

Terrorism

Terrorism defined

Neither the venerable *Encyclopaedia Britannica* nor the *New Illustrated Columbia Encyclopedia* of a generation ago had a listing for the term “terrorism.” Today, the shelves of libraries and commercial bookstores are filled with volumes offering the public information on the subject of *warfare intentionally waged on civilians in order to destroy their support for governmental policies to which the terrorists object*. Note that this is a war against the free world, using a broad strategy and ruthless tactics, not a series of individual criminal acts, however cleverly planned and cruelly executed.

The distinction between criminality and warfare is vitally important for the survival of **Western civilization**, because if we fail to understand the intentions of the terrorists currently threatening the free world, we are likely to employ the wrong types of defense against their attacks. This is not a traditional war of conquest on their part, although domination of the Middle East’s petroleum reserves would provide them with immeasurable wealth to fund their killing operations, and possession of **Islam**’s holy sites in the Middle East would provide them with religious validation in the eyes of many Muslims. Generally speaking, the current string of terror attacks is part of a war for the total destruction of liberal **democratic** modes of government and the free market economic system that supports it. Specifically, it is a war of extermination by **Islamists**. These **extremists** want to destroy Israel (“Little Satan”), the United States (“Big Satan”), and any European nation (Britain) brave enough to support the current war on terrorism.

Characteristics of political and religious extremists

Political extremism means excessive (not moderate) ideas about the way a political or religious leadership should treat people. Much can be understood about the way terrorists think by examining the way in which they view their opponents. Note the following general characteristics of all types of extremists:

Black and white world view

Extremists tend to see the world as divided into good and evil. They see their group as good, and anyone who refuses to go along with their policies as evil and a threat that must be eliminated.

Character assassination

Extremists prefer to attack their opponents, rather than debate their policies. They question their opponent's personal honor, rather than debating the issues rationally.

Doomsday thinking

Extremists often predict national disaster if their opponents come to power, or if they are allowed to remain in power.

Censorship

Extremists see themselves as possessing the truth, and feel they need to *silence* anyone who disagrees with their policies. Debate, a vitally important concept in any free society, is seen as a threat.

Divine support for their cause

However bloody their attacks, or unfair their accusations, most extremists—unless they are atheists like the Communists—believe that God hates their enemies and supports their violence.

Yugoslavia: a case study of ethnic and religious extremism

After World War I, the victorious Allies created the kingdom of Yugoslavia in southeastern Europe by combining Serbia, Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro, and Macedonia. It lay along the ancient dividing line between Christian and Islamic civilizations, and between Serbian and Albanian **nationalism**.

Why has Yugoslavia suffered such ethnic and religious strife for so long?

Yugoslavia is divided into Eastern Orthodox (Serbs), Roman Catholic (Croats) and Muslim (Bosnia and Kosovo) religious faiths. First ruled by the **Ottoman Turks** (who kept control of the region by keeping the various ethnic and religious groups at each other's throats) and later the Austro-Hungarian Empire, massacres by one group against the other have taken place with alarming frequency over the centuries. **Communism** arrived after the Second World War and kept the country relatively quiet until the fall of Communism in 1989. Ethnic unrest among Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Macedonians, Montenegrins, and Albanians quickly resurfaced and the nation began to tear itself apart.

What events in Yugoslavia in modern times have kept ethnic and religious tensions high?

In 1914 a Serbian nationalist in Sarajevo shot the heir to the Austro-Hungarian throne and lit the fuse that soon engulfed Europe in the First World War. During World War II the Roman Catholic Croats sided with the invading Nazis and committed terrible atrocities against the Eastern Orthodox Serbs and Muslim Albanians. In recent years, the Serbs have committed mass rape and murder against the other ethnic groups in an effort to terrify them to the point that they would abandon certain lands (most significantly Kosovo) the Serbs wish to regain for themselves.

Where is Kosovo?

Until recently it was a semi-autonomous part of Yugoslavia, about the size of Connecticut, bordering Albania, Montenegro, and Macedonia. It has been a trouble spot for generations. Before the Serbs attacked the region, ethnic Muslim Albanians made up approximately 90% of the population and Serbs the remaining 10%. They had lived peacefully together only when a strong central government enforced ethnic peace.

Who was Slobodan Milosevic?

Born in 1941, he was a Communist Party official who helped rule Yugoslavia after the death of President Tito in 1980. As Communism began to collapse across Eastern Europe in 1989, he resorted to preaching the old ethnic hatreds, and the idea of a manifest destiny for his fellow Serbs. His call for taking by force the lands long coveted by the Serbs resulted in hundreds of thousands of deaths in what used to be Yugoslavia. He died in March of 2006 during his trial before a special United Nations court for war crimes committed during the Kosovo War of 1999.

Can peace ever come permanently to Kosovo?

Although Albanian Muslims have lived there in great numbers for many generations, the Serbs across what used to be Yugoslavia claim it as the heartland of their culture. Telling Serbs that they cannot possess Kosovo is not unlike telling Jews or Arabs that they cannot visit the sacred shrines in Jerusalem. As with the Holy Land, religion and ethnic differences are mixed up with deadly politics. Both sides are absolutely convinced that they have a right to the land in question, and both sides are willing to kill and be killed in great numbers to control it.

Is peace possible in places like the former Yugoslavia or the Middle East?

That depends on one's definition of peace and how many billions of dollars the United States and European nations are willing to spend to prevent one side from pushing the other off the land being contested. No amount of money or peacekeeping troops can overcome centuries of hatred and suspicion between ethnic and religious groups unless those groups decide that they care more about the future wellbeing of their grandchildren than avenging wrongs done to them in the past. So far this has not been the case in the lands that used to constitute Yugoslavia. Similarly, in the Middle East, constant violence has for decades retarded the economic

development of that region and dooms the children living there to suffer the same high levels of unemployment and social unrest that has torn the Arab world apart since the birth of Israel in 1948. If peace is defined as a *permanent* arrangement between Israel and the Muslim nations of that region, the future looks bleak. The lessons learned recently in Yugoslavia reveal the uphill effort the West will experience in the Middle East as it tries to end the killing that has continued, despite the best efforts of presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, G. H. W. Bush, Clinton, and George Bush.

Origins of modern terrorism: Western Europe

The revolutionary origins of European terrorism.

The first great period of “modern” terrorism began with the fall of the Bastille at the beginning of the **French Revolution** in 1789 and ended with the fall of the **Berlin Wall**, which signaled the collapse of Communism in Eastern Europe in 1989.

Vertical terror: the reasoning behind France’s Reign of Terror.

For thousands of years governments have used terror (violence or the threat of violence) against their own citizens as a way to remain in power and to defend the *status quo*. The ancient Assyrians flayed prisoners alive and made mountains of their skulls outside the cities they conquered. However, it was in France during the late 1700s that the revolutionary government used mass executions to protect the *radical changes* they were making in all aspects of French society (including the execution of the **Bourbon** king and queen). They used the **Reign of Terror** (an extreme spasm of horrific violence in 1793 and 1794) as a way to rid France of anyone they suspected of being spies or saboteurs, as well as to destroy the traditional power of the Catholic Church, which for centuries had been closely allied to the monarchy, and to break the hold of the landed **aristocracy**, which had traditionally formed the officer corps of the royal army. This was *vertical terror*, in that the revolutionary elites directed violence downward against their own citizens.

Anarchism: people strike against all forms of government

Anarchism defined.

(An - archy = Greek for “no government” or “no leader”) A theory that all forms of government interfere with individual freedom and should be replaced with the voluntary association of cooperative groups.

Anarchism in theory.

This theory, dating back to the Greek founder of **Stoicism**, Zeno of Citium, is based on the belief that man is naturally good, but has been corrupted by artificial institutions such as government, whose use of coercion is the root cause of society’s problems. The state does not protect man, they believe, but rather hinders his development. Anarchists wish to abolish all prisons, armies, and policemen whom they believe exist only to protect private property rights. They object to paying taxes to a central authority, and to the enforcement of contracts and debts. They believe voluntary agreements between groups and individuals will suffice to run a society that will produce both equality and peace. The question of how a society without prisons and policemen can protect itself from criminals and the violently insane goes unanswered. Anarchism has always suffered from the fact that it is difficult to put together a well organized group of people strong enough to rid society of “the government” without having to assume the very characteristics of the government they hope to overthrow.

Anarchists in action: from assassinations to peaceful protests.

Anarchists today are often associated with the anti-globalization movement, joining other groups on the political **Left** in demonstrations against the **International Monetary Fund (IMF)** and the **World Bank**. These public protests, despite a few objects tossed at the police, is well within the law and far short of “terrorism.” However, a century ago, individual anarchists were involved in the assassinations (“propaganda of the deed”) of several political figures such as the wife of Emperor Franz Joseph of Austria-Hungary (1898), King Umberto I of Italy (1900) and U. S. President McKinley (1901). Just how the murders of political leaders were supposed to *reduce* the power of government has never been adequately explained. Such outrages have always resulted in

governments assuming more, not less, powers over their own citizens. The people themselves were horrified by the apparent senselessness of the deeds and demanded harsher punishments and more stringent surveillance of everyone in the hope of preventing further acts of violence.

Although today's American anti-government terrorist groups are not anarchists, their attempts to strike at the central government are a perfect example of how the "propaganda of the deed" can backfire. The 1995 Oklahoma City bombing by Timothy McVeigh took the lives of 168 people, including several small children in the federal building's day care center. It did not reduce the power of the federal government, as he and other anti-government terrorists had hoped, but only served to strengthen it because the citizens of the United States who had been his targets angrily demanded that Washington, DC assume additional powers in order to prevent another such attack.

Communists used terror against political opponents in Soviet Union

The Russian Revolution of 1917 and the Red Terror that followed.

A similar type of government terror against its own citizens was used by **V. I. Lenin** when the Communists came to power in the 1917 **Russian Revolution**. The terror was massively increased during the dictatorship of his successor, **Joseph Stalin**, who sent millions of innocent Russians to the slave labor camps built by his secret police in the coldest part of the Soviet Union. To keep the armed forces and his own political party in line, he instituted massive purges in which most of the top military officers and leading Communist officials were tortured into confessing a variety of offenses, which they were forced to recite during highly publicized "show trials." After assuming the blame for the failures of Stalin's economic policies, these men were executed and their families disappeared behind barbed wire. The idea that no one was safe from Stalin's secret police spread terror among all levels of society and served to increase his grip on the Soviet Union as well as Communist parties around the world.

Communists used terrorists to destabilize democratic governments

After World War II, the Soviet Union seeks to break out of democratic containment.

Facing President Truman's post-World War II **containment** policies, and realizing that **NATO** blocked any further extension of Russian power into Western Europe, Stalin opted to break free of what he saw as "capitalist encirclement" by exporting Communism into the chaos engulfing the former colonies in the Middle East, Africa, and Asia. As the European colonial powers departed (and before stable governments could form among nations with little or no experience in self-rule) the Soviets saw a chance to increase their own influence among the former colonies - and to destabilize the **capitalist** democracies at the same time - by arming and funding the local Communist terrorist/**freedom fighters** in those regions. The Soviet secret police trained, armed, funded, and advised a variety of pro-Communist, anti-Israeli, or anti-colonial groups operating in areas once governed by the former **imperial** powers such as Britain, France, Belgium, and Holland.

In the early 1960s, the aggressive foreign policy of the Soviet Union brought the planet as close to a nuclear war as it ever got during the **Cold War**. In 1962, Moscow decided to place Soviet long-range nuclear missiles in Cuba, ninety miles from the United States. President Kennedy remained calm during the **Cuban Missile Crisis** and it was resolved peacefully, but not before the world had stumbled close to the edge of the nuclear abyss.

The Cuban Missile Crisis forces the Soviets to change their plan of attack against the democracies.

After the Cuban Missile Crisis, the Soviet Union recoiled from dangerous *direct* encounters with the world's other superpower. Instead, it opted for an indirect approach to weakening the free world: political and social destabilization of capitalist democracies by terrorist groups Moscow could claim it had no hand in supporting. It was much cheaper, and far less dangerous for the Soviet Union itself, to arm and support terrorists attacking democratic governments than to risk a direct nuclear confrontation with the West. These *indirect* terror attacks on the West shielded Moscow from much of the blame for the horrors this strategy produced among the West's innocent victims.

Not long after the Cuban Missile Crisis ended, the Soviets convinced Cuba's Communist dictator **Fidel Castro** to allow the construction of a string of terrorist training camps on his island. **KGB** experts trained terrorists from all over the Western Hemisphere in the fine arts of explosives, spying, document forgery, and sabotage. The Soviets got Castro to agree to hosting terror camps by threatening to cut off Cuba's supply of inexpensive Russian oil and to cease buying Cuba's sugar crop at vastly inflated prices. The Weather Underground, a violent group of American **Marxists** who robbed banks and murdered policemen in an attempt to spark a revolution in the United States, were trained in Castro's terror camps. The Soviets would later send Cuban instructors to train terrorists in Africa, the Middle East and in Central and South America. By avoiding the use of Red Army troops outside their own borders, and by referring to terrorists as "freedom fighters," the Soviet Union could claim it had no hand in the violence it was unleashing across the non-Communist areas of the planet.

What the Soviet Union did to destabilize the West before the Cold War ended in 1989 went far beyond using their secret police to keep their own citizens cowed. **Horizontal terror** was used by the governing elites of the Soviet Union against the democratic capitalist nations that were competitors for worldwide influence. The West's nuclear weapons were no good against this new type of warfare, and it the seemingly endless string of terrorist bombings and assassinations nearly brought Western Europe to its knees.

Marxist terrorism's Fright Decades: 1960s and 1970s

Democratic governments struggle with home-grown Leftist terrorists.

By the 1970s, the Soviet secret police were also training, arming, funding, and offering safe haven in Eastern Europe to a variety of pro-Communist groups operating *inside* democratic Western Europe. These **Leftists** favored the replacement of capitalist democracies with totalitarian Communist police states similar to the **dystopias** in East Germany and North Korea.

Western European terrorist organizations.

The Baader-Meinhoff Gang in Germany committed bank robberies, blew up industrial sites and American military assets, and murdered industrialist Hanns-Martin Schleyer. The Red Brigades in Italy managed to commit fourteen thousand acts of violence in the 1970s, including the murder of former Prime Minister Aldo Moro in 1978. The people carrying out most of the terror in Western Europe were ruthless **Leftist** killers who worked to destabilize their own countries. This type of terrorism was a violent response to specific grievances and their goal was to transform society by getting rid of democracy and capitalism, not to destroy society outright. They would soon be followed onto the world stage by far more dangerous terrorists with unlimited goals and no desire to even discuss their grievances with the people they consider their enemies. In this category are the radical Islamist terrorist groups such as **Hamas, Hezbollah, and Al Qaeda**.

Because of these acts of extreme violence against innocent civilians in such cities as Rome, London, Madrid, Paris, and Berlin, the 1960s and 1970s became known as Fright Decades I and II. It would be 1979 before the Soviet Union's invasion of neighboring Afghanistan (Russia's "Vietnam") would finally reveal Moscow's foreign policy strategy for all but the most **ideologically** blinded pro-Soviet observers to see.

Mikhail Gorbachev tries to reform the Soviet Union.

When **Mikhail Gorbachev** came to power in the Soviet Union in 1985, he reduced efforts to undermine democratic countries and began to concentrate on internal political reforms and an (unsuccessful) effort to revitalize the moribund economy. These policies failed because the Soviet Union was economically a **Third World** nation with a hugely expensive military. Decades of spending billions to prop up Communist governments in Eastern Europe, as well as financially supporting ruthless Marxist dictatorships in Africa and the Middle East, had left them bankrupt. By Christmas Day of 1991 there was no more Soviet Union. It had shattered into fifteen republics. Boris Yeltsin was the new president of Russia and Gorbachev was out of a job.

The collapse of the Soviet Union persuaded most people in the West that the victory of liberal democracy and free market **capitalism** over totalitarian Communism had removed the greatest danger to Western Judeo-Christian civilization since Nazism. They looked forward to a period of peace not seen since before the outbreak of World War I in 1914. But in 1979, almost unnoticed by the general public in Europe and America (and well before the collapse of Communism), events in the Middle East were dragging the West into a very different kind of confrontation. This new struggle would not be between nations so much as a clash between two very different civilizations: the secular Judeo-Christian West and that of **fundamentalist** Islam.

The Age of Radical Islamist Terrorism begins in 1979

January 16, 1979: Iranian Revolution.

Fright Decade I (1960s) and Fright Decade II (1970s) overlapped with the beginning of the Age of Radical Islamist Terrorism, which began on January 16, 1979 when the shah fled Iran and reached a crisis point on November 4, 1979 when Islamist radicals took over fifty hostages from the American embassy in Tehran. The taking of civilian hostages from an internationally recognized embassy and holding them as prisoners violated laws and understandings that date back to the Middle Ages. As a result of the replacement of the Shah of Iran by Islamists representing the most extreme branch of **Shi'ite** Islam, the fate of a major nation with vast oil reserves was placed in the hands of men whose hatred for everything Western stemmed from a religious mindset frozen in the **Middle Ages**. This should have been a warning to the West that we faced a ruthless enemy that played by no rules but their own. Hardest for Westerners to understand is the fact, learned much later from statements made by the hostage takers, that the hostages were seized to *prevent* relations from between American and Iran improving after the fall of the shah. In the fall of 1979, President Carter had sent his top national security advisor, Zbigniew Brzezinski, to meet with the Iran's relatively moderate prime minister, Mehdi Bazargan. The radicals, fearing an increase in American influence, attacked the embassy to prevent this possibility. In this, they were successful.

July 17, 1979: Saddam Hussein becomes president of Iraq.

After eleven years as chief enforcer of the Ba'ath Party, Saddam pushes his cousin aside and seizes power for himself (the cousin would die under questionable circumstances three months later). Thousands of potential opponents are tortured and killed. The man who studied *Mein Kampf* and the biographies of Joseph Stalin then proceeded to murder sixty of his opponents in the Party's leadership (some by his own hand) and to grab absolute control of a nation with a large portion of the world's oil reserves. On September 22, 1980, he invaded Iran and began a senseless war that cost a million lives over eight years. His dream of uniting the entire Middle East as a second Saladin was only stopped by his capture by American troops during the Iraq War decades later.

November 20, 1979: Seizure of the Grand Mosque in Mecca.

As the Iranian hostage situation played out, more shockwaves were sent across the Muslim world when a thousand religious radicals seized the Great Mosque in Islam's most sacred city. Hostages were taken and hundreds died in the fighting before Saudi security forces could regain control of the building. During the struggle, the radicals used loudspeakers to denounce Westerners in general, which they claimed were destroying Islamic values, and the Saudi royal government for being the accomplices of non-Muslim nations bent on stealing the region's oil wealth. The Iranians endorsed a rumor that American troops had been involved in the fighting at Mecca and, as a result, the American embassies in Islamabad, Pakistan were attacked by Muslim mobs, leaving four dead.

December 25, 1979: Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

The second strand of Islamist religious and political extremism can be traced back to the Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan, also in 1979. Moscow's decision to use its own troops to prop up a shaky Communist regime in a neighboring country signaled their belief that the American failure in Vietnam five years before meant the policy of containment, dating back six administrations to President **Truman**, had come to an end under **Jimmy Carter**.

Afghan men, whose warrior ancestors had fought armed invasions from Alexander the Great to the British Empire, knew what to do when the Red Army arrived to bring them atheistic Communism the hard way. The religiously devout mujahideen (roughly translated as “warriors for the faith”) retreated to their rocky strongholds and attacked the Russians as they slowly moved along the small number of serviceable roads available in that mountainous nation.

The United States, embarrassed by its recent loss in Vietnam, decided to turn Afghanistan into the “Soviet Union’s Vietnam” by arming and training Muslim fighters to do to the Red Army what the Soviets had armed the North Vietnamese to do to the Americans in Southeast Asia just a few years before. The decision by the Carter and Reagan administrations to arm and train tens of thousands of “**freedom fighters**” in nearby Pakistan to cross into Afghanistan to fight the Red Army came back to haunt the United States after the Soviet Union finally admitted defeat and pulled out in 1989. While most mujahideen returned to their homes after the Russian troops left Afghanistan, hundreds of heavily armed and expertly trained “freedom fighters” became “terrorists” (“one man’s terrorist is another man’s freedom fighter”) and turned their weapons on the United States and its allies following the 1991 Gulf War. They had no fear of a superpower like the United States. After all, they reasoned, Allah had given them the power to drive the world’s other superpower out of Afghanistan.

We must take note of the fact that nations and empires that hire and equip mercenaries to fight for them often end up regretting that decision (Rome hired one tribe of barbarians to hold back another, only to end up being assaulted by both). Among those mujahideen fighting the Red Army in Afghanistan was a Saudi millionaire named Osama bin Laden, a Sunni Islamist. He was angered by the fact that the Saudi royal family allowed foreign (non-Muslim) troops into Saudi Arabia to defend the country against Saddam Hussein during and after the Gulf War of 1991. He managed to overlook the fact that those same American and coalition troops had liberated Kuwait from Saddam Hussein, and had prevented his massive army (the fourth largest army in the world at that time) from swinging down into thinly defended Saudi Arabia to grab the oil wells and the holy cities of Mecca and Medina. Instead, bin Laden declared holy war on the United States and all its allies. No civilian, however young, would be spared in this “crusade in reverse” against Christians, Jews, and moderate Muslims. The West’s military creation in Afghanistan, like the creature created by Victor Frankenstein, had turned on its creator.

Sources of radical Islamist hatred of Western civilization

Will future wars ignite over conflicts between civilizations?

Today, **Western civilization** can generally be said to reside in Europe, where it began, and in areas where Europeans settled—North America, South America, Australia, and New Zealand—which became the centers of economic growth between the end of World War II and the rise of China’s powerful free market in the last decade. The Confucian civilization in mainland China has survived both half a century of Communism and the latest efforts to graft a free market economy onto a one-party Marxist police state (only time will tell which will dominate the other). Japanese civilization is quite distinct from that of the West, despite its trade contacts with the rest of the world and its military alliance with the United States. The ancient Hindu civilization of India continues to thrive, as the world’s largest democracy; it rivals China in population growth and economic power. Slavic-Orthodox Christian civilization survived 75 years of atheistic Communism in Russia. Today the nation that endured manmade famines, mass arrests, slave labor camps, and tens of millions of deaths at the hands of the invading Nazis, attempts to redefine itself as it adjusts to the loss of its empire in Eastern Europe. Non-Arab African civilization south of the Sahara Desert struggles to throw off the effects of colonial misrule, half a century of civil wars, ethnic and tribal conflicts, and an AIDS epidemic that is leaving a generation of children without parents.

Lastly, and perhaps most importantly for this discussion, there is the vibrant Islamic civilization, with one foot in the social attitudes of the Middle Ages and the other in the political and economic realities of the 21st century. Islam gives meaning and direction to the lives of hundreds of millions in the Moslem countries that lie in an arc across the Pacific, Asia, the Middle East, and North Africa. This great world religion is growing in adherents so

fast its numbers may outstrip those of Christianity within a few decades. Because of Muslim immigration from North Africa and large family size among the faithful, Europe, the birthplace of Western civilization, may have a Muslim majority by 2800AD. This change in **demographics** could be the single most important cultural event since Charlemagne's grandfather, Charles Martel, stopped the conquest of Europe by a Muslim army at the **Battle of Tours** in 732AD. However, numbers alone are not the issue. The dedication to the spread of Islam by any means resembles the thinking of Christians during the time of the Crusades. The level of vehemence with which the radical elements within the worldwide Moslem community fear and hate the cultural influence of the West has not been seen since the terrible religious wars between Protestants and Catholic Christians during the **Reformation and Counter-Reformation**.

Globalization brings both wealth and terrorism in its wake.

In recent decades, the vast increase in world trade has brought Western culture in general (and American culture in particular) into the Muslim world. Our modern ideas about women's rights, our toleration of drugs, alcohol, and non-traditional life styles has not gone down well in traditional societies that strongly object to our emphasis on individualism, acquisitive competition, and profit-seeking. Western politicians tend to look at free market capitalism and secular democratic government as positive concepts that should be emulated by the developing world as a way to relieve their poverty. Although Mohammed himself was a successful merchant capitalist, the very notion that there could be a universal civilization based on democracy and global capitalism is a *Western idea*, 180 degrees away from societies like those in the Middle East that value stability and tradition over conspicuous consumption and constant social evolution.

No better distinction can be made between Western and Islamic civilizations than to examine their ideas about what constitutes a perfect society. The West works for a better life in the future with extended life spans and increased material wellbeing that will benefit all classes of citizens. Traditional societies like Islam seek their Golden Age in the accomplishments and the benefits of a slower moving and less complicated past, and believe the **Koran** contains not only the literal Word of God, but all the answers any society might need to guide their daily lives.

We must realize the core values that are most important to Western civilization are often the *least* important in the Muslim world. In fact, much of what the West stands for today is despised by millions of fundamentalist Muslims, who are willing to destroy the civilization they hold responsible for pouring those ideas into their societies. The Christian West should not be too quick to criticize current Muslim religious, social, and political attitudes. Defense of the religious and political status quo was a characteristic of the Christian European Middle Ages from the **Council of Nicaea** in 325AD until after the Renaissance and Reformation transformed **Christendom** well over a thousand years later. The West's present conflict is not with Islam, but with *Islamists* who use religion as an excuse for violence.

Deadly mixture: outward religious fervor and underlying economic motives.

We can look back to Christian Europe during the Crusades for thinking very similar to that exhibited by today's Islamist extremists. In 1095, the pope, hoping to reduce the excessive violence between different factions of Europe's Christian nobility, called for a **Crusade** to liberate the Holy Land from the Muslims. If a knight or noble died in the fighting, he was promised rewards in heaven and his sins, however grave, would be forgiven. The added enticement of capturing land overseas in which a minor noble might rule as a king only added to the fervor of the landed aristocracy – especially younger sons of the aristocracy (dukes, counts, barons) who expected to receive little or no land upon the death of their fathers. Therefore, there was a deadly mixture of religious fervor (the recapture of Jerusalem where Christ had died would bring merit in heaven) and economic motives (to capture both the cities and the Middle Eastern land routes that led to the riches of the Orient, then in the hands of the Muslims). The religious and economic aspects of the current Islamist **Jihad** bear more than a little resemblance to Pope Urban II's efforts to turn the violence of his own flock outward to a people with whom he saw as religious and economic competitors.

Goal of some extreme Islamist terrorists: rebirth of the Caliphate as a global theocratic totalitarian regime.

Caliphs were the leaders of Islam after the death of the Prophet Mohammed. The ultimate goal of some of the radical Islamist terrorists today is to set up a Caliphate to gain control of an arc of territory running from the Western tip of North Africa, across the Middle East, into Asia, and out into the Pacific. With that accomplished, they hope to make the entire planet submit to their fundamentalist form of Islam, which they regard as the One True Faith. The rebirth of the Caliphate is, in itself, not a danger to non-Muslims, but if it is reborn as a global **theocratic totalitarian** regime it would be a grave threat to everything Western civilization holds dear: democracy, capitalism, individualism, the secular rule of law, human rights, and equality of gender, race, class, and religion.

Some issues are too fundamental to be settled by negotiation.

The last time the United States faced an opponent that was *culturally* unable to face a political and military reality (that was starkly obvious to the rest of the world) was in the 1945, when the Japanese generals and admirals insisted that their entire nation fight to the death rather than admit that their best efforts to defeat a hated enemy had failed. Japan was eventually forced to admit defeat, but less militant fervor and more common sense among their leaders would have spared both sides the massive additional casualties and terrible physical destruction. Americans today face another opponent that is culturally unable to tolerate Judeo-Christianity, democracy, or the idea of a free market, and is unwilling to even discuss these concepts. Religious violence is their solution to this impasse, and the sooner the West admits that some things are too fundamental to be settled by peace conferences and goodwill visits by diplomats, the sooner we can devise a realistic strategy to survive the next few decades.

Why terrorists (and dictators) NEED enemies

Dictators and terrorists need internal and external enemies to deflect the anger of their own people.

Dictators need both “external enemies” and “internal enemies” to remain in power, and if they do not exist, their security services will create them. “External enemies” provide a dictator with an excuse to maintain a large, expensive standing army to “protect the homeland.” In reality, that army exists to grab territory from his neighbors and to prevent other nations from interfering in the mistreatment of his own citizens. As a general rule, the more severe the dictatorship, the larger the army he fields.

Dictators use “internal enemies,” to provide justification for a large secret police (**KGB** in Russia, **Gestapo** in Nazi Germany) whose real job is to monitor the lives of all citizens to assure their continued loyalty to the dictator or the ruling political party. The Soviet dictator, Joseph Stalin, made an art out of subjecting other high ranking Communists to “show trials” in which they confessed to all sorts of bizarre “crimes” before being executed. This ruthlessly effective technique served the double purpose of eliminating potential rivals *and* providing scapegoats to publicly take the blame for the dictator’s failed policies.

The terrorists funded by dictators also need “enemies” to justify their extreme behavior and their insane goals. By demonizing Israel and the United States, Islamist terrorists can deflect blame for the hopelessly inept way Middle Eastern dictators have run their nations’ economies. Depression-level unemployment is a fact of life in the Middle East, despite the trillions of dollars in oil profits that have poured into that part of the world for the better part of a century. The ruling elites must hide from their own populations the obvious fact that the oil wealth that should have built schools, universities, and hospitals and brought the Middle East from the Middle Ages into the modern world were diverted into private bank accounts - or spent on weapons with which to attack Israel – or other Muslim countries. Saddam Hussein is a perfect example of one man squandering billions on palaces for his own family’s enjoyment and weapons with which to attack both Iran (1980-88) and Kuwait (1990-91) when the wealth could have been shared between all the people of Iraq.

At a time in history when the entire planet is moving toward liberal democracy and personal freedoms, Islamist dictators have used the supposed “danger” posed by “enemies” to account for the singular lack of civil rights (Israel is the one exception) in their part of the world. Therefore, because dictatorships like Iran and Syria *need*

enemies upon which to focus the anger and frustrations of their own populations, the sincere desire on the part of the Western nations to live in peace with the Islamic thugocracies will come to nothing. The Middle Eastern elites need us as “enemies” to remain in power as much as we need their oil to keep our economy running. The demonization of Jews and Christians will continue.

Terrorist strategy: attack the West's vulnerable economies.

The terrorists clearly understand that the Western industrial democracies are most vulnerable in their economies. The overall strategy is to destroy the delicate financial underpinnings of the free world as a way to reduce its military power.

The critical role of propaganda in spreading hatred and violence.

The West only has to look at the role of propaganda in Nazi Germany to understand how deadly such a sickness as **anti-Semitism** can be. After Hitler came to power in 1933, young people were approached in their most impressionable years and filled with ideas about the greatness of their own nation and race, and how vile were those races (Jews and **Slavs**) or nations (Soviet Union) their government has chosen to demonize. The shooting of Jews began as his armies entered Poland in 1939. Within two years, the death camps appeared in order to streamline the killing process by making it faster and more efficient. With these “factories of death” the full fury of the killing was unleashed by a modern, industrial European nation whose educational system had been, before the Nazis took power and ruined it, admired as the best in the world. If the Nazis could play on old anti-Semitic prejudices to produce the Holocaust in a single generation, what can Moslem fanatics do with a population that has heard nothing good about Jews since Israel was founded in 1948? It is questionable if decades of vicious propaganda pouring out of government-controlled television and radio stations across the Muslim world could ever be overcome by education and counter-propaganda, even if it were to completely stop today. With the Internet currently spilling over with religious and ethnic hatred, the task will be that much harder.

Terror for profit: the global role of organized crime families

What is organized crime?

Organized crime means secret hierarchical organizations continually operating illegal enterprises, often in league with crooked police, judges and politicians. Members are involved in hundreds of enterprises, including illegal gambling, loan sharking, pornography, car theft, extortion, prostitution, union racketeering, and construction kickbacks. For years, heroin and cocaine have been the biggest single source of cash.

Who controls organized crime today?

Today, fabulously wealthy crime syndicates from around the globe have gathered under the general direction of the Sicilian Mafia to control the worldwide trade in hard drugs. The sale of heroin and cocaine is now, in terms of return for dollar invested, the most profitable enterprise on earth. It was inevitable that North America's wealth and liberal legal codes would attract the attention of these criminals. Since the fall of the Soviet Union, hundreds of Russian Mafia associates have entered the United States legally, along with Chinese Triad members and Colombian drug dealers. Many more arrive illegally every week by way of Canada. Once here, they fan out to all our major American cities to assist the Sicilian Mafia in heroin and cocaine distribution, and to take part in a hundred traditional illegal activities. Because we know very little about these recently arrived individuals, or the structure of their organizations, there will be a lag time of several years before effective law enforcement measures can be put into place.

What could happen if organized crime families join with terrorist cells?

A recurring nightmare for the governments of the free world is a *partnership* of convenience between these highly organized criminal organizations and terrorists who have access to some of the oil revenues currently being paid by the West to such **rogue nations** as Iran. In the 1970s, such partnerships did result in conventional bombings and executions, but today such a combination could result in the terrorists purchasing radioactive materials from the Russian Mafia, still a powerful force in the former Soviet Union.

Where might criminals and Islamist terrorists come into constant contact with one another?

Prisons in the United States are a perfect breeding ground for anti-American terrorists. Ruthless street criminals who are in prison for using violence in their line of “work” are sitting side by side with Muslim criminals who are already angry at the “white power” government for incarcerating them. People in prison often seek solace in religion as a way to handle the daily rigors of incarceration and the Islamist message of Holy War can be found in the pamphlets the courts allow prisoners to possess in their cells as part of their “religious training.” It is almost inevitable that contacts made in prison between these two groups will continue in some fashion after their release into society.

Greatest danger: apocalyptic terrorists with *unlimited* goals

Despite the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, a period free of terrorism never materialized. The thousands of terrorists already trained by the Soviets to destabilize the capitalist democracies had long ago spread across the globe and had trained others in the art of mass killing using conventional explosives, radiation, and germs. The funding of their efforts to destroy the West has been taken over by oil-rich radical Islamic governments who fear everything represented by modernity: the rule of law, the separation of church and state, religious and political toleration, women’s rights, and sexual liberation. Ironically, Russia now has a terror problem of its own and has asked the democracies of Western Europe and the United States for assistance.

Any lingering hope that the spread of free market democracy would bring prosperity and political freedom across the globe ended on 9/11. News of the deaths of three thousand innocent people inside the **World Trade Center** sent huge crowds dancing in the streets all over the Muslim world, proof that we are now in the Age of Islamist Terror, and we have no choice but to fight back. Even a craven attempt at surrender would not save us from destruction. These people wish the extermination of the West, not its conversion to their ways of thinking.

The Western **democracies** are now entering a period of supreme danger. The war by Islamist **apocalyptic terrorists** against Western civilization began even before the destruction of the World Trade Center in 2001. These various terrorist organizations are well funded with oil revenues paid by the very nations their sponsors hope to destroy. They refuse to negotiate with the Judeo-Christian democracies, and they are willing to employ nuclear devices, germ warfare, or any other weapons of mass destruction they can purchase or create. This war against Islamist extremists may last many generations, and there is no certainty that the West will win. Those who maintain that the United States and Western Europe will survive this latest threat, as they survived World War II and the Cold War, need to realize that this form of terrorism cannot be held off with superior firepower. This threat is less like an assault by a bully and more like a cancer attacking a body from within. America’s police, FBI, armed forces, and nuclear missiles are no protection against a small group of men carrying a city-killing atomic device in an automobile or in the hold of a merchant ship docking in a major American port like New York or New Orleans.

Debate between “defensive legalists” and “proactive warriors”

In September of 2006 the news media reported that nearly two hundred Afghan **Taliban** fighters had attended the funeral of a comrade. The American military knew this because they had a photograph, shot from above by a drone. No missile was launched at the terrorists, a perfect target because the men were standing close together in straight ranks, because our government’s “rules of engagement” would not allow attacks on an enemy to be made in or near a cemetery. In 1996, the government of Sudan offered to turn Osama bin Laden over to the United States, but the Clinton administration refused because it felt it lacked sufficient legal evidence to try the terrorist leader in a court of law. These are very by-the-book “legalistic” approaches by *both* political parties to fighting a war against terrorists who observe no such legal niceties. It was also reported that the same day the photograph of the terrorists at the Taliban funeral was published in Western newspapers a Taliban suicide bomber attended the funeral of a provincial Afghan governor (killed by the Taliban) and blew himself up in the middle of the mourners, killing six.

There are two schools of thought on how the free world should react to apocalyptic terrorism. The first is the “legalist” point of view that holds that terrorist acts, however bloody, should be viewed as crimes, not as acts of war. The police investigate the incidents *after* they occur and the courts handle the dispensation of the cases. This “legalist” point of view requires the government to extend to terrorist the same rights as any other criminal defendants. Because “legalists” view acts of terror as a law enforcement matter, in their minds the difference between a serial murderer and a terrorist is one of *degree* not of *kind* (the murder of ten innocent people is a crime, and whether it was done during the course of a robbery or done with a bomb at an airport is not legally relevant to the case). To the “legalist,” the preservation of everyone’s civil rights (terrorists included), even in the face of fierce terrorist assaults on the nation, is paramount. This is a *defensive* posture, and its proponents fear the loss of precious civil rights more than they fear a series of terrorist attacks, however bloody. There is merit to this point of view. No one living in a free country wants to permanently give up his or her personal freedoms to gain what may be a temporary measure of safety. They fear that once civil rights are surrendered to any government, in return for a promise of enhanced security, they may be lost forever. A look at past history (Nazi Germany is a solid example) reveals that these fears are not unfounded.

Those associated with the “proactive” school of thought disagree fundamentally with the way the “legalists” perceive the terrorist danger we face. They view the recent series of assaults by Islamist fundamentalists as part of an ongoing war between religious extremists and the Western world, often fought on a level lower than the armed combat seen in World War II, but a genuine war nevertheless. These “proactive warriors” call for an *offensive* posture in which the free nations under assault use every military and intelligence asset they possess to go after the terrorists overseas before they strike the homelands in Europe and North America. According to this line of thinking, it risks national suicide to wait in a defensive position for an attack to occur when it might take the form of a nuclear device, a “dirty bomb,” or germ warfare. They see the “legalists” as waiting for another attack like the one on the World Trade Center, when the assault by apocalyptic terrorists may be more like Hiroshima than Pearl Harbor.

Leaving aside the fact that the cities struck by weapons of mass destruction cannot prosper for generations, the terrorists involved in such attacks frequently choose to die in them, leaving no one to put on trial for the “crime” in any case. The “proactive warriors” also strongly object to extending criminal rights and protections to captured terrorists because they believe that elevates them to the same level as conventional uniformed soldiers observing the **Geneva Conventions on War**, laws terrorists consistently violate by intentionally targeting innocent civilians and previously off-limits targets such as embassies. When asked about the need to preserve civil liberties, even at the cost of hampering the war on terrorism, the “warriors” reply that the Constitution is not a suicide note and the Founding Fathers did not extend the same rights to Indian tribes, who savagely attacked unarmed colonials while allied to the British during the Revolution, that they extended to Redcoats captured on the battlefield at Saratoga or Yorktown. What good, they ask, are the finer points of law if a series of attacks in a nation’s urban areas causes a nationwide panic that empties all the cities and could throw the country into a depression? What good, they ask, are civil liberties if social chaos following those attacks sends millions into the streets insisting that the government remove the civil liberties of this or that minority thought to be involved in the attacks – or calling for a full-scale nuclear response against whatever **rogue nation** is thought to have indirectly sponsored the attacks? The “warriors” insist that sacrificing a few civil liberties today (profiling in airports, requiring national identification cards with photos for the duration of the terror attacks, or listening in on suspicious phone calls) is preferable to forfeiting most, or all, of those rights following an attack with weapons of mass destruction that leads directly to a nationwide declaration of martial law.

In the end, it may take an attack far more serious than the one that brought down the World Trade Center to understand whether the “legalists” or the “warriors” were right on how best to balance civil rights with national security – and by then it may be too late to preserve our nation or our civil liberties.

Must we choose between freedom and safety?

Islamist **radicals** use well-established guerrilla tactics to “work” their propaganda, aided by biased media in Muslim countries and by clueless media in the West who focus on the attacks (“if it bleeds, it leads” television journalism) and make little effort to understand terrorist intentions. These terror groups can be defeated, the question is whether or not they can be defeated by a free society *without sacrificing the very freedoms we hold dearest*. Must we, in order to survive attacks by intolerant individuals, transform our own nation into one like the intolerant countries where they were born? Surviving a series of attacks by weapons of mass destruction will require a balancing act by the governments under assault unlike anything they have previously encountered. For over two centuries, the United States felt safe because of the wide oceans to the east and west and friendly nations to the north and south. Even during the height of the Cold War, Americans knew that a nuclear attack by the Soviet Union would be suicidal for both superpowers and, therefore, was improbable. The Communists, Americans figured, were ruthless, but they were not insane.

However, as the 21st century begins, Americans and Europeans know that religiously-inspired radicals have shown themselves quite willing, if not eager, to die in the course of a terrorist attack. How long can a democratic country persist in extending an array of rights to people who may be using them to plot the destruction of Western civilization? How long can religiously and politically tolerant nations like Britain and Holland survive with large numbers of religiously and politically intolerant immigrants living within their borders? How long can a nation of immigrants like the United States continue to allow millions of strangers to illegally enter the country across borders that are no more than colored lines on a map?

What type of attacks are possible in the future?

Where capitalist democracies are vulnerable: the “base” and “superstructure.”

The “base” of a society is the economy and the “superstructure” is the government, religion, and general culture. Terrorists wishing to destroy the United States know from bitter experience that they cannot defeat our military in a straight up fight on a battlefield. Therefore, they have chosen to go after our women and children in what are called “soft targets” and to disrupt our economy, which is the ultimate source of every nation’s power. A nation’s economy is a web of continuous business relationships that are as delicate as they are vital to a nation’s health. Find a way to disrupt the daily creation and distribution of goods and services and any modern, urban nation can be brought to its collective knees.

Nuclear weapons aboard ships.

Many of America’s greatest cities are ports and ports will always be vulnerable in ways other urban areas are not. If a group wishes to seriously disrupt the economy of the United States it could easily place atomic devices inside the bowels of, say, two merchant ships and sail them into the harbors of New York and New Orleans. They could be exploded long before the ship’s contents could be searched by port authorities. Hundreds of top corporations are headquarters in New York City, and its great port is vital to the nation. Anti-Semitic terrorists would have a second reason to select New York City: a chance to kill large numbers of Jews who have worked and lived in the city for generations. Destroying New Orleans would seal the mouth of the Mississippi River, perhaps for generations, greatly reducing our ability to ship Midwestern grain to buyers overseas and to bring in goods from Europe, Africa, and South America. Such a series of body blows to the nation’s economy might send us spiraling into a deep recession or another depression. It would certainly send the stock market spiraling downward, taking with it the wealth of a large percentage of American workers whose savings are locked into mutual funds invested in stocks.

Computer viruses.

Anyone who has attempted to purchase an item from a store whose computerized cash registers are not working can easily imagine the chaos that would result if a virus were released into the free world’s Internet-based computer and accounting systems. Most large businesses have linked their cash registers directly to their

inventory purchasing systems so the sale of an item informs their purchasing department to order more of that particular product.

A virus assault on our computers becomes several degrees more frightening if one considers what might happen to our modern armed forces, which rely on computers to run every aspect of their operations at home and overseas. What if a nation's computerized missile systems could be made to attack their own cities or those of their allies?

The vulnerable electrical grid.

It would not take too sophisticated an effort to go after a nation's electrical grid that is already three or four generations old. Regular explosives in just the right places could cut off every power to entire regions, and what appliances today do *not* run on electricity? One only has to look back a few years to simple malfunctions that caused black-outs for hours in New York City and other large urban areas. Imagine the result of coordinated multiple assaults on the vital points of the nation's major electrical grids. The finest anti-computer virus software can do nothing for any computer if the power source is lost.

Germ or radiation warfare in urban areas.

Imagine the panic in urban areas if the news media revealed to the public that deadly germs or radioactive bombs had been unleashed in one or more of our major cities. The resulting panic would cause a chaotic evacuation of the large urban areas that would dwarf that of New Orleans just prior to Hurricane Katrina.

The damage would not be limited to human tragedy. The money markets would panic and trillions of dollars might leave the United States overnight for safer places overseas. The meltdown of the Asian financial markets in the late 1990s was a lesson in how rumors can spook the world's financial markets. Hundreds of billions of dollars of wealth left Asian money markets electronically in a matter of days, and that region is just now recovering. But that panic would be nothing compared to the financial chaos engendered by a biological attack in, for example, New York City, Chicago, or Los Angeles. The rest of the world invests in the United States precisely because they believe their wealth will be safe. What would happen to us if the rest of the planet decided that America is not a safe environment for their investments? Let us not forget that two jets hit the World Trade center and the stock market lost a trillion dollars in a short amount of time. How much worse would it be if New York suffers the fate of Hiroshima, or if the capitol in Washington, DC is struck with biological weapons?

Poisoning the public food or water supply.

It would only take a few simultaneous reports across the United States of multiple intentional poisonings of uncooked vegetables and meats to cause the public to fear purchasing all such available foods. One can only imagine the economic backlash against the nation's supermarkets, farmers, and livestock growers as people who have no way of testing each package of beef or head of lettuce quickly switch to the very limited supply of canned goods. For example, it would only require a rumor of oranges being randomly injected with a poison to cause the public to avoid the entire crop. Think back to the Mad Cow disease scare and the negative impact it had on livestock sales. Remember how an outbreak of e.coli on fresh spinach in September of 2006 nearly ruined that entire industry. Magnify that fear by a factor of one hundred and we have an idea what chaos might result if the very food we feed our children might be tainted.

A human can live for weeks, even months, without food, but water is vital to the survival of every living thing on the planet. The chaos produced by rumors of tainted food would be doubled by rumors of poison or germs released into the public water supply.

Disadvantages of free nations fighting the terrorists

Fundamental Western vulnerability: impatience.

Compared to other civilizations, Westerners are not a patient people. We live in societies that move at a rapid pace and the only certainty is constant change. Traditions are thoughtlessly swept aside as if our ancestors were all fools; nothing is held sacred and everything is questioned as we rocket blindly into this new century, pulled along by the rapidly expanding global trade that is, itself, beyond the control of the politicians. We exist on fast food and watch televised news that reveals events literally as they happen. Add to this the fact that impatient Americans learned the wrong lesson from our low-casualty, 100-hour victory in the 1991 Gulf War. The American public now demands that our military use its superior firepower to win every war quickly, with casualties which are a fraction of the number of lives lost at home in automobile accidents during the same period. If the military fails to win both quickly and painlessly, calls are immediately heard in Congress and the media for a retreat dressed up as “redeployment.”

If our current lack of patience had been an American trait in the past, the slaughter of the first three years of the Civil War would have led to Abraham Lincoln being voted out of office in 1864 and slavery might have continued for generations. Despite a monumentally vast increase in the size and cost of government, Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal policies failed to put a large number of people back to work in the years before World War II. If the American people back then had been as impatient as they are today, Roosevelt might have been voted out of office in 1936 and the United States would have been thoroughly unprepared for the war when it was thrust upon us by the Japanese in December of 1941.

Americans today have very little understanding of the terrorist mind, but we can be sure that the terrorists understand Western impatience as well as the North Vietnamese Communists did a generation ago. The troops Hanoi sent into South Vietnam never won a major battle against American soldiers or marines, but they destroyed the morale on the American home front by playing on the nation’s proverbial lack of patience in military matters. American politicians and voters alike must understand that their love of quick and easy solutions can significantly hinder their efforts to survive these terrorist attacks. A good way to begin facing up to this unpleasant reality would be to admit to ourselves that this struggle against Islamist terror may continue through the remainder of the 21st century.

The cardinal mistake: believing the enemy perceives the world as we do.

The FUNDAMENTAL mistake Westerners make trying to deal with Islamist terrorists today is the same one the free world made when trying to negotiate with the Communists during the Cold War. This was the sadly mistaken idea that people ideologically opposed to everything the West stands for could somehow be brought around to our point of view by honest dialogue, reasoned argument, and unilateral concessions that were meant to be signs of goodwill on our part. The very idea of honest dialogue and reasoned argument is a Western concept quite foreign to Communists who believed that capitalism was evil and democracy a sham. Therefore, how can the democratic nations expect to “reason” (a Western concept dating to the ancient Greeks) with religious fanatics who think blowing up guests at a wedding reception is honoring their religion and furthering their goal of spreading their extreme version of Islam around the world?

Religious and political extremists view moderation as weakness.

This idea of proving to the terrorists that we mean them no harm, rather than confronting them with force (which anyone can understand, regardless of their culture) was attempted without success for decades with the leaders of the Soviet Union. Concessions were repeatedly made by the United States and NATO countries as proof of their goodwill. Sadly, all attempts to “make friends” with the Communists by easing tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union was perceived by Moscow as a sign of American weakness, or as a signal that the West was tiring of the superpower competition. The Soviet leaders were ideologically opposed to democracy and capitalism, and no amount of reasoned argument could have changed that. The same is true for attempting to negotiate with apocalyptic terrorists who view killing large numbers of Israelis or Americans as a religious duty.

Western civilization is significantly different than Islamic civilization.

Every civilization has its own traditions. Those beliefs, customs, and practices have the effect of unwritten law. They affect the way a people look at the world. Judgments about personal behavior would be impossible without them. Western civilization is totally different (that is not to say it is superior) from Islamic civilization because the history each civilization has experienced is so different. The language, culture (the ideas, customs, skills, morals, religious beliefs, and arts of a given people), and traditions (stories, beliefs, and customs handed down over many generations with the effect of unwritten law) are not at all similar. Most importantly for the present conflict, the religious beliefs are very different. The core belief of turning the other cheek when assaulted and forgiving one's enemies is not a mode of thinking to be admired by people who fly jets into buildings.

Despite the cultural gap that exists between Judeo-Christian Western civilization and that of Islam, decent people living in the free world still want to believe that all that is required to bridge that gap is be tolerant of the feelings and opinions of other cultures. Because of our liberal Western upbringing, most modern Europeans and Americans believe that hatred against the West is the result of the colonial sins of the past, current discrimination against Muslims, or our support for Israel. According to this line of thinking, terrorists are just "freedom fighters" by another name, and if these "misunderstandings" could somehow be cleared up and the sources of discrimination eliminated, the people currently trying to kill us will rejoin the community of man and the terrorism will cease. This is the product of a school of thought that recommends that the Western nations work harder to "get at the root causes of the terrorism" by eliminating poverty or the lack of job opportunities for young Muslims. It is admirable, but it will not keep us safe from a tiny minority of intolerant Muslim fanatics who seek our destruction.

The free world would do well to remember that any sign of weakness in the face of terrorist attacks will only whet the appetites of nations like Iran and Syria that are using terrorists as pawns to increase their own power in the Muslim world. Perhaps another look at the **Domino Theory** might shed some light on how *not* to react to terrorism.

Israel: the "Domino Theory" in the Middle East?

The Domino Theory was a foreign policy concept first put forth by President Eisenhower in 1954. He suggested that if one nation in Southeast Asia should come under Communist control, others were likely to follow (as a row of dominos tip each other over in sequence). If this Communist expansionism were not opposed, he said, it would call into question America's support for its allies around the world and tempt aggressors to strive for further conquests. Opponents of the Vietnam War ridiculed the Domino Theory, assuring the free world that no further Communist expansion would result when South Vietnam finally fell to Communist North Vietnam in 1975. By 1980, as the Carter administration was coming to an end, other "dominos" had fallen to the Communists: Cambodia, Laos, South Yemen, Angola, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Grenada, Nicaragua, and Afghanistan.

Allowing a democratic ally like Israel to be destroyed by terrorists would not end the conflict in the Middle East, as some believe. The "glory" of destroying Israel would, however, embolden the Iranians and their Syrian allies and tempt them to extend their power by using proxy troops like Hamas, Hezbollah, and Al Qaeda to bring Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Egypt, and Lebanon into line - and to the infant democracy the Americans have established in Iraq. At that point, a new Persian Empire, built on oil, would arise in Iran and a restored Caliphate dedicated to the destruction of Western civilization will have near-total control of the West's oil supplies.

Consequences of West's failure to defeat terrorism

Rights and privileges the West must defend.

Islamists have nothing but hatred and suspicion for the following concepts that are the treasures of Western civilization:

1. Democracy, compromise, and free elections followed by the peaceful transfer of political power.
2. Separation of church and state, the opposite of Iran, a radical theocracy in which the clergy appoint judges, control the armed forces, and make all major foreign and domestic political decisions.
3. Capitalism in which privately owned businesses compete for a profit in a market relatively free of government interference, and the interplay of supply and demand sets the prices for goods and services.
4. The respect for a permanent founding document (Constitution) that demands compliance by all political leaders, rather than laws created by one temporary political leader to be ignored by his replacement.
5. Individual freedom, which is beyond the control of others so long as one acts within the law.
6. Individualism, where the rights of the individual are balanced with the needs of society as a whole.
7. Gender, race, class, and religious equality.
8. The rule of law in which all citizens must obey the same set of laws, regardless of wealth, class, or position.
9. Respect for human rights, regardless of color, religion, or nationality.

Religious and political toleration will end.

Religious and political toleration is absolutely vital in any racially and ethnically diverse nation of immigrants such as those found in Western Europe or the United States, a nation entirely composed of immigrants. If anti-American, anti-Christian, and anti-Semitic verbal attacks by Muslim clerics continue inside American and European mosques, the pressure to declare these sermons as “hate crimes” will only increase. If another attack of the magnitude of 9/11 should be visited on the free world, the government of the nation suffering the attack will be asked to close down those mosques and deport the offending clerics on charges of inciting violence. No matter what happens regarding the politically radicalized houses of worship and their clergy, religious toleration will diminish as the subject itself will appear less of an issue of private belief and more like an issue of national survival. How long, the public will ask, can a religiously tolerant nation allow intolerant people to reside among them?

The separation of church and state will end.

This separation protects both a people’s right to worship without government interference and prevents undue influence of any one set of beliefs on a nation’s popular government.

The idea of political compromise will be lost.

This agreement to meet political opponents halfway enables democracies to function in societies in which many creeds and colors reside. The alternative to this method of giving everyone some, but not all, of what they desire is to have the majority force their entire political or religious agenda on the minority. The loss of this tool would cause a huge rise in social tensions among the various racial, ethnic, and religious groups inhabiting a nation.

Basic freedoms will be lost.

The *basic freedoms* enshrined in such documents as the **Bill of Rights** will be lost, including the freedoms of religion, speech, press, and assembly, the right to possess a firearm, the right to be protected against unreasonable searches and seizures, the right to a speedy and public trial, and the right to be protected against cruel and unusual punishment. The rights that people in the West have long taken for granted have never been available to most of the world’s people. They can be quickly given up if the public begins to fear terrorist attacks against their families more than they value these protections. What good is it, they will argue, to have the theoretical protection of people’s rights if they fail to keep us alive?

The key to survival in the Age of Islamist Terrorism

Locate and neutralize the nations sponsoring the terrorism.

The terrorist is a “puppet” and the sponsor of terrorism is the “puppet master.” The individual terrorists are involved in the tactics (movements on the “battlefield”) and their sponsors decide the strategy (the overall goals for which wars are fought and the methods to be used). Since it is the job of the “sponsor” to educate the terrorists doing the killing (anyone other than a mentally disturbed serial killer needs a *reason* to kill innocent people he does not know) the “sponsor” describes the targets as *external enemies* of Islam. A terrorist without a

proper enemy is just a murderer, but a terrorist who kills people deemed to be the enemies of Allah can see himself as a hero. If he dies, he is regarded as a martyr to be respected and his family is often financially rewarded by the thugs pulling his strings.

As long as Western countries refuse, for whatever reason, to carry the fight to the nations that train, advise, arm, and protect terrorists, these attacks will continue. The only choice the Western democracies have is to publicly warn the sponsors of terrorism that further attacks will be considered as *acts of war by their nation* and they will suffer for those actions both economically and, if necessary, militarily. Then, if this warning is not heeded, the West *must act* decisively so that the sponsors pay a heavy price for disturbing the peace of the world. Force is the one thing the sponsors of terrorism understand.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Q: *What caused the rise of Islamist fundamentalism?*

A: After World War II in 1945, the colonial world rapidly fell apart. Not only did the exhausted European powers abandon their holdings in Africa and Asia, they slowly gave up control of the Middle East as well. Many of the new governments formed in that political vacuum attempted to use **secular** (non-religious) nationalism to bind their people together. Many of the borders in the developing world had been drawn by white colonial overlords with no regard as to where tribes and religious groups lived, and this made it nearly impossible to unite a mixed group of religious sects and tribes that had warred with one another for centuries.

The Soviet Union, with its tendency to fish in troubled waters, sent Communist agents into the Middle East and dangled foreign aid (as well as weapons to attack Israel) to gain influence in the area the West depended upon for its oil. However, after decades of attempting to jump-start an atheistic ideology in a part of the world famous for its devotion to Allah, the attempt to unite Muslims under the banner of Marxism failed. By the time the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991, millions of Muslims, angered at the Red Army's invasion of Afghanistan, were ready to return to their cultural roots by embracing Islam in its most fundamental form. They were told by their religious leadership that all of the problems currently being experienced were the result of falling away from the life strictly dictated by the Koran. The idea that Islam was a political system as well as a religion is known as Islamism.

Q: *Why should the West worry about Islamist terrorists when the vast majority of Muslims are moderate people who claim they want to coexist peacefully with other faiths?*

A: It does the West no good to rely on the fact that terrorists are but a small minority among millions of moderate Muslims if those "moderate Muslims" cannot find a way to restrain the violent members of their faith. The American Mafia is estimated to have more than 5,000 sworn members concentrated in twenty-four crime families across the United States, and yet they steal billions from their fellow countrymen every year and kill people on a regular basis in order to maintain their power.

Let us not forget that a cancer is only a tiny percentage of a victim's total body mass, but cancer kills thousands of people every month. On September 11th of 2001, nineteen terrorists (15 from Saudi Arabia, 2 from United Arab Emirates, 1 from Egypt, and 1 from Lebanon) killed 3,000 Americans. That kill ratio of 1 to 157 is similar to Timothy McVeigh's kill ratio of 1 to 168 in the 1995 Oklahoma City bombing, and he accomplished that death and destruction with a single rented van filled with explosives bought on the open market. Imagine what a lone terrorist with a nuclear device could do to the other 99.999% of the people living in a major city in Europe or America. If such an attack does occur in a major urban area, those "moderate Muslims" to whom we constantly hear reference will die alongside moderate Christians and Jews.

Q: *Was the United States wrong to invade Iraq and overthrow Saddam Hussein as part of its war on terror?*

A: Leave aside the argument for denying Saddam Hussein a chance to provide terrorists with **weapons of mass destruction** (WMD). Forget, for the sake of this argument, that he was a psychotic monster who modeled his

career on that of Joseph Stalin and who killed tens of thousands of his own people, kept his torture chambers in constant use, and had a tendency to invade neighboring countries to steal their oil fields.

The question the American government needed to have asked itself *before* unleashing an armed invasion of Iraq was: would the loss of Saddam's iron rule create a political vacuum in a part of the world that was already extremely unstable and prone to ethnic and religious violence? Surely, as much as free people love the idea of democratic institutions replacing bloody dictatorships, someone in Washington had to have asked how a viable democracy could be created *quickly enough* (in a nation with no experience in a form of government requiring tolerance of all opinions and constant compromises between political factions) to hold off the forces of chaos that are always just below the surface of every Middle Eastern nation. Many of the countries bordering Iraq are run by thugs as violent as Saddam - and they were bound to do all they could to prevent an American success in Iraq because they correctly understand that their own dictatorships might be next to fall.

Coalitions are rarely strong, and the Americans had to follow their relatively easy battlefield victory over Saddam's army with the creation of a coalition government that had to be conjured up out of a culture based on tribal loyalties. Iraq still suffers from religious hatred between Shi'ite and Sunni as fierce as between Catholics and Protestants during worst of Europe's religious wars of the 16th and 17th centuries. One wonders if the American Founding Fathers themselves could have created a viable republic in the middle of a civil war—with elements of foreign terrorist fighters thrown into the mix just to further complicate an already difficult job. America's love for democracy should not have blinded our officials to the fact that this type of representative government cannot be quickly grafted onto a nation whose religious and political worldview is nothing like that of the world's successful republics, even if the invasion was intended to free a people from a repressive dictator like Saddam. Good intentions will count for nothing if this attempt at installing a democracy by military conquest fails.

What about the successful democracies in Japan and Germany? Were they not installed by military force by the victorious Allies after World War II? Yes, but Japan was the most thoroughly defeated nation in history and the Emperor was *kept on the throne* to help the Japanese people adapt to the social revolution (a Japanese version of Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal) that General MacArthur brought to them. The Japanese were hungry, their nation lay in ruins, and they feared the Soviet colossus to the west might do to them what the Communists were already doing to Eastern Europe. When the Americans spared the Emperor, fed and clothed their children, rebuilt schools and hospitals—and only asked in return that they give up the rule of the military and adopt rule by the people, they quickly agreed.

Germany, too, was laid waste and the eastern half of the country was in the grip of the Russians, who proceeded to pack up entire factories and ship them by rail back to the Soviet Union to replace the ones destroyed by the Germans on the Eastern Front. Seeing Eastern Germany forced to become a Communist police state allied to the Soviets, was it any wonder that the western half of Germany was happy to agree to anything the Americans wanted, especially when they asked nothing but for Germany to root out the remaining Nazis and become a prosperous democracy allied to other democracies? No, the social, political, religious, and military situation in Iraq is very different from that of Germany and Japan after 1945.

More importantly, let us not forget that, after World War I, the Allies forced the defeated Germans to accept a weak democratic form of government in place of the Kaiser, who had abdicated. Although his abdication was intended to rid Germany of the militarism the Allies blamed for starting the 1914-18 war, the German people strongly resented a republic being imposed on them by the same people who had killed so many of their sons in battle. For that reason alone, they gave the new democracy grudging support at best. By 1933 their allegiance was not sufficient to sustain the **Weimar Republic** and they had turned to Hitler to redress their complaints. With little effort, he quickly managed to overthrow the republic the victorious democracies had clumsily grafted onto Imperial Germany. Nations tend to reject leaders, however honest and well intentioned, who have been imposed on them by outsiders.

Q: Did the Bush administration actually create more terrorists when it invaded Iraq?

A: According to critics of the Iraq War, invading any Muslim country (WMD or no WMD) was bound to be interpreted as a call to arms by thousands of passionate young Muslim men who might otherwise have remained on the sidelines. There is truth in this line of thinking, but Bush's decision to invade Iraq did not set off the string of terrorist attacks on the West.

Let us not forget that the war on Western civilization did not begin with the overthrow of Saddam Hussein. It started in 1979 with the overthrow of the Shah of Iran. This was followed by the return from exile of Ayatollah Khomeini and the creation of the Islamic Republic, a **theocracy** in the same oil-rich nation that had previously been America's strongest ally in the Muslim world. This rapid, 180-degree shift from Iran being a force for stability in the most unstable region on earth, to a radical Islamist center for destabilizing other governments in the Middle East, makes 1979 the pivotal year in the global war on terror. It also made Iran Ground Zero for the apocalyptic terrorism that soon spread around the world. The fact that the Soviet Union decided to send the Red Army into nearby Afghanistan in December 1979, while America's attention was focused on the Iranian Revolution and the hostage crisis, only added to the confusion.

World War II began on September 1, 1939 when Germany invaded Poland. The United States, while sympathetic to the Allied cause, became directly involved in the fighting only after the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. The Global War on Islamist Terror began in Iran on November 4, 1979 when 53 American citizens were taken hostage from our Embassy in Tehran and held, against all international law, for 444 days. The Bush administration, while supportive of other nations suffering repeated terror assaults by Islamist radicals, was brought directly into the fighting after the attack on the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001. Both wars were already well underway when the American people launched direct military actions against nations they held responsible for the attacks.

Q: Would anti-American sentiment in Muslim countries be reduced if the U. S. ended its support for Israel?

A: Despite what many in the academic world and the news media believe, support for Israel is not the fundamental cause of anti-Americanism among Muslims. In fact, America's support for Israel was a consequence of Soviet penetration of the Middle East, not part of a bid to insert a pro-Western imperialist Trojan Horse into that region. Evidence that ending support for Israel would not save the United States from further terrorist attacks is suggested by the following facts:

1. During the 1930s, Germany's harsh anti-Semitic policies were the main reason German Jews sought refuge in Palestine. The British, who had controlled that area since the end of World War I as a mandate under the League of Nations (and who hoped to curry goodwill among the oil-rich Arab nations) enforced restrictions on the numbers of Jews allowed to settle there. However, when World War II began in 1939, Arab leaders in the Middle East sided with the Germans who had sent Jews to Palestine and against the British who tried to reduce that flow of refugees. In fact, the Grand **Mufti** (senior Islamic authority) of Jerusalem, Mohammad Amin al-Husayni, fled to Germany and cooperated with Hitler during the war in the creation of Balkan **Waffen-SS** units in Bosnia to fight for the Third Reich. He hated the British and French for going back on their promise to allow the Arabs an independent homeland in the Middle East as a reward for their efforts against Turkey and Germany in World War I, as well as for British effort to create a Jewish homeland in Palestine against the wishes of Arabs living there. His hope was that the Nazis would win World War II and assist him in "cleansing" the Middle East of all Jews in return for access to that region's oil supplies. Despite the fact that the Nazis lost the war, their ideas are still admired by millions of people in the Middle East today. The Ba'ath Party in Iraq and Syria is modeled on the Nazis, and *Mein Kampf* can still be found in most of the region's book stores. If Hitler was able to use the anti-Semitism already present in Germany to create the Holocaust within twelve years of coming to power, what chance is there that rational argument on the part of the Western nations can overcome a century of extreme anti-Jewish hatred in the Middle East so that Israel might exist in peace with her neighbors?

2. The Soviet Union played an important role in the creation of Israel in 1948. Stalin did this, not out of any concern for the welfare of the Jews, but because he hoped to cause problems for the British who, as previously stated, ruled that area as a mandate. Once he realized that the Americans, and not the exhausted British, stood in the way of the Soviet Union realizing the ancient dream of the Tsars (control of the Middle East), he turned his back on Israel. The fact that he had given wholehearted support in the United Nations for recognition of the new state of Israel, while the Americans had initially provided only de facto recognition, failed to impress the Muslims. Soviet financial aid, advisors, and weapons were welcomed by Arab dictators for four decades, beginning in the 1950s.
3. In 1956, the West was presented with a perfect example of the selective outrage among the Muslim nations in the Middle East. The Arab nations in that region were still congratulating Egypt for signing an arms deal with the Soviet Union the previous year (it was viewed as a slap in the face of the West), when Egypt's President Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal and denied its use to Israel. Although a vital chokepoint for the Western Europe's oil distribution was endangered, President Eisenhower did not support Britain, France and Israel in their attempt to use military power to regain control of that vital waterway. Instead, America publicly joined the Soviet Union in berating the two European powers (who, unlike Egypt, were American allies) in the United Nations for their use of force against Egypt. The United States put far less diplomatic effort into opposing the Soviet Union's use of tanks to crush the Hungarian Revolution, which was going on at the same time. France was embittered by America's lack of support (the French to this day enjoy opposing American initiatives around the world) and the British quietly resigned themselves to the second rank of world powers, leaving the United States to carry on the expensive and frustrating diplomatic efforts to bring about a compromise peace in the Middle East. The Muslim nations were not impressed by what America had done for the Middle East, and they said little about the crimes committed by the Soviets in crushing the Hungarian Revolution.
4. One could be forgiven for thinking that the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979, and the installation of yet another atheist Communist puppet government in that country, would have led to public demonstrations of outrage across the religiously faithful Muslim world. Although many young Muslim men went to Afghanistan to fight the invaders, the actual response was surprisingly muted, considering the amount of protests directed at American attempts to liberate Kuwait, Afghanistan, and Iraq a generation later. This should not be surprising, given the fact that little protest was heard among Arab leaders when the Soviets used force to crush Islam in Central Asia and the Transcaucasian republics (in which only two hundred mosques were authorized by the Communists to serve a total of 50,000,000 Muslims) prior to sending the Red Army into Afghanistan. When Soviet troops crossed into this Muslim nation in late 1979, the United Nations, as usual, took its time in condemning the action (calling it an intervention, not an armed invasion, and failing to even mention the Soviet Union by name). Syria and Algeria abstained from voting against the Soviets, Libya was silent (but would later condemn the United States), South Yemen actually voted against the condemnation, and the non-voting PLO made a speech strongly supporting the Red Army's actions. Although some Muslim voices were raised in protest that Afghanistan faced an invasion by avowed atheists who slaughtered civilians at will, most of the Islamic nations preferred to confine their complaints to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict that produced hundreds of casualties between 1979 and 1989, while during that same period of time 1,500,000 died as a direct result of Soviet efforts to "pacify" that mountainous nation.
5. The defeat of Saddam Hussein in the Gulf War of 1991 liberated Kuwait from the grasp of the Iraqi dictator and prevented him from sending his enormous army into lightly defended Saudi Arabia. The valor of American and allied troops prevented Saddam from grabbing control of much of the world's oil supplies as well as Mecca and Medina, Islam's two most sacred cities. The stationing of American troops on Arabian soil to prevent a bloody dictator from capturing his country (as American troops on the DMZ in South Korea prevent North Korea from attempting a second invasion) was viewed by Osama bin Laden as a religious crime that would lead directly to the September 11th slaughter of 3,000 American civilians.

6. President Bill Clinton worked ceaselessly during the last part of his presidency to find a solution that would bring peace between Israel and the Palestinians. He successfully pressured Israel to grant concessions to the PLO that no previous Israeli government would have dared consider. His thanks for those efforts came when Yassir Arafat left the peace talks and launched a series of suicide bombings and rocket attacks on Israel that are still going on today. Hundreds of casualties have been suffered on both sides because, as the PLO has stated publicly for decades, they seek not peaceful coexistence with Israel, but that nation's destruction.
7. The Clinton administration's military defense of Muslims against Christian ethnic cleansing in Bosnia, Kosovo, and Albania brought nothing in the way of goodwill for the United States among the world's Islamic communities. Instead, the efforts on behalf of Muslim civilians by American Christians and Jews in uniform was answered not long after Clinton left office by the attacks of September 11, 2001.

If the United States were to abandon Israel, like Britain and France surrendered Czechoslovakia to Hitler before World War II, it would convince the radicals in the region that America had finally lost its will to fight. Surrendering our national honor by cutting loose the only real democracy in a region ruled by tyrants and religious extremists, would endanger the flow of the West's oil supplies, which would place the free world in a dangerous economic position not experienced since the Great Depression. In 1938, when the British and French abandoned the Czechs, the only democracy in Central Europe, future prime minister Winston Churchill warned the House of Commons that his nation had a choice between war and dishonor. They had chosen dishonor, he said, and would get war later.

Q: *Did the Bush administration ignore the lessons of the Vietnam War when it invaded Iraq?*

A: According to its critics, the Bush administration did indeed ignore the lessons of the American experience in Southeast Asia between 1965 and 1975. The killing went on for years, the United States dropped more bombs in Vietnam than America did during World War II - but the type of clear victory demanded by an impatient public back home remained unattainable. But the REAL LESSON for Bush's Iraq invasion is not to be found in the American experience in Vietnam.

In 1975, after thirty years of struggle, North and South Vietnam were finally unified as a ruthless, highly centralized one-party Communist police state. Nothing like that is going to happen in Iraq unless the United States leaves before the country is sufficiently pacified and Iran mounts a full-scale military invasion of its own to seize control. On the contrary, the lesson American war planners ignored the second time they prepared to fight Saddam (the first was the **Desert Storm** of 1991) was not Vietnam, but the breakup of Yugoslavia after the fall of Communism in 1989.

Yugoslavia was a nation created the victorious Allies in the aftermath of World War I, and it contained ethnic and religious groups that had periodically slaughtered each other for centuries. When the Communists took over after World War II, the central government used the very real threat of **KGB**-style terror to keep those groups from attacking one another. As long as Yugoslavia's Roman Catholic Croats, Eastern Orthodox Serbs, and Muslims feared the central government more than they hated each other, a kind of "peace" was preserved. It lasted until the power of the central government began to dissolve after the collapse of Communism in 1989. This "peace" cannot be sustained among the three main groups in Iraq because the Americans *replaced* the strong central government under Saddam with a peaceful democratic coalition that has admirable dreams of a united and democratic Iraq, but no teeth. For this reason, Iraq will not turn into another Vietnam, but it could easily "**balkanize**," breaking into Shi'ite, Sunni, and Kurdish territories, with all three fighting over a fortune in oil revenues.

If Iraq does fly apart, the Shi'ite, Sunni, and Kurdish "tribes" will withdraw into their religious or ethnic groupings and seek outside assistance in their struggle for power. That will, in turn, invite the encroachment of nearby Shi'ite Iran. The Persians (Iranians) will be tempted to make their move for leadership of the Middle

East by continuing to fight a proxy war with the Americans in Iraq (as they are currently doing by backing various terrorist groups inside the country) and against Israel from Lebanon (through Hezbollah rocket attacks of the kind seen during the summer and fall of 2006). The political vacuum created by American military intervention in Iraq, no matter how well intended the invasion, has the potential to produce more trouble for the free world than Saddam Hussein ever could have, with or without weapons of mass destruction.

Winning a war is not the same as creating a lasting peace. Let us remember that the democracies that won World War I broke up Imperial Germany and the Austria-Hungarian Empire in order to set up Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Yugoslavia as separate nations. What was the practical result of the most extensive redrawing of Europe's political boundaries since the time of Napoleon? Hitler came to power a few years later and made Austria a part of Germany, absorbed Czechoslovakia without firing a shot, and conquered the western half of Poland (igniting World War II). He then took Norway, then Denmark, and defeated France, Belgium, and Holland in a matter of weeks. Germany had, by July 1940, gained complete control over all of Western Europe except for Britain, whose army had been rescued by the Royal Navy after the Germans drove it into the English Channel at Dunkirk. This situation had been made possible by the fact that, after World War I, the victorious Allies had created a belt of weak new states around the Kaiser's defeated Germany. When Hitler became Chancellor of Germany he only had to contend with new, small individual nations he could absorb one at a time. If Iraq collapses into a civil war, it will offer Iran a perfect opportunity to gain control of part or all of Iraq's oil. This would be a greater disaster than having Saddam in control of Kuwait's oil in 1991, because Iran is the number one sponsor of terrorism in the world today.

The **mullahs** who currently control Iran have already shown a willingness to stand up to America and Israel, and will eventually be armed with nuclear weapons to place atop the ballistic missiles they already possess. These weapons, and the support of radical Islamist forces across the Middle East, provide the Iranians with a good chance to add control of Iraq's oil reserves to their own. In doing so, they may create economic havoc in Europe and the Americas – all without firing a shot. The West might do well to remember that, after coalition troops forced his army to retreat from Kuwait, Saddam Hussein is said to have blamed his failure on his lack of nuclear weapons. The Western nations, he came to believe, would not have dared tangle with his troops if he had possessed atomic weapons. This lesson was not lost on the mullahs calling the shots in nearby Iran.

Q: *If the United States cannot stop the sectarian violence in Iraq, why not divide the nation into three parts with the Kurds, Shi'ites, and Sunnis each having their own autonomous regions?*

A: This sounds equitable, but would be a repetition of the mistake the Allies made when they redrew the map of Europe after the end of World War I (mentioned in the answer to the previous question). Before 1914, Imperial Germany faced large, powerful empires on every side. When Hitler came to power in 1933, the Nazis found themselves surrounded by a belt of newly created weak states which could be swallowed one by one. Today, the Persians are making their bid for dominance in the Middle East, just as Nasser's Egypt attempted to do half a century ago. The Iranians are seeking atomic weapons, and they already dominate Syria with their immense wealth. They have purchased the allegiance of Hezbollah for tens of millions of oil dollars each year in order to draw Lebanon into their orbit and to continue the pressure on Israel's northern border as Hamas does the same from Gaza in the south. The last thing the West needs to create is three contentious states where Iraq used to reside and then leave them to be picked off, one after another, by the Iranians and their proxy terrorist armies, once American ground troops "declare a victory and depart."

Q: *Is democracy the answer to the instability in the Middle East?*

A: It could be. However, let us not forget that Adolf Hitler came to power *legally* in Germany, and his intention was to destroy democracy from within. He was appointed Chancellor by President Hindenburg on January 30th, 1933. By Christmas of that same year, the Nazis had managed to strangle the free press, cancel all civil liberties, force the Jews out of government jobs and the teaching profession, destroy the power of the trade unions, abolish all political parties other than their own, fill the concentration camps with their opponents, and make the

German parliament a rubber stamp for Hitler. Democracy is, generally speaking, less aggressive, but it is also delicate.

Secondly, the right of the people to choose their own leaders carries with it the possibility that they will elect officials who, like Hitler, will not act in ways the older democracies in North America and Europe believe is appropriate. After all, near the end of World War II Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin promised Franklin Roosevelt and Britain's Winston Churchill that "free elections" would be held in the Eastern European nations as soon as his Red Army freed them from the grip of the Nazis. At first, the Communists pretended to share power with other political parties (keeping the police, internal security, and armed forces firmly under their control). Slowly, the representatives of the other parties began to disappear. Within a few years, all of Eastern Europe was in the grip of Communism and it would remain so until 1989. For the Communists, "free elections" meant asking the public which Communists they preferred to hold public office in order to follow Moscow's orders, not which candidates from an array of political parties would put the welfare of their own country ahead of all other considerations.

We must also remember that America's new democracy did not fare well during the first decades after the American Revolution. Some citizens thought George Washington should become George I of America in order to prevent the thirteen colonies from flying apart. Others wanted a democracy so complete it would allow each new state to exist as if it were a separate nation. In order to survive, the United States had to be a nation ruled by the revolutionary elite until the radical new idea of democracy could take hold among the citizenry.

The American people needed to "practice" ruling themselves and that took time, the one thing Iraq does *not* possess today. Fortunately for America, there existed in the colonies a group of lawyers, planters and merchants who had years of experience in public life (and who knew and trusted one another), available to lead the new nation. The infant republic went through a period of rule by men so it might survive to be a nation ruled by laws. When Abraham Lincoln managed to hold a national election in the middle of the Civil War, Americans knew the political experiment the Founding Fathers attempted had been successful after all. Today, Iraq lacks men and women who are accepted equally among Sunni, Shi'ite and Kurdish voters as qualified for office and, more importantly, can be trusted to rise above their "tribes" to rule for the benefit of all. The sad fact of religious hatred and ancient ethnic suspicions among the three main groups, together with the constant terrorist attacks on anyone attempting to build democracy in Iraq, puts the fate of this latest experiment in self-rule in doubt.

Q: *Why does the United Nations appear weak when trying to reduce the level of terrorism in the world?*

A: The effectiveness of the United Nations (created after World War II to preserve the peace of the world), like the **League of Nations** (created after World War I to preserve the peace of the world), depends on a concept called *collective security*. If one nation should threaten aggression against another nation, the combined might of the rest of the world's countries would come together to prevent it. That is the theory, but not the reality.

For collective (combined) security to work in the real world, all the nations of the world have to agree to do the following:

1. *Renounce the use of force* in dealing with one another. (What will happen when two nations attempt years of serious diplomacy, but cannot agree on a fundamentally important issue?)
2. *Agree to a common definition of what constitutes aggression* (Did the United States invade Iraq to steal their oil or to liberate their people from a mass-murdering dictator? If Red China attempts to regain control of Taiwan by force, is that aggression or nothing more than what Lincoln did to regain control of the South during the Civil War?)
3. *Submit troops or funds toward a worldwide peace-keeping force* to enter areas in which war is about to break out. (Will citizens in Europe and North America be willing, year after year, to spend billions of

dollars and sacrifice the lives of their own sons far from home by getting involved in a seemingly endless string of conflicts in the Middle East, Africa, or Asia?)

What is to be done if a government decides to murder its own people (Saddam's mass murder of Iraqi Kurds, or Slobodan Milosevic's decision to start a civil war in Yugoslavia in order for his Serbs to have an opportunity to murder the local Muslims and Croats)?

Does collective security also apply to internal matters, or only when the killing threatens the security of a nearby nation?

Collective security calls for all nations to combine their military and economic resources to put down any attempt by a single powerful nation to disturb the peace of the world. The problem with this admirable concept is the various nations of the world *do not see threats the same way* and, therefore, often refuse to react to them the same way. If one doubts this, consider the different ways nations reacted to George Bush's attempt to fight a war on terror. Even the American people themselves cannot agree on whether the 9/11 attack should be handled by the military as an act of war or as a legal matter better left to the police and the courts. The vast differences between the world's major civilizations make it impossible that they will see the same conflicts the same way. This means their responses will be very different as well. On this rock, collective security has always foundered.

In 1931, Japan, a member of the League of Nations, attacked and conquered nearby Manchuria so as to benefit from additional land and coal deposits. The League of Nations investigated the situation thoroughly and solemnly announced that Japan was an aggressor and her attack was unwarranted. Because no combined military effort was mounted to force Japan to retreat from Manchuria, the conquest stood and Japan simply left the League.

In 1935, Italy invaded Abyssinia (Ethiopia), also a member of the League of Nations, and used poison gas and machine guns on the tribesmen who were opposing their invasion with muskets. The League clearly viewed this invasion as unprovoked aggression and declared a trade embargo (refusal to buy from or sell to a nation) on the Italians—but not of oil, the one item that could have quickly forced Italy to back down from her aggression. The League did not embargo oil because it did not want to upset the Italians. After much slaughter, Abyssinia was lost to the Italian Fascists and, thereafter the League of Nations was ignored as a talking society with no teeth—just as Adolf Hitler began to disturb the peace of Europe.

The League of Nations fell apart in 1946, and was replaced by the United Nations. The present UN has proved itself even less willing to take on rogue nations than the old League of Nations, because (unlike the League) it is populated with scores of nations that are, in reality, Marxist dictatorships, tribes with flags, and, in some cases, mere criminal enterprises that have a seat in the UN General Assembly. This collection of dictators and uncommon thugs that today use the UN to make speeches about American aggression came to power in their own countries by spilling a river of blood, threaten their neighbors, and remain in power by using terror against their own people. We cannot realistically expect such nations to vote to use force against other aggressor nations when they are, themselves, guilty of mass murder and gross violations of civil rights.

Imagine, for a moment, that the twenty-four American Mafia families sent representatives to vote their interests in the U. S. Congress. Any American would question the validity of any laws that might issue from such a corrupt legislature. However, the United Nations thought nothing of allowing Cuba or Sudan to sit on the committee handling human rights violations, or having one-party police states like the old Soviet Union and the Red Chinese to wield a veto power in the Security Council. The UN is a talking society whose "peace keeping troops" have more than once stood by while massacres occurred around them. (Imagine how effective the police would be in any country if they patrolled on foot, without weapons, and could only *suggest* that criminals cease to rob and rape.)

It is a nearly impossible task to attempt to maintain order using a world legislature filled with scores of nations ruled by Marxist dictatorships with the blood of millions on their hands, oil-rich tribes with flags, one-party dictatorships involved in ethnic cleansing, and warlords with direct connections to the illegal sale of drug and arms. The only realistic hope for collective military security lies with a coalition of nations willing to risk money and lives to defeat countries that sponsor terror against other nations or who, like Saddam, invade their neighbors seeking to control their natural resources. Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, and the United States could, if their leaders so decided, create such a force for stability in the world.

Q: *Islamists claim that Muslim deaths at the hands of Christians during the Crusades justify their terrorist attacks on Christian and Jewish civilians today. Is this reasoning fair?*

A: It is a sad fact of history that many Muslim civilians were killed by the Crusaders. We must also not forget that Muslim conquests of Christian lands in the generations after Mohammed's death took place well *before* the Crusades (the end of the 11th century to the 13th century) and frequently involved the deaths of Christian or Jewish civilians in cities who had resisted the armies of the Prophet. Neither side is without sin in this matter.

We must also remember that the **Ottoman Turks** were Muslims, and their conquest of the city of **Constantinople** in 1453, as well as large areas of the **Balkans** in the following generations, produced rivers of Christian blood over far larger areas of land and for far longer than the duration of the Crusades. The Turks managed to retain control in the Balkans by keeping the various religious and ethnic groups at each other's throats. That area today still suffers from the hatreds these Muslim rulers kept burning among those unfortunate people of Southeastern Europe. The Muslim Turks also murdered hundreds of thousands of unarmed Armenian Christians during World War I in what was plainly **genocide** against civilians, not warfare.

Is it really fair to blame the intentional murder of innocent women and children today on deaths, however unfair or unfortunate, that occurred centuries ago? If all mankind were to adopt this type of extremist thinking, the planet would always be consumed by war. Would any sane person today agree that the great-grandson of a Jew murdered in a German death camp during World War II would be justified in blowing up a German pre-school today? What would such an act accomplish? Would either the killer or his victims be better off after the fact?

We must also note that in World War II, the United States fought the Japanese in some of the worst man-on-man combat the world has ever seen. Islands like Iwo Jima were hell on earth for men on both sides. Despite the fact that Allied prisoners had been intentionally tortured and maltreated for years by the Japanese army, the United States entered defeated Japan and proceeded to feed the starving Japanese children, to respect their mothers, and to rebuilt the country into a prosperous democracy. By treating one's former enemies in this fashion, the chance of another war in the future was reduced.

After World War II, the United States created the Marshall Plan to rebuild its European allies and enemies alike. How did Osama bin Laden and his followers repay the American people for using the U. S. army and air force to prevent the mass murder of Albanian Muslims at the hands of Christian killers in Bosnia during Bill Clinton's time in office? They burned and crushed to death nearly three thousand American civilians inside the World Trade Center and tried to turn the Pentagon into a square. The Marshall Plan was an original idea intended to prevent Germany and Japan from seeking revenge at some point in the future, while the attack on the World Trade Center was the result of a mindset frozen in the religious wars of the Middle Ages.

What if the United States blew up a kindergarten in Tokyo in the year 2800AD to avenge Japanese mistreatment of American prisoners of war during World War II? Would any amount of mistreatment of American POWs during the 1940s warrant such an insane delayed reaction centuries after the fact? Then it is equally insane to try to justify killing innocent Christians and Jews today because of events that occurred during the Crusades eight centuries ago.

Q: *Was the attack on the World Trade Center similar in effect to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor that silenced the isolationists who had opposed fighting Japan, Italy, and Germany?*

A: Not at all. Although **isolationist** sentiment was strong across the United States during the first two years of World War II, the attack on Pearl Harbor in December of 1941 put to rest any reservations the isolationists might have had about taking part in the defeat of Germany, Italy, and Japan. The nation quickly pulled together behind Roosevelt's war effort.

The attack on the World Trade Center in 2001 shocked the nation and both political parties temporarily worked together on the war effort. The war in Afghanistan against the Taliban seemed justified because they had helped train the 9/11 terrorists, but when Bush decided to invade Iraq and overthrow Saddam Hussein the Democrats accurately predicted that such an expensive effort might prove counterproductive and cost a lot more in lives and money than the Bush administration estimated. The conventional war against Saddam's troops went quickly and the dictator was overthrown, but the terrorist assaults on American and coalition troops continued, year after year. The Democrats, citing the lack of WMD, began to oppose the war and to demand that a timetable for withdrawal be announced. As the 2006 off-year election approached, the Democrat attacks on Bush increased in volume as the party in opposition saw a chance to win back one or both Houses of Congress.

A democracy cannot function properly without a loyal opposition to keep the party in power from making domestic and foreign policy mistakes that might harm the interests of the United States. However, as the war in Iraq dragged on for longer than the USA had been involved in World War II, the political situation was more like France's divided government during the 1930s than Roosevelt battling the isolationists. As World War II approached, the political Left in France wanted to strengthen their military in order to match the huge German rearmament program, but the political Right feared that increasing the power of the military might tempt the Left to use that power against them. When the Right took office and attempted to bolster the military, but the Left fought the measures in the French parliament out of fear that the Right might use the army in a coup against the republic itself. Years went by and the politically divided French failed to make the military reforms necessary to stand up to Nazi Germany invaded France in 1940.

This same type of thinking is present today in America. Some Democrat politicians fear the Bush administration's attempts to listen to terrorist telephone conversations and to track terrorist money transfers more than they do another terrorist attack. These secret anti-terrorist measures were publicly exposed by liberal newspapers as serious violations of our civil rights. Housing terrorist suspects in secret CIA prisons overseas were exposed by the liberal media as violating the **Geneva Conventions of War** and much public concern was shown by most Democrats (and some Republicans) about the housing of terrorist suspects in a special prison in Cuba. The **Patriot Act** was opposed by most Democrats and the liberal media as a threat to civil liberties. The current American war on terrorism looks much less like what Roosevelt had to contend with and more like a politically polarized France as it waited for Hitler to invade.

Q: *What does the term Judeo-Christian-Islamic civilization mean?*

A: The term Judeo-Christian-Islamic civilization is used to remind Jews and Christians of the debt they owe to Muslims for preserving much of the wisdom and knowledge of **Classical** Greece and Rome while Western Europe stumbled through the **Dark Ages**. While the largely illiterate West was surviving amid the ruins of the Roman Empire, the great Islamic scholars of the **Fertile Crescent** were preserving what would later constitute the intellectual foundations of Western civilization. For example, during the Middle Ages, scholars at the university in Baghdad carefully translated into Arabic the texts on Babylonian astronomy, Hindu mathematics, and Chinese science and technology. Those Arabic texts would later be translated by Jews, who could speak both Arabic and Latin, into the Latin texts needed by Western European scholars. The revival of learning that flowered during the Italian **Renaissance** would not have been possible without the prior efforts of Muslim scholars to preserve the ideas of many of the Greek and Roman authors still studied on college campuses today. So, when we speak of preserving the treasures of Western civilization we would do well to refer to it as Judeo-Christian-Islamic civilization.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Al Qaeda

Arabic for “the base” or “the foundation.” Violent Sunni Islamist (Muslims who believe Islam is a political system as well as a religion and should guide society and the economy as well as the personal lives of individual Muslims) terrorist organization that specifically targets American and Israeli civilians. Osama bin Laden is recognized as the spiritual leader and the 2001 attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon are its best known terror operations.

anti-Semitism

Discrimination against Jews. It can run from social prejudice (refusing to sell a home or rent a hotel room to a Jew), to persecution (denial of civil rights), to outright mass murder (Christian riots during the Crusades or the Holocaust during World War II).

apocalyptic terrorists

Terrorists whose extreme religious views make them desire not to change a government’s policies, but to destroy a civilization they fear. There is no way to negotiate with this type of terrorist.

Arafat, Yassir

(1929-2004) Leader of the Palestinian Liberation Organization. Shared 1994 Nobel Peace Prize with Israel’s Shimon Peres and Yitzhak Rabin for the 1993 Oslo (peace) Accords, which dissolved when Arafat launched the murderous al-Aqsa Intifada (Arabic for “uprising”) in September 2000.

aristocracy

The warrior nobility. Powerful families who owned large tracts of land and had foot soldiers and knights to fight for them.

Auschwitz

The most notorious of a series of Nazi death camps located in southern Poland where between 1,200,000 and 1,500,000 people died from maltreatment or execution in gas chambers. Exact numbers of those killed are not available because the Nazis burned many of the camp’s records at the end of the war. The mass production techniques of the Industrial Revolution were used to move people efficiently by rail from the farthest corners of Europe to killing centers like this one, specifically designed to gas to death thousands of people each day and to burn their bodies in the large crematoria.

Ayatollah

A high rank (meaning “Sign of God”) granted by the followers of an esteemed Shi’ite Muslim cleric and teacher who is an expert on the Koran and Islamic law, philosophy, and ethics.

Balkans

The area of southeastern Europe lying between the Black Sea and the Adriatic. It is strategically located at the crossroads of Europe, Asia, and the Middle East. In 1914 it was one of the most religiously, ethnically, and politically unstable regions on earth because for centuries the traditional Ottoman method of maintaining control in the Balkans was to keep the various ethnic and religious groups constantly at each other’s throats so they would be less likely to join forces to overthrow Ottoman rule. (Those hatreds still keep that part of Europe in deadly turmoil today).

In the early 20th century, as the weakness of the Ottoman Empire became obvious, various ethnic and religious groups armed themselves and attempted, with some success, to push the Turks out of the Balkans. The region's constant violence has given rise in modern times to the word "*Balkanize*," which refers to the breakup of a territory into mutually hostile political units.

In his book *Diplomacy*, Henry Kissinger pointed out the fact that the area running between modern Croatia and Serbia represents the "fault line of European history." To the west lay the lands of the old Western Roman Empire, the Latin alphabet, and the Catholic Church based in Rome. To the east lay the Eastern Roman Empire based in Constantinople, the Cyrillic script, and the Eastern Orthodox Church. In this area live Greeks, Albanian Muslims, Bulgarians, Jews, Turks and the Southern Slavs (Croats, Serbs, Slovenes, and Montenegrins).

The lure of land and influence led both Russia and Austria-Hungary to move into the political vacuum left by the slow retreat of the Ottoman Turks from the Balkans. Because the Eastern Orthodox Serbs, one of the major Slavic peoples in the region, did not wish to trade Turkish rule for that of Roman Catholic Austria, a group of Serbian terrorists murdered the heir to the throne of Austria-Hungary in June of 1914. The Eastern Orthodox Russians rose to defend Serbia from a war of revenge by Austria-Hungary and Germany responded by backing Austria-Hungary. World War I broke out a month after the terrorist act.

"balkanize,"

Refers to the breakup of a territory into mutually hostile political units.

Berlin Wall

27-mile concrete and barbed wire wall built in 1961 by the Communists government of East Berlin (the city had been divided between free and Communist after the end of World War II) to prevent people from escaping to freedom in West Berlin. It became a potent symbol of the failure of Communism to provide people with a decent standard of living as well as the civil rights enjoyed in democratic nations. It was demolished in 1989 by a crowd of people as the satellite nations of Eastern Europe began to break free of the political and military control of the Soviet Union (which would itself collapse in 1991).

Bill of Rights

I. Personal freedoms

- (a) religion
- (b) speech
- (c) press
- (d) assembly
- (e) petition

II. Citizens have the right to own and carry guns

III. No soldiers to be quartered in private homes in peacetime

IV. Protection against unreasonable search and seizure, or those performed without a warrant

V. Rights of the accused

- (a) indictment by a grand jury
- (b) cannot be tried twice for the same crime
- (c) no forced self-incrimination
- (d) no jail or loss of property without due process of the law
- (e) just compensation for property taken for public use

VI. Rights at trial

- (a) right to a speedy and public trial
- (b) right to confront witnesses
- (c) right to call witnesses for the defense

VII. Right to a trial by jury in civil cases

VIII. Protection against excessive bail, fines or cruel and unusual punishment

IX. Government must respect all rights of the American people, including those not listed in the Constitution

X. The states and people retain any powers not specifically given to the federal government

Bourbon

French kings who ruled from Henri IV (1589) to the overthrow of Louis XVI (1792) during the French Revolution. The dynasty regained the throne between 1814 and 1830, and a cadet branch of the family ruled France from 1830 to 1848.

capitalism

An economic system in which the means of production and distribution of wealth (mines, machinery, transportation, factories, land) are privately owned, and businesses compete with each other for profits within a market free of excessive government interference. The government serves as a referee to make sure that private businesses act fairly toward the public, and toward one another, so that goods and services can move to where they are needed by responding to prices set by supply and demand.

Carter, Jimmy

(b. 1924) 39th President of the United States who served between 1977 and 1981. Secured a peace treaty between Egypt and Israel, but his warnings that the free world was too obsessed with the dangers of Communism hurt his image when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in 1979. His last year in the White House was plagued by the Iranian hostage crisis. Denied a second term in office, the hostages were finally released, after 444 days in captivity, just after Ronald Reagan was sworn in as the 40th President of the United States.

Castro, Fidel

(1926-) Communist dictator who seized power in Cuba in 1959. He quickly allied the island with Moscow and, in return, received massive aid until the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. After the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962, Castro agreed to allow the Soviets to construct numerous terrorist camps around Havana. In them, Soviet KGB experts trained revolutionaries from all over the world in the use of violence to bring Marxist governments to power in the former colonial areas of the Middle

East, Africa, and Asia, and to destabilize the democratic nations of the free world with urban bombings, kidnappings, and executions.

Christendom

Those parts of the world in which most inhabitants profess the Christian faith.

classical antiquity

Term refers to the literary, artistic, scientific, political, and philosophical achievements of ancient Greece and Rome at their cultural height from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* of Homer (7th century BC) to the end of the Western Roman Empire in 476AD.

Cold War

The period of confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States lasting from the end of World War II until the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991.

Communism

A centrally planned economy in which the government owns the means of production and distribution of wealth (mines, machinery, transportation, factories, land) and operates them, in theory, for the benefit of society as a whole. They believe revolutionary violence is unavoidable and all other political parties must be banned in favor of revolutionary party narrowly dedicated to the needs of the working class. See also “Karl Marx.”

Constantinople

Great seaport in northwest Turkey lying on both sides of the Bosphorus (a 20-mile strait between the Black Sea and the Sea of Marmara). Today called Istanbul.

Containment policy

American policy developed during the Truman administration in the years after the end of World War II. It was first revealed publicly in written form in a July 1947 article by George Kennan for the quarterly, *Foreign Affairs*. Kennan’s ideas about “containing” the expansion of Soviet Communism around the world, rather than opposing it with direct military action that would risk another world war, became the fundamental policy of America during the Cold War that lasted from 1947 until the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. Kennan (1904-2005) was one of the most respected and influential American diplomats of the 20th century and a realist when it came to the crimes of Joseph Stalin and his intention to export Communism around the world.

Council of Nicaea

The first great church council, convoked by Constantine, the first Christian Emperor, at Nicaea (in what is now Turkey) in 325AD. It was in response to a controversy within the Christian community over the nature of the Trinity. Some historians date the true beginning of the so-called “Middle Ages” not to the end of the Roman Empire in 476AD, but to this earlier council, which they believe marks the beginning of a partnership between popes and emperors in ruling European society. The Church was thereafter a force for the preservation of the status quo (warrior princes would rule society by the sword and tax the people, priests would look after the spiritual needs of the community and receive a regular tithe, and the farmers and merchants would pay those taxes). This stability in Europe came at the price of keeping people in the class and profession into which they were born, and it lasted until the discovery of the New World in 1492

and the Reformation sparked by Martin Luther in 1517AD helped usher in the modern world.

Counter-Reformation

Reaction of the Roman Catholic Church to the religious strife sparked by Martin Luther's public protests against the corruption and worldliness of the Church in 1517. Many German princes, following Luther's teachings, refused to send wealth from Germany to Italy in the form of papal tithes, and confiscated large tracts of German land owned by the Church. The popes were forced to reform the Church internally and to fight off the Protestants at the same time. At the Council of Trent in 1545, the Church did manage to rid itself of many of the practices (the sale of indulgences and bishoprics, the worldliness of the priesthood) that had reduced its support among the faithful. It created the Jesuits in 1534 to carry the faith to the New World, but it did so too late to regain control of much of Northern Europe, which to this day follows the teachings of Luther (Germany), John Calvin (Switzerland) and John Knox (Scotland).

Crusades

In what was perhaps the most effective single speech in European history, at the Council of Clermont in 1095, Pope Urban II called upon Europe's Christian nobility and knights to undertake a crusade to regain the Holy Land from the Moslems. It was also launched to regain control of valuable trade routes to the riches of the Orient that had been barred by Muslim conquests in that area. What followed was a series of military campaigns that, despite a number of Christian victories, ultimately failed. It can be argued that the discovery of the New World in 1492 was a result of the failure of the Crusaders to reopen trade routes to the East blocked since the Moslem conquests of the 600s cut off, or greatly increased the cost of, trade between Western Europe and the East.

Crusade 1: 1095-1099

French and German peasants slaughtered in Asia Minor * Four large European armies rout Turks at Dorylaeum in 1097 and capture Jerusalem in 1099.

Crusade 2: 1146-1148

Turks recapture of Edessa in 1144 launches this crusade * Led by Louis VII and Conrad III of Germany * Mutual jealousy prevents successful attack on Damascus * Saladin captures Jerusalem in 1187.

Crusade 3: 1189-1192

Provoked by Saladin's recapture of Jerusalem in 1187 * Led by Holy Roman Emperor Frederick I, Richard I of England, and France's Philip II * Mutual jealousy prevents successful attack on Jerusalem * Richard wins Acre and several coastal towns * Truce with Saladin allows Christian pilgrimages to Jerusalem.

Crusade 4: 1198-1204

Diverted from Egypt to Constantinople by Doge of Venice and rival claimants to throne * Latin Empire of Constantinople set up.

Crusade 4.5: 1212

The Children's Crusade * Death or slavery on the way.

Crusade 5: 1217-1221

Against Egypt, center of Muslim power * The last crusade launched by papacy * Failed when Crusaders had to be evacuated from floodwaters near Cairo.

Crusade 6: 1228-1229

Peaceful effort * Holy Roman Emperor Frederick II claimed his title to Jerusalem and secured city for the Christians * Fell to Muslims again in 1244.

Crusade 7: 1246-1250

Louis IX led attack on Egypt but was captured at Mansura.

Crusade 8: 1268-1270

Louis IX led this effort but died in Tunis * Last Christian city of Acre falls to Muslims in 1291 * No further large-scale Crusades.

Cuban Missile Crisis

October 1962 confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union that brought the world the closest to a nuclear exchange during the Cold War. The Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev (1894-1971) decided to rattle a young and inexperienced American president John F. Kennedy by placing long-range nuclear missiles in Cuba, just ninety miles from the shores of Florida. Kennedy demanded their immediate removal, blockaded Cuba with warships, and sent the American B-52 bomber force aloft worldwide. For several days, the world waited to hear the Soviet reply. Finally, Moscow agreed to remove the missiles and the United States promised never to invade Cuba to overthrow the Communist dictatorship of Fidel Castro.

Dark Ages

A period in medieval European history from the end of the Roman Empire in 476AD to around the year 1000AD, characterized by general poverty, provincialism, cultural decline, and intellectual stagnation.

democracy

A type of government with limited powers and more than one political party. The people hold the ruling power, either directly or through elected representatives.

Democracy is a type of government that has limited (*limited by a Constitution or tradition – and by regular elections in which politicians can lose their offices*) **powers and more than one political party. The people** (*not political, religious, economic, or military leaders*) **hold the ruling power, either directly** (*a direct democracy in which every citizen votes on every issue like at a town meeting*) **or indirectly through elected representatives** (*Britain's parliament or a republic like America*).

Characteristics of a healthy modern democracy:

1. The majority rules but the rights of the minority are protected
2. A government of laws not of men - even the president must obey the laws of the nation

3. The political party that loses a fair election surrenders power peacefully to the winners
4. The political party out of power becomes the loyal political opposition to the party in power
5. The critical role of free press as “watchdog” of the party in power is protected
6. Government censorship of speech and press limited to times of war and national danger
7. Role of compromise in governing a nation of many races and religions is clearly understood
8. Toleration of all political and religious ideas is practiced at all times
9. The military votes in elections, but never interferes directly in political affairs of the nation
10. In USA, a Bill of Rights spells out what the government may or may not do to its own citizens
11. The American System of Constitutional “checks and balances”
 - Congress: *makes the laws*
 - President: *enforces the laws*
 - Courts: *decide on the constitutionality of the laws passed by Congress*
 - States: *fifty state governments prevent the central government from becoming too powerful*
12. Direct relationship between economic freedom and political freedom is clearly understood

demographics

A branch of sociology, it is the study of the composition, distribution, and internal structure of human populations. It uses statistics to understand and predict such factors as birth rates, immigration (entering an area), and emigration (leaving an area).

Desert Storm

A 1991 invasion of Iraq by American and coalition forces to push Saddam Hussein’s occupying force out of neighboring Kuwait. The U. S. lost 146 dead and the Iraqis lost over 100,000 killed in four days of terrible fighting. Kuwait was liberated, but Saddam remained in power.

dirty bomb

A radiological device that combines deadly radioactive materials with conventional explosives. The explosives are intended to distribute the harmful radioactive material across a wide area in order to harm the largest number of victims. This type of terror weapon would be most effective in crowded urban areas.

DMZ

Demilitarized zone. An area between two nations that is free of a military presence so that an outbreak of fighting might be avoided.

dystopia

The opposite of a utopia, usually characterized by a strict totalitarian government with little or no personal freedom. The types of societies described in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*, Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We*, or Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451*. The Soviet Union in the 1930s, during Stalin's manmade famines, mass arrests, and bloody purges of the Communist party and the military, might be considered a dystopian society.

extremist, extremism

Social, political or religious views which are not moderate; advocating severe or drastic solutions to problems; deviating significantly from the center of general opinion on any of a number of subjects. The political Right (Nazis) who hated people because of their race, and the political Left (Communists) who hated people because of their economic class were *political* extremists. People who believe their own religion is the only true religion and other faiths should be destroyed are *religious* extremists.

Fertile Crescent

A historic region in the Middle East running in an arc from modern Iraq through the Holy Land and down into Egypt. It is called "fertile" because its roughly 500,000 square kilometers is watered by the Nile, Jordan, Tigris and Euphrates rivers. Today this area corresponds to the modern nations of Egypt, Israel, Lebanon and parts of Jordan, Syria, Iraq, Iran, and Turkey. The modern population of the river basins of the Nile, Jordan, Tigris and Euphrates rivers is about 120,000,000 people, roughly a third of the population of the Middle East.

freedom fighters

In an attempt to suggest some sort of moral equivalency between soldiers actually liberating people (USA and Britain liberating occupied France after D-Day in 1944) and troops attempting to install a Communist government by force (no nation ever voted in a one-party police state Communist government in a free election), defenders of totalitarian political parties, or terrorist groups they sponsor, use the phrase "one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter." It is a false comparison because no Communist, Nazi or terrorist ever set anyone *free*.

French Revolution

Began in 1789 with the storming of the Bastille, the royal prison in Paris, and ended in 1799 when general Napoleon Bonaparte assumed dictatorial powers. It was one the most important events in modern European political history (the Industrial Revolution beginning in England about this time constituted the most important economic transformation of modern times). During this period, the mob overthrew and later executed the most famous royal family in Europe, ended the privileges of the landed aristocracy, and broke the power of the Catholic Church. When the hopes of the common people turned to fear during the Reign of Terror (1793-94), a young general named Napoleon Bonaparte used the army to take power in a coup d'état. He later made himself emperor (1804-14) and, through brilliant generalship, conquered much of Europe. His final defeat at the Battle of Waterloo in 1815 ushered in a century of peace that only ended in 1914 with the beginning of World War I.

Fundamentalism, religious	The attempt to reclaim sacred authority and to use it to reshape civil and political society. Fundamentalists argue that society should conform to religious not secular laws.
Geneva Conventions on War	Treaties created in Geneva, Switzerland that set the international standards for conducting warfare. As of 2006, 194 countries have ratified this effort to reduce unnecessary suffering among both the military and civilians.
germ warfare	The use of viruses or bacteria to incapacitate or kill opponents. This type of terror weapon would be most effective in crowded urban areas.
genocide	The intentional, systematic killing of an entire national or ethnic group, such as occurred in World War I when the Turks killed or starved to death hundreds of thousands of Christian Armenians, or during World War II when the Nazis murdered millions of Jews for the crime of being Jewish.
Gorbachev, Mikhail	(b.1931) Seventh leader of the Soviet Union. A humane man who assumed power in 1985, his attempts to reform his country (<i>glasnost</i> = openness and <i>perestroika</i> = restructuring) brought him a Nobel Peace Prize, but led to an attempted coup by hard-line Communists and the eventual collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. In 1996, Boris Yeltsin became the first elected president of Russia. Vladimir Putin has been the current president since 1999.
Gulag	Russian acronym for the hundreds of slave labor camps that were spread over 4,000 miles of the Soviet Union from the Baltic to the Pacific. During the decades following the Russian Revolution of 1917, millions of political prisoners worked for the state in inhuman conditions building dams and factories, digging canals, and mining for coal and precious minerals. Fear of being sent to such camps helped repress political opposition within the Soviet Union. Millions lost their lives from exhaustion, poor diet, and maltreatment by the guards. The free world first learned of the details of such camps when Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's 1800-page nonfiction narrative, <i>Gulag Archipelago</i> , appeared in the West in 1973. After World War II ended, the Allies hanged Nazi officials for running slave labor camps similar to the ones the Communists operated for generations.
Hamas	Arabic for "Islamic Resistance Movement." A Palestinian Sunni Islamist (Muslims who believe Islam is a political system as well as a religion and should guide society and the economy as well as the personal lives of individual) terror organization that currently makes up a majority of the Palestinian National Authority. Founded in 1987, it calls for the creation of a Palestinian Muslim state in what is today Israel, Gaza, and the West Bank. It is known chiefly for suicide bombings of Jewish civilians and Israeli military personnel.
Hezbollah,	Arabic for "Party of God." A Shi'ite Islamist (Muslims who believe Islam is a political system as well as a religion and should guide society and the economy as well as the personal lives of individual) terror organization located in Lebanon which comprises both an armed militia that carries out

attacks on Israel and a political wing that participates in the government. The 2006 war in Lebanon between Israel and Hezbollah was sparked by their kidnapping of Israeli soldiers in a cross-border raid. Hundreds of Hezbollah rockets were fired into Israel and there was much destruction of civilian property in southern Lebanon as the Israeli army and air force attempted, with limited success, to destroy Hezbollah rocket launchers and drive the terrorists away from the border with Israel.

Holocaust

The systematic murder of millions of Jews by the Nazis during World War II, ending centuries of Jewish life in Europe. This is the most thoroughly documented mass murder in history because the Germans kept careful records of these killings, and their own documents were used against them in the war crimes trials after 1945.

horizontal terror

Term coined by the author of this article to represent the use of terrorists by one nation against another nation in order to destabilize it and, by doing so, reduce its power and influence.

ideology

A set of beliefs upon which a political, economic, or social system is based.

imperialism/empire

Generally speaking, a government, under a single ruler (usually, but not always, an emperor or empress), that maintains control, through military or economic power, over lands and populations that are distinct from the mother country. The major nations involved in World War I were empires (note that even the United States could be ranked as an empire because it had won control of Guam, the Philippines, and Puerto Rico from Spain in the brief Spanish-American War of 1898).

International Monetary Fund

(IMF) International organization affiliated with the United Nations whose task it is to develop international monetary cooperation. It was established in 1944 (during World War II) at the Bretton Woods Conference and began functioning in 1947 by extending credit to stabilize currency exchange rates.

Iranian Revolution

In January of 1979, the Shah of Iran leaves the country in the hope his absence will reduce the civil unrest. The following month Ayatollah Khomeini (see below) returns from exile and launched the Iranian Revolution. Mass executions of the Shah's supporters, as well as anyone who might hinder the creation of an Islamist state, quickly follow. A republic based on the Koran is declared in April. In November, over fifty American citizens are taken by force from the U. S. embassy in Tehran and held for 444 days.

Iron Curtain

Term for self-imposed isolation of European Communist countries during and after the dictatorship of the Soviet Union's Joseph Stalin from the end of World War II in 1945 to the collapse of Communism in Eastern Europe in 1989. The purpose of closing borders and severely restricting travel outside of Communist countries was to reduce knowledge of the free world, to prevent information about the failures of Communism from reaching the outside world, to prevent citizens from defecting to the West, and (in the case of the Berlin Wall) to prevent the loss of valuable workers

seeking political freedom and a better life in free market democracies in Western Europe or the United States. The term, representing the physical and ideological division of Europe, was made popular by Winston Churchill in a famous speech he gave in Fulton, Missouri in 1946. He said, “From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic an “iron curtain” has descended across the Continent. Behind that line lie all the capitals of the ancient states of Central and Eastern Europe...in what I must call the Soviet sphere...”

Islam

One of the great world religions, founded by the Prophet Mohammed in the 600s. The word means “submission to God.” A “Muslim” is one who has submitted to the will of God.

Islamism

Refers to Muslims who believe Islam is a political system as well as a religion and should guide society and the economy as well as the personal lives of individual Muslims.

isolationism

The belief that one’s nation should remain aloof from the conflicts of other nations. During the 1930s, as Germany, Japan, and Italy threatened Europe and Asia with a second world conflict, many Americans argued against the United States getting involved in another European war just a generation after 100,000 Americans had died helping Britain and France defeat the Kaiser’s Germany. This sentiment evaporated with the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in December 7, 1941.

Jihad

From the Arabic word for *utmost effort* or *struggle*. Although it can refer to a spiritual struggle within a person, or waging war against evil through scholarship, writings, sermons, or making religious pilgrimages, in this sense it refers to violence to further the cause of Islam.

KGB

Komitet Gosudarstvennoy Bezopasnosti – in English: “Committee for State Security” – the secret security service (in earlier times it was known as the Cheka, OGPU, NKVD, and MGB) that used terror to keep the Communist Party in power in Russia from 1917 to its collapse in 1991. In addition to espionage and counter-intelligence, the organization ran the Gulag (hundreds of slave labor camps that were spread over 4,000 miles from the Baltic to the Pacific), executed the “enemies of the state,” and patrolled the extensive borders of the Soviet Union. They controlled the links between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and those in all foreign countries. It is now the Ministry of State Security. Since 1991, Vladimir Putin, a former KGB officer, has been the President of the Russian Federation.

Khomeini, Ayatollah

(1901-1989) Leader of the 1979 Iranian Revolution that overthrew the government of the Shah and replaced it with a radical Islamist state that swore death to the United States and called for the destruction of Israel.

Koran

The holy book of Islam. The literal Word of Allah as dictated by the Supreme Being through Mohammed.

League of Nations

(1920-1946) World organization created in the aftermath of World War I in the hope that negotiations between the member states (there were 63 at

various times) would reduce tensions worldwide and prevent other such costly wars. President Wilson worked hard to see the organization thrive, but neither the United States nor the Soviet Union joined. Because it had no way of enforcing its edicts, it was unable to prevent Japan's conquest of Manchuria in 1931, Italy's invasion of Abyssinia (Ethiopia) in 1935, nor the German invasion of Poland in 1939 that sparked World War II.

Left (political)

Designation stems from the seating arrangement in the French National Assembly of 1789, at the beginning of the French Revolution. The radicals were seated to the *left* of the presiding officer and the more conservative members sat on his *right*. In the *center* were the moderate legislators. Today, the more liberal groups in a nation's legislature (Democrats in the United States or the Labour Party in Britain) are referred to as being on the *Left*. Generally speaking, parties on the political Left favor equality of result over equality of opportunity, and emphasize wealth redistribution (through progressive taxes) over wealth creation to protect the less successful members of society. On the Far (extreme) Left are the Communists, who denounce elections and negotiations between political parties as horse-trading, and insist upon obedience of all citizens to a single party. They reject the idea of compromise, the rule of law rather than of men, and the peaceful transfer of power between parties following elections.

Lenin, Vladimir I.

(1870-1924) Radical Marxist leader of the Bolshevik Party that seized power in Russia during the Russian Revolution of 1917. His embalmed body is still on display in Moscow.

Marx, Karl

(1818-1883) The "Father of Communism." With Friedrich Engels, he wrote the *Communist Manifesto* of 1848, one of the most influential political documents of all time (the "Magna Carta" for a workers' revolution to overthrow capitalism and create a classless society), and *Das Kapital* (an in-depth analysis of the workings of capitalism). V. I. Lenin used Marx's ideas as an intellectual foundation upon which to create Communism in Russia after 1917.

Marxists

The main aspects of Marxism are:

1. *Labor Theory of Value* (the value of an item is determined by the amount of labor required to produce it, not by the interplay of the supply of the item and the demand for it, as in a free market).
2. *Materialist conception of history* (mankind's situation is determined by economic factors more than any other).
3. *Iron Law of Wages* (any rise in the overall level of workers' wages will result in a slight temporary improvement in their wellbeing which, in turn, will produce a rise in population. These additional mouths will drive the overall level of wages back down to subsistence levels)
4. *Class Struggle* (from nomadic hunting, to pastoral life, to farming, to trade, and finally to industry, history has been a series of struggles between the class of poor workers and the class above them that owned the means of production. One class overcomes the class that has been exploiting it and is, in turn, overcome by the class it proceeds to exploit)
5. *Violent Revolution* (only when workers own the means of producing wealth – mines, machinery, transportation, factories, land – will they cease to be exploited).

This can only be accomplished by overthrowing the middle classes who own the means of production and exploit the workers for a profit)

6. *Economic Determinism* (political or historical developments are determined by the underlying economic system)

7. *Dictatorship of the Proletariat* (revolutionary violence is unavoidable in order for the workers to overthrow the middle classes that are exploiting them. All other political parties must be banned in favor of revolutionary party narrowly dedicated to the needs of the working class and, Lenin later added, should be led by a vanguard of professional revolutionaries - like his Bolsheviks)

8. *Atheism* (religion was invented by the powerful elites to prevent the poor from fully understanding their plight by offering them rewards after death for quietly enduring poverty while alive)

9. *Withering Away of the State* (once pure communism has been achieved, plenty will replace poverty and government itself will no longer be needed)

Mein Kampf

Hitler's book, first published in 1925, outlining his ideas about race and his plans to restore Germany to greatness after he achieved high political office. His intentions were made quite clear in this book, but most people chose to believe his threats about harming the Jews, his denouncement of democracy, and his promise to use the military to seize land from Russia were merely boasts for domestic consumption and that he would become a traditional statesman once he attained power in Germany.

Middle Ages

It represents the centuries between the end of the Classical world (imperial Rome ended 476AD) and the beginning of the modern world (the Renaissance that began in Italy in the 1400s and the Reformation sparked by Martin Luther's protests against the Catholic Church in 1517).

Mohammed

Mohammed may be the only man in history who was supremely successful in both religion and politics. Born to humble parents in a desert lacking even a sufficient supply of water, he used the new religion he created to transform polytheistic (the worship of many gods) Arab clans into a nation built upon a common monotheistic faith rather than on tribal loyalties. After his death in 632AD, his followers united the Arabian Peninsula and went on to conquer Mesopotamia and Egypt, the ancient heartland of Western Civilization.

Within a century of his death, Muslim generals gained control of the Middle East, North Africa, and Persia, before pressing on to India in the east and Spain in the west. Only a defeat in France at the hands of Charlemagne's grandfather in 732AD ended a century of unbroken Arab victories. A Christian victory in the Battle of Tours may have prevented a defenseless Western Europe from becoming a part of an Islamic Empire stretching from the Atlantic to India, the Bible from being supplanted by the Koran, and the New World being settled by Muslims rather than Christians.

In the opinion of many historians, an unparalleled combination of secular and religious influence makes Mohammed the single most influential figure in human history.

Mufti

A Muslim scholar who interprets or expounds on Islamic law and is capable of issuing a "fatwa," or legal pronouncement.

Mullahs	Revered Islamic scholars regarded as authorities of the Koran, as well as Islamic law and traditions.
Nasser, Gamal Abdel	(1918-1970) Egyptian president and leader of the Arab world. He ended the British military presence in 1954 and seized the Suez Canal two years later. He led his nation into the disastrous war with Israel in 1967. He was followed into power by Anwar Sadat (1918-1981), who expelled the Soviet military and won the 1978 Nobel Peace Prize for making peace with Israel. In 1981, he paid for that effort with his life when he was murdered in public by fanatical army officers.
nationalism	The love of one's own country over all others. It is more than patriotism, because it suggests identification with national rather than regional political units.
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization. A military alliance between the United States and several Western European nations created to oppose the expansion of Soviet power into that part of the continent. This alliance, along with the Marshall Plan to feed and rebuild war torn Europe, were sponsored by the Truman administration. Truman, who had replaced Franklin Roosevelt in 1945, worried that the Communists would take advantage of the fear, mass unemployment, and hunger to expand their influence into the nations of Western Europe liberated by the British and American armies. This fear was not unfounded, as the Communists were the largest political parties in Italy and France at that time, and recently opened files in Moscow dating to this period clearly show Stalin would have liked to have gained control of Western Europe as far as the English Channel - if he could have done so without having to fight the Americans. (see "Containment Policy")
nuclear device (weapon)	An atomic bomb, whether dropped from an aircraft, sent over a continent on a ballistic missile, or carried into a major city in a truck driven by a terrorist.
Ottoman Empire	At its height during the 1500s, the Ottoman Empire stretched from the Persian Gulf and the Black Sea in the east to Budapest, Hungary in the north and Algiers in North Africa in the west. In 1453, Constantinople fell to the Ottoman Turks, and from that great city Muslim armies advanced into Europe by way of the Balkans. Vienna, Austria barely escaped capture in 1529. During the 1700s and 1800s the decaying empire fought against Russian moves to gain a warm water port by capturing Constantinople and the Straits that lead from there into the Mediterranean. During World War I, the Turks sided with the Germans and were defeated. A Turkish republic was proclaimed in 1922.
Patriot Act	Law passed by large majorities of both political parties (98 to 1 in the Senate and 357 to 66 in the House) in the U. S. Congress the month after the 9/11 attack. It was meant to strengthen America's law enforcement agencies in their efforts against terrorists by vastly increasing their powers. It was passed again, with some modifications, in March of 2006 by a vote of (89 to 11 in the Senate and 280 to 138 in the House). The

differences in votes on the second law generally reflect an increase in Democratic opposition to the bill in the five years since 2001.

Prohibition

A period in American history between 1920 and 1933 when the federal government prohibited the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages. This was accomplished by the 18th Amendment to the Constitution in 1919 and repealed by the 21st Amendment in 1933. It was a noble experiment that failed due to the fact that alcohol was too popular with the public, the expense of enforcing the ban on liquor was too high, and the creation of a continental-sized black market for alcohol diverted tax revenues from the Treasury into the hands of gangster who provided it. This income made the organized crime families politically powerful and wealthy beyond anything they might have accomplished had the government not banned liquor in the first place. The government removed the *supply* of legal liquor, but failed to remove the *demand* for it among a public that was used to drinking it.

Protocols of Zion

A literary hoax, possibly created by the secret police of the Russian Tsar in the late 1800s. It purports to be a plan by Jewish elders to take over the world through control of the media and domination of the world of high finance. Although this book has been repeatedly shown to be a forgery, the Nazis used it to further their mistreatment of the Jews. Today, this book can be found in book shops in the Muslim nations of the Middle East, where it is taken by the public as proof of the evils posed by Israel and by Jews living around the world. Terrorist groups such as Hezbollah, Hamas, and the PLO swear the book is accurate.

radical

Not moderate. One who favors fundamental or extreme changes in politics or religion. The opposite of being politically or religiously moderate.

Red Army

The army of the Soviet Union.

Reformation

Generations of religious and political upheaval in Western Europe, sparked in 1517 by Martin Luther's public protests against the corruption and worldliness of the Roman Catholic Church. Many German princes, following Luther's teachings, refused to send wealth from Germany to Italy in the form of papal tithes, and confiscated large tracts of German land owned by the Church. Peasant revolts broke out and civil wars within the German lands went on for generations as various princes fought to reduce the power of the Holy Roman Empire, using religious differences as an excuse for the bloodshed. Some stability was finally achieved by the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, which signalled the beginning of the modern era by ending the religious warfare between Protestants and Catholics and ushering in the modern nation-states we know today.

Reign of Terror

(1793-94) A period during the French Revolution in which the government felt the need to imprison or execute those citizens it believed were not sufficiently loyal to the revolution, as well as spies, saboteurs, and those wishing to restore some form of monarchy. The Terror ended the lives of between 18,000 and 40,000 people, depending on which source one uses, including many of the original revolutionary leaders.

Renaissance

In the traditional view, the period is understood as an *historical age* that followed the Middle Ages. It represented a reconnection of the West with Classical antiquity (ancient Greece and Rome), an explosion of knowledge brought on by the invention of printing with movable type, and the creation of new techniques in art and architecture. In this period Europe emerged from a long period of feudalism into a time of commerce and exploration. It is often labeled as the beginning of the “modern” epoch.

rogue nations

Many of the world’s governing classes mistreat their own citizens, but “rogue nations” are those whose conduct threatens *other* nations in ways that could draw them into a conflict. Today, the U. S. government insists that North Korea and Iran are rogue nations.

Russian Revolution

Contrary to Communist propaganda, the Communists did not overthrow the Tsar in 1917; they overthrew the democratically elected government that took power *after* the Tsar abdicated the throne. The Bolsheviks renamed themselves Communists, and immediately moved to ban all other political parties, end personal freedoms, and sought to spread their revolution around the world.

secular

Non-religious. Having to do with worldly concerns rather than those of a religious nature. Secularism is a belief that religion should not enter into the functions of government. Secularists favor the separation of church and state.

Shi’ites

These are members of an Islamic sect who are opposed to the orthodox Sunnis. They reject the first three Caliphs (successors to Mohammed). Instead, they favor descendants of Mohammed’s son-in-law, Ali, as the rightful leaders of Islam and honor different accounts of the Prophet’s life. The Shia number approximately 50,000,000 and are concentrated in Iraq and Iran.

Slavs

Largest European ethnic and language group concentrated in Central Europe, Eastern Europe, and Siberia. They are divided into Eastern Slavs (Russians, Ukrainians, and Belorussians), Western Slavs (Czechs, Slovaks, and Poles), and South Slavs (Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Bulgarians, Montenegrins, and Macedonians)

Soviet Union

A “soviet” is a government council, and the correct name after 1924 was Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a collection of fifteen “republics” of varying size (Russia was by far the largest unit) encompassing over 8,600,000 square miles of territory from the Black Sea to the Arctic Ocean and from the Pacific to the Baltic Sea and ruled from Moscow. When it collapsed in 1991, nearly all of the territory captured by Russia since Tsar Peter the Great (1672-1725) began to shake free of Moscow’s centralized control. The Soviet Union was a Third World nation with a first class military. It collapsed from within due to a poorly functioning economy, the vast expenditures lavished on a military far larger than it needed for national defense, and the costs of maintaining large armed forces in satellite nations in Eastern Europe in order to keep in place Communist governments loyal to Moscow. No other empire in world history lost that much territory without losing a war.

Stalin, Joseph	Brutal dictator of the Soviet Union between 1928 and his death in 1953. Millions of Russians died during those years from manmade famines, maltreatment in slave labor camps, and from outright executions by his secret police.
Stoicism	Philosophical system, founded by Zeno of Citium (c. 336-c. 264BC), that teaches that all things, relations, and properties are governed by natural laws, and that a wise man should follow virtue alone, being indifferent to both pleasure and pain.
Suez Canal	Hundred mile long ship canal through Egypt linking the Red Sea and the Mediterranean. It reduced the distance from Britain around Africa to India by 4,000 miles, and was a major commercial waterway since it opened in 1869.
Sunni	The orthodox followers of Mohammed who constitute a majority of Muslims.
Taliban	Sunni fundamentalist fighters who ruled parts of Afghanistan between 1996 and 2001. They gained control of much of the country by taking advantage of the power vacuum created by the retreat of the Soviet Red Army from Afghanistan a few years earlier. Their religious beliefs are exceedingly strict and their punishments for failure to observe their version of Islamic law are severe. After the September 11, 2001 the U. S. government declared that Osama bin Laden was the mastermind behind the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, and that he and his fighters were hiding in Afghanistan. The Americans demanded that the Taliban hand bin Laden and the Al Qaeda leadership over for trial and to close the terror training camps in their country. They refused. The U. S., Britain, and a coalition of NATO nations fought the Taliban gained control of the Afghan government. The Taliban took to the hills to continue a guerrilla war against the pro-American government installed in Kabul.
totalitarian	A severe dictatorship in which the rule of law is suspended and the most vital department of government is the secret police. Obedience to the government is enforced by terrorism in order to root out all dissent among its citizens.
theocracy	A government ruled by the clergy.
Third World	The underdeveloped “emerging” nations in parts of Africa, Asia, and the Middle East that were colonies until after World War II. The First World constituted the Western nations and the Second World was made up of Communist countries, although these two terms are seldom used.
Tours, Battle of	(732AD) A great Christian victory, won by Charles Martel (Charlemagne’s grandfather) over an invading Muslim army near Tours, France prevented the Arab conquest of Western Europe. It preserved the foundation of Judeo-Christian civilization based on the the ideas of ancient Greece and the legal structures of Rome.

During the century between the death of the Prophet in 632AD and this battle, Islamic armies seemed unstoppable. Brilliant victories had given Mohammed's successors possession of the old Persian Empire and half of the Christian lands in North Africa and the Middle East. When an army from Muslim Spain entered France seeking more tribute and territory, their success seemed assured. This battle, which was narrowly won, made it possible for European Christianity to survive intact until Martin Luther's protests against the corruption and worldiness of the Church in 1517 brought on the Reformation and split Christendom permanently into Catholics and Protestants.

The invading Muslim forces defeated by Martel had entered France to set up permanent outposts for further expansion. Proof that Tours was one of the most important military and political events in Western history is found in the fact that it would be seven centuries before the Muslim armies of the Ottoman Turks managed to invade Europe again via the Balkans.

It is hard to imagine the Renaissance taking place under the rule of a religion that strictly forbids the depiction of images of humans, and it is anyone's guess what direction scientific inquiry might have taken under fundamentalist Islamic rulers who regarded the Koran as possessing all that men needed to know. Charles Martel's victory also had implications beyond politics and science. It assured that Columbus would carry the religion of Christ, not Mohammed, to the New World in 1492.

Truman, Harry S.

(1884-1972) 33rd President of the United States who served between 1945 and 1953. Became president upon the death of Franklin Roosevelt just before Germany surrendered to the Allies. Oversaw the reconstruction of post-World War II Europe with the Marshall Plan. Created the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), a military alliance between the U. S. and several Western European nations, to oppose the expansion of Soviet power into Western Europe. Sent American troops to South Korea when it was invaded by the North Korean Communists in 1950. Fired MacArthur as senior commander in Korea for insubordination, despite his immense popularity with the American public, when the general refused to abide by the policies of the Truman administration. Extremely unpopular by the time he left office, he is now regarded as one of the better U. S. presidents.

Truman Doctrine

1947 declaration by President Truman that the United States would support "free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures" (specifically the effort by Communists allied with Stalin's Soviet Union to overthrow the governments of Greece and Turkey).

vertical terror

Term coined by the author of this article to represent violence, or the threat of violence, by a governing elite against their own citizens in order to retain power or force compliance with their policies.

Waffen-SS

World War II German military divisions, under the command of Heinrich Himmler, leader of the SS, composed of Nazi Party members rather than

regular German troops. Some of the units committed war crimes against prisoners of war and civilians.

weapons of mass destruction

(WMD) Nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons with the potential to kill great numbers of people or to destroy large areas of a given territory.

Weimar Republic

Weak parliamentary democracy imposed on the defeated Germans following World War I. It lasted until Hitler overthrew it legally from within following his appointment as Chancellor in January of 1933.

Western civilization

The heritage of European people, and their descendents, living overseas. It can be traced culturally back to the Greeks and Romans of Classical times, through the Renaissance, Reformation, and the Enlightenment. It can be traced politically to the American and French Revolutions. Economically, it was greatly affected by the Industrial Revolution, when steam power and modern weapons helped spread European power around the globe. Ethically and religiously, it is a mixture of Judeo-Christian-Islamic culture and traditions. It is characterized by, among other things, participatory democracy, religious toleration, rational inquiry, and free market capitalist economies. It represents a cultural tradition that began around the Mediterranean Sea and remained in Western Europe for centuries before traveling around the earth with European explorers and imperialists.

World Bank

International organization affiliated with the United Nations whose task it is to lend money to member states for investments, repayment of debts, and for foreign trade. It was established, along with the International Monetary Fund, in 1944 (during World War II) at the Bretton Woods Conference.

World Trade Center

Twin business towers rising 1,350 feet (110 stories) above the Lower West Side of Manhattan in New York City. They were both destroyed on September 11, 2001 by terrorists using passenger jets as weapons. Approximately 3,000 people died in the buildings, at the Pentagon in Washington, DC, and on United Airlines Flight 93, a commercial jet that crashed into a field when the passengers realized they were probably going to be used in a similar attack and attempted to prevent that from happening. It was the worst single day of carnage for Americans since the Civil War and the first military attack on America's capital since the War of 1812.

SUGGESTED READING

Beyond Terror: Strategy in a Changing World

by Ralph Peters

Stackpole Books, New York. 2002. ISBN: 0-8117-0024-0

The Lessons of Terrorism

by Caleb Carr

Random House, New York. 2002. ISBN: 0-375-50843-0

The Clash of Civilizations

by Samuel P. Huntington

Simon and Schuster, New York. 1996. ISBN: 0-684-81164-2

The Terror Network: Secret War of International Terrorism

by Claire Sterling

Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York. 1981. ISBN: 0-03-050661-1

Thieves' World: Threat of the New Global Network of Organized Crime

by Claire Sterling

Simon and Schuster, New York. 1994. ISBN: 0-671-874997-8

Nazis, Communists, Klansmen, and Others on the Fringe

by John George and Laird Wilcox

Prometheus Books, Buffalo, NY. 1992. ISBN: 0-87975-680-2

The Crisis of Islam

by Bernard Lewis

Random House Trade Paperbacks, Buffalo, NY. 2004. ISBN: 0-8129-6785-2

Wikipedia article: Mohammad Amin al-Husayni, Grand Mufti of Jerusalem

Note the close relations, both before and during World War II, between the Third Reich and the anti-Semitic elements in the Middle East which led to the creation of the Ba'ath Party in Syria during World War II.
