the dramatic locally produced series, "The Collapse of Legends." Its central premise is that there is no archeological evidence to support the stories of the Old Testament; that the Torah we hold holy is nothing but one big forgery made up by rabbis; that it has no connection with the Ten Commandments, but is rather a fabrication of history designed to give the Jews a claim to the Land of Israel. So in the dramatized serial, a group of Syrian archeologists sets out on a campaign to expose a group of Zionists who have infiltrated their party with the aim of tampering with the ancient antiquities at the famous archeological site of Ebla, in order to give some scientific basis to the forged scripture.

And in case you were worrying, Arafat is not being left behind. Palestinian TV is broadcasting a series of documentaries with one single objective: to disprove the "myth" that any Jewish Temple ever stood in Jerusalem, and to present any historical reference to that claim as an act of deception. The message is that the Jews have no business in the Holy City.

And as most of our readers will already know (see pages 28-31 of this magazine), the Egyptian series "Horseman without a Horse" is reviving the "Protocols," albeit in a dreadful, painfully slow-paced production with laughable acting. The Jews in the series look like they've jumped straight out of Der Sturmer and behave like devil's advocates, scheming, sowing corruption and generally encapsulating all that is ugly about humanity.

The inevitable conclusion is that significant numbers, though by no means all, of the young generation of Arab artists, a stratum that usually represents liberal trends and openness, have volunteered their services to sharpen and stylize the message that up until now has been promoted by fundamentalist movements such as Hamas. The essence of the message is that there is no possibility of making peace with the Jews -- not because of any political argument or clash over territory, but because that nation is a priori unfit to be counted among the human race. The Jewish religion is one big, ongoing lie, and Jewish history is the fruit of a consistent distortion of the past. Furthermore, the Jewish people present a future threat to the rest of the world.

For some time now I, along with a few colleagues who lend their ears day by day to the voices coming from the other side, have been asking ourselves: Where is this campaign leading? After all, this is not about withdrawing from the territories or granting Palestinian refugees the "right of return." Rather, it is a far-reaching, dangerous rationale laying the ground for the justification of a mass exile of Jews from Israel -- "ethnic cleansing" in contemporary terms -- and even beyond that, it is gradually building a case for justifying genocide!

At the forefront, of course, are the Muslim holy men and clerics whose poisonous fatwas flood the Internet. According to them, the Jews, by their very nature, corrupt their environment, are "prophet killers" and are the "sons of pigs and monkeys." They point out that there is a promise in Islamic tradition that

## 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*

ת"ט  
the stone behind which the Jews seek refuge on Judgment Day will break its silence to give them up.

It is not the approval to fight against Israel that is being sought here, but rather the religious authority and "moral" basis for much more than that. Sure, there are more than a few Arab intellectuals raising their voices in protest against such declarations. But no number of nicely written articles can counterbalance the effect of a dramatic,

well-promoted, prime-time TV series screened right after the break-fast meal. (The Jerusalem Report December 16)

### **A Despicable Act of Anti-Semitism:** *Concordia Student Union vote to decertify campus groups is clearly anti-Jewish* By Lorne Gunter

One can be anti-Israel without being anti-Semitic. Even some ultra-orthodox Jews believe the creation of the state of Israel is an impediment to the realization of God's plan for their people.

But it is impossible to be anti-Jewish, without also being anti-Semitic. So what has transpired this week at Montreal's Concordia University can only be described as one of the most craven and despicable acts of anti-Semitism recently witnessed at a Canadian university, or anywhere in the country for that matter.

The Concordia Student Union (CSU) voted to decertify Hillel Concordia as a registered student organization on campus. And, at least for now, neither the university's administration nor its board of governments has seen fit to intervene.

How does this constitute an act of anti-Semitism? Hillel is a Jewish students' organization, not solely or even mostly a pro-Israel lobby. As such, banning Hillel amounts to banning Jews.

So the CSU's ban goes beyond censorship, beyond an affront to freedom of speech. It is an attack on a group of Concordia students because of their race and faith. The ban is anti-Semitic, and all the more disgusting for its racist nature.

Since September of 2000, when Yasser Arafat and the Palestinian Authority commenced the second intifadeh against Israel, Hillel Concordia has increased its information campaign in defence of Israel's right to self-defence.

Concordia is a hotbed of pro-Palestinian sympathies. Indeed, it has been described as "the centre of militant Arabism in Canada." Montreal has a large and growing Arab population, drawn disproportionately from states that act as incubators for terrorism, such as Algeria, Lebanon and Syria.

No doubt many of Concordia's 800 Jewish students have felt an increased need, through Hillel, to present the Israeli side in this highly charged pro-Islamist atmosphere. But that doesn't negate the fact that Hillel is predominantly Jewish, not predominantly pro-Israeli.

A year ago, the annual CSU handbook was entitled Uprising. It was an amalgam of pro-Palestinian and anti-corporatist propaganda. Apparently, at Concordia, militant Arab students and the militant anti-globalists have found common cause. There was a cartoon depicting jets crashing into a room full of men in suits and ties, under the heading "an agenda for uprising." It pointed out that Concordia's two senior administrators were both Jews, and it charged that the Canadian media were controlled by "two Zionists," Israel Asper of CanWest Global and Conrad Black of Hollinger.

Also in 2001, the CSU sought, but failed, to bar defence contractors and large corporations, such as Bell Helicopter and Nortel Networks, from recruiting on campus because of their "corporate crimes" and crimes against humanity.

In September of this year, a rampaging crowd of Arab students and their sympathizers rioted on campus in an attempt to block a speech there by former Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu. They blockaded streets and entrances to the lecture hall, and shouted anti-Israel and anti-Jewish slogans. A group of middle-aged Jews who had come to hear Netanyahu were shoved, kicked and smeared with ketchup that, protesters boasted, symbolized "Palestinian blood." When university officials cancelled the speech, the protesters erupted with joy.

The group Solidarity with Palestinian Human Rights routinely organizes angry protests and parades on campus, without interference or harassment from the CSU or, significantly, from Concordia's Jewish students. And while

**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)**

Hillel was decertified for allegedly displaying a pamphlet encouraging voluntary enlistment in the Israel Defence Forces, no action has ever been taken against SPHR for distributing pamphlets denying the Nazi Holocaust or claiming that Israel is researching an "ethnic bomb" that kills Arabs, but not Jews.

Just this week, one of the leaders of the anti-Netanyahu riot burst in on a Hanukkah celebration at Concordia shouting denunciations of Israel and Jews.

The vote to expel Hillel from the CSU came Monday, the last day of classes, at midnight, when only nine of 27 councillors were present. With full attendance at its meeting this coming Monday, the CSU may well reverse its earlier Hillel decision.

University administrators, not altogether unjustifiably, have said they do not and should not direct CSU affairs. The ban is a student matter. Yet their denunciations of the inherent anti-Semitism should be more forceful.

Moreover, had administrators been less politically correct, and more firm from the start against the anti-Jewish thuggery on their campus, it might not have come to this. (Edmonton Journal Dec 8)

---

**Concordia Et Al: Future Shock** By Steven Martinovich  
*Campus life is 'an island of repression' in a sea of tolerance'.*

Although Concordia University is known as one of Canada's top post-secondary institutions, it's also rapidly gaining an international reputation as one of the most intolerant.

On September 9, a riot broke out at the university when Binyamin Netanyahu came to deliver a speech; during the fracas a 72-year-old Holocaust survivor was assaulted. Days later, a Jewish student was allegedly assaulted by an Arab counterpart.

The latest incident occurred on December 2 when the Concordia Student Union passed a motion suspending all funding to Hillel, an international Jewish student group, and revoked its ability to hold events, displays and information tables on the instigation of a Palestinian activist because Hillel members allegedly distributed a flyer for Mahal, a volunteer Israel Defense Force program for overseas students.

The Hillel incident is somewhat ironic given that the university had just come out of a self-imposed cooling-off period designed to bring a return to civility surrounding issues involving the Middle East. The student union - which seems to be in the forefront of anti-Israel activism and has announced it will pay the legal fees of five people arrested at the riot - Hillel, and a group representing Palestinian students had even agreed on a statement of principles that included "respect for all persons" and "reasoned respectful dialogue." This borders on the humorous, given that one of the groups involved has already had its respect and ability to promote dialogue stripped from it.

Although Concordia is earning its reputation for intolerance, it is hardly the only university in North America to see anti-Jewish incidents. At one university in southern California this past fall, a peaceful pro-Israel rally turned violent when its participants were attacked by pro-Palestinian supporters. Across Canada and the US a tide of anti-Jewish incidents has been reported.

Although we comfort ourselves with the thought that universities are the home of free speech, the quest for knowledge and the expansion of intellectual borders, the fact is that for several decades activist students and their radical allies in the faculty have worked hard to silence dissent. Regardless of whom their opponents are, though they tend to be on the radical Left, students are finding it increasingly difficult to express themselves in and out of the classroom.

I was a victim of this too just a few short years ago, when as a columnist for a student newspaper at Laurentian University I was repeatedly threatened by students and at least two professors for expressing opinions they didn't care for. I learned quickly that students who dare to speak their minds had better be ready to suffer intimidation.

It's important to note that the intimidation usually flows in one direction only. After September 11, student newspapers and faculty screamed after several professors were punished for voicing opinions blaming the US for the terrorist attacks.

Those voices, however, are mostly silent when it comes to defending people like Jewish students, conservatives or others with unpopular opinions when they are shouted down during meetings by radicals, when posters advertising their events are torn down en masse, or when thousands of copies of student newspapers are stolen when their opinions are published.

In their hearts, groups that fight dissenting opinions on campus believe free speech is merely one of the tools oppressors use to maintain their power. National Review editor Stanley Kurtz believes that the attitudes displayed at universities like Concordia are an indication of what is to come in the future. In a March 5, 2001 essay, Kurtz explained, "Many argued, in the Marxist fashion, that oppressors have no rights, and that classic liberal notions of fairness are themselves a cover for the despotism of the powerful."

Free speech is what people like the Concordia Student Union are afraid of. In that same essay Kurtz posed a question for enemies of free speech on campus: "Are you afraid that affirming the principle of universal free speech might disenchant your magical world of oppressors and oppressed?"

For many people on Concordia's campus it would appear that the answer is yes. Rather than being havens of free speech, universities really fit prize-winning

author Abigail Thernstrom's description of campus life as "an island of repression in a sea of tolerance."

Jews and their supporters at Concordia are learning firsthand.  
*The author is a freelance writer in Sudbury, Ontario. (Jerusalem Post Dec 10)*

---

**The Bush-Sharon Reeducation Camp: Toward a new order.**

By Saul Singer

President George W. Bush and Prime Minister Ariel Sharon are not ministers of education, but they could be. The two leaders seem to be leading their nations, this region, and to some extent the world, gently through an educational process.

Bush is coaxing the world toward a new order in which rogue regimes will have to divorce themselves from terror or lose power. This takes reeducation, because the world has got used to the idea that nothing can really be done about such states integrating terror into their foreign policies and racing to obtain weapons of mass destruction.

Iraq will be the most dramatic field trip in Prof. Bush's seminar of the past 15 months, having far greater impact than the extensive time in the classroom.

Sharon has an even more difficult reeducation job. Many Israelis, not to mention the rest of the world, had been convinced the Palestinians wanted peace, so the objective was to pry the requisite land out of Israel for peace to break out. Now the scales have begun to tip toward the view that it is the Palestinian leadership that would rather kill and be killed than accept the state that was being handed to them on a platter.

But just as September 11 was enough to discredit the old global order but not automatically justify its replacement, Yasser Arafat's unmasking also did not automatically change old habits. The land for peace paradigm has not yet given way to what might be called peace for land: the idea that peace does not depend on Israeli real estate, but on an Arab decision to live with a Jewish state.

The State Department's "road map" demonstrates how it is possible to stall in the middle of a paradigm shift. On the one hand it pays lip service to stopping terror and to democratization; on the other it recycles from the sludge pile of failed Mideast peace plans named after largely forgotten diplomats (remember William Rodgers?).

The reason all these plans failed was that they assumed the conflict was over borders and therefore solvable through negotiation and compromise. It is not.

Peace does not depend on what Israel has to offer, since Israel cannot offer to dismantle itself. But once peace does not depend on Israeli offers, then all "road maps" are rendered useless, unless they are merely disguises for a transformation of the Arab side.

When educating someone out of long and deeply held beliefs, one has to take baby steps, or nothing sinks in. It hardly helps to keep telling students, in an exasperated tone, that they should start by forgetting everything they thought they knew.

Prof. Sharon seems to understand this. In an unusually revealing speech given to the Herzliya Conference on Wednesday, he did not attack the "road map" directly, and was even reported to have accepted it "in principle." In fact, Sharon accepted Bush's June 24 vision, not the "road map," which he proceeded to redraw.

"The American plan," said Sharon, "defines the parties' progress according to phases. The transition from one phase to another will not be on the basis of a pre-determined timetable" (emphasis added).

Without its myriad deadlines the "road map" becomes a list of principles, and the burden of implementation shifts to where it belongs: the Palestinian side. The Bush sequence end terrorism and replace the Palestinian leadership, then negotiate, is basically correct. But add deadlines to it and you have another failed attempt to impose peace on "both sides."

The Bush-Sharon plan, as opposed to the "road map," says to the Palestinians: "You want a state? Earn it." All they have to do to earn it is exchange their leadership for one that wants peace with Israel, and is willing to fight terrorism in order to get it.

For decades the peace process has been built on the premise that Israel needs to gain the trust of the Palestinians, or perhaps that each side must learn to trust the other. But now, since the Palestinians launched the most-vicious conceivable war against Israel after being offered the deal everyone thought they wanted, it should be evident that it is Israel's trust that must be earned.

The State Department, the Israeli Left, the rest of the Quartet, and other slow students may still be handing in papers that don't make the grade, but Profs. Bush and Sharon seem to be patient.

Judging by their success as politicians, the Arab world had better get used to the idea that there will be no substitute teachers for some time.

*The writer is editorial-page editor of the Jerusalem Post.*

(National Review Dec 9)

---

**A Single War** By Max Boot

There is at least one silver lining in the ghastly carnage in Mombasa, Kenya: The homicidal swine who turned the Paradise Hotel into an inferno blew away the illusion that Israel's war on terrorism can be separated from America's.

This is a myth treasured by many in the U.S. government, especially at the State Department, who believe that America is right to use overwhelming force against its enemies, but that Israel should show "restraint" no matter the provocation. While America roots out the source of our terrorist problems in Afghanistan, Washington sternly admonishes Prime Minister Ariel Sharon that he must not touch a hair of Yasser Arafat's head -- even though Arafat is at least as much responsible for terrorism as Mullah Omar once was.

This attitude reached new heights of absurdity after the targeted killing of six al Qaeda terrorists in Yemen by a CIA-operated Predator unmanned aerial vehicle. State Department spokesman Richard Boucher took pains to argue that there was absolutely no comparison between this action and Israel's targeted killings of terrorists, which the U.S. government continues to condemn.

But what if the people attacking America are also the people attacking Israel? If it turns out that al Qaeda was responsible for the Kenya attack, as now appears likely, this conclusion will be inescapable. Yet the evidence already strongly pointed in that direction long before last week's bombing.

One only has to think back to 9/11: The suicidal attacks on America caused great grief in Israel - and undisguised joy in the Palestinian territories.

Though Arafat took pains to quash coverage of pro-al Qaeda demonstrations, the Palestinian reaction was hardly an aberration. Remember that in the 1991 Gulf War the Palestinians also openly rooted for America's enemy, Saddam Hussein.

It's more than a matter of rooting interest, however; there are also much closer connections between anti-American terrorists and anti-Israeli terrorists.

At the broadest level, both groups represent an extremist Islamist ideology that revels in suicidal attacks and seeks to inflict maximum civilian casualties. The 9/11 hijackers were similar in spirit to those who tried to blow an Israeli airliner out of the sky over Kenya with SA-7 missiles.

Not all Palestinian terrorists, much less all Palestinians, are Islamists -- but fanatical groups like Hamas and Islamic Jihad are at the forefront of the current Al Qsa intifida.

Within extremist Islamic circles, hatred of America ("the Great Satan") and Israel ("the Little Satan") go hand in hand. The Islamists even debate which is their greatest enemy: Some argue for America, on the grounds that Israel is merely an outpost of the "Crusader" empire centered in the United States; others suggest that the "Zionist entity" is the greater threat, on the grounds that a Zionist conspiracy secretly controls the U.S. government. But there is no denying that the two are closely linked in the Islamists' minds because both countries stand for everything they detest: religious freedom, women's rights, democracy, pluralism.

Thus Hezbollah (Party of God), the Iranian-sponsored Lebanese terrorist group, has carried out major operations against both Israel and America. Hezbollah is believed to be behind the blowing up of the U.S. embassy and the U.S. Marine barracks in Beirut in 1983, the kidnapping and killing of numerous Americans in the 1980s, and the bombing of the U.S. Khobar Towers barracks in Saudi Arabia in 1996. At the same time, Hezbollah has waged a relentless war against Israel from its bases in Southern Lebanon, a war that has not slowed down even after its ostensible provocation (Israel's occupation of part of Lebanon) ended in 2000.

Many observers wrongly focus on the divisions between terrorist groups. Some, such as Hezbollah, are Shites. Others, like al Qaeda, are led by Sunnis. Still others, such as the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, have secular leaders. But even rivals cooperate in their common campaign against Israel and the West, much as disparate terrorist groups of the 1970s and 1980s (the Baader Meinhof Gang, Red Army Faction, Irish Republican Army, etc.) worked together under the tutelage of Communist intelligence services.

The modern Islamist movement began with the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt in the 1950s-'60s, but has since spread throughout the Middle East and beyond, from the Palestinian territories to Pakistan. All these groups see themselves as fellow jihadis (holy warriors) for the Dar al Islam (house of Islam) against the Dar al Harb (house of war - or all non-Islamic societies).

If we are ever to defeat them, we must see them as they see themselves. If we do, we'll realize that the Israeli conflict is not a "distraction" from the war on terrorism -- it is the war on terrorism. (New York Post Dec 2)

*The writer is the Olin senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations and author of The Savage Wars of Peace: Small Wars and the Rise of American Power.*

---

### **Drop the Dichotomy** Jerusalem Post Editorial

The United States has sent a number of contradictory signals in the last few days. First, it issued a report finding that PLO is engaged in terrorism and imposed one sanction required by US law - but then immediately waived the sanction on "national security" grounds.

On the positive side, the US, for the first time, voted against a UN General Assembly resolution calling on Israel to repeal the Jerusalem Law, which provides for Jerusalem to remain our undivided capital. In previous years, the US

had abstained.

Flipping back again, Ambassador Daniel Kurtzer, in a long speech to the Herzliya Conference, decided that now is the time for a blast against settlement activity.

Finally, and again on the positive side, Elliott Abrams, a known advocate of President George W. Bush's approach toward promoting democracy and employing "regime change" in the war against terrorism, was appointed to oversee Mideast policy within the National Security Council.

What is one to make of what of this contradictory mishmash?

There is a struggle going on for the soul of US Mideast policy similar to the one that raged over whether to depose Iraq's Saddam Hussein. Though Saddam is yet to be ousted, the struggle over whether to do so is long over in Washington. Despite Bush's June 24 speech, the struggle over Mideast policy has barely begun.

The analogy between the two policy struggles is instructive. After September 11, Bush had to reinvent US foreign policy, much as Harry Truman had to shift from a World War II alliance with the Soviet Union to fighting the Cold War.

Notionally, and to some extent on the ground, great strides have been made.

In Afghanistan and presumably in Iraq, Bush has and will demonstrate that support for terrorism is a crime punishable by regime change. Along the way, he has introduced a doctrine of preemption against the threat of rogue regimes arming themselves with weapons of mass destruction.

Yet the transition to the new paradigm remains incomplete. The US cannot really decide whether Saudi Arabia is a friend or an enemy, and continues to define the enemy by its means - terrorism - rather than who it is - militant Islamism.

We are relatively confident that such clarity will come and that the paradigm shift will not simply stop in its tracks. But in no arena are the contradictions of a policy that is in mid-transition so evident than concerning the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Kurtzer's speech was full of such contradictions. He began strong, noting that the first "roadblock" to peace was that "a large number of Arab and Muslim countries do not accept the legitimacy of Israel, let alone recognize its existence as an independent state." He also noted that Palestinians and the Arab states strongly opposed UN Resolution 194 when it was adopted more than 50 years ago, the same resolution that they now claim grants a "right of return."

These were refreshingly frank statements that we hope are being made by his colleagues in Arab capitals, and should be made by the president himself.

Yet Kurtzer immediately destroyed their effect by claiming that a "similar hard look" is necessary regarding Israel's great sin, the settlements.

Quoting Secretary of State Colin Powell, Kurtzer said, "Consistent with the report of the Mitchell Committee, settlement activity must stop." This impulse, to obsessively match any criticism of the Arab states, now matter how fundamental, with criticism of Israel, no matter how strained and derivative, is a form of a diplomatic pathology. It is what has ailed Western policy toward the Middle East for half a century.

There is, at bottom, no possibility to strike a balance between the Arab desire to destroy Israel and our attempt to survive. But since September 11, the issue has greatly sharpened and become of direct interest to the US: Placating Arabs regarding Israel weakens America's war against radical Islamism.

Bush's June 24 speech instinctively captured this, when, for the first time, Israeli suffering under terror was not paired with Palestinian suffering under occupation, but with Palestinians suffering under their own leadership.

The simple model of Palestinians and Israelis tormenting each other was replaced with one of both being tormented by dictators who use the conflict to sustain their regimes and could care less about the interests of their own peoples, including Yasser Arafat.

The "road map" being shopped about by the State Department should not just be amended, but scrapped and replaced by a joint strategy to be developed by the US and Israel in a cooperative fashion, not sprung on Israel as if it is just another ruffian in a bothersome backyard brawl.

That strategy must be merged with the larger goal of eliminating or pacifying regimes that foment aggression against the West.

The attempt to divorce the attack against Israel, which is obviously the most virulent form of hatred of the West, from this wider conflict is unsustainable. The sooner this false dichotomy ends, the sooner the conflict can be won and real peace achieved. (c) Jerusalem Post

---

### **Boldly Standing up for Israel**

It is not easy to be an Israeli today. They are faced with threats of terror, taunted by unyielding and unjust condemnation from the international community, yet the country continues to grow. So do its institutions.

The Weizmann Institute has grown into a great center of research, learning and advancement for all mankind. It was founded in 1934 on the unshakable belief by Haim Weizmann that a free and democratic state would need a

research center as good as and as path-breaking as any in the world.

My partners and I have been in the newspaper business for 35 years. What began with a small newspaper in Sherbrooke, Quebec, has led to the ownership of such titles as the Daily Telegraph in London, the Ottawa Citizen and the Vancouver Sun and Province. We are also the owners of the Jerusalem Post and the bi-weekly magazine, the Jerusalem Report. While the Post is not our largest newspaper, I suspect I would not be standing before you today had it not been for the purchase of that newspaper in 1988.

At the time of the purchase, I made the statement that this was a purely economic decision and that we would be no more emotionally attached to the Jerusalem Post than we would be had we purchased the South China Morning Post newspaper in Hong Kong. Of course, this proved not to be true.

Conditions in the Middle East have deteriorated since 1988, and we, along with other publishers, have been forced to make choices.

We support President Bush's war on terror. We, therefore, support Israel's war on terror.

In Europe, the Middle East conflict is framed as a colonial affair, which depicts Israel as a heartless bully and the Palestinians as innocent victims. This view is widely embraced by the European left, which has romanticized Yasser Arafat as a Third World freedom fighter. In the United States, this depiction is not nearly as prejudiced.

Among American media, the Mideast is often portrayed as a contest between two sides whose passions are excessively inflamed but ultimately whose behavior is morally equivalent.

Columnist George Jonas wrote in the Ottawa Citizen, "To be impartial between tyranny and democracy the better to protect human rights is like being impartial between wood and copper the better to conduct electricity. In plain words, it's nonsense."

This position can be clearly depicted in the news and opinion pages of another Chicago daily newspaper. In an effort to create a balance in covering the Middle East, the public editor of this other Chicago newspaper

has, among other things, described Ariel Sharon as responsible for the Sabra and Shatila massacres. He also stated that President Bush was overly concerned about the multimillion-dollar, 50-ton arms shipment from Iran that the Israelis intercepted at sea.

Our Chicago newspaper, the Sun-Times, has been clear and unambiguous.

We recognize that Israel has made numerous offers of territorial and economic concessions to achieve peace. Not only have those offers been rejected, but the concessions have likely succeeded in enhancing terror.

Israel and the United States are on the front lines of the war on terror for the same reasons. Both are free and both are democratic. Professor Bernard Lewis wrote in his most recent book, 'Islam: What Went Wrong': "It is precisely the lack of freedom - freedom of the mind from constraint and indoctrination, to question and inquire and speak; freedom of the economy from corrupt and pervasive mismanagement; freedom of women from male oppression; freedom of citizens from tyranny. . . ."

With the exception of Turkey, the national movements in most of Israel's neighbors led to despots rather than democrats.

These people were independent but not free.

While the military leadership of these countries robbed the people, they generated among the population a sense of humiliation. They also required an enemy. You need an enemy to justify a large military presence as well as to deflect the criticism of your own hijacking of the economy.

The best example of the requirement for military expenditures is the continuation, in Syria, of the Assad regimes, both father and son. They could settle with Israel tomorrow but recognize that there would be a downside to settlement as a result of the inevitable reduction of the military requirements. These rulers are propped up by their military.

The Palestinian Authority is a brutal dictatorship and perhaps one of the most financially corrupt regimes in the world. It has not lived up to any of its obligations under the Oslo agreement, including removing the anti-Israel clauses in the Palestine National Charter. They have persuaded young people that a glorious eternity awaits them if they manage to murder Israelis while blowing themselves up.

Marwan Barghouti, head of Fatah-Tanzim, about to go to trial in Israel and who, according to Israelis, led, ran and set in operation terrorist actions against the State of Israel along with his field commanders, was questioned in the New Yorker magazine on July 9, 2001, and was asked: "And if you get 100 percent? Will that end the conflict?"

Barghouti smiled, and then said something impolitic for a Fatah man: "Then we could talk about bigger things."

Such as?

"I've always thought that a good idea would be one state for all the peoples." A secular democratic Palestine?

"We can call it something else."

The late Faisal Hussein, as reported June 24, 2001, by Al-Arabi in Egypt, said: "Had the U.S. and Israel realized, before Oslo, that all that was left of the Palestinian National movement and the Pan-Arab movement was a wooden horse called Arafat or the PLO, they would never have opened their fortified gates and let it inside their walls."

He also stated: "The Oslo agreement, or any other agreement, is just a temporary procedure, or just a step towards something bigger. . . . We distinguish the strategic, long-term goals from the political phased goals, which we are compelled to temporarily accept due to international pressure. . . . [Palestine] according to the higher strategy [is]: 'from the river to the sea.'"

The leaders of the so-called friendly nations, Jordan, Egypt and Saudi Arabia, refer to the difficulties of controlling "the Arab street." Are we to believe that the dictators in these countries, who have successfully repressed even the most mild opposition to their continued existence, have suddenly become so fearful of the "street"?

Are we to believe that spontaneous demonstrations by the "street" are possible in repressed Arab countries? For these countries, the "street" is nothing but a useful tool - a tool to influence the West but mainly a tool to distract their own citizens from their own failure in statecraft.

One of the so-called moderate states is Egypt. The country receives \$2 billion per year in American aid. When Secretary of State Colin Powell visited the Middle East in April, Hosni Mubarak snubbed the secretary, refusing to meet with him when Powell could not bring an early end to Operation Defensive Shield.

Mubarak has also expressed dissatisfaction against the United States' plan to move against Saddam Hussein. While claiming to be a country that accepts Israel, the Egyptian embassy in Tel Aviv has been leaderless since November 2000. Mubarak has made the cold peace even colder.

In April of this year, Egypt said it was downgrading cultural and commercial contacts with Israel, and Mubarak continues to allow the state-run Egyptian media to incite against Israel.

Egyptian doctors have refused to treat Israeli embassy personnel, thus necessitating the government of Israel to fly doctors to Cairo. This is not a moderate position. Notwithstanding his anti-Israel posturing, Islamic fundamentalists have not warmed up to Mubarak.

In a press release on the Islamic Web site, Al-Muhajiroun, dated June 4, 2002, the U.K. branch called for "the immediate removal of Hosni Mubarak and his execution for his crimes against Muslims in particular and the civilian population in Egypt generally." Moderation may have its price in that part of the world.

Syria has never made claims to moderation. In July, among the visitors to Damascus was Kim Yong-nam, president of North Korea's Supreme Peoples Assembly Presidium. Just before Kim arrived in Damascus, Assad was hosting Ayatollah Mahmoud, Hashemi Shahroudi, head of the judiciary in Iran, and a prominent anti-Khatami hard-liner. These visits coincide with other exchange visits with Cuba, Iraq and Sudan. One suspects that the common chord between these countries is simply where there is a problem, blame America.

On Aug. 1, United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan released a report on Israel's military operation in Jenin and other West Bank cities and found no evidence to support Palestinian allegations of a massacre. At a General Assembly Emergency Special Session on Aug 5, delegates debated Annan's report and Israel's alleged war crimes against the Palestinians. The report itself, which wasn't favorable to the big lie, was described by various diplomats as follows:

\*Palestinian Ambassador to the UN Nasser al-Kidwa: "The notion that the report confirmed that no massacre had been committed was simply not correct."

\*Kuwaiti Ambassador Mohammed Abulhasan described Jenin as "the atrocious events in Jenin against an unarmed, innocent people using their legitimate right to resist occupation." And called Israel's actions "the massacre which has caused the whole world to tremble."

Needless to say, a resolution that questions the validity of favorable treatment to Israel in Annan's report managed to pass 114 - 4, including all members of the European Union. The anti-Israeli tally of 114 might have been higher if at least 25 countries had paid their dues.

The Chicago Sun-Times clearly and proudly affirms its unambiguous faith in freedom and democracy. The Sun-Times finds no moral equivalence between soldiers who protect the innocent and suicide bombers who murder them. We are also clear that Hamas, Islamic Jihad and Fatah-Tanzim are terrorists, not militants.

Militants don't bomb campuses - terrorists bomb campuses.

Militants don't explode buses - terrorists explode buses.

Militants don't open fire at weddings, bar mitzvahs and Seder celebrations - terrorists do.

When terrorists kill civilians in Israel, we have no problem labeling them the same as we label the al-Qaida terrorists of Sept. 11.

Through different owners and different leaders, the Chicago Sun-Times has stood tall with the State of Israel and the Weizmann Institute. This is a legacy that will never, never change.

*F. David Radler is publisher of the Chicago Sun-Times and the Jerusalem Post. These remarks are excerpted from an Oct. 6 speech he gave when accepting a tribute from the Weizmann Institute of Science.*