

# Jihad Has Discovered Australia

February 21, 2004

By Robbie Friedmann

The "solidarity" that Muslims feel with their "brethren" (a matter of convenience and definition) is evident in the worldwide spread of jihad efforts. These efforts may seem to emanate out of the Middle East but have wide-range support from Muslim clerics in places that on the surface seem to have been immune to such rhetoric. Here we can find the chief Muslim cleric for Australia calling for Jihad ("[The Mufti of Australia Calls for Jihad; 'Australia was Discovered by Afghan Muslims.'](#)" MEMRI, Special Dispatch - Jihad & Terrorism, 18 February 2004, No. 664) expressing strong anti-American and anti-Western sentiment and offering strong support for Hizbullah, Hamas and Islamic Jihad.

He vilifies Australia for "being dangerous" to Muslim life style. In fact, he lays claim for Muslim domination over Australia by identifying its aborigines as having their roots... in "ancient Islamic culture." His claim that aborigines "practiced circumcision, marriage ceremonies, respect for tribal elders and burial of the dead" as proof of Islamic influence is ludicrous and hence highly dangerous as it twists historical fact and context. These days it may be too much to expect an Islamist cleric to acknowledge that 7th Century Islam was heavily influenced by Judaism and Christianity.

But this arrogant attitude is not limited to Islamists from the Middle East, Australia, England or Europe. It is evident in the U.S. as well. A mosque in Chicago reflects the ascendancy to power of hardliners over moderates ("[Struggle for the Soul of Islam: Hard-liners won battle for Bridgeview mosque.](#)" Noreen S. Ahmed-Ullah, Kim Barker, Laurie Cohen, Stephen Franklin and Sam Roe, *Chicago Tribune*, 8 February 2004) as a recent fund-raiser for a Palestinian accused by the U.S. government of being a supporter of terrorism has proven. It also provides insight into the wave of Islamic radicalism sweeping many parts of the world.

More evidence that extremism is creeping up in the bone marrow of the U.S. can be seen with radical Muslim (and supporters') behavior on U.S. campuses. A guest lecture by a Middle East scholar who is critical of Islamists was disrupted by organized students who have gone well beyond lifting a sign or shouting a protesting question. Their behavior was characterized by a writer who was present at the lecture ("Fascism at Berkeley," Cinnamon Stillwell, Chronwatch.com, FrontPage Magazine, 16 February 2004) as "fascism is alive and well at UC Berkeley....The fact is, radical Muslim students and their leftist counterparts are the most domineering, destructive and dangerous forces in higher education today. If we're to win the War on Terrorism, we may have to start with our own college campuses."

The surge in (Muslim-inspired) antisemitism (which has also reawakened the more classical but dormant antisemitism) is more than evident and writing about it helps document what is already known. However, a new book (*The Return of Antisemitism*) tries not to address those who perpetrate the hate and the acts but those who do not stand up against them ("Hating Jews Is Cool Again," Ramesh Ponnuru, *New York Post*, 15 February 2004). The book "is not an

argument against the antisemites, who are generally beyond the reach of reason, so much as one against those who underestimate their poisonousness - or, worse, tolerate it.... provides a short but thorough survey of a disheartening scene. Most people know that antisemitism is rampant among contemporary Muslims; they may not be aware of the frankly genocidal nature of much of that antisemitism. They will know it all too well after reading this book."

The release of the new film on Jesus has stirred concern in the Jewish community which has misplaced its fears of antisemitism to the wrong source or target. Historical precedent provides an understanding to the trauma and impact that antisemitism had on Jews through two millennia, but an eye on the present and to the future points out that - understanding and sympathy notwithstanding - the concern is largely misplaced. One of the few sober reviews of the tempest around the movie is offered by a (Jewish) film critic ("Falling into the 'Passion' Pit," Michael Medved, *Jerusalem Post*, 19 February 2004) who aptly argues that "the misguided agony over 'The Passion of the Christ' serves as a tragic distraction at a time when we need unity and allies more than ever before. Let us never forget that the menacing recent wave in antisemitism in the Middle East and around the world arises from the Islamic community and the anti-religious Left, not (so far, at least) from traditional Christians. In this context, the challenge to Christian orthodoxy implicit in the more intemperate attacks on Mel Gibson's movie serves no constructive purpose and works to foment, rather than deflect, antisemitic attitudes."

The critic is correct. There may be understandable concerns that the film may fuel antisemitic sentiments, but one remains wondering why outside a couple of civil rights organizations such as the [Anti Defamation League](#) and the [American Jewish Committee](#), the organized Jewish community (and to that extent - the West at large) remains fairly tolerant to Arab/Islamic vile and vociferous antisemitism. Not implied antisemitism; not a conjectural antisemitism and not "just" propaganda; but killings, burnings, bullying, intimidation and indoctrination that are at a scope unprecedented since World War II. That is truly where the danger is and misplacing the concern to the possible impact of a film is absolutely counterproductive. The Jewish community (and Israel) should heed the ongoing documentation of the hate spewing from Arab/Muslim radicals all over the world (see [CAMERA](#), [HonestReporting](#), [MEMRI](#), Palestinian Media Watch, [CampusWatch](#)) and focus the (justifiable) fear, (valid) concern, efforts, energy and rage where it should be directed - on the radical Islamists and their supporters.

Some are rightfully chagrined with the incessant anti-Israel onslaught as Israel appears to have replaced the European Jew as a target of demonization. Some Jewish leaders are demanding that a European Commission seminar dealing with antisemitism actively seek the end to the demonization of Israel ("Jewish Leaders Urge End of Israel's 'Deionization,'" Reuters, 19 February 2004). Others - perhaps not willing to accept the truism that facts are not allowed to stand in the way some people think about the world - are thinking as CPAs: If the world will only see a balance sheet and how much good Israel has done for the world it will change attitudes towards her ("[Israel Doesn't Deserve Brickbats](#)," Karen L. Dunn, *Seattle Post Intelligencer*, 13 February 2004). Maybe, but not very likely. Yet it is worth pointing out.

One of the biggest - and saddest - ironies of modern antisemitism is that in the 1930s Europeans told Jews to "get out of Europe - go to Palestine." Today they say - "Get out of Palestine." The "Palestine" of today is more like a clip from a portrayal of hell as was their "civil war" in

Lebanon in the 1970s. When they are not busy sending terrorists to Israel they terrorize each other in what appears to be total anarchy dominated by gangster culture ("Violence Fills the Vacuum as Gaza Becomes Lawless," Harvey Morris, [Financial Times](#), 18 February 2004)

Indeed, what is happening in the areas controlled by Palestinians is only a micro-cosmos that reflects the damage the extremists have brought on Muslim societies. Even Muslim writers readily acknowledge this and call it the Muslim "dirty little secret" (Salim Mansur, *Toronto Sun*, 13 February 2004).

For many in Palestinian areas it was - and is - convenient to hide behind a facade of charity, to pretend that social service provision is the good side of terrorist activities. While this was exposed in most organizations it is still working for Hamas. A recent in-depth research paper on Hamas shows evidence for the integration of social service and terrorism in Hamas. That evidence demonstrates that the distinction between social services and terrorism is not only false but actually abets the very acts of terrorism that have thwarted all initiatives for peace ("[Hamas from Cradle to Grave](#)," Matthew Levitt, *Middle East Quarterly*, Winter 2004).

A glimpse into the Islamic mind is offered by one who shunned it. A Palestinian Muslim who renounced Islam, converted to Christianity and became pro-Israel provides an interesting journey into the environment in which he grew up. It exposes where the Arab Christian establishment has been proven to be heavily involved in support for terrorism ("[The Ravages of the Jihad-Occupied Mind](#)," Alyssa A. Lappen, *FrontPageMagazine.com*, 17 February 2004).

Very few have understood the phenomenon of modern terrorism as more than the pyrotechnics it displays and the hate it represents. However, beyond the atrocities of explosions lie vested political interests. For the first time since the (latest) wave of Arab terrorism against Israel started in September of 2000 a European official accuses Europe of cynically exploiting terrorism for its own political ambitions. Going beyond the traditional European antisemitic sentiments and prejudice against Israel, a European parliamentarian describes what she sees as the European prevailing view ("The EU and the Axis of Evil," Melanie Phillips, 8 February 2004): "The longer the conflict continues and the deeper it gets, the more evident is the incapability of the U.S. to moderate a peace process. The EU thus concludes that both sides are in need of - ironically speaking - the good uncle from Europe to resolve this conflict with European democratic and ecological values, its welfare state and civil society... This is why the EU does not want the conflict to end before it gains a major role."

And shortly after her speech in Europe, the parliamentarian wrote ("Europe's Crocodile Tears," Ilka Schroeder, an independent member of the European Parliament, *Jerusalem Post*, 20 February 2004) that the European aim is "to use the Middle East as a playing field for Europe's ambitions to become an independent and dominant superpower in world politics." Judging from the recent prisoner exchange between Israel and Hizbullah it is evident the Germans (who mediated the deal) were those who benefited most as their stocks went up in the terror organizations and Iran exactly along the script that Schroeder has described.

What could have been one of Tom Friedman's better observations of possible developments in the Middle East was marred by his obsession with Israel and the security fence it is building.

Friedman cites ("[Look Who's Talking](#)," Thomas L. Friedman, 19 February 2004; Atlanta paper titled it "Saddam's Fall Gives Arabs Starting Point for Change") a Lebanese writer who urges more "transparency" of Palestinian leadership. He brings as examples an investigation into millions of dollars reportedly transferred to Yasser Arafat's wife in Paris, and a prominent Palestinian family whose cement factory is alleged to be secretly providing the cement for the wall Israel is building. Does Friedman comprehend that Palestinians did not initiate the first investigation? And would Friedman be able to explain why selling cement to Israel is criminal? If anything, both of these activities signal the corruption of the Palestinians not the hope that Arab countries are turning to democracy.

Muslims did not discover Australia but their extremists have set their eyes on conquering it, having found out where it is and what it is made of. And Australia is only one target. In this battle for supremacy and domination we are in a zero sum-game. It is not a win-win situation and not a lose-lose one. If the radicals win we have lost. That is why facts are still important. Not because they will change the minds of the terrorists and the ideologues who send them, but because it will reinforce for us who we are and perhaps make us less tolerant to this creeping evil before it engulfs us.