

Jihad Al-Kuffar

A COLLECTION OF THREADS POSTED IN 2013

***In pursuit
of a progressive justice system***

(January 15, 2013)

***A terror attack on the West
and its credibility***

(February 1, 2013)

***A staunch enemy of “do-gooders”:
the drone***

(March 11, 2013)

***Thousands of teen girls in love
with Boston bombing suspect***

(May 13, 2013)

Is the West flying Assad's flag?

(June 5, 2013)

IN PURSUIT OF A PROGRESSIVE JUSTICE SYSTEM



January 15, 2013

Once again, at the beginning of a new year, the world is going to face challenging times. As usual, several populations continue to live under the threat of bombs (in Syria, Israel, Gaza, Nigeria, Mali, Somalia—just to name a few places). As happens since 2008, all countries are in the midst of a chronic financial crisis. As we learned in July 2011 (and as we were warned a couple of weeks ago), the US might soon lie under the ruins of the debt ceiling. And so on.

However, despite a constant tidal wave of bad news, the most progressive part of the Western world can find relief in the growth of positive forces that are aiming at defending the human rights of the poor people who are responsible of sexual abuse and their crimes.

The best of the Planet Earth seems to be on the right track and a major milestone was achieved some months ago, in April 2012, when a man who had joint Irish-US nationality could welcome a historical decision of a British court.

As reported by BBC, he was "accused of raping a 14-year-old girl and sexually molesting two 11-year-olds in Minnesota between 1993 and 1994". He also had "a previous conviction for sexually assaulting two 12-year-old girls in Ireland, for which he was given a suspended sentence."

[cf. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-18625225>, still available in March 2013]

The BBC website explains that this gentleman "won his appeal against extradition after US authorities refused to pledge he would not be placed on a controversial sex offender treatment programme". The main problem was that "no one had been released from the treatment programme, operated by the Department of Human Services in Minnesota, since it began in its current form in 1988". Therefore, two British judges (fortunately!) ruled "there was a real risk" that the fugitive "would be subjected to an order of civil commitment to the treatment programme in a 'flagrant denial' of his human rights". More precisely, extradition might contravene a citizen's rights "under Article 5.1 of the *European Convention on Human Rights*".

It is quite interesting to have a look at Lord Justice Moses' statement (April 24, 2012): "Civil commitment is unknown to European law, but is a process available in 20 states in the United States. Minnesota's law is said to be more draconian than many others. Under Minnesota law, as described by Professor Janus, who has considerable experience of representing those subjected to petitions for civil commitment in Minnesota, a 'sex offender' may be committed indefinitely if under criteria specified in the Sexually Dangerous Persons Act 1994 he is found by a judge to be 'irresponsible for personal conduct with respect to sexual matters and thereby dangerous to other persons'. The evidence at the date of the hearing suggested that no sex offender committed to indeterminate detention since the programme began in its current form in 1988 has been released. The Court was referred to three cases where there is a likelihood of release but when I questioned counsel for the United States he was unable to report that any one of those three had been released at the time of this hearing."

[cf. <http://www.baillii.org/cgi-bin/markup.cgi?doc=/ew/cases/EWHC/Admin/2012/1680.html&query=shawn&method=boolean>, still available in March 2013]

As pointed out in the FOX News website, "The U.S. policy of committing repeat child molesters to civil confinement -- where they are kept off the streets even after completing prison terms -- was deemed too barbaric."

[cf. <http://www.foxnews.com/world/2013/01/14/uk-high-court-blocks-extradition-convicted-sex-offender-over-draconian-us-laws/>, still available in March 2013]

Such a remark appears to be definitely correct. In actual fact, Europe has been in the frontline of the *defence of human rights* for decades. As pointed out in Jihad Al-Kuffar and in this blog (cf., e.g., ARCHIVE: Posts2012, thread dated October 17, 2012), there are several outstanding examples. For instance, in 1972, the German authorities released three terrorists who had taken part in the Munich Olympics massacre. Next, in 1985, the Italian government did not allow the Americans to seize a bunch of terrorists (including Abu Abbas, the mastermind of the attack on an Italian cruise liner, and Youssef Magied al-Molqi, who had killed a disabled Jewish American citizen on that ship). Incidentally, Youssef Magied al-Molqi was later arrested in Italy, allowed to escape, re-arrested and finally released (probably because "civil commitment is unknown to European law").

Italy (and, in general, Europe) must certainly feel proud of a law that does not resort to "barbaric" practices, such as "civil confinement". And in 2006, in Italy, a child was kidnapped and killed by a man who had already been charged with sexual abuse in 2000. On that occasion, he was given a six-year sentence, but—you know, not only does Italy abhor "civil commitment"... as happened in the case of Youssef Magied al-Molqi, prison terms are often cut short. Therefore, that gentleman was released after spending nine months in jail, instead of six years (which, in someone's view, might be "deemed too barbaric"). Eventually he came across his baby-victim—but, *mind you!*, no one will ever dare to say that Italian law (and, in general, European law) might be better if it were a bit more "draconian".

As a final remark, I would like to quote a paragraph of Jihad Al-Kuffar (Chapter 5). According to the story, the main character (a radical fighter) is in London in 2000 and talks to some fellow militants, who have just planned to hijack an airliner by using the method that was later adopted in the US for the September 11 attack. The members of the terrorist cell are enthusiastic about their idea and feel ready to do the job somewhere in Europe. After leaving his friends, the radical fighter makes some comments:

At the very beginning, I raised some objections. The job seemed too hard for a small team of almost unarmed mujahideen. I was wondering how they would keep pilots, flight attendants, and passengers under control. Yet, in the end, I had to acknowledge that my skepticism was unjustified—reactions on the aircraft should be unlikely. If our militants only killed a few people, maybe a couple of crew members, all passengers would calm down in less than no time. "There's nothing to fear," insisted the cell leader. "On European flights, we won't have any problems. Most passengers would think that, after all, we're nice people. It goes without saying, we come from Third World countries, and they would certainly assume that we're in the right. Most of them would blame American policy for the hijacking. Everyone would judge it unfair to put a spoke in our wheel. We can only win; I feel confident, although I realize we might get into trouble if we tried to seize an American or Israeli airliner. In this case, the passengers' feelings would be much different, and I would give us some 20 or even 30 percent chances of failure."

COMMENTS

Remark by Jimmy S. ON 05/26/2013 at 03:54:22 PM

Subject: **A successful record of accomplishments by the British Authorities**

Content: Interestingly enough, not only did the British Authorities took the historical decision to deny extradition of a man who had been accused of raping a young girl in the US. As reported by BBC (<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-22673164>) the Foreign Office has confirmed that "one of the suspects in the Woolwich murder case was arrested in Kenya in 2010", but "was handed over to UK authorities when it emerged he was a British citizen." The Foreign Office also pointed out that "it gave consular assistance 'as normal' in the circumstances", when the suspect (Michael Adebolajo) was arrested in Kenya. The BBC article is enlightening: "He was believed to have been preparing to fight with Somali militant group al-Shabab, a Kenyan government spokesman told the BBC, and was later deported." According to BBC, there is evidence that, in his court appearance, Mr Adebolajo said: "These people are mistreating us, we are innocent." Once more, we clearly see the result of a frequent, common, popular, "normal" misinterpretation of the concept of *human rights*. In order to protect a man who "was believed to have been preparing to fight with Somali militant group al-Shabab" and in a noble effort to save him from the Kenyan justice system, the British Authorities took care of a man who has brutally killed a British soldier who leaves behind a two-year-old son and served with distinction in several countries, including Afghanistan.

Remark by Robert, St. Paul, MN on 01/16/2013 at 02:27:14 AM

Subject: **Barbaric practices**


Content: I think that it always depends on the general mood of a nation. There is a class of humans who like to rape women and abuse children. So, they tend to oppose draconian law (with the help of socially-motivated supporters who want to be politically correct and take it for granted that they will never be victims of sex violence or child abuse). Vice versa, there exists a class of humans who hate and fear these crimes. Perhaps even more, they hate and fear the perpetrators. So, they tend to believe that draconian law is fair. It may well be that the majority of the people in Minnesota belong to the second class, while the majority of the Europeans either belong to the first class or feel a kind of sympathy for rapists and pedophiles and other criminals. That might explain why civil confinement is unknown to European law, while Minnesota is not so gentle with sexually dangerous persons!

A TERROR ATTACK ON THE WEST AND ITS CREDIBILITY

February 1, 2013

Even though Jihad Al-Kuffar has nothing to do with financial issues, it is worth talking about a recent event that has all the features of a terror attack on the West and its foundations (with regard to both economy and ethics). I refer to an attack that was launched in the context of

a non-traditional war, in which the enemies are not religious fanatics and do not use explosive, but appear to be as dangerous as terrorist organizations, look like floating mines (ready to strike the Western system) and tend to become more aggressive by the day.



The comment above is some kind of gut reaction to an interesting news that probably was not given all the attention it deserved. It is about an Italian company (Saipem) which is active as contractor in the oil and gas industry in remote areas and deepwater. So, what happened? As some of you may have spotted, Saipem lost 34 percent of its value on January 30, "when the Milan-based company cut a forecast for 2013 profit. The day before, Bank of America Corp. (BAC) had managed the sale of almost 10 million shares, or 2.3 percent of the company's stock, for an institutional investor that's yet to be identified."

[cf. <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-01-31/ally-tarp-exit-irs-id-theft-battles-hsbc-compliance.html>, article dated January 31, 2013, still available in March 2013].

As pointed out by the media (especially by some Italian media), there is enough evidence to suspect an insider trading plot. However, in my opinion, this is not the worst of the matter. Actually, I feel that the most revolting aspect of the incident comes out when we examine some further details, that started to surface after "the sale of almost 10 million shares". For instance, it is particularly instructive to have a look at the website of *Il Sole - 24 Ore*, the Italy's leading financial newspaper

[cf. <http://www.ilsole24ore.com/art/finanza-e-mercati/2013-02-01/caso-saipem-consob-convoca-064201.shtml?uuid=AbHj78PH>, still available in March 2013].

We can learn that the sale took place in London through an accelerated book building process, while the European markets were closed. In addition, the price was 30.65 euros per share (while the Saipem security had closed at 30.44 euros last Tuesday, January 29). Thus, the total amount was about 300 million euros (roughly, over 400 million US dollars). Strange enough, the price remained flat on Tuesday night (while shares tend to plunge when big sales occur). As for the total value of the Saipem shares, it was around 13 billion euros (or 18 billion US dollars) at that time, since the transaction involved 2.3 percent of the company's stock.

Let's focus on the figure of 18 billion US dollars for a moment. I do not want to downplay the importance and the *weight* of a company like Saipem, but I would like to observe that, after all, 18 billion US dollars do not represent an astronomical sum of money, when large companies come into play. For example, there is quite a difference between Saipem and some major US companies—such as AIG (American International Group, Inc.), BAC (Bank of America Corp.), C (Citigroup, Inc.), just to list a few of them. Why do I make such a comparison? Because I was surprised by the staggering sale of 10 million Saipem shares while everything in Europe was surrounded by the darkness of the evening... and suddenly I decided to look at the nasdaq.com website in order to check what happened last night in New York City during the After-Hours trading session.

Believe it or not, 115,221 AIG shares were traded in the range of \$ 37.65 to \$ 37.90 (total amount: about 4 million US dollars); 1,786,079 BAC shares were traded in the range of \$ 11.25 to \$ 11.35 (total amount: about 20 million US dollars); 287,029 C shares were traded in the range of \$ 41.43 to \$ 42.25 (total amount: about 12 million US dollars).

Given these figures, it is probably obvious what I am aiming at: I wonder how it was possible to find people (*institutional investors*) who were ready to pour over 400 million dollars overnight into a relatively small company. Of course, I have no answer—but, at least, I have an idea. It may happen (occasionally) that some *institutional investors* are available to collect money from *small investors* (i.e., ordinary, unaware, naive people) and are inclined to (consciously, intentionally) spend that money in order to safeguard the interests of some *privileged investors* by absorbing their losses. Mind you, this is just an idea and I do not intend to suggest that this kind of thing really happens (or did happen in the case of the Saipem shares). Definitely, I am *not* claiming that both the seller and the buyer knew very well what they were doing. Mine is just a simple *working hypothesis*...

As I said before, Jihad Al-Kuffar does not deal with financial issues. So, I cannot find any specific comment related to the topic of this thread. Yet, there is a short sentence in Chapter 11 that might serve the purpose. In the book, it refers to a completely different context and, regrettably, it is clouded by feelings of pessimism, but I believe that it can fit in this post. Here it is:

We should harbor no illusions about human nature.

COMMENTS

Remark by Jeremy La. ON 05/24/2013 at 04:15:07 AM

Subject: **Ups and downs**

Content: I agree that \$400,000,000 is an awful lot of money, especially in the after-hours trading session, but I would not fight against windmills. Actually, what happened last February is nothing worse than the usual average and some comments (e.g., "We should harbor no illusions about human nature") look naive in this context. Just think of the Nikkei 225, which plunged over 7% yesterday. It is obvious that the "poor" investors who had fallen prey to panic couldn't do everything on their own. They needed to find some optimistic investors who were damn glad to buy stocks that were plummeting.

Remark by Jack M. on 02/02/2013 at 01:12:07 PM

Subject: **Ups and downs**

Content: Since you like charts, you might be interested in the many graphs that show the daily trends of shares, when the markets are open. If you do so, you will easily notice several peaks and valleys. In front of these frequent up and down shifts, you can put a couple of easy questions to yourself: "Is there any chance that some institutional investors are so clever that they regularly sell when the shares reach a peak and buy when the shares end up in a valley? Have the so-called Financial Services Authorities ever checked if this phenomenon really occurs (obviously, by sheer coincidence or because those investors are exceptionally good)?"

A STAUNCH ENEMY OF “DO-GOODERS”: THE DRONE

March 11, 2013



As clearly stated in several threads and, even more, in several pages of Jihad Al-Kuffar, I do have sympathy for the policy of the US Republican Party. However, having sympathy does not mean that I am ready to accept any idea from a Republican representative or any criticism of a Democratic president.

Thus, it is not surprising that I was quite stunned when I read of a performance by a Republican senator who gained some fame after his ninth-longest filibuster in recorded history. Later, burning with curiosity, I had a look at the (unofficial) transcript of his speech (*unofficial*, but hopefully reliable and credible, since I found it in the web page http://www.paul.senate.gov/?p=press_release&id=732, which could be easily accessed from the *Official Homepage* of US Senator Rand Paul: <http://www.paul.senate.gov>).

Here follows a most memorable part of the transcript:

"Overseas, one of the most famous citizens they killed Anwar al-Awlaki he worked with our enemies I think he could have been tried for treason. I think if I were on the jury, from what I read, I would have voted for his death. The thing is, some kind of process might be helpful. His son, though, 16 years old, was killed two weeks later in a separate drone strike and he was on nobody's list that I know of. They won't respond. But I think the response by the President's spokesman is reprehensible and really should be called out. It is sort of this flippant response that I think shows absolutely no regard for individual rights or for Americans. He said, well, the kid should have chosen a more responsible father."

I do not know if the President's spokesman really made the above remark and stated that "the kid should have chosen a more responsible father". If he expressed this opinion, I think he should have chosen better words—suitable for all the situations in which terrorists were targeted, while they were surrounded by innocent civilians in an attempt to protect themselves by using human shields (family members and/or common citizens who, perhaps, were not even aware of the presence of radical fighters in their neighborhood).

Definitely, I would have liked this kind of comment: "WELL, THE TERRORIST SHOULD HAVE CHOSEN A DIFFERENT PLACE TO HIDE, FAR FROM HIS FAMILY AND HARMLESS PEOPLE, INSTEAD OF THREATENING THE LIFE OF HIS SON AND NEIGHBORS." In my view, that would have been a proper way to deal with the problem and put an end to the complaints that often arise wherever a drone comes into play: Yemen, Iraq, Pakistan, and so on.

As already pointed out in this blog (and as clearly proved by the behavior of many fugitives who find protection in safe havens, such as Waziristan, in Pakistan, or the Gaza Strip, in Palestine), it is extremely naive to insist that "some kind of process might be helpful". With people like Osama bin Laden or Anwar al-Awlaki, it is simply impossible to knock at their doors and kindly ask: "Excuse me, Mr. Terrorist, would you mind coming along with me to a legitimate and fair court of justice?" (*cf.* http://jihad-al-kuffar.com/jak_posts2011.php).

Can someone be so naive as to believe that a few cops from the NYPD or the LAPD could have been dispatched to Pakistan or Yemen to arrest Osama bin Laden or Anwar al-Awlaki? Is it really a good idea to endanger the lives of American troops in Pakistan or Yemen in order to catch a man like Osama bin Laden or Anwar al-Awlaki (instead of using drones)?

Incidentally, I often wonder if certain people are so concerned with the issue of human rights just because they believe that they will never be the victims of the criminals and the terrorists they want to protect. So, let me put this question:

if a moralist were really convinced that a man like Osama bin Laden or Anwar al-Awlaki might target HIS home (*not* the general interests of the US government or random American citizens), would he prefer to see Osama bin Laden and Anwar al-Awlaki alive or would he run the risk of causing collateral damage?

Don't forget that the death of terrorists like Osama bin Laden or Anwar al-Awlaki might save a good number of lives all over the world. Not only in America, but also in Saudi Arabia and Pakistan and Iraq and India and Afghanistan and Yemen and Turkey and... [a pretty long list could follow]. In my view, the damage (intentional damage, *not* collateral damage) that can be caused by this kind of people is more than enough to forget moralistic arguments. In other words, I would not waste thirteen hours of my time to claim that the lives of a few persons who happen to be in the wake of a terrorist are worth more than the

survival of US troops and lots of honest people who live in Saudi Arabia or Pakistan or Iraq or India or Afghanistan or Yemen or Turkey or...



Hopefully, the picture on the left leaves little to imagination (both the video frame and the caption were copied from the web page <http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2011/09/awlaki-dead-yemen/>, still available in March 2013).

Note that the *fatwa* mentioned in the caption is likely to be a ruling that was published in 1998. No matter if you are a senator or a common citizen, it might be enlightening to go through that document. You just need to open the web page

<http://www.library.cornell.edu/colldev/mideast/wif.htm>, still available in March 2013.

The most sincere lovers of "legitimate and fair courts of justice" should also remember that terrorists easily find safe havens in the Western world itself. For instance, the Senator who feels sad about the victims of drone strikes should mull over the problem and find out if his moral standards are in line with the most progressive moral codes, which are becoming quite popular all across the planet. Actually, while talking of Anwar al-Awlaki, the Senator claimed that he could "have voted for his death". Alas, the sense of justice of that Senator appears to be in contrast with the widespread opinion of the most advanced ideals of mankind. Just last year, a progressive British judge (BRITISH, *not* Pakistani or Yemenite) ruled that an American citizen could not be extradited to the United States because the poor man ("accused of raping a 14-year-old girl and sexually molesting two 11-year-olds in Minnesota between 1993 and 1994") could "be subjected to an order of civil commitment to the treatment programme in a 'flagrant denial' of his human rights" [cf., e.g., http://jihad-al-kuffar.com/jak_P1301.php].

That said, regrettably, I can only make a pessimistic remark: even if it were possible to have a friendly chat with a terrorist who lives in a foreign country, it would not be so obvious to get him in front of a US court.

Finally, it is worth noting that the present US Administration has clearly shown great concern over the use of drones. The most interesting case is the final attack on Osama bin Laden, when a ground operation was not the only option. However, the US President decided to send a special forces military unit (and, most fortunately for him, for the US and for the Navy Seals, a helicopter was the only loss that day).

In Jihad Al-Kuffar many pages deal with the continuous attempts to undermine the security of the West and defend the interest of terrorist groups on the basis of alleged moral principles. Special attention is paid to the case of Israel. An example is found in Chapter 5: according to the story, a radical militant is talking about the suicide bombers who blow themselves up in Israel. It is the year 2000, when the Israelis start to build the controversial *West Bank Barrier* (which has significantly reduced the attacks on their homeland). Here follow some comments of the militant, an al-Qaeda affiliate:

I have just heard about forthcoming illegal controls and unlawful road blocks—racist, evil measures aimed at imposing severe restrictions on human rights. By now, there is just speculation, nothing serious, but we fear an unjustified crackdown on civil liberties. In the future, the Jews might implement stricter security standards. Positive and negative consequences are obvious. The good news is that our brothers would immediately receive unconditional support from humanitarian organizations and the European Union and the United Nations, which continues to snatch any opportunity to condemn the Zionists and vindicate the rights of our martyrs. The

bad news is that diplomacy is likely to be ineffective; no matter how harsh reprimands may be, the Jews would not change their illicit, stubborn policy aimed at self-defense.

Well, let's go back to the point—the performance of the US Senator who does not like drones. There is no denying that there are also plenty of dangerous people who do not like America, including American citizens who seek refuge abroad (e.g., in Yemen). Similarly, there is no denying that more and more people care about the human rights of terrorists. What conclusion can I draw? I think it is wise to get ready for the day when all radical fighters will become untouchable and will be granted complete immunity. When it happens, we can only hope for a miracle and a good help from above. As for the United States, may God bless America...

COMMENTS

Remark by George J. Q., Fl. on 03/13/2013 at 09:25:31 AM

Subject: **God bless America**

Content: God bless America -- stand beside her, and guide her through the night with a light from above.

THOUSANDS OF TEEN GIRLS IN LOVE WITH BOSTON BOMBING SUSPECT

May 13, 2013

Are you aware of the latest *One Thousand and One Nights* tale? Thousands of teen girls have fallen in love with Boston bombing suspect Dzhokhar Tsarnaev.



“Somebody needs to stand up for him, and not the little high-school girls who just think he’s cute,” a girl from Kansas said, as reported by the Pakistan Defence website www.defence.pk [cf. <http://www.defence.pk/forums/americas/251830-thousands-teen-girls-love-bombing-suspect-dzhokhar-tsarnaev.html>].

Mind you—the article, which was posted today on the Pakistan Defence website, is not the only (almost *incredible*) source. Just have a look at the New York Post website www.nypost.com and you will find more moving stories. For instance, you will learn that another girl was highly *fascinated* by her new hero: “Yall can judge me as much as you want. I’m on his side. This kid needs people behind him. I hope to meet him one day he fascinates me.” [cf. http://www.nypost.com/p/news/national/girls_lovesick_twisted_OLK6eLVJM5U6618gAVXT00].

I assume that it is not convenient to state that certain people deserve to suffer the consequences of a terror attack. Neither is it a good idea to suggest that radical fighters would not be a problem, if their only victims were the far-sighted people who love killers and suicide bombers. To put it straight, I am afraid that remarks of this kind are not politically correct. More importantly, they are likely to be against the law in many countries. However, I am surely allowed to observe that, in my opinion, certain people are so enthusiastic about terrorists because their mothers or fathers or brothers or sisters or husbands or wives or sons or daughters have not died in the explosion of a bomb placed by a fanatic—and because they did not lose a leg or an arm or an eye in Boston.

That said, the reaction of so many people is not surprising. After all, we could experience a wide range of anti-Western feelings (especially anti-American feelings) all over the world (including the United States) on many occasions. A most impressive wave of pro-terrorist propaganda dates back to the time of the Afghan War in 2001, as pointed out in *Jihad Al-Kuffar*. If you read Chapter 18, you find a radical militant who is fighting side by side with the Taliban and does not hesitate to express his sympathy for the myriad of Western citizens who support the war on the West:

Lots of unbelievers who promote our values do exist, Insha Allah. No matter who they are, no matter where they live, forward-looking demonstrators make all possible efforts to oppose the Great Satan and guarantee the survival of the Afghan jihad. In the name of brotherhood and third-worldism, they keep crying: “Stop the war, feed the poor!” They ask for food and financial aid to help the Taliban government accomplish its social project for the future of Afghanistan. More importantly, they understand that mujahideen should be given the constitutional right to strike the West when they want and where they want, without facing the unfair threat of violent reprisals.

COMMENTS

Remark by R.H.M. on 05/15/2013 at 04:18:39 PM

Subject: **A question of fashion**

Content: I agree with Jane S. It's a question of fashion. Lots of people feel stupid and bad if they don't complain about the Greenhouse Effect, if they don't stand by the coyotes (even where these animals pose a threat to public health and safety), if they don't fight for the survival of something. So, there are individuals who feel stupid and bad if they don't fight for the survival of terrorist groups.

Remark by Jane S. on 05/14/2013 at 11:02:43 AM

Subject: **Pro-terrorist propaganda**

Content: It seems to be a simple question of fashion. There were times when many people made human sacrifices, or used to support racial discrimination, or did not hesitate to shed tears on the death of dictators like Stalin and Kim Jong-il. Now there are girls who are totally mad about a bombing suspect. Basically there is nothing new.

IS THE WEST FLYING ASSAD'S FLAG?

June 5, 2013

You might have noticed that the media have a strange way of updating the public with the top news: suddenly, everyone stops talking about key stories that have made headlines for several months. Unexpectedly, there is no more media hype, without any apparent reason—without a word to explain how a breathtaking problem has been solved, how a breathtaking disease has been defeated, how a breathtaking revolution has changed the destiny of a nation.

This well-known scenario looks typical of our world (at least, the Western world). On several occasions, most of the people cannot wait to turn on the telly or browse the websites of the major news agencies or run to the kiosk to get the newspaper. There is a worldwide desire to hear the latest news. Yet, one day, unexpectedly (inexplicably) there is deep silence, together with general indifference. Nobody seems interested in some comments about the dramatic events that caught so much attention in the recent past. Nobody wants to know the end of the story.

Obvious questions remain unanswered: "Is the breathtaking problem still a problem?", "Is the breathtaking disease still a disease?", "Is the breathtaking revolution still a revolution? Or has a new government taken office in an atmosphere of joy, optimism and happiness? Or has the breathtaking revolution been made obsolete by a boring counter-revolution, which no one cares about?"

I am far from joking. I am just thinking of *Greece* or *Cyprus* or (not to downplay the largest economy in the world) the *Fiscal Cliff*. And I am just thinking of *SARS*—the (ex) world-famous *Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome*, which seemed to be the plague of the New Millennium. And I am thinking of *Egypt* or *Libya* or *Syria*. After the fall of their cruel dictators, are the citizens of Egypt and Libya living a new, prosperous life? Are they enjoying the sweet taste of democracy?

Let's take a look at Syria. Well, you might object that Syria is still making headlines and that we often hear about severe casualties, or massive shellings, or test samples that prove the use of gas. This is true, but it is also evident that no one is seriously willing to go into details. I am not saying that the most popular choice is to pretend that the problem does not exist, but we cannot ignore the enormous difference between the role that the media are playing in Syria today and the role that the same media played in North-eastern Africa some time ago. Of course, similar remarks apply to the so-called *international community* and, more importantly, to the most prominent world leaders.

The difference is so big that I wonder what the West is feeling about its enthusiastic welcome to the *Arab Spring*. Is someone thinking that some dictators, after all, were not so bad? Is someone afraid that it was a mistake to leave Reza Pahlavi, Hosni Mubarak and Muammar Gaddafi to their fate? It is hard to give an answer to this question, but I am inclined to assume that the West is *silently* siding with the Syrian President.

You certainly remember the international pressure on Mubarak and Gaddafi. And in Libya, when diplomacy failed to achieve its objectives, the *poor* rebels were heavily armed (not to mention the air support offered by the US, the UK and France). Instead, nothing happens in Syria, over two years after the beginning of the civil war. Surely, it can be claimed that China and Russia are determined to maintain the *status quo*. It can also be claimed that Syria has no oil to lure investors (and heads of states, who have no interest in launching air raids). This is absolutely correct. Nonetheless, there is at least a remote possibility that several Western governments start to doubt whether the *Arab Spring* is a positive event or a trap laid by radical organizations—as the Chinese and the Russians probably suggest.

Perhaps, something is brewing and many people begin to understand that some pessimistic views (e.g., some views expressed in Jihad Al-Kuffar) were based on sound evidence. This is the case of a short sentence in Chapter 17 (more details about the same section of the book can be found in a thread [c.f. http://jihad-al-kuffar.com/jak_posts2012.php]) that was posted on November 15, 2012). According to the story, this sentence was written in the diary of a radical fighter in October 2001:



Most Western governments (and most Western media) don't mind that free elections are hardly considered in Islamic countries, and that the fight for democracy is often a pretext for imposing a different form of absolute power, as happened in Iran, or for promoting holy war, as would happen in Palestine, if the people of this land were allowed to vote.

COMMENTS

Remark by JSV, F on 07/06/2013 at 02:15:34 PM

Subject: **A new age**

Content: I would rather talk of a new age. Just a few people seem to care about Syria, even though the Americans cautiously refer to the possibility that they might arm some rebel groups. However, the real news is the Western reaction to the turmoil in Egypt. Effectively, the interim president has come into power with a coup d'état, but no one in the West seems to care. Now, in my opinion, what really matters is the attitude of the majority of the Egyptians. Are most of the people convinced that it was a mistake to vote for Mr. Morsi? Are they ready to do what the Iranians should have done soon after the return of Ayatollah Khomeini? Will the next step be a true democracy, without a Mr. Hitler or a Mr. Morsi who turns into a tyrant after winning democratic elections? Or is Egypt going back to the times of Mr. Nasser and Mr. Mubarak?

Remark by Mark, NZ on 06/17/2013 at 05:21:56 PM

Subject: **A new trend?**

Content: Before talking about a new trend, I would rather wait and see if the US is really prepared to help the rebels. Also remember that we simply know of weapons that should be given to a bunch of fighters. There seems to be quite a difference between Libya and what might happen in Syria. So, in the end, the fate of Assad is likely to be better than the fate of Gaddafi, who was eventually killed by his countrymen when his convoy was attacked by French warplanes. In any case, I doubt that the US will arm the rebels, unless it finds an agreement with the Russians.

Remark by JKA, Mn on 06/14/2013 at 02:15:22 PM

Subject: **A new trend**

Content: This post is based on out-of-date theories. US officials have stated that the Syrian government has deployed chemical weapons and Barack Obama seems ready to arm the rebels.

Remark by Mark, NZ on 06/06/2013 at 11:23:04 AM

Subject: **Pessimistic views**

Content: I would not confuse pessimism with reality. Ahmadinejad, Erdogan, Haniyeh, Khamenei, Khomeini, Morsi (in alphabetical order) are real people. Similarly, Ali Zeidan, the Libyan Prime Minister, is a real person and clearly defined the objectives of his government when he sworn in. Namely, "the belief in God, His Prophet and a state based on Islam" was one of his goals. In principle, I have no objection, but I am afraid that "a state based on Islam" might simply become a state based on Mullah Omar's perception of Islam. Instead, it might be miles away from the concept of state which is in accordance with the true will of God and the true ideals of the Prophet.