

The "I do not do windows" Approach to Fighting Terrorism

September 28, 2003

By Robbie Friedmann

Prior to the attack on Iraq demands came out from various Arab/Muslim corners that the U.S. and its allies should not attack on the holy days of Ramadan. Yet the Arabs had no hesitation in attacking Israel in 1973 on the holiest Jewish day of Yom Kippur; last year terrorists attacked during Passover night, and this year a Palestinian terrorist ("militant," "gunman") knocked on the door of an Israeli family celebrating the Jewish New Year 5764, murdered a seven-month old baby and a 30-year old guest of the family before being shot by guards. The terrorist was released recently from an Israeli prison and the organization he belonged to - Palestinian Islamic Jihad - took "responsibility" for the terror attack ("Two Israelis, including baby girl, killed in West Bank attack," *Jerusalem Post*, 28 September 2003).

Meanwhile hundreds of demonstrators marched in Nablus recently - led by Hamas and other terror group activists under the explicit support of Yasser Arafat - to mark the third anniversary of the "Intifada" (the Palestinian misnomer for their violent strategy) by marching with suicide vests, setting fire to mock Israeli planes and busses and glorifying terror and obsessed with death. A far cry from showing any interest in peace.

Last week was still abuzz about the need for Arafat's ousting. On one hand he is declared irrelevant for making peace and on the other he is rightfully blamed for not doing enough to stop terrorism and actually for instigating it himself. ("Arafat must be stopped," Mortimer B. Zuckerman, *U.S. New and World Report*, 29 September 2003). Thus, because of the renewed attention to and focus on Arafat he has thrived on being thrown into the limelight again ("[Arafat's Bonus Round: Emboldened by Israel's threats, the Palestinian leader is gobbling up power and vexing the U.S.](#)," Romesh Ratnesar, *Time*, 29 September 2003): "For now, however, Arafat seems too enthralled with the plaudits he is getting for obstinacy to even contemplate compromise."

Arafat does not simply sit idle on his murderous laurels. As a true leader of a criminal gang he sends his wife to live and shop in Paris boutiques, he is amassing millions to his private pockets or in slash funds under his ultimate control. Evidence to this effect has surfaced from no less a source than the International Monetary Fund report ("Audit: Arafat diverted millions in public money; \$900 million moved to special account controlled by leader," Sam F. Ghattas, *The Charlotte Observer*, 21 September 2003).

Some call for killing Arafat outright ("Why Not Kill Arafat?" Joel Mowbray, Townhall.com, 18 September 2003) while others suggest to expose him to his constituencies as a Muslim deviant who is a homosexual and a pedophile ("[Outing Arafat](#)," Joseph Farah, WorldNetDaily.com, 22 September 2003). Farah assumes this fact is not known among Arab circles and is asking for volunteers to translate such reports about Arafat to Arabic. However, it is highly likely these facts **are** known about him and given the mindset of his followers, publicity about this will only elevate him to higher level as a "victim" or "martyr" whose character is defamed by infidels.

Farah is referring to a damning report issued by a former ranking Romanian intelligence officer who worked with Arafat under a KGB plot to build him as a national leader ("The KGB's Man," Ion Mihai Pacepa, *The Wall Street Journal*, 22 September 2003). More than this report is damning to Arafat and the now defunct former Soviet Union, it is a damning document to the gullibility of Western leaders, among them former presidents Jimmy Carter and Bill Clinton, for promoting Arafat under a script written by the KGB and played out by Arafat.

Whether exposed, tarnished or killed, the question of Arafat's removal remains rhetorical ("[Should He Go? Violence is all Arafat knows. Without a change in leadership, the Middle East will never see peace.](#)" Efraim Karsh, *Los Angeles Times*, 21 September 2003): "Arafat has failed his people, sacrificing them to a bloody, devastating and unnecessary war. Now Bush has presented an alternative vision. But it cannot be implemented with Arafat in place. Just as the creation of democratic societies in Germany and Japan after World War II necessitated a purge of the existing political elites and re-education of the entire populace, so the Palestinians deserve a profound structural reform that will sweep Arafat and his corrupt Palestinian Authority from power, free West Bankers and Gazans from the stifling PLO grip, eradicate endemic violence from Palestinian life and teach the virtues of peaceful coexistence with Israel. This is certain to be a difficult and protracted process, one requiring sustained international guidance and support. But if history tells us anything, it is that any other alternative is an assured recipe for disaster."

The most important sentence in Karsh's article is the one about the removal of not only Arafat but his entire corrupt Palestinian Authority regime. But that might not be enough. The support for terrorism and specifically suicide bombing is rampant in Palestinian society. No corrupt regime could have had its way without such support and hence lies the difficult problem of coping with such malignant attitudes that have permeated all Palestinian society to the extent NGOs and civic groups offer sound support to terror and death ("PA Society's Universal Support for Suicide Bombers," Itamar Marcus, *Palestinian Media Watch Bulletin*, 24 September 2003).

Indeed, one liberal Arab diplomat admits the problem is inherent to Arab society and is not limited to a specific regime ("[Reformist Arab Diplomat: 'Are We a Nation that Preaches Morality and Tolerance?'](#)" MEMRI, Special Dispatch - Reform in the Arab and Muslim World, 26 September 2003, No. 579). Rather, the problem lies in the gap between words and deeds. He is sickened by the Arab websites, he does not see the Arab battles as the world's battles and even goes so far as suggesting that Islam is not the answer to Arab problems.

Israel's enemies are plural. It is several Arab states, Iran (which is non-Arab), and numerous terrorist organizations (sponsored by and in the service of rogue states). One of those is the Hizbullah ("Party of God") in Lebanon which openly admits it is using suicide bombing as a strategy to defeat Israel militarily and they believe they are winning ("[Hezbollah's Success,](#)" David Ignatius, *The Washington Post*, 23 September 2003): "This stark assessment makes clear that suicide bombings are part of a very deliberate strategy. They are not driven by poverty, neglect, irrational fanaticism or the other factors Westerners often cite. They are motivated by a belief that killing Israelis will bring military victory." Indeed, they perceive terrorism to be working for them, reaping great dividends for fairly little investment against powers they have no chance at beating in "normal" combat ("Why Terrorism Works," Irwin Graulich, *American Daily*, 5 September 2003).

Despite the obvious declaration by Israel's enemies that their wish is to destroy Israel (and beyond that America and the West) it appears that some want to simply ignore it and stay "even-handed" as if that is in accordance with U.S. policy and tradition ("[Road map rubble](#)," Arnold Beichman, *Washington Times*, 24 September 2003). As rhetoric of the election year escalates some are highly critical of unfounded statements made by some political candidates and stress that "no matter what Israel gives or pledges to give, there will be no peace now or in the foreseeable future because neither Iran, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Egypt or, most visibly, Osama bin Laden will permit Israel, a democratic, modern state to exist. In other words, 'peace negotiations' are not about giving up the 'settlements' or some other fictitious issue. They are about Israel's existence."

Yet, it is increasingly understood that these organizations and countries are not only enemies of Israel but they pose a tremendous danger to the rest of the world. Syria's stockpiling of biochemical weapons, its interest in "peaceful nuclear energy" and the possibility that much of Saddam's WMD are stashed in Syria have elevated this country to a "respected" slot of danger spots ("Syria-ous Problem," Peter Brookes, *The New York Post*, 22 September 2003). And Saudi Arabia is reported as wanting to acquire Pakistani nuclear weapons to have its own nuclear bomb. Not a heartwarming development.

The top slot though is undoubtedly occupied by Iran whose leaders have openly declared that as soon as they have nuclear weapons they will use them. There is little doubt that Iran is developing nuclear weapons not for its own defense but rather for hostile/aggressive intentions on the part of its clerical leadership. Iran will not cooperate with international bodies and at best it will use deception to dupe these organizations into a false sense of cooperation. The best hope against these Iranians intentions is an internal revolution which will bring about the demise of the clerical leadership along with a responsible government there ("How to stop Iran's radical clerics from adopting the nuclear option," Dr. Assad Homayoun, *World Tribune.Com*, 25 September 2003). The big question still remains: which will come first, the promising regime change or the Iranian Muslim bomb?

It is perhaps appropriate then to suggest a refined terminology to address the linguistic usage which amounts mostly to having misnomers guide our understanding of current realities. I have tried it earlier by calling suicide bombers "sui-genocidal bombers" or simply "human weapons." Rosett goes a little further to address several other terms ("New Word Order: It's time to revamp the language of diplomacy and war," Claudia Rosett, *The Wall Street Journal*, 24 September 2003) suggesting "... that one requirement for this (a new world order) is a new *word* order, a constant effort to better define the world we now live in, to enlist language not to cover up the real dangers, but to help us face and defeat them."

In this context it has been argued that while Israel has a number of options at hand its current policy is optimizing the best reaction in its diplomatic and military arsenal ("Why Israel's policy is far from wrong," Barry Rubin, *The Jerusalem Post*, 23 September 2003): "Fight the Palestinian-imposed war, trying to minimize threats to Israeli citizens and capture or punish terrorists. The aim is to show the Palestinians they cannot win, that terror will not intimidate Israelis into surrendering; inflict costs that will encourage the other side to implement a real cease-fire." This approach debunks other options such as more and larger military operations

(including killing Arafat), a unilateral Israeli withdrawal or bringing in an international force. While agreeably any strategy is fraught with difficulties and subject to the laws of unintended consequences, the fact remains that what Israel is currently finding itself in is three bloody years at a devastating cost to its people and its economy. Moreover, Israel may have to utilize the military solution (including killing Arafat) the same way the U.S. is fighting in Iraq or against terror in Afghanistan what with the Iranian nuclear threat or the growing intimidation from terrorist organizations Iran sponsors.

Despite the lack of convincing evidence, some renowned experts on the Middle East strongly believe democracy is possible there and see the lack of it as evidence that it threatens the current regimes and leaders who are doing their very best to oppose it ("Lewis of Arabia: A visit with America's greatest Middle East sage," Tunku Varadarajan, *The Wall Street Journal*, 23 September 2003).

Yet, international efforts - led by the U.S. - to democratize Iraq and bring it to the fold of civilization are constantly undermined by those who call themselves allies as well as by the United Nations. While it is too soon to talk about a grassroots campaign to bail out of the U.N., various voices are heard as very critical of the U.N. In this context a variation of the [address President George W. Bush made at the United Nations General Assembly](#) (23 September 2003) is offered by a writer who thought the President should have focused on the U.N. itself ("Bush U.N. Policy Address On Iraq," Irwin Graulich, MichNews.com, 25 September 2003) suggesting it is more of the problem than the solution.

The risks for the U.S. are not only off-shore. Following years of abashed abuse practiced by Mideast Studies departments and faculty, [Campus Watch](#) was established to draw attention to this abuse and it now celebrates its first anniversary. Despite vile criticism from those exact same critics who dish out more rhetoric than they can take, Campus Watch offers a valuable service to those (students, faculty, administrators, sponsors) who want to know what is being done in these departments under the guise of "scholarship" ("[Campus Watch](#)," Jonathan Calt Harris, FrontPageMagazine.com, 23 September 2003).

Indeed, the politicization of these academic departments is not merely the result of misguided or naive professors and students. It is more often the result of a carefully orchestrated campaign of funding and endorsing activities that are aimed at voicing the Arab view and agenda. By the same manner in which scholarship is abused in the name of academic freedom to promote an Arab agenda (coupled with an anti-American and anti-Israel stance), religious freedom is being abused in the U.S. (and in the U.S. military) to a level that some see as posing a risk to national security. The spate of arrests last week of clergy, interpreters and other military personnel on charges of spying, is understandably seen by some as signs of a fifth column in the country ("Fifth column II," Frank J. Gaffney, Jr., Townhall.com, 22 September 2003).

The attrition of the last three years is starting to show its signs in Israeli society as well. Last week a sonic political boom was heard in Israel when 27 pilots announced their refusal to fly missions over Palestinian territories under the guise of not being willing to give a hand to collateral damage. As it turns out, only nine of those pilots are on (active) reserve duty and while they all have flying as a common denominator, this looked more like the organization of a social movement with very clear political aims. Indeed, the pilots went so far as suggesting that as long

as Israel is "occupying" the territories it is inviting attacks against her ("Israel's Rebel Fliers Grounded before Takeoff," DEBKAFfile Special Analysis, 25 September 2003).

Israel as a democracy has experienced far worse political statements in its history. Indeed, Israel has tolerated statements that if made in Arab countries would have resulted in incarceration and death. That is indeed one of the strengths of Israel as a democracy, but it comes with a price. This particular public argument is political in nature. If the pilots would have been acting as members of a political party (and some are) expressing opinions that are then brought to a public debate - it is one thing. But for the pilots to suggest they "do not do windows" has injected the military into a political turmoil that confuses the difference between being a citizen and being a soldier. The initial reaction has been highly negative and at this time the (reserve) pilots have been grounded - one of them has already retracted ("Signatory of pilots' letter says regrets signing petition," Amos Harel and Gideon Alon, *Ha'aretz* Correspondents, and *Ha'aretz* Service, 28 September 2003) - and it appears they may be dismissed from the Air Force and even court-martialed.

And if politically motivated pilots have created a sonic boom, politically motivated Islamists have created a mini-earthquake when part of the wall of Jerusalem's Old City collapsed last week ("Temple Mount Wall Collapses," *Jewish World*, 25 September 2003). As so typical in the Middle East, the perpetrators quickly turned around to blame the victim and shed any responsibility from themselves ("[Structural collapse on Temple Mount: Muslims blame Israel for failure of interior wall in Al-Aqsa Mosque](#)," WorldNetDaily.com, 24 September 2003).

This is a sign of worse things to come. In a place so ripe with symbolism, an additional collapse of the wall or even the plate upon which the Al-Aqsa Mosque is built (the Temple Mount) could stir up already heated emotions. Logic, reason, and facts will give way to emotions and finger-pointing and the situation could easily deteriorate to a tragedy of amazing proportions as the Arabs will no doubt take advantage of any such tragedy for their political gains.