

# Terrorists Murder Arabs Too

March 21, 2004

By Robbie Friedmann

This past weekend, on 20 March, an Israeli jogger was murdered in the French Hill area of Jerusalem. He was a student at the Hebrew University and the son of a prominent attorney. His grandfather was also murdered in Jerusalem in 1975. Both murders were committed by Palestinian terrorists. In Israel these are statistics, not stories. What makes this a story is that the student was an Israeli Arab, and when the murderers discovered this they issued an "apology" and asked to participate in the funeral. Yasser Arafat even called to offer his personal condolences. The father did not blame the Palestinian Authority - whose business is to authorize murders - because it has "no control" over the terrorists ("Al-Aqsa Brigades Apologizes for Killing Israeli Arab in Jerusalem," Jonathan Lis, *Ha'aretz*, 20 March 2004).

This one vignette epitomizes how a planned atrocity combines with a personal tragedy to play a role in the theater of the absurd. In this theater it is permissible for the terrorists to kill Israeli Jews but not for an Arab father to blame the terrorists who murdered his son. No one is "responsible." One Israeli Arab member of the Knesset already rehashed the Arab mantra that this is because of the "occupation." Eureka! Now we know why Muslims slaughter Muslims in Algiers, why they do so in Iraq, in Turkey, in Saudi Arabia, in Morocco and many other places around the world. It is all because of the Israeli occupation. What a lunatic method to explain away decadence, vengeance, atrocities and lack of accountability - by always of blaming someone else. And note the "apology" is to the specific family, not to Israel, not to the Mayor of Jerusalem. This is not merely collateral damage, but a "mistake in operation" and thus they count the victim as another "*shahid*" or "martyr," even though he was a Christian (they must have automatically converted him after his death)! The same way terrorists picked a 12-year old porter to deliver a bag with explosives to kill (himself and) Israeli soldiers without his knowledge. True to longstanding Arab democratic principles, the terrorists did not bother to ask them if they wanted to become willing participants. Their martyrdom is assumed.

Even Arafat's own cabinet demanded of him to rein in terror and he refused ("[Arafat Rejects His Cabinet's Demand to Act against Terror](#)," Arnon Regular and Aluf Benn, *Ha'aretz*, 16 March 2004). What better evidence is needed to realize that the Arafat-headed PA is a terrorist organization? It also employs a sophisticated propaganda apparatus with paid clerics who vilify and preach murder ("[Last Week's Friday Sermon on PA Television](#)," MEMRI, Special Dispatch - PA/Arab Antisemitism, 19 March 2004, No. 683).

The Palestinian (paid) clerics pit their "stand" as "truth battling falsehood," justify why "Jews had to be destroyed" (by Muhammad), argue that "the Jews" evil deeds led to their "downfall," make the preposterous claim that "Jews seek to conquer Saudi Arabia," complain that "Arab states are abandoning the struggle," pledge that "we will fight the Jewish cancer" and argue that "the Palestinian mother wishes to receive her son as a corpse, but not butchered." Perhaps even a Ph.D. in psychiatry may not be sufficient to understand the sheer lunacy of such sick propaganda and indoctrination.

However blatant such indoctrination is, the more sophisticated and subtle versions of it have already permeated American school textbooks ("[Textbooks for Jihad](#)," Lee Kaplan, *FrontPageMagazine.com*, 19 March 2004): "...prestigious American textbook publishers such as Prentice-Hall, Simon and Schuster, TCI and others are educating your child to the 'Arab point of view' and its aspirations of world domination through what the Islamic world calls *Dawa*, a means of proselytizing unbelievers to the faith. They are doing this no matter how much that point of view may be distorted, farfetched or, in some extreme cases, outright lies."

"To be sure, it [Islamic culture] is a major part of world history. But the activities of organizations like CIE and AWAIR seek to glorify historical Islam while ignoring Islamic historical tenets that even survive today and are affecting our world. Jihad is virtually ignored in many of the texts or sweetened to mean a personal internal struggle. Bernard Lewis, one of the most prominent Middle East scholars, has stated in the past that jihad has always referred to Muslim conquests in military terms in Islamic culture and to claim otherwise is a diversion... If the use of false history and propaganda to promote the goals of our enemies overseas becomes commonplace in our textbooks here, how long before those goals are achieved in our next generations? Our schools and children have become targets of militant Islam and its apologists. Congress did right by insisting on oversight of Title VI funds in our colleges. It is time now they take an equally hard and long look at the textbooks being used to indoctrinate our children still in grades K through 12."

Regrettably they produce naive admirers and blind followers who abuse the term "peace" as a commodity the Israelis are not deserving of. Thus they are also playing a role in the theater of the absurd by preaching "peace" but willfully and knowingly supporting terror. A recent cynical article by an Israeli is illustrative of the low regard in which so-called "peace activists" are held ("A Tribute to Rachel Corrie: Thanks for showing us what 'peace' really means," Ruhama Shattan, *The Wall Street Journal*, 16 March 2004).

Once in a while the "right" voice is heard from Arab corners. Usually replete with classical canards against the crusaders (Christians) and Jews, it is surprising to find an unequivocal criticism of the Arab practice to vilify and blame everyone else. The latest is by a Saudi columnist ("[Saudi Columnist: The Creed that Sanctions Blowing Up Worshippers in Mosques ... Should Be Declared the Public Enemy of Humanity](#)," MEMRI, Special Dispatch - Saudi Arabia/Reform Project, No. 681, 17 March 2004) who states that "terrorists in Iraq are more barbarous than Saddam," that "Arabs 'blame others and shun the facts'" and suggests that "Shia and Sunni know perfectly well who the perpetrators [of the Karbala massacres] are." Yet even he does not specify who they are, but leaves very little doubt when referring to them as "Arabs" and being part of the "religious elite." This is a clear reference to al-Qaeda on one hand and Iran on the other.

There is something common to terrorism and antisemitism. They target similar "enemies" and end up doing even greater damage to many others in the process as evidenced by Nazi atrocities. Terrorism and antisemitism metastasize like cancer. Cutting the growth (or the "snake's head") is no longer sufficient to eliminate it ("[The Cancer of Antisemitism in Europe](#)," Jeff Jacoby, *The Boston Globe*, 14 March 2004): "What the world should already know but so often forgets is that

Jews are the canary in the coal mine of civilization. Antisemitism is like cancer; unchecked, it can metastasize and sicken the entire body. When civilized nations fail to rise up against the Jew-haters in their midst, it is often just a matter of time before the Jew-haters in their midst rise up against them."

Other metaphors for antisemitism equate it to a mutating virus ("[Antisemitism is a Virus and it Mutates: To claim Jews cause their own suffering by failing to denounce Israeli policy is a revival of an old hatred](#)," Stephen Byers, *The Guardian*, 15 March 2004). Indeed this is an appropriate metaphor given that the individualized Jew as an object of hate and vilification - and as a candidate for extinction - has been replaced by what the Jew has created, namely the State of Israel.

As British Member of Parliament Byers writes: "The reason for the resurgence of an old hatred is simple. Antisemites feel emboldened again. Their prejudice, suppressed out of guilt but lingering on in the past 50 years is finding its way back to the mainstream. This cannot be ignored. Anti-racists everywhere have a responsibility to challenge and expose antisemitism wherever it occurs."

And a scholar on antisemitism ("[Memories Are Short, Hatred Is Forever](#)," Omer Bartov, *Los Angeles Times*, 15 March 2004) adds a warning: "We should not wait until it is too late. We must not repeat the fatal misunderstanding of the 1930s and ignore the lesson Hitler taught us: that some people, some regimes, some ideologies and yes, some religious groups, must be taken at their word."

Too many of these signs are blatantly evident. In the U.S. teenagers are committing "pranks" by stuffing mailboxes of Jews with hate mail, and media mavens and politicians are talking about "neo-cons" as a euphemism for Jews and get away with it ("The Usual Suspects," Ronald S. Lauder, *The New York Sun*, 16 March 2004), partly because Jews themselves have not yet learned when is it appropriate to cry wolf and not be bitten by the cry itself. But also partly because it is tolerated, allowed or simply ignored. And then when it emerges from the gutters to the "civilized" surface the result is "amazement" at "not seeing" the writings earlier, even when they have been smeared rather saliently on the wall.

There is more to the results of the Spanish elections that took place in the aftermath of the terrorist attack on trains in Madrid than submitting to terror ("Terror and Democracy: The bombers 'voted' and Aznar's party lost in Spain," Editorial, *The Wall Street Journal*, 16 March 2004).

Commentators aptly labeled it appeasement, capitulation, and even decadence, pointing out that it is not only Spain at stake but the fate of all Europe ("Spaniards Capitulating . . .," Charles Krauthammer, *The Washington Post*, 19 March 2004): "So when Zapatero and, more important, Prodi speak of nonmilitary means to combat terrorism, they do not mean draining the swamp by gradually building free institutions. They mean buying off the terrorists, distancing themselves from America and seeking a separate peace. Sure, they will continue to track down individual al-Qaeda terrorists. But that is no favor to anyone. They want to make sure there is not another Madrid, in case European appeasement is not quite thorough enough to satisfy the terrorists. But

on the larger fight, the reordering of the Arab world that produced the terrorists, they choose surrender."

Others ascribe the victory of the terrorist not so much to their power to instill fear, but to the identified weak point of their targeted victims who no longer have the wherewithal to oppose them ("[Spain's Elections Show Why Radical Islam Can Win](#)," Spengler, *Asia Times*, 16 March 2004). This has to do with demographic decline and long historical trends that are now catching the Spaniards as an unwilling party to protect themselves (at least for now).

The British have their own radical Muslim threat from within and some of their experts offer fairly nebulous remedies for terrorism ("Terror Unlimited: After Madrid We're in Shock. But we are more resilient than our leaders think," Tim Garden, *Independent*, 14 March 2004). A British scholar and former Air Marshall wrongly identifies past terrorist activities, suggesting that terrorists transform into legitimate governments once they obtain their objectives. He wrongly focuses on the pain and anger of the Spaniards demonstrating in the streets following the atrocity yet fully ignores the political shift which resulted from their elections. He is also too politically correct when suggesting that "leaders must resist the temptation to throw away our individual liberties in the hopeless search for absolute security. Coping with terrorism is the challenge of the century." This is the kind of "truism" and classical "expert" advice that dooms its recipients to failure.

By no means is this sentiment shared by all Europeans or all Brits. Others in England have a far better read on what needs to be done with terrorists ("Let Us Pray by all Means, and Then Pass the Ammunition," Barbara Amiel, *The Daily Telegraph*, 15 March 2004). There is a correct analysis of the depth of the hate and "grievance" displayed by terrorists. When it goes back to 1492 ("losing" Spain) or 80 years ago ("losing" the Ottoman Empire) it means there is no time period and no appeasement that will soften or satisfy any real or imagined grievance. In other words, no matter how many times the Islamists lose they only see it as an incentive for additional demands.

Indeed, "...by their own mad statements, the Islamists will not be content until all the lands they believe belong to the Muslim world are free of the infidel and the "humiliation of 80 years ago" is reversed, meaning the reversal of the end of the Ottoman Empire. Given their rather bloody interpretation of the command of the Koran to spread the word to all infidels, unless we pull ourselves together we shall find ourselves spread all over streets and railway lines. In the fight against Satan, it is traditional to have a deity. Let's pray by all means - and then pass the ammunition."

What is missing in the Spanish script is the understanding of what the objectives of the terrorists (and their handlers) are. One commentator takes them at their word ("These Guys Want to Kill Us Anyway," Mark Steyn, *The Australian*, 15 March 2004). Therefore, "the choice for pluralist democracies is simple: You can join Bush in taking the war to the terrorists, to their redoubts and sponsoring regimes. Despite the sneers that terrorism is a phenomenon and you cannot wage war against a phenomenon, in fact you can - as the Royal Navy did very successfully against the malign phenomena of an earlier age, piracy and slavery. Or you can stick your head in the sand and paint a *burqa* on your butt. But they'll blow it up anyway."

Perhaps the French would be wise to heed the latest Islamist threat against them ("[Muslim Group Threatens France: Group plans to inflict 'terror into the heart of the French people,'](#)" CNN, 17 March 2004). An exceptionally gutsy British editorial ("The World at War," Editorial, *The Daily Telegraph*, 14 March 2004) understands that this unusual threat that terror poses requires fighting it with unusual means, not with designer kids' gloves we cannot afford. In reference to the British criticism raised against the holding of detainees in Guantanamo, it states: "No country at war has ever treated captured saboteurs or spies as ordinary criminals...They need to ask themselves if, in order to increase the chances of preventing the next episode of mass murder, it is worth restricting some of the protections which the law extends to those suspected of involvement in terrorism. It is difficult to believe that the answer to that question must always be No."

One only need look at the differing perception of events in Europe and the U.S. to realize that even if the terrorists mistake U.S. resolve again (to be weak), they will be matched with an even more fierce response than what is currently taking place ("[Al-Qaeda's Wish List,](#)" David Brooks, *The New York Times*, 16 March 2004). Yet the point is not whether "in the end" the terrorists will not win. That should be axiomatic. The point is they might (and are very likely to) try to imitate and re-apply the Spanish model to influence the American elections shortly before they take place.

The negative lesson taught by the recent Spanish political experience is also an omen of what not to do in the Middle East. Any early Western retreat from that area ("[Like It or Not, the West Just Can't Leave the Middle East: The dreams of al-Qaeda and its allies are destructive - but doomed,](#)" Martin Woollacott, *The Guardian*, 19 March 2004) will be perceived as defeat. And the U.S. has already been to that movie in [Beirut](#), when it decided in 1983 it no longer had business there because it became too costly: "As Spain demonstrates, it may be that in the future the Western leaders who will have to deal with the consequences of the Iraq intervention will not be those who led it. But deal with it they must, as well as take other decisions that may prove equally hazardous, if the pernicious idea that the West and the Islamic world have separate futures linked only by hostility is to be defeated."

It is normal to be fearful and concerned about terrorism, it is normal to plan ahead, it is normal to be resilient, it is normal to hope for better days to come. Yet if there is anything that boggles the mind as an unexplainable abnormality it is the persistent hijacking of the "peace narrative" by those who claim they are for peace but will not say a word against terrorism. City streets all over the world should have been filled with mourning, angry citizens protesting like the millions of Spaniards immediately following the Madrid bombing. In fact, the Spaniards were the only ones displaying such massive and strong sentiments against terror. Until their election results three days later, which turned their dignity into misplaced opportunism. But why is the rest of the world silent? Why could a million people march in London against the war in Iraq or in numerous cities around the world, but very few go out to the streets to protest daily massacres committed by terrorists, the abuse, the decadence, the corruption, the twisted mindedness, the evil and the sheer cold-bloodedness of murderers who are so brazen as to declare a Christian Arab to be an Islamist "shahid" after they murdered him? When we have answers to this question we may also have the first signs that victory against terrorism is indeed possible. The answers will likely come and hopefully not at a high cost.