

Jihad Al-Kuffar

A COLLECTION
OF POSTS
PUBLISHED
IN 2015

List of contents

France (& other countries) under siege
(January 12, 2015)

The Communist experience is back
(January 26, 2015)

The hooligans and the holy warriors
(February 20, 2015)

The progressive anti-Bush campaign is back!
(February 27, 2015)

A tragic farce ***(April 22, 2015)***

Pope Francis,
the anti-immigrant wall and Adam Kabobo
(June 21, 2015)

Stop the war ***(September 13, 2015)***

Paris, 2 Safar 1437 AH ***(November 16, 2015)***

Boycott Israel and keep flying Kuwait Airways
(December 22, 2015)

FRANCE (& OTHER COUNTRIES) UNDER SIEGE

January 12, 2015

The Western world has reacted to the terrorist attack in Paris with almost unanimous words of contempt. As expected, there are people who do not appreciate the satirical wit of *Charlie Hebdo*, others who believe that many Muslims have reason to feel offended by stereotypical representations of the Islamic universe, many more are sure that the spread of terrorist gangs all over the world is the consequence of the aggressive policy of the Western powers—but despite bitter recriminations from critics and inevitable questions of principle, the West has taken a clear stand against the terrorists, with a significant support from Muslim countries.



Here, I do not want to focus on the editorial line of *Charlie Hebdo*, whose satirical attacks have always taken aim at different (religious and political) targets. Instead, I would like to stress that certain stereotypes are the simple consequence of objective, verifiable facts. Therefore, the people, the communities, the countries in which terrorist organizations have found a fertile soil should be the first people, the first communities, the first countries in which the local authorities, the leading figures, the ordinary citizens should be willing to crack down on any signs of terrorist activities.

This is exactly what does not happen in the Gaza Strip or Somalia or Lebanon or Iran—just to name a few countries. In consequence, it is not surprising that many people (in all continents) tend to beware of certain religious groups. Apart from the usual fanatics who are inclined to tar everyone with the same brush (without thinking of the criminals who live in their countries and/or profess their religion and/or belong to their race), there is no denying that horrible crimes have been committed for decades in the name of a well-known religion. It is true that in Paris (as well as in other places), we have just seen heroic, loyal, unselfish, honest Muslims who have fallen victims of a terrorist attack and/or have fought against fanatic criminals. Nonetheless, it is clear that the killers felt inspired by precise religious beliefs. In my opinion, the moral is simple: the *true Muslims* should make a special effort to prevent their brothers from practicing and supporting terrorist activities. Unfortunately, there are still too many safe havens for the *Holy Warriors*.

In view of the dramatic events of the last decades, I cannot agree with those pundits and/or common citizens who condemn the Paris killings, but object that the magazine was offensive toward Islam. No doubt, many satirical comments were really harsh. However, the cartoons and the articles of *Charlie Hebdo* did reflect behaviors and activities, which appear to be popular in well-defined geographical areas and (more importantly) appear to be tolerated in those geographical areas. Last, but not least, the publishers of *Charlie Hebdo* are not responsible for the fact that an incredible number of terror attacks are carried out by militants who shout "Allah Akbar!" while shooting around or blowing themselves up.

That said, what appears to be more disturbing and, in the long term, more dangerous, is the attitude of the Western people who believe (or pretend to believe) that the development of terrorist organizations is mainly due to aggressive policies (especially US policies or, above all, President George W. Bush's policies).

If this assumption were true, Germany, Italy and Japan should not be close allies of the United States owing to the destructions and devastating effects of World War II. The point is that the majority of the German, Italian and Japanese people clearly proved to be ready for a new way of life. Instead, there is nothing new on the horizon when we have a look at the countries in which terrorism continues to be a threat. For instance, as reported in *Jihad Al-Kuffar* (Chapter 6), President Hafiz al-Assad used to give the following controversial message to the youth of his country: "Our main objective should be martyrdom or victory, and martyrdom comes first, for martyrdom is our road to victory" [cf. http://www.impact-se.org/docs/reports/Syria/Syria2001_ch10.pdf]. Thus, his beloved son Bashar al-Assad, today, should not wonder why there are so many militants in his country (and abroad) who are ready to face martyrdom in order to achieve victory (and establish an Islamic Caliphate, which will include Syria if those militants really succeed in fulfilling their dreams).

In the meantime, President Hollande is involved in emergency meetings with the aim of protecting his country and, possibly, understanding what went wrong, since the terrorist attacks were somehow unpredictable, but were carried out by fanatics who were well known to the local police. So, what happened? What's to be done now?

Of course, I am not in a position to discuss the procedures followed by the French secret services and give useful suggestions. I just wish to observe that Iraq has been a damn dangerous country since the

Eighties, as shown by the military adventures against Iran and Kuwait. Then, in 2003, someone took the wise decision to destroy its military power, but the progressive world (including France) did not believe that a preemptive war was politically correct. All possible steps were taken to boycott the American government. Even when Saddam Hussein was defeated, the progressive world (including France) continued to oppose the policy of George W. Bush, forced the Americans to sustain the cost of keeping troops in Iraq and made a significant contribution to the election of Barack Obama, who eventually abandoned Iraq to its fate, opened the doors to the Islamic Caliphate and did not attend the so-called *unity march* in Paris last Sunday, on January 11.

In closing, I feel that

- ▶ the *war on terror* should go on with renewed vigor
- ▶ the progressive world (including France) should understand the importance of *preemptive wars* (precious tools to save a lot of lives)
- ▶ the United States should be part of a coalition force, which is not ashamed to acknowledge that a huge number of radical militants feel inspired by Islam
- ▶ the *true Muslims* (both Sunnis and Shiites) should be in the front line of the *war on terror*, if they do not want to be considered accomplices of criminal organizations
- ▶ there should be no hesitation in condemning (and fighting) the heads of state and religious leaders who praise the most fanatic believers and give them the illusion that they risk their lives for the sake of God (as happened in the case of Saddam Hussein, who encouraged his fellow citizens to become martyrs, but tried to save his own life by all means as long as he could)

The comments I posted today were obviously inspired by the terrorist attack on *Charlie Hebdo*. Thus, I would like to give emphasis to the great difference between the journalists who do their job to defend their values and the journalists who do not mind being slaves to terrorist factions. An example of this second group of journalists is mentioned in *Jihad Al-Kuffar* (Chapter 6), when a radical fighter explains what is the duty of the “wisest reporters”, according to his principles:

The wisest reporters who work in the Middle East always respect (and will continue to respect) the journalistic procedures established by the Palestinian Authority for journalistic work in Palestine and will never fail to be credible friends of its fighters.

This strange sentence was based on a letter that was sent by a “Representative of RAI” (*Radiotelevisione Italiana*, the official Italian television network) and was published after the lynching of two Israeli reservists in Ramallah in 2000. Here follows the text of that letter:

“My dear friends in Palestine. We congratulate you and think that it is our duty to put you in the picture (of the events) of what happened on October 12 in Ramallah. One of the private Italian television stations which competes with us (and not the official Italian television station RAI) filmed the events; that station filmed the events. Afterwards Israeli Television broadcast the pictures, as taken from one of the Italian stations, and thus the public impression was created as if we (RAI) took these pictures. We emphasize to all of you that the events did not happen this way, because we always respect (will continue to respect) the journalistic procedures with the Palestinian Authority for (journalistic) work in Palestine, and we are credible in our precise work. We thank you for your trust, and you can be sure that this is not our way of acting. We do not (will not) do such a thing.”

[cf. <http://www.icjs-online.org/index.php?article=1516>]

THE COMMUNIST EXPERIENCE IS BACK

January 26, 2015

In a post, which is dated November 24, 2011 [cf. ARCHIVE (posts published in 2011)], I made some remarks about the European Union and its common currency. At that time, I spoke in general terms, essentially insisting on an obvious concept: a political/economic system cannot work properly, if it is not supported by common rules. Next, I pointed out that, in my opinion, some leaders had taken part in a difficult adventure without evaluating the risks—or even pretending that there were no risks. Of course, I didn't mean to say that they had only been concerned about their own prestige. Definitely, however, there seemed to be something strange in the air since the very beginning.

In first, the rates German Mark/Euro, French Franc/Euro, Italian Lira/Euro, Greek Dracma/Euro and so on turned out to be key instruments to give special benefits to some countries and create problems to others. Perhaps more importantly, when the new currency was introduced, there was no concern about the corruption, the pension system, the tax rules, the fiscal benefits, the false balance sheets that were a common practice in certain countries and were likely to jeopardize the whole system. The so-called virtuous countries (or, better, the countries that appear to be virtuous today) did not care at all. They were only interested in the products that they would sell across Europe thanks to a single currency.

As always happens when the rules are not clear and it is easily possible to behave as if there were no rules, nowadays everyone claims to be right. The rich countries (which are probably rich because their citizens have been working harder) believe it is not fair that they should pay the debt of other countries. Meanwhile, the citizens who are squeezed by high taxes, low salaries and explosive costs of health care do not want to accept the conditions imposed by their creditors. No doubt, these citizens have good reasons to complain, but they cannot hope that other countries are willing to come to their rescue.

For instance, many European leaders do not agree with Mr. Alexis Tsipras, who seems to be inspired by a well-known saying: "What is mine is mine and what's yours is mine." Alternatively, I might say that Mr. Alexis Tsipras, probably, would not be happy if he had lent one hundred thousand euros and the debtor tried to give him back fifty thousand euros.

Anyway, right now it would be fruitless to discuss what the debtors and the creditors can claim to defend their position. I just want to observe that, in my view, both the debtors and the creditors should curse the day when their political leaders forgot (or, rather, refused) to investigate the consequences of a common currency, which did not come together with a common financial and economic policy.

Above all, the citizens who complain today (for one reason or another) should take the blame themselves or put the blame on their fathers, because the governments that created the Eurozone had taken power as a result of free elections. And while we are there, let me speak quite frankly. I believe that even the countries which ended up in the hands of dictators had (or still have) what they deserved. Sure enough, heads of state like Hitler or Stalin or Pol Pot or Kim Il-sung could do what they wanted because they grew up in lands where they were allowed to do what they wanted.

The same thing (in terms of free elections and new government) is happening in Greece today. The Greeks have made a choice and their decision must be respected. Unfortunately for them, however, they should also acknowledge that their debt went out of control and should understand that no one is eager to pay that debt on their behalf. Of course, they also know very well that no one will ever wage a war to get his money back. Therefore, debt default is a solution. But it is not guaranteed that Greece will be able to recover with its own resources. In addition, after a default, the Greeks cannot expect that a huge number of investors will come to their aid. Last, but not least, the path (freely) chosen by the Greeks is full of unknowns. Actually, it would be quite surprising if Mr. Alexis Tsipras succeeded in



transforming Greece into a rich, prosperous country. After all, he seems to be driven by the same philosophical background that sealed the fate of countries like Cuba or Venezuela or Cambodia or North Korea. So, it is hard to believe that the final outcome will be much different from what was achieved by Fidel Castro, Hugo Chavez, Pol Pot and Kim Il-sung (just to name a few distinguished leaders who were able to completely destroy the already weak economies of their countries). In any case, while waiting for the next developments, I wonder what the Greeks would do if Greece, Congo, Zimbabwe and Burundi were the only countries on Earth. Would they give their money to sustain the economies of their African friends, who are much poorer? I am afraid that the answer is *no*.

In closing, I would like to remember that several pages of *Jihad Al-Kuffar* are concerned with the communist legacy and, in general, with the most fascinating dreams of radical left-wing parties. For instance, in Chapter 9, we find some remarks about a famous project that played an important role in the history of the communist movements. The words come from a *jihadist* who will never forget the days when the Chechens were deported by Stalin to Central Asia and will never love the communist doctrine (no matter if we are talking about Russia or Cuba or other countries):

Revisionism is often implacable. It's so cruel that it doesn't spare anything, not even Mao Zedong's Great Leap Forward—an epic failure that was hailed as an unrivaled success and triggered an incredible explosion of popular madness at the end of the sixties, when revolutionary youths all across the Western world were imbued with a burning passion for Maoism. But I'm afraid that even communist hard-liners will soon concede that collective farming in China claimed twenty to thirty million victims of socially engineered famine between 1959 and 1962.

THE HOOLIGANS AND THE HOLY WARRIORS

February 20, 2015

Most of the readers are certainly aware of the destructions that have just occurred in Rome: Feyenoord fans (or, better, Feyenoord hooligans) showed up on the famed Spanish Steps (armed with bats, chains, Molotov cocktails), clashed with the police and trashed one of the most beautiful squares in the world.



It is worth noting that a monument was badly damaged, many shops were forced to close and some fans (*i.e.*, hooligans) were arrested, but a large number of the Feyenoord supporters were gently accompanied to the stadium and (after the match) to the airport or the railway station. As collateral effect, some fifteen buses were damaged during the operation.

In the aftermath of the havoc, there were inevitable comments, remarks, talk shows filled with the very best of the political, sociological, psychiatric, philosophical knowledge. However, the top performance came from the top local authority who had been in charge of the security measures and the police forces before, during and after the football match.

He was simply proud of the way he had handled the emergency. After all, who cares for some damn shops, or a silly monument, or a square of the Italian capital that had been turned into a dumping ground? The real issue is that no one was killed. That was his goal and he would have never run the risk of killing a poor hooligan to protect a restaurant, or safeguard a monument, or keep the city tidy.

Surely, he had succeeded in achieving his aim. Perhaps more importantly, he had saved the anti-riot police from the attacks of the public and the press, if someone had died. Actually, it would not be surprising to learn that the whole operation was inspired by what happened in Genoa, Italy, fourteen years ago, when three youngsters (during rallies that devastated the city) attacked a police jeep with a wooden bar, an iron stick and a fire extinguisher. In the end, an officer shot his gun, and the protester with the extinguisher got killed. No need to say what happened next. The protester was hailed as a hero and a martyr, while the officer... well, let's forget about it.

Of course, I can only suppose that this top bureaucrat thought back to the Genoa events when he had to deal with the Feyenoord fans. Instead, what I know for sure is that he definitely behaved in accordance with the will and the sentiments of the vast majority of the population (and I am not just thinking of the Italians: I refer to the average European and, possibly, Western people).

The unwritten law is that poor criminals must be understood and protected, in order to defend their inalienable human rights (no matter if the consequence is a continuous offence against the rights of the honest citizens). *Mutual understanding. Social rights. Charity. Solidarity. Peace. No war.* These are the keywords and the inspiring values of the millions of people who insist that the criminals must have a second (and third and fourth and so on) chance in their lives. And unfortunately these millions of people also share the idea that the threat posed by Al-Qaeda or ISIS can be solved by diplomatic means—and firmly believe that the boats coming from Libya to Europe are not packed with terrorists (or, at the very least, with people who might be easily turned into terrorists).

Above all, *no bombs*. There is no reason to attack the terrorists. The Western world is a civilized world and cannot resort to weapons (before it is too late). As well as the Feyenoord hooligans, the terrorists shall be free to do what they want. We must not interfere with their plans. The anti-riot police cannot charge a bunch of criminals and our aircraft cannot strike the terrorists.

In *Jihad Al-Kuffar* there are several pages that deal with the naive attitude of the West and its unbelievable fight in favor of incredible human rights (including the human rights of the terrorists who behead innocent civilians and burn their enemies alive). An example is given in Chapter 13. A radical militant is in Genoa in July 2001, on the eve of the riots that destroyed the city center and a couple of months before the attack on the Twin Towers in New York. He makes some comments about the peace activists who are going to hit the streets without considering the dire consequences of what they are doing in the name of an ideological belief:

Think of those Western kids who march with colored balloons, demanding their leaders to immediately convert military industries to civil and social uses. They get brainwashed since their childhood and are instructed to

welcome tomorrow's mujahideen with joy. Allah willing, one day, while chanting peace slogans and waving banners, they'll surrender to our militants, they'll share the same fate as Lebanon—a land that was Christian in a recent past, but now is administered by Islamic rulers and has dramatically increased the number of Muslim brothers. When it is time for the intifada children to attack the West, our fighters will find themselves face-to-face with peace activists and conscientious objectors who will be tickled pink to know that they've always been on the side of the weak, on the side of antiwar organizations.

Interestingly enough, the militant talks about “intifada children” and the book was published in 2010. If these words seem to be out of place, it might be wise to remember that Hamas has already taken a stand against international military actions aimed at striking ISIS targets in Libya.

THE PROGRESSIVE ANTI-BUSH CAMPAIGN IS BACK!

February 27, 2015

It is well known that the White House is not very happy with the imminent speech that Mr. Netanyahu will give in Washington D.C., after accepting the unilateral invitation from House Speaker John Boehner. Both Netanyahu and Boehner have been harshly criticized since the very beginning, as soon as the Israeli Prime Minister's visit was announced.



The very best, however, came out a few days ago, when Secretary of State John Kerry gave proof of his progressive anti-Bush sentiments with words full of scorn and spite, as reported by the media: “[Mr. Netanyahu] was profoundly forward-leaning and outspoken about the importance of invading Iraq under George W. Bush. And we all know what happened with that decision.”

[cf., e.g., <http://www.cnn.com/2015/02/25/politics/susan-rice-netanyahu-visit-destructive/index.html>]

I assume that Mr. Kerry had lost memory of the military attack on Muhammad Gaddafi and the help that was given by the Obama Administration to the insurgents in Benghazi, which was a stronghold of terrorist organizations and/or Islamist groups. Similarly, Mr. Kerry had surely forgotten (or, perhaps, had never been aware) that Osama bin-Laden had been given military supplies by the Clinton Administration. Needless to say, there is no reason to believe that Mr. Kerry has ever realized that Ruhollah Khomeini succeeded in turning Iran into a major terrorist hub thanks to the forward-looking policy of former US President Jimmy Carter.

But, mind you, there's an enormous difference between Obama, Clinton, Carter (on one side) and George W. Bush (on the other side). There's an enormous difference between Obama's Libya, Clinton's Afghanistan, Carter's Iran (on one side) and Bush's Iraq (on the other side).

Indeed, Obama, Clinton and Carter candidly decided to trust politicians and warlords who (perhaps, hopefully, with some luck) might be suitable to promote democratic reforms. Therefore, these politicians and warlords were allowed to do what they wanted without any control and supervision (in the case of President Obama with the aggravating circumstance that the Islamist nature of the Benghazi insurgents was patently clear). Instead, when Bush attacked Iraq, he sent ground troops and was well prepared to keep control of the country. Of course, I am not saying that he did not make mistakes, but (in my opinion) the only real and serious mistake was to believe that a vast majority of the international community would fight together with the Americans, at least after the fall of Saddam Hussein. As Secretary of State John Kerry has pointed out, things went a different way and the progressive politicians (including the American progressive politicians) got a great victory.

Even countries like France, Russia, Egypt, Jordan and Turkey did not support the US efforts, although they were definitely interested in destroying the terrorist networks and capabilities, which had been given a boost under Saddam Hussein. And (why not?) China, too, should have thought that it might be a good idea to put an end to the danger posed by Iraq and its most fanatic fighters.

Once more, the progressive world succeeded in giving free hand to terrorist groups of any kind, since the United States (which is part of a global system) was unable to sustain the cost of the military operations in Iraq and was forced to abandon that country to its fate. So, in the name of freedom, peace and free determination, Iraq fell in the hands of terrorists and thousands of people were killed, raped, brutalized (much more than the poor innocent civilians who might have lost their lives during the crackdown on the most fanatic factions).

As I said, scores of people were (and continue to be) murdered, abused and tortured. Quite often, these people are targeted because of their religious beliefs—and in actual fact we continue to hear of Christians who fall victims to radical *jihadists*. This is absolutely true, although it should be acknowledged that, so far, Muslim communities have paid the highest price (as shown, e.g., by the fate of a Jordan pilot who was burnt alive). Above all, it should be acknowledged that one of the most prominent religious authorities in the world (the Pope) continued to attack Bush, the US administration and its policy, when the *Iraqi Freedom* operation was in progress, without understanding the damage that the anti-American propaganda of the Holy See would cause to the local population, including (or, starting with) the Christian communities.

Obviously, I do not mean to say that the Pontiff should have encouraged the invasion of Iraq, but I am convinced that it would have been nice of him to avoid harsh words. At the very least, the Pope could have spent some time to think that the *Iraqi Freedom* operation was a unique opportunity to introduce democracy into a Muslim country. Therefore, instead of fueling anti-American sentiment and protests, he could have tried to emphasize the need of international cooperation when it was time to build and safeguard a new, democratic Iraq. After all, in spite of his strong anti-war feelings, he had even called for a military intervention of international forces in Croatia and East Timor while the fighting was going on (*not* during the reconstruction of war-damaged areas).

In *Jihad Al-Kuffar* (Chapter 11) there are several remarks about the attitude of the Vatican when the (mostly Catholic) inhabitants of Croatia and East Timor were involved in a dramatic fight for independence. For instance, there is a point when an Islamist fighter expresses his views about the support that was given to the people of East Timor against Muslim militias:

I'm still shocked by the enemies who used to declare that the international community couldn't limit itself to imposing economic sanctions on Indonesia. I will never forget the appeal to political and military leaders and to the international community. Everyone was asked to listen to the cry of the weak and defenseless, and to come immediately to their aid. I couldn't believe my ears. An appeal to military leaders! Military leaders! At that time, nobody in the West used to teach that critical issues were to be dealt with through dialogue and discussion. Nobody shouted 'Peace! Peace! Peace!' to oppose the deployment of Western troops. Nobody was interested in a soft approach to the crisis, without irrevocable conditions. Nobody made an effort to explore a new way to solve international disputes by refraining from absurd demands for independence. Yet, there was a solution and could easily be adopted. Peace was at hand. The unbelievers of East Timor had to take their own responsibilities, welcome Muslim rulers, and behave like the inhabitants of Kuwait before the violent raids of the Americans. Nothing more was needed—just a sign of good will. In order to avoid conflicts and massacres, the infidels only had to abandon rallies and hostile acts against Islamic militias. They simply had to follow the beautiful example of the Kuwaiti people from August 1990 to January 1991. If the unbelievers had behaved properly, it would have been easy to come to an agreement without resorting to military actions, which are typical of the Great Satan, are completely useless, don't solve international problems, and always represent a defeat for humanity. Day after day, meeting after meeting, any mutual misunderstanding could have been peacefully removed by promoting a constructive dialogue, until the unconditional surrender to the Indonesian authorities.

A TRAGIC FARCE

April 22, 2015

Apparently, the Western communities are well aware that several terror organizations are spreading all over the world—especially across Africa, the Middle East and Central Asia. Just a few people, however, seem to be seriously worried. A vast majority does not even think that it might be wise to launch a coordinated action against the criminals who have seized large swaths of territory, massacred thousands of civilians and destroyed archeological sites.

The consequence is obvious. These criminals feel free to pursue their agenda and are encouraged to have confidence in the future of their business. It cannot be any different, because the West has raised the white flag of surrender and, more importantly, the holy warriors have nothing to lose. They do not fear death and believe that their reward will be great, if they continue to fight in the name of a God who, according to His most fanatic believers, does not like the infidels.

Of course, we might object that the logic of the most excited holy warriors is not flawless. Indeed, we might wonder why God has filled the Earth with scores of infidels and next, as claimed by His most fanatic supporters, He has ordered *jihad* to get rid of those hordes of infidels. Last but not least, we might observe that God is known to be Merciful and Compassionate, as often pointed out by those fanatics.

I assume that comments of this kind sound reasonable, but a true holy warrior is likely to reply that the ways of God are inscrutable. Above all, he is likely to reject any peace offer or diplomatic initiative.

Anyway, I'm not happy to see that the most impressive coordinated action against terrorist organizations (with wide participation of world leaders and, in first, Western leaders) was the Paris March, after the Charlie Hebdo massacre—or the Tunis March, after the attack on the Bardo Museum. Do the world leaders and the citizens they represent really believe that al Qaeda, ISIS and other gangs of criminals can be defeated with rallies, slogans and talk shows? Do they really believe that the terrorists are terrorized by what they watch on TV screens and by the droves of people taking to the streets with chants against the Islamic State?



I don't want to be cynical, but I am puzzled when huge masses rally against terrorist organizations and, maybe, show off the banner "Together Against Terrorism" (as happened during the Tunis March). Do these people really believe that criminals like the gunmen who attacked the Bardo Museum will be scared to death?

Probably, there is a common belief that it is better to be cautious. And this belief is particularly popular in the Western world, where most citizens have reason to hope that terrorist groups will never be able to pose a serious threat to their countries. After all, who cares about Boko Haram? Nigeria is a faraway land. Who cares about the gunmen who have taken control of Derna and Benghazi? Libya is not a neighboring country. Who cares about the Palestinians in the Yarmouk camp? They are just being killed by their Arab brothers and, unfortunately, there are no Israeli troops around—so, there's no chance to make a political case against an Ariel Sharon, as happened at the time of Sabra and Shatila, where thousands of people were actually massacred by Christian Phalangists, but the Israelis were blamed for the slaughter. Who cares about the fate of Mosul or Kobane? Iraq and Syria are not behind the door. Who cares about the civil war in Yemen? This is just an insignificant country, somewhere in the Arabian Peninsula, which happens to be a safe haven for gangs of Sunni terrorists and Shiite militias. So, let us turn our face away from the battlefield! Let these fighters kill each other (as well as opposite factions are killing each other in Libya and Syria)! Let us simply hope that Yemen will not become a province of the Islamic Emirate or a Hezbollah enclave in the Gulf of Aden...

The Western world is so naive that terrorist organizations eventually proliferate and strengthen their position, even when the so-called international community is in favor of a military intervention. Why? The answer is simple: with rare exceptions, the basic idea is to deploy troops to war zones without using weapons, which might harm innocent civilians, are not politically correct and interfere with the inviolable rights of local warlords. This was the case of Somalia (where the Americans and the Italians completely failed to fix the problem). Later, something similar happened in Iraq, where the Americans

and the Britons (victims of an international demagogic campaign) were eventually forced to give a free hand to terrorists, who are probably worse than bin Laden and his fellow fighters.

Alternatively, it may happen that some virtuous countries decide to launch air raids in order to support some militias, in the hope that these militias will be eternally grateful to their foreign allies, if they succeed in grabbing the power—and here is the problem! There is no real strategy—just hope! The whole operation is carried out *in the hope* that everything will be alright, without investigating the nature of the fighters, who will take advantage of the air raids. This is exactly what happened in Libya (thanks to the American and French bombardments), this is what will possibly happen in Iraq (where Hezbollah-like terrorists are good candidates to take the place of the ISIS terrorists) and this is what might happen in Yemen (if the Saudi-led air campaign does not come together with the deployment of ground troops).

As usual, Western moral standards appear to be the most effective weapon against the West itself. In fact, not only is it impossible to fight (and defeat) terrorist organizations in their lands (because preemptive wars are not politically correct), but there is also a strong desire to fill the West with terrorists or, at the very least, with desperate people who are likely to increase poverty and fuel social tensions.

Right now, in the name of international solidarity, enormous amounts of money are spent to transform warships into cruise liners. This policy appears to be crazy, if we observe that the country, which is mostly involved in this humanitarian project (Italy), is a country with a huge debt and a huge jobless population. In addition, don't forget that Italy is a member state of the European Union. Under the circumstances, it seems wise to focus on the problems of Greece (and Portugal and Spain and Ireland and Italy itself) before trying to solve the problems that afflict Africa and the Middle East.

No way! The passion for politically correct strategies is too strong. The progressive majority of the Western world does not care for what is going on in South Africa, where angry protesters are targeting foreign workers, who are accused of stealing jobs. Most of the people are not afraid that similar problems, sooner or later, might affect Europe. Just think of what happened last year in the Italian island of Lampedusa, a fabulous pearl of the Mediterranean Sea that used to be packed with tourists and now is packed with migrants. The vital tourist industry of this tiny island is suffering, but no one dared to go against the grain, when Pope Francis visited Lampedusa in July 2013 and encouraged the local people to welcome more and more migrants.

The progressive majority of the Western people is reluctant to impose a sea blockade on Libya: as proud members of a civilized society, the Western nations must help the poor migrants to cross the sea and save their lives. Just a few protesters insist that the (civilized) European Union would have saved a lot of lives, if its warships had stopped the flow of migrants since the very beginning.

Definitely, the navies of the European Union must have the capability of damaging the propellers of the coffin ships used by traffickers—and must have the capability to tow these vessels toward the Libyan coast. Surely, many people would have died in the process (possibly killed by their Libyan brothers) if the European Union had adopted this policy, but much more desperate men, women and children would have saved their lives, instead of drowning in the sea. To put it straight, I doubt that a sea blockade would have killed more people than the migrants who died a few days ago in a single accident, when a boat sank sixty miles from the Libyan coast and (to the best of our knowledge) some eight hundred lives were lost.

Of course, this tragedy has shaken the conscience of the European leaders, who seem to be ready to take a concerted action. Meanwhile, they also point out that the solution must be political. Even better, they claim that the solution must be found in Africa—namely, in Libya. What does it mean? The most obvious answer is that no solution will be found. Probably, a few more ships will be deployed, a few more migrants will possibly be rescued, a few boats will probably be destroyed and each country will do its best to prevent those migrants from entering their borders. Surely, there is no chance to go to Tripoli or Tobruk and put a few simple questions to a local leader: “Excuse me, Sir, would you mind taking care of the people who are preparing to cross the sea? Could you kindly invite them to stay in your country? Or should we invade Libya and set up our reception centers right here?”

I might be too pessimistic, but I cannot see any immediate solution to the turmoil in Africa (especially in Libya). I rather expect that the massacre will continue, if the West cannot send combat troops to Misrata or Benghazi or Tripoli. Meanwhile, the never-ending flow of desperate people (and potential terrorists) will fuel social tensions as well as religious conflicts, as shown by the recent killings of Christian migrants, who were thrown overboard during a crossing from Libya to Italy.

Well, at this point it's high time to put an end to my politically incorrect remarks—but, before closing, let me remind you of a short comment in the Preface of Preface of *Jihad Al-Kuffar*:

This book [also attempts] to dwell on some aspects of demagogic and “do-good” culture that are quite fashionable, especially in the West. I will just mention the case of Iraq. I agree that any protester or any political pundit was free to deplore military action, starting with the Gulf War in 1991, if that protester or that political pundit believed that peace was to be maintained at all costs. Similarly, anyone can praise the insurgents who tried to avenge the fall of Saddam Hussein and opposed free elections in 2005, when the majority of Iraqis decided to cast their ballots despite terror attacks and violent intimidation. However, I do not think that people who hold these beliefs have the moral right to celebrate events like the war against Nazi-fascism or the partisan struggle against Mussolini and his supporters from 1943 to 1945. Otherwise, they do not simply express their opinions. They go far beyond: they cross the border of hypocrisy.

POPE FRANCIS, THE ANTI-IMMIGRANT WALL AND ADAM KABOBO

June 21, 2015

It may well be that you have never heard of a man called Adam Kabobo. This guy is a gentleman from Ghana who arrived in Italy in 2011 (illegally), submitted an asylum application (which was rejected), was not deported (even though the Italian Government has just spent millions of euros in order to transform its Navy into a cruise line), was arrested several times on different charges (including theft and vandalism) and eventually, armed with a pickaxe, went on a rampage killing three people and injuring two more, in a random attack that occurred two years ago.



Surely, all of you know Pope Francis and, possibly, his recent appeal to the faithful (at the end of a general audience), when he tackled the problem of the immigrant crisis: “I invite you all to ask forgiveness for the persons and the institutions who close the door to those people who are seeking a family, who are seeking to be protected”.

Interestingly enough, the Pope’s remarks came together with the Hungarian Government’s plan to seal the border with Serbia by means of a four-meter-high fence. Of course, there was an immediate reaction from Belgrade. However, to my great surprise, there was also a strong reaction from a *spokeswoman for the European Union*, Mrs. Natasha Bertaud. “We have only just torn down walls in Europe,” she said. “We should not be putting them up.”

Definitely, I was quite surprised at that *official* statement and I will explain why. Given the fact that any remark made by a *spokeswoman for the European Union* (I assume) must be *official* and must be *on behalf of the whole European Union*, I really felt puzzled. Indeed, the most recent developments of the immigrant crisis, in my opinion, do not allow any comment against the Hungarian Government *on behalf of the whole European Union*. While all citizens and politicians are free to express their own views on this controversial issue, it is unbelievable that *the whole European Union* arrogates the right to condemn what several EU countries have been doing for years and are currently doing without any constraints, because the so-called *European Union* has no power to impose a common policy.

A clear example can be found along the French-Italian border: while all the European leaders insist that each country should share the burden of the migrant crisis, it is quite obvious that several European governments prefer to keep the immigrants abroad. So, why should the European Union complain with Hungary? Just because the Hungarian-Serbian border is more difficult to seal than the French-Italian border, which is also *protected* by impressive mountains (e.g., Mont Blanc, much higher than the proposed anti-immigrant wall along the Hungarian-Serbian border)?

In any case, it should be noted that there’s an enormous difference between the Berlin Wall (implicitly mentioned by Mrs. Natasha Bertaud) and the Hungarian Wall: the Berlin Wall was meant to prevent people from fleeing the Communist Paradise, WHILE the Hungarian Wall would prevent people from illegally entering Hungary. Last but not least, do not forget the many (poor) migrants who cross the European borders and take selfies with their smartphones, while many Hungarians (probably) do not even have an old mobile phone.

That said, let’s come back to Pope Francis and Adam Kabobo. Frankly speaking, I think it would be better to *ask forgiveness* for all the lawmakers, prosecutors, attorneys, lawyers, judges and common citizens who have been fighting to forge a justice system that continually defends criminals and systematically denies basic rights to honest people—and, for example, made it possible for Adam Kabobo to be in Europe and out of jail two years ago.

Alternatively, if you are not inclined to forgive, you might be interested in some words taken from the Bible (just to stick to religious matters): “May their eyes grow dim so that they cannot see, and make their loins shake continually. Pour out Your indignation on them, and may Your burning anger overtake them. May their camp be desolate; May none dwell in their tents.” [Psalm 69:23-25]

Finally, I would like to quote a short passage from Jihad Al-Kuffar. A radical militant is talking about Europe and its migration policy (Chapter 5). He points out that do-good sentiments do play an important role, but he also suggests that many European citizens and politicians might be afraid of terrorist attacks—in their homelands, as well as in foreign countries, if they have interests to defend: for instance, in North Africa and the Middle East.

Here is what he says (and don't forget that today, five years after the publication of *Jihad Al-Kuffar* or, if you prefer, despite five more years of do-good sentiments, the Islamic State is behind the door):

The whole continent is pervaded by third-worldist instincts, by the spirit of welfarism, and even more, by the perennial desire to avoid retaliation. Fear is much stronger than love for freedom, Insha Allah, and many westerners are willing to wave the white flag.

STOP THE WAR

September 13, 2015



With few exceptions, the entire world seems to be driven by a strong desire to welcome huge crowds of migrants. Most countries are caught in an overwhelming wave of do-good feelings and many people vie with each other to help, rescue, support thousands of refugees (or alleged refugees). In this flurry of international solidarity and humanitarian concern, the most active Western philanthropists tend to forget the current financial crisis and the poor conditions of their fellow citizens, who can hardly get a meal at the end of the day, even when they live in the so-called rich countries.

A good example comes from Austria, which is definitely a rich country, but is probably filled with a good number of people who might deserve some help. Yeah, they might deserve it, but—who cares? Recently, humanitarian agencies and brave volunteers, eager to challenge the *brutality* of the Hungarian authorities, did not hesitate to organize car convoys to take myriads of migrants to Austria. Meanwhile, as far as we know, no one made any special effort to ease the suffering of the poorest Austrian citizens who live in Vienna or Graz or Salzburg.

Of course, there was no fear of social tensions or terrorist activities or increased street crime or severe cuts on the welfare front. All the philanthropists seemed to be happy. Instead, just a handful of politically incorrect *demagogues* keep complaining about a massive systematic invasion promoted by politicians, opportunists and mafia members, who need slave labor or get rich by lodging migrants or want to create socially useless jobs with taxpayers' money.

Interestingly enough, no publicity is given to the fact that Syria and the Syrians have been unable to build a reasonable society. Nothing is said about the arguments of the people who are not fully convinced that the Western world should pay for the mistakes of the migrants and the migrants' fathers. After all, many nations were battered by civil wars (from Russia to Spain) and/or oppressed by unscrupulous dictators (from Germany to Chile). Yet, their lives eventually went back to normal, without the need of biblical migrations. Perhaps more importantly, it should be clear that every nation has the dictators and the terrorists it deserves. Surely, people like Hitler, Stalin, Pol Pot or Kim Il-sung and his descendants did not succeed in taking power in their countries by pure chance. Similarly, if Syria, Libya and Pakistan are filled with terrorist organizations, I cannot believe that lots of murderers were not welcomed and encouraged to proliferate in these countries. For instance, in the specific case of Syria, the Assads (who have been in power thanks to their fellow Syrians) have always sympathized with Hezbollah. Therefore, Bashar al-Assad and his friends should not be surprised if Syria is devastated by terrorists who have ended up on the other side of the barricade.

That's what I feel, but for some reason, there is no interest in exploring why certain nations are so desperate. Every day, we continue to witness an almost unanimous feeling of anger against the West (especially against Europe), while opinion-makers and political pundits keep silent about the inalienable right of each nation to pursue independent development and about the possible consequences of self-determination.

So, let me try to be a responsible, politically correct person as well. Let me keep silent about this critical issue—the *possible consequences of self-determination*. Instead, I will say a few words about the *wise* remarks of a young Syrian boy, who was interviewed at a train station in Hungary some days ago. As pointed out by several news networks, he *nailed the truth* and *sent his message in a powerful video* and *summed up the refugee crisis in one sentence* and *perfectly explained everything*. Most of you certainly heard about his words: "Syrians need help, now. You just stop the war and we don't want to go to Europe. Just stop the war in Syria. Just that."

The idea was absolutely wonderful and was greeted in an enthusiastic way by the most progressive layers of the Western society (*i.e.*, by the vast majority of the Western world). However, there is nothing to suggest that the most zealous utopians and most enlightened gurus know how to stop a war. The most zealous utopians and most enlightened gurus do not dare to admit that there is no chance to stop a war as long as we live in a system dominated by peace activists. The most zealous utopians and most enlightened gurus refuse to point out that a war takes place in a war zone, where you cannot send peace activists or boy scouts to solve the problem. The most zealous utopians and most enlightened gurus are not willing to understand that a war can only be stopped by waging a war on warmongers, as was the case of Hitler's Germany. The most zealous utopians and most enlightened gurus easily forget that any (Western) government, which might be prepared to send combat troops and keep a tight rein on the most excited warlords, immediately becomes the target of worldwide protests because of the innocent civilians who occasionally get killed by Western aircraft (as happened when the US tried to

change things in Somalia or Afghanistan or Iraq). Above all, while they complain about the few (possible) innocent victims of airstrikes, the most zealous utopians and most enlightened gurus pretend to ignore that, in the meantime, much more innocent people are (systematically, certainly) massacred by radical militants.

To put it straight, the direct result of the Western policy appears to be a strong support for the worst terrorist organizations. After all, it is not surprising, since the West has fallen prey to progressive forces and has a strong will to keep the hands off Cain. The evidence is before our eyes: the only wars that are regularly stopped and can never be fought are the wars on terror!

Just yesterday, we had a new proof, when Mr. Jeremy Corbyn became leader of the Labour Party in Great Britain, with an impressive majority of votes. Clearly, a significant percentage of Britons are not happy enough with *jihadi John* and British girls who join ISIS and British Islamists who blow up London buses and metro trains. They want more migrants in the UK and increase the chances of coming across some fanatics when they catch a bus or a train. Not to talk about the wail of despair for the *tragic* fate of *poor* Osama bin Laden, who was killed (sorry, *assassinated*) instead of being gently taken to a court of (progressive) justice.

That said, here is the real problem: it is not very practical to ask a Western country to stop a war. It is much wiser to ask Russia to do the job, since its weapons have already proved to be successful in Chechnya and Eastern Ukraine. In addition, as pointed out in an old post (*Is the West flying Assad's flag? - ARCHIVE: Posts2013*), it is very likely that the West is fed up with military operations and political initiatives that are aimed at helping rebels and getting rid of dictators: no doubt, the Western world has learned that the rebels can be much worse than the dictators, as happened in Iran, Libya and Egypt. And when the war we are talking about is a civil war in Syria, there is an extra reason to turn to Russia rather than Western Europe or the United States. Indeed, after provoking Russia through their policy in Kosovo, Libya and Ukraine, the Western leaders must have come to the conclusion that Assad, a traditional friend of Russia, should be treated with kid gloves. Incidentally, don't forget that the US did not want Russian rockets in Cuba... so, why should the Kremlin welcome American rockets in Eastern Ukraine?

In a few words, if the Syrians really want to see the end of their civil war, they should probably turn to Moscow. Next, if diplomacy and petitions do not work, they can try to migrate to Russia, using the slogan "You just stop the war and we don't want to go to Russia." If they do so, good luck!

No doubt, the Syrian affair is an intriguing drama, characterized by conflicting international interests. Yet, even when the Western countries believe that they can carry out lawful and legitimate military actions for humanitarian reasons or for the sake of self-defense, their operations are often jeopardized by naive rules of engagement, combined with ridiculous strategies, which generally do not contemplate the use of ground forces.

Although it was published five years ago, well before the world was faced with the need to stop a Syrian war, *Jihad Al-Kuffar* also deals with warlords, gangs of militants and mass killings perpetrated by fanatic murderers. No matter how the mainstream elites might react, you don't find feelings of mercy or compassion in *Jihad Al-Kuffar*. It is rather suggested that warlords and fanatic fighters should be attacked and annihilated in order to stop useless wars and save human lives. Next, there are some remarks about the moral standards of the Western world. As pointed out above, the basic idea is that the most popular ethical principles eventually lead to an amazing result: *the only wars that are regularly stopped and can never be fought are the wars on terror*.

In the end, *Jihad Al-Kuffar* often puts emphasis on the various *Stop the War* movements, which are always ready to undermine the security of the West and support terrorist organizations. We find a good example in Chapter 18, when a radical militant, who is fighting against the Americans in Mazar-i-Sharif, Afghanistan, in November 2001, makes some comments about the peace activists who are waging war on the Western world:

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 the 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. And do-good politicians are also convinced that criminals are those who go on the offensive against the mujahideen. There is no hesitation

among the peace activists who keep burning US flags and depict the Great Satan as a foul entity. Progressive movements have no doubts. America is the real terrorist.

PARIS, 2 SAFAR 1437 AH

November 16, 2015

According to the *Umm al-Qura* Calendar of Saudi Arabia, the second day of the second month (Safar) of the year 1437 AH (After Hegira) in the Islamic Calendar started last Friday, November 13, 2015, at sunset. A few hours later, some fervent believers (or self-proclaimed fervent believers), launched their attack in Paris, proudly shouting “Allah Akbar”.

Probably, the words I have just written suggest that I intend to identify Islam with violence, barbarity and terrorism—but this is far from the truth. Actually, it is light-years from the truth for an obvious reason (or, at the very least, for what I believe to be an obvious reason). Just think of the most dreadful terrorist attacks of the last ten-twenty years. In New York, as well as in London and Mumbai and Madrid and Nairobi a bunch of militants were enough to kill scores of people and spread panic across the Western world. Recently, a few thousand criminals were enough to create an *Islamic State* (or self-proclaimed *Islamic State*) and seize large swaths of territory in Iraq, Syria and even Libya. Given the fact that there are about one thousand five hundred million Muslims all over the world, it is quite clear (to me) that Islam cannot be considered the mother of all evil. Otherwise, the Western world (as we know it today) wouldn't exist. It simply couldn't exist!



Of course, you might quote convenient Koran verses (and, maybe, define them *verses of violence*), drawing a completely different conclusion. A typical example can be the fifth verse of *Surah Al-Tawbah*: “...when the forbidden months are past, then fight and slay the Pagans wherever ye find them, and seize them, beleaguer them, and lie in wait for them in every stratagem (of war).” This is actually written in the Koran, but it should be noted that most religions feature *sacred texts*, which are filled with *verses of violence*. Frankly speaking, in my opinion, the most subtle verse, which can be used to justify any crime, is found in the Gospels of Luke and Matthew: “Whoever is not with me is against me, and whoever does not gather with me scatters” [Luke 11:23, Matthew 12:30].

If you are convinced that you are acting in the name of God (or you succeed in convincing someone that he is acting in the name of God), this verse is perfect to condone (or even approve) any abuse. For instance, it could have been an excellent excuse when Pope Urban II, shouting “God wills it”, called for the First Crusade (which ended up with a massacre in Jerusalem) or when Pope Innocent III made any effort to launch the Fourth Crusade (which ended up with a slaughter in Constantinople). Indeed, many Christians committed horrible crimes in the Middle Ages, as well as (nowadays) the Buddhists in Myanmar tend to persecute the Muslim minorities and the Hindu fanatics enjoy to raze mosques. And I am sure that every criminal could find a suitable *sacred text* to justify his violence. So, I firmly believe that Islam *per se* is not the real problem. The problem is rather created by groups of *islamists* and by a *significant number of Muslim believers and Muslim nations*.

That said, it is quite clear that *Muslim believers* and *Muslim nations* have been quite a problem for several decades. Indeed, modern terrorism was born with people like Yasser Arafat, who was supported by most Muslim states (which still refuse to hold diplomatic ties with Israel and often aim to erase Israel off the map). More importantly, lots of *Muslim believers* and *Muslim nations* seem to be happy to host military and paramilitary organizations, which have always been free to operate in vast regions of their countries, as happens/happened in Nigeria, Egypt, Somalia, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Lebanon, Yemen, Iraq, Libya, Syria, Palestine. In my view, the most intriguing examples are represented by Hezbollah (always supported by Iran, Syria and, undoubtedly, many Lebanese Muslims), by Hamas (always tolerated or even supported by the so-called *Palestinian Authority* and various *Muslim governments*), by the Shia terrorists of Sadr City (the infamous district of Baghdad) and by the so-called *Islamic Emirate of Waziristan*, which appears to be (*de facto*) recognized by the Pakistani government.

The case of Pakistan is emblematic and gives evidence of the danger posed by a *significant number of Muslim believers* in today's world. Apart from Waziristan, the Pakistani State also hosts the *Army of God* (*Lashkar-e-Taiba*), one of the most active terrorist organizations in Asia—and nobody seems to be worried. In addition, Pakistan is still detaining Shakil Afridi, the physician who worked with the

Americans to prove that bin Laden was hiding in an Abbottabad compound. Instead of taking part in the war on terror, instead of being ashamed for not being able to find out that bin Laden's hideout was less than a mile from a *Military Academy* and instead of rewarding a fellow citizen who had put his life at risk to fight against a terrorist organization, the Pakistani government continues to keep Shakil Afridi in jail, because the issue is *politically sensitive* and too many (Muslim) people in the country are still mourning the fate of poor Osama bin Laden. Unfortunately, this attitude is not surprising: after all, Pakistan is full of (Muslim) people who have always shown to be fond of bin Laden and various terrorist groups. Posters, flags, rallies and talks given by influential religious leaders often reflect widespread feelings.

The above comments, however, should not be interpreted as a sign of resentment against a specific country. It was just an example, not worse than the example given by Hezbollah or the Iranian ayatollahs (with their words of hatred) and by Saddam Hussein (with his rewards in favor of suicide bombers) and by Hafez al-Assad, who used to claim: "Our slogan should be *martyrdom or victory*, and I say *martyrdom first*, for martyrdom is our road to victory."

[cf. http://www.impact-se.org/docs/reports/Syria/Syria2001_ch10.pdf]

What conclusion do we come to? After stating that Islam, *per se*, is not responsible for terrorism, do I want to blame the Muslim communities or, at the very least, a *significant number of Muslim believers*? Not really. After all, if they feel happy with Hezbollah or Hamas or Lashkar-e-Taiba or the Iranian ayatollahs or Sadr City, that's their business. The real problem for the West (especially in view of terror attacks like the one that took place a few days ago in Paris) is the West itself. It's the West with its policies and moral standards. Actually, it's unbelievable that the West is upset by alleged abominable violations of human rights in Egypt (where terrorists are still moving around in Sinai and have the capability of blowing up commercial aircraft) and is studying how to boycott Israel (which has been desperately trying to defend itself for almost seventy years, surrounded by hostile countries). Instead of wasting time, the West should implement more efficient practices in order to investigate suspects, who *might have been radicalized in 2010* and *might have gone to Syria in 2014*, as apparently happened in the case of a terrorist involved in the Paris attack. Surely, *it might be better* to keep a tight rein on certain people, even at the cost of violating some inalienable rights of poor criminals. Similarly, *it might be wise* to be careful with the millions of poor refugees who are flooding Europe and appear to be welcomed with open arms by the most progressive, politically correct layers of the European society.

At this stage, *it might be interesting* to know if the French citizens, who were aligned with their former president Jacques Chirac and shared his strong anti-American/anti-Bush views, have started to think that every opportunity should be taken to strike both terrorists and potential terrorists, in order to increase the security of the West. For instance, when the cooperation of Saddam Hussein's Iraq did not appear to be fully satisfactory during an inspection process, which was supposed to assess the presence of weapons of mass destruction, the question had not to be whether those weapons were really hidden somewhere. The question had to be whether it was worth taking the risk—and in my opinion the answer had to be *no*. Again, after the fall of Saddam Hussein, there was no reason to take care of the inalienable right of the poor terrorists of Sadr City or bow to the new Shia ruling class. Yet, even the Americans (probably forced by a progressive wave of anti-war campaigns) gave up the idea of harassing the poor militias that were hiding right there. Next, we can mention the air raids that Barack Obama and Nicolas Sarkozy launched against Muammar Gaddafi to protect the poor Libyan rebels. On that occasion, especially after the Iraqi experience, it was quite naive to think that a few bombs could be enough to solve the problem, without sending troops on the ground (with serious rules of engagement, at the cost of violating the inalienable progressive rights of the poor terrorists who were scattered all across the country). Last but not least, it would be nice if the Europeans learned something from the Israeli experience. Namely, if a man *might have been radicalized* and *might have gone to Syria*, *it might be a good idea* to think that this man (together with his friends, relatives, acquaintances and fellow members of cultural/religious centers) is likely to pose a threat, instead of assuming that, after all, he might be an honorable, respectable person.

Probably, the only positive development of the Western anti-ISIS campaign that occurred last week was the lack of reaction against the drone that apparently killed poor *jihadi John*. It looks like a big step forward when compared to the progressive complaints by US Senator Rand Paul against drone attacks when a terrorist (Anwar al-Awlaki) was killed in Yemen—*against drone attacks*, not against Islamic militants or against gangs of fanatics, who claim that they are fighting for the sake of a god.

This danger is the main focus of *Jihad Al-Kuffar* and, even though the book was published five years ago, it also mentioned the interaction between sleeper cells in Europe and terrorist groups in well-known regions. The novel is about events that occurred before and after September 11, 2001: at that time, terrorists and would-be terrorists used to travel from Europe to Pakistan before reaching Afghanistan (as well as, today, they use to travel from Europe to Turkey before reaching Syria). In the

book, we often find comments about the training facilities, which were built in Afghanistan with the aim of turning foreign adventurers into skilled terrorists. Unfortunately, after so many years, it still happens that someone *might have gone to Syria* and is assumed to be a jolly good fellow, although he lives in Molenbeek, a hot district of Brussels—the same district where Abdelhamid Abaaoud used to live. By the way, have you ever heard of Abdelhamid Abaaoud? I am sure you have! As reported by the media, he is a gentleman who is linked to terrorist activity, including the Thalys train attack in August 2015. But right now you cannot knock at his door and have a chat with him. By pure chance, he disappeared some time ago and his whereabouts seem to be unknown. There is no doubt, however, that he has been in contact with ISIS, but it goes without saying that he and his friends must be exemplary citizens (by definition) if they have not planted bombs, yet. You know what I mean: preemptive wars are not politically correct. It is much nicer to pretend that certain people do not pose any threat and to welcome millions of self-proclaimed refugees, who are free to roam across Europe.

Anyway, let's go back to the comments about the training facilities in Afghanistan. In *Jihād Al-Kuffar* we find the following remarks, made by a radical militant, when he writes some pages of his diary in London, in August 2000 (Chapter 5):

By the grace of Allah, Europe is packed with youngsters in search of spiritual assistance. And when they enter our schools of faith, a sage scholar is there, ready to shape the brain of the most motivated worshippers and send them to Pakistan. Then, a new future is to begin: as they arrive at Peshawar or Thal or Quetta, Afghan training centers are a stone's throw away. Would-be fighters just need to cross the border and the camps of Khost, and Jalalabad, and Kandahar are there—with perfect facilities to forge holy warriors. "Once in Afghanistan, these folks don't spare themselves," said [my fellow militant]. "Few weeks are enough to store their minds with religious truth and feelings of hatred. Then, they return to Europe with a solid desire to strike the West or face the unbelievers on the battlefield, wherever we need to defend our honor and glory, from Kosovo to Chechnya, from Bosnia to Palestine."

BOYCOTT ISRAEL AND KEEP FLYING KUWAIT AIRWAYS

December 22, 2015

Flight Details 1						
Flight	Departure	Arrival	Duration / Stops	Equipment	Class	
Outbound: New York (JFK) to Kuwait City (KWI) Sat, 09-Jan-16						
KU102	John F Kennedy International Airport (JFK) 21:00 Sat, 09-Jan-16	Kuwait International Airport (KWI) 19:55 Sun, 10-Jan-16	1 Stop(s)	Airbus A340	Economy	USD 707.80 for 1 passenger(s) (Fare USD 535.00 + Carrier Imposed Charges, Taxes and Fees USD 172.80) Select this flight
Fare Conditions Fare Breakdown Conditions of Carriage						

As reported, e.g., by CNN, Kuwait Airways “pulled its connection between New York’s JFK airport and London Heathrow after U.S. authorities threatened legal action over alleged discrimination” [<http://edition.cnn.com/2015/12/17/aviation/kuwait-airways-flight-israeli-passengers/>].

The story started when the airline refused to sell a ticket to a passenger carrying an Israeli passport. Then, the US Department of Transportation came into play, stating that it would not tolerate discrimination. At this stage, the airline replied that it could not issue the ticket “in compliance with Kuwaiti law, which forbids doing business with Israel or Israelis”.

Apparently, however, the problem is only concerned with passengers who would like to buy a ticket for flights between the US and countries where Israeli passengers are allowed to enter. In other words, if you want to fly from the US to Kuwait (where the local law “forbids doing business with Israel or Israelis” and, consequently, a passenger using an Israeli passport is not allowed to enter), you can still fly Kuwait Airways. For instance, if someone is interested in a one-way ticket for a flight from JFK to Kuwait International airport on January 9, 2016, in order to commemorate (celebrate?) the terrorist attack that took place at the *Hypercacher Kocher Food* superette in Paris on January 9, 2015, it is easily possible to browse the Kuwait Airways website, pay 707.80 US\$, get a ticket and board the New York-London-Kuwait flight (while no one could take the same flight and disembark at London Heathrow—because the US Department of Transportation does not tolerate discrimination, as pointed out above).

Of course, it is clear that Kuwait does not like Israel (a country that declared independence in view of a UN Resolution, was immediately attacked by Arab countries and is continually forced to defend itself). Yet, the Kuwaitis refused to be annexed to Iraq when their Arab brother Saddam Hussein invaded their lands. They even asked for the help of Western powers and were saved by foreign troops (probably including Jewish soldiers). To put it straight, I am sure that the Kuwaitis would not be happy if some militants started to fire missiles at their homes, as well as Hamas militias continue to launch rockets against Israel.

Definitely, I would not be surprised to learn that the Kuwaitis do not like missiles flying over their heads, because the Arab/Islamic world is a nice system where some funny rules are supposed to be legitimate in their countries, BUT would be deemed a violation of human rights in the Western world. Good examples come from Saudi Arabia, Brunei and Somalia.

In Saudi Arabia a woman cannot dress the way she wants and no one is free to profess a religion of his choice, but Muslim women should be allowed to wear the *hijab* in the West and Saudi institutions should be allowed to sponsor the construction of mosques all over the world. Brunei and Somalia have forbidden any celebration of Christmas (and even of the New Year), but their governments would certainly protest if Islamic celebrations were not allowed in the West.

By the way, don’t forget that Brunei, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and Somalia are member states of the United Nations. Therefore they should comply with the provisions of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, including Article 18: “Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.”

Meanwhile, the European Union is playing a role in this context and has a funny policy: its bureaucrats are very sensitive to the issue of human rights and have decided to label the Israeli products that are made in the occupied territories... but the same bureaucrats do not care a damn about airlines (and countries) which forget the second article of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: “Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.”

That said, let me remind you of a paragraph you can read in *Jihad Al-Kuffar* (Chapter 4). It’s about a radical militant, who was born in an Arab country and starts talking about the time when he was a child...

My father insisted on the terrible destiny we had to face because of the Jewish settlements in the Middle East. I
xxxx

was seven, and it was high time for me to realize that Palestine had to be freed from a people of no understanding. "I've already told you the story of the Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings upon Him)," he used to repeat. "The Jews tried to assassinate Him more than once. He warned us of the Jews and of the evil of the Jews and of the deceit of the Jews. You remember that the Messenger (peace be upon Him) fought against them and expelled them from our land, saying, "Two religions can't coexist in Arabia!" In the Holy Koran, He often explained the nature of the Jewish people because we have to beware of them at all times. We must be prepared to deal with the Jews and we need to know the only words they deserve: "Expect your graveyard! Expect the final battle!" [*]

[*] Paragraph based on the statements of a Palestinian cleric

[cf. http://www.palwatch.org/main.aspx?fi=1062&fld_id=1062&doc_id=3896, available in December 2015]