

# The Sui-Genocide Bomber

August 16, 2003

By Robbie Friedmann

The Palestinian-Kuwaiti rough tango continued this week. First, the Palestinians were "upset" at the Kuwaiti cancellation of Abbas' visit ("PA upset with Kuwait for Canceling Abbas Visit," Khaled Abu Toameh, *The Jerusalem Post*, 11 August 2003). After whining, being offended and expressing anger at the Kuwaiti decision, they issued some sort of an "apology" to Kuwait (or at least so did the latter report) and the public show was over ("[Kuwaiti News Agency: Palestinian PM Says Wrong to Back Saddam](#)," Reuters, *Ha'aretz*, 11 August 2003).

So now the Palestinians can move on and kiss their brethren in Kuwait. They can also continue to receive financing for their terror acts from Iran ("Iran financing tied to teen suicide attacks by Fatah," *World Tribune.com*, 13 August 2003).

It looks like suicide terrorism is getting some attention from those who care about language. After some initial reservation about "suicide bombers" which emanated out of concern that the suicider is the only one negatively affected by the act, some in the media have reverted to the usage of "homicide bombers" to denote the active aspect of the act where in the process of killing oneself many others are killed and injured. So now there are those who criticize the latter term recommending a return to the former ("Taking Cides: Fox News Should Drop the Term 'Homicide Bomber,'" James Taranto, *The Wall Street Journal*, 11 August 2003).

Yet, both are somewhat correct. The fact remains that in the name of a false cause people kill themselves not to prevent or to defend but to simply murder others in the process. Another term altogether should be coined to denote this barbaric murderous action because, after all, [homicide bombing](#) is not merely taking one's life in one's hand as traditional "passive" suicide has been perceived. Some suggested to call this "genocidal bombings" and while they certainly are, what about other genocidal activities that are not caused through suicide? Therefore, the closest term that combines the usage of one's body as a weapon is geno-suicide (bombing, shooting or other action). It depicts the purpose and describes the act. Or alternatively, sui-genocide is even more precise.

The Palestinians are masters of doublespeak. They announce the *hudna* (the so-called "cease-fire" that enables them to regroup and continue with terrorism) is still "on" yet they continue to commit sui-genocide ("[Militants Re-arm Under Cover of Israel Truce](#)," Ross Dunn, *Scotland On Sunday*, 10 August 2003) and they make it appear as if it is part of a natural law: "It is natural that we strengthen ourselves during *hudna* [the three-month cease-fire declared by Palestinian groups in June]...It is natural that the Palestinians, Fatah, the Islamic Jihad, Hamas, be ready to defend their people in the coming stages."

They continue to glorify sui-genocide and they broadcast music videos that promise "maidens of Paradise" and "72 dark-eyed virgins" that should "reward" the sui-genocider - whom they refer to as a "martyr" - as a prelude to two sui-genocide bombings in Israel recently ("PA Music Video

Promising 'Maidens of Paradise' to Shahids - 2 days before Suicide Bombings," Itamar Marcus, Palestinian Media Watch, 12 August 2003).

It is not only those aspiring for a state who resort to terrorism. Behind the scenes, existing states (such as Iran, Syria, Saudi Arabia as well as Egypt and Libya and many others) actively trigger and sponsor terror acts. The latest shelling from Lebanese territory is reported to have been instigated by Iran and Syria who are not pleased with the American progress in Iraq nor with the prospects for peace (dismal as they are) in the Middle East ("Who killed Haviv Dadon?" Editorial, *The Jerusalem Post*, 11 August 2003).

And the Palestinians continue the propaganda war by denying that Jews have any connection to the Holy Land and particularly to Jerusalem and the Temple Mount ("[The Jewish Temple](#)," Joseph Farah, WorldNetDaily.com, 14 August 2003). This is not merely a ludicrous claim; after all, if Jews have no linkage to these places then by default the Muslims have no history either. Clearly that is not the logic at play here. What they are aiming at is a zero sum game where the denial of one's rights "automatically" grants rights to the Palestinians. It is policy by negation not by affirmation of one's own qualifications.

The internal Israeli debate about the security fence has ended and the fence itself is in the process of being erected. Popular or not, it is now a policy and a reality. Heavy international criticism is placed against the fence but the one that is most hypocritical is that sounded by the Arabs themselves who are "offended" by it. In this case being offended means being deprived of the option of free(er) movement to kill ("A Fence Is Offense Is Offensive," Irwin N. Graulich, MichNews.com, 8 August 2003).

When criticizing Arab-Muslim countries and societies for their current grim status, lack of achievement and disruption to world peace, such criticism is met by Arabs being "offended" and by some in Western circles screaming racism and discrimination. It is perhaps valuable then to examine the (very rare) criticism when it is coming from Arab circles. An Arab columnist has recently provided a unique and insightful self-examination of problems inherent to the Arab world ("[Liberal Arab Columnist: 'Why do Arabs Hate the West, Especially the U.S.?'](#)" MEMRI, Special Dispatch - Reform in the Arab & Muslim World, 12 August 2003, No. 551).

The columnist reminds us - and the Arabs - that Arabs invaded and occupied Europe before the crusades (thus nullifying the grievance that Arabs have against "crusaders"), that since 1948 the Arab world has regressed (after all it has been involved in internal and international wars), that Arab fascism and fundamentalist Islam have nothing to offer people (perhaps other than hate) and that Arabs reject western inventions, only to embrace them later (by corrupt leaders). One could only wish that his brethren will open their eyes to such insight and act on it positively. In all likelihood a *fatwa* to kill him will be issued.

If you look hard enough you will find them. Western attempts to find some Arabs who support democracy is becoming a sad joke when stone after stone is being turned around and the snakes coming from under are defined as the "best last hope" (for democracy). The latest prophets for democracy have been discovered by the talent scout who recently unraveled in front of our eyes the Saudi "peace plan." Yes, the same Tom Friedman found a Shiite Sheikh who served as host

to the grandson of Iran's Ayatollah Khomeini as the new prophets of Muslim democracy ("[Dinner with the Sayyids](#)," Thomas L. Friedman, *The New York Times*, 10 August 2003).

Problem is that with dinner he also ate everything else that was served him including their slick rhetoric. And as he went for the so-called Saudi "peace plan" he embraced the new democrats of the Middle East [One could only wonder why he has not yet discovered Libya's Ghadaffi's 2002 "peace plan" for the Middle East called "Isratine" (now available also in Hebrew for Israelis to demonstrate to them how Ghadaffi will destroy the Jewish state by saying that he wants to build one country for two people) which Ghadaffi apparently shamelessly stole from a one Abu Shakra].

The problem with their approach is that it is rhetorical only and does carry vastly different meaning than attributed to these terms in the West. Whether religious or secular, a millennium and more of Muslim atrocities was inspired by religious edicts such as jihad. Thus "separation" of mosque and state will not change it unless the nature and interpretation of Muslim holy scriptures will explicitly forbid violence - not glorify it. That kind of liberalism is unheard of from clerics. Since Friedman is a reader of [MEMRI](#) he should have read their translation of the young Khomeini's positive references to - and idolization of - his grandfather to quickly be disabused from any hope that reform - and hope - will come from such corners.

On the home front there is some progress with the plans for a temporary appointment of Daniel Pipes to the board of the United States Institute of Peace. President George W. Bush is trying to take advantage of the summer recess to provide a temporary appointment. Given some current emergent and vocal senatorial opposition this may backfire when the appointment will be considered later on. This is a political battle that all those concerned about terrorism would want to win. Losing it to advocates of terror and those organizations that serve as apologists for terror, as well as to those who might cater to them politically, will place the U.S. at an even greater disadvantage ("The Truth about Daniel Pipes," Charles Krauthammer, *washingtonpost.com*, 15 August 2003).

As 50 million people in the U.S. were directly impacted by the largest electrical power failure in history, many others were indirectly disturbed by it, domestic and international travel has been disrupted, and with economic damages estimated at \$30 billion a day, it serves as an eye-opening metaphor to what the forces of darkness (pun fully intended) can do to the free world if they will be allowed to continue with their sui-genocidal activities, with their hateful propaganda and incitement, and with their deceitful practices. We should resist this steadfastly; but the very least we should do is not foolishly aid them in the process.