

# And the Wolf Cried, "The Sheep Attacked Me"

October 11, 2003

By Robbie Friedmann

The theater of absurd is now playing center-stage at the United Nations Security Council where attempts are full steam ahead to condemn Israel for attacking a terrorist base in Syria. Israel, like no other country in the world, has given U.N. bureaucrats endless opportunity to justify their misrepresentation of the purpose of their service (as well as the U.N.'s mission). A very large percentage of the Council's work as well as that of the General Assembly would have been seriously gutted had they not had Israel to bash.

Syria is one of the more assiduous sponsors of terrorism and at the same time also a member of the U.N. Security Council. This is tantamount to serial killer Ted Bundy filing a complaint that one of his victims refused to die and thus violated his civil rights to murder people. The Israeli Ambassador to the U.N. had an eloquent commentary before having to leave for Yom Kippur Services ("Ambassador Dan Gillerman Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations," Emergency Session of the Security Council, 5 October 2003). If there was an element missing in Gillerman's speech it was that Syria is a rogue state, an enthusiastic supporter of Nazism, antisemitism and harbors former Nazi criminals (such as Alois Bruner).

The vote in the Security Council has been delayed as the U.S. is trying to push for a more "balanced language" in the requested condemnation of Israel for acts of retaliation against a Syrian based terrorist group ("U.N. Security Council Vote Condemning Israeli Air Raid Delayed," *Ha'aretz* Staff and Agencies, 6 October 2003). At the same time Syrian President Bashar Assad was busy giving interviews condemning Israel and the U.S. , bragging how he "fights terrorism" but also implying that Palestinians and Syria are justified in using it ("[Syrian President Bashar Al-Assad: 'Terrorism is a State of Mind'](#)" MEMRI, Special Dispatch - Syria, 5 October 2003, No. 584).

In the meantime, the international condemnation of Israel's action in Syria has been offered by a chorus of mostly European leaders suggesting the attack on the terrorist camp in Syria "violated the sovereignty of a third country" and it "cannot be accepted" (German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder during a state visit to Egypt); "unacceptable" (France and Britain); "an escalation" (Canada). All these pious countries want Israel to fight terrorism but do so "within the rules of international law" (as the European Union's Javier Solana has put it). This of course amounts to rendering Israel passive in the face of mortal danger and glaringly defenseless.

Yet some public voices - from expected and unexpected corners - justify Israel's response as being fully understandable and legitimate ("The Price of Indulgence," Editorial, *Daily Telegraph*, 6 October 2003), by outlining the credible information on Syria's active involvement in terrorism ("[Striking Syria](#)," David Bedein, *FrontPageMagazine.com*, 6 October 2003) and by pointing the finger at Syria as being explicitly responsible for terrorism ("Self-Defense sans Frontiers: By Backing Terrorists, Syria Defies Even the U.N." Ruth Wedgwood, *The Wall Street Journal*, 8 October 2003).

Indeed, Israel knows and provided evidence (some produced by Iranian TV bragging of terrorist activity in the bombed camp) that Syria sponsors terrorism ("Israeli Map Shows 'Terror Network' in Damascus," Megan Goldin, Reuters, 7 October 2003). And it appears while Europeans indulge in condemnation exercises, the U.S. is strategizing with Israel on how to address the Syrian menace ("U.S., Israel Move Toward Common Position on Terror Sponsors as Sharon, Assad Flex Muscles," Barry Schweid, An AP News Analysis, *San Francisco Chronicle*, 7 October, 2003).

The terror industry is busy producing it, glorifying it and preaching instructions to carry it out. The latest to join the fray - publicly - is no other than Libyan leader al-Qaddafi who after securing his re-acceptance into the international community (after agreeing to pay reparations to victims of Pan-Am 103 which he initiated and perpetrated) is again stirring the terrorism pot ("[Al-Qaddafi: 'Libya Should Quit the Arab League... Women Must be Trained to Booby-Trap Cars, Houses, Luggage, and Children's Toys'](#)" MEMRI, Special Dispatch - Inter-Arab Relations, 10 October 2003, No. 587).

The Palestinians continue to perfect their obsession with death ("Palestinian Death Cult," Mark Steyn, *The Jerusalem Post*, 8 October 2003). They dehumanize Israelis thus making them "legitimate targets" for their murderous acts ("Dehumanization of Israelis in official PA daily," Itamar Marcus, Palestinian Media Watch Bulletin, 9 October 2003) and continue to promote their declared mission to destroy Israel (see video) by violence ("Official PA TV: Israel will be destroyed through violence," Itamar Marcus, Palestinian Media Watch Bulletin, 8 October 2003).

It might be worth a glimpse to visualize what they want to take (which is not theirs), destroy (so the other will not have it) and conquer (so they will rule). Here is a fantastic panoramic tour of Israel that will bring back enjoyable memories to previous visitors and hopefully entice more to come and see for themselves.

Despite suggestions there is no military solution to the Palestinian violent onslaught against Israel, the fact remains Israel has not fully exercised its military options. Military operations that have been carried out have been limited and restrained by both internal political pressures as well as international ones. Such restrictions have been taken advantage of by terrorist organizations to regroup and to continue violent aggression ("The 'Military Solution' Works," Evelyn Gordon, *The Jerusalem Post*, 7 October 2003).

International terrorism - the modern warfare against innocent civilians - is indeed hard at work. Pakistani secret service agents indoctrinate Indian Muslims in Dubai to the cause of jihad ("[ISI's Friday Sermons in Dubai](#)," Rediff.com, 8 October 2003). Pakistan harbors and supports the Taliban to destabilize the efforts to rebuild Afghanistan ("Safe Haven for the Taliban," Ahmed Rashid, *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 16 October 2003) and radical Islamists are successful in recruiting spies from within the U.S. military to their ranks ("[Guantanamo Spy Cases](#)," Robert Spencer, *The Washington Times*, 7 October 2003).

Those who support terrorism naturally tend to accuse and blame the victim. A high ranking Saudi royal figure provides the traditional attack on the U.S. suggesting it is the "apex of evil in history" and describes the "Genocidal U.S. 'Crime' in Iraq" ("[Saudi Princess Assails American History and Policy](#)," MEMRI, Special Dispatch - Saudi Arabia, 8 October 2003, No. 585).

Terrorists also acquire help from journalists that turn perpetrators into victims or are too quick to side with those who support terror ("Journalists: Unwitting Friends of Jihadis?" Moorthy Muthuswamy, South Asia Analysis Group, Paper no. 806, 1 October 2003).

As Israel contends with state-sponsored terrorism, India also is seeing a growing move by terrorists crossing into India's territory to strengthen their foothold there ("[Insurgents Push into Kashmir: As talk of peace fades, militants scurry to cross into Indian areas before this winter's snows](#)" Scott Baldauf, *The Christian Science Monitor*, 7 October 2003).

Israel also is increasingly under the threat of Iran's potentially close nuclear capability, to the extent it is reportedly prepared to attack Iranian nuclear facilities (as reported in *Der Spiegel* - "[Israel plant Angriff auf iranische Atomanlagen](#)," 11 October 2003). Concern comes not only from Israel or India (which almost went to war with Pakistan recently) but from Arab and other Muslim corners such as Pakistan which see Iranian nuclear power as more of a threat to themselves than to Israel ("[Al-Sharq Al-Awsat Editor: Iran's Nuclear Weapons a Threat to Arab and Islamic Countries](#)," MEMRI, Special Dispatch - Iran/Jihad and Terrorism Studies, 10 October 2003, No. 586).

Some explicitly see India and Israel as being threatened by the same sources of terrorism ("Be On Guard For Attacks," Dr. Mihir Meghani, *Detroit Jewish News*, 9 October 2003). Others see common interests to cooperate already inspiring and yielding very positive outcomes ("India Combats Complex Web of Pakistani-Supported Terror Cells: Counter-Terror Aid and Timely Assistance After Kargil Clashes Paved Way for Close Israeli Ties," Jess, Altschul, JINSA 3 October 2003).

Indeed, cooperation between India and Israel was elevated to its highest level with the signing of the early warning aircraft deal ("Israel Inks Deal with Russia, India for Early-warning Aircraft," Amnon Barzilai and AP, *Ha'aretz*, 10 October 2003). Not surprisingly, Pakistan expressed its irritation at the agreement but there are no reports (yet) of Western human shields rushing to protect Pakistan.

Terrorism is successful because it understandably scares people. It is also perilous as it is increasingly being used as a political tool and as a war strategy. It is thriving because of those who find ways to justify it, accept it or simply appease it ("Wittingly or Not, Two NH Representatives Appease Terrorism," Ravi Subrahmanyam, *The Union Leader*, 8 October 2003).

Indeed, as these state representatives are meddling in the wrong side of international affairs, the classical appeasers and provocateurs such as the never-retiring Helen Thomas ("Cost of Favoritism Toward Israel Made Clear," *Atlanta Journal Constitution*, 10 October 2003) want to sacrifice Israel to appease the Arabs. She quotes a heavily unbalanced report, the result of a "public diplomacy study" (laced with pro-Arab advocates), saying: "Arabs and Muslims support

our values but believe our policies do not live up to them." Now which pot is calling the kettle black given that no Arab nation practices the values she - and the report - maintains they believe in? Next perhaps she will suggest the judges in the Nobel Prize for physics should be those who consistently flunked physics in high school.

Then comes the current master of appeasement and the voice of the Saudi Royal House ("[Long Spoon Diplomacy](#)," Thomas L. Friedman, *The New York Times*, 9 October 2003). First he discusses the "Israeli-Syrian-Shiite-Hezbollah conflict" as if the Iraqis were not part of it and as if the Saudis, Libyans, Lebanese, Iranians, the Yemenites and others are not part of it. Then he wants to "let the bad guys out." Why not appease them for a while? Maybe they will behave? Maybe we can "cut a deal with them?"

The Atlanta paper won the "triple appeasement crown" this past week. In addition to the Friedman and Thomas columns, it offered its very own editorial ("U.S. Fails to Act as Chance for Mideast Peace Ebbs," *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, 7 October 2003) arguing that: "In recent weeks, Israel has attacked neighboring Syria and announced the expansion of illegal settlements in occupied Palestinian territory. Its Cabinet has voted to remove Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat, perhaps even by assassination, and the Sharon government has begun to extend a wall deep into Palestinian land, in effect trying to permanently annex that territory to Israel in violation of international law." And hence "The consequences of doing so will be damaging to Israel, damaging to the United States and damaging to the overall war against terrorism."

The editorial relies on Israelis, politicians and media pundits critical of their own government to suggest "the Israeli nation today rests on a scaffolding of corruption and on foundations of oppression and injustice...Neither Sharon nor Arafat possesses the vision needed to break that cycle and serve as peacemaker. President Bush, by his unwillingness to act independently of Sharon, has ceded that role as well." This is an arrogant, condescending and completely erroneous editorial. It must have been written by those claiming a far better understanding of world realities than this editorial proves they actually do.

Of course Israel attacked "neighboring Syria" but this is a neighbor who sends his pit-bulls to bite Israeli children; not one from whom you can borrow eggs and sugar. Even the phrase "neighboring Syria" implies that Syria is innocent (glad the editorial did not say "neighborly"). It is not. It is a perpetrator of terror and a declared enemy of Israel that has only an armistice agreement with it, not peace. It has also been diagnosed by the U.S. as a major threat to world security.

Settlements are not illegal. Some may not be approved by the government but Israel has a right to build settlements in disputed territories. The Roadmap addresses settlements built after 2000, but does not call for dismantling settlements in existence prior to that. This is not "Palestinian occupied territory." It is a disputed area (at best). According to the [British Mandate](#) (under the [League of Nations](#)) this was all land designated for Jewish habitation. There is a difference between negotiating away what is yours and giving up that right to begin with. According to the editorial's logic Israel has no legal rights on its 1967 territory as the Arabs allege a claim on it too.

And what is wrong with removing Arafat? It may not be wise but it is as legitimate as removing Saddam and the Taliban.

The wall does not go "deep" into "Palestinian territory" as there is no definition of what Palestinian territory is.

Finally, self-defense is not against international law but in compliance with it. The Atlanta editorial may serve terrorism well but not the U.S., Israel, India and the few democracies really caring about fighting terrorism.

Perhaps the Atlanta paper might have benefited from reading an article, written with Yom Kippur as an inspiring backdrop, about dangerous misconceptions ("Wrong and Wrong Again," Barry Rubin, *The Jerusalem Post*, 7 October 2003). Then it might have "Stop(ped) demanding we risk our lives to try out its theories. Take responsibility for the terrible situation arising from the fact that Israel heeded its past advice. Ask how much of what is written comes from double standards and a long-standing bias against a certain people.

The problem with this editorial is not only that it is one-sided but it applies double standards judging Israel one way and the Arabs yet another. A case in point is Jordan, the Arab darling in the West (and in Israel). While perhaps justifiable at times, on and off depending on its position (in 1991 supporting Saddam Hussein, in 2003 supporting the U.S.), comparing Jordan's record to that of Israel provides a stunning perspective as to the hypocrisy of all those who are quick to judge Israel as it illustrates how much the West will tolerate when it is perpetrated by Jordan but not by Israel ("The Case Against Jordan," Alan M. Dershowitz, *The Jerusalem Post*, 7 October 2003).

And since we started with the theater of the absurd it is appropriate to finish with it. Recently Arafat gave a heart attack to all Arafatologists when he appeared frail and hardly in physical control. Rumors of a heart attack were quickly dismissed by his cronies who rushed in a parade of doctors to declare he was only suffering from a cold. Indeed, yesterday he was in full force demonstrating his praying faculties at Friday morning prayers. He is not done yet. His prime-minister-on-duty was almost though. After what was reported as a disagreement between them it appeared that Arafat was going to have to appoint his *third* prime minister within just a few short months. However, the latest Abu is still in place. But one thing remains clear: he will not dismantle the terrorist organizations. Perhaps Israel will do the job for him.

Stay tuned.