

Yet Another Year of the Terrorists

January 5, 2003

By Robbie Friedmann

2002 went out with a bang. Sort of. With the exception of the - now "routine" - Palestinian terrorism, the French airport worker who was found with weapons ("[Paris Airport Worker Held After Weapons Seizure](#)," John Tagliabue, The New York Times, December 30, 2002) and the horrible fireworks incident in Mexico ("[Mexico fireworks mishap kills at least 28](#)," USA Today, 1/1/2003) the much expected year-end mega-terror event has given way to a different kind of terror by charlatans who made claims about a successful birth of a cloned human being ("Getting a Grip: Gangs of the world make barbarism look real Enough," Daniel Henninger, Wall Street Journal, January 3, 2003):

"Indeed our short tour through 2002's blurred world of fact and the fantastic will end shortly, but a departing point needs to be made. Media and marketing, which saturate our lives and hammer our brains, do make it harder at times to hold onto normal distinctions." Typically a slow news period, end-of-the-year reports focus on light entertainment. Yet what started as a curious almost gossipy anecdote quickly mushroomed into statements from the White House and even the Vatican. Now the "company" that claimed a human clone is backing off from furnishing any evidence and yet it managed to produce two winners and a loser: the company/cult got free publicity, the media got the "story," and the public was seriously shortchanged and terrorized yet again.

The cult that is behind the human cloning announcement is reported to have a record of perpetrating hoaxes, frauds, and blood libels in the name of creating a "new world order." On its web site (named "Subversion.com") it has a "story" on the "Jenin Massacre" where it blatantly blames Jews (where are those little green aliens when you need them?) for committing a holocaust: "Concentration camps patrolled by Jews! Who would have believed it? And with ovens to cremate bodies, which we are not even sure are dead!" They have clearly managed to get more than their share of 15 minutes of fame. To those concerned about the ethics of cloning a new concern has been added with the surfacing of yet another source of virulent antisemitism. This cult is far more dangerous than merely dealing with science fiction and human alchemy because its rhetoric leads to dehumanization and violence not to the (artificial) creation of life. This French-based Montreal-housed cult continues to promote and nurture the Euro-antisemitic tradition.

In an atmosphere where this antisemitism fuels Arab violence the cult is not doing civilization any favors (unless it will decide to go out of business). Currently antisemitism and anti-western (particularly anti-American) sentiments run high in the Arab/Muslim world. One indication (for those who need proof) is the reaction in the Arab/Muslim world to the U.S. Middle East Partnership Initiative aimed at democratizing it. In a three part series [MEMRI](#) has reviewed the reaction and found it overwhelmingly negative. The reaction centered on themes suggesting that the initiative "lacks credibility," that the sum allocated for the initiative is a 'joke,' and that democratic reform must come from within not from outside ("Arab Media Reactions to The U.S.

- Middle East Partnership Initiative, Part I: Opponents' Views," MEMRI, Inquiry and Analysis - Reform in the Arab and Muslim World, December 31, 2002, No.115).

Obviously, the Arab/Muslim world is not interested in any help from its friends but it is correct in maintaining that such change has to come from within. Of course, they do not take the initiative to achieve exactly that and do not comprehend that such passivity actually means they have to take responsibility - but they do not - for their own predicament.

The second piece in the series focuses on articles that attempt to fill that exact gap ("Arab Media Reactions to The U.S.-Middle East Partnership Initiative Part II: In Support of the Initiative," MEMRI, Inquiry and Analysis - Reform in the Arab and Muslim World, January 1, 2003, No.116). Here a few articles suggest that "The Powell Plan Guarantees Prosperity and Progress'; 'It is Unfortunate that the Arabs Had No Part in Encouraging It,' 'It Is Our Obligation to Bear Responsibility for Reform,' and 'For Once, Let's Try the American Goods.' However, the third piece demonstrated that the pendulum is still swinging at the wrong end ("Arab Media Reactions to The U.S.-Middle East Partnership Initiative Part III: It's a Zionist/American Plot," MEMRI, Inquiry and Analysis, Reform in the Arab and Muslim World, January 3, 2003, No. 117).

The articles in this piece feature again the conspiratorial paranoid nature of Arab reaction: "The Zionist Lobby Is Behind Powell's Plan," "The Initiative is Aimed at Destroying Arab Society and Replacing It with a Democracy in the Service of American Interests," "American Society Is No Role Model," "What Motivates the Americans is their Desire to Rule the World - About Which they are Ignorant," and "It is the Americans Who Need to Change their Curricula."

Despite persistent denials of being antisemitic or anti-American, Egyptians - under tremendous pressure to refrain from such behavior - are trying to appear to mollify the West. And they have done it in a brilliant yet Machiavellian fashion. The top advisor to the Egyptian president has written against the use of Nazi phraseology that denigrates the Jews ("Mubarak political advisor to Arab writers: stop using Nazi myths against Jews," the Associated Press, The Jerusalem Post, Dec. 30, 2002).

Indeed, the Osama Al-Baz articles have already elicited the reaction they intended to have. An impulsive and naive group of Israeli "intellectuals" and the traditional host of too-eager and shamelessly self-aggrandizing politicians already is sending a letter blessing, thanking, and bowing to the advisor's "grace and wisdom" ("Israeli writers voice appreciation of Egyptian administrator's stand against Anti-Semitism," The Jerusalem Post Internet Staff, Jan. 4, 2003). These marginal politicians are already in Cairo today meeting with the advisor and other Egyptian officials. In short, this hot-aired combination of politicians and intellectuals provide him with a (kosher) stamp of approval by embracing his position so uncritically.

The problem with this premature and thoughtless legitimization is that the Egyptian political advisor has used a 1-2 punch: He first plays the "good cop" by stating that the "bad cop" was hitting "too hard" and that he really "needs to stop" but the "good cop" has not changed the basic premise of what the antisemitic campaign has been based on - he just shifted the formulation and changed the tone. A closer examination of his articles reveals that he still makes the same charges but in a much more sublime fashion ("[Egypt's Response to Accusations of Arab Media](#)

[Antisemitism: In a Series of Articles Published in Al-Ahram, Mubarak's Political Advisor Refutes Antisemitic Myths, Blames Antisemitism on Europe, Explains that Zionism is the Root of the Arab-Jewish Conflict, and Offers Arabs and Israel Ways to Improve Their Relationship,](#) MEMRI, Special Dispatch Series - No. 454, January 03, 2003 No.454).

Al-Baz sheds any responsibility for antisemitism by claiming that it originated in Europe and that it is "foreign to the Arab world." While he refutes some of the most common antisemitic myths and dismisses some common Arab claims about antisemitism, he tells the readers that "Arabs cannot possibly be antisemitic because they themselves are Semites and that the term "antisemitism" refers to Jews only. But the point is that the term antisemitism was developed to describe exactly that phenomenon and by saying that Arabs are Semites as well it does not absolve them from being anti-Jewish and hence antisemitic. He then blames Zionism (i.e., Israel; and the Jews) for the Middle East conflict (the Arabs of course, had "nothing to do" with it...). He then makes some observations, the worst being that because several Jews are highly critical of Israel that provides legitimacy for others to do so as well. The list he cites as critics is not very credible even if it is most vocal in serving as useful idiots. Al-Baz ends by "offering practical advice" to Israel. A careful reading points out the dangers in his not so sweet rhetoric:

First, he demands Israel redefine itself from "a democratic Jewish state to a state for all its citizens." Given that Egypt is not exactly a beacon of democracy, the source for such advice is dubious at best. Yet he harbors the dismantling of Israel's mission and *raison-d'etre* as a Jewish state (which has been an Arab objective for years). Second, he demands that "Israel stop blaming Arabs for wanting to push it to the sea" (read: destroy it). He must have purposefully ignored the rhetoric to that effect flowing from Iraq, Iran, Egypt itself, the terrorist groups, Syria, and Saudi Arabia (but why let facts stand in the way of his theory?). Third, he wants Israel "to cease its settlement policy" (why not demand that Syria get out of Lebanon?). Fourth, "Israel must stop attacking Arabs/Muslims" (read: defend itself; of course, Arabs are not forbidden to attack Jews). Fifth, "Israel must stop undermining inter-Arab relations by setting Arab countries against each other" (doesn't this imply, perhaps that the Arabs may have some problems of their own?). Sixth, "Israelis and Zionists in general should cease accusing anyone who criticizes Israel of being anti-Semitic" (and what are Israelis and Jews to do with the rampant, government produced, blood libels? Define it as an expression of true love?). Seventh, "Israelis must acknowledge that Arabs are right to want to end Israeli occupation of their land, a demand backed by the provisions of international resolutions and humanitarian law" (read: Arabs have a "legitimate claim" over Israel except that he does not say how much of Israel - he lets others specify that it is ALL of it). Eighth, "It should be a sobering thought to Israelis and Jews abroad that Israel's inhuman practices against the Palestinians have unleashed a new tide of antisemitism in many European countries" (read: Al-Baz is "against" anti-Semitism on one hand but "understands" and justifies it on the other; in the process he also justifies Palestinian terrorism). Ninth, "Israel must negotiate 'seriously' with the Palestinians and with Syria and withdraw from Lebanon" (read: "serious" negotiations mean to "give it all up"). Tenth, "Israel should issue an official declaration..., stating that Israel has no expansionist designs on Arab territories" (sure, Cairo, Damascus, Riyadh, and Baghdad are in "serious danger" from Israel....one could think that the Arabs have buried any desire to eliminate Israel). Eleventh, "Israelis should dismiss from government those officials who incite racial hatred against Arabs" (the Sheikh of Al Azhar University is still in office). Twelfth, "...It will refrain from demanding military superiority over all the Arabs" (read: how do

we make Israel weaker so it could finally be the loser in a war) Thirteenth, "Israel should ...enter into negotiations towards eliminating its nuclear arsenal in tandem with the elimination of other weapons of mass destruction in the region" (read: make sure Israel gives up its deterrent power).

And what are the Arabs supposed to do as their part in this? Lower the volume of the antisemitic vitriol (that is considered a concession?). But none of the demands placed on Israel are placed on the Arabs. No expectation for democracy, no reciprocity in the arms race, no expectation that their officials be fired for racist rhetoric, no equal demands for the elimination of nuclear arsenal say from Iraq and Pakistan. In short, the Israeli fools have speedily rushed in but the "calming" letter by Egypt's presidential top political advisor is far from comforting and far from reassuring that anything has changed for the better. In fact his explicit (and implicit) positions are dangerous to the very existence of Israel. He has only used more articulate and less vile statements to craft the same position as the hooligans, terrorists, and extreme radicals and Arab governments have been espousing for decades. He just said it with his suit and tie on.

Perhaps a better way of understanding the vileness of the Arab antisemitic propaganda (which Al-Baz openly opposes but tacitly approves of) is offered by someone who was an Arab victim of it ("[The Daughter of an Arab Warrior Tells Her Tale](#)," Nonie Darwish, FrontPageMagazine.com, December 30, 2002): "I learned that the hard way, but thank God I triumphed. I could not have done it without living in freedom in the USA. As a child I was asked by many: "Are you going to avenge the killing of your father by killing Jews?" My answer now as an adult is a firm "no". Instead, I will live to expose the dark side of the Moslem culture and Islamic fundamentalists." Perhaps Al-Baz ought to add another "advice" so that Arabs should never criticize their own...

But it is not only obscure cults and Arab media that target Jews, Israel, and the U.S. Some of the most respected (certainly in their own mind) media outlets promote the same and come out with hideous and obscene charges. The New York Times has become one of the many targets of media watchdog groups for its twisted and biased reporting ("Eye on the Media: Times hits year-end false notes," Andrea Levin, The Jerusalem Post, Dec. 31, 2002): "The Times literally reversed and disconnected these events, in the same manner that it chooses with so much of its coverage to blur cause and effect, perpetrator and victim, guilty and innocent. The Times' shoddy review of 2002 and romanticizing of a young hate-mongering novelist does not, to put it mildly, bode well for its journalistic integrity in 2003."

And Time Magazine continues to glorify the Hamas homicidal bombers. It is enlightening to see that a decade ago Time thought that Israel was exaggerating the dangers of Hamas (" Hamas and The Heartland: Are terrorists being directed from the U.S.? Israel levels overblown charges that they are -- to put the heat on Washington," Bruce W. Nelan, Time, February 15, 1993) yet in numerous articles in 2002 clear reference was made by Time to the horrendous danger Hamas poses, and not only to Israel.

Another media watchdog group distributed its 2002 awards for dishonest reporting ("[Dishonest Reporting 'Award' for 2002](#)," Honest Reporting, Communique: 30 December 2002) and the list includes: Associated Press Headline Writers, BBC (last year's "winner"), CBC, CNN, MSNBC, NPR, New York Times, John Pilger (for his "documentary on the Middle East"), Reuters, Geraldo

Rivera, and the Washington Post. And the winner this year? The British Media for promoting Palestinian Mythology, for Residual References (to the Jenin "Massacre") and for accepting and unquestionably promoting the Credibility of Palestinian Spokesmen.

The point made by HonestReporting about the unquestioning acceptance of Palestinians spokespersons' credibility is well served by a thorough review of Palestinian statements that exposes the depth of their brazen lies that too often are - regrettably - accepted as facts ("Eye on the Media: Liar, liar," Bret Stephens, The Jerusalem Post, Dec. 26, 2002): Palestinians have perfected the Nazi technique of the Big Lie: "Lie habitually, lie shamelessly, lie unnecessarily, lie about small things and big things, lie about the past, lie about the future, lie about lies, lie with every "and," "but" and "if," and some of your lies are bound to be believed. Of course, it helps if they are printed in The New York Times.

Some commentators are notorious for their anti-Israel bias. In his latest hot-air fulmination, Robert Novak manages to turn facts, impressions, and understandings upside down to a comic extent had it not been so pathetically sad and misguided ("Narrow approach to Mideast, terror war," Robert Novak, Chicago Sun-Times, December 26, 2002). Defining himself as a conservative he too often sounds as representing the left.

Novak is obsessed with Israel, slanders it for being "obstructionist" and as exerting a sinister influence on U.S. Policy. He recycles Arab propaganda claiming that the Israeli government directs Washington's diplomatic traffic. Novak resuscitates the old straw man by blaming the victim for the transgressions of the offender and he syndicates amnesia by minimizing the threat assumed by Hizbollah as if it is dangerous only to Israel and not to the U.S. Novak perhaps has not seen some of the positive reports on the friendship that various Christian groups are displaying toward Israel and the Jews because otherwise he might have stated that the Vatican is also being directed from Jerusalem ("Catholicism is our friend," Yossi Klein Halevi, The Jerusalem Post, Dec. 26, 2002).

In the meantime, the peace-loving Muslims continue to preach for Jihad ("What Is Jihad?" Daniel Pipes, The New York Post, December 31, 2002) and the friendly Saudis fund terrorism. In the last decade alone they have directly funded terror to the tune of half a billion dollars ("Saudis gave Al Qaida \$500 million and never stopped giving," World Tribune.com, Friday, January 3, 2003).

At times it seems that some in the West are not paying sufficient attention to the directions from which the terror threats are coming as is the case appears to be in South America ("Blind Eye: Are South American countries downplaying the threat of Islamic terrorism?" Jonathan Goldberg, The American Prospect, 12.20.02). This is clearly posing serious dangers to the US. While another mega-terror event did not take place at the end of 2002 another serious front has opened with North Korea's nuclear threat. Many accounts attribute the Korean ploy to an extortion game (to negotiate with the U.S. and elicit benefits it uses aggression to seek a non-aggression pact...) with an added recognition that the consequences could be serious if this game gets out of hand but even more so, that North Korea was able to develop nuclear power because of prior appeasement by the U.S. ("The Lesson of North Korea: Appeasing a tyrant leads to disaster," Karen Elliott House, The Wall Street Journal, January 3, 2003).

Yet, the U.S. will not negotiate with North Korea directly ("[U.S. Eases Threat on Nuclear Arms for North Korea](#)," David E. Sanger, The New York Times, December 30, 2002): "Mr. Powell said repeatedly today that the administration was willing to communicate with North Korea, even if it rejected direct talks. He seemed to suggest that messages would be sent through China and Russia, or through the North Korean mission to the United Nations. But he insisted the North would receive no benefits while its nuclear programs remained active. "They want us to give them something for them to stop their bad behavior," he said. "What we can't do is enter into a negotiation right away where we are appeasing them."

This is of course an interesting statement because the U.S. is urging other parties to negotiate "peace" yet it will not practice what it preaches when it is itself a party to a conflict. After all, the statement Powell made about North Korea could have easily been made by Israel vis-a-vis the Palestinians: "They want us to give them something for them to stop their bad behavior. What we can't do is enter into a negotiation right away where we are appeasing them."

While the situation with North Korea is highly volatile, North Korea does not have any territorial designs on the U.S. and does not pose an existential threat to the U.S. It certainly poses a strategic threat. Yet the existential threat to Israel has been viewed as a "local conflict" that has international implications and needs to be contained. But can Israel really negotiate itself out of existence? In a sense that is what the new Peace Roadmap is more than suggesting ("The roadmap to peace: With whom are the Israelis supposed to make peace?" Michael Anbar, *israelinsider*, December 29, 2002).

Despite the deficiencies of the "Roadmap" - it commits to the Palestinian strategic goals but not the Israeli ones; it spells out no real responsibilities of Arab countries; and it creates the illusion of specificity which it does not offer - the State Department seems bent on moving forward with it no matter what the Israeli concerns are ("U.S. reject Israeli objection to 'roadmap,'" *World Tribune.com*, January 3, 2003).

But the threat of terrorism and international bullying is misread internally (in Israel and in the U.S. alike). And the problem is identified mostly by an attempt to place the blame on the victim instead of on the perpetrator. And as war seems to be looming closer this attitude is nothing short of self-defeating. In the same manner that some Israelis rush to worship the enemy and attribute ill will to their own leaders, so do some Americans ("As we look towards a future filled with the clouds of war," David Horowitz, *Jewish World Review*, Dec. 31, 2002): "The heart of the self-deception of America's "liberal" establishment, however, comes from forgetting the lesson of 9/11 and thinking we are invulnerable. It is this complacency that leaps at the crumbs from dictators' tables and proposes leaving Saddam and Kim Jong Il and Hamas and Hizbollah alone under the promise that getting paper agreements will buy peace in our time. It won't."

A good example of constructive internal criticism is provided by Caroline B. Glick ("The price of betrayal," *The Jerusalem Post*, Dec. 27, 2002) who appropriately chastises the Israeli government for neglecting its southern Lebanese Christian allies who fought alongside Israel and now found refuge in it but feel abandoned and betrayed: "September 11 was enough for the Americans to begin a systematic and brutally honest debate about the efficacy of coddling

regimes that represent the antithesis of all their country stands for. Here in Israel unfortunately, our continuous battle against the same dark forces of blackmail and brutality has caused no reassessment of our abandonment of our friends and our embrace of our enemies...In betraying our friends and rewarding our enemies in Lebanon, Judea, Samaria and Gaza, Israel has shown that absurdity is not necessarily funny. When life reflects parody, the result is not humorous but treacherous, violent and tragic."

The story on human cloning was a sad episode of greedy journalists - who will broadcast anything - and a power-hungry publicity-seeking hedonistic cult. Making the connection between the exaggerated attention the cult received and the rising threat of terrorism and violence was more an exercise in combining oddities. No longer. When a cult rabidly promotes antisemitism, it doesn't only want to "change the world." It is engaged in what should be defined as criminal and dangerous activities. Yet the exercise in oddities is still helpful: The Palestinians want to clone (yet) another Arab state and they use antisemitism, lying, deceit, and violence to achieve their goal. But the creation of this new state is desirable for them only if it means the destruction of Israel (no matter how much the Egyptian presidential advisor denies it).

So it is not really the science of reproduction but the science of destruction. Mary Shelley wrote in the preface to [Frankenstein](#): "THE event on which this fiction is founded has been supposed...as not of impossible occurrence. I shall not be supposed as according the remotest degree of serious faith to such an imagination; yet, in assuming it as the basis of a work of fancy, I have not considered myself as merely weaving a series of supernatural terrors. The event on which the interest of the story depends is exempt from the disadvantages of a mere tale of spectres or enchantment. It was recommended by the novelty of the situations which it develops; and, however impossible as a physical fact, affords a point of view to the imagination for the delineating of human passions more comprehensive and commanding than any which the ordinary relations of existing events can yield."

This loony cult has certainly tried to delineate human passions (group sex), market impossible physical facts (claims without proof; hiding under pseudo-scientific facades) and change ordinary relationships (by claiming we are descendants of aliens and should clone Hitler so he can be tried.....). It has also proven that it is not only a fool but is also a knave. The Palestinians and their supporters are doing exactly the same. They passionately murder, they market impossible physical facts (the concept of Palestinian origin, history, and geography), and change ordinary relationships (where the aggressor is considered a victim and the loser is entitled to more than the winner).

The problem with modern day terrorism and charlatanism is that it is not fiction. Any fiction written by Mary Shelley would have been far surpassed by what passes today for "reality."

Let's hope that 2003 will be better but be prepared that it might not.

With all that in mind have a Happy New Year!