



## 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*

The more compelling the conflict there is as a source of pain and passion, the less compelling the argument that that was a motive. The Russians have indeed been brutal in suppressing the rebellion, far more than the West or Israel has acted toward anyone. So what cause

overrides that one? Yet Chechen grievances will be a good source of obfuscation.

Then there will a frantic search for the "blame ourselves" theme. If the issue wasn't such a tragic one, this would be humorous. Could America have acted more kindly toward these two brothers? Don't underestimate how well this theme will play with those citizens who drink other flavors of Kool-Aid.

In this pursuit no idiocy is unthinkable. Canadian Liberal Party leader Justin Trudeau, who is trying to be an Obama clone, explained: "There is no question that this happened because of someone who feels completely excluded, someone who feels completely at war...with society."

The solution, then, is not to "marginalize people even further who already feel like they are enemies of society rather than people who have hope for the future." In other words, doing anything is more dangerous than doing nothing. To combat radical Islam is to hurt people's feelings and that will produce more terrorism.

Actually, the brotherly duo and their family was treated extraordinarily well by the country they betrayed. They were allowed in (rather questionably) as permanent residents and suddenly large numbers of relatives were in the United States as well (so much for draconian immigration laws); one of the brothers became a citizen. They went to the best schools. What did they learn there about the greatness of America? Was the seed of rage fertilized by the demonization of American history as evil, greedy, racist, and imperialist? One of them even got a scholarship.

It is vital to understand the profound difference between these two and the September 11 hijackers, men who came on a mission of sabotage and murder. They reached the U.S. shore as enemies, reliable agents of revolutionary retribution.

These two young men, however, had a free choice. They had to actively close their minds to everything good they experienced and to adopt an ideology of hate. Only a very powerful force could move them in that direction. We have seen this frequently in the United Kingdom and France.

Guess what? If such comparisons were to be made it would have to be acknowledged that there is a second-generation (though strictly speaking these two were first generation) time bomb implanted. That means one can expect many more attacks like this. But will anyone make that point?

There normality will be used to make them seem...normal, their motive inexplicable. But on the contrary it is their very apparent normality, their seeming assimilation into American life, which makes the situation so scary.

Of course, a key argument is that Islam has nothing to do with this and that Islamism isn't directly behind it. A new theme that is being used by a lot of people in conversation is this one: "Muslims view 'Islamic' terrorists the same way Christians view the Westboro Baptist Church."

Here is a positive evaluation of this quote which explains that the idea that there is much support among Muslims for terrorism comes merely "from the Vast Right Wing Echo Chamber" but then changes the argument to say that the claim is that the Boston terrorists "are representative of all Muslims everywhere. It's a ridiculous double standard." In other words, the terrorists in Boston and everywhere else don't represent much of anything but themselves. As I recall, the Westboro Baptist Church doesn't govern ten countries. You don't want to be a right-wing nut, do you? Then don't say that the Boston attack arose from an ideology of Islamism, linking it to thousands of other such attacks around the world.

But guess what? American Muslims do not agree that support for terrorism is minimal in their community. In 2011, 21 percent of all American Muslims and a higher number, 32 percent, of U.S.-born Muslims think there is a great deal or fair amount of support for terrorism

## Commentary...

### The "Mysterious Motive" Cover-Up on the Boston Attack Begins

By Barry Rubin

Now that the two (main at least) terrorists from the Boston Marathon attack have been killed or captured we enter a new phase, the phase in which the dominant Politically Correct (but Factually Incorrect) forces try to explain away the attack.

Can this be done? Will they really try? Well, yes. True, as one of my correspondents remarked it is much easier to obfuscate far distant Benghazi than the total shutdown and horror in the middle of a major American city. Yet the spin-masters are already at work.

The first step must be, in part, a stalling technique but it sets the pattern for what is to come. As, in the words of a Reuters story, the "Boston Marathon bombing investigation turns to motive," the motive must be obfuscated.

The Reuters piece is a good start. The article spends seven paragraphs discussing the parents' claim that the two brothers were framed. This suggests that the mass media and politicians will not shrink from suggesting—perhaps I should say, gives fair hearing—to bizarre conspiracy theories and doubts. People shouldn't believe these completely, is the theme, but you just can't be too sure that two young Muslims would have any reason to harm Americans.

There are now witnesses who heard the two terrorists' mother claiming that September 11 was a U.S. plot to make people hate Muslims. That's where playing with that kind of fire leads.

In the article, the word "Islam" is not mentioned, except to say that they once lived in one predominantly Muslim country and another place they lived, Dagestan, is "a southern Russian province that lies at the heart of a violent Islamist insurgency." Here, we have another technique, minimize Islam as a factor and turn it into background noise.

Obviously, this will not apply completely both because the elephant in the room is too big and there is still some journalistic integrity in places. Both the Washington Post and Mother Jones took a lead in exposing the You-Tube likes of one of the terrorists which showed a propensity for al-Qaida views to say the least.

There are a lot of other quivers, however, in the arsenal of denial.

On "Face the Nation" Massachusetts Governor Deval Patrick said that he had no idea why the Tsarnaev brothers would target "innocent men, women and children in the way that these two fellows did." The answer, of course, is that these people were not regarded as innocent at all but as soldiers in the alleged Christian-Jewish war on Islam, precisely the same thinking that has been produced by Islamists for decades. Might September 11, 2001, be a clue here?

Of course, for Patrick to say that at this point in the investigation is understandable on one level, a refusal by a government official to remark on an ongoing investigation and a relief from "the police are stupid" or "Trayvon looks like the son I didn't have" remarks by someone else. Yet what is this claim is sustained week after week until the heat is off?

NBC News has just reported that Tamerlan Tsarnaev had visited an Islamist radical six times in a mosque in Dagestan. The Caucasian/Chechen angle, however, does offer some hope for obfuscation. A lot of media time can be spent talking about that conflict. Of course, if the young men were acting as Chechens they would have attacked a Russian and not an American target. The United States has not, even by the usual stretch of radical Islamist imagination, had anything to do with the conflict in Chechnya.

*This week's issue is dedicated  
in commemoration of  
the fourth yarzeit for  
שרה בלמה בת אפרים פישל ז"ל  
Sylvia Zeifman z"l*

among them. Why is the number of U.S.-born Muslims who believe this so much higher? Because they tend to be younger people who are more in contact with social media and people like the two young Boston bombers.

What about the Boston terrorists' mosque and other contacts in the Muslim community? Why didn't they get an anti-extremist indoctrination there, an explanation of what Islam is all about? They attended a Muslim Brotherhood sponsored mosque (but that won't be said) and the Boston Muslim religious leadership is full of extremists (the evidence of which has long been available). The mosque even received a subsidy from Boston even as it hosted anti-American speakers who made the precise arguments used to rationalize terrorism.

We won't be hearing much about these issues though. Well, except for two aspects: the story is now circulating that one of the brothers was thrown out of his mosque for being too radical. Then, there are all the denunciations of the terror attack by Islamist front groups. The New York Times article on motive cited these statements three times. I believe that groups like CAIR do not support the Boston attack or al-Qaida. But they support many other terrorist attacks and they support the ideology and set of beliefs on which the Boston attack is based. That's why so many associated with CAIR, even on a senior level, have become involved in anti-American terrorism.

Having followed this issue for many years, I have never heard of a single anti-radicalization program conducted by any mosque or "mainstream" Islamic group. Real moderates are isolated, vilified, denied media attention, and even forced out of local mosques. In a 2011 Pew poll, fully half of American Muslims say their leaders aren't doing enough to fight extremism. That last point can safely be used as a certified non-"Islamophobic" argument about where much of the problem lies. But it won't be.

And of course there is the troubled youth angle to be played to the fullest. Yes, the tribulations of young adulthood and adolescence are factors. But only inasmuch as it makes them vulnerable to systematic indoctrination. In other words, their specific psychology and even personal experiences are not the motive any more than the childhood of a professional hit-man for the Mafia is.

It is also possible to fall back on the idea that the motive is impossible or irrelevant. There's just too much stuff out there, dude. Or in the words of Brian Levin, director of the center for the study of hate and extremism at California State University, "The individual, particular motivations of the perpetrators have little significance since there are multiple grievances out there and, in the Islamic world, there is free-floating angst." This was too much for even Bill Maher.

Another angle will be the growing story of governmental incompetence in using intelligence to stop terrorists. In part, this is unfair since there have also been many successes. A more important issue is why government officials, politicians, army officers, academics, and journalists fear to point out the truth. Look at the Nidal Hassan/Fort Hood case. Doing so is bad for their careers and reputation, as well as being sometimes counter to their ideology.

Then there is the partisan argument, as made most memorably by a journalist who openly hoped the terrorists would be white right-wingers. There is an unnoticed dimension here. If the attack is seen as a political defeat it cannot be a learning experience. The question isn't, Does this attack tell us something important about the real world, but: How can we explain it away so we don't suffer losses in the effort to fundamentally transform America into a just, non-racist society?

And so it can be claimed that, in a sense, white right-wingers, or at least the kind of policies they would endorse, did cause the Boston attack. America was mean to these kids; it is aggressive in other countries, counter-terrorist protection was reduced by budget cuts.

In other words, lying, concealing, and misleading become defined as virtuous. As Trudeau said, talking honestly about revolutionary Islamism would be to inspire more racism and terrorism.

Finally, there is a "full admission" fallback argument on which U.S. foreign policy is based. Sure it was those evil SOB's at al-Qaida. That's why other Islamists are relatively good. That's why we have to promote them into power since only they can counter the "bad" Islamists. That's why Islamist governments in Egypt, the Gaza Strip, Lebanon, Syria, Tunisia, and Turkey are good for you.

Indeed, Secretary of State John Kerry in Turkey compared Americans' feelings about the Boston attack to Turkish feelings about the killing of jihadis engaged in supporting a terrorist group (Hamas) who attacked Israeli soldiers during the Gaza flotilla incident. This should not be seen merely as a clumsy statement but as dangerous and revealing stupidity.

It is dangerous because it tells Muslims that they are equally the victims of "our" terrorism; and it is revealing because the context shows the equation of all violence, no matter what the cause, that reinforces such

thinking. A U.S. attack on terrorists in Yemen, Afghanistan, or elsewhere then becomes anti-Muslim violence that justifies the next terror attack in an American city.

Former NBC anchorman Tom Brokaw explained that American drones were killing innocent people and this led to rage against the "presumptuousness of the United States."

In an honest discussion it must be considered what U.S. policy factors lead to terrorism. But now there is the transfer to America of the old "cycle of violence" argument about the Middle East. Terrorists murder Israeli civilians or fire rockets at Israel; Israel defends itself and the two events are treated as indistinguishable.

Defending yourself offends people.

The proper response is to denounce the terrorists, the ideology of terrorism, and the right of focused self-defense, which means doing everything possible to retaliate against those responsible and not citizens of another country chosen at random.

The American secretary of state, a leading Canadian politician, journalists, and others are thus rationalizing in advance more such attacks. They will get their "wish" and then explain away the next event as more proof for their worldview. (PJMedia Apr 22)

---

**The Coming Canard: 'Constructive Unilateralism'** By Martin Sherman

*Fanaticism consists in redoubling your effort when you have forgotten your aim.* – George Santayana

I realize some might find the tone of this article overly acerbic – even abrasive. But I make little apology for this. I was compelled to write it by a profound sense of exasperation.

It articulates a feeling of deep despair, and reflects a sentiment of disbelief, disillusionment and disappointment at the conduct of prominent public figures, which is difficult to characterize, without recourse to epithets such as "moronic" and "myopic" – while less charitable souls might venture the use of "maniacal" or "malevolent."

It is becoming increasingly difficult to avoid recognition of the fact that any prospect of a negotiated two-state-solution (TSS) is receding into oblivion.

However, as reluctant realization of the increasingly undeniable and inevitable failure of their favored, but fundamentally flawed, formula begins to dawn on even the most hitherto-enthusiastic two-staters, their responses wax evermore hysterical, harebrained and hallucinatory.

Unchastened by the misery and mayhem wrought by attempts to promote TSS-initiatives, desperate advocates of political appeasement and territorial retreat, which comprise the doctrinal underpinnings of such initiatives, are energetically promoting their latest – and loopiest – "initiative."

True, it seems that the bitter realization has set in that there is no Palestinian negotiating partner with the desire and/or the ability to deliver a durable peace accord.

As prominent and persistent two-stater Ami Ayalon (former commander of the navy and the Shin Bet) conceded in an interview with Charlie Rose (August 8, 2012): "We have to accept [something which] if you had asked me two years ago I would not [have] accepted... there is no Palestinian partner..."

Yet, despite the acknowledged disproof of the major tenet buttressing their political thesis, obsessive two-staters have begun to conjure up a notion – one that could have come straight from the make-believe world of Lewis Carroll's Alice in Wonderland. This is the concept of "Peace without partners." No kidding. You can almost hear Alice's sigh of exasperation: "It would be so nice if something would make sense for a change."

But wait, things get curiously and curiously.

One of the first symptoms of this disturbing intellectual malaise appeared in the international media a year ago, in the form of a New York Times opinion piece titled – yes, you guessed it – "Peace without partners."

Written by a trio of well-known Israelis – Ayalon, Orni Petruschka, a successful hi-tech entrepreneur) and Gilead Sher (formerly prime minister Ehud Barak's chief of staff) – and almost immediately endorsed by Tom Friedman (itself a reason for concern), the article plumbed, new depths of absurdity.

Sound excessively harsh? Judge for yourself.

The authors (all founders of an organization known as Blue and White Future (B&WF), whose stated objectives include endeavoring to "resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict on the basis of a 'two states for two peoples' solution"), acknowledge: "We recognize that a comprehensive peace agreement is unattainable right now... It now seems highly unlikely

that the two sides will return to negotiations...”

Yet, undaunted by recalcitrant realities, the intrepid trio nevertheless urges: “Israel can and must take constructive [unilateral] steps to advance the reality of two states based on the 1967 borders...regardless of whether Palestinian leaders have agreed to accept it.”

In response, I wrote a column, titled “Stupidity on steroids” (May 24, 2012), remarking: “...the very oxymoronic nature of the title, “Peace without Partners,” testifies to the nonsensical nature of its content, which not only resurrects the failed formula of unilateral retreat but suggests a new one of “unilateral peace,” whatever that might mean...”

As we shall soon see, the notion of unilateralism, misleadingly designated “constructive,” comprises a radical departure from – and from Israel’s point of view, degradation of – the rationale underpinning the familiar formula of “land-for-peace.”

In the past, when they still clung to the illusion that “there was someone to talk to,” the logic driving the TSS paradigm was that in exchange for transferring territory to Palestinians, Israel would receive some sort of negotiated quid pro quo from the Palestinians in the form of a mutual peace – or at least, non-belligerency – accord.

This principle has now been entirely jettisoned.

The concept being seriously proposed and aggressively promoted is no longer one of “land-for-peace” but in effect “land-for-nothing” – naught, nada, zilch, zero...

In the light of the consequences of previous experience with unilateral initiatives, it is difficult to overstate the gravity of this initiative, were it to gather sufficient momentum to impact Israeli policy-makers.

In fairness to its endorsers, they do attempt to argue that these initiatives are qualitatively different from those undertaken in the past. However, it requires little analytical ability to demonstrate that, if anything, this makes the proposal even more preposterous and perilous.

It is essential to expose just how reckless and ridiculous it is, before any such regrettable outcomes materialize – especially in view of the energetic efforts being made of late to mobilize support for it.

This notion of “constructive unilateralism” is being bandied about with increasing frequency in the mainstream press both in Israel and abroad. In recent months it has been the topic of discussion in both the electronic and printed media – in radio and TV interviews, in opinion columns and in letters to the editor, including in the Los Angeles Times, Foreign Policy and The Washington Post to name but a few.

As will soon become clear, the cross-organizational affiliation of many of the authors/interviewees is both intriguing and significant.

The elements of this proposed “constructive unilateralism” appear repeatedly in several of the previously mentioned media items, but arguably the most concise articulation thereof is to be found in a Foreign Policy article (March 18), headlined “Unilateral Peace: It’s time for Israel to move toward a two-state solution, alone if necessary,” authored by Maj.- Gen. (res.) Amos Yadlin and Gilead Sher.

Yadlin was credited as former chief of Israeli Military Intelligence and director of Israel’s Institute for National Security Studies, and Sher as co-chairman of B&WF, a senior research fellow at the INSS.

In the article, Yadlin and Sher set out the elements comprising “constructive unilateralism”: “We suggest a new series of unilateral steps towards disengagement that have a better chance of succeeding [than the 2005 Gaza disengagement].”

“First, Israel should renounce its sovereignty claims over areas east of the security fence... Second, it should end all settlement construction east of the fence. And third, Israel should enact a voluntary settlement evacuation and compensation law.”

They continue: “Israel should coordinate these moves – particularly those related to security – with the United States, the international community and the PA...The Jordan Valley and possibly other strategic locations should provisionally remain in Israeli hands to prevent the smuggling of weapons... and assure Israel’s security,” leaving the reader to puzzle over what the meaning of “coordinated unilateralism” is and what to do if others decline such “coordination.”

On this issue Sher, in an earlier op-ed, “Time has come for 2 states,” (January 29) is a little more assertive, if no less fanciful: “The IDF will remain in the territory until the security responsibility will be handed over to an element that is acceptable to us (we learned this lesson in the aftermath of the Gaza disengagement of 2005).” This position which closely parallels views set out in the previously cited Ayalon et al. New York Times piece: “...the Israeli Army would remain in the West Bank until the conflict was officially resolved with a final-status agreement.”

So there you have it – the elements of the new TSS-paradigm driven by “constructive unilateralism”:

- A voluntary forgoing of Israeli claims to sovereignty over virtually all of Judea and Samaria while maintaining the deployment of the IDF – thus

instantly transforming “disputed” territories into unequivocally “occupied” ones.

- An initiative to remove all Jewish presence east of the security barrier, either by financial inducement, economic deprivation or eventual physical abandonment.

Clearly, under these conditions any hope that “the conflict [will] be officially resolved with a final-status agreement” is detached from reality. For why should the Palestinians offer any quid pro quo to negotiate the withdrawal of the IDF when Israel has a priori conceded sovereignty to them and ceased all construction of the settlements, condemning them to inevitable decay and disintegration? Indeed, what would be the justification for any further IDF deployment in the sovereign territory of others – especially as that deployment itself is likely to be cited as the major grievance precipitating the belligerency between the sides? Little imagination is required to comprehend the catastrophic consequences should such a policy fail in inducing/coercing the Jewish residents to evacuate. For by voluntarily voiding its claims to any affinity with the land, Israel will have deemed itself indelibly an “occupier” and all settlements “illegal,” since it would have no power to legalize their existence.

But even if it were to succeed, the prospects are scarcely more palatable. It is difficult to know how to characterize the political-legal structure that would prevail in an area whose only residents are non-Israelis and over which Israel makes no sovereign claims, yet maintains the deployment of its military – unless you think of pre-2000 South Lebanon. And we all know how that ended – in ignominious unilateral flight of the IDF.

Significantly, Yadlin and Sher seem to view this favorably, claiming: “The decision to withdraw... was correct...unilateral action legitimized Israel’s border in the north...”

Could this reflect their real intentions? And if not, how do they propose preventing repetition of such undignified and unreciprocated “unilateral action to legitimize Israel’s eastern border” – and the subsequent stockpiling of formidable armaments on the fringes of Greater Tel Aviv.

Formally, this concept of “constructive unilateralism” is being promoted by the previously mentioned B&WF, which describes itself as “a non-partisan political movement...funded by private donors in Israel, the United States and elsewhere.”

However, even a cursory glance at the identities of the individuals involved, the vehicles of publication and the cross-organizational affiliations will reveal an almost seamless symbiosis between B&WF and the INSS, chaired and largely funded by Australian billionaire philanthropist Frank Lowy.

Thus although the two are organizationally separate, there is a striking overlap between the figures who endorse the “constructive unilateralism” idea and their attributed affiliation with the INSS – from the director of the institute, through prominent senior research associates to junior interns. Indeed, the concept has been touted in the INSS’s quarterly publication Strategic Assessment and a plausible case could be made for the claim that the institute provides the intellectual bona fides for B&WF’s public activism.

It would take a volume to enumerate/expose the gamut of logical flaws, glaring non sequiturs and dangerous defects that riddle the intellectual edifice and operational rationale of “constructive unilateralism,” but the limits of space dictate that I desist.

However, one can only wonder whether the devoted Zionist billionaire Lowy is aware that the institute that he funds is vigorously promoting a policy which, rather than preclude an apartheid-like reality, would create a South Lebanon-like one on the fringes of Greater Tel Aviv.

True, it is a policy proposal with an impressive array of supporters, including the former heads of the Shin Bet and Military Intelligence. But with all the esteem I (genuinely) have for their achievements, past seniority is no guarantee of current infallibility.

That said, the proposal does contain elements that Israel should adopt.

As I have urged in numerous columns, Israel should embark on unilateral initiatives – not those geared to relinquishing territory but to retain it. It should embark on a large-scale and vigorous program of evacuation- compensation – not for Israeli Jews, but for Palestinian Arabs.

Perhaps the generous billionaire might consider alternative causes to support. After all, if there is no moral defect in funding the voluntary evacuation of Jews from their homes in Judea-Samaria to facilitate the establishment of what, in all likelihood, would become a failed mini-micro-state and a base for radical Islamist terror, what possible moral objection could there be to funding the voluntary evacuation of Arabs from their homes to prevent the establishment of such a base for Islamic terror? (Jerusalem Post Apr 19)

## **Kerry's Appalling Analogy** By Ruthie Blum

On Sunday, when U.S. Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel arrived in Israel to seal an arms deal and reiterate Obama administration platitudes about not allowing Iran to acquire nuclear weapons, U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry was in Ankara, trying to shift reconciliation between Turkey and Israel into high gear.

Israel is ready and willing. Not only did Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu issue an apology to Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan last month, but he sent a delegation to Turkey on Monday to iron out details of the compensation package that Israel will provide for the families of the activists killed by Israeli soldiers during the 2010 "Free Gaza Flotilla" raid.

It is the Turkish officials who are being intransigent, in spite of the fact (or perhaps because of it) that not a single person would have died on the Mavi Marmara ship had Turkish and other activists not brutally attacked Israeli soldiers who had been dispatched to prevent the flotilla from violating the naval blockade on Gaza.

Neither the Turkish authorities nor much of the Turkish public sees it that way. Erdogan is an Islamist through and through, which is why he is planning a trip to Gaza in the near future to pat his Hamas buddies on the back.

This is problematic for Kerry, who doesn't want it to be so obvious that this American "ally" is growing closer by the minute to a terrorist organization. And it is a source of dismay for Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas, who is playing two hands simultaneously: portraying himself as the only legitimate leader of the Palestinian people, and trying to bury the hatchet with Hamas.

Abbas may wear a suit and tie when he's not on a mat at the mosque, but the only reason he opposes Hamas is because it constitutes a political threat to his rule. In other respects, his Fatah organization and Hamas are of one mind when it comes to the ultimate goal of eliminating Israel. Their disagreement is on timing and method, much like the disagreement between the United States and Israel on how to deal with Iran.

Because Kerry has made it his mission to create a Palestinian state by the end of 2014, he is frantic about getting Turkey on board. Abbas, too, is eyeing Turkey these days. Indeed, he also went to Ankara this week, where he had a private meeting with Kerry, before asking Erdogan to help him join his Fatah forces with Hamas.

This is the same Hamas that runs Gaza, the terrorist enclave that celebrated last week's bombings in Boston by cheering, dancing in the streets and handing out cake and candy to passersby. It was like 9/11 all over again, and the residents of Gaza were rejoicing.

This did not prevent Kerry, who enjoyed a "prolonged and constructive" discussion with Turkish Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoglu on the renewal of ties with Israel, to compare the events of the Mavi Marmara to the Boston bombings.

"I know it's an emotional issue with some people," he empathized. "I particularly say to the families of people who were lost in the incident that we understand these tragedies completely and we sympathize with them ... I have just been through the week of Boston and I have deep feelings for what happens when you have violence and something happens and you lose people that are near and dear to you. It affects a community, it affects a country. We're very sensitive to that."

This false and vile analogy should have caused the Israeli delegation, led by National Security Adviser Yaakov Amidror, to cancel Monday's trip. But, of course, with Hagel in Jerusalem to sell Israel crucial military equipment for a potential strike on Iran's nuclear facilities, and faced with the need for Turkish airspace in the event of such a strike, off they went to negotiate the multi-millions of dollars that Israel will be forced to pay to the perpetrators of the flotilla carnage.

Someone else who won't be canceling a scheduled trip is Erdogan. He is planning to go to Gaza in May to commemorate the third anniversary of the Mavi Marmara incident, which will involve an anti-Israel hate-fest.

This is why Kerry requested that he postpone his visit, for fear that it might "jeopardize" the ability to "jumpstart the peace process" between Israel and the Palestinians.

And speaking of the Palestinians, Abbas, too, asked Erdogan not to go to Gaza until Fatah and Hamas settle their differences.

Given Kerry's kowtowing, it is no wonder that Erdogan has no intention of honoring his request. Islamists view bowing down as a sign of weakness, and America keeps showing them that they are right to hold this view.

While Washington continues to assert that it still does not know for certain what "motivated" the two brothers from Chechnya to attempt mass murder at the Boston Marathon, and American pundits argue over whether the remaining brother's constitutional rights should be upheld, radical Muslims everywhere are hailing the success of jihad against the West.

Shame on Kerry. (Israel Hayom Apr 23)

## **An IDF Soldier Lost an Eye; Time to Untie IDF's Hands**

By Josh Hasten

Driving into Jerusalem this morning, I saw a familiar face just after passing the security checkpoint in Gush Etzion (yes for those who don't realize it, Jews who live in Judea and Samaria also have to go through security before entering major cities. "Checkpoints" are not just for Arabs).

I stopped the car after realizing it was my old friend and work colleague who was trying to get a ride to work in Jerusalem, as he has been doing his miluim (reserve army service) in the Gush for the past week, and was given two days off.

In one hand he was schlepping his army-green colored duffel bag while over his other shoulder was his IDF-issued M-16. Since he wasn't on duty he was in his "civilian" work-clothes.

We got caught up on life when the subject turned to what had been keeping him busy while in the army for a week. More than anything his unit has been dealing with DAILY rock attacks being carried out by Arab youth and teenagers directed at the soldiers near the Northern entrance to Efrat from the nearby village of Artas.

According to the soldier (whose identity I'm keeping private), from dawn till dusk Arabs from the nearby Beit-Lechem (Bethlehem) neighborhood of Deheishe (referred to by some as a refugee camp, but that's a posting within itself) have infiltrated the village with the goal of throwing rocks and firebombs at Israeli motorists trying to enter Efrat.

As we know, from recent tragedies, and there are many examples, rocks are murder weapons - finally acknowledged as such in the recent ruling against the terrorists who murdered Asher and baby Yonatan Palmer HY'D.

I'll pause here to remind you that baby Adele (Adele Chaya Bat Adva) a three-year-old girl wounded in such an attack remains in critical condition and needs your prayers for a speedy recovery.

Back to the subject at hand - thanks to the continuous presence of the IDF soldiers, on one hand the road has become relatively safe since when soldiers see the rock throwers approaching, they intervene, but on the other it's the soldiers themselves who are bearing the brunt of the attacks.

The most frustrating aspect in this deadly game of cat and mouse for the soldiers is that THEIR HANDS ARE TIED. While they don't lack the motivation to put an end to the rock throwing, their orders only allow them to fire rounds of tear gas at the gathering mobs, as they are not allowed to use live fire.

According to my friend the only time they are allowed to use their weapons is when they feel their life is in immediate danger if an approaching Arab has an already lit firebomb (Molotov cocktail) in-hand ready to throw.

If not all of those conditions are met - and these are decisions the soldiers are forced to make in a split second, then only tear- gas rounds may be fired to disperse the stone throwers.

In other words, if the Arab is using a rock - teargas. If the firebomb is not yet lit - teargas. If the firebomb has already been thrown - teargas. Lately, the Arabs have also been throwing stun grenades, which release shrapnel, and the protocol according to my friend has not officially been established in terms of what is a "legitimate response," in that case.

The most blood-boiling fact my friend told me this morning, which I did not see ANYWHERE in the press, possibly because they did not get the information, is that just a few weeks ago, a soldier stationed in this very village LOST AN EYE, when suffering a direct hit by a rock.

For the rest of his life he will only have the use of one eye, while his attacker's crime as we've seen time and time again is justified or downplayed by many members of the mainstream media - as in "these are only pebbles," or "rocks are a non-violent means of protest," or in one of the most incitement-laced columns I've ever read - by Ha'aretz reporter Amira Hass - rock throwing is the "birthright" of the "Palestinian" children.

I applaud Nadia Matar and the Women in Green organization and dozens of residents from Gush Etzion for holding an event at the northern entrance of Efrat 10 days ago and raising awareness on this issue.

But after learning about the IDF soldier who lost an eye, and the fact that the rock throwing takes place literally almost every day (the Arabs stayed home yesterday because of the rain, giving the soldiers a much needed reprieve) it's obvious that the situation is worse than we know.

It's time for our elected officials - those in charge of issuing the orders to the IDF to untie their hands so that they can defend themselves, and successfully put an end to the rock attacks emanating from Artas and all other popular points of attack throughout Judea and Samaria.

Please help raise awareness, and INSIST from your elected members of Knesset that the rock attacks must stop once and for all. (Israel National News Apr 22)