

Mirror Mirror On the Wall: Who is the Wickedest Mayor of Them All?

November 23, 2003

By Robbie Friedmann

While terrorists have targeted Iraq, Turkey and Israel recently the most important act on the world stage was President George W. Bush's visit to London. He was first met with a statement by London's excuse for a mayor who defined the President as "the greatest threat to life on Earth" ("Livingstone Found Wanting," *The Daily Telegraph*, editorial, 19 November 2003).

For this mayor it was not those who threaten and kill millions like Adolf Hitler, Genghis Kahn, [Pol Pot](#), Joseph Stalin, Saddam Hussein, [Ayatollah Khomeini](#) or Kim Jong Il but it is no other than George W. Bush. It is the same mayor who last May called the President "corrupt" ("[Mayor Condemned for Attack on Bush](#)," CNN, 9 May 2003). This mayor must be getting his marching orders directly from the Iranians who last April issued very similar vile characterizations of Bush ("[Iran Paper: Bush Worse than Hitler, Stalin - Editorial Hammers U.S. for Torturing and Killing Defenseless Civilians](#)," WorldNetDaily.com, 9 April 2003). Just look again at the [pot calling the kettle black](#).

This is like Ted Bundy calling the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court "blood thirsty." The mayor of London follows a dark British tradition and could certainly fit in the shoes of [Lord Haw Haw](#) (who was born in Brooklyn to an English mother and an Irish-American father and became a British Nazi propagandist following in the goose-steps of the British supporters of Nazism). However, the mayor has been condemned by his own party and his re-election chances are not high. Despite expressions of Nazism in England, the British were on the right side in World War II and helped defeat Nazism. The same will happen with the war against terrorism.

President Bush also was met with large and well-organized demonstrations (though smaller than expected) of fanatics who also see Bush as the "worse menace to the free world." The problem of course starts with their definition of freedom, which is clearly not universal. It is interesting to note who these demonstrators are, who care more about ousting Bush and Blair than about fighting terrorism ("The London Streets: Who are these Anti-Bush People?" Amir Taheri, *National Review*, 18 November 2003).

The demonstration was organized by a shadowy group called "Stop the War Coalition," part of the Hate-America-International, which has orchestrated a number of street "events" in support of the Taliban and the Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein since 2001. It has "a steering committee" of 33 members. Of these, 18 come from various hard left groups: Communists, Trotskyites, Maoists and Castroists. Three others belong to the radical wing of the Labour party. There are also eight radical Islamists. The remaining four are leftist ecologists known as "Watermelons" (green outside, red inside). The chairman of the coalition is one Andrew Murray, a former employee of the Soviet Novosty Agency and leader in the British Communist party. Cochair is Muhammad Asalm Ijaz of the London Council of Mosques. Members include John Rees of the Socialist

Workers' party and Ghayassudin Siddiqui of the Muslim Parliament. Tanja Salem of the al-Awdah (The Return) group, an outfit close to Yasser Arafat, is also a member along with Shahedah Vawda of "Just Peace," another militant Arab group, and Wolf Wayne of the "Green Socialist Network."

Clearly, the coalition "has succeeded beyond the wildest dreams of its founders. For the first time ever it has brought together all radical leftist and anarchist groups. Under its umbrella march such traditional former archenemies as Stalinists and Trotskyites. But the coalition's biggest success is the alliance that it has forged between the extreme Left and militant Islamist groups." And so a dozen years after the crumbling of Communism and the Soviet Empire, Marxism-Leninism and Islamic Fascism are the strangest political bed-fellows threatening the resurgence of the darkest forces in history.

If anything, the covenant between al-Qaeda and far left groups proves we live in an age beyond ideology where the objective is nothing but raw power and all means are legitimate to achieve it. Yet at best, they prove the West may not be monolithic but by no means does it prove the West has totally lost its sense. Indeed, a tabloid editorial may have expressed British sentiments far better than some of the more articulate papers when it was able to point to the real sources of trouble ("The REAL Threat to World Peace," editorial, *The London Sun*, 21 November 2003): "... we should direct our anger against the terrorists, not the good guys."

Another sign of sanity - which came in the wake of the terrorist bombing of British interests in Istanbul - was heard from the British Foreign Office that compared terrorism to Nazism ("British Minister Compares Terrorism to Nazism, Tyranny," Douglas Davis, *The Jerusalem Post*, 21 November 2003). But the statement went even further. For the first time since president Bush iterated that countries either stand with the U.S. in its fight against terrorism or are against it - it called on the Muslim community to make a choice between fighting terrorism or supporting it: "It is time for the elected and community leaders of British Muslims to make a choice...It is the British way - based on political dialogue and non-violent protests - or it is the way of the terrorists against which the whole democratic world is now uniting...I hope we will see clearer, stronger language that there is no future for any Muslim cause anywhere in the world that validates, or implicitly supports, the use of political violence in any way. Democracy has no place for terrorism and - like Nazism and other forms of tyranny - it must be defeated by the common will and determination of all who live under rule of law and in democratic freedom."

Indeed, the President's visit to London was successful because it set and reiterated the parameters of the fight against terrorism and as such was deemed by some as one of his most significant speeches ("Bush Conquers England: 'Liberation is still a moral goal,'" editorial, *The Wall Street Journal*, 21 November 2003).

If anything, the President's speech (President Bush Discusses Iraq Policy at Whitehall Palace in London, Remarks by the President at Whitehall Palace, Royal Banqueting House-Whitehall Palace, London, England, 19 November 2003) emphasized the belief in open societies and moral convictions, and argued that the threat (of terrorism) has not passed. Hence the recognition that this is a long struggle requires the harnessing of proper means that will bring about the defeat of terrorism and that cannot be done by one president alone ("Joining the Fight: One President Can't

Wage War on Terror Alone." Daniel Henninger, *The Wall Street Journal*, November 21, 2003).

Terrorism has to be fought by those who helped produce it, but when it comes to the Saudis don't hold your breath. It may appear that the Saudi habit of talking from both sides of their mouth (officially opposing terrorism yet actively supporting it) has backfired with the increase of terrorism that is both home grown and home-aimed. Recent calls by three radical Saudi sheiks to start a dialogue with terrorists was strongly rebuked by the regime ("[A Debate in the Saudi Press on Dialogue with Saudi al-Qaeda Members](#)," MEMRI, Special Dispatch - Saudi Arabia/Jihad and Terrorism Studies, 21 November 2003, No. 614). Yet it seems the Saudis still have plenty of print space to ridicule the American President ("[Saudi Daily Newspaper Mocks President Bush: 'May Get Killed for the Heck of It,'](#)" MEMRI, Special Dispatch - Saudi Arabia, 21 November 2003, No. 613), the one who poses the best promise ever in the international fight against terror.

It seems the Saudis understand how to use the right rhetoric when it is called for. Perhaps they have learned well from Americans and Israelis who use the same rhetoric (but also accompany it with consistent action - which is still lacking with the Saudis): "terrorists do not understand the language of dialogue - they should be removed like cancer;" "We don't need dialogue with this ideology - we need to uproot it by force;" and "No dialogue with murderers - only an iron fist." Now if they can act on it, not only when violence is directed against them, they may actually contribute to the fight against terrorism. But again, do not hold your breath. Their money is still flowing to fund terror against others. It is also evident in historical practices of using the holy month of Ramadan to incite wars and terror attacks against the "infidels." This holds true for the Palestinians, for Chechnya, for the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, for the Mufti of Lebanon, and of course for al-Qaeda ("[Escalation of Incitement to Violence During the Month of Ramadan](#)," MEMRI, Special Dispatch - Jihad and Terrorism Studies, 20 November 2003, No. 612).

Attempts and claims to distinguish between the political arm of a terror group and its "military wing" (terror cells) have been made by Palestinians for years. However, there are fewer and fewer buyers. Recent exposes on financial support and direct lineage between ideology, command structure and military operations have pulled the dusty rug from under any such claims ("The Emperor's Old Clothes," Caroline Glick, *The Jerusalem Post*, 21 November 2003). It is also clear that the distinction between the various terror groups is often only a matter of convenience not because they truly have different causes or are lacking coordination ("The Hamas-Jihad Axis," Ehud Ya'ari, *The Jerusalem Report*, 17 November 2003). Thus in the Gaza strip the close proximity of Hamas and Islamic Jihad threatens a Hizbullah-like situation there.

Add to this the ever-present financial corruption of the Palestinian leadership which has been recently documented ("A Short History of PA Corruption," Bret Stephens, *The Jerusalem Post*, 13 November 2003) or the fact that the "new" Palestinian government consists of Arafat cronies and his prime minister is a mere puppet ("Puppet on a String," Khaled Abu Toameh, *The Jerusalem Post*, 20 November 2003) and hopes that are banked on some possible peace deals with the Palestinians do not really hold much water.

Success for the U.S. in fighting terror will have a lot to do with how quickly the administration recognizes which whom it is dealing. Until now Arafat has been demonized as the source of all terrorism in Israel. It is widely believed that once he is isolated, removed or dies "peace" will

come to the region. Nothing could be further from the truth. As analysis of other regimes (such as the Taliban) or even fighting terror on the home-front shows, the administration has a great deal of improvement to do ("With Friends Like These: Two new books look at American failures against terrorism," Adrian Karatnycky, *The Wall Street Journal*, 20 November 2003).

The international jihad terror campaign has already spread beyond control and marks daily successes. The terror attacks in Istanbul against Jewish and British targets were first and foremost aimed against Turkey itself by trying to weaken and destabilized a strong moderate pro-Western Muslim country and also to prove operational capability in well planned and well carried out suicidal missions by local Turkish Islamists ("Al-Qaida Aiming at Moderate Islam," Matthew Gutman, *The Jerusalem Post*, 20 November 2003). It also pointed out that the International Jihad effort has encompassed global horizons with direct links to Pakistan ("[Pakistani Link in Synagogue Attacks](#)," Rediff.com, 20 November 2003).

The British reaction is interesting. One editorial scolds Europeans for not waking up to the danger of international terrorism. Terrorism has been rampant in Israel for years and yet the British continue to show far more sympathy for the "plight of the Palestinians" than for the victims of terror. When the British were hurt they displayed strong moral convictions that were gravely absent when it came to Israel ("Waking up to the Age of Terror," *The Daily Telegraph*, editorial, 21 November 2003): "Many Europeans have been astonishingly slow to understand the impact of what happened on September 11. Yesterday's atrocities are yet another reminder that the West and its allies, and moderate Muslims throughout the world, are up against a foe who blasphemously glorify their deaths and the innocent people they kill as a passport to Paradise. They represent a radically new and ever-present danger. And the sooner we wake up to it, the better."

Arab American advocacy groups continuously whine that their "constituency has been evidencing" a rising level of hatred and violence. They do not refer to Muslims being killed by Muslims all over the world but to Americans whose policy they do not see as commensurate enough with their desire for greater Islamic dominance of the world and the U.S. In the meantime it is Israelis and Jews who are blown up in Israel, Turkey, Argentina, Tunisia and Paris, and the increase in antisemitic rhetoric and sinister actions have gone to levels unprecedented since World War II (see "[Explosion of Global Antisemitism](#)," ADL).

Ironically, Israelis have become the lightning rod for antisemitic sentiments. The country is attacked not only by hostile countries or their terrorists but also by those who complain against defensive measures Israel is taking militarily or by building a fence ("Why Condemn Israel for Fighting Back?" Peter Worthington, *Toronto Sun*, 16 November 2003). It is interesting to note the U.S. State Department has criticized Israel for demolishing houses of terrorists. Yet now the U.S. is doing exactly the same thing. It deems it a necessary, effective and legal measure against insurgency in Iraq ("Destruction of Iraqi Homes Within 'Rules of War,' spokesman Says," Jeff Wilkinson, Knight Ridder Newspapers, *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, 18 November 2003).

Even traditionally unsympathetic British media sources have recognized the onslaught and effect of modern antisemitism ("[Antisemitism: Our Dulled Nerve](#)," *The Guardian*, 18 November 2003): "A new antisemitism is on the march across the globe. It is no wonder that the Jewish

community in the UK feels unsettled, uncomfortable and fearful. If the random attacks here have not been as ugly as in Turkey, they have nevertheless included schools, synagogues and cemeteries. The community is well aware of widespread violence in France, home to the largest Jewish community in Europe, along with rising attacks in Belgium and Germany. Then there has been the deliberate targeting of Jewish civilians in Moroccan and Tunisian attacks, in which, like Turkey's car bombs, the al-Qaeda network is believed to have been involved." An astute observation indeed. Except that it is (perhaps facetiously) asking the wrong source for help: "Could not the liberal Left, which in an earlier era vigilantly sought to protect Jews from prejudice and bigotry, rediscover its old values?" Presently, it is one of the key sources of support and condoning of antisemitism.

Hate and violence are on a continuum with a fairly direct link from the former to the latter. Throughout history persecution of people - particularly and consistently that of Jews - started with hate, vilification and dehumanization, and then ended with lethal violence. The Nazis perfected this with a clear-cut ideology of their "Final Solution." The Palestinians, Arab countries and modern day radical Islamists have adopted this ideology lock stock and barrel and have perfected it to an international objective. Hence there is little shock in discovering that the virulent antisemitism spewing from Islamic quarters ends up with actual terror activities ("Terror and Antisemitism," editorial, *National Post*, 18 November 2003).

In what is undoubtedly one of the most eloquent analyses of antisemitism, former Soviet dissident and current Israeli Minister Natan Sharansky outlines the historical backdrops against which religious, secular, political and individual antisemitism has flourished through various periods. Yet he also points out that Jews generally elicit some sympathy that evaporates once they gain political strength (particularly after 1967). But his most striking point is made when he compares the Jewish Israeli predicament to the American one suggesting that the two phobias and hatreds - against the Jews and against the U.S. - emanate out of similar forces ("On Hating the Jews: The inextricable link between antisemitism and anti-Americanism," Natan Sharansky, *The Wall Street Journal*, 17 November 2003):

"Despite the differences between them anti-Americanism in the Islamic world and anti-Americanism in Europe are in fact linked, and both bear an uncanny resemblance to antisemitism. It is, after all, with some reason that the United States is loathed and feared by despots and fundamentalists of the Islamic world as well as by many Europeans. Like Israel, but in a much more powerful way, America embodies a different - nonconforming - idea of the good, and refuses to abandon its moral clarity about the objective worth of that idea or of the free habits and institutions to which it has given birth. To the contrary, in undertaking their war against the evil of terrorism, the American people have demonstrated their determination not only to fight to preserve the blessings of liberty for themselves and their posterity, but to carry them to regions of the world that have proved most resistant to their benign influence."

It appears that in their campaign against Israel the Arabs are taking advantage of a multi-prong approach to destroy the very being and symbolism that Israel stands for. They coalesce with Left-wing radicals who hate Israel and are willing to forgo any support for universal human values such as life itself if they can see Israel and the U.S. decimated in the process. They coalesce with terrorists who do their job for them when their armies prove incapable of

destroying Israel or resisting America, and they rely on self-serving Israeli politicians who come up with independent peace initiatives which will actually backfire against Israel even if never achieved.

Of course it helps their cause when "even-handed" American journalists promote such initiatives without seeming to fully understanding their implications as in the case of a *Philadelphia Inquirer* columnist ("Geneva Accord is a Sane Proposal in a Mad Conflict," Trudy Rubin, 19 November 2003) who is also well known for her constant Israel-bashing ["Israel-Bashing Op-Eds (Trudy Rubin)," Michael Goldblatt]. Clearly the problem lies not only with the details of the initiatives but with its framing, its negotiators and with it becoming eventually an opening gambit rather than a final agreement ("The Travails of a Rejected Politician," David Horowitz, *The Jerusalem Report*, 17 November 2003): "If and when we all meet again at the peace table, the official Palestinian leadership will be reluctant to settle for less than the Geneva terms, and may well attempt to obtain more. Beilin, in short, may have achieved the opposite of his ambition, and rendered the prospects for a mutually acceptable deal more remote, not more realistic."

On the diplomatic front the Arabs have incessantly and skillfully used the United Nations to serve as an unambiguously negative international organ against Israel ("In the U.N., Arabs Have the Ultimate Revenge Over Israel," Barbara Amiel, *The Daily Telegraph*, 17 November 2003): "...the Arabs have had a great revenge. They have taken over the very body that was responsible for [the establishment of Israel] - the United Nations - with the hope that the organization that created the injustice may well be the instrument of its undoing."

Subversive politicians or radical propagandists certainly exacerbate the struggle against the evil of terrorism. Yet history points out that in any era there were those who aided and comforted the enemy, who were more concerned about the welfare of the enemy than their very own people and who could always find something wrong with their own people but not a blemish in the "perfect" enemy. This variation of the "Stockholm Syndrome" where the supporters of the enemy derive a sense of control over their future is no doubt risky, dangerous, damaging and frustrating. Yet it should serve as a sign that moral clarity will need to persevere despite these challenges and therefore add them to the "difficulty index" already posed by the enemy and deal with them with the full range of legal, moral, ideological and other means available to democracies.