The Terrorist as a Ventriloquist (No Offense to the Latter)

August 3, 2003

By Robbie Friedmann

All Saudis may not be alike, but it seems the House of Saud manages to consistently come up with strong anti-American and antisemitic sentiments that receive prominent airing and tacit support. This despite the ongoing Saudi declarations about its long-term *friendship* with the U.S. and its desire for *peace* in the Middle East. As ventriloquists often do in their schizoid shows - as if they are arguing with themselves - "Who? me? I didn't do it" responds the puppet to the puppeteer. So when one of their several thousand princes writes -rather eloquently- on American weakness and arrogance, or on cousins (Jews) who will be "cut at the knees" it raises serious concerns about Saudi attitudes and intentions. It certainly does not contribute to alleviate the anti-American and antisemitic threat emanating from the Saudis ("The Anti-American and Antisemitic Writings of Saudi Prince Amr Muhammad Al-Faysal," MEMRI, Special Dispatch - Saudi Arabia/ Arab Antisemitism, 30 July 2003, No. 544).

These same Saudis have not only perpetrated the 9-11 atrocity but also sent their *Jihad fighters* against the U.S. in Iraq along with their brethren from other Arab and Muslim countries ("Arab and Muslim Jihad Fighters in Iraq," Steven Stalinsky, MEMRI, Special Report - "Jihad and Terrorism Studies," 27 July 2003, No. 19).

The anti-American sentiments are also echoed by other Arab officials such as the Syrian foreign minister ("Syrian Foreign Minister Farouq Al-Shar'a on the U.S. Government: "The Most Violent and Stupid American Administration Ever," MEMRI, Special Dispatch - Syria, 29 July 2003, No. 543). Yet back in the U.S. Muslim Americans seem to be courted by the up-for-re-election President ("Bush Kicks off Muslim Strategy for Reelection," World Tribune.COM, 28 July 2003) as the White House reportedly "regards the Muslim vote as a key element in the campaign."

And the onslaught continues. In the last three years of Palestinian violence (purposefully and strategically aimed at Israel) great attention has been given to physical violence and to incitement that encourages and condones it. Despite the *hudna*, both the violence and incitement continue unabated. Just last week the Palestinian Authority has re-broadcast an old TV clip that features violence ("Violence, Dead Bodies and Seriously Wounded in PA TV Clip," Itamar Marcus, Palestinian Media Watch, Multi-Media Bulletin, 30 July 2003). The PA continues encouraging youths to sacrifice themselves in what amounts to absolute child abuse and the glorification of it (see "Palestinian Child Abuse: Brain Wash and Indoctrination in Hate").

During that time violence by Israeli Arabs (a 20% minority) was limited to the beginning of the wave of violence in September-October 2000 and has significantly subsided after 13 Arabs were shot in Nazareth during a violent riot that got out of control. Yet, sporadic violent activities have continued and several Israeli Arabs committed suicide/homicide bombings, assisted in perpetrating such atrocities, and have been detained for conspiracy and sedition. Now a new phase is evident in the nationalization of Israeli Arabs who conduct summer camps for their

youths by resorting to the model of the Palestinian camps which promote incitement and violence ("[Police Disperse Summer Camp for Alleged Incitement](#)," Uri Ash and Yair Ettinger, *Ha'aretz*, 1 August 2003).

This latest development points out the danger that Israel is facing from inside as well as the danger of Pan-Arabism and Pan-Islamism which are forces that are not easily - if at all - changeable. Similar threats are aimed at the United States. Indeed, any effort at defending Israel and the U.S. has to take into account that there are limitations not only on what the West could aspire to, but to what it is willing to do, and what it actually can do. If such limitations are recognized then efforts should be placed on making it clear to perpetrators that violent behavior and the incitement leading to it will not be tolerated ("Accepting Our Limitations," Caroline Glick, The *Jerusalem Post*, 1 August 2003).

The first four weeks of the so-called *hudna* - incompletely translated as *cease-fire* or *truce* when it is actually regrouping to hit when convenient - point out that there may be a reduction in the level of terror activity and the number of casualties. However, this arrangement - which is internal to the Palestinian terror organizations and is not an agreement with Israel - does not even hold up to its name. During this period, terrorists have thrown stones, stabbed, shot, launched mortars and Kassam missiles, and carried out one suicide bombing, amounting to 167 reported incidents in which several Israelis died and many were injured. In addition, terrorists trained at sea to improve the precision and range of the Kassam missiles, had well-placed caches of ammunition (a few discovered), smuggled arms and ammunition (through Egypt) and had several suicide/homicide missions that were luckily intercepted in time by Israeli security forces.

Thus, the terrorists continue to commit terror and hide under the guise of the so-called *hudna* - as if they have agreed to a *cease-fire* - which is not even kept. This leads some to question the level of tolerance that Israel has shown to the abuses of the declared *hudna* ("Happy *hudna*!" Michael Freund, The *Jerusalem Post*, 30 July 2003): "The first step toward emerging from this crisis is to return to our senses. Israel must remain firm in demanding zero tolerance of terror. And zero tolerance means zero attacks. Period. Making excuses for the Palestinian leadership's failure to quash terror, or minimizing the extent of the violence itself, is merely a recipe for further bloodshed and carnage. For by doing so we come perilously close to accustoming ourselves to terrorism and even accepting it as part of our daily lives."

Indeed, in addition to the current level of terror activities, the security established in Israel has ample evidence - and expresses public concern - that the Palestinians are preparing another round of violence that could be even worse than the current one ("Terrorist Groups Rebuilding During *Hudna* - Mofaz," Nina Gilbert, The *Jerusalem Post*, 30 July 2003) and it is more than fair to say that it threatens the *Roadmap* and puts Israel even at a greater disadvantage by pushing her to concede more and more and at the same time ignore the gross transgressions of the Palestinians ("^You Call This a Cease-Fire?," Joseph Farah, WorldNetDaily.com, 31 July 2003).

The Roadmap does not only call for the complete cessation of terrorism. Of course, the dismantling of terror organizations is a prime element in it. It also calls for the termination of corruption, the upholding of human rights, and for the ending of incitement. The problem is that

the Palestinians have not delivered on these counts either. Therefore, it is premature to offer any trust in the Palestinian intentions and actions as leading to the actualization of the Roadmap ("Too Early to Trust," Rachel Ehrenfeld, *New York Sun*, 31 July 2003).

The Roadmap has not even dried out from the print shop and already the Palestinians have imposed two additional components that are not included in it: First the release of the 7,000-8,000 prisoners they have in Israeli prisons, and second, to stop building Israel's security fence. Israel has agreed to release more than 500 terrorists including members of Hamas and Islamic Jihad and appears to slow, alter or even stop the building of the fence in some areas. But not all are buying the Palestinian argument ("Do Fence Me In," William Safire, The *New York Times*, 31 July 2003).

Yet even the usually conservative *Wall Street Journal* editorialized against the fence ("Mideast Peace Progress: Israel Can Help by Taking Down its Security Fence," 31 July 2003). There is little wonder that for Tom Friedman the only problem that holds the Middle East from becoming *new* is the issue of Israeli settlements. Remove them and peace and tranquility will arrive because the terrorists will have no more reason to commit terror... No doubt this is Pulitzer Prize logic; yet one is entitled to ask Friedman how would he explain continued Palestinian terror AFTER Israel withdraws from all the territories; after all, terror happened before Israel acquired the territories in a war that was forced on her in 1967 ("A New 'New Mideast,'" Thomas L. Friedman, The *New York Times*, 30 July 2003).

Following the recently acknowledged fiascos at the BBC and the *New York Times*, a former editor of the *Wall Street Journal* argues that it is time for journalists to remove any claim for objectivity ("The Press: Time for a New Era? The BBC and *New York Times* Scandals Show that "Objectivity" is Dead," Robert L. Bartley, The *Wall Street Journal*, 28 July 2003). This is an advice that should be particularly heeded by organizations such as the National Public Radio (NPR) that in recent years has been notorious for presenting itself as *objective* while being overly one-sided (pro-Palestinian).

So as President Bush continues to press Israel to release (some but not all) terrorists - under the false assumption that it will improve the *negotiating climate* in the area. He has at least been reported to object to a State Department plan to "reform" the terrorist organizations and is not willing to take them off the terror list ("Bush Rejects State Dept. Plan for Hamas," World Tribune.COM, 28 July 2003).

Yet, the main problem with the Roadmap is evident in the lack of "what if." Namely, an exit strategy IF the Roadmap fails ("A fallback plan in the Mideast?" Tom Neumann, *Washington Times*, 26 July 2008). The Roadmap can *succeed* only under the following conditions: The Palestinians fully abide by it and the Israelis fully abide by it. If the Palestinians do not completely abide by it (and they are not), this will have one of two dangerous implications: 1) Israelis will be forced to accept it and continue to abide by it even against such evidence; 2) Israel will pay the price of accommodation irrespective of the level of Palestinian transgressions.

Given the ample evidence that Palestinians have not dismantled their terror apparatus, they continue with terrorism, they continue with incitement, they continue with corruption, with child

abuse, and with the usurpation of their own people, this means that the Roadmap is dead upon arrival. There is only one hope in this intolerable situation and it is a long shot: After the Bush administration realizes the Palestinians have not changed, American disappointment will register far deeper than is currently admitted. It is not enough to isolate Arafat; it is imperative to demand unequivocal compliance with **all** elements of the roadmap and the non-acceptance of new demands the Palestinians tend to heap on the course of events.

The situation where the Palestinians - like the Saudis - act as a ventriloquist saying one thing from the mouth of the puppeteer and another from the mouth of the puppet needs to be brought to a screeching halt. And the same goes for the Saudis. These are among the key troublemakers in the world who will be appeased by nothing less than submission or conversion. Since neither one is a real option for Israel or the U.S. then nothing short of complete vanquishing of terror should be strived for.

The battle is not only in the Middle East. It is now seeping to internal American political spheres. The vociferous objection of Arab/Muslim advocacy groups to the appointment of Daniel Pipes to the U.S. Institute of Peace is better understood when examining Pipes' writings on such groups as misrepresenting Islam and as operating in the U.S. as a fifth column ("What Americans Think About Islam," Daniel Pipes, The *Jerusalem Post*, 30 July 2003).

According to Pipes, these groups only help enhance the negative perceptions Americans increasingly have about Islam. He demonstrates that the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) does not consider suicide bombing as terrorism, it supports terrorist groups such as Hamas and it aspires to turn the U.S. into an Islamic country. Yet, it is formally recognized as the representative of Islamic bodies in the U.S., is invited to official functions, provides *sensitivity* training and frequently is interviewed in the media as representing the Islamic views.

So when Pipes argues that "Improving Islam's reputation will require two steps: that the great institutions of American life reject all contact with CAIR and like groups, while moderate Muslims build sound organizations, ones that neither apologize for terrorism nor seek 'the government of the United States to be Islamic,'" he earns the wrath of these advocacy groups.

As the battle over the nomination of Daniel Pipes continues to heat up, there is a serious danger that he may not be appointed. Should that happen it will amount to more than succumbing to political correctness. It would be tantamount to radical Muslim advocacy groups wielding more control over the American political scene than ever before ("Debunking Political Correctness," Diana West, The *Washington Times*, 31 July 2003).

Pipes needs to win this one for the good guys and for homeland security.