

Commentary...

Israel on Campus By Ruth R. Wisse

The claim of universities to be fostering diversity and preventing discrimination against vulnerable minorities is oddly compromised by a surge of anti-Semitism. With the recent addition of Columbia and Yale, over 50 campuses are currently circulating faculty petitions to divest from Israel and from American firms selling arms to Israel. Faculty at Georgetown, Michigan and Harvard have gone out of their way to invite speakers best known for their defamation of Israel and the Jews.

To be sure, hundreds of university presidents have either spoken out publicly or signed a statement deploring the presence of anti-Semitism on campus. But none has tried to explain the phenomenon, much less undertaken to do anything about it. So questions abound. How does one know, for example, that the divestment petition is anti-Semitic? Why should Jews have become a target in a campus atmosphere of such advertised sensitivity? And what can universities do to remedy the situation without stifling healthy debate?

Like many such initiatives since the 1960s, the petition campaign against Israel is promoted by relatively small numbers of faculty with interlocking interests. Its driving force are Arabs, Arabists, and their sympathizers who help prosecute the war against Israel as a way of diverting attention away from Arab regimes. They are joined by Leftists -- including Jews -- who see in Jewish particularism the chief hindrance to their internationalist faith; by radicals who consider Israel and America to be colonial powers and who promote their reactionary or revolutionary alternatives; and by antiwar enthusiasts who blame Israel for inviting Arab aggression against it.

The call for divestment sets up an implicit comparison between Israel and South Africa, whose apartheid policy once inspired a campaign of divestment aimed at forcing democratic change. In South Africa, a minority of whites had established a government based on racial criteria. But not only is Israel a vigorous democracy, it is, with Turkey, the only democracy in the Middle East. Arab autocrats and despots attack the Jewish state precisely because it embodies the democracy they are determined to resist. Arab rulers see in Israel's free and open society a threat to Muslim hegemony and to autocratic rule.

Most university professors and students who support divestment do so in the misguided belief that it will force Israel to improve its human-rights record in the West Bank and Gaza. What they fail to recognize is that, far from championing human rights, the divestment petition is a springboard for the spread of anti-Semitic hostility to American campuses. The economic boycott has been part of the Arab arsenal in the war against Israel for the past 50 years. Last month, the Arab League formally reactivated its boycott at a meeting in Damascus. Saudi Arabia recently blacklisted about 200 European, American, and other companies for importing Israeli products or product parts under other labels; and its Chamber of Commerce and Industry called on citizens to report the presence of any Israeli product exported through a third country. The divestment petitioners are asking their universities to join the Arab boycott that has the destruction of Israel as its larger goal.

The divestment campaign did not just happen, and speakers assaulting Israel do not appear of themselves. This antipathy to Israel grows from a campus culture that is selectively repressive. All the while that students, in the spirit of diversity, are actively discouraged from making pejorative comments about other vulnerable minorities, some Arab and Muslim students have been actively fomenting hatred of Israel as an expression of their "identity." On campuses with a large Arab presence, such as Wayne State in Detroit, this has resulted in a palpable threat to Jewish students, and outbreaks of physical violence have actually occurred at San Francisco State and Concordia University in Montreal. Since Arab and Muslim students are currently the only ones who exuberantly defame another group, and who blame that group rather than Arab and Muslim governments for the failings of their own anti-democratic societies, it is hardly surprising that they should be joined by others looking for a villain or scapegoat. Anti-Semitism thrives because slandering Israel is the only aggression against a minority that is encouraged by the rules of political correctness.

Along similar lines, universities have allowed Middle East departments to disseminate anti-Israel propaganda to an extent unimaginable a generation ago,

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*

representing violations of intellectual honesty and academic impartiality that may be unique in our academic life. Martin Kramer's book on Middle East Studies in America, "Ivory Towers on Sand," points out the conditions that encourage this abuse. Instead of scrutinizing the obsession with Israel that has retarded the development of Arab societies, many professors of Arab and Muslim civilization have themselves become obsessed with the obsession. Here the

damage to America is at least as great as to Israel, for had these scholars been submitting Arab regimes to honest scrutiny, they would have long since been investigating the connections between anti-Semitism, opposition to democracy, and hostility to the U.S. Why has it been left to private think tanks to inform us about the rise and nature of terrorism in the Middle East?

The last thing university authorities ought to do in addressing this latest outbreak of what has been called "the longest hatred" is to enforce the kind of speech codes that have been invoked to protect other sensitive minorities. What is wanted is more honest debate, not less, but honest debate on both sides of the issue. Anti-Semitism works by making Jews the defendants of a political charge. Its hostile agenda invites counter-scrutiny. The more the Arab world and its defenders try to blame Israel, the more critically we should be studying the Arab world to see how it uses anti-Semitism to divert attention from its problems, and where the responsibility for those problems really lies.

Anti-Semitism perverts the ideal of a mutually tolerant campus. The Faculty and administration, and students who wish to uphold that ideal, will have to exercise their free speech to address the function and the roots of this virulent phenomenon. (Wall Street Journal Dec 13)
The writer, a professor of Yiddish and comparative literature at Harvard, is the author of "If I Am Not for Myself: The Liberal Betrayal of the Jews"

Palestinian Statehood: A Reward for Terror

By Gary Bauer and Morton A. Klein

Two weeks ago, Muslim terrorists fired shoulder-launched missiles at an Israeli civilian aircraft as it took off from an airport in Kenya, in an attempt to murder its 260 passengers.

If a Palestinian state is created, its western border will be just a few miles from Ben-Gurion airport, and terrorists carrying shoulder-launched missiles will be able to take aim at every plane taking off from or landing there.

Despite such grave dangers, US President George W. Bush, who has said that there must be an end to terrorist states, is now laying the groundwork for the creation of what will be a terrorist state. The Middle East "Road Map" that the Bush administration is promoting proposes to create a "provisional" Palestinian state next year. This plan sends a wrong and dangerous message to the terrorists who are murdering innocent Israelis in buses and cafes. It tells them that their massacres will reap political dividends - that the more Jews they kill, the more the United States will seek to meet their demands.

Can the administration really believe that giving a sovereign state to the Palestinians will create a civilized democracy? Sovereignty does not necessarily put an end to terrorism. In fact, it only strengthens the existing pro-terrorist culture to wreak even more havoc. Iraq, Iran, Libya and Syria are sovereign states; yet sovereignty has not transformed them into civilized democracies.

A recent poll commissioned by the Zionist Organization of America and carried out by the Hanoch Smith Institute found 68 percent of Israeli Jews believe that "regardless of the size or strength of a Palestinian state, if one is established it will constitute a threat to the State of Israel." Only 9% of Israeli Jews believe that creating a Palestinian state would reduce the Arab states' threat to Israel.

Let's look at the Palestinian record. During the past 25 months, the Palestinians have carried out thousands of terrorist attacks against Israelis, murdering nearly 700 and maiming many more. Most of the attacks - including many of the recent suicide bombings - are being executed by forces under Yasser Arafat's control: Fatah, Force 17, and the Palestinian Authority's own police and security officers.

Israel has revealed numerous documents proving that the PA pays for and orders the murder of Jews.

Furthermore, the PA has not disarmed or outlawed terrorist groups. It has

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

not seized their tens of thousands of illegal weapons or shut down their bomb factories; nor has it honored any of Israel's 45 requests for the extradition of terrorists. It has not closed down the terrorists' training camps. It has rewarded terrorists with jobs in the PA police force. In short, the PA has actively collaborated with and sheltered the terrorists. It has also created an entire culture of anti-Jewish hatred in its official media, schools, summer camps, sermons by PA-appointed clergy, and speeches by PA representatives.

A Palestinian state would be a mini-Iraq, sharing a long border with Israel, flanking the areas that contain 70% of Israel's population, including Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, and Haifa - plenty of tempting targets for cross-border attacks. The attackers could then slip back into "Palestine," where they would find refuge behind the protective border of a sovereign state.

A Palestinian state would have its own airports and seaports, as well as share borders with Egypt and Jordan, making it relatively easy to import heavy weapons. The PA already has the nucleus of an army; statehood would give it the freedom to establish a full-fledged military force.

The same kind of Iranian "volunteers" who have been sent to aid the Hizbullah in southern Lebanon would no doubt be dispatched to "Palestine."

A Palestinian state would virtually force Israel back to the pre-1967 borders, stripping it of the protective Judea-Samaria mountain ranges and leaving it just nine miles wide at its mid-section.

US Lieutenant-General Thomas Kelly, director of operations for the Joint Chiefs of Staff during the Gulf War, said this would leave Israel indefensible: "I look out from those heights and look onto the West Bank and say to myself, 'If I'm the chief of staff of the Israel Defense Forces, I cannot defend this land without that terrain.'"

Advocates of Palestinian statehood claim such a state would be demilitarized. But there is no way to ensure that it would be. The Versailles agreement after World War I required Germany to be demilitarized, yet Germany built the most powerful army in Europe.

A Palestinian state would also endanger Jewish religious rights. The PA has already destroyed one key Jewish religious site, the Tomb of Joseph, turning it into a mosque and barring Jews from the area. PA officials have called for banning Jewish prayer from Jerusalem's Western Wall and Hebron's Cave of the Patriarchs, and PA police officers regularly carry out shooting attacks on Rachel's Tomb, near Bethlehem.

A Palestinian state would also endanger Israel's water sources, a significant portion of which originates in Judea and Samaria. If the PA had sovereignty, it could shut off the flow of that water. There would also be the danger of Palestinian Arab terrorists sabotaging the Israeli water supply.

The last thing the world needs now is yet another totalitarian, anti-American terrorist state. Yet that is exactly what a Palestinian state would be, to judge by the behavior of the PA during the eight years since it was created. The PA is a brutal Muslim dictatorship which tortures dissidents, silences newspapers that deviate from Arafat's line, and persecutes Christians. The official PA media actively incite hatred against America, and the PA maintains warm relations with the most anti-American regimes in the world, including Iraq, Iran, Syria, Sudan, Libya, North Korea, and Cuba.

The only way to advance the chance for peace is, first, by defeating the terrorist regime. The training camps must be shut down; the weapons must be seized; the terrorists must be apprehended and brought to trial; and the PA-controlled areas must be completely demilitarized. These actions must be followed by a lengthy period in which the PA's culture of hatred is stamped out, comparable to the de-Nazification process that the Allies imposed on Germany after World War II and the de-Saddamization plan that has been proposed for Iraq after Saddam Hussein's regime is ousted.

The only long-term hope for Middle East peace lies in permanently weaning the Palestinians off their diet of hatred.

Terrorists, whether led by bin Laden or Arafat, should be fought and defeated, not appeased with offers of statehood. Sending a message that terrorism pays is the worst possible move at a time when terrorists are threatening America, Israel, and the entire Free World. (Jerusalem Post Dec 13)

Gary Bauer is the president of American Values; Morton A. Klein is the national president of the Zionist Organization of America.

Sheep, Wolves, and Reality By Mortimer Zuckerman

In the Middle East today, farce masks real tragedy. The first farce is that of the world's press rushing to the ornate gates of Saddam's palaces as if there were the remotest chance of stumbling on evidence of his weapons of mass destruction. Expect nothing to come of this charade. The second farce, one that deserves real scrutiny, is the continued push by the West for negotiations between the Palestinians and Israel. Expect nothing to come out of this either. Why? Because diplomacy has come to a dead end. Terrorism has supplanted reason and even self-interest.

What is at stake now is not the shape of a future Palestinian state, or this or that border adjustment or security procedure. It is the existence of Israel. As the Kenya outrage shows, the right of Jews everywhere to live in peace is under siege. It bewilders Israelis that so much of the world tolerates and even excuses the terrorism they face each day. It is to his everlasting credit that President Bush sees clearly the stakes of this conflict and has the courage to speak plainly about it. Contrast that with the weasel words we hear from foreign governments

and, sometimes, from our own State Department in the form of talk about a moral equivalence between Arab terrorists and Israel's response in its defense.

The fact that the Palestinians and their Arab sponsors have dedicated themselves to a war to wipe out Israel is manifest in their response to every peace initiative. Israel opens up an area like Hebron or Bethlehem. The terrorists rush right back in. The Palestinian Authority doesn't consider the shooters and suicide bombers terrorists, of course; they neither detain nor deter them. Quite the opposite. Arafat has released all Hamas and Islamic Jihad terrorists from Palestinian jails. The PA's commitment to fight terrorism has proved, in a word, meaningless. The same is true for its "commitment" to constrain the incitement and the hatred of Jews and of Israel.

Quartet. In Palestine and throughout the Arab world, fabrications about Jews are taught every day in the schools and broadcast daily in mosques. Arafat conceded as much when he offered, as a "reform," to end the teaching of fanaticism in PA schools. What an admission! How could so many have failed to understand the reality of this hatred and what it says about the rejection of Israel as a Jewish state? How can anyone continue to believe there is the slightest possibility of good-faith negotiation until the terrorism is ended? This performance standard, established by President Bush in his June 24 speech on the Middle East, must become the official position of the quartet made up of the United Nations, the European Union, Russia, and our own State Department.

It sounds so reasonable to urge both sides to return to the negotiating table. But it is, almost certainly, an exercise in futility. Not only is the hatred and mistrust deeper than ever on both sides; there are huge gaps between the Israelis and the Palestinians on key issues that make a political breakthrough virtually impossible.

The majority of the Palestinians who continue to support suicide bombers believe that violence has helped the Palestinian side. But some leading Palestinians now admit that the resort to terrorism was a strategic mistake resulting in the loss of most of the political gains made by Palestinians over the past two decades. PA institutions are in ruins. Palestinians are suffering terribly from the collapse of their economy. Relations with Washington are at their lowest ebb ever. And Israel's pro-peace camp, once the Palestinians' most strategic ally, has been shattered by the endless scenes of Palestinian terror. Today, as a result, the world no longer falls for the bogus Palestinian claims of Israeli atrocities.

Yet after so much loss, and so many lies, the terrorism and incitement continue. Palestinian terrorists have provoked Israel, for the protection of its citizens, to invade and reinvade the West Bank and Gaza. Even Israel's left wing understands that victory over terrorism is a prerequisite for an eventual Israeli negotiation and withdrawal. As one Israeli commentator put it: "It is desirable, even in the era when the wolf dwells with the sheep, to take care never to assume the role of the sheep." Is there any cause for hope? Washington remains committed to the idea of establishing a democratic basis for a new Palestinian regime to negotiate with Israel. This is, sadly, a delusion. Palestinians with the will to reform do not have the power, and those with the power do not have the will. Arafat has killed the reform movement. There is no one to challenge him. No one publicly criticizes him; anyone who does is threatened and promptly shuts up.

And still the western push for negotiations, blind to history, prevails. But history must be recalled. Long before 1948, 1967, Israeli settlements, and suicide bombers, there were murderous attacks in the Holy Land against the Jews who lived there. Palestinians wanted them out. Period. Once Israel was a reality, the Palestinian goal was to destroy the Jewish state first by war, then by terrorism, then by deceptions like that at Oslo, which-it is now clear-the Palestinians had no intention of honoring. Faisal Husseini, the former PA representative in Jerusalem, even described the accord as a "Trojan horse," one more cynical step in the "war of independence and return."

This is not paranoia. It is reality. And it is both wrong and dangerous to sweep under the rug the true ends and purposes of the Palestinians. How else to explain a society that extols as heroes suicide bombers whose objective is to kill as many innocent civilians as possible? How to rationalize a society in which mothers appear proudly on TV to extol the virtues of their children who have become martyrs and urge their younger children to follow in the elder siblings' path? What to say of a society where the entire religious establishment calls upon its faithful to hate Jews simply because they are Jews, where news of Israeli women and children being blown apart by yet another bomb is greeted with joyous street celebrations?

Return. To the West, and especially to the western media, the Palestinian narrative is one of Israeli occupation, of colonialism through settlement-of-apartheid. These are myths intended to provide the West with familiar language and terms to help differentiate the good guys from the bad guys. But the term occupation lost all relevance two years ago when Israel made firm proposals at Camp David to resolve the problem that would have ended Israel's occupation. Arafat's rejection of the proposals was based on his insistence that Israel agree to the right of return of Palestinian refugees who fled the 1948 war and for all of their descendants as well. This would have created demographic conditions that would have spelled the end of Israel as a Jewish state-a condition no Israeli leader, obviously, could accept. And so, in the words of the recently deceased Abba Eban, the Palestinian leadership

extended its record of never missing an opportunity to miss an opportunity.

The Arab narrative to their own people, since then, has been one of mobilization for jihad and a refusal to recognize not just Israel's right to exist but any legitimacy of the connection between the Jewish people and the land of Israel. Even when they speak of a "just peace," Arabs are using code for a state in which Palestinians dominate Israelis. Read what Arafat's ideological chief, Sakher Habash, one of the founders of Fatah, said: "[T]here can be no coexistence between Zionism and the Palestinian national movement . . . [Jews] must become citizens of the state of the future, the democratic Palestinian state."

At this point, can anyone truly believe that the wave of terrorism and suicide bombings that were unleashed after Camp David two years ago was prompted by Ariel Sharon's visit to the Temple Mount? No. It might have sparked a few days of rage. But what followed was a wholesale reversion to a program of terrorism and violence, clearly approved by the PA. And now we know, of course, that even before the Sharon visit, Arafat was preparing to launch a new intifada. This, in the Palestinian argot, is yet another step in their Doctrine of Phases to undermine Israel.

And it is what they mean by a just and lasting peace--and why the return of refugees into Israel's territory is but a step toward creating a sweeping pan-Palestinian state in the place of Israel and the Hashemite kingdom of Jordan. According to this vision, a Palestinian state, alongside that of Israel, would assume control of its border crossings. This in turn would enable the new state to absorb thousands of Palestinian fighters from Fatah, Hamas, and the other armed militias from Lebanon. That accomplished, the new state would have the enhanced capability to threaten both its neighbors, Jordan and Israel, especially with terror.

Is it any wonder, then, that Israelis insist on controlling Palestinian borders and Palestinian air space? Is it any wonder they want to wait until there is democratic reform, that is, a regime change of the Palestinians, that would give the Israelis a minimum confidence of a regime and a people prepared to live in neighborly harmony?

American policy in the Middle East has been to try to formulate a workable "road map" that could serve as an outline for a dialogue between the Palestinians and the Israelis. The policy will not succeed--or deserve to succeed--unless it recognizes the brutal realities behind the code words and the determination to wage a campaign of terrorism against the only democratic state in the Middle East. It is in the best interests of the Palestinians to turn away from such a path. Or are they, irredeemably, a society that practices suicide not only against innocent Israelis but, ultimately, against its own citizens? (JewishWorldReview.com)

Mr. Rice Guy: *The significance of Elliott Abrams's new job at Condi's NSC.*

By Fred Barnes

Sometimes the Washington press corps reports a story, but entirely misses its significance. This was the case with last week's naming of Elliott Abrams to the position of senior director for Near East and North African affairs on the National Security Council staff at the White House. The job makes Abrams a major player in setting policy on Israel and the Palestinians. And Abrams's view of the right policy is quite different--more pro-Israel, less solicitous of Palestinians--from that of Secretary of State Colin Powell and the permanent cast of characters at the State Department.

As early as this week, Abrams will be knee-deep in Middle East affairs. What must be worked out is the so-called road map for pursuing peace between Israel and the Palestinians. Abrams's job is to make certain that the conditions and guidelines laid down by President Bush in his speech last June 24 are not watered down or ignored by the Powell forces. This is easier said than done, particularly since Bush's attention has turned to the war on terror and regime change in Iraq.

The appointment of Abrams, 54, is an important statement by national security adviser Condoleezza Rice--and by Bush--that the White House will not cede control of Middle East policy to Powell. In the past, a foreign service bureaucrat has held the NSC post and more often than not echoed State's view. Until late 2001, a holdover from the Clinton White House, Bruce Reidel, had the post. Over the past year, a fight was waged over who would replace Reidel. One potential appointee after another was blocked. Rice was urged to name someone from inside the system, either from State or the CIA. But she insisted on Abrams, who comes from outside the system and whose pro-democracy, pro-Israel, and anti-peace process views on the Middle East are anathema to the State/CIA establishment.

Abrams's background is in Latin American affairs and human rights. But he expressed his opinions on the Middle East in his essay in a book, "Present Dangers," published in 2000. Most striking was the absence of enthusiasm for resuming the "peace process." He wrote: American interests "do not lie in strengthening Palestinians at the expense of Israelis, abandoning our overall policy of supporting the expansion of democracy and human rights, or subordinating all other political and security goals to the 'success' of the Arab-Israel 'peace process.'"

Such a view pits him against Powell's State Department. There, the key to all good things in the Middle East is thought to be a quick return to the peace process with full-blown negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians. Abrams's view--and Rice's and Bush's--is that since September 11, 2001, the war

on terror is a higher priority. But September 11 has also reinforced Bush's view of Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat not as a leader seeking independence for his people, but as someone more like the terrorists who attacked the United States.

At the moment, the White House plans to implement the Bush guidelines from his speech last June. Among these are the easing aside of Arafat, the end of Palestinian terrorism against Israel, and reform of the Palestinian Authority. The Bush speech indicated these steps must be taken first, before moving on to concessions the Israelis might make and, finally, to high-level negotiations. However, State's position is that the Palestinians don't have to complete their required steps, only begin them. Under State's plan, Arafat would merely have to start leaving office, not actually be gone, and reforms would only need to have begun, not be fully implemented. A final administration policy must be reached by December 20. That's when representatives of the "Quartet"--United States, Russia, the European Union, and the United Nations--meet to discuss the Middle East.

It is Abrams's strong public views on the Middle East that make his appointment surprising. No doubt it has caused heartburn at State and among Palestinians and their sympathizers. In Israel, the choice of Abrams was seen favorably as further evidence of Bush's commitment to support both Israel and democracy in the Middle East.

Abrams joined the NSC staff in June 2001 as senior director for democracy, human rights, and international operations. After the Reagan administration, he worked with Latin American interests and then became head of the Ethics and Public Policy Center in Washington. But while out of government, he kept in touch with Dick Cheney, now Bush's vice president. He barely knew Rice at all when he was hired. But he had other contacts, including Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz and Rice's deputy Steve Hadley. Wolfowitz is said to have been instrumental in getting Abrams his initial job at NSC, where he helped draft a tough new policy toward Cuba.

Press stories about Abrams's elevation to the new job stressed a single point: Iran-contra. In 1991, Abrams pleaded guilty to two misdemeanor counts of withholding information from Congress, for which he was pardoned by the first President Bush in December 1992. The Washington Post headlined a wire story on the Abrams appointment, "Iran-Contra Figure Named To Senior Post In White House." The lede of the story in Newsday said, "Iran-contra figure Elliott Abrams, who received a pardon from the first President Bush for his role in the scandal . . . has been promoted to a key post among the current President Bush's national security aides." Neither newspaper mentioned the policy significance of Abrams's appointment. They missed the real story.

The writer is executive editor of The Weekly Standard. (Weekly Standard Dec 16)

Two Challenges to Our Integrity By David M. Weinberg

The Oslo money trail and anti-Zionist academic activity warrant serious attention.

Over the past week, two major clarion calls have been issued that demand the sustained attention of our press and politicians. In the rush of election frenzy, I fear they will be forgotten.

The first is to "follow the Oslo money trail." Ben Caspit's expose in Ma'ariv last week about Yossi Ginnossar's shady business dealings with Yasser Arafat is but the tip of the corrupt Oslo iceberg. The story poses a challenge to our entire political system.

Will this expose of improper and sordid Oslo money-machinations be properly followed-up by our politicians and police? Reportedly, former Shin Bet official Ginnossar secreted-away abroad millions of dollars for Arafat, using the profits of exclusive business dealings in cement, gas and gambling that he made through close ties with both Israeli and Palestinian leaders. This, while serving as a formal Israel-PA diplomatic go-between.

In the past, similar revelations about the undersides of Oslo have been ignored by the mainstream media and the political elites. In fact, most of what Caspit published was first reported two years ago by Adir Zik in Hatzofeh - but ignored.

Makor Rishon and the Norwegian press have published extensive investigations of European Commission and other funds improperly flowing through the Peres Center for Peace. These funds have reached the pockets of Oslo hacks like Terje Larsen and his wife, as well as pet projects established or backed by Yossi Beilin. The Israeli press has paid only perfunctory attention.

No one has seriously taken up investigation of the \$60 million that the Peres Center invested in Paltel, the PA telephone and communications cartel. Shimon Peres raised the money from foreign investors through his "Peace Technology Fund," and then bought massive shares of Paltel.

Guess who is on the board of the Center and the Fund and who was centrally involved in the purchase? Yossi Ginnossar.

Then there is the unfinished and seemingly-forgotten business of the amutot, the manifold and super-secret not-for-profit organizations which funded Ehud Barak's first election campaign. Much of these funds naturally came from American Jews aligned with Labor.

Now we learn from Caspit's expose that some of the profits made by

Ginossar and held in trust for Arafat apparently made their way from Arafat's Swiss accounts to at least one prominent American Jew centrally involved in a pro-Labor and pro-Barak support group, which in turn has been connected to the murky puzzle of amutot.

Is there a connection? Did Ginossar's shady dealings with Arafat partially pay for Barak's campaign? According to sources, other Arafat-Ginossar funds may have oiled the tongue, pen and research center of a high-profile American Jew with an international bully-pulpit who has become a pro-Palestinian propagandist.

Given the centrality of Oslo to our political life and national security debate, you would think that there is enough smoke here to draw in the investigative attentions of half-a-dozen rightist politicians. To paraphrase the legendary Deep Throat of Watergate: Follow the money trail.

Yet, not a soul in the Knesset stirs. Why? The attorneys have warned their right-wing MK clients to sit tight and shut-up, because Labor threatens to retaliate: "You pursue our back-room money matters too closely, and we'll go after yours..." And thus, more Oslo mendacity may go unreported and unpunished.

The second is a call for academic faithfulness. In an important speech delivered at the opening of the Herzliya Conference on Israel's National Security - and completely ignored by the press - Herzliya Interdisciplinary College President Uriel Reichman issued an unprecedented plea to his colleagues to join the battle against the "pariah-ization" of Israel around the world and to contribute to "the strengthening Israel's national cohesion."

Reichman decried the anti-Israel and anti-Zionist activity of too many Israeli leftist professors. "Sadly," he said, "a group of my colleagues recently has supported conscientious objection to military service beyond the Green Line - at a time when we are fighting for our mere existence. Others have lectured across Europe saying that Israel's anti-terrorist activity - simple self-defense, aimed at stopping those who would murder Israeli citizens - is tantamount to war crimes."

Some professors in Israeli universities no longer limit themselves to criticizing the settlement movement. Rather, they describe Israel as a ruthless, non-democratic occupier that seeks to expel, starve, humiliate and abuse the Palestinian population. Some of them have even supported the calls for an academic boycott of Israel. Entire circles within academia are obsessed with a narrative that describes Zionist history in terms of colonialism; others talk of Zionism as a force which "manipulates the Holocaust" to justify its "racist" actions.

Reichman named Tel Aviv University Prof. Adi Ophir - who for many years edited the country's leading intellectual journal, *Theory and Criticism* - as an example of the worst kind of Israeli self-hatred; as someone who considers Israel to be "an accused remnant of European nationalism, racism, fascism, colonialism, militarism and capitalism." But as anyone who has lived or traveled enough abroad knows, the problem goes far beyond Ophir.

Will other university presidents take up Reichman's challenge and join him in this important message of intellectual patriotism and national solidarity?

Will our Foreign Ministry heed the message, as well, and learn to be more selectively and defiantly Zionist in its choice of academics sent abroad to defend the country?

We dare not let this and the above clarion calls go unanswered.
The writer is director of public affairs at Bar-Ilan University's Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies. (Jerusalem Post Dec 15)

'Process' of Elimination By Claudia Rosett

Why does America ask Israel to let its people get blown up?

Much talk these days centers on the process we've come to call nation-building and the recognition that for peace, one needs democracy. So far, so good. The pity is that there is not more wisdom brought to bear on defending the democracies that already exist, especially that most beleaguered of all free states: Israel. That might sound strange, given the billions the U.S. spends on Israel's military defense. But undercutting this effort for decades has been the strange history of Washington-backed peace-processing, in which Israel at every turn has been urged to do something that the U.S. itself immediately forswore after Sept. 11--negotiate, compromise and above all show "restraint" with terrorists and their sponsors. Sped along by questing for the holy Nobel grail (which Jimmy Carter just won and Bill Clinton did backflips for), the "peace process" established a routine in which violence against Israel would be answered with the international community reciting yet again the terms of unworkable deals. Everyone would then spend more time bargaining over what constituted an acceptable level of terrorism inflicted on Israel.

In theory, those days are over. Sort of. Yasser Arafat has lost his exalted status among U.S. policy makers as the only Palestinian in the world who could be capable of delivering peace. Even Human Rights Watch, not generally known as a backer of Israel, has condemned the murderous bombings of Israeli civilians as crimes against humanity.

President Bush, heeding the philosophy of Israel's Deputy Prime Minister Natan Sharansky, has named democratization as the real solution for Palestinians, and a prerequisite for a Palestinian state. Most importantly, if the U.S. goes through with removing Saddam Hussein, the rulers of the horrifically unfree Arab world will at long last receive a message that policies of menace and murder do not necessarily reward the killers.

But here in Israel the realities of peace-processing are still everywhere to be found, and they are horrifying. Earlier this month, I attended a conference at Herzliya, on the outskirts of Tel Aviv--the third round of what has become an annual event bringing together dozens of the most influential politicians and academics in Israel, as well as guests from abroad. Over three days, the discussions ranged as widely as one might expect in a free society heading for elections next month. Deputy Prime Minister Natan Sharansky gave his trademark presentation on the need for Arab democracy before any more peace-processing: "We can't negotiate with leaders who are not dependent on their people." Defense Minister Shaul Mofaz warned that Palestinian leaders see the very existence of Israel as "an historic mistake that should be amended." Labor Party leader Amram Mitzna offered his latest rendition of what might be called the Neville Chamberlain position, that concessions offered under threat will bring peace.

From speaker after speaker came reminders that the threats Israel faces are simply enormous: bombs, germ warfare, the focused hostility of an entire Arab world in which rulers urge their subjects to vent their frustrations ever so prudently, by hating not their own oppressors, but the Jews. Saddam Hussein rewards the families of suicide terrorists with cash. Egypt--despite being paid by the U.S. to behave as one of the friendlier powers in the region--has been broadcasting the latest variant on the anti-Semitic forgery "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion," revamped for prime-time TV as "Horseman Without a Horse," a serial drama in 40 parts. Iran and Syria support the arms buildup of one of the world's most ruthless terrorist organizations, Hezbollah, just north of Israel, in southern Lebanon. Palestinian television continues to engender a cult of terrorism, airing such stuff as poetry and music videos that tell children that the noblest goal in life, the way to make their mothers proud, is to die while murdering Israelis.

When you are actually sitting in a hotel near Tel Aviv, all this does not feel academic. Through Ben-Gurion airport, just before the conference convened, had passed the survivors of the terrorist attack last month on Israeli tourists in Kenya. Just a few miles up the road is the town of Netanya, where last March a bombing at a hotel killed 29 civilians and wounded more than 100. Within reach of an easy afternoon's drive are the sites of scores of other attacks that have killed almost 700 civilians and maimed thousands since Arafat called for the current intifada.

It's an intriguing exercise to imagine how the U.S. would respond if this were the tenor of life in, say, Massachusetts, which is about the size of Israel. Somehow, I doubt Colin Powell would be sent for tea and bargaining sessions with the sponsors of such activities. At least, I hope not.

In the face of all this, Washington's ambassador to Israel, Daniel Kurtzer, delivered a dinner speech at the conference in which, nanny-like, he chided both the Israelis and Palestinians, reminding them all, in the phraseology of a group-therapy session, of "the need to make choices." There followed a more encouraging stretch in Mr. Kurtzer's speech, in which he also stressed the need to stop terrorists and their supporters. But then he got busy talking about "the road map" to peace, meaning a series of steps being hashed out somewhere in the State Department, that will lead to the creation of a Palestinian state. The more Mr. Kurtzer talked about the road map "currently under discussion," the more it sounded like the latest buzzword for the "peace process." He described the road map, variously, as "an evolving document," "a scale model of reality" and "a living document that exists in the real world." At which point, I found myself listening for the real-world punctuation of a bomb blast somewhere down the road--though on that particular evening, especially with all that tight security for the dignitaries, it didn't happen.

The day after the conference, I went with another American journalist to have a look at Jerusalem, where a hospitable archaeologist took us on an afternoon tour of the Old City. Our visit included a brief delay near the Western Wall, where, having already passed the metal detector, we walked into the middle of a bomb scare. So frequent are such threats that the people praying down by the wall scarcely paused as Israeli security forces cleared the plaza nearby and brought in a device to detonate a suspicious unclaimed package. This one turned out to be a dud. We waited while from around the corner came the dull thud of the four small explosions needed to blow it up. As traffic resumed, and we passed yet another metal detector en route to lunch, our Israeli host noted that "we're the test. Whatever happens here is going to happen elsewhere."

Which brings me back to that "living" road map, the precise details of which have yet to be made public. The latest word is that the U.S. administration has wisely decided to hold off until after the Israeli elections, on Jan. 28. One might hope the delay has less to do with Israeli elections than with the likelihood that by late January the Middle East will have experienced the real change of course vital to creating any true hope of peace--the removal of Saddam Hussein. That would be the serious beginning of a policy that could offer the people of the Arab world the breathing room to direct at least some of their anger away from Israel and toward their own despots, who are the real source of the huge miseries of the Middle East.

Until that happens, there is no peace process, road map or other form of diplomatic fantasy worth bothering with. Israelis and Arabs are not the only ones making choices in the conflicts of the Middle East. I hope America itself chooses wisely. (Wall Street Journal Dec 18)

The writer is a member of The Wall Street Journal's editorial board.