

Jewish Hate Fest at Washington College

By Marc Roffman By E-mail November 10, 2003

Anti-Semitism is alive and well at Washington College in Chestertown Maryland. On October 30, 2003, a symposium, endowed by the Louis Goldstein Foundation, was held to present a panel discussion on the Middle East conflict. The event was sponsored by Dr. Shaad, chairman of the International Relations Department. The symposium featured a group called "Partners for Peace", which ostensibly represented both the Palestinian and Israeli views of the current Middle East conflict.

This meeting was attended by approximately 200 people including students as well as members of the community at large. There was a panel of 3 women, 2 Palestinian one Israeli, each speaking for 20 minutes and giving their views of the Mid East conflict. The well dressed and very well spoken woman from Ramallah spoke about the cruel oppressive "occupation", telling about the Jews bombing their houses, denying them their "rights", forcing the Palestinians to spend hours at the various checkpoints. She told how this resulted in 50 births at these checkpoints with 30 babies dying, bringing a collective gasp from the audience. She closed her presentation with a quote from John F. Kennedy regarding the beauty of freedom which her people have been so long denied. The second speaker, a Christian Palestinian, used her time to describe how hard her life was in Bethlehem and how the Jews were desecrating the Christian holy sites including the Church of the Nativity where "civilians" fled to escape the Jewish terror; the audience shook their heads in acknowledgment. The final speaker, Yehudit, represented the group Machsom, whose

mission it is to man the Israeli checkpoints and protect the Palestinians from the cruel inhumane treatment by the Jewish occupiers. As each person was speaking, slides were continually flashed on the screen behind her, showing the cruel soldiers not allowing ambulances through, humiliating people at the checkpoints etc.; the same slides again and again and again.

This presentation was the last of a 17-day tour where these people were reaching 4 schools per day. That's 68 educational institutions exposed to these views by the "Partners for Peace".

A question and answer period followed with students' questions selected first. When I was finally called on I asked if I could speak for 5 minutes to refute the complete fantasy that had just been presented. I was booed and hissed and not allowed to speak (so much for academic freedom). As I continued to plead for 5 minutes, I was grabbed by the International Relations Professor who proceeded to push me out of the room just as the cops were arriving.

Though I was not arrested, the police did escort me to my car and off of campus.

There are many conclusions which can be drawn from this incident, but the most important to me is the tremendous need of our community to develop polished educational programs for our schools and universities to meet this growing threat.

The author is an Israel activist and a Suburban Orthodox member. You may reach him at skywaytoo@comcast.net to help formulate a proper response.

Fenced In

By Yossi Klein Halevi Israel Insider / New Republic November 6, 2003

The fence that Israel is building along the length of the West Bank should appall me. Fencing in the Jewish state, after all, mocks Zionism's promise to free the Jews from the ghetto. And fencing out the Arab world violates the hope that Israel will one day find a cultural and spiritual place in the Middle East - a hope that once took me on a yearlong pilgrimage into mosques in Israel and the West Bank, as a way of connecting to my neighbors' prayer lives. The fence ends more than three decades of Israeli attempts to reach out to the Middle East, from the

"open bridges" policy across the Jordan River in the 1970s to the "good fence" on the northern border in the 1980s, through which Lebanese workers daily crossed into Israel. Finally, as a Jordanian acquaintance sympathetic to Israel recently warned me, the fence actually reduces Israel's deterrence by sending a message of weakness to the Arab world, reinforcing the popular Arab notion that Israel's demise is just a matter of time.

The argument for the fence, of course, is that it will save lives. The fence won't offer the total

separation from Palestinians that Israelis crave: About 200,000 Palestinians in Jerusalem and several tens of thousands of West Bank Palestinians could remain on the Israeli side, and at least 20,000 settlers, or 10 percent of the settler population, will find themselves on the wrong side of the fence. Nor will the fence offer absolute security: Breaches will be pried open and tunnels dug underneath the barrier; recently, snipers crawled through a drainage ditch under the fence and killed a child on a road within pre-1967 Israel. Conversely, the more successful the fence becomes against attacks into Israel, the more terrorists will turn against the settlers living on their side of the barrier - and the more pressure will grow within Israel to evacuate those settlements under fire, a move that would further reduce Israeli deterrence by granting victory to terrorism. Still, the security argument is compelling enough: Though more than 120 successful suicide bombers have crossed into Israel from the West Bank, not one has managed to cross from Gaza, which is surrounded by the same kind of formidable fence.

Beyond the security argument, though, what's appealing about the fence is precisely what Israeli officials are trying to deny: its political message. Even more than a separation between Israelis and Palestinians, the fence is a demarcation line between the Oslo era of Israeli delusions and the post-Oslo era of Israeli realism. The fence embodies the lesson of this war: that the violent Palestinian rejection of peace three years ago wasn't merely a setback on the way to a comprehensive settlement but the negation of a comprehensive settlement. September 2000 was an historic turning point as decisive as November 1947, when the Arab world rejected U.N. partition. To insist otherwise is to risk repeating the Oslo syndrome of Palestinian deception and Israeli self-deception. And that's precisely what happened recently with the Geneva Accord, a bit of freelance diplomacy between left-wing Israelis, who obviously don't speak for the Sharon government, and Palestinians linked to Yasser Arafat. Even as Israelis who participated in these negotiations were heralding the Palestinians' renunciation of the right of return, Kadoura Fares, a Palestinian delegate to the talks, was reassuring his people that he had done no such thing. Indeed, to expect Arafat's regime to uphold its commitments is absurd. The fence, then, is Israel's acknowledgment that the Palestinian leadership - in this generation at least - won't honor any commitments to respect Israel's legitimacy.

The main objection to the fence, which is scheduled for completion in 2005, is that it doesn't adhere to the pre-1967 green line but deviates "deep" into the West Bank. In fact, at most points, the fence either winds close to the green line or extends several miles over it without compromising

Palestinian territorial contiguity - hardly the massive land grab warned against by opponents. So far, 108 miles of fence have been completed in the northwestern part of the West Bank, and about 1.5 percent of the West Bank has been incorporated into the Israeli side. If the fence is eventually extended to include Ariel - a town of 18,000 residents, which the Camp David negotiations included within the eventual borders of Israel - it will protrude, finger-shaped, about 15 miles into the territories. Yet even then the fence will encompass only a few percentage points of the West Bank. (The highest figure I've encountered is 10 percent.) And, note Israeli officials, the fence can be moved or even dismantled.

Still, that apologetic argument misses the point, which is that the fence must violate the green line. Building the fence on the 1967 border would play into the Palestinian strategy by creating the outlines of a de facto Palestinian state in all of the West Bank, without requiring the Palestinians to cease terrorism or genuinely recognize Israel. Building over the green line, by contrast, reminds Palestinians that every time they've rejected compromise - whether in 1937, 1947, or 2000 - the potential map of Palestine shrinks. That message is the exact opposite of the left-wing trajectory of increased concessions under fire - from Camp David to Taba to Geneva. The fence is a warning: If Palestinians don't stop terrorism and forfeit their dream of destroying Israel, Israel may impose its own map on them. Indeed, the fence is a reminder that the 1967 border isn't sacrosanct. Legally, the West Bank is extraterritorial: The international community didn't recognize Jordan's annexation, and, because Palestine isn't being restored but invented, its borders are negotiable.

The only justification for withdrawal to the green line is pragmatism. Most Israelis would accept an approximate withdrawal to the 1967 borders in exchange for genuine Palestinian acceptance of Jewish sovereignty on this land. Reinstating the green line, then, would be a reward for peace, not war. But what we've learned in the decade since Oslo began is that "land for peace" was never an option. At best, Israel was being offered land for a cease-fire. And that is hardly justification for returning to the precarious 1967 lines.

That's especially true for Jerusalem. The Oslo negotiations left the fate of Jerusalem for last, assuming that the joint administering of this fragile city would require a level of trust between Palestinians and Israelis possible only after a prolonged process of reconciliation. Precisely the opposite has happened. Thanks, ironically, to Oslo, which subjected the Palestinians to a decade of Palestinian Authority propaganda glorifying hatred of Israel - in schools, mosques, and the media -

Palestinians are far less prepared for peace than they were before Oslo. The result of Palestinian hatred and Israeli mistrust is that sharing the administration of Jerusalem has become untenable. Imagine the effect on the Jewish presence within the Old City today, for example, if Palestinian police were positioned on its walls. "Sharing" Jerusalem means dismembering it. A fence around Jerusalem, then, isn't only a buffer against suicidal terrorists but against suicidal blueprints.

Palestinians have begun calling the fence "The Apartheid Wall." In fact, it is neither apartheid nor a wall. The first surprise in encountering the fence is that it really is a fence. Except for about five miles of concrete wall near the West Bank cities of Tulkarm and Kalkilya, which is necessary to prevent sniper attacks on an adjacent Israeli highway, the projected 370-mile barrier is an electrified fence mounted with surveillance cameras and flanked by trenches and barbed-wire pyramids.

The second surprise is the similarity of the landscape on either side of the fence, especially in the area known as the "Triangle," the mostly Arab-populated area of pre-1967 Israel bordering the West Bank and parallel to the coastal plain. On both sides are white stone houses, olive groves, and minarets; the only difference is that the houses and fields in the Arab-Israeli towns and villages are larger and more prosperous. The fence, then, doesn't separate Arabs and Jews but primarily Palestinians and Israelis - Israeli Arabs as well as Jews. One of the most common complaints about the fence that I've heard from Israeli Jews, on the left as well as the right, is that it leaves the Triangle, which is the center of Arab-Israeli Islamic fundamentalism, within Israel's borders.

Separating West Bank Palestinians from Israeli Palestinians is, in fact, a crucial by-product of the fence. Throughout the 1990s, tens of thousands of West Bank Palestinians illegally crossed into Israel and are living in Arab communities in the Triangle and the Galilee. Frustrating that silent "return" is an essential part of Israel's struggle to maintain its Jewish majority. And it's one of the reasons,

according to Israeli Defense Ministry Director-General Amos Yaron, that Palestinian leaders are so outraged by the fence.

Certainly, the fence causes serious hardship to many Palestinians. According to B'Tselem, the Israeli human rights organization, the fence will cause economic or social dislocation for some 200,000 Palestinians.

The fence will separate farmers from their lands in 36 villages. Israel is trying to minimize the damage. It has built 41 "agricultural gates" along the fence exclusively for the use of farmers. And the army has replanted olive trees uprooted by the fence. But those efforts don't compensate for a brutal reality. Palestinian farmers trying to get to their fields complain of complications at the gates, including an inability to bring in trucks on which to load large quantities of crops.

Still, the fence is hardly a case of the many suffering for the terrorism of the few. The war against Israel was initiated by the official Palestinian leadership with overwhelming popular support. According to one poll, 75 percent of Palestinians backed the recent suicide attack on Haifa's Maxim restaurant, which murdered three generations of two Jewish families and five Israeli Arabs. In its very ugliness - a scar across an often-pastoral landscape - the fence is an apt expression of the Palestinians' grotesque war. Palestinian society has been overtaken by a culture whose deepest longing isn't for the creation of a state of its own but the destruction of the state of its neighbors. Indeed, according to another recent poll, 59 percent of Palestinians want to see terrorism against Israel continue even after the creation of a Palestinian state. The very hardships imposed by the fence are part of its message: When one society declares war against another society, there's a price to pay.

And if a miracle happens and reconciliation becomes possible? Then, indeed, the fence can be moved or uprooted. The Berlin Wall, as Palestinian spokesmen remind us, did eventually fall. And a fence, after all, isn't even a wall.

Viewpoint: Step on It, Arik

By Amiel Ungar The Jerusalem Report November 3, 2003

There is a change in the air and it is not merely the advent of autumn. Americans for Peace Now placed an ad in the pre-Rosh Hashanah issue of The Jerusalem Report resembling a Monopoly board and urging us to play the "Give Peace a Chance" card again. A year ago the advertisement would have elicited an appropriate reply. Peace Now would have been awarded the dreaded "repairs assessment" card from the Chance deck. Repairs and amends were

definitely in order for over 1,000 Israeli lives lost, myriads rendered jobless and an economy wrecked as a result of the Oslo fantasy. It is equally doubtful that the "rebellion" of the (predominately inactive) pilots would have been treated semi-seriously a while ago. In the selling of Oslo and Camp David, not to mention the ignominious flight from Lebanon, the left provided a stock assurance to the argument over what would happen if the withdrawal for peace

vision turned sour. In such an eventuality, parried the left, Israel's vastly superior military power (i.e., the air force) would be unleashed and wreak havoc. Massive collateral damage would have been the initial objective, rather than a regretted consequence, of sorties. We did not hear the slightest protest from moralistic pilots and their backers in the media over the inescapable logic of such a strategy.

Rather than joust with the left, it's necessary to honestly identify the reason why the peace quacks and bogus moralists have reacquired a sense of confidence. Ariel Sharon unfortunately is responsible for the reassertion of discredited doctrines, since he has not articulated a strategy for victory, except for gritting one's teeth and outlasting the enemy. Sharon's failure to communicate and pursue a strategy for victory has created a dangerous vacuum which Oslo variants will fill.

Perhaps Sharon desperately wanted to shed the "reckless driver" label which his detractors had affixed to him. But now he resembles the driver who causes accidents by keeping to a steady 30 on a superhighway. Sharon has striven to preserve unity at home and American support abroad -- two areas where he had failed previously. Unity is a desideratum; it is not a substitute for policy. The old adage that a camel is a horse designed by committee applies here. Sharon has gone the extra mile for unity and gotten a policy camel. Unity, if it is to be sustained, also needs concrete results.

Keeping permanently in touch with American policy is no solution either, when the U.S. is unsure of its policy and has other priorities. First Israel was kept in check until after Saddam; following the Iraq war, Israel was expected to keep a low profile until America had pacified Iraq; now Israel shouldn't make waves until November 2004. Our relationship has become a case of damage control with a clear division of responsibility: Israel absorbs the damage and the Americans exert control.

Condoleezza Rice reportedly warned Israel not to do anything "irreversible." Rice has things upside down. The Israel-Arab conflict has persisted precisely because the Arabs believe that everything

and first and foremost Israel's very existence is reversible. They must be forcibly disabused of this notion for things to progress.

This is why I support two controversial policies -- expelling Arafat and building the fence. I do not subscribe to the nonsense that with Arafat gone Arab blood lust will miraculously abate. This is a war for which the Palestinians, not just their leadership, are culpable. Arafat, however, has epitomized the Arab hope to return on the ruins of Israel. After all Arafat himself -- thanks to Oslo -- made it back from Tunis to Ramallah, a spitting distance from Jerusalem. If he can do it, why not your average Palestinian. By packing Arafat off, we would go some way toward puncturing the myth of Palestinian return.

Similarly the much-touted fence is a security palliative and not a panacea. It is useful, however, precisely because of the reason it is drawing fire: by signaling that Israel intends to annex territories liberated in the Six Day War. The longer the Palestinians prolong the war the greater the forfeit they should pay. Wars carry a price tag -- ask the Germans or the Japanese. Instead of being taught that war is hell, the Arabs have been pampered into believing that war is free. Yes, Arab farmers will be severed from their fields and any Palestinian entity will be truncated. Too bad. The lives of many Israelis have been truncated and families have been severed from their loved ones. If the hard-pressed Israeli economy and budget must cough up with blood a billion dollars for a security fence of dubious value, let us at least enjoy some compensation. Via the fence and its subsequent extensions, we can permanently reacquire our land and build houses and communities. This strategy, rather than another game of chance, is the way to win at Mid-East Monopoly.

Amiel Ungar, a contributing editor of The Jerusalem Report, teaches political science at Judea and Samaria College in Ariel.

Farewell, GA Delegates

By The Jerusalem Post editorial November 19, 2003

Against expectations, you came. In the run-up to the General Assembly, we heard voices whispering: "Just watch: At the last minute, they'll forfeit their deposits and cancel." So it was with a mixture of surprise and delight that we watched as hotel lobbies crowded with 4,200 delegates, and Jerusalem once again resembled -- if only for a few days -- its former self.

Last year you were in Philadelphia; next year it'll be Cleveland. This is appropriate. As one delegate told us, Israel is on the GA's agenda, but it is not the agenda. The challenges that confront North American Jewry -- intermarriage, gay rights, and so on -- are remote from those that confront us here, and each house must tend itself.

But it's also true that the Jewish state increasingly is the main locus of Jewish feeling in the

Diaspora. This is partly by default: As religious identification wanes, identification with Israel tends to take its place. Nor is the phenomenon entirely welcome. Many prominent Diaspora Jews, most recently George Soros, have blamed the Israeli government for the alarming rise of anti-Semitism in the West, and all that entails.

There is also a danger in this. "Solidarity with Israel is not always an uncritical solidarity with the Israeli government," Hebrew University Prof. Yaron Ezrahi said at a panel meeting on Monday. Piling on, former Knesset speaker Avraham Burg urged your fellow delegates not to support the Sharon government. Elsewhere, Burg has called Israel "a colonial state, run by a corrupt clique which scorns and mocks law and civic morality."

Caveat emptor. While you are as entitled as your gentile neighbors to criticize Israeli government policy, you also have a responsibility not to give aid and comfort to Israel's enemies, much less to give political cover to anti-Semites posing as anti-Zionists. Yet this is exactly what Burg would have you do, for no other reason than to enlist your aid in an Israeli political battle he long ago lost.

As Jews, all of you have the right to participate fully in our debate by becoming Israeli citizens and taking part in our elections. There are, of course, honorable reasons to forfeit this option. But in doing so, you forfeit the right to join the fray, and your duty becomes to respect Israeli democracy.

What does this mean? Pace Prof. Ezrahi, it first means solidarity with the Israeli government, whether that government is of the Left or Right. It would be impudent for Israelis to interfere in

American or Canadian elections on the grounds that we know what's best for you. Kindly return the favor.

True, solidarity does not mean blind allegiance to whatever decision the government takes. But it does mean a certain deference to our judgments, if only because we are better acquainted with the facts of our case. And if you must criticize, do so with humility, reluctance, and respect, because we are the ones who will live with the consequences, not you.

So what is it that Israel wants of you? As we write, Israel is fighting a two-front war. To our east, a virulent strain of Islam seeks our physical annihilation. To our West, there is a swelling chorus of voices seeking to reinterpret Zionism as an historical anachronism, a racist state, and a doomed enterprise. At least the IDF is well equipped to fight the former battle. But as we've learned over the past three years, we are less adept at fighting the latter.

This is where Diaspora Jews must make a stand – on university campuses, in op-ed pages, and everywhere else where Israel's cause is fiercely contested. No Jew can rest easy for Israel simply because we are militarily strong, or because we have the technological edge on our enemies, or because our economy outpaces that of our enemies. No state whose very legitimacy is in doubt has ever survived in the long run. Lose this fight, and eventually Israel will be lost, too.

For two millennia, Jews everywhere have prayerfully said, "Next year, in Jerusalem!" By coming here, you have realized the dream. Now let it be said, festively, "Next year, in Cleveland!"

A Day at Baltimore Airport

By Will Ross on the Internet October 30, 2003

I hope that you will spare me a few minutes of your time to tell you about something that I saw on Monday, October 27.

I had been attending a conference in Annapolis and was coming home on Sunday. As you may recall, Los Angeles International Airport was closed on Sunday, October 26, because of the fires that affected air traffic control. Accordingly, my flight, and many others, were canceled and I wound up spending a night in Baltimore.

My story begins the next day. When I went to check in at the United counter Monday morning I saw a lot of soldiers home from Iraq. Most were very young and all had on their desert camouflage uniforms. This was a change from earlier, when they had to buy civilian clothes in Kuwait to fly home. It was a visible reminder that we are in a war. It probably was pretty close to what train terminals were like in World War II.

Many people were stopping the troops to talk to them, asking them questions in the Starbucks line or just saying "Welcome Home." In addition to all the flights that had been canceled on Sunday, the weather was terrible in Baltimore and the flights were backed up. So, there were a lot of unhappy people in the terminal trying to get home, but nobody that I saw gave the soldiers a bad time.

By the afternoon, one plane to Denver had been delayed several hours. United personnel kept asking for volunteers to give up their seats and take another flight. They weren't getting many takers. Finally, a United spokeswoman got on the PA and said this, "Folks. As you can see, there are a lot of soldiers in the waiting area. They only have 14 days of leave and we're trying to get them where they need to go without spending any more time in an airport than they have to. We sold them all tickets, knowing we would oversell the flight. If we can, we want to get

them all on this flight. We want all the soldiers to know that we respect what you're doing, we are here for you and we love you."

At that, the entire terminal of cranky, tired, travel-weary people, a cross-section of America, broke into sustained and heartfelt applause. The soldiers looked surprised and very modest. Most of them just looked at their boots. Many of us were wiping away tears.

And, yes, people lined up to take the later flight and all the soldiers went to Denver on that flight. That little moment made me proud to be an American, and also told me why we will win this war.

If you want to send my little story on to your friends and family, feel free. This is not some urban legend. I was there, I was part of it, I saw it happen.

The author is an administrative judge with the United States Department of Defense.

Yasser Arafat is the Big Winner

By Arthur Cohen Arutz Sheva November 20, 2003

Yasser Arafat is the one who gains the most from the so-called Geneva peace plan. The State of Israel is its prime loser.

During the last few months, and especially after the acceptance of the road map, Arafat was urged to finally take concrete and serious steps against terror. Has he done anything to fulfil his obligations? What is happening now, in reality, is exactly the opposite: while he and his accomplices continue to praise suicide bombers as martyrs, they are hailed as partners for peace.

Yossi Beilin and his friends ignored, during the Oslo years, all signs of Palestinian refusal to honor their commitments. Arafat never used the word peace in Arabic; he said explicitly (Johannesburg, Stockholm) that Mohammed himself did not honor agreements. He educated a new generation to hatred of Israel and the Jew; and he misused enormous amounts of funds from many sources - funds that were meant as a contribution to the well-being of the Palestinians - for the creation of a terror infrastructure. He and his followers have learnt that regardless of their breaches of promises and agreements, nothing will happen. In fact, they are soon even rewarded, despite their frightening disregard of formal understandings. Even the terrorists who killed dozens of Israeli civilians in Israel - against the explicit agreement in the Oslo treaty - are to be freed in the framework of a new proposed agreement. It is almost an invitation to terrorize Israel now, with release sure to follow.

Arafat was urged to introduce democratisation of his government. Now, he can show the world how the democracy of the State of Israel works. The very same public figures who lost in three different elections (Burg against Ben Eliezer, Mitzna against Sharon, while Beilin was not even elected to the Knesset) are negotiating a peace plan. And the government of Switzerland - a proud democracy on its own - supports this totally undemocratic process financially and politically, thus willfully bypassing the democratically elected Israeli government.

Arafat rejected all peace proposals and never made any concrete counter offer. Instead, in reaction to the far-reaching Ehud Barak/Bill Clinton proposals, he started the second genocide-terror Intifada. Now, again, Israeli politicians have made new proposals. Of course, Arafat doesn't officially endorse them. He just looks on, while official government sources in Israel reject them and, as a result thereof, are accused by the Arab countries, the UN and the EU of undermining the peace process. Again, Israel is the bad guy, accused of unbearable stubbornness.

The Israeli society, which was united in its stand against the arch-terrorist Arafat, is being divided again because of different reactions to the Geneva document. In the war against inhuman terror ("Kill the Jews wherever you find them."), the Geneva plan succeeded to divide the Israelis and weaken their strength. Another success of Arafat, who built his strategy on the inner decay of Israel.

Arafat always described Israel as the last colonial power. He denied the historic roots of Israel in this area and ignored even the deep connection between the Jewish people and Jerusalem. Now it is suggested that the Jews give up all their rights to the holiest site of their tradition, the Temple Mount, which was, for thousands of years, the center of their prayers and longings. Let us remember: Anwar Sadat prayed in Jerusalem towards Mecca, while Jews around the world are always Jerusalem-oriented.

Now, for the first time in history, Israel is requested by Israelis to give up willingly their rights in the heart of Jerusalem, the basis of their Zionism, thus justifying Arafat's claim; he has historic bonds with Jerusalem, while Israel and the Jews are colonialists.

There is an additional irony in the Geneva proposal, in that Jewish worship in holy places will again depend on the Palestinians. Don't we know how they respect religious rights? From 1948 until 1967, we didn't even get access to the Wailing Wall (despite Arab commitments). And who doesn't remember what happened since Oslo to the

synagogue of Jericho and the tomb of Joseph in Nablus?

The proposed plan includes - so we are told - a formal retreat from the Palestinians' right to return. However, there is no such clear paragraph in the agreement (Palestinian participants denied such an understanding).

Tens of thousands of refugees will have to be absorbed by Israel. The moral responsibility of Israel for the refugee problem is not waived. As usual, in such Beilin documents, this very central issue is dealt with in an unclear and ambiguous manner, posing a frightening danger to any true understanding in the future. What an irony: Israel has to retreat from its historic places (like Hebron, where Jews have always lived) and make the Palestinian State judenrein, while Israel with its one million Palestinian Arabs has to absorb many more.

The new plan will automatically become the basis for further negotiations; like the Barak plan, which was the starting point of the present Beilin initiative.

The expectation of the Palestinians in regard to a peace agreement with Israel are increasing in a dangerous manner with every peace proposal of this kind. Who is the Palestinian leader of the future who can bargain for less than what irresponsible Israeli politicians agreed to in this Geneva document?

Consequently, the Geneva document is not bringing peace closer but just the opposite: Peace is being put off to a very distant future!

Arthur Cohn is an international film producer whose productions include "The Garden of the Finzi-Continis," "Central Station," and "One Day in September."

Embassy Row: Destination Jerusalem

By James Morrison The Washington Times November 19, 2003

A new Senate resolution would require the United States to relocate its embassy in Tel Aviv to Jerusalem before recognizing a Palestinian state and would leave President Bush no option to suspend the move.

The measure also prohibits the United States from recognizing Palestine "until the international community" declares Jerusalem the undivided capital of Israel.

Palestinians have demanded the city also serve as a capital of their new state, and all Middle East peace efforts have left the status of Jerusalem for final negotiations, after national boundaries, Jewish settlements, national security and other matters are resolved. Sen. Sam Brownback, Kansas Republican and the chief sponsor of the resolution, says that approach has only bogged down negotiations.

"The Middle East peace process is in need of a major paradigm shift," he said in a statement. "We can't continue to bog ourselves down in the mechanics of the process."

He said his resolution "has the potential to catapult the Middle East peace process forward." The resolution would become law if adopted by both houses of Congress and signed by the president.

Mr. Brownback, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations East Asia and Pacific affairs subcommittee, said the resolution requires the United States to move the embassy to Jerusalem three months before recognizing a Palestinian state.

"For the past decade, we have attempted to forge a peace agreement between the Palestinians and Israelis based on the model of 'land for peace.' That model has failed," he said.

"We should make a new attempt, addressing two major issues at the outset. By tackling the tough issues first, we can chart a new path and help create a powerful momentum for peace on all sides."

The resolution differs from the 1995 Jerusalem Embassy Act, which allowed the president to impose six-month waivers of the requirement to relocate the embassy to protect U.S. national security interests. President Clinton repeatedly suspended the act, and Mr. Bush has also signed the waiver despite a campaign pledge to move the embassy to Jerusalem.

Mr. Brownback also said Israel has a right to select its capital. His measure recognizes Israel's biblical claims to Jerusalem, noting that the city, under its Hebrew name, Iruslm, is cited 766 times in the Tanach, the Hebrew bible, and never in the Koran.

Muslims consider Jerusalem their third-holiest city after Mecca and Medina because of the Prophet Muhammad's "night journey." Islamic tradition says Muhammad, led by the Angel Gabriel, traveled in A.D. 620 from Mecca to the "farthest mosque" and was raised to heaven for a meeting with God. Islamic scholars identify that site as Jerusalem and revere the Al Aqsa Mosque as the place of Muhammad's ascension. He returned the same night and met many of his followers.

"The night journey was a great miracle that Muslims believe was given to Prophet Muhammad as an honor and as a confirmation of Mecca's spiritual link to Jerusalem," according to Muzammil H. Siddiqi, president of the Islamic Society of North America.

Al-Qaida's Latest Target Understanding the Istanbul Synagogue Bombing

By Christopher Hitchens Slate.com November 18, 2003

When I am at home, I never go near the synagogue unless, say, there is a bar or bat mitzvah involving the children of friends. But when I am traveling, in a country where Jewish life is scarce or endangered, I often make a visit to the shul. I always feel vaguely foolish doing this (the sensation of being a slight impostor is best conveyed in "Christian" terms by Philip Larkin's marvellous poem "Churchgoing") but as a result I have seen some fascinating evidences of survival in Damascus, in Havana, in Dubrovnik, in Sarajevo, and in Budapest, among other places. And more than a decade ago, I did go to the Neve Shalom synagogue in Istanbul.

This was slightly more than a side-trip of curiosity. Not long before my visit, a group of killers had thrown gasoline through the doors in mid-service, ignited it with a grenade or two, and then followed up with gunfire. This was more energetic than anything attempted on *Kristallnacht*. The people "claiming credit" for the "operation" (as the sayings now go) were the Abu Nidal group. I had met them, too, along with their leader, in their villa in Baghdad a few years previously. Of course, one must always be careful to insist that there is no "smoking gun" connecting Saddam Hussein to the activities pursued by his honored guests.

Last Saturday, the Neve Shalom community in Istanbul was hit again, this time along with another Jewish temple, by a truck bomb. There was a bar mitzvah in progress at the time, so the attackers could be assured of a fair generational cross-section of targets. It seems that the suicide-murderers who perpetrated the deed also killed a fair number of non-Jewish Turkish passersby. It also seems, according to the most plausible "claims," that the perpetrators were members of the al-Qaida underworld. There appears little doubt that their action is related, however distantly, to Turkey's fairly neutral position in respect of the current battles in Iraq.

I have not yet read any article explaining how the frustrations of the oppressed Muslims of the world are alleviated by this deed, or how the wickedness of American foreign policy has brought these chickens home to roost, or how such slaughters are symptoms of "despair." Perhaps somebody is at work on such an article and hasn't quite finished it yet. (I have noticed, though, a slight tendency on the part of this school to shut up, at least for the time being.)

There is a vulgar reason for this reticence. In recent attacks from those gangs who have been busily fusing Saddamism with Bin Ladenism—and who didn't start this synthesis yesterday—it has been noticeable that Saudi citizens (the week before last),

or Iraqi citizens (every day, but most conspicuously in the blasting of the Red Cross compound in Baghdad), or Indonesian citizens (in the bombing of the Marriott in Jakarta in August), or Moroccan citizens have been the chief or most numerous casualties. To this, one could add the Christian Arabs whose famous restaurant in Haifa was blown up, along with its owners, on Yom Kippur. I sometimes detect a strained note in the coverage of this. Why would the jihadists be so careless, so to speak? Have they no discrimination, no tact?

Those who think this even semiconsciously have already forgotten what jihadists were doing in Algeria, Egypt, Afghanistan, and elsewhere, long before the assault on the World Trade Center (which also killed a substantial number of Muslims). It's pretty safe to say that the large majority of those murdered by Islamic holy warriors have not been Europeans or Americans as the term is usually understood. This is why I disagreed with the president when he described Sept. 11 as an attack "on America." It was true, but it was not the truth. The current jihad is still waged chiefly against Muslim states and societies and, as Istanbul proves, not just against dictatorial ones. (That last distinction is unsafe in itself, by the way, since the Afghanistan of the Taliban was more dictatorial and oppressive than Saudi Arabia or Algeria, and since Bin Laden never conducted any operations against Saddam Hussein or his embassies or outposts.)

Whatever its faults, Turkey is a society with many elements of pluralism and democracy. (Just last week, in accordance with its expressed desire to conform with EU rules, it abolished capital punishment.) It also has a tradition of hospitality, offered in traditional Islamic terms, to the Jewish people. When expelled and dispossessed by Christian Europe, the Sephardim found refuge under the protection of the Caliph, in dominions of Islam as far apart as Bosnia and Baghdad. From this latest outrage, then, we can see how false the Bin Ladenists are, even to their own expressed reverence for a lost Muslim empire. The worshippers at the Neve Shalom were not killed for building a settlement in the West Bank: They were members of a very old and honorable community who were murdered for being Jews. Their Turkish neighbors were casually murdered as "collateral damage."

This is in the nature and essence of the foe that we face. Try and bear it in mind, even as the networks speak so lazily of the same foe for "targeting Americans." Understanding why this is lazy is the whole justification of the war, just as it is the real reason why this war will be won.

Addendum, November 18, 2003: I wrote yesterday that, concerning the murders at the synagogues in Istanbul, I had "not yet read any article explaining how the frustrations of the oppressed Muslims of the world are alleviated by this deed, or how the wickedness of American policy has brought these chickens home to roost, or how such slaughters are symptoms of 'despair.' Perhaps somebody is at work on such an article and hasn't quite finished it yet. (I have noticed, though, a slight tendency on the part of this school to shut up, at least for the time being.)"

Goes to show how soft I am getting. Even as I was writing these words, the presses of the London *Guardian* were churning out the following paragraph, from someone named Fiachra Gibbons:

So when six die, as they did on Saturday morning when their blood mingled with that of their Muslim neighbors blown to bits by a suicide bomber outside the Neve Shalom synagogue, the heart should miss a beat and the world weep. For we are mourning the loss of souls who had learned to span a supposedly unbridgeable gulf that is being daily widened by George Bush and our own dear, deluded leader.

In a way, this effort doesn't quite meet the standard of moral cretinism that I had suggested. It

actually fails to make any link *at all* between the actions of the murderers and the policy of Bush and Blair. Rather, it simply *assumes* that the victims are to have their deaths attributed in this fashion. The prevalence of this assumption, along with its facile appearance in the pages of a great liberal newspaper, is something worth noting.

As the author undoubtedly knows—she elsewhere demonstrates some knowledge of Turkish Jewry—and as I reminded readers yesterday, the Neve Shalom synagogue has been lethally attacked before. The last occasion was in the late 1980s. At that time, the Reagan-Bush-Thatcher governments had for some years taken a pro-Saddam Hussein "tilt" in the Iran-Iraq war. I can't remember what the excuse of the Jew-killers was on that previous occasion, but it most certainly wasn't their hatred for regime change. Maybe they didn't come up with an excuse, imagining that the action spoke for itself. Anyway, why bother with a justification when there are so many peace-loving and progressive types willing to volunteer to make the excuses for you?

Christopher Hitchens is a columnist for *Vanity Fair* and author of *The Long Short War: The Postponed Liberation of Iraq*

Destroying Israel is not a legitimate Mideast option

By Saul Singer *National Review* (on line) November 10, 2003

The genie is out of the bottle. There is a thread linking seemingly disparate events: Mahathir's ovation from Muslim leaders when he called for modernizing the struggle against Israel; Tony Judt's *New York Review of Books* article calling for a bi-national "alternative" to the Jewish state; and Palestinian demands this week that the British apologize for the Balfour Declaration of 1917. The connection? A resurgent daring to question Israel's right to exist.

Bret Stephens in the *Jerusalem Post* and Leon Wieseltier in *The New Republic* have written devastating responses to Judt's article, but as Stephens points out, once a discredited idea becomes only "controversial," the battle has, in some sense, already been lost.

The question is whether calls for Israel's destruction, however politely wrapped, should be an acceptable part of civil discourse. Or as Stephens puts it, "... will the *New Republic* sack Judt [now a contributing editor] the way *ESPN* recently sacked Rush Limbaugh for making an arguably derogatory comment about a black football player?" To argue for placing five million Jews under the tender mercies of, as Mahathir Mohamad puts it, "1.3

billion Muslims," is a transparent recipe for dispersion at best, and genocide at worst.

This is not one of those nice, vaguely postmodern ideas that can be harmlessly bandied about, but an old-new fantasy of the same militant Islam that is stalking America. Editors and producers should be as intolerant of such musings as they are of racism, and for the same reason: Both reek of the genocides of the last century.

Sometimes, though, matters must get worse before they can get better, and this may be such a case. The idea that Israel has no right to exist moved underground long ago. Before the 1967 war, Arab leaders openly proclaimed the goal of throwing the Jews into the sea. Running Israel over with tanks has since become gauche, but overwhelming Israel demographically through the demand of "return" is not. And now, apparently, neither is emptying Israel of all meaning by stripping it of its Jewishness.

That the destroy-Israel notion has been forced to adopt various disguises is a mixed blessing. On the one hand, Israel has gained permanence with each passing year, and it is good and important that this has been reflected in the international debate. On the other, it is harder to combat a vulgar idea in disguise than in its unvarnished form.

The garb of the destructionist fantasy has become so enticing that it has even attracted a sizable Israeli minority. This minority does not wish Israel ill, but is uncomfortable with the state's Jewishness for some understandable reasons. To Israelis, the idea of being a "normal" country is intensely attractive, and normal countries just are, without any adjectives attached. Appeals to Israelis' modern, democratic, and egalitarian instincts have shown the power to sow bitter divisions among them.

In its latest incarnations, however, the destructionist fantasy has had all but its thinnest veils removed. When Palestinians say that the Balfour Declaration calling for a Jewish national home was a crime, it is obvious they are not interested in a two-state solution, but one state: Palestine. When Mahathir gives a pep talk claiming it is inconceivable that the piddling Jewish people can succeed against the Muslim multitudes, he is not calling for inter-faith dialogue. And when Judt writes about the failure of the quest for two states, Jewish and Arab, he is not talking about eliminating an Arab state, but instead the only Jewish one.

If this trend continues it will, at least initially, be bad for Israel's legitimacy, but good for Israeli unity. The more emboldened Israel's opponents become, the more obvious it will be which side is struggling

to survive and which side is on the attack. Finally, the more the one-state (Palestine) solution gains currency, the more the two-state solution will lose steam.

If the Left, which, after all, has been the engine behind the two-state solution, starts boarding the one-state ship, who will be left to champion the idea of Israel next to Palestine? The rise of the destructionists hollows out the middle, leaving Israel with its back to the wall, and clarifying what this "conflict" has always been about. There is no "conflict" to be resolved between a fly and a flyswatter: Either the fly makes it or it doesn't.

The West is in a fight to the finish with militant Islam. Two masks must be lifted before we can win. First, it must be realized that drawing borders does not generate peace. Peace — that is, an Arab decision to stop trying to destroy Israel — will generate borders. Second, it is not possible that militant Islam will end its war with the West without ending its war against Israel.

To the enemy, Israel and America are two fronts in the same war. For the West, this war, like any other, will not be won until it is won on all fronts.

Saul Singer is the editorial page editor of the Jerusalem Post

Calendar Of Israel Events

- ❑ **Suburban Orthodox Israel mission** Our mission is now closed at 42 people. We are looking for sponsors for our Elon Moreh community as well as for mission incidentals. Also, we will have our second annual Suburban Orthodox Israel reunion on Wednesday night, December 24th at 7:00pm in Jerusalem at a location to be determined. Please pass the word to our Israel members group.
- ❑ **Shabbat Chevron** The Sedra describes the purchase of Machpela by Avraham in Chevron. Celebrate the event at Shul on Shabbat and join for a Melava Malka at the Brasserie at 7:30pm featuring Avraham Rosenbloom.
- ❑ **Adopt-A-Family** Donations are readily accepted, contact Avie Rock at arock@bcpl.com. We will be visiting Elon Moreh on our December mission. We intend on dedicating the Torah we contributed to the community during our mission. Also, Rabbi Silber spoke on the pulpit on Shmini Atzeret of emergency medical needs. Please support our efforts for the Elon Moreh community.
- ❑ **Shalom USA Radio Program** Sunday mornings from 8:00am to 10:00am on WJFK 1300AM. Includes news and interviews from Israel.
- ❑ **Sar-El program update** Sar-El is accepting volunteers for a special one-week period in Israel. For more information contact the Lowensteins at (410) 484-3884.
- ❑ **Baltimore Zionist District (BZD) Brandeis Gala** Join BZD (410) 602-1200 on Tuesday, December 2 at the Meyerhoff Symphony Hall, featuring Noa.
- ❑ **Hear Blu Greenberg** Sponsored by the Modern Orthodox Forum and hosted at Ner Tamid Congregation on Sunday November 23. Call (410) 358-8500.