

Rulers of the World Means Candidates for Extinction

October 26, 2003

By Robbie Friedmann

Terror against Israel continues unabated with Israelis attacked on a daily basis. One analysis sees Yasser Arafat as the main obstacle for any peace in the Middle East along with the Syrians botching any attempt by Americans to establish democracy in Iraq ("[Undermining the War on Terrorism: The Role of Yasser Arafat and the Syrian Regime](#)," Maj.-Gen. (res.) Amos Gilad, Jerusalem Issue Brief, Institute for Contemporary Affairs, Vol. 3, No. 7, 19 October 2003). This is a fairly accurate view of current realities but it does not take into account the wider picture of what might happen if Arafat is 'taken out' of the equation (not necessarily by force), or if the Syrians are given the riot act by the Americans and Israelis as Turkey did a few years ago. Indeed terrorism (enacted in the interest of states supporting it) has wider implications than attacks against Israel.

The terror attack against American personnel who came to interview potential Palestinian candidates for Fulbright scholarships killed those who came to help Palestinians. But a larger question looms in the background that has to do with who are the recipients of Fulbright scholarships and awards. Regrettably, some are themselves connected with and supporters of terrorism ("Fulbright's Terrorist Tie," Daniel Pipes & Asaf Romirowsky, *New York Post*, 20 October 2003).

As expected, the U.S. has made some harsh statements (harsher than usual but not the same as directed against the Taliban) about this recent planned murder of Americans, but the fact remains that many other Americans who were as coldly murdered by Palestinians in previous years - in Israel and elsewhere - did not receive such attention. Clearly, the U.S. is still looking at the Palestinian Authority as the government of a potential state rather than a collection of organized killers ("[Palestinian Terrorism, American Blood](#)," Jeff Jacoby, *The Boston Globe*, 19 October 2003).

It appears though that the threat of terror is currently even more ominous than the three Americans murdered in Gaza or the 3,000 murdered in 9-11. In the last few years there has been increasing talk about the dangers of weapons of mass destruction. The fact that countries like Pakistan and Saudi Arabia are negotiating nuclear pacts, Iran is developing nuclear weapons and Libya might acquire nuclear weapons increases the likelihood that nuclear capabilities may fall into the hands of terrorist groups like al-Qaeda and be put to actual use. The reality of a nuclear device blowing up to achieve political goals was reinforced by Iranian statements that while denying having or working on nuclear capability ("we only use it for peaceful energy sources") they also declared that as soon as they have nuclear weapons they will use them against Israel ("The Terror Ahead: A nuclear attack? Be very afraid," Gabriel Schoenfeld, *The Wall Street Journal*, 21 October 2003).

Last week, the *New York Times's* Tom Friedman advanced the promise of Saudi Arabia as the next great democracy. One letter the paper did not print highly criticized Friedman for ignoring

the vile antisemitism displayed by the Malaysian prime minister while praising a yet-to-be-proved unborn democracy ("Evian II and Times Apologists," 19 October 2003).

A report on the status of Arab development was released this week in Jordan ("Building a Knowledge Society") offering observations on a dour reality of education and human rights but also quick to criticize the West for restricting Arab travel following the 9-11 atrocities ("[A Grim Arab Survey of Rights and Education](#)," The Associated Press, *The New York Times*, 21 October 2003). Friedman would undoubtedly suggest this report proves his point that the Arab world needs to change. Perhaps so. But it proves more than anything else how difficult a task it is to undertake.

Now Friedman comes up with yet another "original," "easy" and quick solution: let Iraq, Egypt and Israel join NATO ("[Expanding Club NATO](#)," Thomas L. Friedman, *The New York Times*, 26 October 2003). This sounds like something he would sip coffee over in Brussels. Iraq has a long way to go before this idea could be considered and, in this case, timing is important. Egypt has to get off the bandwagon of hostility towards the U.S. and Israel before it should be considered. And Israel? Friedman recommends it join *to provide balance to Egypt's joining*, thank you very much. And what about the hostile European attitudes toward Israel? What about Arab rejections of the West? Apparently these do not count in his comfortable equation for a new world order. Every time Friedman sips coffee another global idea balloon floats and the air goes quickly out of it.

The false peace initiative concocted by unelected and failed Israeli political figures and Palestinian Arafat puppets received the expected backing from Egypt - which is rightly seen as an attempt to lull Israel into a false peace as a stage in achieving its destruction ("Egypt Backs False Peace to Facilitate Israel's Destruction," Jerusalem Newswire Editorial Staff, 19 October 2003). In Israel, criticism against the initiative continued to mount and perhaps the most eloquent articulation was the comparison of the Beilin/Geneva Initiative to the Logan actions which prompted the passage of the 1799 Logan Act ("Yossi Beilin in the State of Nature," Bret Stephens, *The Jerusalem Post*, 26 October 2003).

Moreover, this comparison is appropriate because it draws attention to the nature of democracy and describes the conditions under which private citizens action could lead to anarchy or revolution. Anarchy paralyzes the possibility to govern while the conditions for a revolution are clearly not warranted under the Israeli scenario for "alternative peace."

It was interesting to note some of the apologists (even in Israel) who brushed away the most vile antisemitic statements by a world leader - this time by the Malaysian Prime Minister - since the Nazi era. Of course most were shocked ("Malaysian Malaise," Irwin N. Graulich, MichNews.Com, 24 October 2003), some tried to be cynical about it "admitting" - tongue-in-cheek- that people like Napoleon "were Jewish" ("[Ruling the World: It's high time to fess up and tell the world the truth: We Jews do run the world!](#)" Jeffrey Dunetz, Aish.Com) and others tried to explain it away as "necessary rhetoric" Mahathir "had to use" to maintain his stature in the Muslim world. This juvenile attitude that dismisses rhetoric as if it does not encourage action is part of the pre-set notions that plague Western leaders when considering such extreme conduct. In fact, his expressions reflected rather deep-seated sentiments in the Arab and Muslim world as

echoed by another official Egyptian tirade against Jews ("[Egyptian Government Weekly: Treason and Deception are in the Blood of the Jews](#)," MEMRI, Special Dispatch - Egypt/ Arab Antisemitism Documentation Project, 23 October 2003, No. 594).

For rational people such rhetoric seems as verging on the insane. One can get caught in the argument that Mahathir is insane, but whether he is or not is irrelevant and frankly not very helpful. Saying that Hitler, Ghadafi, Arafat, bin Laden or Il-Song are insane may make us feel a bit better ("they are not ok but we are") but will do little to change their policies which they carry out in a very sane fashion as part of a very calculated strategy. Therefore, the danger in Mahathir's comments is seen in enabling this "Muslim Strategy" or "Muslim Agenda" to move on unabated ("Malaysian Road Map," Caroline Glick, *The Jerusalem Post*, 24 October 2003).

Moreover, it provides additional proof that even if this war is not a religious one, the Muslims do their very best to capitalize on religious sentiments to further their political goals. As Glick suggests: "... it is important that Israel be honest with itself and its ally, the U.S., about the intentions of its enemies. We may not have ever believed we would need to take a delusional bigot like Mahathir seriously. But he seems to be an able spokesman for hundreds of millions of like-minded people. We must respect these Islamic bigots enough to take their threats at face value. We must look at their intentions and soberly assess their actions and their capabilities. When Mahathir defined us as the enemy, he did us a favor. He told us where he and the Islamic world stand, and where they intend to go. Forewarned, as they say, is forearmed."

The fact remains that the majority of world conflicts today are perpetrated by Islamic countries and groups and that among all the terrorist groups all but two hail from radical Muslim ideologies and even the two exceptions portray signs of religious radicalism ("Radical Islam and Suicide Bombers," Michael Radu, Foreign Policy Research Institute, 21 October 2003).

Indeed, terror is comprised not only of suicide bombings. It is also enslavement, torture and oppression. Just examine the history of a Sudanese boy who was able to run away from that ill-fated period in his life when he was a slave to Muslims and the 1400 years of Muslim slavery of millions (which is also responsible for slavery in the U.S.) is suddenly put in an eye-opening context ("[Jihad Slavery: An Ugly Living Legacy](#)," Alyssa A. Lappen, *FrontPageMagazine.com*, 17 October 2003).

In short, what leaders of the Arab and Muslim world do and say and the support they receive in the West is not only frightfully reminiscent of the sounds and visions of the 1930s and the young and vocal brownshirts; it is indicative of things to come. In previous e-Letters, I discussed the danger that this new radicalism poses and suggested it is more menacing than Nazism and Communism combined. In the 1930s Jewish intellectuals and organizations also did not take that seriously enough or soon enough. A good deal of the "peace activism" rhetoric of today is actually pro-Palestinian terrorist tactics, repeated Hamas propaganda, heavily laced with virulent antisemitism and anti-Americanism. This increasing evidence is there for us to see. The questions remains: Can we?

Clearly some can not. While not (yet) a candidate for the Nobel Prize for Peace, Hanan Ashrawi, the Palestinian trumpet of invective continues with her globetrotting robotic speeches that

apparently have given her grounds to win the Sydney Peace Prize ("Sydney's peace prize hijacked: The selection of long-time PLO advocate and Arafat ally Hanan Ashrawi for the Sydney Peace Prize makes a mockery of the award," Piers Akerman, *The Daily Telegraph*, 23 October 2003). At least some have noticed it and the Lord Mayor has shunned it but the city council and the premier have endorsed it and accepted the academic recommendation that ignored Ashrawi's record.

This blindness in the face of known facts is what has historically underscored misinterpretations of facts that then led to disasters such as Pearl Harbor, the Yom Kippur War, the Oslo Accord and now the Geneva Initiative ("Why the Media Botches it," Bret Stephens, *The Jerusalem Post*, 17 October 2003).

MSNBC's American Voices pitted Itamar Marcus of Palestinian Media Watch against two rival groups of democrats and republicans (26 October 2003). One member fiercely maintained that "surely, this hate that the kids are growing up on is available on both sides and is not limited to the Palestinians." She just could not imagine that there is no 'quality' between the two sides and was very comfortable blaming both sides for the current conflict. That is the problem. Blame is **not** equally shared. Hate is not equal and aims at destroying the 'other.' This is a monopoly of Palestinians only. In fact, in a recent survey 80% of the Palestinians surveyed maintained they will still have the right of return and 59% encouraged additional terrorism against Israel even *after* they have an independent Palestinian state.

They will continue to support violence because what they want is not independence or freedom or an end to the conflict. What they want more than anything is the destruction of Israel. Why then encourage any process that leads to the establishment of a Palestinian state?

Far from being rulers of the world Jews are actually candidates for extinction. And so is Israel, the U.S., and the rest of the West should it wish to recognize it. The facts are available - and the writing is on the wall - seeing them for what they are is the challenge. At least we can never say the enemy is not sincere in revealing its true intentions.