



ISRAEL NEWS

*A collection of the week's news from Israel
From the Bet El Twinning / Israel Action Committee
of Beth Avraham Yoseph of Toronto Congregation*

beating innocent ת"ב
Palestinians, perhaps it would be possible to understand this assault against the Right. But as it works out, the videotape that was supposed to be the definitive proof that settlers are violent criminals was a fabrication. It was simply the latest anti-Israel snuff film brought to us by our friends at Pallywood Productions. These are the same creative filmmakers whose

Events...

Motzei Shabbat, November 22, 8:30PM

Famed Jerusalem educator and Shabbat host **Rabbi Mordechai Machlis** will speak at the Sephardic Kehila Centre.

Sunday, November 23, 8:45am

BAYT Brotherhood Breakfast with Hon. Peter Kent, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs. Men and Women from the entire community are welcome. Call 905-886-3810 ext. 290 or email BAYTbrotherhood@gmail.com with VISA/MasterCard info for reservations. \$25/person; \$250/able.

Wednesday, November 26, 12:00 noon

The Speakers Action Group and the Canadian Jewish Civil Rights Association present **Yoram Ettinger**, who will present an Israeli perspective on the recent US elections at Cassels Brock, Scotia Plaza, 40 King Street West, 21st Floor. To reserve, email projectmanager@speakersaction.com or call 416 966 0722.

Monday, December 1, 8:30pm

Aish Hatorah's Israel @ 60 Event "**The State of our Future**" featuring **Caroline Glick**, Nobel Laureate Professor **Robert Aumann** and **Jonathan Medved**, at **Shaarei Shomayim**. For info and tickets, call 905-964-9340.

Commentary...

From Tel Aviv to Teheran, with Love By Caroline Glick

Two weeks ago, the Palestinians and their anti-Zionist Israeli and international partners finally produced a smoking gun. They had a videotape of evil settlers brutally attacking poor, defenseless Palestinians as they innocently picked olives with their enlightened supporters in a grove by the Tel Rumeida neighborhood in Hebron.

The local media went into a feeding frenzy. The footage led the television news broadcasts. Photos taken from the video were plastered across the front pages of the newspapers. Radio talk show hosts denounced the criminal settlers and celebrated the guileless Palestinians and their heroic Israeli supporters. The Olmert-Livni-Barak government was quick to weigh in, promising stiff punishment for the Jewish fascists involved and a curtailment of their supporters' civil rights.

In the weeks that have followed, and with elections looming, Foreign Minister Tzipi Livni and Defense Minister Ehud Barak have stepped up their attacks on the evil right-wing extremists. At Saturday night's memorial ceremony/political rally for slain prime minister Yitzhak Rabin in Tel Aviv, Barak called right-wing activists "cancers." He claimed that they are a "threat to democracy." And he pledged, "We will uproot this evil from within us."

The crowd loved Barak's statement. The few audience members who might have booed him had already been beaten and arrested by police for disturbing the peace. A handful of anti-leftist activists from the student group Im Tirtzu came to Rabin Square carrying signs decrying leftist demonization of the Right. The police beat them and carted them off before the rally began.

If it were true that settlers are marauding around Judea and Samaria

previous credits include the fabricated IDF shooting of Muhammad al-Dura, the Jenin massacre that wasn't, the Kafr Kana massacre that wasn't and a host of other notable blood libels.

The inconvenient truth that these activists remain liars was exposed at the remand hearings of the settlers accused of beating the Palestinian olive harvesters. As the NFC news Web site reported exclusively on Sunday, the Palestinians showed their film as evidence against the arrested offenders in two separate hearings before two different judges at the Jerusalem Magistrate's Court. And at each hearing, after viewing the film the judges concluded that through heavy editing, the video had inverted reality. Both stated that it was impossible to know who began the fight - the Palestinians and their Israeli and foreign supporters who beat the settlers, or the settlers who walked to the grove on Shabbat carrying nothing but their prayer shawls and hit them back.

The judges also noted that one of the Palestinians threw a large rock at the back of one of the settlers after he and his friends had disengaged from the fight. The judges expressed anger and amazement at the police for failing to arrest the Palestinian who had clearly attacked the Jewish defendant without provocation.

IT GOES without saying that the local media have chosen to ignore the court's exposure of the latest hoax. The truth doesn't fit their anti-right-wing narrative and so it isn't being covered.

What the local media and politicians such as Barak and Livni who seek to criminalize the Right for political gain refuse to acknowledge is that their embrace of these lies not only harms the settlers, it harms the country as a whole.

Although from the rap they've gotten from the political Left and its supporters in the media, it seems like right-wing extremists are both numerous and powerful, the fact of the matter is that the number of right-wingers who reject the authority of the state or would take the law into their own hands is tiny. And they are politically isolated both at home and abroad and have no money.

In stark contrast, the anti-Zionist, Israeli Left is an integral part of a well-funded international movement actively engaged in waging political warfare not against the settlers, but against Israel as a whole. The end of this political war is Israel's destruction. The anti-Zionist Israeli Left advances this destruction both by directly assisting terror groups and by indirectly assisting terror groups through activities aimed at delegitimizing Israel's right to defend itself.

The clear collusion between both Israeli and international anti-Israel leftist activists with terrorist groups like Hamas is nowhere more evident than in the terror-supporting International Solidarity Movement's newest spin-off, the Free Gaza campaign. On Saturday, this group broke the IDF's sea blockade of the Hamas-controlled Gazan coast for the third time in recent months by sailing a ship filled with rabidly pro-jihadist and anti-Israel European politicians from Cyprus to Gaza.

According to a credible source with close ties to the operation, the Free Gaza campaign works closely with Israeli far-left groups including Anarchists against the Wall, Gush Shalom, Gisha, Machsom Watch, New Profile and Women in Black. These organizations are generously funded by the US-based New Israel Fund, by European governments and by anti-Israel church groups like the Quakers. The Free Gaza campaign's first ship, which arrived in Gaza

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.

See *Israel News* on the internet at www.bayt.org and www.frumtoronto.com

Opinions expressed do not necessarily represent the views of BAYT. Thank you to Continental Press for their ongoing support.

in late August, was led by Israeli anti-Zionist activist and former lecturer at Ben-Gurion University Jeff Halper.

The Free Gaza campaign is a clear assault on Israel's national security. Under the banner of "human rights," this new ferry service between Cyprus and Gaza is meant to compromise the country's ability to combat terror operations and to provide political support for Hamas. Crew members and passengers on board these boats meet with Hamas terror commanders in Gaza and coordinate future missions.

Their newest campaign is to prevent the navy from interdicting fishing boats. Hamas and other terror groups make wide use of fishing boats to import weapons and transport terror personnel from abroad into Gaza. By demonizing the navy for interdicting fishing boats, and in open collusion with Hamas, the activists provide political cover for weapons transfers and jihadist maritime traffic into and out of Gaza.

To date, Israel has chosen not to intercept the Free Gaza campaign's boats out of concern that taking such necessary action will prove a public relations disaster both at home and abroad. And this concern is reasonable. But by taking no diplomatic or military steps to prevent this terror-supporting traffic from continuing and expanding, the government allows these Israeli and European terror supporters to strengthen Hamas's war machine and legitimize Hamas's objective of destroying Israel.

Official Israel's failure to act against this breach of its security is directly related to its support of Israeli anti-Zionist groups when they direct their guns at the Israeli Right - rather than Israel as a whole. As a practical matter, it is difficult for the government to show that the Free Gaza campaign actively supports the war against Israel when it willingly embraces the bona fides of the Free Gaza campaign's supporters when they attack settlers, or when the government adopts these organizations' false assertion that the Right is the greatest threat to the country.

By the same token, it is difficult for the government to discredit films purporting to demonstrate the human rights plight of Gazans as Pallywood propaganda flicks when the government accepts these films as accurate when their culprits are right-wing activists.

But while the domestic Left sees a distinction between its right-wing opponents and the country as a whole, the international community sees no distinction between the two. Indeed, the international community has used the cover that official Israel provides anti-Zionist activists for their settler vilifying activities in order to advance the cause of criminalizing Israel as a whole.

Case in point is what has become known as the Durban II conference in Geneva. Durban I, it will be recalled, was the UN's 2001 "anti-racism" conference in Durban, South Africa. The conference, which took place the week before the jihadist attacks on the US, was an anti-Semitic hate-fest. The American and Israeli delegations walked out as Israel and the Jewish people were castigated as the greatest human rights abusers, genocide committers, apartheid propagators and general all purpose bad guys in the entire world.

The Nazi-like propaganda emanating from the conference led to violent attacks against Jews all over the world. Durban I's resolutions also provided the policy blueprint for much of political warfare that has been waged against Israel by so-called human rights groups ever since. These include the violent demonstrations against the security fence organized by anti-Zionist Israeli groups, the Free Gaza campaign they support, and the international boycotts against Israeli exports and academics they advocate.

Today, the UN is busily organizing its follow-up conference that will be held next year in Geneva. As the watchdog group Eye on the UN reported over the weekend, the conference's organizing committee just met and approved most of the resolutions it is set to adopt at Geneva. These resolutions again castigate Israel as the chief violator of human rights in the world. Israel is accused of committing genocide, crimes against humanity and being an apartheid state. It is also condemned as the most serious threat to international peace and security.

But of course, what starts with Israel doesn't end with Israel. The conference organizers have used the basic unanimity about Israel's criminal nature to launch an assault against the foundations of Western civilization. In addition to the numerous and repetitious attacks against Israel and Jews, the conference organizers passed multiple resolutions calling for the abrogation of freedom of expression and the criminalization of political speech in order to outlaw discussion of Islamic terrorism and block counterterror efforts in the West.

Among the conference's chief organizers are Iran, Libya, Egypt and Cuba. Iran is the vice-chairman of the executive committee responsible for planning

Durban II. Much of the language in the proposed resolutions is taken directly from resolutions passed at a planning session last year in Teheran.

Israel had no hand in organizing this conference, which, following Canada, it announced it will boycott. But over the years, it could have taken actions that might have tempered or weakened the international coalition arrayed against it.

If the government had outlawed anti-Israel groups like Machsom Watch, New Profile, Gisha, Gush Shalom, Women in Black and Anarchists against the Wall, rather than tolerate them on account of their activities against settlers, it could at least have weakened their efforts. Had they been disbanded, they would have had less capacity to legitimize and assist Palestinians and Europeans who engage in political warfare against Israel on the ground.

By refusing to recognize the international consequences of their domestic battle against their political opponents on the Right, the Olmert-Livni-Barak government and the local media have strengthened Israel's enemies in their battle to destroy the country. (Jerusalem Post Nov 10)

Rabin Day By Naomi Ragen

Today is the 13th anniversary of the assassination of Yitzhak Rabin according to the Jewish calendar. In Israel the week around the day has long been turned by the Israeli political establishment into an annual ritual of McCarthyist attacks on freedom of speech. In ceremony after ceremony and speech after speech, Israelis are reminded by their politicians and by the chattering class that Rabin was murdered because those who disagreed with his policies were allowed to exercise freedom of speech. The myth of a conspiracy by Rabbis and by the political Right to have Rabin killed is repeated with all the mechanical repetition of the Big Lies of two generations ago. This year, even Olmert repeated it, although he was a member of the Likud in 95 and is clearly one of those the McCarthyist Left asserts is collectively guilty of the murder.

Never mind that not a single Rabbi has been identified as having expressed approval of the idea of killing Rabin, nor approval after it happened, and not a single politician from the Israeli Right cheered or said hurrah when Rabin was killed. A handful of fringe Kahanists might have said hurrah, half of whom were probably police moles, but they are hardly representative of the half of Israelis who opposed Rabin's policies.

I disliked Rabin and his policies. I think his policies were disasters and that they directly produced the 2000 or so Israeli deaths from the Oslo "peace process." That does not make me a killer of Rabin. I am tired of being accused by the McCarthyists of having been part of the assassination. Like virtually everyone else who hated Rabin's foolish policies, I wanted him evicted from power via an election and not murdered. I also want Kadima evicted via an election.

The anniversary of Rabin's killing could have been turned into a day of education about democracy and freedom of speech. A day in which Israeli children are reminded that political assassination is an attack on democracy, and where they are also reminded that everyone has the right to freedom of speech even if they disagree with the leftist canon. Most importantly, a constructive Rabin Day would remind Israelis of the massive anti-democratic wave of McCarthyism launched by the Left right after the assassination, in which dissidents (including Rabbis) were arrested, indicted, harassed, demonized.

On a constructive Rabin Day, Israelis should also be warned of the efforts at deification of Rabin and the attempt to build around him a cult of personality, where his policies have been represented not as controversial and often foolish political proposals, but instead are raised to unchallengeable theological canon. A constructive Rabin Day might also address the dangers to democracy from a situation in which the entire media are self-recruited for one wing of the political spectrum. A constructive Rabin Day might point out the dangers to democracy of incidents such as Ehud Barak's getting up and screaming that those who disagree with the Left are a cancerous tumor. In a week in which a communist candidate is running for mayor of Tel Aviv, a constructive Rabin Day might be spent discussing the dangers of totalitarian ideologies.

The McCarthyism around Rabin Day reasserts itself in the Israeli media every year. This year it is being fed by hysteria over an attempt to bomb far-leftist anti-democratic Prof. Zeev Sternhell, an attack attributed by the Israeli media with no evidence whatsoever to the political Right and to "settlers."

The media continue to demonize daily the Jews who live inside the West Bank as violent criminals.

One component of the Big Lie invented by Israel's McCarthyist Left is that the political Right consists of people who are congenitally lawless and violent. No one denies that there have been a handful of violent criminals to emerge from the Right, people universally repudiated by the leaders and thinkers in the Right. Yigal Amir may be the worst.

But let us not forget the long long long history of crime and violence by the Left. Leftist hooligans clash violently with police and soldiers in the West Bank every day, trying to sabotage the security fence so that the terrorists can get in more easily. The Left produced the spies and the traitors, including Mordecai Vanunu, Azmi Bishara, Tali Fahima, Marcus Klingberg, and including the ring of espionage and terror operated by kibbutznik Udi Adiv (today a lecturer in political science at the Open University) in the 1970s. Those with long memories will remember the earlier campaigns of leftist violence against the Right in the 1940s, the "season," the sinking of the Altalena, the betraying of members of the Edsel to the British by the Left, the gangs of street thugs operated by Ben Gurion to beat opponents, etc.

A constructive Rabin Day, devoted to stopping political violence and promoting open political debate, would mention not only Yigal Amir and the clown who threw a grenade at a Peace Now demonstration in 1983, killing protester Emil Grunzweig, but also Vanunu and Adiv and the others. (NaomiRagen.com Nov 10)

A Letter to the President-Elect By Barry Rubin

Dear President-elect Obama,

They say that you prefer the name Barry, and so it pleases me no end that another Barry is finally president of the United States. In addition, I once worked as a community organizer, so we have two things in common.

On that basis, then, I hope you don't mind my making some suggestions about how you might think about the Middle East. I'm not looking for a job in Washington. In fact, as I look back on my life, I note that if I'd been successful in some obsession for a US government post, I might have been a participant in such endeavors as the catastrophic mishandling of Iran's revolution, the failed US dispatch of troops to Lebanon, the botched trade of arms for hostages with Iran, the crashed peace process and the Iraq war.

So don't be misled. Today, everyone's talking about how wonderful you are. Those are the people who want jobs, favors and access. There are others who want something else from you - like control over Lebanon, Israel, Iraq or Georgia - who are more likely to be psychopathic than sycophantic.

Your expressed theme for your administration's Middle East policy can be described in one word: conciliation. You think that your predecessors made unnecessary enemies and blocked, rather than furthered, progress. Building on the basis of your perceived popularity and sincere goodwill, you believe that it is not so hard to make friends with Iran and Syria, soothe grievances that have caused Islamism and terrorism and solve the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Good luck. We hope you succeed.

But please bear in mind some important points.

- In the Middle East, it is not so useful to think yourself popular and show yourself to be friendly. You have to inspire fear in your enemies and confidence in your friends. And if you don't inspire fear in your enemies - if you're too nice to them - then you will indeed foment fear among your friends.
- Not everyone thinks the same way. When you talk of "empathy," America's enemies hear the word "fear." When you speak of change, they, too, want change. Unfortunately the change they want means wiping other states off the map, creating radical Islamist dictatorships and kicking the United States out of the region.

This is no misunderstanding: it's a conflict.

IN THE film, *Cool Hand Luke*, the noble convict (played by Paul Newman) jokes to the sadistic guards, "What we have here is a failure to communicate." The audiences laughed. What everyone has forgotten is that a moment later they shoot him dead. Harvard Law School meets the law of the jungle.

You are going to talk to Iran, negotiate with Syria and try to buy the Palestinians or press the Israelis into making peace. It's your presidency and many Americans think - rightly or not - that this hasn't been tried enough.

But please keep in mind four very important points for when the going gets rough:

1. How much do you offer them and at whose expense? Not too much, please.
2. How closely will you monitor whether or not they are keeping their

commitments? Be tough, please.

3. At what point will you conclude that they don't want to end existing conflicts or be America's friends? Don't wait too long, please.

4. What do you do when you figure out this doesn't work? Don't be afraid to admit the truth, blame those responsible and try something else.

Iraq, for example: You want to withdraw and turn the war over to the Iraqis. This makes sense. But what will you do if Iran escalates to make your withdrawal look like a defeat and fill the vacuum - subtly, of course, not too openly.

And what do you do to combat Iranian and Syrian efforts to turn Iraq, Lebanon and the Gaza Strip into their sphere of influence? They will pump in money, pump up hatred and kill anyone who stands in the way. Making a good speech, apologizing for the past or offering more concessions won't work.

If you think Afghanistan is easier to deal with than Iraq, the opposite is true. No one tames Afghanistan. Its endless conflicts are a product of geography, ethnic conflict, a macho militarist political culture and a very low level of development. In Iraq, the majority wants a stable resolution. In Afghanistan, the choice is permanent holding action or collapse.

What happens when the Europeans hug and kiss you, then refuse to extend sanctions on Iran further? Will you remain Europe's favorite American president by asking them to do nothing? How will you convince the Saudis, Jordanians, Egyptians, Lebanese and others that you are their reliable protector against Iranian nuclear weapons and the advance of Iranian-Syrian power when they know how eager you are to make up - possibly at their expense - with Teheran and Damascus?

Westerners are eager to resolve conflicts; revolutionaries want to use conflicts. You think grievances can be resolved; their grievances are insatiable. Make a concession, they ignore it and demand another. Withdraw from a territory, they occupy it and turn it into a base for the next advance. Explain that you feel their pain, and they add to your pain.

This is what it is like to deal with extremists and ideologues.

Right now you don't understand why Bill Clinton and George Bush couldn't solve a little thing like the Arab-Israeli conflict, defuse the massive hatred of America in the Middle East, end terrorism or turn radical Islamism into an ideology of peace.

Don't worry. You will. (Jerusalem Post Nov 9)

The writer is director of the Global Research in International Affairs Center and editor of the Middle East Review of International Affairs.

Facing Iran, Alone By Mladen Andrijasevic

In May 1940 Britain stood alone facing Nazi Germany. The USSR had signed the Ribbentrop-Molotov nonaggression pact; the US had not entered the war yet.

On May 7, Leo Amery spoke in the Commons, attacking Neville Chamberlain's government, quoting Oliver Cromwell: "You have sat too long here for any good you have been doing. Depart, I say, and let us have done with you. In the name of God, go!"

On May 10, 1940, Winston Churchill became Prime Minister.

Ever since the US government's National Intelligence Estimate report it has become increasingly probable that Israel will be the one to tackle Iran. With the election of Barack Obama this is now almost certain. We are back in May 1940.

There are many who believe that, for all their talk, the Iranians would never launch a nuclear attack. The 12th Imam is for the masses, the way Marx was, the argument goes, and not to be believed in verbatim. How many Arab or Muslim leaders have become suicide bombers to get the virgins? None.

But comparing Communists with the followers of the Islamic prophet is misleading. For one, the Communists never produced suicide bombers and we already have had 148 explode here in Israel. Muhammad Atta was not the top leader, but he was among the educated, for whom education was just a tool to be used in accomplishing his jihadi goals. Mahmoud Ahmadinejad is an ardent believer in the Mahdi, the Hidden Twelfth Imam, the four-year old who went into hiding in a well 1,140 years ago. The idea that Iran itself may become a nuclear suicide bomber is real.

Those who question Iranian motives are projecting Western values, almost patronizingly so. The privileged party members in the USSR, the so-called prviligentsia, would not dream of sacrificing themselves. They had their

closed shops, hospitals and pharmacies, access to foreign media and, most coveted of all, access abroad. They enjoyed their privileges. The Iranian mullahs are no Bolsheviks.

The world watched Hitler rearm, reoccupy the Rhineland in 1936, annex the Sudetenland in October 1938 and the rest of Czechoslovakia in March 1939, and rape Austria in 1938. As Churchill put it, they kept feeding the crocodile hoping they would be eaten last.

Anyone who reads about the policies and the press of the 1933-1940 period cannot but be struck by the similarities. We know what happened then, yet we are following almost the same path. Scary.

Might Israel strike at Iran before Obama takes over? As reported in the Jerusalem Post, Benny Morris says yes. Most other analysts disagree. I believe that it is in the US interest for Israel to destroy the Iranian nuclear sites, since the destruction and the rise in oil prices resulting from a non-nuclear Iranian retaliation would still be much less than the consequences of a nuclear war following an Iranian nuclear strike on Israel and an Israeli nuclear retaliation.

There is only one remaining scenario left.

On February 10 Israel goes to the polls. The leaders we elect will be our last line of defense. Help will not come from the Europeans, the United Nations and not even from the US. The decisions that will determine the survival of this country will come from Benjamin Netanyahu, Moshe Yaalon, Benny Begin or Tzipi Livni. Make your pick. (IsraelNN.com Nov 10)

U.N. American Agenda By Anne Bayefsky

Getting to work during the Obama administration.

Nobody is happier about the election of Barack Obama to the Presidency of the United States than the folks at the United Nations. It is as if they finally discovered kryptonite, and Superman will soon be disabled.

The U.N. is an uncomplicated place. Every sick, unsatiated tyrant, European has-been, or miserable wretch brainwashed about the Great Satan wants to take America down - unless they are able to immigrate of course. Their modus operandi? The United Nations.

The beauty of it, from the perspective of the majority, is that Americans are paying for their own demise. Americans are even convinced that the flagellation must be deserved.

President Obama will take over from where what might be called "Bush III" left off. The foreign policy of Bush II was so different than that of the man currently in office, it's hard to ascribe them to the same human being. Even die-hard U.N. enthusiasts admit they were pleased with many aspects of the American-UN relationship over the last few years, particularly after Bush III fed Bush II's U.N. ambassador John Bolton to the wolves. Ongoing genocide in Darfur was shuffled off to the ponderous International Criminal Court. The Israel-Lebanon war was "solved" with a Security Council resolution. The U.N. reform package, and any serious effort at economic oversight after Kofi Annan's Oil-for-food scandal, was tossed out the window. The green light was given to a multi-billion dollar renovation of U.N. headquarters in midtown Manhattan, notwithstanding advice that it could have done for a fraction of the cost. Efforts to tie reform or accountability to American U.N. contributions were abandoned, and five billion a year flows smoothly from American taxpayers to U.N. bank accounts.

On November 13, 2008, Bush III will chum around with Saudi mobster King Abdullah at U.N. premises in New York. The occasion is a Saudi-initiated event on "a culture of peace" which a U.N. spokesperson describes as "religious dialogue, plus." The spectacle completes the Bush III metamorphosis. Think back to the image of Christian American soldiers stationed in Saudi Arabia in order to protect the country from Saddam Hussein, but forced to hide the crosses around their necks because their public display is a criminal act in the Kingdom?

Bush III notwithstanding, President Obama will have what his friends will call an unprecedented opportunity to tie American foreign policy to the U.N. ship of state, lance it down, and sail off into the sunset, never to be separated again. The predicament of the Saudi wife would be an apt comparison.

The U.N. apparatus has mapped out the priorities for President Obama's early days in office (taking it for granted he'll be hightailing it out of Iraq), and the only question is how fast President Obama will say "I do." Here's the plan now sitting on the President-elect's desk:

Run for election to the U.N. Human Rights Council as a vote of confidence in the U.N. "human rights" apparatus and the ability to change it from the inside. (Forget that the U.S. would have one vote, that the Western regional

group of states is overwhelmingly outnumbered, and that reform of an agency serving the human rights abusers is the last thing of interest to the abusers firmly in control.)

Decide to participate in the Durban II "anti-racism" conference in April 2009, and send along a high-level emissary such as the Secretary of State. It would be hard to run for re-election to the Human Rights Council without attending the Council's number-one priority, which is scheduled to take place shortly before the election. (Ignore that Durban II is a unredeemable and dangerous fraud. It adopts an anti-racism mantra to foment racism, the demonization of Israel and the defeat of free speech.)

Revitalize the Middle East Quartet, which drives the Arab-Israeli conflict through a multilateral prism with the U.N. as a full and equal partner. (Dismiss the fact that the U.N. partner always weighs in on just one side of the conflict, adopting the predetermined position that Israel is the "root" of the problem and any Arab "peace" proposal is the solution.)

Put Israel on the chopping block. "Israel first" has long been the calling card of the UN. The U.N. governing principle is this: "if only Israel did x, y, and z," (the list to be expanded in response to successive Arab no's), animus against the West would cease, terrorism would stop, the messiah would appear, and there would be no more war. (This might be called the "ass-backwards approach to Middle East politics," since Israel is actually on the front line of the war against democracy and America's way of life, not bringing up the rear. Serving up an Israeli hors d'oeuvre is just that - first course.)

Drive the effort to stop terrorism through the 2006 United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. (The strategy contains no definition of terrorism since U.N. members can't agree on what counts as terrorism. It inverts priorities by focusing first and foremost on alleged "conditions conducive to the spread of terrorism," such as "poverty" and "youth unemployment" "religious discrimination" and "socio-economic marginalization." Plain old Jew-hatred or enmity of freedom and equality are mysteriously absent from the list of causes.)

Agree to some form of global taxation, giving rise to an even more powerful, wealthy, and undemocratic U.N. fiefdom (and a poorer America).

All that remains is for President Obama to put a date beside each one of the items on the U.N.'s first "to do" list. And down we'll go.

The writer is a senior fellow at the Hudson Institute and at Touro College.

She is also editor of www.EyeontheUN.org (National Review Nov 10)

Asymmetry In Nature Of Arab And Israeli "Dreams" Must Not Be Ignored By Dr. Aaron Lerner

Withdrawal advocates trying to understate the consequences of increasing Israel's vulnerability frequently argue that "both sides have dreams" - as if a Beitarnik member singing the old "there are two banks to the Jordan and they are both ours" is the same thing as an Arab relating his dream of one day Israel not existing.

"Everyone can dream", they argue, "but they are only that - dreams."

But there is a fundamental difference between these "dreams".

That Beitarnik has absolutely no genuine interest in kicking out the Jordanians and in fact extending Israel so that it includes the East Bank. Even if Israel could do it and get away with it - that Beitarnik and his government wouldn't do it.

In sharp contrast, the Arab dream of Israel not existing is not just a song - it is a genuine goal. And if the Arabs thought that they could destroy Israel and get away with it they would do it.

This simple and painful truth has profound policy ramifications as it dramatically raises the probability that an Israeli concession that makes it easier to attack or destroy Israel may in fact be exploited at some point in the future to do just that.

The above is something that the overwhelming majority of the Israeli public recognizes. The Peace Index poll of 1-2 January 2007 found that 69.5% of Israeli Jews said the Palestinians would destroy Israel if they could. Among Meretz voters, 33% think the Palestinians would destroy Israel if they could, 23% oppose this view, and 44% do not know. It is probably safe to say that most of those 44% Meretz "do not knows" didn't feel comfortable telling the pollster what they really thought.

And a poll today would show pretty much the same.

It is up to the election campaigners to get them to connect the dots between this simple truth and its policy ramifications. (IMRA Nov 13)