

Scientific Terrorism

December 21, 2002

By Robbie Friedmann

This week the U.N. inspectors in Iraq declared their lack of satisfaction with the documentation provided them; Britain and the U.S. actually argued that Iraq is in "material breach" of UN Resolution 1441; Trent Lott stepped down as incoming Senate majority leader; former president Carter came home with the gold, and Israel found out that it is continuing to be a victim of terror with the added realization that Arab Israeli political parties have as their mission to undermine the character of the state, namely, destroy it.

The West - and particularly western media - has a tendency to be single-issue-focused. While Iraq is the most visible blip on the radar screen these days other serious problems are relegated to second-class importance. So we are evidencing a repeat of the Chamberlain syndrome with different players. In September 1938 Neville Chamberlain flew to meet Hitler at his private mountain retreat at Berchtesgaden. In December 2002 Bashar Assad flew to London and received the royal treatment in the hope of eliciting his support for the Brits ("Britain appeases a dictator," Editorial, The Jerusalem Post, Dec. 14, 2002).

Despite the 64 years since 1938 the historical lessons have not been learned. Then the Brits were duped by Hitler's "limited" appetite hoping it will end with Czechoslovakia. Now they have been duped again as Assad has not delivered his support nor did he condemn terrorism. In fact he continued to support it: "We don't have in Syria what is called organizations promoting terrorism... We have press offices ... These offices express the opinions of Palestinians inside Palestine and outside Palestine." In short, the Palestinians of today are for Syria the pretext that Hitler used to invade the Sudetenland. It is therefore worth analyzing a Berchtesgaden meeting record and apply it to the 2002 London royal treatment. The similarities are too striking.

While the Brits may be concerned about the Middle East, the U.S. is concerned about its own backyard. In the last few months persistent reports have surfaced about terrorist funding and activities of "Islamic militants" in Latin America ("[U.S. Expanding Effort to Block Terrorist Funds in Latin Region](#)," James Dao, The New York Times, December 21, 2002). Together with news of similar activities in Europe, Australia, southeast Asia, and Africa, it is clear that no continent is immune. With reports that Al Qaida is now operating in more than 90 countries it further reaffirms what not so many are willing to recognize and accept - that it is a world war. And one of a nature that could be far more grievous than the previous two. As the U.S. is busy chasing and foiling terrorists all over the world, and Israel has more than its share at home, it appears that many terrorists are also caught on U.S. soil.

What is alarming is the observable response by self-styled Arab U.S.-based advocacy groups who serve as apologists and who do not miss any opportunity to bash the "American system" or Israel. Examine a press release by the Council on American-Islamic Relations ("DFW Muslim Leaders Issue Statement Regarding Elashi Family Arrests," CAIR, December 19, 2002, Dallas Fort-Worth) in which it "protested" the manner of the arrest of those suspected of terrorist links.

CAIR complained about "humiliation," a bad choice of the hour (late night), and the day (showing a film on Muhammad on PBS), stating how hard it is becoming for these American Muslims to defend their own country: "The significance of these arrests is clearly exaggerated for political purposes. One is left wondering whether these arrest orders were issued from Tel Aviv or Washington, D.C! we are concerned that these charges result from what appears to be a "war on Islam and Muslims" rather than a "war on terror." We, as American Muslims are facing an uphill battle in defending our own government's foreign policy, as well as the, so-called, war on terrorism, while being targeted by our own law enforcement agencies." Thus an organization purporting to represent American Arabs/Muslims sees it more important to chastise the government that is trying to protect its citizens than in helping it find out whether these "four prominent, respected members of our community" intended to cause harm. Clearly CAIR is expert at word washing.

This dishonorable doublespeak where the victim is further attacked and the perpetrator is seen as victim is a motif of those who claim that the Arab streets are "enraged" at western "transgressions" and the lack of willingness to accept any responsibility for their own role in causing and flaming the conflict. They continue to vilify the victims as if they have a god-given entitlement to victimhood and innocence on one hand and a license to kill on the other. The Arab propaganda machine is wasting easy-earned cash on ineffective strategies to warm the hearts of western victims to Saudi terrorists ("Saudi PR Turns From Spin To Stonewalling: Even the flacks aren't willing to defend their lies," William McGurn, Wall Street Journal, December 16, 2002). Yet there are worrisome reports that the Saudis are successful in buying political influence in the U.S. ("What Riyadh Buys," Daniel Pipes, New York Post, 12-11-2002).

They are also spending their money very successfully on indoctrination in-house and internationally alike. The themes in a MEMRI report on Saudi education are shocking and it helps understand what not only the Jews but Christianity and the West are now facing (["Saudi Arabia's Education System: Curriculum, Spreading Saudi Education to the World and the Official Saudi Position on Education Policy,"](#) Steven Stalinsky, MEMRI, Special Report - No. 12, December 20, 2002 No.12).

Jihad is a recurring theme (and not as a "peaceful soul searching" activity as some "interpretations" go). Jews and Christians are "Cursed by Allah and Turned into Apes and Pigs." "The Whole World Should Convert to Islam and Leave Their False Religions Lest Their Fate Will Be Hell." "There is a Jew Behind Me, Come and Kill Him!" which is "supported" by a theme of "Jewish Treachery." And to those Christians who do not "wish to convert" the Saudi message is that "Jesus is Not the Son of God." Clearly the desert heat has had a major impact on this ideology.

The Palestinians are of course grateful for their Saudi financiers and out of the same very textbooks they now formulated a new blood libel suggesting that it is the Jews who denigrate their religion ("PA Libel: Jewish Religion sees Arabs as Stage between Jew and Monkey," Itamar Marcus, Palestinian Media Watch Bulletin, Dec. 15, 2002). They also show gratitude - if not wishful thinking - towards Iraq (which they supported in the 1991 Gulf War and where Hussein is busy with a megalomaniacal personality cult building: ["Hussein's Obsession: An Empire of Mosques,"](#) John F. Burns, The New York Times, December 15, 2002) when they

officially state that they "know" that "Iraq will be a graveyard for the American soldiers" (Itamar Marcus Palestinian Media Watch Bulletin, Dec. 19, 2002). A new ADL report on antisemitism helps place the Arab "contribution" to this notorious historical plague in proper and frightening context ("Antisemitism in the Arab world," Anti Defamation League).

Despite the expected tendency to attribute ill will to the Saudis, the Palestinians, and their brethren around the world, they do not live on hate and a false sense of racial and religious superiority alone. They also have national and international interests to boot. As soon as territories previously held by Arabs were captured by Israel, the Palestinians have conveniently forgotten their national charter (which calls for the destruction of Israel and which they have never abolished despite their commitment to do so) in which they laid no claims to the "west bank" or "Gaza" as long as they were in Jordanian and Egyptian hands ("Explaining 'Palestine' and the lack thereof," Martin Sherman, The Jerusalem Post, Dec. 12, 2002).

Now the Palestinians are increasingly realizing that the violence of the last 27 months is not bringing them any desired results. They do not lament the loss of life but now hang their hopes on internal Israeli discord which might undo Israel and on external international pressure ("[Abu Mazen in Gaza: Stop the Armed Operations; Our Way Failed; Israeli Arabs Can Help Us by Bringing Down and Setting Up Israeli Governments, Not by Participating in the Intifada](#)" MEMRI, Special Dispatch - Palestinian Authority, December 15, 2002, No. 449).

Not only are they hoping that "Israeli Arabs Should Help Us by Bringing Down or Setting Up Israeli Governments" (so with which government would they then deal?) but they still insist that "The [Saudi] 'Arab Initiative' Included the Right of Return" and that Israel "Must Accept" it. In other words, the Palestinian and Arab narrative concerning Israel is summed up in Arabs seeing their construction as dependent on Israel's destruction.

But not only. There is more. The Palestinians learned their tactics from the Vietnamese and are already being encouraged to export their suicide bombing techniques all over the world ("[Vietnam all over again in Mideast?](#)" Joseph Farah, WorldNetDaily.com, December 17, 2002). Yet they will fail because unlike the U.S. in Vietnam Israel has nowhere to retreat and cannot afford nor survive a loss (Yom Kippur 1973 is a good case in point). However, this raises several questions. First, how is it that the U.S. and the rest of the free world constantly promote the democratization of the Arab and Muslim world are allowing Israel - a leading democracy - to suffer what they are unwilling to tolerate? ("Process' of Elimination: Why does America ask Israel to let its people get blown up?" Claudia Rosett, The Wall Street Journal, December 18, 2002). Second, Why are they forcing Israel to reward terrorism by treating the Palestinians as a victorious party that is entitled to an equal seating at the negotiating table rather than placing the onus of demonstrating responsible behavior on the Palestinians prior to any such rewards? ("Palestinian statehood: A reward for terror," Gary Bauer and Morton A. Klein, The Jerusalem Post, Dec. 12, 2002).

The anti-Israeli and anti-western sentiments have permeated traditional western strongholds of freedom and independence such as the university campuses. They are increasingly becoming bully pulpits for pseudo-academics who are busy preaching instead of teaching and who are pre-occupied with ideology and not with science. The politicization of the campus has reached a

stage in which the death of social sciences may be just around the corner - give or take a decade or two ("[Lessons in hate, on a campus near you.](#)" Leonard Stern, Ottawa Citizen, December 14, 2002).

These academic bullies (particularly the majority of the so-called Middle East experts) maintain that President Bush "wants" to "destabilize" the planet. For them it is not Al Qaida, not the corrupt Arab regimes, not the terror-supporting Saudis, not the North Koreans, not the ayatollahs from Iran, not Iraq. And the public media in the U.S. seems to be helping spread misunderstandings rather than help clarify them. The Public Broadcasting System followed its tradition of "objectivity" in portraying Islam only in a positive light ("Mister Allah's Neighborhood: When did PBS become a for-prophet network?" Collin Levey, December 19, 2002).

Yet, "... If you want to hear any of the opinions frequently sprouting from PBS documentaries, you only have to travel as far as the nearest college campus. Americans are equipped to handle propaganda and sort it out for themselves, but there's something slippery about a program that offers up a vision of Islam without violence and controversy as an "educational" service... A procession of PBS-approved American Muslims assuring us that nothing in Islam condones Sept. 11 is hardly comforting when millions of Muslims around the world plainly believe otherwise. Religious history is always interesting, but intellectual dishonesty and wishful thinking by TV producers aren't. PBS is obviously out to make sure Americans are properly sensitive and respectful of Islam, even if it means distorting Islam's history. Such a tack is likely to hinder rather than advance the true cultural rapprochement that the producers claim to be seeking." This is important because no respected religious (or secular) figure or organization anywhere came up with an unequivocal, unconditional, condemnation of terrorism. There are always strings attached and "understanding" and "justification" clauses tailing such statements.

Providing a fuller picture is imperative given the tendency pointed out earlier of vilification, of a false sense of victimhood, and an arrogant entitlement to kill. This becomes even more important when the lessons from the European community are applied to the U.S. and alarming signs are strongly indicative of ill will spreading by the Arab/Muslim newcomers to the host societies ("[Belgium, Islam and the Boomerang of "Multiculturalism."](#) Michael Radu, FrontPageMagazine.com | December 19, 2002): "...already American Moslems' self appointed leaders are clamoring for treatment similar to that of Blacks and Hispanics - never mind that they are richer than the 'oppressor' white group, and nothing good to expect."

Of course, biased science in the service of propaganda will eventually cause the demise of science and the proponent of what passes for economic analysis. In a recent "analysis" of cost/benefit Israel did not come up well in the Christian Science Monitor. HonestReporting pointed out the deficiencies of such analysis but it is clear that the damage was intentional so as to undermine Israel's value to the West and particularly the U.S. ("[The Christian Science Monitor delegitimizes and sensationalizes the amount of U.S. foreign aid to Israel.](#)" HonestReporting.com).

Surely, the peace maker could fix all that. Right? What former president Carter has fixed is his Nobel medal in his presidential center for public viewing. It turns out that in his acceptance

speech the engineering-minded president has omitted some facts and misinterpreted others. Most important is that he conveniently neglected to distinguish between "territories" and "the territories" ("Jimmy Carter's Selective Memory," Ariel Natan Pasko, Arutz Sheva, 15 December 2002). Article 1(I) of U.N. Resolution 242 (English version) states the "Withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict." And not as Carter mentioned in his acceptance speech "the territories."

Shortly after the 9-11 atrocity President Bush was often heard saying that the terrorists are after freedom and "our way of life." First they are after our lives. Second our way of life does not only mean being able to shop in the mall securely or taking a flight without the risk of mid-air explosion. Freedom does not only mean that one could go anywhere anytime. It also means that values of truth, consistency, facts, and refutation, need to be upheld because there is for the first time a dogmatic terroristic threat to academic freedom. Not the academic freedom commonly revered in universities where everyone is perceived to be able to teach and say what they want without any repercussion. Rather the risk is to academic freedom of the spirit of science. It is impossible to create gold from other elements. Alchemists tried it and failed miserably. But in universities today the social sciences are sacrificed, abused, and twisted to serve political purposes without any adherence to facts and to the proper methods of scientific investigation. When Carter omits a key word over which countries vehemently argued, until U.N. Resolution 242 was approved, it is bad and sad politics. But when scientists in the social fields and humanities become evangelists for political causes they have maliciously disregarded the principles they ought to have abided by and have relinquished their rights and privileges to practice as scientists. In this sense those who call themselves scientists are nothing but terrorists who are hijacking the scientific agenda. They are in the service of malicious causes and as such they constitute a danger to "our way of life."