Such a stance is just about equivalent to saying it is a pity US counterterrorism measures are working, because if more September 11-type attacks were to succeed, Americans would be nicer to Muslims.

UN's contribution to peacemaking), a rapprochement between the PA, which rules the West Bank, and Hamas, which rules the Gaza Strip; and the PA's wish to compete with Hamas in attacking Israel and trying to kill Israelis.

Following the logic of the Washington Post we should hope lots of Isarels are killed by terrorists as a way to pressure those obdurate Israelis to make peace.

The Washington Post article basically follows the same Palestinian political line that has prevailed since the 1960s: forget about a negotiated compromise, Israel must be defeated, and Isarels made to suffer. The main goal is to get Israelis to give up altogether and abandon their state; the short-term goal is to get Israelis to accept a

Israelis extinction.

A hostile Turkey whose rulers support Hamas and Hezbollah.

A Syria where radical Islamists seem poised to gain power. They cannot possibly be more anti-Israel than the current regime, but they are willing to make the anti-Israel war a higher priority for direct action.

So this is an era where Israel clearly needs to defend itself. Compare this to the early 1990s. Saddam Hussein had been defeated in the 1991 war; the radical Arabs' main ally, the USSR, had fallen; America was the sole superpower; the PLO was so weak and depressed that it seemed conceivable it might be pushed into peace because it had no other alternative (in contrast to the contemporary Palestinian Authority which just got recognition as a state and is feeling very confident); and other factors. That was a moment when Israel could take risks, and did so with the Oslo agreements. And yet, of course, we know — it

Or that if the British air force had only not defeated the Luftwaffe, perhaps prime minister Winston Churchill wouldn't have been so insulated from the need to make peace with the Axis.

What's most infuriating about all of this is that Israel has tried so hard to make peace — including risks and concessions — but that the very attacks referred to in the Washington Post article were made possible only because Israel withdrew from the Gaza Strip in an attempt to promote peace!

Yet the essential insanity of the kind of thinking epitomized by this article is shielded when it comes to Israel, by the media's bias and sense that it can get away with any nonsense when it comes to discrediting Israel.

MEANWHILE, THERE is some concern among Israel's intelligence officials with regard to a possible new intifada in the West Bank. This will be due to new confidence created by the UN's decision to make Palestine a non-member state (the Palestinian state unconditionally so it can get on with the task of finishing that job.

BEFORE AROUND 1980, the above analysis would have been considered normative in Israel. Between the 1980s and 2000, when there was rising hope of a compromise peace with the PLO and its child, the PA, it would have been considered a right-wing view. Since 2000, however, that assessment — based on evidence and experience — has again become that of the overwhelming majority almost all of the political spectrum.

Internationally, the refusal to face the fact that the Palestinian side is responsible for the failure of peace leads to such bizarre theories and blinds people to the actual situation.
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