

## Islam's Anschluss

By Mark Steyn *The New York Sun* July 11, 2005

To be honest, it was something of a relief, a few hours after the London bombs, to leave the US for Britain. American expressions of solidarity with plucky Britannia tended to the Churchillian, not to say Shakespearean: We shall fight them on the breaches, dear friend. On the radio, some talkshow hosts played bursts of Elgar and "Rule Britannia". On arrival in London by contrast, I found the local reaction to the terrorists, as expressed by the lads down the pub, to be rather more to the point: "Sod off, tossers."

Indeed. The sodding off of the terrorist tossers is devoutly to be wished. But what if they don't? If one wanted to fight them on the beaches, to which beaches would one go? Despite the urge among Britain's friends across the Atlantic to present 7/7 as "London's 9/11", the label doesn't quite fit. Within 24 hours after September 11th, it was clear somewhere some sovereign state was going to get invaded. America could simply not afford not to respond. There's no sense of that in Britain.

Some readers may disagree of course. The dust had barely settled on Thursday's bombings before Derrick Green sent me a congratulatory e-mail: "I bet you Jewish supremacists think it is Christmas come early don't you? Incredibly, you are now going to get your own way even more than you did before, and the British people are going to be dragged into more wars for Israel."

Ah, the Jew is so infinitely cunning, isn't he? The Muslim world has spent decades assiduously peddling the notion that the reason a vast oil-rich region stretching thousands of miles is mired in political deformity and other grim psychoses is all because of a tiny strip of land barely wider than my New Hampshire township. But Mr Green is evidence of the theory's rampant post-9/11 expansion to wilder shores yet: it seems a thin sliver of sinister Zionists is now destabilizing the whole of Europe, if not the entire world.

Whatever the attractions of anti-Semitism, it tends not to work out too well for those who over-invest in it — see the Third Reich, and the loopier parts of the Arab world today. And even among my own correspondents suspicion of the dread Jew seems to be blinding them to what last week's events may more plausibly portend: the Israelification of European life.

Thursday was an appalling act of savagery: the final death toll, in the high dozens, would have been

regarded as a spectacular body count in the heyday of the IRA terror campaign; hundreds more will bear the scars of that morning for as long as they live; and thousands of other Britons — the families and friends of the dead — have had a huge gaping hole blown in their lives. Had this happened in 1975 or 1985, it would have been an act of murder that reverberated through British political life for weeks and months.

And yet and yet? In the post-New York, post-Bali, post-Madrid reconfiguration of terror, it was arithmetically small beer. It lacked the searing iconic precision of using airplanes to demolish the Manhattan skyline. It added up to a bad day in Iraq, or a couple of bad days in Thailand, where far from the gaze of CNN and the BBC some 800 people have been killed by Islamic terrorists in the first six months of this year.

The British and many Continental police forces have long experience of terrorism, and are good — within the political constraints they operate under — at dealing with it. In their glory days, the IRA blew up members of the Royal Family and the British Government. By the end of their campaign, they were reduced to splattering grannies and expectant mothers across shopping centres. Now as then, prestige targets will be secured against terrorism, and that will leave soft targets — in a word, you, your morning bus ride, that little restaurant you like. And, as in Israel, Europeans will get used to the idea that every so often, entirely at random, there will be days when your husband or daughter or best friend sets off for work and doesn't come home.

I say "Europeans" because, granted that in the eyes of western intellectuals this is all the fault of George W Bush, there are significant differences between Europe's and America's relationship with Islam. It was the late Ayatollah Khomeini who popularized the idea that the United States is the Great Satan — a shrewd shorthand in that it acknowledges not merely that the hyperpower is evil but that he is a great seducer, too. And, when one contrasts the vast number of British, European and Canadian jihadists who've turned up in the thick of it in Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, Iraq, Israel, Bosnia, Chechnya and beyond with the relatively insignificant number of American Muslims so embroiled, one begins to appreciate that the Great Satan is indeed a relatively effective seducer — at least to the extent that America seems to be doing a

better job at assimilating Muslims than Europe or Canada. Of course, to assimilate you have to have something to assimilate with, and the yawning nullity of the European idea seems to be a wee bit deficient in that respect.

But there's another difference, too, and this is what I mean by Israelification: the jihadists understand that Europe is up for grabs in a way that America isn't. Israel/Palestine is, in the old joke, the twice promised land — a western democracy and a disaffected Muslim population exist in (for the most part) two solitudes but claim the same piece of real estate. As it happens, that's also how more and more Muslims see Europe.

And as their numbers grow it seems likely that wily Islamic leaders in the Middle East will embrace the cause of the rights of European Muslims in the same way that they claim solidarity with the Palestinians. When France began contemplating its headscarf ban in schools, it dispatched government ministers to seek the advice of Egyptian imams,

implicitly accepting the view of Islamic scholars that the Fifth Republic is now an outlying province of the dar al-Islam. As the Zionist Entity can testify, that's not a club you necessarily want to be signed up for.

Few European leaders have a clue what to do about this, but, as that French headscarf law and Britain's Incitement to Racial Hatred bill and Dutch responses to the murder of Theo van Gogh all underline, mediation between what Tony Blair called on Thursday "our way of life" and Muslim values has already become a central dynamic of European political culture — a remarkable achievement for a minority few Europeans were more than vaguely conscious of pre-9/11. Meanwhile, across the borders pour not primarily suicide bombers or suitcase nukes, though they will come in the end, but ideology — fierce, glamorous and implacable. That's the final irony of the Israelification of Europe: distressing as it may be to Continental anti-Semites, in this scenario they're the Jews.

## Terrorism's Root Causes

By Cal Thomas TownHall.com July 11, 2005

British politicians and much of the U.K. media are engaged in a familiar Western practice following a terrorist attack. They think they can explain it using Western standards.

Many Americans blamed the race riots of the 1960s on racism and unemployment, which contributed to hopelessness they said only equality and prosperity could solve. That most unemployed blacks did not riot escaped the mainly white sociologists and commentators who desired a "nonjudgmental" explanation for lawless behavior. Having abandoned a sense of personal responsibility for one's actions, the explainers and excusers of evil and illegal acts in America 40 years ago have been reincarnated in Britain.

Now it is unemployment and hopelessness among Muslims that are the root cause of terrorism. Finding jobs for them so they can drive nice cars, live in upscale flats and attend West End theaters supposedly will convert them to the British way of life.

Or maybe it is evil America that caused the terrorist attacks. If only the Americans had not invaded Iraq and dragged Britain along, perhaps Britain might have been spared the bus and tube bombings. Sometimes it takes an outsider to bring people to their senses. Former Israeli Prime Minister (and current Cabinet minister) Benjamin Netanyahu told BBC's "Breakfast" program Sunday that Iraq and other actions by Britain and America are the consequences of terror attacks, not the cause.

He said to blame Britain and the United States for causing terrorism is "reverse causality."

Netanyahu recalled the numerous terror attacks before the Iraq war and prior to 9/11, noting there was Islamic terrorism before 1948 when Israel became a modern state. If recent Israeli, American and British policies cause terrorism, how does one explain earlier terrorism? In the U.K., The Sunday Times carried a front-page story exploding the myth of a causal relationship between terrorism and poverty among Muslims. The newspaper reported on leaked Whitehall documents that show "Al-Qaeda is secretly recruiting affluent, middle-class Muslims in British universities and colleges to carry out terrorist attacks" in Britain. The targets of the "extremist recruiters" are students with "technical and professional qualifications."

These are not Muslims without a future. These are bright and educated students who, if they wished, could be productive and prosperous members of British society. But many are embracing a false theology and a god who requires them to kill "infidels."

No amount of G8 aid to the "Palestinians," nor a resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict, will pacify these current and potential killers. Even if Israel were obliterated (the goal of much of the Muslim world), the terror would continue until the entire non-Islamic world is under their control.

This is not the belief of an "Islamophobic" bigot. This is what they say in their sermons and media, teach in their schools, and believe in their hearts. It matters little that "the overwhelming majority of Muslims are not terrorists," to quote a familiar Western mantra. It matters a great deal that

most terrorists are Muslims. The sooner Western leaders and Western media begin stating what is obvious to most people; the quicker the real root cause can be dealt with.

The excuses given by Westerners and many Muslim clerics for terrorism are just that: excuses.

If Britain and the West are guilty of failing to adequately address the "oppression" of Muslims in Kashmir and Chechnya, do they earn points for intervening in Bosnia to protect Muslims and sending billions to the Palestinian Authority, money that went down a rat hole of corruption?

Do America and Britain win friends among Muslims for allowing them to practice their faith openly (no Muslim country offers the type of religious tolerance that Muslims enjoy in the U.S. and Britain). Why must America and Britain be held

accountable for every perceived and actual slight against Muslims, but beheadings of Westerners receive little more than pro forma condemnation and are soon forgotten?

More than 25 years ago, then-British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher famously noted that we in the West make a mistake when we transpose our morality on those who don't share it. Terrorists do not share and cannot be made to share our morality.

There will be no detente, entente or peace treaty between the forces of darkness and those of light. As much as Western politicians may wish to avoid the true root cause of this war, they do so at the peril of their citizens. This is a religious war. The terrorists understand it as such. Too many in the secular and wimpishly religious West do not.

## The Jewish State-icide

**By Frank J. Gaffney, Jr. JewishWorldReview.com July 12, 2005**

Suddenly, the world is seized with the danger of ignoring the Islamofascists in our midst. Lengthy front-page articles in Sunday's New York Times and Washington Post describe how British authorities allowed this virulent ideology-masquerading-as-a-religion to establish - and metastasize - into a veritable "Londonistan" in the years preceding last week's murderous attacks on the host community.

The complacency shattered by the four bombs in London has been replaced with hard questions about the threat posed to other West societies. The French, Dutch, Germans and Italians are suddenly seized with the prospect that their own Londonistans are festering Islamist breeding grounds, sores that can at any time subject transportation and other soft targets in these democracies to the sort of bloodletting seen over the past fifteen months in Spain and Britain.

Here in America, political correctness still compels the conversation to focus mostly on the vulnerabilities of our infrastructure and what is - or is not - being done to mitigate them. There is, however, a growing appreciation post-London that we can no longer ignore the fact that Islamofascists are hard at work here as well, seeking to dominate their co-religionists as the prerequisite for forcing the rest of us to submit to a new, global Caliphate under an unforgiving religious law called Shari'a.

The one place we apparently are indifferent to the rising power of the Islamists is in the would-be state of "Palestine." There, the establishment of an Islamofascist Gazastan is not only being tolerated by the West. It is being enabled by the government of Israel, the G-8 and the Bush Administration.

To be sure, the government of Ariel Sharon (which is determined to unburden itself next month of Palestinian populations in Gaza and parts of the

West Bank), the leaders of eight industrial nations (who last week pledged \$3 billion for Palestine) and President Bush (who has been a steadfast supporter of Israel and opponent of terror) have something different in mind. They envision a democratic Palestinian state living peaceably side-by-side with Israel. Unfortunately, this prospect is no more likely at the moment than was that of an Islamofascist Londonistan living side-by-side in peace with its non-Islamist neighbors. If anything, it is less likely since the West's behavior can only be seen as a reward for Palestinian terror. Alan Dershowitz put it well in Front Page Magazine on July 8:

"The Palestinian Authority, and its leaders, are the godfathers of international terrorism. They developed airplane hijacking into a high art. They invented the high-profile murder of athletes and other prominent public figures. Were it not for their employment of terrorism, the Palestinian cause would today be regarded as the fifth-rate human rights issue that it rightfully is. But because the Palestinian leadership has always used terrorism (from the 1920's on) as the tactic of first resort, their cause has received worldwide recognition."

Now, that recognition will be extended to a Palestinian terrorist state. Such will be its character whether the Islamofascists' ally - Mahmoud Abbas, the Palestinian Authority's recently elected president - somehow manages to hold onto power or, as seems more likely, his ruling clique is soon replaced by the Islamists of Hamas. (Abbas celebrated the London bombings in Damascus, where he was the guest Thursday night at a festive meal hosted by Syrian dictator Bashir Assad, along with Hamas' Khaled Mashal, Islamic Jihad's Ramadan Abdullah Shallah and Ahmed Jibril, head of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, all designated as

terrorist organizations by Britain and the United States.)

The emergence of a new Arab state-sponsor of terror that is flush with Western cash and enjoys the protection of the international community will, of course, be a mortal threat to Israel. Having enhanced the stature of terrorists determined to destroy the Jewish State, Israelis will find the Islamists making a redoubled effort to do just that from their new safe-havens. The existential threat to Israel is made all the greater by the deep domestic divisions now evident over Sharon's so-called "disengagement" plan. There is serious talk that a civil war may ensue over that initiative, which is now opposed by a majority of Israelis. Such a conflict is being fueled, in part, by secular Jews who seek to destroy the political power of their religious countrymen.

Should anything approaching a civil war eventuate, Israel's Arab enemies must be expected to exploit what would thus be afforded: the best chance ever to realize their unrequited ambition to "drive all the Jews into the sea" - especially if, as is now being proposed, Israel were to allow Egyptian and

Jordanian/Palestinian armies to return to Gaza and the West Bank, respectively.

Gazastan will be a terrible menace for the United States, too. Such an Islamofascist state will not only threaten the very existence of Israel, our closest, democratic ally in the Middle East. Given the Palestinians' record of past treachery towards other Arabs, it should be expected to undermine the Bush strategy of bringing to power moderates elsewhere in the region.

The creation of a new Palestinian safe-haven for terrorist recruitment, training and planning will also endanger Americans and their interests in Iraq, Europe, Asia and here at home. The fact that such terrorists will benefit from the counter-terrorist training, funding and arms we are giving the Palestinian Authority will only exacerbate this threat.

For states as for individuals, the rule should be that friends don't let friends commit suicide. It's not too late for the U.S. to discourage Israel from doing just that by abandoning Gaza and parts of the West Bank under present circumstances - and the lessons of Londonistan make clear that we must.

## **London Terrorism: British "Covenant of Security" with Islamists Ends** **By Daniel Pipes The New York Sun July 8, 2005**

Terrorism usually comes like a bolt from the blue, but not so the four explosions yesterday in London, killing at least 37. Some British Islamist leaders have been warning for months that such violence was imminent.

An Islamist British group called Al-Muhajiroun - "the immigrants" in Arabic - for some time publicly stated that Britain was immune from Islamist violence because of its acceptable behavior toward Muslims within the country's borders. In an April 2004 conversation, the 24-year-old Sayful Islam, who heads Al-Muhajiroun's Luton branch, announced that he supported Osama Bin Laden "100%" in the quest to achieve "the worldwide domination of Islam," but went on to voice an aversion to himself performing terrorist acts in Britain.

Yet, Mr. Islam endorsed terrorism in Britain in a broader sense "When a bomb attack happens here, I won't be against it, even if it kills my own children. ... But it is against Islam for me to engage personally in acts of terrorism in the UK because I live here. According to Islam, I have a covenant of security with the UK, as long as they allow us Muslims to live here in peace." He further explained. "If we want to engage in terrorism, we would have to leave the country. It is against Islam to do otherwise."

Covenant of security? What is that? In an August 2004 story in the New Statesman, "Why terrorists love Britain," Jamie Campbell cited the author of Inside Al Qaeda, Mohamed Sifaoui, as saying, "it has long been recognized by the British

Islamists, by the British government and by UK intelligence agencies, that as long as Britain guarantees a degree of freedom to the likes of Hassan Butt [an overtly pro-terrorist Islamist], the terrorist strikes will continue to be planned within the borders of the UK but will not occur here."

The New Statesman story drew from this the perversely ironic conclusion that "the presence of vocal and active Islamist terrorist sympathizers in the U.K. actually makes British people safer, while the full brunt of British-based terrorist plotting is suffered by people in other countries."

A Syrian immigrant to Britain who headed Al-Muhajiroun, Omar Bakri Mohammed, confirmed the covenant of security, describing companions of the Prophet Muhammad who were given protection by the king of Ethiopia. That experience, he told the magazine, led to the Koranic notion of covenant of security: Muslims may not attack the inhabitants of a country where they live in safety. This "makes it unlikely that British-based Muslims will carry out operations in the U.K. itself," Mr. Mohammed said.

But in January 2005, Mr. Mohammed determined that the covenant of security had ended for British Muslims because of post-September 11, 2001, anti-terrorist legislation that meant "the whole of Britain has become Dar ul-Harb," or territory open for Muslim conquest. Therefore, in a reference to unbelievers, "the kuffar has no sanctity for their own life or property."

The country had gone from safe haven to enemy camp. To renew the covenant of security would require British authorities to undo that legislation and release those detained without trial. If they fail to do so, British Muslims must "join the global Islamic camp against the global crusade camp."

Mr. Mohammed went on overtly to threaten the British people: "The response from the Muslims will be horrendous if the British government continues in the way it treats Muslims," explicitly raising the possibility of suicide bombings under the leadership of Al-Qaeda. Western governments must know that if they do not change course, Muslims will "give them a 9/11 day after day after day!"

When Sean O'Neil and Yaakov Lappin of the London Times asked Mr. Mohammed about his

statements on the covenant, he said his definition of Britain as Dar ul-Harb was "theoretical" and he provided a non-belligose re-interpretation:

It means that Muslims can no longer be considered to have sanctity and security here, therefore they should consider leaving this country and going back to their homelands. Otherwise they are under siege and obviously we do not want to see that we are living under siege. In a less guarded moment, however, Mr. Mohammed acknowledged that for him, "the life of an unbeliever has no value."

Yesterday's explosions mark the end of the "covenant of security." Let's hope they also mark the end of an era of innocence, and that British authorities now begin to preempt terrorism rather than wait to become its victims.

## Palestinian responsibility

By The Jerusalem Post Editorial July 13, 2005

For weeks, this newspaper has echoed the warnings of security officials and elected leaders stating the obvious: The Palestinian Authority is not fighting terrorism, the terrorists are using the cease fire to rearm and reorganize and, therefore, terror will return. In fact, even before the suicide bombing in Netanya yesterday that killed at least two people and injured dozens, and the earlier failed suicide bombing at the Shavei Shomron settlement, terror had already returned in the form of foiled attacks.

To call what has happened an experiment is to give too much credit - as if there were any possibility of another outcome. But even if Mahmoud Abbas's effort to sweet talk the terrorists into ending their attacks were considered a legitimate attempt, it must be deemed to have failed.

Though he was speaking before the most recent attacks, Vice Prime Minister Ehud Olmert said in an interview that appeared in yesterday's Post what Israel has been arguing for a long time: The Palestinian leadership must confront terrorist groups, not reach agreements with them or invite them into its government, fully armed and unrepentant. Olmert suggested that Palestinian leader Mahmoud Abbas should take a leaf from David Ben-Gurion's playbook.

"The Palestinians keep saying 'how dare you ask that we engage in a civil war against our own people,'" he said. "[But] unless they engage in a tough and uncompromising campaign to disarm these [terrorist] organizations, there will not be a chance for genuine dialogue between us."

Olmert continued, "This is precisely what Ben-Gurion did in Israel when he proclaimed that there will be one army, one educational system, one government. And, when it was necessary, he

imposed this in the most aggressive and sometimes violent manner."

While issuing disclaimers that he did not agree with everything Ben-Gurion did, that the situations were not parallel and that Abbas could do things his own way, Olmert's point was clear.

"This is your chance," he said to the Palestinian leadership. "You take it, you may gain a lot. You don't take it, you will not survive."

The Palestinian situation today and the one faced by Ben-Gurion as Israel took its first steps as a state are, indeed, as Olmert took pains to stress, not analogous. Menachem Begin was no terrorist; he did not systematically target either British or Arab civilians. Even more: it was Begin who averted civil war by deciding not to respond in kind to the attacks on him ordered by Ben-Gurion. Such patriotism and restraint can hardly be expected by the terrorists Abbas faces.

But there is an even greater difference. Both Begin and Ben-Gurion believed deeply in, and were fighting for, the project of creating a Jewish state.

The Palestinian leadership would have the world believe that it, too, has embarked on a creative enterprise, in contrast to Hamas and Islamic Jihad, who seek to destroy Israel through terrorism. But Abbas's refusal to touch, let alone dismantle, the infrastructure of terrorism that he has committed to eliminating destroys that contention.

His refusal to act led directly to yesterday's terror attacks and places full responsibility for them on his doorstep. This refusal also renders irrelevant any purported difference between him and the "rejectionist" groups. If there really were such a difference, if these groups really jeopardized Abbas's

state-building project, then why would he not be acting against him?

The lack of such inter-Palestinian physical conflict can only suggest a high degree of ideological agreement. Unless, or until, actions by Abbas prove the contrary, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the Palestinian leadership shares the rejectionist creed, which says that the Jewish people has no national rights to independence in this land, and that the only legitimate Palestinian state is one that

replaces Israel, not one living in permanent peace along side us.

The international community must help Israel make the Palestinians understand that terrorism will neither build them a state nor destroy ours. There is no excuse for continuing to "help Abu Mazen" when such "help" only encourages him to stay on the unacceptable course he is on. The refusal to recognize this will only cost more Israeli and Palestinian lives.

## Countdown in Gaza

By The Washington Post Editorial July 11, 2005

It appears increasingly likely there will be one major positive development in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in the coming months: Israel will remove all of its settlements and soldiers from the Gaza Strip, as well as several small settlements in the West Bank. That would be a big step toward disengaging Israelis from Palestinians and creating the room for a new Arab state alongside Israel. Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon has courageously dedicated his formidable willpower and political leverage to pulling it off. Israel is now committed to beginning the evacuation on Aug. 17, despite attempts by settlers to forcibly prevent it, multiple mutinies in his Likud Party and threats from extremists so severe that Israeli cabinet members have taken to wearing bulletproof vests. The difficulty of what Mr. Sharon is doing should not be underestimated, nor should its value as a building block for a long-term peace.

It is nevertheless alarming that, just 37 days before the pullout is to begin, efforts by Israel, the Palestinian Authority and international brokers to coordinate the transfer of territories and provide for stability in Gaza after Israel leaves appear to be making little progress. It's not yet clear how Gaza's borders will be patrolled, how goods and workers will be able to pass from there to Israel, the West Bank and the rest of the world, what will happen to the Israeli-run greenhouses that now employ thousands of Palestinians, or how the territory will be treated by the international community. Even an agreement on the demolition of Israeli homes,

announced with fanfare two weeks ago by Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice during her most recent visit, has not been finalized. Israeli-Palestinian committees have been negotiating half a dozen specific issues, but leaders on both sides appear reluctant to make commitments.

The risk is not so much that the evacuation will be stopped but that it will be followed by disorder in Gaza and renewed enmity or even warfare between Israel and the Palestinians. Rather than propelling a renewal of the peace process outlined in President Bush's "road map," as all sides say they want, the withdrawal could renew the Middle East stalemate that extended though Mr. Bush's first four years in office. The Bush administration has been trying to promote a coordinated pullout through two envoys: Lt. Gen. William E. Ward, who is working on security issues with the Palestinians, and former World Bank president James D. Wolfensohn, an international representative who is trying to broker economic agreements and new development aid. Mr. Bush separately hosted both Mr. Sharon and Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas at the White House before Ms. Rice's visit. Still, it appears the level of U.S. engagement may not be sufficient. In the end Israelis and Palestinians may find a way to agree on the withdrawal in the final weeks before it begins. But the more pressure they feel from the United States, and the higher the level from which it comes, the greater the chances for accord will be.

### SPECIAL ISRAEL ANNOUNCEMENT

The **Jewish National Fund** Cordially Request Your Presence For an Evening Discussion with Guest Speaker, **David J. Margules** at the "**Suburban Orthodox Essence of Life Campaign**" *The Reservoir and Recreation area at the Ramon Air Force Base in Mitzpeh Ramon in the Negev*. The event will take place on **Tuesday, July 19, 2005 at 7:30 pm** at the home of Sheldon and Ann Berman, 3212 Northbrook Road, Baltimore, MD 21208. **Please RSVP by Friday, July 15, 2005 to:** Ariane Aronhime (410) 486.3317 or by e-mail: [aaronhime@inf.org](mailto:aaronhime@inf.org) Light refreshments will be served. Dietary laws observed.

## Why terrorism works

By Alan M. Dershowitz [FrontPageMagazine.com](http://FrontPageMagazine.com) July 8, 2005

Within a day of the horrific multiple bombings in London, the G8 announced a \$3B grant to the Palestinian Authority. The symbolism of this connection may be lost on some Westerners, but it clearly sent a powerful message to terrorists and potential terrorists: namely, that terrorism works.

There were no grants announced to the Tibetans, who have been occupied more brutally and for a longer period of time than the Palestinians. The Tibetans, however, have never resorted to terrorism.

The Palestinian Authority, and its leaders, are the godfathers of international terrorism. They developed airplane hijacking into a high art. They invented the high-profile murder of athletes and other prominent public figures. Were it not for their employment of terrorism, the Palestinian cause

would today be regarded as the fifth-rate human rights issue that it rightfully is. But because the Palestinian leadership has always used terrorism (from the 1920's on) as the tactic of first resort, their cause has received worldwide recognition.

The primary cause of terrorism is not occupation, humiliation, or desperation. If it were, the Tibetans would be the greatest terrorists. The primary cause of terrorism is that it works. And it works because the craven international community gives into it and rewards it. It also works because too many Islamic leaders praise it and too few condemn it. Terrorism will continue as long as potential terrorists believe they will benefit from using that tactic.

## Disengagement and PA chaos

By The Washington Times Editorial July 11, 2005

With just 37 days left until Israel begins the painful process of uprooting more than 9,000 of its citizens from Gaza and the northern West Bank, the contrast between Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon's approach and that of the Palestinian Authority is jarring: While PA President Mahmoud Abbas continues, without any apparent results, to try to persuade Hamas and state supporters of terrorism like Syrian President Bashar Assad to behave themselves, the situation in the West Bank and Gaza grows ever more chaotic, as rejectionists openly challenge his authority, members of his own Fatah organization settle their squabbles over money and power by fighting gun battles in the streets and Palestinians are repressed by Fatah and Hamas alike.

On the Israeli side, by contrast, a comprehensive strategy has been put together in order to ensure the disengagement is completed as smoothly as possible. Nearly 15,000 police officers so far have received specialized training for their roles in disengagement, and detailed plans are being put together to ensure that the evacuation, which Israeli officials expect will last no longer than two weeks, goes forward as smoothly as possible. Forty-one thousand Israeli soldiers will participate in removing the settlers. Seventeen Israeli soldiers and policemen will be employed to evacuate each of the more than 1,700 settler families being removed from Gaza and the West Bank.

Specialized plans are being put in place to deal with compensation requests from settler families; to provide temporary housing while families search for homes inside Israel; to provide employment opportunities for people who lose their jobs; and even to disinter more than 100 Israelis buried in

Gaza (many of them victims of terrorist attacks) for reburial in Israel. For some of the Israeli families who will lose their homes in Gaza, it will be their second such traumatic sacrifice in the hope of attaining peace. In 1982, these people lost their homes when Israel turned over the Sinai town of Yamit to Egypt.

In carrying out disengagement, Mr. Sharon's goals are very clear -- he wants to withdraw Israeli civilians (and in the coming year, Israeli troops as well) from Gaza and the northern West Bank with minimal loss of life. And he wants to ensure that there is no repeat of the debacle that took place when Prime Minister Ehud Barak in May 2000 decided to unilaterally withdraw from southern Lebanon. The Lebanon pullout ended in a rout when Hezbollah overran positions abandoned by the Israel Defense Forces and their Lebanese allies. Mr. Sharon understands that Israel paid a huge price for such a conspicuous display of weakness: Just four months later, PA Chairman Yasser Arafat decided to go to war with Israel. And approximately four months after that, the Israeli people threw Mr. Barak out of office in a landslide, electing Mr. Sharon with 62 percent of the vote.

Unfortunately, Israel's withdrawal from Gaza appears very likely to occur under fire. Mr. Abbas has thus far given no indication that he is prepared to do much of anything to rein in Hamas and the other rejectionist groups who operate in PA-controlled territory. And his passivity breeds contempt. On Wednesday, Mahmoud al-Zahar, a senior Hamas operative in Gaza, declared that the group had "lost faith" in Mr. Abbas and the PA and warned that it would continue to attack Israel from

Gaza following disengagement. Mr. al-Zahar declared that Hamas would not "serve as a fig leaf" for PA control of Gaza after Israeli settlements are gone, and said that it would not give up its weapons because they are needed "to defend every centimeter of the homeland against Zionist aggression." He added that Hamas would likely continue to attack Israel after it leaves Gaza "in order to liberate the West Bank and Jerusalem."

Other Hamas representatives, operating in damage-control mode, claimed that al-Zahar was exaggerating Hamas' differences with PA. But there is no question that Hamas is committed to Israel's destruction. It continues to fire rockets at Israel, and it has been using the "ceasefire" in place since February to rebuild a terror network that had been decimated by Israel's security services in recent years.

Indeed Hamas makes no secret of its efforts to expand its ability to produce Qassam rockets beyond Gaza and into the West Bank. An article published June 28 on the Web site of Hamas' military wing discusses the advantages of targeting Jerusalem and

Tel Aviv with Qassams and predicts that the rocket "will serve as the key weapon of deterrence in the next phase of the confrontation as the acts of suicide martyrdom served as the weapon of choice" in the past.

And Hamas terrorist capabilities are just one of the many problems facing Mr. Abbas. Last week Hezbollah, which stepped up its support for Palestinian terrorists in the West Bank and Gaza following Israel's pullout from Lebanon, attempted to infiltrate northern Israel in a bid to kidnap IDF soldiers. In the increasingly lawless West Bank and Gaza, Palestinian gangs and militias, affiliated with Fatah, openly settle personal disputes with guns. A Palestinian human-rights monitoring organization on Thursday issued a report criticizing the role that Fatah and the religious extremism of Hamas have played in preventing the growth of a genuinely pluralist political structure for Palestinians.

If Mr. Abbas fails to exert some leadership, he will bring catastrophe and ruin to his people.

## Dangers of Capitulation

**By Louis Rene Beres The Washington Times July 11, 2005**

If you liked what happened in London on July 7, you'll love what is now planned for Gaza. Next month, the forcible expulsion of Jews from this tiny piece of territory will set the stage for further Arab terror attacks in Europe and the United States. While President Bush and Prime Minister Tony Blair have high hopes that carving up Israel will protect their own countries, they have neglected to understand that a "disengaged" Gaza will quickly become the site for expanded terror violence against the West. They should have learned by now that the smell of carrion always inflames the vulture.

On the eve of Prime Minister Ariel Sharon's disengagement from Gaza, Israel continues to ignore the obvious. The official map of Palestine remains clear and explicit. Gaza is merely the start of a long-established and never-revoked plan to dismantle Israel in "phases." This carefully-constructed cartography defines the emergent 23rd Arab state to include all of Judea/Samaria (the West Bank), Gaza and the entire state of Israel. A small slice of Jordan is also included on the map, which purposefully excludes any references to Jewish populations.

If you liked London, you'll love Israel's planned August deportation of Jews -- the prime minister's incomprehensible plan of "Land For Nothing." Following this deportation, the Palestinian Authority and its many collaborators will turn Gaza into an organized area for more ferocious Islamic attacks against selected targets in Europe and the United States. The terrorists who are responsible for the July 7 London bombings are in very close association with the terrorists of the Palestinian Authority and

Hamas. In essence, in spite of widely-presumed distinctions, they are simply different wings of the same overarching Jihadi movement.

Manifestly delighted that Britain and America have unhesitatingly agreed to turn Israel into a present-day Czechoslovakia, al Qaeda and its various Palestinian cousins fully understand that capitulation has been the West's predictable response to Islamic terror. Yes, of course America and England fight together in Iraq and Afghanistan, but this often heroic effort is strangely coincident with offering tiny Israel as a sacrificial lamb to the very same terrorist enemies. In time, this unforgivable surrender of Israel in pieces will create pieces of terrorist devastation within our own European and American heartlands.

Now London has become Tel Aviv. Tomorrow it could be New York (again), Los Angeles or Chicago. For years, British newspapers and TV news journalists have referred euphemistically to Palestinian suicide bombers as "militants." Today, however, when the victims are not just Jewish women and children in Israel, but English mothers and daughters on London buses and subways, the militants are finally called "terrorists." How desperately human beings always want to ignore what is true.

Soon the body parts will have been properly collected in London, and the affected streets and rails hosed down to a pre-incident state of cleanliness. Soon, London, like Tel Aviv, will return to "normal." Driven by an unstoppable passion for both commerce and self-delusion, British authorities

will take prudent steps to ensure that the hotels stay filled and the air charters keep flying. But London, like Tel Aviv, will never return to normal until it understands exactly who is responsible for defiling its people.

Moreover, for the foreseeable future, England, like America and Israel, will also have to prepare for previously unimaginable attacks on civilians involving weaponized pathogens (bioterror) and "dirty bombs" -- that is, nuclear materials dispersed over cities by conventional high explosives.

In Pericles' Funeral Speech, as recorded by Thucydides, Athens' wartime leader commented: "What I fear more than the strategies of our enemies is our own mistakes." Understood in terms of our stubborn march to repeated misfortune in America, in Europe and in Israel, Pericles' wisdom points to the mistake of underestimating one's own national vulnerabilities. For England, for America, for Israel, the only true refuge now lies in a sober awareness that we face a distinctly common enemy and that we should not capitulate to this enemy on one front while combating him on another.

## Unreal for 30 Days

**By Debbie Schlüssel The Wall Street Journal June 24, 2005**

Morgan Spurlock got famous from his Oscar-nominated documentary "Supersize Me." He ingested big McDonald's meals three times a day for 30 days, then blamed McDonald's for his bloated body and dodgy health. Now he's using his 30-day premise to get Americans to ingest his version of radical Islam on cable's F/X Network.

Last year, I received a request to appear on Mr. Spurlock's new reality show, "30 Days." The episode for which I was being recruited, "Inside an American Muslim Family," airs next Wednesday. It features Mr. Spurlock's childhood friend from West Virginia, David Stacy, spending 30 days "living as a Muslim" in the Detroit area.

While Mr. Spurlock is often referred to as a journalist, and touts "30 Days" as a "documentary," the outcome of the show was decided before production began. A show summary sent to me before taping said: "This process aims to deconstruct common misconceptions and stereotypes....[O]ur character will learn firsthand about Islam and the daily issues that...Muslims in America face today. The viewers will witness our character emerge from the immersion situation with a deeper understanding and appreciation for the Muslim-American experience....The potential is great for this program to enlighten a national television audience about the Muslim American experience and increase their compassion, understanding and support."

And indeed, the Journal's own Dorothy Rabinowitz, writing about the show last week from a preview tape, noted that Mr. Stacy, by the end of his

For us, paradise has been bolted shut. No American, Englishman or Israeli can force an entrance there. The persisting Sharon/Peres dream of a New Middle East is based on a theoretical impossibility. Nurtured also in London and Washington, this immature dream is a curious counterpoint to reason, a childlike vision that points determinedly to mass-destruction terrorism on several fronts.

A dying civilization compromises with its disease, sometimes even nurturing the virus that produces the infection. So it is today with Israel and its supposed allies in England and the United States. If you don't like what just happened in London, you will not like what is about to take place in Gaza. "Disengagement" is a virulent compromise that will further endanger us all.

**Louis Rene Beres graduated from Princeton University. He is the author of many books and articles dealing with strategic issues and international law.**

30 days, "has become so enlightened that he is pronouncing, if incomprehensibly, on the meaning of Islam, his knowledge of the Quran, the real definition of jihad."

I asked the show's executive producers -- all of whom worked on "The Awful Truth With Michael Moore," a cable TV show -- how this could be a documentary when they had decided the outcome in advance. Wasn't it possible that Mr. Stacy would come out seeing that there isn't Islamophobia to the extent that the Muslim community claims? Might he see that there is disturbingly strong support in the Detroit-area Islamic community for terrorist groups Hamas and Hezbollah -- a fact regularly documented even in the normally pliant Detroit media?

No, the producers told me. "Morgan [Spurlock] wants the show to demonstrate to America that we are Islamophobic and that 9/11's biggest victims are Muslims." With this in mind, I agreed to be filmed only with final approval of my appearance, which I never gave. Thus I will not appear in Wednesday's show.

When I met David Stacy, about halfway through his 30-day experience, I was amazed at how uninformed he was. This new "expert" on Islam never heard of Wahhabism -- the extremist Sunni strain of Islam that dominates Saudi Arabia and informs the terrorist-breeding maddrassa schools throughout Arab and other Muslim lands. He was unfamiliar with groups like Hamas and Hezbollah. He did not believe me when I told him that Hezbollah had murdered hundreds of U.S. Marines

and civilians in Beirut and elsewhere. He seemed mystified to learn that President Bush shut down American Islamic charities, like the Holy Land Foundation and Global Relief Foundation, for funding Hamas and al Qaeda.

In Mr. Stacy, it is clear, Mr. Spurlock had found the perfect tabula rasa. He had also found the perfect "experts" and "key members" of Detroit's Islamic community to educate him. One such was Muqtedar Khan, a professor at Adrian College whose occasional columns in the Detroit News and elsewhere have urged us to understand how devout Muslims can be driven to commit terrorism because of the West's economic alliances.

Mr. Stacy was also taught by Imam Hassan Qazwini of Dearborn's Islamic Center of America, the largest mosque in North America. In November

1998, Mr. Qazwini's mosque hosted Louis Farrakhan, who was introduced as "our dear brother" and "a freedom fighter." I was there and watched Mr. Qazwini cheer on Mr. Farrakhan's attacks on America and his descriptions of Jews as "evil" and "forces of Satan."

When I told Mr. Spurlock's executive producer that I felt David Stacy was, well, a moron, she replied that Imam Husham Al-Husainy, a prominent Dearborn Shia cleric, "said the same thing" and refused to continue teaching him about Islam for the show. The biggest morons, though, will be not Mr. Stacy but the critics and viewers who fall for this supersized phony "documentary."

**Ms. Schlüssel is Detroit area attorney, columnist and talk show host.**

## You won, Mr. Sharon, I'm Disengaged

By Naomi Ragen NaomiRagen.com July 1, 2005

I'm watching the news on television. The screen is filled with a major Israeli security operation. Seven hundred police are involved, with major military backup. Could it be, perhaps, an attack on Hezbollah, which just sent three terrorists to infiltrate Israel, and attacked Har Dov with artillery fire, killing a 20 year old soldier from Beersheva?

No, they are involved in clearing out a bunch of teenagers from an abandoned hotel in Gush Katif! There are ten soldiers and policemen for every kid. I see them dragging the children by their legs. I see them putting a young girl in a head hold. It takes them twenty minutes, tops, to empty the "right-wing extremist stronghold."

And this is how I feel: Disengaged, in the real sense of the word, not Mr. Sharon's spin. I feel detached, withdrawn, my ties and obligations severed. Who are these people who are running my country? I didn't elect them. I voted for those who promised to support Gush Katif, to fight terrorism. I sent my son to the army to shoulder arms and risk his young life to protect his people, not drag them kicking and screaming out of their homes. Not to mount a little war against a bunch of miserable teenagers.

Of course, you'd never know this listening to the Israeli media, who have joined forces with European and Palestinian spin doctors to foster anti-Israel propaganda. How many times did I hear the newscaster showing this shameful footage call these kids: "Men of the Right." Men? I didn't see any men. I saw fifteen year-olds, confused and unhappy and hyper.

Now why should that be? I mean, the fact that their government gave out guns to terrorists after signing worthless agreements with them couldn't be

a factor, could it? Or the fact that they sat and had bombs thrown at them for four years, while their government was "negotiating." It couldn't be seeing their friends, neighbors, parents, teachers and Rabbis gunned down or blown up in cold blood by their Palestinian neighbors, could it? Or the fact that they are about to lose their homes and have their synagogues, schools and even cemeteries bulldozed? I mean, that's no excuse for sitting on the roads and blocking complacent Tel Aviv home-owners trying to get to their television sets and humus. No, they must be "dangerous criminals who will be prosecuted to the full extent of the law." Bad seeds, "men of the right," violent fanatics who deserve and who will receive, no doubt, long jail terms if Mr. Sharon and his forces get their hands on them.

I saw one of them throw a rock and injure a Palestinian, which was disgusting. This incident is now being denounced as a "lynch" (Lynch? You mean like the two Israeli reservists who were beaten to death by a Palestinian mob, who dipped their hands in the blood? That kind of lynch?)

Let's kill the kids, why don't we? After all, they are worse than terrorists aren't they, with their "lynch" and their desperate, annoying attempts to wake up their fellow citizens, keeping them in traffic jams in hot days. Or like the soldier who cried out: "This is wrong!" during an operation to drag the kids bodily into waiting vans. He was given the maximum jail sentence. Not for refusing orders, mind you. For expressing his feelings. Let's string him up, too.

Disengagement: To detach oneself. Free oneself from an obligation or pledge. To withdraw. I guess that's how I feel about my government and the Israeli news media today. I'm disengaged. I think I speak for many.