

Israel Arranged Itself So it Has Not Been Put in the Sea

February 14, 2004

By Robbie Friedmann

Recently the *New York Times* succeeded in alarming many who are rightfully concerned with antisemitism by referring to Jews in the same manner that former and current vile antisemites have when they charge that Jews control the world. Its columnist argued Jews control the White House ("[A Rude Awakening](#)," Thomas L. Friedman, *The New York Times*, 5 February 2004).

The reaction this time was rather pointed. From letters to the editor to newspaper articles it became evident that Friedman has crossed the lines of civilized and intellectual discourse. A media watchdog group criticized Friedman - by quoting Harvard University President Lawrence H. Summers - for using words that are "antisemitic in their effect if not their intent" and called on the editors to apologize or write an editor's note ("[Tom Friedman Hits New Low](#)," Lee Green, CAMERA, 9 February 2004).

Friedman's "correction" only worsened the situation. First he ignored the fact that Israel released hundreds of terrorists as a gesture to the first Palestinian prime minister. Now he acknowledges the gesture but dismisses it as insignificant. But not a word about his antisemitic language ("[Arabs, It's Your Move](#)," Thomas L. Friedman, *The New York Times*, 12 February 2004; titled in the Atlanta paper: "Arab Leaders Need to Redirect Sharon Bulldozer"). Instead, he resurrects the Saudi "peace plan" and suggests it is up to the Arabs to make the next (positive?) move. One becomes bewildered: is he writing in the name of a president who is under "house arrest?" If so, then this must be a Jewish/Israeli plan that surely the Arabs will not accept. If he is no longer under "house arrest" what changed in less than a week? Where did all this "Jewish power" go?

His "intellectual" contortions no longer withstand scrutiny and [CAMERA](#) has made it clear the paper needs to take a position even if the writer will not ("[Tom Friedman Makes Grudging Correction: CAMERA and Others Call for Editor's Note](#)," Lee Green, CAMERA, 13 February 2004). CAMERA also correctly points out the deficiencies in Friedman's position with regard to returning all territories (not required by U.N. Resolution 242) for normalization. Where all territories were returned (to Egypt) normalization is non-existent. He also ignores Palestinian non-compliance with accords as well as their terrorist indoctrination and glorification of murder.

One of the more interesting reactions to Friedman came from former New York Mayor Ed Koch who utters what most Jews prefer not to confront or mention. Namely, that Jews can be antisemites ("[Yes, Jews Do Engage in Antisemitic Behavior](#)," Edward I. Koch, *Jewish World Review*, 12 February 2004). Indeed, the same way Arabs argue they cannot be antisemitic because they are themselves Semites does not hold (the term antisemitism was coined to refer to acts against Jews), the fact that someone is Jewish should not provide any absolution for engaging in such activity. On the contrary.

A recent revelation by none other than a Saudi source about the Saudi government bribing local and foreign journalists is an eye-opener ("[Saudi Payments for Foreign Journalists](#)," Special Dispatch - Saudi Arabia/Reform Project, 13 February 2004, No. 662). While the source implies it

is Arab journalists who are bribed (and silenced or "guided") the likelihood that Saudis bribe, threaten or have relations with non-Arab journalists is not far-fetched. The mere fact of granting an exclusive audience with the king could taint any objective reporter's account and perhaps the servants of these masters may actually epitomize the concept of the "butler did it" when writing about the Middle East. Even Friedman himself acknowledged in the past that Arab threats were rather intimidating and affected what he wrote about the area.

Not all voices coming out from Middle East sources are by necessity anti-American. Some actually do offer support for the American action in Iraq (["Former Dean of Islamic Law at University of Qatar: 'America Has Changed the World for the Better,'" MEMRI, Special Dispatch - Reform Project, 10 February 2004, No. 660](#)): "Let us imagine the world if America had listened to the French and German logic saying: Give the murderers of the Serbs and the Arabs a chance for a diplomatic solution. Would Bosnia, Kuwait and Iraq be liberated [today]...?" The former dean of Islamic Law at Qatar's university goes even further and argues that tyrants will be removed only by force, that the U.S. should continue with its democratization efforts and that to fight terrorism "...America needs to encourage the countries to reexamine their educational systems in full - not only the curriculum - and must give financial and professional aid in developing the educational system..."

Yet at home the criticism of the U.S.-lead invasion to Iraq has grown in this election year to shrills of "where are the WMDs?" But the question should have been the outcome not the cause or the declared reason for the war. The problem with democratic civilization is that it can protect itself at a high cost. Namely, it will not use preemptive strikes with very few exception (Israel in 1967); so unless not only threatened, but actually acted-upon, the West did not do anything until the 9-11 atrocity (despite the blatant evidence of a threat as experienced in the first attempt to topple the towers in 1993). Therefore, the removal of the Iraqi tyrant is justified in itself and perhaps what was erroneous about this war is the language used to justify it, not the initiative itself ("Bad Intelligence, So What?" Matti Golan, *Ha'aretz*, 11 February 2004). In short, doing the right thing for the wrong reason.

So against such criticism the former Islamic dean sounds good, doesn't he? Perhaps a little too good to be true? Indeed he is. He is acknowledging only terrorism against Arabs and the U.S., but not against Israel, and after offering convincing in-depth remedies for Arab problems he slips again into the traditional Arab canards as if Israel is their only problem: "Our third demand of America is connected to the Palestinian problem and to improving the image of America, since the [Arab] media focuses on the negative aspects of America and does not mention its positive face. The media help vilify the image of America and increase hatred for it, but it is not acting in a vacuum. America's bias in favor of Israel provides fertile ground for blackening the image of America in the Arab and Muslim public awareness ... and as the emir of Qatar said... We call on America to view our problems with greater balance, justice and honesty. This is what will improve its image in the Arab and Islamic world...." If the gracious dean would just explain to the world what he means by "greater balance, justice and honesty" and how such balance will not result in the destruction of Israel.

The problem of such "scholars" is by no means limited to the Arab-Muslim world or even to the West that has been penetrated by activists and sympathizers. It is also evident in what passes at

times for Israeli scholarship on the topic. A push to establish Israeli studies in American universities as a response to the bastardization of Middle East scholarship - which is often tainted with Arab funds and pro-Arab (anti-Israeli) sympathizers - has backfired at Berkeley ("How Not to Promote Israel Studies," Martin Kramer, Weblog, 12 February 2004). There an Israeli who was appointed to fill the first such chair turned out to be vehemently anti-Israel. Often when debates are carried out in universities there is a seeming balance between Israelis and Palestinians except that often the Israelis brought to supposedly represent Israel do a 180 degree turn when they turn out to represent the Palestinians. It is no surprise to those who know their agenda, yet it serves to "legitimize" anti-Israel positions by the hosts and adversaries suggesting that "even Israelis" state anti-Israel positions.

The reason for this is evident in the asymmetry between Israelis and Palestinians ("Unequal Mideast Equation," John Moscovitz, *The Globe and Mail*, 12 February 2004): "... a troubling asymmetry exists that suggests why Israeli society is significantly prepared for peace while Palestinian society is not. That is, Israel's far Left has accepted the legitimacy of the Palestinian narrative over that of the Israeli narrative. This is a small group, although influential (i.e. Yossi Beilin); it includes the artistic, media and intellectual elite who enjoy significant say in public opinion. Israel's moderate Left accepts the equal legitimacy of the Palestinian and Israeli narratives. The moderate Right can be said to accept the right of Palestinian statehood (although it probably believes the Israelis have something more of a right). On the far Right, a small minority insists that only Israel enjoys national legitimacy." The Palestinians, of course, utterly reject all Israeli narratives and will not accept even minimized versions of it. For them it is convert or die.

Not surprisingly then, Israeli talk about unilateral withdrawal from the Gaza strip has met with skeptical reaction even from the chief of Israeli military intelligence. The problem with unilateral withdrawal is twofold: 1) it gives (some of) the Palestinians what they want anyway and without any return and 2) it sends a message that Israel is weak. The same way Hizbullah kicked Israel out of Lebanon (or so it perceived the Israeli withdrawal) the Palestinians in Gaza will see Israeli withdrawal not as a final settlement but as a bridgehead for continued demands on Israel ("The Gaza Pullout," Cal Thomas, Townhall.com, 12 February 2004): "...A Palestinian state without proof that Palestinian intentions have changed would assure an unprecedented base for terrorism that currently does not exist."

As Daniel Pipes argues, the issue is more than settlements ("It's Not About Settlements," Daniel Pipes, *The Jerusalem Post*, 10 February 2004). Indeed, as long as there is no declaration of an end to the conflict the Palestinians use the settlement issue not as an end in itself but as a step towards their next hostile takeover objective. Therefore, unilateral withdrawal or not, the West must support Israel because it is in the best interest of the West to do so ("Why the West Should Care About Israel's Survival," Dallas Brodie, *The Vancouver Sun*, 12 February 2004): "...no question that Israel sits on the front line against despotism, Islamic fundamentalism and terror in the Middle East. As such, it plays a crucial role in the ongoing war against terror...Essentially...the West must pick a side. Either we believe in democracy and human rights or we do not. It is as simple as that....support Israel because it stands as a tiny island in an exceedingly dangerous sea of totalitarianism with all the challenges of waging war as a democracy."

This is a point that needs to be well understood. As long as the Palestinians' (and those they represent and by whom they are supported) approach to the conflict is grounded in fantasy (like Hitler's march to the Rhineland) no amount of compromise and giving will satisfy their insatiable appetite for land that is not theirs and for murder they are proud of ("Murderous Fantasies: Suicide bombers come from a neighborhood of make-believe," Bret Stephens, *The Wall Street Journal*, 11 February 2004). From this perspective "suicide murder [is] not necessarily an act of despair at all but something approaching the opposite: a supreme demonstration of contempt for everything Westerners hold dear, not least life itself. And they are not the poor-man's F-16 but a robust expression of confidence that the Palestinians are infinitely more ruthless than Israelis in what amounts to a zero-sum game?"

Moreover, "They are unlike the more common types of enemy known to man, who vie for land, prestige or plunder as ends in themselves. The fantasists, by contrast, have only a loose connection to the world as it really is. They may conquer land in the fulfillment of their fantasy, but the land is uninteresting to them except for the role it plays on the stage of their imaginations. Yet paradoxically, says Mr. Harris, it is the very absence of a 'sense of the realistic' that makes the fantasists so dangerous, because they are willing to take fantastic risks. So it was with Hitler's march into Rhineland in 1936, a foolish gamble by rational standards that succeeded because the French high command was unwilling to prick the Fuhrer's fantasy of invincibility--thereby, of course, driving the fantasy to catastrophic proportions."

The proof that Israel stands in the forefront of the battle against Islamist tyranny and that any solution to the Middle East conflict that is "balanced" or favors the Arabs will not bring an end to the conflict is found in the words of a former Pakistani intelligence chief who argues ("[If India Does Not Give Us Our Land We Will Go to War](#)," Rediff.com, 13 February 2004) he is "an Islamist. Islam is the final destiny of mankind. Islam is moderate, Islam is progressive. Islam is everything that man needs. It is not necessary to become a Muslim but it is necessary to adopt the principles of Islam. Naseem Azavi and Iqbal's writings have influenced my thinking... India will give its land when it will be divided into many pieces. India will have to be break (sic). If India does not give us our land we will go to war and divide India." It does not appear that land this Islamist wants is only in Kashmir but in the rest of India.

This demonstrates how little the current conflict has to do "only with Israel." Some leaders have clearly understood Israel's right to defend itself and the obligation to support her in this effort. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld was asked recently by a Palestinian general about the "risk" Israel is posing with her nuclear weapons with the underling assumption that Israel is the problem ("Secretary Rumsfeld Availability at the Munich Conference on Security Policy," 7 February 2004). His answer is rather telling: "You know the answer before I give it, I'm sure. The world knows the answer. We take the world like you find it; and Israel is a small state with a small population. It's a democracy and it exists in a neighborhood that in many -- over a period of time has opined from time to time that they'd prefer it not be there and they'd like it to be put in the sea. And Israel has opined that it would prefer not to get put in the sea, and as a result, over a period of decades, it has arranged itself so it hasn't been put in the sea."

Palestinian terrorism may be embodied and symbolized by Yasser Arafat but by no means is he the only terror leader. The Palestinians are essentially ruthlessly "managed" as a criminal gang that clouds its daily thievery, thuggery, robbery, murder, mayhem and terror with a facade of

ideology that uses religion when it is convenient or rejects it when it is not ("Palestinian Mafia: Heavily armed criminal gangs are turning West Bank and Gaza Strip into lawless shooting galleries "There is a mafia in Nablus," Mitch Potter, *Toronto Star*, 8 February 2004)

It is therefore interesting to watch the French government taking two bold steps: after legislating against religious apparel/symbols in public schools (which was decried by Muslims but not by Jews or Christians who will be also affected by the law), the French launched an investigation into the transfer of millions of dollars from Arafat to his wife who lives luxuriously in Paris ("France Launches Inquiry Into Money Transfers of Arafat's Wife," The Associated Press, 11 February 2004) while his own organization seems to be crumbling ("[Why Was Euro 1M a Month Sent to Arafat's Wife? France launches inquiry into suspect bank transfers as Israelis say EU money went to help suicide bombers](#)," Jon Henley, *The Guardian*, 12 February 2004).

It is safe to say the patience the U.S. has shown the Palestinians is reaching its end. First, the U.S. ambassador to Israel - who in the past was often too quick to criticize Israel - has publicly condemned the Palestinian fiasco in connection with the probe of the murders of the Americans in the Gaza strip ("Kurtzer Faults PA Probe of Gaza Attack," Jenny Hazan, *The Jerusalem Post*, 10 February 2004). And his boss, Secretary of State Colin Powell, has placed the blame squarely on Yasser Arafat ("Powell Blames Arafat for Impasse in Israeli-Palestinian Peace Efforts," David Gollust, *Voice of America*, 12 February 2004) which begs the question what will he say when the violence continues after Arafat is gone.

Yet in the meantime, the Palestinians continue to receive funding from the Europeans and Americans and often these "charity funds" are used to support terror ("Palestinian Refugee Camps: Will U.S. Dollars Fuel a Future War with Israel?" John Waage, *CBN News*, 11 February 2004).

If anything, the Palestinians have increased their vitriolic attacks against Israel with horrendous vilifications ("PA: Israel is 'Satan's Offspring,' Founded on Racism, Protocols," Itamar Marcus and Barbara Crook, *Palestinian Media Watch Bulletin*, 12 February 2004). And their brethren? Look at what they do in England. A new hip-hop style rap video - titled "The Dirty Infidel" - glorifies terror and takes pride in it - jihad-style - in an attempt to use a popular Western music style to recruit more supporters among young Muslims and other potential sympathizers ("[Islamic Rappers' Message of Terror](#)," Antony Barnett, *The Observer*, 8 February 2004).

Just examine some of the words:

"Peace to Hamas and the Hizbullah
OBL [bin-Laden] pulled me like a shiny star
Like the way we destroyed them two towers ha-ha
The minister Tony Blair, there my dirty Kuffar
The one Mr. Bush, there my dirty Kuffar...
Throw them on the fire"

Therefore, if a recent report about sympathetic behavior towards terrorist acts is true ("[Celebrating 9/11 at the FBI](#)," Paul Sperry, *FrontPageMagazine.com*, 11 February 2004) the FBI needs to be worried not only about terrorists coming from abroad or those in sleeper cells

already in the U.S., but also about some of its own employees and perhaps the quality of the work they are doing for the FBI as well as the possibility of actively sabotaging the very work they are supposed to be doing. Can the translation and analysis of those celebrating the toppling of the towers be trusted?

To paraphrase Rumsfeld's words, Israel is not the only target that has to arrange for itself not be put in the sea. The onslaught against the West is in full swing and every week brings with it new horrifying developments about the advent of the jihad against it. Terror in Iraq and many parts of the world, youth football groups in California adopting names with jihad messages, and now rap-for-jihad is out in the market. The French do not speak German today because the U.S. and allied forces saved her from this foe. Now it is the West itself (and those who wish to identify with it) that is under a threat of converting or dying. Not very enticing options and the sea is not even one of them.