

With Peace Like This Who Needs War?

November 24, 2002

By Robbie Friedmann

The atrocious combination of a death-deifying culture and a strategic war against Israel continued this week with yet another suicide bombing on a Jerusalem bus (and many other attacks that were not reported by western media). Israel keeps using measured means to locate the perpetrators and retaliate against some buildings suspected of housing bomb factories ("Bomb kills 11; IDF moves on Bethlehem," Ha'aretz Staff, November 23, 2002). To the chorus of those "condemning" terrorism a wanna-be member added his out-of-tune voice: Palestinian "Minister" Abed Rabbo declared earlier in the week that Israel is responsible for the suicide bombings against it. And Arafat (who is still kicking and killing) had the audacity to claim that Israel's excursion in Bet-Lehem is a threat to peace. This is the classical double victimization: first commit the homicidal crime and then blame-the-victim for being blown away and for trying to defend itself. This is the kind of perverse (yet effective) propaganda that requires much more than a root-canal work to eradicate it.

Statistics compiled by the Israeli military point out that since the Arab violence has started in late September 2000 and leading up to November 17, 2002, there were a total of 15,298 terror attacks against Israel. This comes down to one attack every 68 minutes, every day and every night ("15,000 and counting ..." Michael Freund, The Jerusalem Post, Nov. 19, 2002).

Israel's weakness in addressing the onslaught against it does not originate in its lack of power but stems from a combination of having a great deal of power that cannot be strategically channeled into action because the international community (including particularly the U.S.) applies the breaks to anything that might be "perceived" as an "obstacle" to dealing with Iraq and with terrorism "in general" (namely, in the U.S. or Europe). Indeed, it is a worrisome sign when the "road-map" offered by the U.S. and the Europeans seems to do nothing but reward terrorism ("Creating a Palestinian Arab State Would Reward Terror," Morton A. Klein, Our Jerusalem, November 22, 2002).

And the "world" continues its ritualistic reward with yet another formal recognition. Instead of actively and meaningfully condemning and shunning terrorism and those associated with it, not much more than lip service is paid. At the same time, the world recognizes representatives of terror, invites them to address university campuses to commemorate the 9-11 atrocity, and bestows upon them prizes of "peace" as in the case of Hanan Ashrawi who was also given \$50,000 for being a "peace activist and a champion of human rights" ("The Olof Palme Prize 2002 to Hanan Ashrawi," The Olof Palme International Center, 2002-11-21).

Conspicuously, the Swedes are totally oblivious to the fact that Human Rights pertain to all humans not just Palestinians. Ashrawi has been an advocate for and an apologist of violence through decades of her "activism" as a Palestinian "legislator" and an official of the Arab League having and had little to do with peace or with coexistence. The Palme Center and the current Swedish Foreign Minister are doing a disservice to humanity and to the cause of peace by this

dubious honor. And Ashrawi? She is laughing all the way to the (west) bank.....

Ashrawi represents a group that is actively engaged in violence and for the convenience of the occasional propaganda campaign(s) she utters words like "peace" that are absolutely obsequious and mean nothing other than serving as a deceptive component in a campaign of disinformation. This campaign takes place at several levels but the most important one is that of the Arab public which is being fed an overdose of anti-Israeli, anti-Jewish, and anti-American convoluted propaganda that became the "objectified reality" for millions of captive consumers who are not offered other views or the option of choosing between them. The infamous Egyptian TV series has now reached the stage of the blatant blood libel against the Jews suggesting "they have a plan to rule all of humanity" ("The Protocols of the Elders of Zion: "The Jew's racist plan to rule all of humanity," Itamar Marcus, Palestinian Media Watch Bulletin, November 21, 2002).

Some Arab writers maintain that airing this TV series has little to do with freedom-of-expression (one notes that it does not exist in the Arab world) and they debunk Arab arguments that they are Semites too and hence "cannot be anti-Semitic." However, the majority of the Arab press supports the airing of the defaming series as a given truth, as a right, and as a good move to bring the "word" to the viewers ("Arab Press Debates Antisemitic Egyptian Series: 'Knight Without a Horse' - Part II," MEMRI, Inquiry and Analysis - Egypt/Arab Antisemitism, November 20, 2002, No. 113; see MEMRI's synopsis of the series at the end of the article).

The irony of this anti-Semitic claim lies in the fact that never in history did the Jews actually "rule the world" yet the Muslims have colonized it and ruled it for a significant period of time. And similarly ironic is the fact that while they have been engaged in massive warfare against others (and amongst themselves) they have no problem glorifying and imitating the Nazis, or alternatively - when convenient - using them as a symbol of evil. The latest such rhetoric comes from the beacon of Arab corruption and subjugation - Lebanon. One of its papers is treating President Bush as Hitler ("[Heil Bush, America Uber Alles' - Lebanese Paper Gives President Bush a Nazi Salute](#)," MEMRI, Special Dispatch - Syria-Lebanon/U.S. and the Middle East, November 22, 2002, No. 441). In a sense the world should not be surprised since senior German politicians have made similar statements during their recent election campaign, and a Canadian Prime Ministerial aide was more kind, she "only" called him a 'moron.' Yet the PM adamantly refused her resignation.

However, these western political "sorties" should not take away attention from the turpitude of the crude Arab propaganda. The Jewish Internet Association compiled some of these "sources" and added a warning that the sites have very "disturbing content" ("E-Jihad," Chuck Chriss, November 20, 2002). It is important to view these sites to find out what is it (and how) that they portray to their willing consumers. Note that the technology is sophisticated, the editing is professional, and the presentation appeals to raw emotions - not necessarily to the viewers' intellect, or knowledge. They use effective delivery methods that are abrasive yet trying to elicit sympathy; they pretend to present "facts" (which are inherently faulty) while clearly aiming at dehumanizing the "enemy" and legitimize action against it. Examine one such clip (with the problematic title: "Please help bring justice to a nation massacred, raped and robbed for over 60 years. Its only fault is being in the way of the most powerful special interest group in the world") narrated by a child who is well rehearsed, and fills the listener/viewer with "facts" that are

groundless and bias-laden that clearly send the message of "Arab-good / Jew-bad." No matter how much one will try to argue against the clip and what it stands for, it is like poison spreading in the bloodstream. Its extrication may require a blood transfusion or the patient will die. No doubt that the "propaganda patients" have been terminally infected except that unlike the snake-bitten victim, the patients do not die. They just kill others or support the climate of hate and killing.

Perhaps it might be helpful to examine Who are the Palestinians? (Yashiko Sagamori, National Unity Coalition, November 18, 2002, Our Jerusalem, 11/20/2002) in order to develop a better understanding to one of the greatest international frauds ever concocted. What the Palestinians and Arabs want can be best described as a child of a very large family who wants to take away the toys AND the playground of the neighbors' only child. When the police think that this is a simple feud between two children that could be resolved, it turns out that the family and other neighbors lay (unsubstantiated) claims to the toys and to the playground alike and have beaten up the kid. Even when the court later rules that the claims for the property are unfounded, those decisions are ignored and not respected. Appeasing the bullies will work only if there is a readiness to give up. The bully will not change his way with appeasement. Short of that it is imperative to do exactly the opposite ("A return to Jacksonian Zionism," Caroline B. Glick, The Jerusalem Post, Nov. 22, 2002).

The Arabs of Israel seem to be the first to recognize that the current Arab-instigated violence is counterproductive (at least for them) and for the first time since September 2000 they are coming out against their own elected officials who constantly bash Israel and support terror ("Galilee rally calls for replacing Arab Mks," Khaled Abu Toameh and David Rudge, The Jerusalem Post, Nov. 18, 2002): "Many Arabs are now blaming their representatives in the Knesset for increased tension with the state and for alienating their Jewish neighbors. They believe the actions and statements of the Arab MKs over the past few years have seriously hampered Arab endeavors to achieve full equality with Jews."

While this may be a potential positive sign in the annals of the Middle East, more evidence is needed to determine that this swallow might bring spring with it. The relentless pan-Arabic propaganda campaign and terrorist actions (occasionally transfigured into full-scale wars) demonstrate that this is not simply a "Palestinian problem" and neither is it a matter of peace and negotiations. If it was, this could have been solved many times from 1947 (if not earlier) and on as well as at Camp David in 2000. The fact remains that the Arabs are not ready for an end-of-the-conflict that will recognize and accept the existence of Israel. What they ARE doing is vociferously propagating the Nazi-style "final solution" to annihilate Israel ("Brotherhood of blood," Matthew Gutman, Nov. 21, 2002).

The head of the (Palestinian) Islamic Jihad (Sheikh Assad Tamimi, author of a 1982 booklet "The Obliteration of Israel: A Koranic Imperative" - see "The Islamic Jihad: the Imperative of Holy War," A Special Report, Boaz Ganor, ICT) stated in 1990 that "The Jews have to return to the countries from which they came. We shall not accede to a Jewish state on our land, even if it is only one village." And shortly before his death, Faysal Al-Husseini gave an interview to an Egyptian newspaper where he openly admitted that the Oslo peace overture with Israel was a Trojan Horse aimed to dismantle Israel. Thus past Palestinian "peace offerings" (not to mention

signed agreements) were nothing but a deception campaign. Interestingly enough, one could point out to Sheikh Tamimi that the Jews have indeed returned to the country they came from, namely, Israel.

And it is not very likely that their propaganda campaign will be diverted in the foreseeable future to the kind of media ideals (which - with all its flaws - is far more promising than the dogmatic and intolerant Arab media) we hold in a free and open society. The reason is that while their modern media seem to pretend to be independent they are government-controlled. This is partly due to the infusion of huge amounts of money and partly because they also reflect the sentiments of both the government and the people. Jon B. Alterman argues ("Slouching Toward Ramallah: Why aren't "independent" Arab media undermining extremism?" The Wall Street Journal, November 21, 2002) that internal criticism of Arab problems is channeled into charges flying at external sources and perceived enemies: "...a funny thing happened on the way to the Arab media bazaar. Rather than contribute to a public debate on the ills of the Arab world, Arab media have concentrated much more on the ills of the non-Arab world. Rather than help Arab publics articulate their grievances toward their governments, they have nurtured Arab grievances against other governments. Arab media have gone a long way toward building solidarity among Arabs, but, to an extraordinary degree, that solidarity is treated as an end in itself rather than as a means to achieve some other goals." When debates are publicly displayed they are fixed from the outset: "...Arab debates often resemble nothing so much as professional wrestling, where the outcome is clear before the adversaries even step into the ring."

It is therefore rather stunning when Israeli and western writers opt to ignore the writing on the wall and while condemning terror they express sympathy and understanding to the Palestinian's "just cause" ("Palestinian bombers maim a just cause," Jay Bookman, The Atlanta Journal-Constitution, 11/21/02). The bombers are only "historically mistaken;" stated as if they have purchased the wrong product off a supermarket shelf. Bookman holds that: "... as Jewish settlements multiply and expand in occupied Palestine, hidden from world notice by Palestinian terror attacks, you have to wonder." Like Tom Friedman he believes that the problem lies with the settlements - not with terror - and he refers to the land as "occupied." It is writers like Bookman and Friedman who demonstrate the success of Arab propaganda against the backdrop of a misguided western notion of equality and fair-play. Unless the debate in the West shifts towards recognizing and addressing the substantive issues at hand the current "opposition" to dealing with terrorism and Iraq will be recognized for what it is, namely, fruitless political posturing ("On the Left: Hysteria and Name-Calling," Robert L. Bartley, The Wall Street Journal, November 18, 2002).

Indeed, the need to recognize and understand the magnitude of the current threat (well beyond that against Israel) is best outlined by Daniel Pipes ("Know Thy Terrorists," The New York Post, November 19, 2002) who states that "A war cannot be won without identifying the enemy. If the U.S. government intends to prevail in the current conflict, it must start talking about the war against militant Islam. This will then make it possible for others - the media, Hollywood, even academics - to do likewise. At that point, both war efforts will be on the right footing." It is also well articulated by Stephen Schwartz who points out the complexity of Islam ("The Good & the Bad: Stephen Schwartz on Islam and Wahhabism," Kathryn Jean Lopez, National Review, November 18, 2002): "Proper media coverage of Islam, meaning the views of serious clerics and

intellectuals, seems unlikely to happen in a media industry where Barbara Walters remains transfixed by Saudi princes handing out charity and Bill O'Reilly preens himself by referring to Islam as "the enemy's religion."

It appears that neither Israel nor the West are yet fully cognizant of the nature, magnitude, and severity, of the threat coming from the Palestinians and from militant Islam. But some do realize the need for proactive pre-emptive action because deterrence alone does not work ("The Bugs of War: Kill the terrorists before they strike with bioweapons," Pete du Pont, the Wall Street Journal, November 20, 2002): "...terrorists have no nation, no people and little at risk when they attack--indeed, they think paradise awaits them as a reward for their evil acts--, so they cannot be deterred. Thus destroying terrorist groups and keeping weapons of mass destruction out of their hands must be our highest priorities." It is important to add that while terrorists do not have nations, some countries do have and support terrorists.

Why should Israel endure the continued terrorist attacks is quite beyond any frame of reference. Why should the U.S. - and the rest of the free world - be under a similar threat that involves the loss of life and is compounded by the new threats from the dead-or-alive OBL that Americans can be saved if they convert to Islam?

War has little to do with killing the enemy. That part has been proven too effectively - and at times efficiently - throughout history as most, if not all, nations have methodologies in place to reward their military with bits of ribbons and metals to make them heroes for effectively killing the enemy. War is really about experiencing the loss of those who are close to you and suffering the frustration of not being able to prevent it and/or not being able to effect any meaningful retribution. It's not much different than losing family members, because the few people you grow to trust in their abilities, commitment, and personal allegiance in a combat circumstance, develop a bond that is essentially every bit as strong as family.

As terrorism so horribly demonstrates, the untimely and violent loss of family members, friends, and countrymen is impossible to accept as they are being indiscriminately targeted and killed under the guise of "war," "retaliation," or acts of "anti-oppression;" or better yet: "peace." The grief, pain, and emotional scars of those who suffer the loss of family members and friends is compounded beyond belief to create a sense of helpless and frightening vulnerability. To even suggest that there is any redeeming basis to justify such actions is blatantly insane. Yet we evidence such justification not only from the perpetrators but from pundits and politicians alike who are supposed to know better. To suggest that those who conduct (or perpetrate) such acts are somehow deserving of being permitted to continue their actions, or even continue to be considered part of the human race, is maddeningly beyond comprehension.

The amount of restraint that Israel has shown in the face of 25 months of relentless atrocious violence is nothing short of dumbfounding. And in a sense the same could be said about the people in the U.S. who, on 9-11, fell victim to an unprecedented attack against civilians and are now under the threat of more of the same.

While not all Arabs/Muslims are "evil," there is enough evidence about identifiable individuals and groups whereby an appropriate use of force could be applied to eliminate the problem. Is this

reasonable? As horrible as it sounds - it is: when whole populations who believe that everything that you stand for is by definition "evil", and that the surest way to Heaven is through the act of killing you, this does not auger well for a secure and promising future, and it is not going to go away because we would like it so, or because we have some (unfounded) belief in the innate good of all mankind.

A lethal combination is at work: First, relatively uneducated Arab/Muslim populace is being fed lies, perverse propaganda, and disinformation, from leaders and manipulators whose objectives are fanatical - and calculated to maintain power through subjugation - and who strengthen their position by applying religious postulations that not only support terrorist actions against non-combatants, but preach such actions as a sure and beautiful way to please their God and find a way into their Heaven. Second, western governments and certain groups who seem to feel the ostrich approach is the solution and anyone who suggests a proactive defense that seeks to prevent a problem before it happens is a "war monger." This combination provides for dangerous times indeed.

At the very least let us not be fooled by the rhetoric of "peace" and "human rights" as they are not only a misnomer (and rather selectively applied) but they have actually produced the exact opposite of what they preach and constitute a risk to our very existence.

Stay tuned.