

## Do Not Show a Fool a Job Half-Done

November 30, 2003

By Robbie Friedmann

On 30 November 1947 the U.N. adopted its historic Partition Resolution (#181; learn more on the Resolution and the circumstances surrounding it) that was instrumental in establishing the Jewish state. Ever since the establishment of Israel in 1948, the U.N. seems to be doing all in its power to prove how much it regrets that decision by using its very own body and committees as a world stage to undo the Jewish state. To wit: For the first time the U.N. will "commemorate" this date as an "international solidarity day with the Palestinian people." Not with the people of Israel or the Jewish people, but with the "Palestinian people." The U.N. also passed a resolution to protect "Palestinian children" but did not see fit to do the same for Israeli children.

Indeed, this was the first resolution Israel initiated in 25 years and Israel had to withdraw it ("Israel Withdraws U.N. Resolution," Melissa Radler, *The Jerusalem Post*, 26 November 2003) after "amendments proposed collectively by Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Malaysia, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan and others would have substituted 'Middle East' for 'Israeli' children and inserted language condemning 'foreign occupation' and 'violation of international law.'" ("Israel Withdraws First U.N. Resolution in 25 Years," Evelyn Leopold, Reuters, 27 November 2003).

There is more. You would think the U.N. would condemn terrorism and support the "Roadmap" to which it is a party, but no. Its sleepy-eyed Secretary General demands that Israel stop building its security fence and destroy the parts already built because he sees it as a violation of U.N. resolutions, a charge Israel has steadfastly rejected ("Israel: Fence Only Necessary Because PA Tolerates Terror," JPOST.com Staff, 28 November 2003). The U.N. no longer exhibits hypocrisy as Israel's representative to this shameful body has suggested. It has shown its true colors in full daylight and has exposed its anti-Israel agenda and its domination by the Arab-Muslim block and their supporters. Perhaps it is time to dismantle the destructive U.N., not the defensive Israeli security fence.

The same U.N. arrows aimed at Israel are also aimed at the United States. The U.N. is continuously complaining, criticizing and refusing to cooperate with the U.S. The complaint against "U.S. unilateralism" is ludicrous when years of active U.S. multilateralism have backfired. Criticism of U.S. foreign policy is groundless given the U.N. membership (Russia, the European Union) has its own economic competitive agenda that has guided their manifestation of opposition to U.S. policy ("Multilateral Mantras: The Fantasies of the Old World Meet the Realities of the New," Victor Davis Hanson, *National Review*, 26 November 2003).

Whether hidden or explicit, modern antisemitism - within the U.N. as well as without - derives its stamina from two sources that feed each other. The old traditional antisemitism and the "new and improved" Arab/Muslim version. The link that "allows" this symbiotic relationship between these two poison-sources is Israel, which now becomes the lightning rod that "legitimizes" the old Jew-bashing with "valid criticism" of Israel by suggesting the bashers are not *really* antisemitic. While the Arabs play this game in a thinly veiled disguise they have sunk antisemitism to levels even lower than those developed by the Tzarists, the Nazis and the Communists. Even the Europeans "forget" that they are not only anti-Israel but are also antisemitic. To wit, a cartoon

drawn by David Brown in England depicting Ariel Sharon as a (Palestinian) baby eating monster (along the lines of traditional antisemitic blood libels) won first prize in the British Political Cartoon Society's annual competition ("[Cartoon of PM Eating Palestinian Baby Wins Top Prize](#)," *Ha'aretz* Staff, 26 November 2003). To add insult to injury he thanked the Israeli Embassy for its angry reaction which he thinks contributed greatly to its publicity.

Denial by some key British media outlets - such as the BBC - of their anti-Israel biased reporting is no longer being accepted at face value. A new BBC watchdog site includes reports on its inherent bias and not only with respect to Israel but also with respect to the war in Iraq ("The BBC Meets its Match," Manfred Gerstenfeld, *The Jerusalem Post*, 23 November 2003) resulted in a special appointment of a senior editorial post to advise it on its Middle East coverage. However, do not expect significant changes in the near future as its bias is fully institutionalized throughout this monopolistic body.

Another example of the mix of old-new antisemitic trends was in Paris where a Jewish school was burned down and the Chief Rabbi recommended that Jews not wear skullcaps in public. This prompted a prominent Israeli who is a legal scholar and a former (justice) minister to point out the dangers of antisemitism not only to Jews. He argues that antisemitism has been transferred from the individual Jew to the Jewish State ("[Jews Out of Palestine](#)," Amnon Rubinstein, *Ha'aretz*, 27 November 2003). In the same manner Jews could not live among gentiles as Jews, then could not live among gentiles, and then could not live at all, now Israel is not allowed to live as a Jewish state among nations and is under a threat to its very existence.

It is a sad reality that key information institutions such as media and higher education have been harnessed as anti-Israel and antisemitic tools. In Western society this does not mean all media outlets are doing so or that everyone on university campuses is involved. But suffice it say that antisemitic biases along with outright condoning of terrorism is practiced and tolerated as a social movement. Thus the University of Pennsylvania condoned the visit of William Baker (and apparently paid for it), a neo-Nazi who was invited to speak to "Christian and Muslims for Peace" at Penn's recent Islam Awareness Week ("[Impunity for Antisemitism at Penn](#)," Francisco J. Gil-White, *IsraelNationalNews.Com*, 11 November 2003).

Even sadder, guess who defended the invitation? The Muslim Student Association (MSA) (obviously) and Hillel (a Jewish campus organization). First Hillel refused to see Baker as a neo-Nazi; when it was hit with the fact, it argued that it learned about it too late. Yet even after the event there was no repudiation from the MSA, and Hillel praised the MSA for "reaffirming [its] commitment to battling bigotry." One could of course question why would Penn pay for a dangerous provocateur like Baker to come on campus but it is obvious the administration did not interpret his incitement to kill Jews as shouting fire in its very own theater ("[Penn Hillel: Whitewashing Bigotry](#)," Jared Israel, *IsraelNationalNews.Com*, 23 November 2003).

Little wonder that some are correctly seeing the strong parallels between the 1930s' emergence of Nazism and the destruction it has wrought and the current circumstances ("The 1930s, Again: A hard rain is going to fall," Victor Davis Hanson, *National Review*, 25 March 2002) which are still not recognized by many for the danger they entail and for the culprits responsible for it:

"After 30 years of listening to nauseating chanting from Teheran to Islamabad to Nablus, hearing the childish rants about 'The Mother of All Battles' and 'The Great Satan,' and witnessing

presidents from Carter to Bush burned in effigy, the ritual torching of the American flag, the misspelled banners of hatred, the thousands of paint-by-the-numbers posters of psychopaths from Khomeini to bin Laden, televised threats that sound as hideous as they are empty, Nazi-inspired antisemitism, embassy takeovers, oil-boycotts, hijacked planes, cars and ships, lectures from unelected obese sheiks with long names and gold chains, peacekeepers incinerated in their sleep, murders at the Olympics, bodies dumped on the tarmac of airports, shredded diplomats, madmen in sunglasses in Iraq, Syria and Libya, demented *mullahs* and whip-bearing *imams* in Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and Iran, continual televised murders of Americans abroad, our towers toppled, our citizens butchered, our planes blown up, hooded Klansmen in Hamas and Hizbullah, killers of al-this and Islamic-that, suicide bombers, shrill turbaned nuts spouting hatred on C-SPAN broadcasts, one day the salvation of Kuwait, the next sanctions against the swallower of Kuwait, the third day fury against the sanctions against the swallower of Kuwait, the fourth day some grievance from 1953, the fifth another from A.D. 752; and all the time sanctimonious fingerpointing from Middle Eastern academics and journalists who are as bold abroad in insulting us as they are timid and obsequious under dictators at home in keeping silent, I have about had it. No more. The problem is you, not us you, you, you."

Indeed, some are arguing that the era of internal debate within Islam is here probably under the false premise of wishful thinking that moderates will win this debate against the radicals ("Debate Rages Within Islam Over Faith," Shelia M. Poole, *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, 26 November 2003). Yet even a cursory reading beyond the title does not find its promise in the text. There is no debate and rage is found on the part of the radicals. There may be some voices within Islam that may be discomforted by the atrocities of the radicals but they are mostly far and few in between and by no means equal in influence and stature. Before such a debate will truly rage, the moderates have a long way to go to overcome fear and demonstrate their effectiveness and influence on the masses. That vision is not yet evident on the Islamic horizon.

Antisemitism is not a simple discomfort for which doctors can prescribe two aspirins and it will go away in the morning. It is a deep-rooted cancerous growth that has become second nature if not a religion to its many adherents; or more correctly a phobia, a serious mental disorder where facts no longer matter (actually they never have and never will). This is prevalent not only in Leftist groups who have overtaken the discourse on morality and are trying to dictate it in Western campuses and media but also by Arabs who have very few Jews left amongst them, as is the case in Iraq, or in Japan where there are no Jews. This is the epitome of antisemitism without Jews.

The fear of the Jew in Iraq is so pervasive the term Jew became synonymous to anything non-Muslim and even American soldiers are perceived to be Jews. As a disheartening recent report from Iraq demonstrates ("[Iraqis Wrestle with Jewish Factor](#)," Nir Rosen, *Asia Times*, 26 November 2003) the epidemiology of this disease has reached paranoid proportions: "A common belief in Iraq and the Arab world in general is that when held to a mirror and reversed, the Coca-Cola logo says 'No Mecca No Mohammed.' This is attributed to the alleged Jewish ownership of Coca-Cola. It is said that all night long trucks smuggle Iraqi oil through Jordan into Israel. The rumors continue ad nauseam."

Yet there are doctors who are trying to provide treatment. Not to antisemitism but to a real heart disease ("[Israeli Doctors Working to Save Iraqi Baby](#)," Fox News, 26 November 2003). Israel has exercised the policy of humanitarian/medial aid for decades and has treated Arabs from

countries prior to having a peace accord with Israel (Egypt, Jordan) and those who are still declared enemies of Israel (Saudi Arabia, the Emirates). However, Israel has not publicized this. The West has little knowledge of it and the Arabs have the best of all worlds: they get medical treatment and feel no compulsion to thank Israel for providing it. There is also little evidence or hope that this attempt at winning the hearts and minds of the enemy is effective in any way.

American soldiers are working on instituting democracy in Iraq, and Israeli doctors are working on saving the life of a newborn Iraqi baby. It is ironic that such "out-of-the-box" thinking is limited to an idealized regime that never existed before in that part of the world. The effort in Iraq should go beyond the notion of continuing with a unified Iraq.

One know-it-all reporter has the solution (assuming he identified the problem correctly). Believing that the U.S. is not fully committed to winning the war as well as winning the peace, he warns (as if he were Saddam Hussein) that the U.S. recognizes the seriousness of the problem in Iraq or it will lose whatever it achieved thus far ("Letter From Tikrit," Thomas L. Friedman, *The New York Times*, 27 November 2003). An old adage suggests it is not wise to show a fool work half-done because he will not recognize the complete product until it is finished. Perhaps Friedman will do better by analyzing complete historical events as he is too blind to see them while they are taking place. And this half-baked criticism of his certainly does not constitute any original thinking.

One effort that is original recognizes that Iraq is an artifact to begin with (and clearly not the only one in the Middle East) that was kept together as a political entity only by brutal force. Yet what was known as Iraq is now ripe for a solution that could split it into a Kurdish state (north), a Sunni state (center) and a Shiite state (south) and thus offer long-term stability not likely under a unified Iraq, particularly if democracy succeeds there because once the U.S. is out stability is not likely to hold because of internal struggles. ("[The Three-state Solution](#)," Leslie H. Gelb, *The New York Times*, 25 November 2003).

By the same token, what should not happen in the western part of the Middle East is establishment of another Arab state that will add to the de-stabilization of the area and threaten Israel's very existence and later that of the West. While this is not the issue that guides international diplomacy even from the Israeli side, the Israelis have gained experience in decades of fighting insurgency and are now seen as a most valuable source for the similar challenges the U.S. is now facing in Iraq ("U.S. Seeks Advice From Israel on Iraq: As the occupation grows bloodier, officials draw on an ally's experience with insurgents," Esther Schrader and Josh Meyer, *Los Angeles Times*, 22 November 2003).

President George W. Bush must be making the days of the political bureaucrats who instruct writers in the Arab world what to write. His recent call for democratization has been met with anger and rage, ridicule and venom ("[Reactions in the Arab Press to President Bush's Address on Democracy in the Middle East](#)," MEMRI, Special Dispatch - Egypt/Reform in the Arab & Muslim World, 25 November 2003, No. 615). The Egyptians declared, "Saddam's dictatorship is preferable to Bush's democracy." One Arab newspaper gloated over what it saw as "Bush's insult to pro-U.S. Arab regimes." Some reporters dug into their linguistic sewer line to write "brother W. Bush is a stupid, idiot, fascist, criminal." The Syrian government daily referred to "blood-sucking Americans." And the Palestinians had the "scoop" that "Bush is driven by an evangelical and colonialist mentality."

These "seekers of truth" are aided and abetted by their counterparts in the U.S. where complete support and justification of suicide bombings is offered without any apology on university campuses ("[Campus Rally for Terror](#)," Lee Kaplan, FrontPageMagazine.com, 26 November 2003): "...the suicide bombers and terrorists can ply their trade with the knee-jerk support of those Americans they would most like to kill: pampered college students and Jews from all walks of life."

The U.S. Senate was able to view recently the kind of horrific incitement of Palestinian children to commit these atrocious terror acts. And the Palestinian leadership (not just Arafat) proves on a daily basis why it is not worthy of being supported to achieve statehood. The rhetoric emanating out of this leadership would not have been surpassed by the propaganda coming from bin Laden or that from the Germans and Japanese during World War II ("New Palestinian Minister of Justice Incites to Murder Israelis and to Hate Americans," Itamar Marcus, Palestinian Media Watch Bulletin, 19 November 2003).

Singapore - a world-class business center - apparently sees what the Europeans do not. They are able to identify the current threat of Islamo-fascism for exactly what it is ("Europe hasn't faced up to 'new terror:' Al-Qaeda is not like other terror groups Europeans are familiar with, says SM; its reach to fanatical Muslims is unique," *The Strait Times*, 25 November 2003).

Indeed, the Europeans prefer - still - to hide behind their economic interests hoping they will protect them against terrorism. They are doing everything they can not to wake the sleeping Muslim minority giant that resides within them. This explains why they spiked a report they themselves commissioned which points to Muslims as a major source of antisemitic rhetoric and violence ("[European Officials Slam Decision Not to Publish Study into Causes of Antisemitism](#)," Sharon Sadeh, *Ha'aretz*, 26 November 2003).

This preposterous European conduct receives its due criticism from a disillusioned and cynical commentator ("An Open-and-Shut Case of Hypocrisy," Mark Steyn, *The Daily Telegraph*, 25 November 2003): "...the EU's main concern about an actual epidemic of hate crimes against Jews is that it could provoke a hypothetical epidemic of hate crimes against Muslims. You couldn't ask for a better illustration of the uselessness of these thought-police bodies: they're fine for chastising insufficiently guilt-ridden whites in an ongoing reverse-minstrel show of cultural self-abasement, but they do not have the stomach for confronting real racism. A tolerant society is so reluctant to appear intolerant, it would rather tolerate intolerance....we can at least cherish the absurdities... European Jews menaced by antisemites get less attention than American Muslims menaced by polysemities."

Indeed, the terror propaganda support industry is working overtime and it does so in the heart of the American capital ("[The 'Islamic Affairs Department' of the Saudi Embassy in Washington, D.C.](#)," Steven Stalinsky, MEMRI, Special Report - No. 23, 26 November 2003) where the Saudi Embassy glorifies *jihad*, martyrdom and the rewards of the martyr. It promotes teaching Islam's superiority over Christianity and Judaism. It explains the "rights" of non-Muslim "*dhimmi*" under Islam (not much to brag about); details the punishment of those who do not believe in Islam; justifies why polygamy under Islam is "superior to the monogamy of the West;" and discusses rights of a husband over his wives (note the plural). In short, an unapologetic formula for a planned hostile take-over of anything not yet controlled by Muslims.

Belatedly some voices are being heard demanding the absolute condemnation of hate speech, fully understanding that hate speech leads to hate acts and to crimes ("[Muslim Scholar: Don't Excuse Hate Speech](#)," Lou Marano, UPI, 26 November 2003). "For a long time, Muslim American organizations have been allowed to get away with all kinds of hate speech against the U.S., against Jews, against Christians -- all forms of antisemitism -- and somehow it's been accommodated within the whole program of multiculturalism," Ahmed al-Rahim of the American Islamic Congress told a forum at the Ethics and Public Policy Center this week.

In addition, they are promoting democracy and change that are essential and necessary conditions for a different Middle East, as one leading Egyptian dissident claimed recently ("Reviving Mideastern Democracy: We Arabs need the West's help to usher in a new Liberal Age," Saad Eddin Ibrahim, *The Wall Street Journal*, 26 November 2003).

Yet in the U.S.' own backyard excessive democracy is backfiring. A Bush appointee (Professor Khaled Abou Al-Fadl, currently a Visiting Professor at Yale Law School and a Full Professor of law at the UCLA School of Law) gave an interview to an Egyptian paper strongly criticizing the President and "warning" against his reelection ("[President Bush's Appointee to Commission on International Religious Freedom, Prof. Khaled Abou Al-Fadl, Warns Against Reelecting Bush](#)," MEMRI, Special Dispatch - U.S. and the Middle East, 26 November 2003, No. 616).

This Arab-American scholar sounded as if he came out of an Iranian propaganda session, a bin Laden retreat or a Palestinian Friday mosque sermon. He stated "Bush is a religious fundamentalist like former colonialists in Muslim countries" and "Bush makes continued American aid in the world contingent upon permitting missionary activity" and "20% of U.S. soldiers in Iraq suffer from mental conditions." He concluded "I have the authority and promises from the American administration that what I say is taken into account, and that it is of interest. I do not waste my time. I told them this and I added: 'Either the promises you are giving me will be realistic, or everything is a lie and I'll quit and go back to my academic post.'"

Clearly, if the professor is correct the administration has a problem. But it is far more likely he is not speaking on behalf of the administration (whose appointment he was hypocritical of accepting in the first place). In that case the administration has more than sufficient grounds to be concerned about his rhetoric. After all, it is hard to believe that an appointment to the Commission on International Religious Freedom carries with it a mandate to defame the President, the American soldiers, and the American people. Yet the professor clearly takes that liberty. It is also hard to believe that any presidential appointee would speak like this with impunity. Paul Bremer would have been on the next flight home had he done so. Others who were far less critical were dismissed (as was the case with the general - Bremer's predecessor - who said there were not enough troops in Iraq). The professor should be shown the way back to his campus office and be thankful that expressing opinions in this country is not treated the same way as in the countries he so adores.

The same genius-on-duty-columnist, the know-it-all expert on everything, complained last week that a speech by Colin Powell had to be canceled in London due to security reasons. He then lambastes security experts for over-controlling our lives, sounding as if he would even oppose traffic cops for doing their jobs or doctors for advising him on health, and what about lawyers who counsel? ("[The Way We Were](#)," Thomas L. Friedman, *The New York Times*, 23 November

2003). The alternative would have been to risk an attack and losing the Secretary of State which would have then given Friedman another chance to lambaste someone for not knowing what they are doing.

While planned prior to the intended speech by Powell, President Bush has given Friedman the right answer and went not to "dangerous London" but to Baghdad itself to be with the troops on Thanksgiving ("[Bush Makes Surprise Visit to Troops in Baghdad](#)," FoxNews, 27 November 2003). Perhaps Friedman should have read the speech President Bush gave at Whitehall or the interview he gave while in London to an Arab newspaper ("Interview of the President by Al-Sharq Al-Awsat," The American Embassy, London, England, 19 November 2003).

While fingers and amassing evidence point to al-Qaeda as the culprit in the recent Turkey bombing there is an agreement among commentators that it was not only the Jews and Brits who were targeted but Turkey itself. Not necessarily a daring or original proposition. But add to that the likelihood of jumping on the band wagon so that the perpetrators might have been actually the Kurdish PKK ("Tragedy--and History: Who is Murdering Jews and Englishmen in Turkey?" Norman Stone, *The Wall Street Journal*, 24 November 2003).

Whoever the perpetrators were, now that an element of modern day terrorism has hit Turkish soil there is an agreement that Turkey will deal with terrorism far more seriously than the Europeans and that the Turks are determined to fight and eradicate terrorism. The argument goes even as far as suggesting that the perpetrators (in this case they are perceived to be al-Qaeda) made a serious mistake by choosing Turkey as their playing ground because with Turkey they have found their match ("[Al-Qaeda's Mistake](#)," Claude Salhani, *The Washington Times*, 23 November 2003). But that is also the case with the U.S. and Israel. While the terrorists are likely to be defeated (there is simply no other choice and it beats the alternative of losing to them), their very success lies in the attention and resources they draw, the cost of fighting them and the changes they force on modern civilization.

Terror-international apparently has strong breeding grounds as well as sympathizers in Pakistan including in top government and military positions ("Pakistan: Over the Cuckoo's Nest," Arnaud de Borchgrave, UPI Editor at Large, 28 November 2003). The light at the end of the tunnel appears to be the growing realization of India of the nature of this threat and who her true allies are ("New Deal From New Delhi," Isi Leibler, *The Jerusalem Post*, 23 November 2003) and it points to a promising collaboration between India and Israel.

The president of the State of Israel - largely a symbolic figurehead - condemned the Palestinians for negotiating with unelected Israeli activists instead of with Prime Minister Sharon. Yet he played the politically correct role of the "president of all the people" and met with the group of Israeli (and Palestinian) activists who have devised the "Geneva initiative" ("Katsav: Geneva Negotiators Should Talk Directly to Sharon," Gil Hoffman, *The Jerusalem Post*, 27 November 2003).

Others were far less kind to the very idea of Geneva. One called it a "magical solution" using the Hebrew for witchcraft or voodoo diplomacy ("[The Magical Solution](#)," William Safire, *The New York Times*, 26 November 2003). Another was even harsher, correctly pointing out the pitfalls and dangers of the plan ("Geneva Sellout," Charles Krauthammer, *The Washington Post*, 28 November 2003), equating it to committing suicide and criticizing the State Department for

encouraging it: "This is not a peace treaty, this is a suicide note -- by a private citizen on behalf of a country that has utterly rejected him politically. That it should get any encouragement from the United States or from its Secretary of State is a disgrace."

Interestingly enough, reports from Israel indicate that Arafat stooges in Israel such as Israeli Arab Parliament members who aid Arafat, would not travel to Geneva for the 1 December intended signing ceremony because Arafat himself is not supportive of the initiative. This should be indication enough that this is nothing but a ploy, as were the London talks, the (new) Madrid talks, the old Oslo and the (old) Madrid talks. The question is when will the U.S. and Israel recognize it and act accordingly. After all, the Palestinians are already in a new PR swing suggesting that until Israel dismantles the fence there is "nothing to talk about." Ironically they are actually correct because Israel says it will not dismantle the fence unless the Palestinians stop terrorism. After all, that is the first condition of the U.S.-based Roadmap. The world (namely, Israel and the U.S.) is still waiting but as Sharon said last week "our patience is not limitless."