

Chapter 14:

CONFRONTING AND CONTAINING *HEZBOLLIZATION*

As we have seen in Chapter 13, our western culture is ill-prepared to understand anything more than the materialistic, live-in-the-present-only, society we have created. Moreover, that society is based on a cultural and moral relativism, that holds any culture to be as deserving of respect as our own and hence the resolution of any cultural struggle (between parties who, *prima facie*, are equally deserving of our respect) should be at a point exactly half way between the positions of the disputants. All that is necessary is for good “honest brokers” (as Canadians are wont to see themselves) to help the poor misguided warring parties to find that half-way point which naturally will guarantee peace.

And so, in a Western culture where religion for most is a small part of life, it is almost impossible to understand the mentality of those who live, and are willing to die, only for their religion. Few in the West can understand a religious passion that is so strong, so overwhelming that its proponents are willing to die for it, and are willing to have their children die for it.

We in the West want to believe that religion is about living a good life, having faith in a Deity, and helping people to follow paths such as “doing to others what you would want done to yourself”, or “not doing to others what you wouldn’t want done to yourself”. When a religion becomes infused with an aggressive idea of world hegemony and a culture of death and martyrdom in that quest for world hegemony, we in the West do not seem to understand. Our ideology has become so dependent on infantile notions of multiculturalism, tolerance and diversity, that we have begun to tolerate the intolerable.

Included in the intolerable is state-sponsored anti-Semitism, in the media, in the mosque and in the school, throughout Iran and the Arab world. We in the West should not tolerate that; have we learned nothing from Nazi Germany? I suppose it is a task of *Second Generation Radicals* to remind the West, to remind our media, and our universities, that cultural relativism, must not include toleration of a culture that once again blames everything on the Jews

Accordingly, most of the West is ill-prepared to understand Hezbollah and Hamas. However, there are many who have woken up to a full understanding of the problem, and are engaged in the attempt to wake up the rest of us. Once such writer is the Canadian Robert Fulford, who, in the twilight of an esteemed journalistic and literary career, writes a regular column for Canada’s *National Post*.

In a column, dated August 5, 2006, entitled, *What Hezbollah Wants*, Fulford points out that Hezbollah leader Hassan Nasrallah has clearly stated that Israel’s weak point is its reverence for human life combined with its hedonistic and materialistic lifestyle. Although Israel possesses a high tech airforce and nuclear weapons, it is in fact, says Nasrallah, “weaker than a spider web”, as it is incapable of a sustained war against

fighters who are willing to die, and launch their rockets from residential neighbourhoods, adjacent to schools, hospitals and mosques.

Fulford cuts to the point: Hezbollah wants a society run by Sharia law. Fulford points out that in Indonesia, the province of Aceh has now won the right to have sharia-based criminal law. He states:

“roaming Taliban-like squads of vice police in brown uniforms now tour the streets, looking for men drinking alcohol or women consorting with men other than their husbands. These people are then caned outside mosques, watched by crowds and TV cameras. Women claim they are more often the objects of vice squad raids than men. Ordinary citizens sometimes grab couples sitting in parked cars and hand them over to the vice police... The vice police are turning into a steadily expanding bureaucracy ... So now a great religion, which once inspired enviable poetry, philosophy and architecture, has reduced itself to promoting institutionalized thuggery.

“That’s the world Hezbollah desires. It seems clear that the crisis in the Middle East is a struggle for a decent civilization. Given that truth, anyone arguing that the West should remain neutral looks like either a fool or a scoundrel.”

Yet, isn’t that goal of “neutrality” supported by the majority of Western people? Are we, then fools or scoundrels?

The answer is that we have been made to *look like* fools, as Fulford states. I believe that we look like fools, because we have been misled into a truly ridiculous position. We are attempting to *appease* militant Islam with our fairness, our neutrality and our understanding, and yet each time we advance that fairness and understanding we are *rewarded* with more terrorism. Let me explain.

The recent Israel-Hezbollah war in northern Israel and southern Lebanon was reported on both sides of the Atlantic with a previously unheard of amount of understanding and sympathy for the Lebanese and their popular terrorist group, Hezbollah. After all, the Lebanese were the ones that breached Security Council Resolution 1559, by allowing Hezbollah to install missiles throughout southern Lebanon, and become the de facto government and military for the South. In fact, Hezbollah members of parliament were taken into the Cabinet, with Nabih Berri acting as their spokesperson during the war. In fact, it is now uncertain if the Lebanese government, people, and military have any will at all to disarm Hezbollah or even reduce its influence.

I recently came across a discussion forum on the internet, called *AhluBayt Discussion Forum*, part of *ShiaChat.com*. A Lebanese Shiite was explaining that in his opinion Resolution 1559 had *not* in fact been breached by Lebanon, since the Resolution called for disbanding *militias*, and Hezbollah was more than a militia. He wrote:

“The Lebanese government has officially recognized Hezbollah as a national resistance, and rejects notion that the term militia applies to them, because Hezbollah is a source of pride and honor for Lebanon, and because they have served Lebanon and brought victory to Lebanon, and have acted with dignity and honor in the face of a regime that massacred

and oppressed their people. They have members in both parliament and government, and are at the gist of the political scene in Lebanon. For many in Lebanon and outside, it is astonishing how Hezbollah continues to achieve victory after victory whether on the political, diplomatic, or military levels, and it is the view of many political pundits in Lebanon and outside that Hezbollah will see the ‘Hezbollahization’ of Lebanon before any defeat and disarmament of Hezbollah.”

It then occurred to me that the U.N. ceasefire resolution 1701 at no point explicitly counters the argument that we see made on the above-mentioned discussion forum, namely that Hezbollah is more than just a militia, it is now part and parcel of the Lebanese Government, and is in fact that part of the Lebanese Army that “protects” South Lebanon from Israeli “aggression”. Accordingly I would not be surprised that Preliminary Point 5 of the said resolution says only:

“Welcoming the efforts of the Lebanese Prime Minister and the commitment of the government of Lebanon, in its seven-point plan, to extend its authority over its territory, through its own legitimate armed forces, such that there will be no weapons without the consent of the government of Lebanon and no authority other than that of the government of Lebanon ...”

It is shocking but true that the resolution manages not to name Hezbollah specifically when it requires the Lebanese Government to take certain actions to extend its authority. By not specifying that it is *Hezbollah* that is to be disbanded and disarmed, then it is clear to me that as Hezbollah increases its power within the Lebanese Government that the apparent obligations of the Lebanese Government towards disarming this unnamed militia will be meaningless. Why wasn’t Hezbollah named? The answer is clear; Hezbollah was only too happy to agree to a ceasefire resolution that would allow it to live on, to complete the “Hezbollahization” of Lebanon.

And not only was Hezbollah not named in the resolution, neither was Iran or Syria. What a victory for Iran, in that it armed and trained Hezbollah, yet was not even mentioned by name in the U.N. resolution setting out the terms of the ceasefire. What a victory for Hezbollah – starting a war, firing more than 4000 rockets against civilians, yet no international demand for its dismantling or any sanctions, no requirement that it even compensate Israel for the damage it did to homes, businesses, forests and human lives.

What is so often overlooked in the analysis of terrorism is who is funding and training the terrorists. In the case of Hezbollah, and in the case of the Shia militias now blowing up half of Baghdad, the answer is the same – Iran. As the Americans take all the international criticism for their clumsy operation in Iraq, Iranian theocrats simply promote the training and arming of their Shia terrorist proxies, as an impotent West looks on.

And what have the Palestinians learned from the Hezbollah adventure? Let us examine an article by Khaled Abu Toameh, writing in *The Jerusalem Post* on August 14, 2006. He writes of an interview with PA Information Minister Yusef Rizkiah of Hamas. Said

Rizkah: "The war has taught us that resistance should be a key factor in resolving the problems of Lebanon and Palestine."

Toameh writes that "Rizkah said the war united Arabs and Muslims around the world 'because now they are looking forward to achieving freedom and dignity.' He added: 'If anything, this war has shattered the myth of the invincible [Israeli] army and [shown] that the Israelis are unable to confront the strong determination and will of Muslim fighters.'

"The 'defeat' of the IDF in Lebanon, he added, marks the beginning of the regression of the Zionist project in the Middle East. 'Israel will fail in Palestine the same way it failed in Lebanon,' he said.

Continues Toameh: "Emboldened by what they perceive as the Hizbullah 'victory' over Israel, several writers and commentators in the Arab world have begun openly discussing the possibility of destroying Israel. In a series of articles in the Palestinian and Arab media, many of them said that the poor performance of the IDF in the war proved that the elimination of Israel is no longer unattainable."

And so we see that the *Hezbollahization* of the whole Middle East will mean that Arabs are learning that violent "resistance" is the best approach with Israel. The international community has taught them that this is the proper approach and there are no negative repercussions on the international front for this behaviour. A United States, bogged down in Iraq, has made no significant steps in the face of the new HISH bloc (as Professor Barry Rubin puts it) – Hizbollah, Iran, Syria and Hamas. This bloc is the forerunner to the new "National Islamist Ideology", which is by far a more dangerous development in 2006 than the state of American military success in Iraq.

And so, at the end of the conflict, the U.S.-supported U.N. ceasefire resolution 1701 was anything but a loss for Hezbollah. However, notwithstanding that Hezbollah had emerged from its aggression against Israel with little diplomatic censure, radical Islam was still not satisfied. Right after the ceasefire resolution, British police foiled an attempt to simultaneously blow up 10 commercial airliners traveling between Britain and America.

Accordingly, we see yet another example of how submitting to the terrorist morality and worldview is only seen as evidence by radical Islam of success and the need for more terrorism, that will bring even more success.

Let's look at the most well-known instance of Islamist terror in the U.S. – the 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Towers. A careful review of the statements of world leaders and Muslim leaders seemed to concentrate as much on the need to not hold Muslims responsible for their radical comrades as they did on the need to stop the march of radical Islam.

Let us also look at the British response to the terrorist plot to blow up the 10 aircraft. We shall turn to Douglas Davis, writing in Canada's *National Post* on August 11, 2006,

and his view of the seeming British moral paralysis in understanding what was happening in their world, with the arrest of terrorist plotters, who, as was the case with the subway suicide bombings, were British-born Muslims:

“In London, the word that dared not speak its name throughout the day of drama was ‘Muslim’. Mayor Ken Livingstone set the tone when he warned against any attempt to blame the Muslim community. ‘No community in London can or should be targeted or blamed because of the actions of people who are pure criminals.’

“Senior police officers quickly took up the refrain: It was, said one, outrageous to suggest that the fault lay with Islam, a peace-loving religion that utterly rejected wanton killing. The plot, he declared, was a crime, pure and simple, and the plotters were desperate criminals, pure and simple.

“Language is fast becoming a barrier to dealing with reality. It is adding to the public confusion. Never mind that last year's London terrorists were unambiguous in their posthumous video messages: They perpetrated their missions as Muslims, were inspired by the Prophet, were justified by the Koran and acted in the name of Islam. No messing about.

“In politically-correct Britain, however, the words ‘Muslim’ and ‘Islam’ cannot be used as adjectives of ‘terrorist’ (which also, incidentally, may not be used because in a value-free, morally relative world he might be another man's ‘freedom fighter’). So we are left to face the militant acts of desperate criminals. But language is not alone in clouding the issue. British politicians are fighting a losing battle with a libertarian judicial system, a skeptical public and a Muslim community whose representatives are drawn from the radical, supposedly authentic, end of the spectrum ...

“(T)he government and the police (whose officers routinely attend Muslim Awareness Days) are hypersensitive when dealing with the Muslim community. Muslim leaders are acutely aware of this sensitivity and are quick to exploit it. The reaction to yesterday's drama by Khurshid Ahmed, leader of the British Muslim Forum, is a case in point. No mealy-mouthed expressions of sorrow and regret from Mr. Ahmed after he received private briefings from both government officials and the police. Instead, he responded with a threat: If the police failed to find incriminating evidence to justify the arrests, relations between the government and the Muslim community would deteriorate further. The price of the Muslim community's satisfaction is, for starters, a wholesale change in Britain's foreign policy -- that is, an immediate about-turn on Iraq, Afghanistan and Palestine.”

And so we see that after every instance of terror, or every arrest of prospective terrorists, some Muslim leaders exploit the situation to make further gains in having the West *submit*, in having the West move closer to *Islamist* values. The failure to understand this is what makes us, in Fulford's language, *look like fools*.

To me, the Americans looked like fools when they beat a hasty retreat from Lebanon in 1983, after numerous assurances by President Reagan and Vice-President Bush (Sr.) that they would not run from Hezbollah. To me the Americans looked like fools when they walked away from the opportunity to demolish the Iranian training centre for Hezbollah in Lebanon in 1983. And we keep looking like fools, with every further appeasement and tolerance of Islamist radicalism and terrorism. We look like fools when we, under some misguided notion of freedom of religion, allow North American mosques to import radical anti-Western imams to distort the minds of young Muslims in their congregations. It is time that we insisted that all imams have a Western university education, and that their religious qualifications come from accredited North American institutions of Muslim religious learning. Otherwise, we are allowing the enemy complete access to impressionable young minds, who, although born and bred in the West, take on an Islamist worldview.

British leaders like Mayor Livingstone, then, want us to believe that terrorist plotters, who are trained by Al Qaeda types in Pakistan, are just “pure criminals”. Well, I am not a fool. A pure criminal may steal my wallet, but he is generally uninterested in blowing up my children.

Is there hope? One hopeful sign is that things have gotten so bad that Germany has been forced to, as John Vinocur has recently written in the *New York Times*, to start moving “out of the safe house of moral comfort and limited involvement” and participate in the international *peacemaking* (not just *peacekeeping*) operation by sending naval forces to try to stop Iranian shipments of arms to Hezbollah in Lebanon. According to Vinocur, “(Chancellor) Merkel seems to be attempting to reset Germany’s instinctive compass on how the world works and where Germany should stand. At a time of Islamic fundamentalism and existential threats to the West through Iran’s drive for nuclear weapons, it is a kind of a nonexplicit redefinition of what Germans must do to sustain the self-respect they have regained.”

And so Merkel has stated: “As important as respect and tolerance for other cultures is, it’s also clear that certain values that we demand are not expendable, above all that every human life has its dignity.”

And so, it is ironic, but a very good irony indeed, that our moral compass on Hezbollahization of the world, may have to be lead by Germany. More problematic, however, is the German response, or lack thereof, to the efforts to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear bomb which it has threatened to use in killing another 6 million Jews.

But the Americans are no further ahead in their analyses than the Germans.

The first problem for America is its misguided and clumsy use of *military* operations in Iraq to fight something better battled with *cultural* operations. The battle for people’s minds cannot be won by soldiers, unless those soldiers are also doctors, nurses, teachers, imams, and business trainers. Iraq was, at the time of the American invasion, a highly dysfunctional society, and the American military operations have made it only more so.

David Brooks, writing in the *New York Times*, has publicized the recent work by researchers of the World Values Survey, published by Inglehart, Moaddel and Tessler in the journal *Perspectives on Politics*.

The study confirmed that a country traumatized by decades of totalitarian dictatorship has, during the last few years of war, insurgency, suicide attacks, and now civil war, has become even more xenophobic, sexist and reactionary. Rejection of western modernity, distrust of foreigners, sexist denigration of women, religious fanaticism, and tribal prejudices, have all increased during the Iraq war.

Moreover, a recent study by the major U.S. security organizations has disclosed that insecurities, fanaticism, and hatreds leading to terrorism have only increased during the War, which means that President Bush has not achieved his objective.

As Israel is just beginning to learn, superior military weapons and aircraft, sometimes pale to insignificance when the battle is for the hearts and minds of dysfunctional societies. Such societies may react the opposite to what is expected. Civilian death tolls are not a weapon of the attacking military, but instead are turned around to give a moral victory to the victims and their survivors. It is as if the society says, “Our strength is in our stubbornness, our strength is in our ability to see our dead as martyrs – your weakness is that your people will not accept as many dead as ours will.”

If that is the case, the Western militaries have to rethink their strategies. Hezbollah has indeed changed the power relationship between the West and Radical Islam. The fight should not be with weapons, but with propaganda, and with education, free media, medical care and social work, and mini-Marshall plans wherever the population is so hateful of modernity and our values of freedom, justice and respect for human life that they have become suicide bombers or supporters of suicide bombers.

Unfortunately so many in the West still think that putting pressure on Israel to give up more territory will somehow deflect the Iranians from supporting their proxy's attempts to destroy Israel. In an interview with the *Jerusalem Post* in January, 2007, Israel's Benjamin Netanyahu made the point clearly:

Netanyahu stated that many in the West believe that in order to calm down Iran, “we should have some movement on the Palestinian problem,” which of course sounds good on the face of it. But then you remember that if the pressure is on Israel to divest itself of more territory, who does the territory go to? It goes to Hamas, which means effectively it goes to Iran. You don't weaken Iran by strengthening Iran and giving it forward positions to have its proxies fire rockets at Israeli cities. There are a lot of non sequiturs in the positions of Western governments right now..”

The second problem, as David Brooks has pointed out, is that the “Chinese model” may turn out to work best; that is, political reform may best follow economic reform. Brooks argues that “when people see their standard of living rise, they reject the reactionary survival mentality and they become more open to others and to changes. If people

already see their lives improving materially, they will be more likely to keep their cool as their political institutions are reinvented.”

The problem with this, however, is that, as we have seen with the 9/11 terrorists in the U.S., and the London subway bombers in the U.K., suicide bombers often come from upper middle class families. The sway of Islamist ideology renders Marxist type analyses rather simplistic.

The third problem is that Hezbollahization implies the end of several Arab nation-states in the coming years; Iraq and Lebanon will surely be the first. It is an interesting question, how long it will take for Iranian and Syrian mischief to promote the eventual fall of Jordan and the House of Saud in Saudi Arabia, as well. How long will it take for the western world to identify the threat posed by the “National Islamist” ideology, promoted by Hezbollah, Iran, Syria and Hamas? How long for the western world to understand the vile role of Iran, a non-Arab nation, in the internecine conflicts among Arabs?

How long for the western world to understand that an Iran with nuclear weapons will be stronger and more able to dictate its will?

Accordingly, I believe that while economic reforms and political reforms are both important, recent history has disclosed that neither or both are enough in themselves. First, we must stop Iran. Second, unless we find a way to demand cultural changes in return for economic or political assistance, or we find a way to force cultural changes in some kind of military victory followed by a type of Marshall Plan that overhauls Islamist schools, media, and in fact its theology, we are doomed to failure - doomed to the creeping and creepy Hezbollahization of the world.