

ESSAYS ON APPEASEMENT

<http://academic.brooklyn.cuny.edu/history/johnson/munichdebate.htm>

The British Parliamentary Debate on the Munich Agreement

From *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th series, vol.339 (1938), cols 30, 31-34, 39, 40, 47-52, 54, 56-58, 62-63, 150-154, 162, 360-369, 373, 548-553.

PRIME MINISTER NEVILLE CHAMBERLAIN, HOUSE OF COMMONS, OCTOBER 3, 1938.

In my view the strongest force of all, one which grew and took fresh shapes and forms every day was the force not of any one individual, but was that unmistakable sense of unanimity among the peoples of the world that war somehow must be averted. The peoples of the British Empire were at one with those of Germany, of France and of Italy, and their anxiety, their intense desire for peace, pervaded the whole atmosphere of the conference, and I believe that that, and not threats, made possible the Concessions that were made....

Ever since I assumed my present office my main purpose has been to work for the pacification of Europe, for the removal of those suspicions and those animosities which have so long poisoned the air. The path which leads to appeasement is long and bristles with obstacles. The question of Czechoslovakia is the latest and perhaps the most dangerous. Now that we have got past it, I feel that it may be possible to make further progress along the road to sanity.

My right hon. Friend [Duff Cooper] has alluded in somewhat bitter terms to my conversation last Friday morning with Herr Hitler. I do not know why that conversation should give rise to suspicion, still less to criticism. I entered into no pact. I made no new commitments. There is no secret understanding. Our conversation was hostile to no other nation. The objects of that conversation, for which I asked, was to try to extend a little further the personal Contact which I had established with Herr Hitler and which I believe to be essential in modern diplomacy. We had a friendly and entirely non-committal conversation, carried on, on my part, largely with a view to seeing whether there could be points in common between the head of a democratic Government and the ruler of a totalitarian State. We see the result in the declaration which has been published, in which my right hon. Friend finds so much ground for suspicion....

I believe there are many who will feel with me that such a declaration, signed by the German Chancellor and myself, is something more than a pious expression of opinion. In our relations with other countries everything depends upon there being sincerity and good will on both sides. I believe that there is sincerity and good will on both sides in this declaration. That is why to me its significance goes far beyond its actual words. If there is one lesson which we should learn from the events of these last weeks it is this, that lasting peace is not to be obtained by sitting still and waiting for it to come. It requires active, positive efforts to achieve it. No doubt I shall have plenty of critics who will say that I am guilty of facile optimism, and that I should disbelieve every word that is uttered by rulers of other great States in Europe. I am too much of a realist to believe that we are going to achieve our paradise in a day. We have only laid the foundations of peace. The superstructure is not even begun....

While we must renew our determination to fill up the deficiencies that yet remain in our armaments and in our defensive precautions, so that we may be ready to defend ourselves and make our diplomacy effective--

[Interruption]--yes I am a realist--nevertheless I say with an equal sense of reality that I do see fresh opportunities of approaching this subject of disarmament opening up before us, and I believe that they are at least as hopeful to-day as they have been at any previous time. It is to such tasks--the winning back of confidence, the gradual removal of hostility between nations until they feel that they can safely discard their weapons, one by one, that I would wish to devote what energy and time may be left to me before I hand over my office to younger men.

CLEMENT ATTLEE, HOUSE OF COMMONS, OCTOBER 3, 1938.

We all feel relief that war has not come this time. Every one of us has been passing through days of anxiety; we cannot, however, feel that peace has been established, but that we have nothing but an armistice in a state of war. We have been unable to go in for carefree rejoicing. We have felt that we are in the midst of a tragedy. We have felt humiliation. This has not been a victory for reason and humanity. It has been a victory for brute force. At every stage of the proceedings there have been time limits laid down by the owner and ruler of armed force. The terms have not been terms negotiated; they have been terms laid down as ultimata. We have seen today a gallant, civilised and democratic people betrayed and handed over to a ruthless despotism. We have seen something more. We have seen the cause of democracy, which is, in our view, the cause of civilisation and humanity, receive a terrible defeat.

I think that in the mind of every thoughtful person in this Country when he heard that this settlement had been arrived at at Munich, there was a conflict. On the one hand there was enormous relief that war had been averted, at all events for the time being; on the other, there was a sense of humiliation and foreboding for the future....

The events of these last few days constitute one of the greatest diplomatic defeats that this country and France have ever sustained. There can be no doubt that it is a tremendous victory for Herr Hitler. Without firing a shot, by the mere display of military force, he has achieved a dominating position in Europe which Germany failed to win after four years of war. He has overturned the balance of power in Europe. He has destroyed the last fortress of democracy in Eastern Europe which stood in the way of his ambition. He has opened his way to the food, the oil and the resources which he requires in order to consolidate his military power, and he has successfully defeated and reduced to impotence the forces that might have stood against the rule of violence.

The Prime Minister has given us an account of his actions. Everybody recognises the great exertions he has made in the cause of peace. When the captain of a ship by disregarding all rules of navigation has gone right off his course and run the ship into great danger, watchers from the shore, naturally impressed with the captain's frantic efforts to try to save something from the shipwreck, cheer him when he comes ashore and even want to give him a testimonial, but there follows an inquiry, an inquest, on the victims, and the question will be asked how the vessel got so far off its course, how and why it was so hazarded? All the faults of seamanship and errors of judgment must be brought to light, and no amount of devotion at the eleventh hour will save that captain from the verdict that he has hazarded his ship through bad seamanship. Parliament is the grand inquest of the British nation, and it is our duty to inquire not alone into the actions of the Prime Minister during the last few days or the last few weeks, but into the whole course of policy which has brought this country into such great danger and such great anxiety....

I want to turn now to the cause of the crisis which we have undergone. The cause was not the existence of minorities in Czechoslovakia; it was not that the position of the Sudeten Germans had become intolerable. It was not the wonderful principle of self-determination. It was because Herr Hitler had decided that the time was ripe for another step forward in his design to dominate Europe. I think it is necessary to be clear on this, because the Prime Minister seems to me to be laying a great deal too much stress on the anxiety of Herr Hitler for his fellow-Germans in Czechoslovakia. I have no doubt that has been so, but it did not become intense until about two years ago. It was quite a minor matter, and I fear that the Prime Minister is deceived if he thinks that the cause of this trouble has been the woes of the Sudeten Germans. I say that the question of the Sudeten Germans has been used as a counter in the game of politics, and in other conditions Herr Hitler might just as well have used the people of Memel, the people of South Denmark, the people in the Trentino or the Germans in South Tyrol....

The history of the last seven years is the background of this crisis, and the first point I must make to the Government is this. This crisis did not come unexpectedly. It was obvious to any intelligent student of foreign affairs that this attack would come. The immediate signal was given by the Prime Minister himself on 7th March of this year when he said: "What country in Europe today if threatened by a larger Power can rely upon the League for protection? None." It was at once an invitation to Herr Hitler and a confession of the failure of the Government. The invitation was accepted a few days later by the Anschluss in Austria. Then our Government and the French Government could have faced the consequences. They could have told Czechoslovakia "We cannot any longer defend you. You had better now make the best terms you can with Germany, enter her political orbit and give her anything to escape before the wrath comes upon you." But they did nothing of the sort. Czechoslovakia continued under the supposed shelter of these treaties. True, it was urged that something should be done for the Sudeten Germans but there was no attempt made to take early steps to prevent this aggression....

I heard a suggestion from the benches opposite. "What about the U.S.S.R.?" Throughout the whole of these proceedings the U.S.S.R. has stood by its pledges and its declarations and there has been some pretty hard lying about it, too. There have been lies told, and people knew they were lies, about alleged conversations between M. Litvinoff and the French Foreign Minister. At no time has there been any difficulty in knowing where the U.S.S.R. stood. At no time has there been any consultation. I am aware that the Prime Minister may say that we were not the prime factor in this problem and that we were only concerned after France had been brought into it. But we have had very close collaboration with France, and in the order of commitment the U.S.S.R. comes before this country, and it has been a very great weakness that throughout there has been this cold-shouldering of the U.S.S.R....

When the National Government overthrew the whole policy of collective security and abandoned it and the League, we told this House over and over again that we were entering on a very dangerous course. We realised that we were back in 1914 with all its dangers, and we knew that sooner or later a challenge would come to this country; and that is what has happened. The real pith of it is that, having decided to leave the League system which we practised and in which we believed, and to embark on a policy of alliances and power politics, instead of strengthening the people whose natural interests were with ours, we have had nothing but constant flirtations with this and that dictator. The Prime Minister has been the dupe of the dictators, and I say that to-day we are in a dangerous position.

SIR SAMUEL HOARE, SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT, HOUSE OF COMMONS, OCTOBER 3, 1938.

....A week ago we were on the verge of a terrible abyss. The Hon. Member for Bishop Auckland (Mr. Dalton), who has just sat down, seemed to have forgotten the position in which we were then placed. The speech that he has just made seemed to take little account of the fact that a few days ago we were within a hair's breadth of the greatest catastrophe that the world has ever seen. Did we shrink from it in fear, or did we feel that there was some hope still of finding a path round it to more solid ground? I am fully aware that there are some hon. Members, and some people in the Country, who believe that no peace is possible in Europe as long as the dictatorships exist, who hold, quite sincerely, the view--I think the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down does--that as long as the dictatorships exist, war is inevitable, and that it may be better to have war now, when we have an issue that may be supposed to appeal to the whole world, rather than to put it off to some future date when our position may be more difficult and dangerous. ...

The conclusion of such a view is to me so appalling that I could not accept it if I thought there was still some glimmer of hope that the catastrophe might yet be averted. What is more important, the Prime Minister had that settled conviction. It was on that account that he made his superhuman efforts at great risk to himself, at great risk to the Government of which he is a member--but these things do not count in moments of this gravity--to take upon himself the responsibility of trying at the last moment to prevent this catastrophe coming upon us.

The Prime Minister acted not alone as the head of the Government of which I am a member. He acted rather as the spokesman of the millions of men and women from one end of the world to the other who were determined that we should still try to keep a controlling hand upon the course of events and avoid an appalling calamity that would undoubtedly have ended in the extinction of civilisation as we have known it. . . I claim that, having undertaken the responsibility of mediation, it would have been courting certain failure if at

one and the same time when he was attempting to mediate he engaged himself upon a policy of threats and ultimatums.

That is the answer to the main charge of my right Hon. Friend the Member for St. George's, Westminster (Mr. Cooper). I claim that it would have met certain failure if at the very time when we were attempting to mediate and to obtain a peaceful settlement, we had accepted the advice of those who said you must face Herr Hitler with a public ultimatum. I go further, and I say that if we had made an ultimatum in the days immediately before the Nuremberg speech Europe would to-day have been plunged into a world war....

The hon. Gentleman opposite asked me specifically about Russia. He asked me why there was not closer consultation in these critical weeks with the Government of the Soviet Republic. That Government was under a Treaty obligation similar to that of France, and dependent upon it, to go to the assistance of Czechoslovakia in certain circumstances. The Russian guarantee was only to come into operation when the French guarantee was already operating. M. Litvinoff indicated, indeed he made a public declaration at Geneva on 21st September, that the Soviet Government was ready to give all possible help if France came to the assistance of Czechoslovakia. As I have explained, that is all that Russia was under Treaty bound to do. Her action would have been consequent upon that of France, and it was therefore natural that there should have been consultation, as in fact there was, between France and the Soviet Republic and His Majesty's Government, in view of their different positions. We were content to let the French Government take the lead in consulting with the Russian Government, whose position was analogous to theirs. To say, as the hon. Gentleman said, that the Soviet Republic was cold-shouldered is a complete exaggeration of the position. The Foreign Secretary had an exchange of views with the Soviet Ambassador before the latter left, and at Geneva the British delegates maintained the contact. The Soviet Ambassador was received again, quite recently, at the Foreign Office, after his return to London. So much for the hon. Member's question about our attitude towards the Soviet Republic.

War has been averted; has the price paid been too high? I frankly admit that Czechoslovakia has received a staggering blow....

I say with all deliberation that, when once Germany rearmed and became powerful, and when once the Anschluss took place, the strategic frontier of the republic was turned. The Sudeten Germans looked to reunion with the Reich. [HON. MEMBERS: 'Reunion?'] To union with the Reich. It was reunion with a German State. Union with the Reich was the ideal that they were determined to achieve. Further than that, we faced the fact that owing to the geographical position of Czechoslovakia it mattered not who might win or lose the war, Czechoslovakia would almost inevitably be destroyed. Some said it would be a matter of days and others said a matter of weeks, but all were agreed who had studied the strategic position that it could not be a matter of more than a month or two. In the meanwhile, the republic would have been destroyed; immense slaughter would have taken place within its boundaries; devastation would have run riot. Supposing that at the end of the war we emerged the victors--and I have always believed, as every Member in this House believes, that in the final result we should emerge the victors--then we should be confronted with a position in which Czechoslovakia as we know it to-day would have been destroyed, and I do not believe that the negotiators of the peace treaty in any conditions would ever recreate its old frontiers....

The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, in a picturesque passage, spoke of the Prime Minister as the captain who had saved the ship which his bad seamanship had driven almost on to the rocks. When the time comes for the verdict to be given upon the Prime Minister's conduct, let me tell the right hon. Gentleman that none of us here fears that verdict. I believe that the criticisms to which we have listened in the House to-day very little represent the great body of feeling. I believe the great body of our fellow-citizens not only in this country but in the Dominions and in the whole Empire, are grateful to the Prime Minister for the efforts that he has made. They are grateful to the Prime Minister for having persistently sustained the policy of peace and mediation. They do not take the view that war is inevitable. They believe that under his wise guidance we may succeed in creating a new Europe in which men and women can go about their business in peace and security.

WINSTON CHURCHILL, HOUSE OF COMMONS, OCTOBER 5, 1938.

Having thus fortified myself by the example of others, I will proceed to emulate them. I will, therefore, begin by saying the most unpopular and most unwelcome thing. I will begin by saying what everybody would like to

ignore or forget but which must nevertheless be stated, namely, that we have sustained a total and unmitigated defeat, and that France has suffered even more than we have.

VISCOUNTESS ASTOR: Nonsense.

MR. CHURCHILL: When the Noble Lady cries "Nonsense," she could not have heard the Chancellor of the Exchequer [Sir John Simon] admit in his illuminating and comprehensive speech just now that Herr Hitler had gained in this particular leap forward in substance all he set out to gain. The utmost my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister has been able to secure by all his immense exertions, by all the great efforts and mobilisation which took place in this country, and by all the anguish and strain through which we have passed in this country, the utmost he has been able to gain--[HON. MEMBERS: "Is peace."]. I thought I might be allowed to make that point in its due place, and I propose to deal with it. The utmost he has been able to gain for Czechoslovakia and in the matters which were in dispute has been that the German dictator, instead of snatching his victuals from the table, has been content to have them served to him course by course.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer said it was the first time Herr Hitler had been made to retract--I think that was the word--in any degree. We really must not waste time, after all this long Debate, upon the difference between the positions reached at Berchtesgaden, at Godesberg and at Munich. They can be very simply epitomised, if the House will permit me to vary the metaphor. £1 was demanded at the pistol's point. When it was given, £2 were demanded at the pistol's point. Finally, the dictator consented to take £1 17s. 6d. and the rest in promises of good will for the future.

Now I come to the point, which was mentioned to me just now from some quarters of the House, about the saving of peace. No one has been a more resolute and uncompromising struggler for peace than the Prime Minister. Everyone knows that. Never has there been such intense and undaunted determination to maintain and to secure peace. That is quite true. Nevertheless, I am not quite clear why there was so much danger of Great Britain or France being involved in a war with Germany at this juncture if, in fact, they were ready all along to sacrifice Czechoslovakia. The terms which the Prime Minister brought back with him--I quite agree at the last moment; everything had got off the rails and nothing but his intervention could have saved the peace, but I am talking of the events of the summer--could easily have been agreed, I believe, through the ordinary diplomatic channels at any time during the summer. And I will say this, that I believe the Czechs, left to themselves and told they were going to get no help from the Western Powers, would have been able to make better terms than they have got--they could hardly have worse--after all this tremendous perturbation.

There never can be any absolute certainty that there will be a fight if one side is determined that it will give way completely. When one reads the Munich terms, when one sees what is happening in Czechoslovakia from hour to hour, when one is sure, I will not say of Parliamentary approval but of Parliamentary acquiescence, when the Chancellor of the Exchequer makes a speech which at any rate tries to put in a very powerful and persuasive manner the fact that, after all, it was inevitable and indeed righteous--right--when we saw all this, and everyone on this side of the House, including many Members of the Conservative Party who are supposed to be vigilant and careful guardians of the national interest, it is quite clear that nothing vitally affecting us was at stake, it seems to me that one must ask, What was all the trouble and fuss about? ...

We are asked to vote for this Motion which has been put upon the Paper, and it is certainly a Motion couched in very uncontroversial terms, as, indeed, is the Amendment moved from the Opposition side. I cannot myself express my agreement with the steps which have been taken, and as the Chancellor of the Exchequer has put his side of the case with so much ability I will attempt, if I may be permitted, to put the case from a different angle. I have always held the view that the maintenance of peace depends upon the accumulation of deterrents against the aggressor, coupled with a sincere effort to redress grievances. Herr Hitler's victory, like so many of the famous struggles that have governed the fate of the world, was won upon the narrowest of margins. After the seizure of Austria in March we faced this problem in our Debates. I ventured to appeal to the Government to go a little further than the Prime Minister went, and to give a pledge that in conjunction with France and other Powers they would guarantee the security of Czechoslovakia while the Sudeten-Deutsch question was being examined either by a League of Nations Commission or some other impartial body, and I still believe that if that Course had been followed events would not have fallen into this disastrous state. I agree very much with my right hon. Friend the Member for Sparkbrook (Mr. Amery) when he said on that occasion--I cannot remember his actual words--"Do one thing or the other; either say

you will disinterest yourself in the matter altogether or take the step of giving a guarantee which will have the greatest chance of securing protection for that country."

France and Great Britain together, especially if they had maintained a close contact with Russia, which certainly was not done, would have been able in those days in the summer, when they had the prestige, to influence many of the smaller States of Europe, and I believe they could have determined the attitude of Poland. Such a combination, prepared at a time when the German dictator was not deeply and irrevocably committed to his new adventure, would, I believe, have given strength to all those forces in Germany which resisted this departure, this new design. They were varying forces, those of a military character which declared that Germany was not ready to undertake a world war, and all that mass of moderate opinion and popular opinion which dreaded war, and some elements of which still have some influence upon the German Government. Such action would have given strength to all that intense desire for peace which the helpless German masses share with their British and French fellow men, and which, as we have been reminded, found a passionate and rarely permitted vent in the joyous manifestations with which the Prime Minister was acclaimed in Munich.

All these forces, added to the other deterrents which combinations of Powers, great and small, ready to stand firm upon the front of law and for the ordered remedy of grievances, would have formed, might well have been effective. Of course you cannot say for certain that they would. *[Interruption.]* I try to argue fairly with the House. At the same time I do not think it is fair to charge those who wished to see this course followed, and followed consistently and resolutely, with having wished for an immediate war. Between submission and immediate war there was this third alternative, which gave a hope not only of peace but of justice. It is quite true that such a policy in order to succeed demanded that Britain should declare straight out and a long time beforehand that she would, with others, join to defend Czechoslovakia against an unprovoked aggression. His Majesty's Government refused to give that guarantee when it would have saved the situation, yet in the end they gave it when it was too late, and now, for the future, they renew it when they have not the slightest power to make it good.

All is over. Silent, mournful, abandoned, broken, Czechoslovakia recedes into the darkness. . . . No one has a right to say that the plebiscite which is to be taken in areas under Saar conditions, and the clean-cut of the 50 per cent. areas—that those two operations together amount in the slightest degree to a verdict of self-determination. It is a fraud and a farce to invoke that name....

We in this country, as in other Liberal and democratic countries, have a perfect right to exalt the principle of self-determination, but it comes ill out of the mouths of those in totalitarian States who deny even the smallest element of toleration to every section and creed within their bounds. But, however you put it, this particular block of land, this mass of human beings to be handed over, has never expressed the desire to go into the Nazi rule. I do not believe that even now—if their opinion could be asked, they would exercise such an option....

I venture to think that in future the Czechoslovak State cannot be maintained as an independent entity. You will find that in a period of time which may be measured by years, but may be measured only by months, Czechoslovakia will be engulfed in the Nazi regime. Perhaps they may join it in despair or in revenge. At any rate, that story is over and told. But we cannot consider the abandonment and ruin of Czechoslovakia in the light only of what happened only last month. It is the most grievous consequence which we have yet experienced of what we have done and of what we have left undone in the last five years—five years of futile good intention, five years of eager search for the line of least resistance, five years of uninterrupted retreat of British power, five years of neglect of our air defences. Those are the features which I stand here to declare and which marked an improvident stewardship for which Great Britain and France have dearly to pay. We have been reduced in those five years from a position of security so overwhelming and so unchallengeable that we never cared to think about it. We have been reduced from a position where the very word "war" was considered one which would be used only by persons qualifying for a lunatic asylum. We have been reduced from a position of safety and power—power to do good, power to be generous to a beaten foe, power to make terms with Germany, power to give her proper redress for her grievances, power to stop her arming if we chose, power to take any step in strength or mercy or justice which we thought right—reduced in five years from a position safe and unchallenged to where we stand now....

We are in the presence of a disaster of the first magnitude which has befallen Great Britain and France. Do not let us blind ourselves to that. It must now be accepted that all the countries of Central and Eastern

Europe will make the best terms they can with the triumphant Nazi Power. The system of alliances in Central Europe upon which France has relied for her safety has been swept away, and I can see no means by which it can be reconstituted. The road down the Danube Valley to the Black Sea, the resources of corn and oil, the road which leads as far as Turkey, has been opened. In fact, if not in form, it seems to me that all those countries of Middle Europe, all those Danubian countries, will, one after another, be drawn into this vast system of power politics--not only power military politics but power economic politics--radiating from Berlin, and I believe this can be achieved quite smoothly and swiftly and will not necessarily entail the firing of a single shot. If you wish to survey the havoc of the foreign policy of Britain and France, look at what is happening and is recorded each day in the columns of the "Times..."

We are talking about countries which are a long way off and of which, as the Prime Minister might say, we know nothing. [*Interruption.*] The noble Lady says that that very harmless allusion is--

VISCOUNTESS ASTOR: Rude.

MR. CHURCHILL: She must very recently have been receiving her finishing course in manners. What will be the position, I want to know, of France and England this year and the year afterwards? What will be the position of that Western front of which we are in full authority the guarantors? The German army at the present time is more numerous than that of France, though not nearly so matured or perfected. Next year it will grow much larger, and its maturity will be more complete. Relieved from all anxiety in the East, and having secured resources which will greatly diminish, if not entirely remove, the deterrent of a naval blockade, the rulers of Nazi Germany will have a free choice open to them in what direction they will turn their eyes. If the Nazi dictator should choose to look westward, as he may, bitterly will France and England regret the loss of that fine army of ancient Bohemia which was estimated last week to require not fewer than 30 German divisions for its destruction.

Can we blind ourselves to the great change which has taken place in the military situation, and to the dangers we have to meet?.

This is only the beginning of the reckoning. This is only the first sip, the first foretaste of a bitter cup which will be proffered to us year by year unless by a supreme recovery of moral health and martial vigour, we arise again and take our stand for freedom as in the olden time.

PRIME MINISTER CHAMBERLAIN, HOUSE OF COMMONS, OCTOBER 5, 1938

As regards future policy, it seems to me that there are really only two possible alternatives. One of them is to base yourself upon the view that any sort of friendly relation, or possible relations, shall I say, with totalitarian States are impossible, that the assurances which have been given to me personally are worthless, that they have sinister designs and that they are bent upon the domination of Europe and the gradual destruction of democracies. Of course, on that hypothesis, war has got to come, and that is the view--a perfectly intelligible view--of a certain number of hon. and right hon. Gentlemen in this House....

If that is hon. Members' conviction, there is no future hope for civilisation or for any of the things that make life worth living. Does the experience of the Great War and of the years that followed it give us reasonable hope that if some new war started that would end war any more than the last one did? No. I do not believe that war is inevitable. Someone put into my hand a remark made by the great Pitt about 1787, when he said:

To suppose that any nation can be unalterably the enemy of another is weak and childish and has its foundations neither in the experience of nations nor in the history of man.

It seems to me that the strongest argument against the inevitability of war is to be found in something that everyone has recognized in every part of the House. That is the universal aversion from war of the people, their hatred of the notion of starting to kill one another again....

What is the alternative to this bleak and barren policy of the inevitability of war? In my view it is that we should seek by all means in our power to avoid war, by analysing possible causes, by trying to remove them, by discussion in a spirit of collaboration and good will. I cannot believe that such a programme would be rejected by the people of this country, even if it does mean the establishment of personal contact with dictators, and of talks man to man on the basis that each, while maintaining his own ideas of the internal government of his country, is willing to allow that other systems may suit better other peoples. The party opposite surely have the same idea in mind even if they put it in a different way. They want a world conference. Well, I have had some experiences of conferences, and one thing I do feel certain of is that it better to have no conference at all than a conference which is a failure. The corollary to that is that before you enter a conference you must have laid out very clearly the lines on which you are going to proceed, if you are at least to have in front of you're a reasonable prospect that you may obtain success. I am not saying that a conference would not have its place in due course. But I say it is no use to call a conference of the world, including these totalitarian Powers, until you are sure they are going to attend, and not only that they are going to attend, but that they are going to attend with the intention of aiding you in the policy on which you have set your heart.

I am told that the policy which I have tried to describe is inconsistent with the continuance, and much more inconsistent with the acceleration of our present programme of arms. I am asked how I can reconcile an appeal to the country to support the continuance of this programme with the words which I used when I came back from Munich the other day and spoke of my belief that we might have peace in our time. I hope hon. Members will not be disposed to read into words used in a moment of some emotion, after a long and exhausting day, after I had driven through miles of excited, enthusiastic, cheering people--I hope they will not read into those words more than they were intended to convey.

I do indeed believe that we may yet secure peace for our time, but I never meant to suggest that we should do that by disarmament, until we can induce others to disarm too. Our past experience has shown us only too clearly that weakness in armed strength means weakness in diplomacy, and if we want to secure a lasting peace, I realise that diplomacy cannot be effective unless the Consciousness exists, not here alone, but elsewhere, that behind the diplomacy is the strength to give effect

I cannot help feeling that if, after all, war had come upon us, the people of this Country would have lost their spiritual faith altogether. As it turned out the other way, I think we have all seen something like a new spiritual revival, and I know that everywhere there is a strong desire among the people to record their readiness to serve their Country, where-ever or however their services could be most useful. I would like to take advantage of that strong feeling if it is possible, and although I must frankly say that at this moment I do not myself clearly see my way to any particular scheme, yet I want also to say that I am ready to consider any suggestion that may be made to me, in a very sympathetic spirit.

Finally, I would like to repeat what my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer said yesterday in his great speech. Our policy of appeasement does not mean that we are going to seek new friends at the expense of old ones, or, in-deed, at the expense of any other nations at all. I do not think that at any time there has been a more complete identity of views between the French Government and ourselves than there is at the present time. Their objective is the same as ours--to obtain the collaboration of all nations, not excluding the totalitarian States, in building up a lasting peace for Europe. That seems to me to be a policy which would answer my hon. Friends' appeal, a policy which should command the support of all who believe in the power of human will to control human destiny. If we cannot here this afternoon emulate the patriotic unanimity of the French Chamber, this House can by a decisive majority show its approval of the Government's determination to pursue it.

[The vote which followed supported the government 369 to 150.]

<http://www.britannia.com/history/docs/peacetime.html>

Neville Chamberlain
"Peace for Our Time," September 30, 1938

The following statement was made by British Prime Minister, Neville Chamberlain, in front of #10 Downing Street, London, after his arrival home from the notorious Munich Conference of 1938

We, the German Fuhrer and Chancellor, and the British Prime Minister, have had a further meeting today and are agreed in recognizing that the question of Anglo-German relations is of the first importance for our two countries and for Europe.

We regard the agreement signed last night and the Anglo-German Naval Agreement as symbolic of the desire of our two peoples never to go to war with one another again.

We are resolved that the method of consultation shall be the method adopted to deal with any other questions that may concern our two countries, and we are determined to continue our efforts to remove possible sources of difference, and thus to contribute to assure the peace of Europe.

My good friends, for the second time in our history, a British Prime Minister has returned from Germany bringing peace with honor. I believe it is "peace for our time." Go home and get a nice quiet sleep

Sir Winston Churchill

THE MUNICH AGREEMENT

October 5, 1938. House of Commons

If I do not begin this afternoon by paying the usual, and indeed almost invariable, tributes to the Prime Minister for his handling of this crisis, it is certainly not from any lack of personal regard. We have always, over a great many years, had very pleasant relations, and I have deeply understood from personal experiences of my own in a similar crisis the stress and strain he has had to bear; but I am sure it is much better to say exactly what we think about public affairs, and this is certainly not the time when it is worth anyone's while to court political popularity.

We had a shining example of firmness of character from the late First Lord of the Admiralty two days ago. He showed that firmness of character which is utterly unmoved by currents of opinion, however swift and violent they may be. My hon. Friend the Member for South-West Hull (Mr. Law), to whose compulsive speech the House listened on Monday, was quite right in reminding us that the Prime Minister has himself throughout his conduct of these matters shown a robust indifference to cheers or boos and to the alternations of criticism or applause. If that be so, such qualities and elevation of mind should make it possible for the most severe expressions of honest opinion to be interchanged in this House without rupturing personal relations, and for all points of view to receive the fullest possible expression.

Having thus fortified myself by the example of others, I will proceed to emulate them. I will, therefore, begin by saying the most unpopular and most unwelcome thing. I will begin by saying what everybody would like to ignore or forget but which must nevertheless be stated, namely, that we have sustained a total and unmitigated defeat, and that France has suffered even more than we have.

The utmost my right hon. Friend the Prime Minister has been able to secure by all his immense exertions, by all the great efforts and mobilisation which took place in this country, and by all the anguish and strain through which we have passed in this country, the utmost he has been able to gain for Czechoslovakia in the matters which were in dispute has been that the German dictator, instead of snatching the victuals from the table, has been content to have them served to him course by course.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer [Sir John Simon] said it was the first time Herr Hitler had been made to retract - I think that was the word - in any degree. We really must not waste time after all this long Debate upon the difference between the positions reached at Berchtesgaden, at Godesberg and at Munich. They can be very simply epitomised, if the House will permit me to vary the metaphor. £1 was demanded at the pistol's point. When it was given, £2 were demanded at the pistol's point. Finally, the dictator consented to take £1 17s. 6d. and the rest in promises of goodwill for the future.

Now I come to the point, which was mentioned to me just now from some quarters of the House, about the saving of peace. No one has been a more resolute and uncompromising struggler for peace than the Prime Minister. Everyone knows that. Never has there been such instance and undaunted determination to maintain and secure peace. That is quite true. Nevertheless, I am not quite clear why there was so much danger of Great Britain or France being involved in a war with Germany at this juncture if, in fact, they were ready all along to sacrifice Czechoslovakia.

The terms which the Prime Minister brought back with him could easily have been agreed, I believe, through the ordinary diplomatic channels at any time during the summer. And I will say this, that I believe the Czechs, left to themselves and told they were going to get no help from the Western Powers, would have been able to make better terms than they have got after all this tremendous perturbation; they could hardly have had worse.

There never can be any absolute certainty that there will be a fight if one side is determined that it will give way completely. When one reads the Munich terms, when one sees what is happening in Czechoslovakia from hour to hour, when one is sure, I will not say of Parliamentary approval but of Parliamentary acquiescence, when the Chancellor of the Exchequer makes a speech which at any rate tries to put in a very powerful and persuasive manner the fact that, after all, it was inevitable and indeed righteous: when we say

all this, and everyone on this side of the House, including many members of the Conservative Party who are vigilant and careful guardians of the national interest, is quite clear that nothing vitally affecting us was at stake, it seems to me that one must ask, What was all the trouble and fuss about?

The resolve was taken by the British and the French Governments. Let me say that it is very important to realise that it is by no means a question which the British Government only have had to decide. I very much admire the manner in which, in the House, all references of a recriminatory nature have been repressed. But it must be realised that this resolve did not emanate particularly from one or other of the Governments but was a resolve for which both must share in common the responsibility.

When this resolve was taken and the course was followed - you may say it was wise or unwise, prudent or short-sighted - once it had been decided not to make the defence of Czechoslovakia a matter of war, then there was really no reason, if the matter had been handled during the summer in the ordinary way, to call into being all this formidable apparatus of crisis. I think that point should be considered.

We are asked to vote for this Motion which has been put upon the Paper, and it is certainly a Motion couched in very uncontroversial terms, as, indeed, is the Amendment moved from the Opposition side. I cannot myself express my agreement with the steps which have been taken, and as the Chancellor of the Exchequer has put his side of the case with so much ability I will attempt, if I may be permitted, to put the case from a different angle. I have always held the view that the maintenance of peace depends upon the accumulation of deterrents against the aggressor, coupled with a sincere effort to redress grievances. Herr Hitler's victory, like so many of the famous struggles that have governed the fate of the world, was won upon the narrowest of margins.

After the seizure of Austria in March we faced this problem in our Debates. I ventured to appeal to the Government to go a little further than the Prime Minister went, and to give a pledge that in conjunction with France and other Powers they would guarantee the security of Czechoslovakia while the Sudeten-Deutsch question was being examined either by a League of Nations Commission or some other impartial body, and I still believe that if that course had been followed events would not have fallen into this disastrous state. I agree very much with my right hon. Friend the Member for Sparkbrook (Mr. Amery) when he said on that occasion - "Do one thing or the other; either say you will disinterest yourself in the matter altogether or take the step of giving a guarantee which will have the greatest chance of securing protection for that country."

France and Great Britain together, especially if they had maintained a close contact with Russia, which certainly was not done, would have been able in those days in the summer, when they had the prestige, to influence many of the smaller states of Europe; and I believe they could have determined the attitude of Poland. Such a combination, prepared at a time when the German dictator was not deeply and irrevocably committed to his new adventure, would, I believe, have given strength to all those forces in Germany which resisted this departure, this new design.

They were varying forces; - those of a military character which declared that Germany was not ready to undertake a world war, and all that mass of moderate opinion and popular opinion which dreaded war, and some elements of which still have some influence upon the Government. Such action would have given strength to all that intense desire for peace which the helpless German masses share with their British and French fellow men, and which, as we have been reminded, found a passionate and rarely permitted vent in the joyous manifestations with which the Prime Minister was acclaimed in Munich.

All these forces, added to the other deterrents which combinations of Powers, great and small, ready to stand firm upon the front of law and for the ordered remedy of grievances, would have formed, might well have been effective. Between submission and immediate war there was this third alternative, which gave a hope not only of peace but of justice. It is quite true that such a policy in order to succeed demanded that Britain should declare straight out and a long time beforehand that she would, with others, join to defend Czechoslovakia against an unprovoked aggression. His Majesty's Government refused to give that guarantee when it would have saved the situation, yet in the end they gave it when it was too late, and now, for the future, they renew it when they have not the slightest power to make it good.

All is over. Silent, mournful, abandoned, broken, Czechoslovakia recedes into the darkness. She has suffered in every respect by her association with the Western democracies and with the League of Nations, of which she has always been an obedient servant. She has suffered in particular from her association with France, under whose guidance and policy she has been actuated for so long. The very measures taken by His Majesty's Government in the Anglo-French Agreement to give her the best chance possible, namely, the

50 per cent, clean cut in certain districts instead of a plebiscite, have turned to her detriment, because there is to be a plebiscite too in wide areas, and those other Powers who had claims have also come down upon the helpless victim.

Those municipal elections upon whose voting the basis is taken for the 50 per cent. cut were held on issues which had nothing to do with joining Germany. When I saw Herr Henlein over here he assured me that was not the desire of his people. Positive statements were made that it was only a question of home rule, of having a position of their own in the Czechoslovakian State. No one has a right to say that the plebiscite which is to be taken in areas under Saar conditions, and the clean-cut of the 50 per cent. areas - that those two operations together amount in the slightest degree to a verdict of self-determination. It is a fraud and a farce to invoke that name.

We in this country, as in other Liberal and democratic countries, have a perfect right to exalt the principle of self-determination, but it comes ill out of the mouths of those in totalitarian states who deny even the smallest element of toleration to every section and creed within their bounds. But, however you put it, this particular block of land, this mass of human beings to be handed over, has never expressed the desire to go into the Nazi rule. I do not believe that even now, if their opinion could be asked, they would exercise such an opinion.

What is the remaining position of Czechoslovakia? Not only are they politically mutilated, but, economically and financially, they are in complete confusion. Their banking, their railway arrangements, are severed and broken, their industries are curtailed, and the movement of their population is most cruel. The Sudeten miners, who are all Czechs and whose families have lived in that area for centuries, must now flee into an area where there are hardly any mines left for them to work. It is a tragedy which has occurred. There must always be the most profound regret and a sense of vexation in British hearts at the treatment and the misfortune which have overcome the Czechoslovakian Republic.

They have not ended here. At any moment there may be a hitch in the programme. At any moment there may be an order for Herr Goebbels to start again his propaganda of calumny and lies; at any moment an incident may be provoked, and now that the fortress line is turned away what is there to stop the will of the conqueror? Obviously, we are not in a position to give them the slightest help at the present time, except what everyone is glad to know has been done, the financial aid which the Government have promptly produced.

I venture to think that in future the Czechoslovak State cannot be maintained as an independent entity. I think you will find that in a period of time which may be measured by years, but may be measured only by months, Czechoslovakia will be engulfed in the Nazi regime. Perhaps they may join it in despair or in revenge. At any rate, that story is over and told. But we cannot consider the abandonment and ruin of Czechoslovakia in the light only of what happened only last month. It is the most grievous consequence of what we have done and of what we have left undone in the last five years - five years of futile good intentions, five years of eager search for the line of least resistance, five years of uninterrupted retreat of British power, five years of neglect of our air defences.

Those are the features which I stand here to expose and which marked an improvident stewardship for which Great Britain and France have dearly to pay. We have been reduced in those five years from a position of security so overwhelming and so unchallengeable that we never cared to think about it. We have been reduced from a position where the very word "war" was considered one which could be used only by persons qualifying for a lunatic asylum. We have been reduced from a position of safety and power - power to do good, power to be generous to a beaten foe, power to make terms with Germany, power to give her proper redress for her grievances, power to stop her arming if we chose, power to take any step in strength or mercy or justice which we thought right - reduced in five years from a position safe and unchallenged to where we stand now.

When I think of the fair hopes of a long peace which still lay before Europe at the beginning of 1933 when Herr Hitler first obtained power, and of all the opportunities of arresting the growth of the Nazi power which have been thrown away, when I think of the immense combinations and resources which have been neglected or squandered, I cannot believe that a parallel exists in the whole course of history.

So far as this country is concerned the responsibility must rest with those who have had the undisputed control of our political affairs. They neither prevented Germany from rearming, nor did they rearm themselves in time. They quarrelled with Italy without saving Ethiopia. They exploited and discredited the vast institution of

the League of Nations and they neglected to make alliances and combinations which might have repaired previous errors, and thus they left us in the hour of trial without adequate national defence or effective international security.

In my holiday I thought it was a chance to study the reign of King Ethelred the Unready. The House will remember that that was a period of great misfortune, in which, from the strong position which we had gained under the descendants of King Alfred, we fell very swiftly into chaos. It was the period of Danegeld and of foreign pressure. I must say that the rugged words of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, written a thousand years ago, seem to me apposite, at least as apposite as those quotations from Shakespeare with which we have been regaled by the last speaker from the Opposition Bench. Here is what the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle said, and I think the words apply very much to our treatment of Germany and our relations with her.

"All these calamities fell upon us because of evil counsel, because tribute was not offered to them at the right time nor yet were they resisted; but when they had done the most evil, then was peace made with them."

That is the wisdom of the past, for all wisdom is not new wisdom.

I have ventured to express those views in justifying myself for not being able to support the Motion which is moved to-night, but I recognise that this great matter of Czechoslovakia, and of British and French duty there, has passed into history. New developments may come along, but we are not here to decide whether any of those steps should be taken or not. They have been taken. They have been taken by those who had a right to take them because they bore the highest executive responsibility under the Crown.

Whatever we may think of it, we must regard those steps as belonging to the category of affairs which are settled beyond recall. The past is no more, and one can only draw comfort if one feels that one has done one's best to advise rightly and wisely and in good time. I, therefore, turn to the future, and to our situation as it is to-day. Here, again, I am sure I shall have to say something which will not be at all welcome.

We are in the presence of a disaster of the first magnitude which has befallen Great Britain and France. Do not let us blind ourselves to that. It must now be accepted that all the countries of Central and Eastern Europe will make the best terms they can with the triumphant Nazi power. The system of alliances in Central Europe upon which France has relied for her safety has been swept away, and I can see no means by which it can be reconstituted. The road down the Danube Valley to the Black Sea, the road which leads as far as Turkey, has been opened.

In fact, if not in form, it seems to me that all those countries of Middle Europe, all those Danubian countries, will, one after another, be drawn into this vast system of power politics - not only power military politics but power economic politics - radiating from Berlin, and I believe this can be achieved quite smoothly and swiftly and will not necessarily entail the firing of a single shot. If you wish to survey the havoc of the foreign policy of Britain and France, look at what is happening and is recorded each day in the columns of The Times. Why, I read this morning about Yugoslavia - and I know something about the details of that country -

"The effects of the crisis for Yugoslavia can immediately be traced. Since the elections of 1935, which followed soon after the murder of King Alexander, the Serb and Croat Opposition to the Government of Dr. Stoyadinovitch have been conducting their entire campaign for the next elections under the slogan: 'Back to France, England, and the Little Entente; back to democracy.' The events of the past fortnight have so triumphantly vindicated Dr. Stoyadinovitch's policy..." - his is a policy of close association with Germany - "that the Opposition has collapsed practically overnight; the new elections, the date of which was in doubt, are now likely to be held very soon and can result only in an overwhelming victory for Dr. Stoyadinovitch's Government."

Here was a country which, three months ago, would have stood in the line with other countries to arrest what has occurred.

Again, what happened in Warsaw? The British and French Ambassadors visited the Foreign Minister, Colonel Beck, or sought to visit him, in order to ask for some mitigation in the harsh measures being pursued against Czechoslovakia about Teschen. The door was shut in their faces, The French Ambassador was not even granted an audience and the British Ambassador was given a most curt reply by a political director. The whole matter is described in the Polish Press as a political indiscretion committed by those two powers, and we are to-day reading of the success of Colonel Beck's blow. I am not forgetting, I must say, that it is less

than twenty years since British and French bayonets rescued Poland from the bondage of a century and a half. I think it is indeed a sorry episode in the history of that country, for whose freedom and rights so many of us have had warm and long sympathy.

Those illustrations are typical. You will see, day after day, week after week, entire alienation of those regions. Many of those countries, in fear of the rise of the Nazi power, have already got politicians, Ministers, Governments, who were pro-German, but there was always an enormous popular movement in Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia which looked to the Western democracies and loathed the idea of having this arbitrary rule of the totalitarian system thrust upon them, and hoped that a stand would be made. All that has gone by the board. We are talking about countries which are a long way off.

But what will be the position, I want to know, of France and England this year and the year afterwards? What will be the position of that Western front of which we are in full authority the guarantors? The German army at the present time is more numerous than that of France, though not nearly so matured or perfected. Next year it will grow much larger, and its maturity will be more complete. Relieved from all anxiety in the East, and having secured resources which will greatly diminish, if not entirely remove, the deterrent of a naval blockade, the rulers of Nazi Germany will have a free choice open to them as to what direction they will turn their eyes. If the Nazi dictator should choose to look westward, as he may, bitterly will France and England regret the loss of that fine army of ancient Bohemia which was estimated last week to require not fewer than 30 German divisions for its destruction.

Can we blind ourselves to the great change which has taken place in the military situation, and to the dangers we have to meet? We are in process, I believe, of adding in four years, four battalions to the British Army. No fewer than two have already been completed. Here are at least 30 divisions which must now be taken into consideration upon the French front, besides the 12 that were captured when Austria was engulfed.

Many people, no doubt, honestly believe that they are only giving away the interests of Czechoslovakia, whereas I fear we shall find that we have deeply compromised, and perhaps fatally endangered, the safety and even the independence of Great Britain and France. This is not merely a question of giving up the German colonies, as I am sure we shall be asked to do. Nor is it a question only of losing influence in Europe. It goes far deeper than that. You have to consider the character of the Nazi movement and the rule which it implies.

The Prime Minister desires to see cordial relations between this country and Germany. There is no difficulty at all in having cordial relations between the peoples. Our hearts go out to them. But they have no power. But never will you have friendship with the present German Government. You must have diplomatic and correct relations, but there can never be friendship between the British democracy and the Nazi power, that power which spurns Christian ethics, which cheers its onward course by a barbarous paganism, which vaunts the spirit of aggression and conquest, which derives strength and perverted pleasure from persecution, and uses, as we have seen, with pitiless brutality the threat of murderous force. That power cannot ever be the trusted friend of the British democracy.

What I find unendurable is the sense of our country falling into the power, into the orbit and influence of Nazi Germany, and of our existence becoming dependent upon their good will or pleasure. It is to prevent that that I have tried my best to urge the maintenance of every bulwark of defence - first, the timely creation of an Air Force superior to anything within striking distance of our shores; secondly, the gathering together of the collective strength of many nations; and thirdly, the making of alliances and military conventions, all within the Covenant, in order to gather together forces at any rate to restrain the onward movement of this power. It has all been in vain. Every position has been successively undermined and abandoned on specious and plausible excuses.

We do not want to be led upon the high road to becoming a satellite of the German Nazi system of European domination. In a very few years, perhaps in a very few months, we shall be confronted with demands with which we shall no doubt be invited to comply. Those demands may affect the surrender of territory or the surrender of liberty. I foresee and foretell that the policy of submission will carry with it restrictions upon the freedom of speech and debate in Parliament, on public platforms, and discussions in the Press, for it will be said - indeed, I hear it said sometimes now - that we cannot allow the Nazi system of dictatorship to be criticised by ordinary, common English politicians. Then, with a Press under control, in part direct but more potently indirect, with every organ of public opinion doped and chloroformed into acquiescence, we shall be conducted along further stages of our journey.

It is a small matter to introduce into such a Debate as this, but during the week I heard something of the talk of Tadpole and Taper. They were very keen upon having a general election, a sort of, if I may say so, inverted khaki election. I wish the Prime Minister had heard the speech of my hon. and gallant friend the Member for the Abbey Division of Westminster (Sir Sidney Herbert) last night. I know that no one is more patient and regular in his attendance than the Prime Minister, and it is marvellous how he is able to sit through so much of our Debates, but it happened that by bad luck he was not here at that moment. I am sure, however, that if he had heard my hon. and gallant Friend's speech he would have felt very much annoyed that such a rumour could even have been circulated.

I cannot believe that the Prime Minister, or any Prime Minister, possessed of a large working majority, would be capable of such an act of historic, constitutional indecency. I think too highly of him. Of course, if I have misjudged him on the right side, and there is a dissolution on the Munich Agreement, on Anglo-Nazi friendship, of the state of our defences and so forth, everyone will have to fight according to his convictions, and only a prophet could forecast the ultimate result; but, whatever the result, few things could be more fatal to our remaining chances of survival as a great Power than that this country should be torn in twain upon this deadly issue, of foreign policy at a moment when, whoever the Ministers may be, united effort can alone make us safe.

I have been casting about to see how measures can be taken to protect us from this advance of the Nazi power, and to secure those forms of life which are so dear to us. What is the sole method that is open? The sole method that is open is for us to regain our old island independence by acquiring that supremacy in the air which we were promised, that security in our air defences which we were assured we had, and thus to make ourselves an island once again. That, in all this grim outlook, shines out as the overwhelming fact.

An effort at rearmament the like of which has not been seen ought to be made forthwith, and all the resources of this country and all its united strength should be bent to that task. I was very glad to see that Lord Baldwin yesterday in the House of Lords said that he would mobilise industry to-morrow. But I think it would have been much better if Lord Baldwin had said that two and a half years ago, when everyone demanded a Ministry of Supply. I will venture to say to hon. Gentlemen sitting here behind the Government Bench, hon. Friends of mine, whom I thank for the patience with which they have listened to what I have to say, that they have some responsibility for all this too, because, if they had given one tithe of the cheers they have lavished upon this transaction of Czechoslovakia to the small band of Members, who were endeavouring to get timely rearmament set in motion, we should not now be in the position in which we are. Hon. Gentlemen opposite, and hon. Members on the Liberal benches, are not entitled to throw these stones. I remember for two years having to face, not only the Government's depreciation, but their stern disapproval. Lord Baldwin has now given the signal, tardy though it may be; let us at least obey it.

After all, there are no secrets now about what happened in the air and in the mobilisation of our anti-aircraft defences. These matters have been, as my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for the Abbey Division said, seen by thousands of people. They can form their own opinions of the character of the statements which have been persistently made to us by Ministers on this subject. Who pretends now that there is air parity with Germany? Who pretends now that our anti-aircraft defences were adequately manned or armed?

We know that the German General Staff are well informed upon these subjects, but the House of Commons has hitherto not taken seriously its duty of requiring to assure itself on these matters. The Home Secretary said the other night that he would welcome investigation. Many things have been done which reflect the greatest credit upon the administration. But the vital matters are what we want to know about. I have asked again and again during these three years for a secret Session where these matters could be thrashed out, or for an investigation by a Select Committee of the House, or for some other method. I ask now that, when we meet again in the autumn, that should be a matter on which the Government should take the House into its confidence, because we have a right to know where we stand and what measures are being taken to secure our position.

I do not grudge our loyal, brave people, who were ready to do their duty no matter what the cost, who never flinched under the strain of last week - I do not grudge them the natural, spontaneous outburst of joy and relief when they learned that the hard ordeal would no longer be required of them at the moment; but they should know the truth. They should know that there has been gross neglect and deficiency in our defences; they should know that we have sustained a defeat without a war, the consequences of which will travel far with us along our road; they should know that we have passed an awful milestone in our history, when the whole equilibrium of Europe has been deranged, and that the terrible words have for the time being been pronounced against the Western democracies:

"Thou art weighed in the balance and found wanting."

And do not suppose that this is the end. This is only the beginning of the reckoning. This is only the first sip, the first foretaste of a bitter cup which will be proffered to us year by year unless by a supreme recovery of moral health and martial vigour, we arise again and take our stand for freedom as in the olden time.

<http://www.winstonchurchill.org/j4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=1189>

Natan Sharansky: "Peace Will Only Come after Freedom and Democracy"

Middle East Quarterly

Winter 2005

<http://www.meforum.org/article/666>

*Natan Sharansky is among the world's most consistent advocates of democratization as a basis for foreign policy. Born in Ukraine in 1948, he received a degree in mathematics from Moscow's Physical Technical Institute. A brilliant mathematician and chess master, he entered the limelight as a spokesman for the movement to emancipate Soviet Jewry. Arrested by the Soviet authorities in 1977 for his refusenik activities, he was sentenced to thirteen years imprisonment. President Ronald Reagan interceded and, in 1986, won Sharansky's release as part of an East-West prisoner exchange. In his 1988 autobiography *Fear No Evil*, [1] he discussed both his emotional resistance to surrender in the face of KGB interrogation and also his quest to explore his Jewish roots.*

*Freed from Soviet imprisonment, Sharansky received a hero's welcome in Israel. Dedicating himself as an activist for free Soviet emigration, he became increasingly active among Israel's Russian immigrant population. In 1995, he founded Yisrael B'Aliyah in order to represent this important demographic. He subsequently served in a number of positions, including minister of industry and trade, minister of housing and construction and, most recently, as deputy prime minister. He is currently minister of Jerusalem and Diaspora affairs in the cabinet of Ariel Sharon. His new book, *The Case for Democracy: The Power of Freedom to Overcome Tyranny and Terror*, [2] was published in November 2004. On November 11, President George W. Bush invited Sharansky to the Oval Office for an hour-long discussion of the book. [3] Sam Spector, research analyst at the Long-Term Strategy Project, interviewed him in Jerusalem by telephone on November 24, 2004.*

Democracy and Freedom

Middle East Quarterly: At the Republican National Convention, on September 2, 2004, President Bush said "freedom is on the march" in the Middle East. [4] Do you agree?

Natan Sharansky: Freedom definitely has a much better chance to succeed today than some years or even some months ago. For freedom to succeed, not only must people throughout the Middle East desire freedom, but there needs to be solidarity from the outer world and, also, a readiness to link foreign policy to human rights and support for dissent.

MEQ: What can the United States do to support dissidents in the Middle East and elsewhere?

Sharansky: Washington should replicate the success of its policy toward the Soviet Union. The first nail in the coffin of the Soviet dictatorship was the Jackson-Vanek amendment [of 1973], which linked trade to emigration rights. The Helsinki agreement [of 1975] further enshrined human rights in international relations. In the 1980s, President Reagan stood firm on human rights, emboldening myself and other dissidents in our fight against dictatorship. Washington should adopt similar policies to aid dissidents in Arab countries.

MEQ: Pundits and European governments criticized President Bush for the crudeness of his "Axis of Evil" reference. [5] How important is rhetoric?

Sharansky: The world is full of doublethink. What it most lacks is moral clarity. It is extremely important to call a spade a spade. It is necessary to understand the nature of the war that we are in the midst of. The battle is not between Israel and the Palestinians or between the United States and Iraq. Rather, the current fight pits the world of freedom against the world of terror. I have told President Bush that the two greatest speeches of my lifetime were Ronald Reagan's speech casting the Soviet Union as an evil empire and the president's own speech on June 24, 2002, when he said that Palestinians deserve to live in freedom and that only with freedom would the Middle East enjoy security. [6]

MEQ: Do you believe that your conversations and writings have influenced Bush?

Sharansky: The reason for my meeting with the president was because he was reading my book, and he wanted to discuss it. There is no doubt that the president's statements at his press conference [with British prime minister Tony Blair] were similar to my ideas. I was very happy to hear the president say that freedom is not something that was given to America but rather it is a gift from God to all mankind. I feel very strongly that peace will only come after freedom and democracy. These are the ideas for which I have been fighting all my life, and these are the ideas to which I believe the president is going to devote the next four years.

MEQ: How would you characterize Bush's approach to the challenges facing the free world?

Sharansky: I told the President, "You don't look like a politician. You look like a real dissident, because politicians always look at what polls say, but you believe in democracy and freedom ... Even when your colleagues in Europe tell you that democracy is impossible, you go ahead with it. You are a real dissident."

MEQ: Do you see parallels between events today and your own experience as a political dissident in the 1970s and 1980s?

Sharansky: I have a story in my book about how we dissidents celebrated the day when President Reagan called the Soviet Union "the Evil Empire." We saw the Soviet Union as a rotten, weak society, liable to fall apart quickly, if only the West stopped supporting it. The first step in the Soviet Union's demise would be the West's enunciation of the true nature of the [Soviet] state. When Ronald Reagan, the leader of the free world, called a spade a spade and defined the roots of the struggle, the Soviet Union was doomed. And that's what happened. The same thing applies today. We are speaking about a struggle between the world in which human life is the highest priority and those societies that treat human life with disdain and hold their citizens hostage in an attempt to blackmail civilization.

MEQ: Why has dictatorship flourished for so long in the Middle East?

Sharansky: For too long the free world has been willing to appease dictatorships. The United States is no longer willing to accept a policy of appeasement [toward Middle Eastern dictators]. [Washington's] willingness to coddle dictators has been the main obstacle to dissent in the Arab world.

MEQ: Can't strongmen bring stability?

Sharansky: The more resolute the free world is in not appeasing dictators, the less often it will have to use military power. If you look at the history of struggle between democracies and dictatorships, you will see that outright war is almost always preceded by a period of appeasement. This was the case with both Hitler and Stalin. In the Middle East, Palestinian violence and terror followed a period of appeasement. In Iraq, too, a decade of appeasement emboldened Saddam Hussein and contributed to war. We would not have had this problem in Iraq if the free world had not once thought that Saddam Hussein was good for stability. Had the United States and the West linked their foreign policies to basic human rights, not one shot would need to have been fired in Iraq.

MEQ: Where might Washington better link its policies to human rights?

Sharansky: Many places. Take Egypt, for example. The United States sometimes expresses sympathy for Egyptian dissidents, but Washington's word would mean more if it drew linkages between dissident rights and the \$2 billion in foreign aid it gives Egypt each year. Likewise, in the case of the Palestinian Authority, American support for Palestinian dissidents hasn't gone much past rhetoric.

MEQ: Do you see progress for democracy in the Middle East?

Sharansky: There is progress today in the Middle East because the most dangerous regime, that of Saddam Hussein, has been removed. Saddam Hussein's Iraq gave legitimacy to terrorist groups across the Middle East. Saddam's was a regime that used human life to break the will of the free world. That the West allowed Saddam's regime to continue to hold his people hostage for so many years, encouraged dictators and terrorists worldwide, and discouraged potential dissidents within Iraqi society. But today the situation has changed. The death of [Yasir] Arafat also creates new possibilities.

The Palestinians after Arafat

MEQ: How strong is the will for political change among the Palestinians?

Sharansky: Whenever people are given an opportunity not to live in constant fear, not to live a life of doublethink, they choose freedom. If given the opportunity, the Palestinians can progress toward democracy. They have a strong middle class. They have special business opportunities in the free world. Palestinians are adroit observers of Israel and understand the functioning of democracy. The Palestinian diaspora is well educated. All of these factors provide hope for a speedier transition. There is no doubt that the change of leadership resulting from Arafat's passing creates opportunities. Whether Palestinians seize these opportunities is another question.

MEQ: In *The Case for Democracy* you write that "Palestinians, like every people, are capable of building a free society."^[8] Does Israel have any role or responsibility to help create the conditions for a free Palestinian society?

Sharansky: Israel has a special interest in Palestinian democracy because only with democratic development among Palestinians and in the Arab world will Israel enjoy peace and stability. We can complain as much as we want about the lack of freedom and the lack of democracy among the Palestinians and other neighbors, but we should never forget our role. Israel and other nations in the free world tried to turn a Palestinian dictatorship into a partner. Many Israeli and American policymakers thought that a Palestinian dictatorship would bring stability. We were not ready to support any form of dissent in the Arab world and among the Palestinians because we believed it would weaken the Palestinian Authority and any chance for peace. Israel, the United States, and other free nations need to realize that they can play a very positive role, but that their choices can also be harmful for democracy.

MEQ: You also wrote that free elections can only take place in an atmosphere devoid of fear and only after the basic institutions that protect a free society—such as a free press, the rule of law, independent courts, and political parties—are firmly in place. Can the Palestinian Authority elections meet these criteria?

Sharansky: We should have no illusions that the elections that will take place in January [2005] will have anything to do with democracy. Elections that are not free, that are not held in a free society have nothing to do with democracy.

MEQ: Are Palestinian elections at all worthwhile?

Sharansky: Elections are worthwhile, but casting votes in and of itself is not enough. Democracy can only start when the new leadership selected in these elections embraces reform. A lot depends on our policy. If we embrace a leadership that embraces reform, or if we refuse to give any legitimacy or support to a leadership that refuses to bring democracy and reform, then there is a serious chance for success. In the upcoming Palestinian election, different faction heads will decide the candidates in advance. Voters will not really have the freedom to express their opinions. The leadership selection has nothing to do with democracy, but it is important that this selection take place as soon as possible.

MEQ: What should happen then?

Sharansky: We should not pay too much attention to who will be the next Palestinian leader, but we should pay attention to what we demand of this leader. The first steps towards democracy will be after elections and not before.

MEQ: Is your opposition to the Gaza disengagement plan a matter of principle, or are you concerned over its practical implementation?

Sharansky: Questions of principle and practical matters are always connected for me. I was against the disengagement plan not because I believed we should stay in Gaza but because one-sided concessions could transform Gaza into a beachhead for a terrorist state. If a Palestinian democracy developed, then a Palestinian state would not be dangerous. As I said many years ago, it is very important that the depth of our concessions match the depth of democracy on the other side. If disengagement were linked to democratic reforms, I would be all for this plan. But I object to any plan that leaves territory for terror.

[1] New York: Random House, 1988.

[2] New York: PublicAffairs, 2004.

[3] *The Washington Post*, Nov. 23, 2004.

[4] [White House news release](#), Sept. 2, 2004.

[5] [State of the Union](#) address, Jan. 29, 2002.

[6] "[President Bush Calls for New Palestinian Leadership](#)," White House news release, June 24, 2002.

[7] [White House news release](#), Nov. 12, 2004.

[8] Sharansky, *The Case for Democracy*, p. xxv.

MONDAY, 2ND JUNE 2008

The head of the Police Service of Northern Ireland, Sir Hugh Orde (who most certainly should know better) [said](#) a few days ago that Britain could only stop al Qaeda by negotiation. A little while back there was a clamour for talking to the Taleban. This is all part of a huge establishment push for talking to terrorists (on both sides of the Atlantic – indeed, this is already becoming a major issue in the US presidential election) including Hamas, Hezbollah and Iran. The argument is a perfect distillation of the hubristic ignorance and solipsism of the west which views everything through the prism of its own cultural assumption that the entire world operates according to the rules of rational self-interest and that all conflict can be solved by dialogue. Indeed, the dominant belief is that conflict can *only* be ended through dialogue, and there can be no military solution to terrorism.

In Britain, much of this thinking is driven by the experience of Northern Ireland where the ‘peace process’ is commonly held to have ended the conflict between Republicans and Loyalists. I have written previously about the reasons why this analogy is hopelessly and dangerously flawed -- not least because the ‘peace process’ only happened because the British Army actually beat the IRA into at the very least a permanent stalemate. In other words, the military victory was crucial. If they had not been beaten, the IRA would not have decided they had no alternative but to use democratic politics instead of the Armalite to achieve their goals.

That’s why it’s so disappointing that Sir Hugh Orde, of all people, should have said he could not think of a single terrorism campaign in history that ended without negotiation. In fact, there has not been a single terrorism campaign in which terrorists have been talked to where the terrorism hasn’t *worsened* as a direct result – as indeed happened in Northern Ireland, where the back-channel secret talks with the IRA long before the ‘peace process’ emboldened them to perpetrate yet greater atrocities. The same thing has happened over the years with Hamas, Hezbollah and Fatah. As Hussein Massawi, a former leader of Hezbollah, so helpfully put it:
We are not fighting so that you will offer us something. We are fighting to eliminate you.
It is safe to assume that al Qaeda would not dissent from that proposition.

Within a few hours of Sir Hugh’s published remarks, there was some practical evidence of the wrongness of his position and that of all the other appeasers who say that terrorism can never be ended through military means. The CIA has [declared](#) that al Qaeda is virtually defeated in Iraq and that the country is seeing its lowest level of violence for four years... The relative calm produced by the Shia ceasefire has coincided with what the CIA is now calling the ‘near strategic defeat’ of al Qaeda in Iraq, and a growing rejection of the group’s murderous ideology across the Middle East.

While the commander of the British forces in Afghanistan has [said](#) that the Taleban are on the brink of defeat:

The new ‘precise, surgical’ tactics have killed scores of insurgent leaders and made it extremely difficult for Pakistan-based Taliban leaders to prosecute the campaign, according to Brig Mark Carleton-Smith. In the past two years an estimated 7,000 Taliban have been killed, the majority in southern and eastern Afghanistan. But it is the ‘very effective targeted decapitation operations’ that have removed ‘several echelons of commanders’.

Clearly, these wars are far from over; only a fool would assume that the Taleban and al Qaeda are now finished -- far from it, I fear. But it seems equally clear that they have been seriously weakened as the result of these military campaigns which have recently turned a corner and achieved startling success. It is in fact *only* military or policing campaigns that can defeat terrorism; since the strategic purpose of terrorism is to force a general acceptance of its political aims, talking to terrorists invariably tells them that they are winning and inspires them to step up their campaign. It is indeed *because* the world has talked to Middle East terrorists over the years that we are now facing what we are facing.

<http://www.spectator.co.uk/melaniephillips/748436/terror-and-appeasement.shtml>

February 22, 2006

Appeasement 101

by Victor Davis Hanson
Tribune Media Services

It is easy to damn the 1930s appeasers of Hitler — such as Stanley Baldwin and Neville Chamberlain in England and Edouard Daladier in France — given what the Nazis ultimately did when unleashed. But history demands not merely recognizing the truth post facto, but also trying to reconstruct the rationale of something that now in hindsight seems inexplicable.

Appeasement in the 1930s was popular with the European public for a variety of reasons. All of them are instructive in our hesitation about stopping a nuclear Iran, or about defending the right of Western newspapers to print what they wish — or about fighting radical Islamism in general.

First, Europe had nearly been destroyed during the Great War, a mere 20 years prior. No responsible postwar leader wished to risk a second continental bloodbath.

Unfortunately, Hitler understood that all too well. In a game of diplomatic chicken, he figured many responsible democratic statesmen had more to lose than he did, as the weaker and once-beaten enemy.

British intellectuals, like European Union idealists today, wrote books and treatises on the obsolescence of war. Conflicts were supposedly caused only by rapacious arms merchants and profiteers at home, not by anti-democratic dictators who interpreted forbearance as weakness. Winston Churchill was a voice in the wilderness — and demonized as a warmonger and worse.

Today, the 50-year Cold War is over, and Europe is at last free of burdensome military expenditure and the threat of global annihilation. Like Osama Bin Laden, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad senses a certain weariness in much of the West as it counts on perpetual peace.

He assumes that most sober Westerners will do almost anything to avoid military confrontation to stop a potential threat — even though, unlike Hitler, Ahmadinejad not only promises to liquidate the Jews but reveals his method in advance by seeking nuclear weapons.

Some naive conservatives in prewar Europe thought the German and Italian fascists would prove a valuable bulwark against communism, and so could be politically finessed. So, too, it has been at times with Islamic fascism. Arming the mujahadeen in Afghanistan, Pakistan or Saudi Arabia was once seen as an inspired way of thwarting Soviet communist imperialism.

At the time of the Ayatollah Khomeini's homicidal fatwa against Salman Rushdie, religious conservative commentators from Patrick Buchanan to New York's Cardinal O'Connor attacked Rushdie, rather than defended the Western right of free expression. Apparently, they felt such Islamic threats to supposed blasphemers might have positive repercussions in discouraging left-wing anti-Christian attacks as well.

In the 1930s, the doctrine of appeasement fobbed off responsibility of confronting fascism onto the League of Nations. Both France and England were quiet about the 1936 Italian invasion of Ethiopia and the German militarization of the Rhineland. They counted on multilateral action of the League, which issued plenty of edicts but marshaled few troops.

Likewise, the moral high ground today supposedly was to refer both the Iraqi and Iranian problems to the United Nations. But considering the oil-for-food scandals and Saddam's constant violations of U.N. resolutions, it is unlikely that the Iranian theocracy has much fear that the Security Council will thwart its uranium enrichment.

As fascism spread, France worked on fortifying its German border with the Maginot Line, Oxford undergraduates voted to refuse "in any circumstances to fight for King and Country," and British newspapers decried the Treaty of Versailles for unduly punishing Germany. This was all long before the "no blood for oil" slogan and Al Gore in Saudi Arabia apologizing to his Wahhabi hosts for the supposed American maltreatment of Arabs.

But *deja vu* pertains not just to us, but our enemies as well. Like the Nazi romance of an exalted ancient Volk, the Islamists hearken back to a mythical purity, free of decadence brought on by Western liberalism. Similarly, they feed off victimization — not just recent defeats, but centuries-old bitterness at the rise of the West. Their version of the stab-in-the-back Versailles Treaty is always the creation of Israel.

Just as Hitler concocted incidents such as the burning of the Reichstag to create outrage, Islamist leaders incite frenzy in their followers over a supposed flushed Koran at Guantanamo and several inflammatory cartoons, some of them never published by Danish newspapers at all.

Anti-Semitism, of course, is the mother's milk of fascism. It is always, they say, a small group of Jews — whether shadowy cabinet advisers and international bankers of the 1930s or the manipulative neoconservatives and Israeli leadership of the present — who alone stir up the trouble.

The point of the comparison is not to suggest that history simply repeats itself, but to learn why intelligent people delude themselves into embracing naive policies. After the removal of the Taliban and Saddam Hussein, the furious reply of the radical Islamist world was to censor Western newspapers, along with Iran's accelerated efforts to get the bomb.

In response, either the West will continue to stand up now to these reoccurring post-Sept. 11 threats, or it will see the bullies' demands only increase as its own resistance weakens. Like the appeasement of the 1930s, opting for the easier choice will only guarantee a more costly one later on.

©2006 Victor Davis Hanson

<http://victorhanson.com/articles/hanson022206.html>

Friday, August 3, 2007

Appeasement or 'Grand Strategy'

Boy, when it comes to Saudi Arabia, that Condi Rice and Bob Gates sure drive a tough bargain.

Visiting "the kingdom" (the grating, fairytale nickname for that oil-rich human-rights pit), the U.S. secretaries of state and defense delivered a blunt message: If you keep fomenting and financing global jihad; if you keep teaching and preaching the eradication or repression of non-Muslims; if you keep trampling human rights, women's rights, freedom of conscience and freedom of speech; and, last but not least, if you keep supporting Sunni insurgents in Iraq who are battling American troops, well, then, the United States of America will be forced to act. Yessir, you can bet your bottom petrodollar. You Saudis keep doing all that bad stuff and Uncle Sam is going to... deliver \$20 billion of cutting edge weaponry to you, ASAP.

That'll fix them.

Or will it fix us? It's easy to get things mixed up unless you remember the latest version of the Bush Doctrine: You're either with us, or we sell you smart bombs.

In the Bush administration, such appeasement counts for Grand Strategy. The leading Sunni state, Saudi Arabia, is supposed to serve as a counterbalance to Shi'ite Iranian terror-statism. Forget about Saudi Arabian terror-statism. (That messes up the Grand Strategy.) And, please, don't wonder what happens if/when jihad revolutionaries, already thought to have infiltrated Saudi security forces, get their hands on our smart bombs. Inspired by the teachings of James Baker — practically an honorary Saudi princeling — Condi, Bob, and, of course, George, see the Saudis as Our Moderate Allies. Who cares if they promote jihad doctrine? Who cares if they sponsor Hamas? Who cares how many Saudis support (or belong to) al Qaeda?

The Saudis and their fellow Sunni states including Egypt and Jordan are supposed to agree with the Bush administration that they have a stake in stabilizing Shi'ite-majority Iraq — which, in Bush-land, is supposed to serve as a curb on Shi'ite Iran, and not simply turn into the natural ally thereof. It's in the Sunni states' interests, the Grand Strategy goes, to help stabilize Iraq, and, while they're at it, to support the so-called peace process between Israel and the Palestinians — or, rather, between Israel and "good" Fatah Palestinians, not "bad" Hamas Palestinians. Never mind that both groups' charters call for the destruction of Israel. And never mind Saudi support for Hamas.

The Sunnis aren't buying the administration's world view, which, in politically correct fashion, ignores the \$64,000 Islamic question: Why on Allah's green earth would these states want to staunch the bleeding of ideological enemy number one (us) in Iraq? Of course, these same states are happy to buy American guns and ammo. Which may make Condi, Bob and George masters of let's-make-a-dealpolitik. But that's not saying much.

Oh, but the Saudis have promised to open an embassy in Baghdad and come to peace talks with Israel, administration boosters will say. Well, not exactly. The Saudis said they will consider opening the embassy, and they will consider coming to a peace conference. Frankly, opening that Baghdad embassy makes Saudi sense (it's so much easier to supply insurgents in Iraq using the diplomatic pouch). But since when is the presence of a world-class human-rights violator at a peace conference something worth groveling for?

Answer: Since this week, when the United States, represented by Condoleezza Rice, signed a joint statement endorsing the Saudi's pet peace plan, the one that sends Israel back to indefensible, pre-1967 borders. What comes in return? Arab recognition of Israel. (Oh, joy. The retrograde human-rights violators might possibly recognize the freedom-loving democracy.) This is one big booby prize. It also marks a momentous, if weirdly unremarked-upon shift in American policy that proves one calamitous truth: jihad terrorism works.

It's a dispiriting truth for a dispiriting time. American resolve has given way to American submission, and practically unnoticed. Very little outrage over the Saudi sale has bubbled over, even in what could still be called the war camp. Israelis themselves have expressed little or no dissent. So far, with the exception of New Jersey Republican Rep. Mike Ferguson, the anti-Saudi support group seems centered in a small segment of the Democratic Left: New York Reps. Jerrold Nadler and Anthony Weiner, Florida Rep. Robert Wexler, leftist writer Robert Scheer, and, gulp, presidential candidate John Edwards.

Which leaves us where, exactly? Somehow, it seems appropriate to reply: wandering in the wilderness.

Diana West is the author of the forthcoming book "The Death of the Grown-Up: How America's Arrested Development Is Bringing Down Western Civilization."

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2007/aug/03/appeasement-or-grand-strategy/>

PROJECT SYNDICATE

AN ASSOCIATION OF NEWSPAPERS AROUND THE WORLD

Appeasement Revisited

by Vaclav Havel

I vividly remember the slightly ludicrous, slightly risqué, and somewhat distressing predicament in which Western diplomats in Prague found themselves during the Cold War. They regularly needed to resolve the delicate issue of whether to invite to their embassy celebrations various Charter 77 signatories, human rights activists, critics of the communist regime, displaced politicians, or even banned writers, scholars, and journalists – people with whom the diplomats were generally friends.

Sometimes we dissidents were not invited, but received an apology, and sometimes we were invited, but did not accept the invitation so as not to complicate the lives of our courageous diplomat friends. Or we were invited to come at an earlier hour in the hope that we would leave before the official representatives arrived, which sometimes worked and sometimes didn't. When it didn't, either the official representatives left in protest at our presence, or we left hurriedly, or we all pretended not to notice each other, or – albeit on rare occasions – we started to converse with each other, which frequently were the only moments of dialogue between the regime and the opposition (not counting our courthouse encounters).

This all happened when the Iron Curtain divided Europe – and the world – into opposing camps. Western diplomats had their countries' economic interests to consider, but, unlike the Soviet side, they took seriously the idea of "dissidents or trade." I cannot recall any occasion at that time when the West or any of its organizations (NATO, the European Community, etc.) issued some public appeal, recommendation, or edict stating that some specific group of independently-minded people – however defined – were not to be invited to diplomatic parties, celebrations, or receptions.

But today this is happening. One of the strongest and most powerful democratic institutions in the world – the European Union – has no qualms in making a public promise to the Cuban dictatorship that it will re-institute diplomatic Apartheid. The EU's embassies in Havana will now craft their guest lists in accordance with the Cuban government's wishes. The shortsightedness of socialist Prime Minister José Zapatero of Spain has prevailed.

Try to imagine what will happen: at each European embassy, someone will be appointed to screen the list, name by name, and assess whether and to what extent the persons in question behave freely or speak out freely in public, to what extent they criticize the regime, or even whether they are former political prisoners. Lists will be shortened and deletions made, and this will frequently entail eliminating even good personal friends of the diplomats in charge of the screening, people whom they have given various forms of intellectual, political, or material assistance. It will be even worse if the EU countries try to mask their screening activities by inviting only diplomats to embassy celebrations in Cuba.

I can hardly think of a better way for the EU to dishonor the noble ideals of freedom, equality, and human rights that the Union espouses – indeed, principles that it reiterates in its constitutional agreement. To protect European corporations' profits from their Havana hotels, the Union will cease inviting open-minded people to EU embassies, and we will deduce who they are from the expression on the face of the dictator and his associates. It is hard to imagine a more shameful deal.

Cuba's dissidents will, of course, happily do without Western cocktail parties and polite conversation at receptions. This persecution will admittedly aggravate their difficult struggle, but they will naturally survive it. The question is whether the EU will survive it.

Today, the EU is dancing to Fidel's tune. That means that tomorrow it could bid for contracts to build missile bases on the coast of the People's Republic of China. The following day it could allow its decisions on

Chechnya to be dictated by Russian President Vladimir Putin's advisers. Then, for some unknown reason, it could make its assistance to Africa conditional on fraternal ties with the worst African dictators.

Where will it end? The release of Milosevic? Denying a visa to Russian human rights activist Sergey Kovalyov? An apology to Saddam Hussein? The opening of peace talks with Al Qaida?

It is suicidal for the EU to draw on Europe's worst political traditions, the common denominator of which is the idea that evil must be appeased and that the best way to achieve peace is through indifference to the freedom of others. Just the opposite is true: such policies expose an indifference to one's own freedom and pave the way for war. After all, Europe is uniting in order to defend its freedom and values, not to sacrifice them to the ideal of harmonious coexistence with dictators and thus risk gradual infiltration of its soul by the anti-democratic mindset.

I firmly believe that the new members of the EU will not forget their experience of totalitarianism and non-violent opposition to evil, and that that experience will be reflected in how they behave in EU bodies. Indeed, this could be the best contribution they can make to the common spiritual, moral, and political foundations of a united Europe.

Václav Havel is Former President of the Czech Republic.

Copyright: Project Syndicate, January 2005.

<http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/havel24>

washingtonpost.com

The Right Time for An Islamic Reformation

By Salman Rushdie

Sunday, August 7, 2005; B07

When Sir Iqbal Sacranie, head of the Muslim Council of Britain, admitted that "our own children" had perpetrated the July 7 London bombings, it was the first time in my memory that a British Muslim had accepted his community's responsibility for outrages committed by its members. Instead of blaming U.S. foreign policy or "Islamophobia," Sacranie described the bombings as a "profound challenge" for the Muslim community. However, this is the same Sacranie who, in 1989, said that "Death is perhaps too easy" for the author of "The Satanic Verses." Tony Blair's decision to knight him and treat him as the acceptable face of "moderate," "traditional" Islam is either a sign of his government's penchant for religious appeasement or a demonstration of how limited Blair's options really are.

Sacranie is a strong advocate of Blair's much-criticized new religious-hatred bill, which will make it harder to criticize religion, and he actually expects the new law to outlaw references to Islamic terrorism. He said as recently as Jan. 13, "There is no such thing as an Islamic terrorist. This is deeply offensive. Saying Muslims are terrorists would be covered [i.e., banned] by this provision." Two weeks later his organization boycotted a Holocaust remembrance ceremony in London commemorating the liberation of Auschwitz 60 years ago. If Sir Iqbal Sacranie is the best Blair can offer in the way of a good Muslim, we have a problem.

The Sacranie case illustrates the weakness of the Blair government's strategy of relying on traditional, essentially orthodox Muslims to help eradicate Islamist radicalism. Traditional Islam is a broad church that certainly includes millions of tolerant, civilized men and women but also encompasses many whose views on women's rights are antediluvian, who think of homosexuality as ungodly, who have little time for real freedom of expression, who routinely express anti-Semitic views and who, in the case of the Muslim diaspora, are -- it has to be said -- in many ways at odds with the Christian, Hindu, non-believing or Jewish cultures among which they live.

In Leeds, from which several of the London bombers came, many traditional Muslims lead inward-turned lives of near-segregation from the wider population. From such defensive, separated worlds some youngsters have indefensibly stepped across a moral line and taken up their lethal rucksacks.

The deeper alienations that lead to terrorism may have their roots in these young men's objections to events in Iraq or elsewhere, but the closed communities of some traditional Western Muslims are places in which young men's alienations can easily deepen. What is needed is a move beyond tradition -- nothing less than a reform movement to bring the core concepts of Islam into the modern age, a Muslim Reformation to combat not only the jihadist ideologues but also the dusty, stifling seminaries of the traditionalists, throwing open the windows to let in much-needed fresh air.

It would be good to see governments and community leaders inside the Muslim world as well as outside it throwing their weight behind this idea, because creating and sustaining such a reform movement will require above all a new educational impetus whose results may take a generation to be felt, a new scholarship to replace the literalist diktats and narrow dogmatisms that plague present-day Muslim thinking. It is high time, for starters, that Muslims were able to study the revelation of their religion as an event inside history, not supernaturally above it.

It should be a matter of intense interest to all Muslims that Islam is the only religion whose origins were recorded historically and thus are grounded not in legend but in fact. The Koran was revealed at a time of great change in the Arab world, the seventh-century shift from a matriarchal nomadic culture to an urban patriarchal system. Muhammad, as an orphan, personally suffered the difficulties of this transformation, and it is possible to read the Koran as a plea for the old matriarchal values in the new patriarchal world, a conservative plea that became revolutionary because of its appeal to all those whom the new system disenfranchised, the poor, the powerless and, yes, the orphans.

Muhammad was also a successful merchant and heard, on his travels, the Nestorian Christians' desert versions of Bible stories that the Koran mirrors closely (Christ, in the Koran, is born in an oasis, under a palm tree). It ought to be fascinating to Muslims everywhere to see how deeply their beloved book is a product of its place and time, and in how many ways it reflects the Prophet's own experiences.

However, few Muslims have been permitted to study their religious book in this way. The insistence that the Koranic text is the infallible, uncreated word of God renders analytical, scholarly discourse all but impossible. Why would God be influenced by the socioeconomics of seventh-century Arabia, after all? Why would the Messenger's personal circumstances have anything to do with the Message?

The traditionalists' refusal of history plays right into the hands of the literalist Islamofascists, allowing them to imprison Islam in their iron certainties and unchanging absolutes. If, however, the Koran were seen as a historical document, then it would be legitimate to reinterpret it to suit the new conditions of successive new ages. Laws made in the seventh century could finally give way to the needs of the 21st. The Islamic Reformation has to begin here, with an acceptance of the concept that all ideas, even sacred ones, must adapt to altered realities.

Broad-mindedness is related to tolerance; open-mindedness is the sibling of peace. This is how to take up the "profound challenge" of the bombers. Will Sir Iqbal Sacranie and his ilk agree that Islam must be modernized? That would make them part of the solution. Otherwise, they're just the "traditional" part of the problem.

The writer is a novelist and essayist whose works include "The Satanic Verses."

http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/08/05/AR2005080501483_pf.html

One on One: A 'dhimmi' view of Europe-Interview with Bat Ye'or

Jul. 9, 2008

Ruthie Blum , THE JERUSALEM POST

'I always thought I'd be writing novels," says Bat Ye'or, her wistfulness somehow adding an extra touch of class to her thick French accent. "Not such serious work."

Given the gravity of her subject matter, and what some might consider her alarmist way with words, this is hard to believe. But then, so is the historian's life story, which is the stuff that sagas are made of.

Hers began in Egypt during World War II. The daughter of a middle-class Jewish family named Orebi, Bat Ye'or (her trademark pseudonym, which in Hebrew means "daughter of the Nile") fled with her parents to England in 1957 - after suffering the brunt of the anti-Semitism she claims characterized the entire Arab world.

In 1959, she married a Briton - also a historian - whom she prefers not to name, to protect his and her privacy. The couple then moved to and settled in Switzerland in 1960, where they raised their children and continue to reside.

She is the author of eight books, including *The Dhimmi: Jews and Christians under Islam* (1985); *The Decline of Eastern Christianity: From Jihad to Dhimmitude* (1996); *Islam and Dhimmitude: Where Civilizations Collide* (2001); and - the one which captured international attention and catapulted her into the center of controversy - *Eurabia: The Euro-Arab Axis* (2005). Saying that Europe is basically finished, due to its kissing up to the Arabs, will do that.

Here recently to promote the release of her best-selling "cautionary tale" in Hebrew (*EuroArabia*, Schocken Publishers; translation by Arie Hashavia), Bat Ye'or explains why she believes the West in general, and Europe in particular, is in state of denial at best, and dhimmitude at worst. To make matters more complicated, she asserts, though the citizens of European countries long to preserve their individual and collective cultures of freedom and democracy - which they have been exhibiting at the polls - the European Union, influenced by the UN-backed Islamic leadership, advocates appeasement and passivism.

In an hour-long interview on the terrace of her Mishkenot Sha'ananim digs overlooking the Old City of Jerusalem, Bat Ye'or expounds on her bleak prognosis in an articulate tirade, raising her voice now and then

for emphasis, pausing occasionally to laugh. What she has to say about the state of the world, however, is more likely to make one cry.

Why do you use a pseudonym?

For many reasons. First of all, when I left Egypt and started living in Europe, I found that I had changed - that I was no longer the person I had been before.

Secondly, I have always preferred to keep my personal and professional lives separate. I have always wanted my social standing to be distinct from my being the wife of my husband, the daughter of my parents and the mother of my children. It is a matter of independence.

Why did your family leave Egypt?

We left as part of the big exodus of Jews from Arab-Muslim countries. Jews suffered from severe anti-Semitism, especially in Egypt. There was a powerful Nazi community, established by [then Egyptian president Gamal Abdel] Nasser. There were many anti-Jewish laws. There was a general feeling of insecurity. There was open hatred expressed by the Muslim Brotherhood, especially in relation to the Palestine issue. As early as World War II - particularly after the November 1945 pogroms in Egypt - Jews began leaving the country. Many went to Israel. At that time there was a Zionist underground. Zionism was made a criminal offense for which you could be jailed or even tortured. So, many young people left. For the old people, of course, it was difficult, because many were members of the bourgeoisie, and it was forbidden for Jews to take any money or assets out of the country when they left. My parents' assets were confiscated, for example, which created economic problems for our family.

Are you saying that as World War II ended, and in Europe Nazism became taboo, it was gaining strength in the Arab world?

Yes, but even before and throughout the war, both Nazism and fascism were strong in the Arab world. Hitler and Mussolini were heroes. The whole Middle East was in turmoil because the Arab-Muslim populations were all favorable to Nazism and anti-Semitic policies.

How much of what was going on in the death camps in Europe were you and other Jews in Egypt aware of at the time?

We knew everything. I remember my parents listening very carefully to the radio. And it was also in the newspaper. But also, my mother's family was in France, and they were forced to wear the yellow star. So we knew.

When you heard about the peace treaty that Israeli prime minister Menachem Begin signed with Egyptian president Anwar Sadat in 1979, how did you feel?

I wasn't following it that carefully, due to family problems. Nor was I familiar with Israeli politics at the time. But I trusted Begin to do the best thing for Israel. So, I did have hope. Still, what you have to understand is that the problem is much larger than Egypt. The whole Muslim world is becoming more and more radicalized - more rooted in Shari'a, and less open to anything outside the religion. This is due to the policies of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), with 57 Islamic member states and a permanent delegation to the UN. At its last summit in December 2005, it decided upon a 10-year plan, one of whose resolutions was to root the Islamic uma - the world Muslim community - in the Koran and the [oral tradition of the] Hadith, which, of course, means Wahabbism. They also resolved to make the Palestinian issue the central issue of international politics. This is why we see relentless pressure on Israel from different countries. Because the OIC is an extremely powerful body, demographically, politically and economically.

The OIC is an Islamic body. How has it managed to turn the Palestinian issue into a Western focus? And to what do you attribute the political and cultural success of its ideology in Europe and the United States?

First of all, a distinction has to be made here between Europe and America, which have chosen opposite paths in relation to the Middle East.

As for OIC influence on Europe: It is visible in immigration policy toward Muslims, and in the Muslims' refusal to integrate into European societies.

The OIC considers nationalist-European movements, European history, European culture, European religions and European languages as Islamophobic. Why? Because Europeans have begun to feel that they are losing their own identity, due to their efforts to welcome immigrants who don't want to integrate. As a result, they have adopted measures to stop illegal immigration, to control legal immigration and to curb terrorism. Europeans fear losing their historical and cultural assets - particularly those of democracy and human rights - to Shari'a law. They want one law for everybody - and it's not Shari'a, which involves things like honor killings. It is thus that in all international forums, the OIC attacks Europe and demands that it apply multiculturalism.

Now, Europeans do not want multiculturalism. But this is a problem, because European governments - and especially the European Union - do not want to fight the OIC, and so they collaborate with it. Therefore, what we have inside Europe is a clash of interests between the European citizens and their governments.

A similar claim is often made about Muslim-Arab citizens and their governments - that a majority of the former is moderate, while the latter is extremist. Do you agree with this assessment?

No, I don't agree with it at all. In fact, the opposite is the case. In the Arab world, it is the governments - as we see so well in Egypt - that are at the mercy of the radicalized, Islamized, anti-Western, anti-American and anti-Israel masses who are in a dynamic of jihad. Certainly the majority of Muslims follow the ideology of conquest; it is in the Koran and the Hadith! And every time they go to the mosque, they hear it. I mean, the first shura, that is recited five times a day, is anti-Christian and anti-Jewish. So they cannot escape from it.

Unfortunately, the Muslims who are against this trend don't have the courage to make the effort to change it. And those who do have the courage are threatened with losing their jobs and having harm done to them and their families. So Islamism is the natural culture of the Arab-Muslim world. Even in Turkey an Islamist government has taken over. So, how can we deny the reality? And anyway, if the moderates were in the majority, they would be making protests and issuing manifestos against Osama bin Laden, instead of against America and Israel.

The environment is one of jihad on the one hand and of dhimmitude [the state of being a non-Muslim subject living in a country governed by Shari'a law] on the other. European countries are becoming dhimmi countries, and people don't realize it, because they don't know what jihad and dhimmitude are, so they don't recognize what condition they're in. When you have an illness, but are unfamiliar with its symptoms, you don't know that you are sick. You feel sick, but you don't know what you've got. You therefore can't make a diagnosis or embark upon a method of treatment to cure yourself. This is the current condition of Western civilization right now.

How, then, do you explain the electoral victories of France's Nicolas Sarkozy, Germany's Angela Merkel, Italy's Silvio Berlusconi and London's replacement of mayor Ken Livingstone by Boris Johnson? Wouldn't you consider this phenomenon as indicative that Europeans are making a diagnosis of and seeking a cure to the illness you say they suffer from?

Oh yes, they are extremely important developments which prove what I am saying about European citizens having had enough of this attempt to merge - culturally, religiously and demographically - the Arab and European sides of the Mediterranean. But the pressure exerted by the OIC on European governments is very strong. In addition, there is the pressure of terrorism inside and out of Europe, and that of the oil. So the

task of these new governments you refer to will not be easy, to say the least. I don't doubt their good intentions. But I don't know if they will succeed in bringing about the change their citizens want.

Furthermore, unlike President Bush - who recognizes that Israel has a legitimate right to exist as a normal nation in its homeland - the Europeans think that Israel's legitimacy should be granted by the Palestinians and the Arab states. In other words, Europe is putting Israel into a position of dhimmitude, whereby it will be recognized by Muslims if it abides by certain rules and duties.

This is in keeping with its own mentality. When the European community, in December 1973, published its document on European identity in the Copenhagen Declaration, they themselves were adopting a dhimmi mentality toward the Arab League countries. After World War II, Europeans decided that they didn't want any more wars. Then, when they suffered aggression, such as the oil boycott and Palestinian terrorism that emerged in Europe in the late 1960s, instead of fighting, they joined their aggressors. This was their concept of multilateralism - thinking that by joining those who attacked them, they would be protected. This is when a tremendous Muslim immigration into Europe began.

You keep referring to immigration. Isn't childbirth also a demographic factor, particularly since Muslims tend to have many children, while some European countries suffer from zero or minus population growth? Is it possible that by virtue of their numbers, Muslims in Europe are influencing policy - and that it is not just due to the power of the OIC?

Yes, but you have to understand that those who plan policy are Europeans. In other words, Muslim politics are conducted in Europe by Europeans themselves, based on the interests of Muslim lobbyists.

Isn't Eastern Europe different from Western Europe in this respect?

Yes, and Eastern Europe is more pro-American than Western Europe - which is what the Muslims want. It is easier to take over the West as a whole when it's divided.

How has this affected European academia?

European universities - like those in America - are totally controlled by the Arab-Islamic lobby, as are the schools. A teacher who attempts to teach according to the European view of history is thrown out. Indeed, the freedom of expression and thought that has been so crucial for European democracy has disappeared.

Many Israeli academics bemoan a similar situation in Israel. Do you see the mind frame you're describing infiltrating the Jewish state?

Yes, because the EU is spending a lot of money on Israeli NGOs in order to promote policies which will lead to the destruction of Israel. The EU considers Israel to be an accident of history that has to disappear. It thinks that if Israel disappears, relations between Europe and the Arab world will be much better. Now, the EU doesn't come out and actually say this, but all its policies, statements and actions are indicative of its aims. These aims could be developed in Israel and in America - especially when there is a new president.

Speaking of which, there is a concern among many Jews and Israelis that if Barack Obama becomes president, he will lean toward the kind of alliance with the Arab world that the EU promotes.

Yes, because he has a kind of "Third Worldism" - you know, the view that we all have to get together and appease the enemy. I'm no specialist on Obama. But I think that Bush has been a great politician, and that history will show he was right. Aside from everything else, he has woken up Europe to the calamity of global terrorism - and this is what brought about the coming to power of Merkel, Sarkozy and Berlusconi. And Europe can no longer be as anti-American.

That's ironic, isn't it, considering that most Americans now hate Bush?

That's because they don't understand what is really going on.

Given your bleak view of Europe, how is it that you didn't end up living in Israel or the US?

I love Europe. It is part of my family history and my culture. I can criticize it because I love it and want to help it. Look what Europe has given to the world: democracy and human rights, the love of peace. Look at its achievements in the field of literature, music, law, architecture. There is a tremendous richness. But we have to fight for all those values and accomplishments. Otherwise, we will be living as dhimmis in barbarity.

Finally, how do you envision Western civilization 10 years from now?

The Mishna says, "You are not required to finish the task, but neither are you free to desist from it."

Well, I feel that though I may not have done enough, I have tried the best I could.

As for the future, it is difficult to say, but we must have hope. We have to educate the European, American and Israeli youth to recover their culture and values, since it is they who will have to continue the efforts to preserve freedom and democracy - and they who will have to fight to defend them.

This article can also be read at <http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?cid=1215330916349&pagename=JPost%2FJPArticle%2FShowFull>

[[Back to the Article](#)]

Copyright 1995- 2008 The Jerusalem Post - <http://www.jpost.com/>

Tower of Babble

- Interview with Jamie Glazov

Dore Gold

Frontpage Interview's guest today is Dore Gold, Israel's U.N. ambassador from 1997 to 1999. He is the author of the *New York Times* bestseller *Hatred's Kingdom* and of the new book, *Tower of Babble: How the United Nations Has Fueled Global Chaos*.

FP: What motivated you to write *Tower of Babble*?

Gold: During the period, when I served as Israel's ambassador to the UN in the 1990's, I was struck by a sense that the world was becoming far more anarchical than anyone had anticipated at the end of the 1991 Gulf War. After all the Cold War was over. The competition between the superpowers was no longer going to exacerbate conflicts around the world and their delegations on the UN Security Council were not going to neutralize one another with their respective veto power. For that reason, President Bush (41) envisioned a "New World Order" emerging and after the success of the Security Council in confronting the aggression of Iraq in Kuwait, the UN was supposed to become the main glue holding that order together. Yet instead, the decade of the 1990's was marked by growing disorder--global chaos. A new, and far more dangerous brand of international terrorism arose that struck the US on 9/11, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction accelerated, and acts of genocide returned in Africa and even on the continent of Europe.

From my vantage point, the UN seemed to be directly connected to this global deterioration. Had it not taken responsibility for multilateral diplomacy over the future of Afghanistan during the rise of the Taliban, or not claimed to protect international security through the mechanism of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and finally not deployed peacekeepers on the ground in Rwanda and Bosnia prior to the mass killings in those areas, then I couldn't make that charge. But peoples of the world looked to the UN to protect them, and the UN let them down. And frequently these UN failures led to the spread of far worse crises, particularly in the Central African Republic and in the Balkans. With this record, what moral right did the UN have to attack President Bush seeking to forcibly implement UN Security Council resolutions with respect to the regime of Saddam Hussein?

FP: It doesn't appear it had any moral right at all. So crystallize for us briefly, then, your main indictments against the U.N.

Gold: For President Franklin Delano Roosevelt the UN was supposed to be instrumental in "nipping aggression in the bud," and by doing so, preventing a re-play of the Second World War. But the UN couldn't even define aggression until 1974 and even then its definition was full of loopholes. Worse still, the UN is a manufacturing plant for the worst moral equivalence that just cripples effective action to stop wars: in its international behavior, for the most part, the UN does not distinguish between aggressors and the victims of aggression. In Bosnia, UN forces were partial to the Serbs, and not to their Bosnian Muslim victims. In Rwanda, when General Romeo Dallaire, the UN commander on the ground, proposed to the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations, headed by Kofi Annan, that it was necessary to destroy the arms of the Hutu militia before they were used to exterminate the Tutsi tribe, he was told by Annan's office to not take sides--indeed, he was instructed to remain "impartial". More than eight hundred thousand Rwandans were massacred within a few months.

Most recently, the UN General Assembly sought to activate the UN's judicial arm--the International Court of Justice in the Hague--to stop Israel's security fence. Annan's office supplied supporting documentation to the judges in the Hague about Palestinian grievances over the fence, without even relating to the wave of Palestinian suicide terrorism against Israeli civilians that caused the fence to be built in the first place (nor was there mention of other security fences built on disputed territory in Kashmir or Cyprus). Yet the UN holds

itself up to be "the source of international legitimacy"--a beacon of international justice. It is clear, however, that the UN does not determine the relative justice in the claims of parties engaged in an international dispute. It can only reflect the sum total of the political power that a state or national movement can mobilize on his behalf within the halls of the UN. For many peoples, from Tibetan Buddhists to Rwandan Tutsis, to Lebanese Christians to Iraqi Kurds and Black African Muslims in Darfur, Sudan, (and not just the Jewish people) that leaves them completely unprotected if they have to rely on the machinery of the UN.

FP: How did it happen that the forces of anti-Americanism and anti-democracy hijacked an international institution that was supposed to fight aggression, combat terrorism, and preserve global order?

Gold: I am strongly of the belief that moral values are as important in international diplomacy as they are in domestic settings. The UN was actually born in a moment of extreme moral clarity, when there was no confusion over the evil of Nazi Germany and the good of the allies who liberated Europe. In fact, to join the UN in 1945, a state had to declare war on one of the Axis powers, making the original UN more of an alliance rather than a morally rudderless collective body. Even though Stalin's USSR was an original founding member in 1945, it even had to defer to the leadership of the democracies in many cases. Moscow didn't dare vote against the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it would only abstain. But with the expanded membership in the 1960's, moral clarity was lost. Many pro-Soviet Third World regimes re-worked UN resolutions to serve their interests. Individual human rights and freedoms were increasingly re-defined as collective economic rights; the General Assembly, meanwhile, adopted resolutions about the non-interference in member states' internal affairs by exploiting human rights resolutions. With this ethos, it is not surprising that the UN did nothing when the Khmer Rouge slaughtered two million Cambodians; indeed, the UN invited the Khmer Rouge to the Cambodian peace process -- rather than indicting them for war crimes.

FP: *Tower of Babble* shows how terrorist groups have infiltrated UN organizations. Can you illuminate this horrifying reality for us a bit?

The story of the UN and terrorism is really about the loss of standards in the world organization. There may have been pre-conditions to join the UN in 1945, but no pre-conditions were set years later. In 1974, Yasser Arafat was invited to address the UN General Assembly, without having to first renounce terrorism; in a 1970 interview just recently aired on CNN, he voiced his opinion that airplane hijackings could be justified by UN resolutions. In fact, from 1970 through 1982, the UN General Assembly adopted resolutions condoning resistance to alien domination "by all available means" and then added "including armed struggle" -- to this day this has served as the key phraseology for legitimizing terrorism. More recently, in the years 2002-2003, Syria sat on the UN Security Council and was not required to close the offices of more than a dozen terrorist organizations in Damascus as a pre-condition to this elevation of rank in the UN system. No wonder the Syrians feel that they can back the insurgency against the US in Iraq with impunity. The same trend continued elsewhere. UNRWA, the refugee agency for Palestinians, also sets no pre-conditions about the workers it employs; the heads of UNRWA unions are declared members of Hamas. In short, from 1974 to 2004, those engaging in international terrorism were rarely punished in the UN (its post-9/11 Counter-Terrorism Committee, notwithstanding). A political atmosphere was created that was conducive to the appeasement of terrorism instead of directly confronting its global spread.

FP: So what is the solution for this mess? Do we try to fix the U.N. or just discard it for the anti-American and anti-democratic force that it is, and just pursue justice and security without it?

Gold: It is tempting to just discard the UN, but it would be a mistake. For the US, in my judgment, it would boomerang and just create more enemies. Historically, as I have noted, US administrations have bypassed the UN when their vital interests were at stake. President Kennedy relied on the Organization of American States in the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis and not on UN authorization for his naval quarantine of Castro. President Clinton acted in Kosovo through NATO, and not the UN. Finally, President George W. Bush assembled a coalition of the willing in the 2003 Iraq War, unlike his father's UN Gulf War coalition in 1991. Coalitions of the willing will become the likely vehicle in the future for urgent military interventions.

In the ongoing war on terrorism, it might be useful to form a permanent coalition of democratic countries. Some democracies, like France and Belgium, might be unlikely, at this point, to join. But besides European states, like Britain, Italy, and the new democracies from Eastern Europe, the US could go outside of Europe

to Turkey, Israel, India, Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, and Australia. Should this bloc become substantial, it would be worthwhile to force through the UN General Assembly new resolutions that served our collective interests and brake the hold of the Non-Aligned Movement. It is important for many countries what the UN is saying. If it is condoning terrorism in its resolutions, then they will not act sufficiently against armed groups. If it is protecting the Third World dictatorships by adopting resolutions about the "non-interference in the domestic affairs of states", then they will abuse their citizens and ignore their responsibilities to human rights conventions.

In short, in the near term, it is necessary to bypass the UN when the Free World faces imminent dangers. But in the medium to longer term, it may be possible to alter the UN--not by the kind of structural reforms, now being suggested by a panel of experts reporting to Secretary-General Kofi Annan (enlarging the Security Council from 15 to 24), but rather by reforming the substance of the UN through an agenda that serves the democracies instead of the dictatorships.

FP: What do you think about the rise of anti-Semitism world-wide? What explains it?

Gold: I would pick up from the insight of David Horowitz about the emerging alliance between militant Islam and the radical left. It is important to remember for perspective that Islam, while relegating non-Muslims to a second class status, nonetheless showed a remarkable degree of tolerance at times, especially to the Jewish people: the Ottoman Empire opened its doors to Jewish refugees from the Spanish Inquisition in the 15th century and provided land grants for Jewish resettlement in the Land of Israel, well before the British. The Ottoman Sultans were the caliphs of all Sunni Islam, yet this background of limited inter-religious tolerance has been wiped out entirely by the new Islamic militancy, that has been fed by the Wahhabis of Saudi Arabia and the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood. In their effort to wipe out the "infidels", the new Islamic militancy has even produced in the last few years *fatwas* (religious opinions) that call for the mass murder of non-Muslims and the employment of weapons of mass destruction. Delegitimizing the enemy, including the revival and spread of anti-semitism for them is a critical first step to prepare the groundwork for what they operationally plan. France already has a rich anti-semitic past, but if you throw into the mix the message being spread to French Muslims by radical Islamic preachers, you can easily restore European anti-semitism. Rather than attack the Jewish people directly, the formula that many prefer is to demonize the Jewish state, Israel, to such a disproportional extent that the target audience can only conclude that Israeli behavior emamates from something inherently flawed or evil in Jewish character. That is the nexus between anti-Israelism and anti-semitism.

Here the radical Muslims have found a willing partner. The old European left felt connected to Israel. First, their Soviet allies initially supported Israel as an instrument against British imperialism. Later, after the split between Israel and the USSR, Israel still stood out as a real experiment in socialism; for the European left that no longer bought into the Soviet Union as a workers' paradise, the hard-working farmers on an Israeli kibbutz were to be admired and many Europeans came to volunteer for a summer on a kibbutz. Finally, until 1977, the European socialist parties maintained strong ties with the Israeli governing elite from the Israeli Labor Party through the Socialist Internationale. Secularized European socialists did not have to consider whether the return of the Jewish people to their homeland after 2000 years was legitimate, because the results of this experiment, regardless of its roots, was supposed to be part of their socialist world order, in any case.

When Israel became a global ally of the United States in the early 1970's downing Soviet MiGs over the Suez Canal and taking on Soviet expansionism in the Eastern Mediterranean, the European left became more disenchanted with Israel, just like they became alienated from other American Cold War partners (they went after the human rights record of US allies and not Soviet satellites). And with the rise of the the conservative Likud Party, that replaced the Israeli Labor Party for the first time in 1977 (and kept getting re-elected in the next fifteen years) the special Socialist link to the European Left was broken. Some of their leaders adjusted to the new reality. But for the radical Left, Israel now had no redeeming features. The Bible certainly had no meaning to those who were weaned on a strictly Marxist diet in their youth. Many looked at Israel, not as an epic drama of a people returning to history after centuries of exile, but rather as a throwback to European imperialism. For them it became illegitimate. And just like the radical Muslims, the radical leftists could easily transfer their dislike of Israel, which democratically made a sharp break with its past, to a general dislike of the Jewish people, in general. Today the anti-globalizes have taken on the PLO flag as one of their symbols; they associate Israel with the global capitalist establishment, which is their adversary. And

like the radical Islamists, they buy into wild conspiracy theories about neo-conservatives in America serving Israel's interests in Iraq. This way they convert their anti-Israeli perspectives into a global assault on Jews, whether they are Israelis or just American citizens.

FP: What do you think is the psychology of the Left in its contemporary alliance with radical Islam? The Left supposedly values women's rights, gay rights, minority rights and all other democratic rights and yet it is now on the side of a group of fascists and zealots that violently extinguish all of those rights. What's the story here?

Gold: For all these groups anti-Americanism is a supreme value, above all others. That is why some women's rights groups could oppose the US intervention in Afghanistan even if the Taliban abused women.

FP: The U.S. and Israel are clearly fighting the same battle for liberty against tyranny and terror. Tell us a bit what strategies you think both nations should be pursuing in the terror war.

Gold: The war on terrorism involves a military campaign, but it can only be won with a diplomatic campaign, as well. This is really a world order problem. How do you get countries to adopt a code of behavior that neutralizes all aspects of the new global terrorism. Clearly, states must not provide sanctuary for terrorist groups, but as in the case of Syria, UN membership is insufficient to get Syrian behavior changed. Defeating terrorism means also getting at terrorist financing; efforts in this area have only begun. Most importantly, defeating terrorism involves eradicating incitement to engage in terrorist acts. Given our common background in support of religious liberty, we all get uncomfortable monitoring what is said in a mosque or in a religious school. But the creation of a culture of religious tolerance may be as important as halting terrorist financing. The US does not have to impose these changes by force across the Middle East. It will need diplomatic partners worldwide in this endeavor. When the Wahhabis threatened the Middle East with a new militant extremism in the early 19th century, it was the Ottoman Empire that ultimately crushed them for many decades, not the British Royal Navy. As of yet there is no Muslim power which is willing to play that role today, but the Islamic world will ultimately have to take responsibility for extinguishing its own militancy, that seeks, after all, to first crush the "infidel" regimes of the Arab world, and then complete its global *jihad*. These are not short-term changes; they will take decades to be completed.

<http://www.jcpa.org/art/fpmag-dg7jan05.htm>

Bush Won't Allow Iran To Go Nuclear

ALLISTER HEATH

WEDNESDAY, 9TH AUGUST 2006

The former Israeli prime minister tells Allister Heath why he believes the US President will keep his promise to curb Tehran — even if many Europeans remain blind to the threat

It was not my idea of a joke, but I reluctantly complied with the Israeli detective's request that I hand over all my belongings to him 'as hostages', including my mobile phone and passport. He congratulated himself repeatedly on his sense of humour, before ushering me on to the back seat of the heavily armoured Jaguar, where I squeezed in as best as I could between Benjamin Netanyahu and one of his bodyguards.

As our mini-motorcade began its journey across London, with the Hebrew-speaking security personnel eyeing every passing car, it soon became obvious that these are curious times for Netanyahu, the former Israeli prime minister. He may be leader of the opposition but he has steadfastly supported his bitter rival Prime Minister Ehud Olmert throughout the conflict in Lebanon, while also feeling that the hawkish views that cost his Likud party the March election have now been vindicated by the thousands of Hezbollah rockets that have landed on Israel over the past month.

To Netanyahu, the rise of Iran's extremist regime is the defining geopolitical event of our times; the whole world, not just Israel, is in its sights. Dealing with Tehran is therefore the West's greatest challenge; he is scathing about many Europeans' refusal to recognise the Iranian regime's imperialistic and murderous ambitions. But to my great surprise he is absolutely convinced that America will soon step in, one way or the other, to prevent Tehran from going nuclear, and that this will happen at some point during the remaining two years and three months of the Bush presidency.

'When President Bush said that he will not let Iran develop nuclear weapons, I take him at his word,' he said, quietly. 'How he plans to do it of course is up to him. The fact is that the President of the US said that he — he — would not let Iran develop nuclear weapons. That places first a clear goal. It doesn't define the means, and as you know there is a United Nations resolution, but it does define a time-limit for the achievement of that goal. The timeframe is a logical inference. I take him at his word. Why doubt it?'

Last month's UN Security Council resolution giving Iran until the end of this month to suspend uranium enrichment or face the threat of international sanctions is only a start. 'These are obviously milestones. It is important that they are laid down but we have to keep our mind on the main issue, which is that time is running out. Our intelligence chiefs have said that within three years an unimpeded Iran will be able to produce a bomb.'

I pressed Netanyahu further, asking him whether he thought it would be feasible for the US to take out Iran's nuclear capabilities by force, given that their nuclear research programme is spread across Iran and buried in bunkers deep underground. But Netanyahu simply shrugged. 'Just listen to Bush. He obviously thinks he has some combination of means: diplomatic, military, whatever.'

Rarely are politicians so unequivocal. Although Netanyahu claims to be relying purely on public statements from the White House, his view will be taken extremely seriously across the world. For it suggests that the Bush presidency will end either on a diplomatic breakthrough with a cast-iron agreement that Iran will not develop nuclear weapons; or else with the monumental gamble that war with Iran would represent.

If the US is indeed preparing for a serious showdown, those who argue that President Bush invaded the wrong country in 2003 will undoubtedly feel vindicated. Remarkably, Netanyahu agrees: 'Would it have been smarter to go directly into Iran? Would it have been wiser? In retrospect the answer is probably yes.' But he

also argued that one of the most far-reaching yet least recognised military interventions of the past few decades was Israel's daring raid on Iraq's Osirak nuclear power station in 1981, which destroyed its nuclear programme. 'Saddam with atomic weapons would have been a great danger, too. Israel deserves credit for giving the world two to three decades of nuclear peace from nuclear-armed bandits. Israel was condemned at the time, as it is condemned now, for defending itself, but in so doing also removing a tremendous threat from the world,' said Netanyahu.

But the conversation again turned to Iran and its president, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, who has repeatedly called for Israel to be wiped off the map. 'While denying the Holocaust, he's openly preparing the next one,' Netanyahu said. 'Ahmadinejad is behaving exactly like an Islamist Hitler. He is using the same tactics of signalling in advance the act of destruction. That the same thing is happening is one thing, but that the West is reacting in the same way is unacceptable. What is history for?'

By now, Netanyahu was shouting angrily, shaking his fist as he explained the similarities he sees between the 1930s and today. 'Yes, there are differences, it is not a perfect analogy. Yes, Germany didn't have a billion Germans to infect. Yes, Germany had race and not creed as its prime goal. Nazism started its attacks on the Jews and spread to the rest of the world in their mad militancy, and that is exactly what is happening now.'

For Netanyahu, Israel is a latter-day Czechoslovakia, which deluded and desperately anti-war European powers, led by Neville Chamberlain, sacrificed to the Nazis in 1938 because of the German-speaking minority in Sudetenland, whom he compares with today's Palestinians. 'And, yes, there was apologetics and, yes, there was appeasement and, yes, there was pressure on a small resistant democracy in the face of this German onslaught. It was called Czechoslovakia at the time. And, yes, there were articles in the British press condemning Czechoslovakia for inciting a German response because of the denial of the rights of the Sudeten Germans. Do you want to go on with this?'

Netanyahu rejects the comparison between radical Islamic terrorists and communists. The main difference, he argues, is that the communists were rational when it came to foreign policy, putting their survival first and always backing down at the last moment, as shown in the Cuban missile crisis. This was not true of the Iranian regime, he said, arguing that they were trying to prompt the return of the Hidden Imam, an event which Shiites believe would be accompanied by an apocalypse. 'Is it possible in the 21st century to have a resurrection of the religious wars that we thought had ended in the 17th century? Yes, it's possible. This is what is going on.'

With more civilian casualties announced in Lebanon by the day, I asked Netanyahu whether he thought Israel's military campaign was proportionate. 'Our response is disproportionately low,' he replied, comparing Israel's campaign with Britain's bombing of Germany during the second world war. 'We had thousands of rockets on our cities, on Haifa and the northern cities. You had thousands of rockets on your cities. What was the response? How can you measure proportionality without using precedents? In a court of law that's what people do, they look at precedents.'

But why then were previously friendly Arab regimes now condemning Israel? 'What Arab leaders say privately to Washington and secretly to Jerusalem is something that would make extraordinary copy for you, and it's very different to what they say publicly.' He added that he has had similar conversations over the past two years with leaders of some of the main European countries, and they were far more supportive of Israel in private than in public. For that he blames the media. 'I don't think Churchill could have won the war if he had cameras in Dresden...'

He also said he felt 'very disappointed' by William Hague's recent criticism of Israel. 'I'm sure he knows better. I always thought of him, and still like to think of him, as a friend and colleague, not in the professional sense but in common views and beliefs. All leadership is taking a personal hit; unless you are prepared to pay a cost for your beliefs, you are not a leader. Blair is a leader. I respect him for it.'

The root cause of the current conflict, Netanyahu argued, is that Hezbollah and Hamas consider all of Israel to be illegitimately occupied land, and that the extremists have been trying to prevent any Jewish settlement in the Middle East since at least the 1920s. 'They say very openly that their goal is not merely to stop at the 1967 lines; but we could vacate all the West Bank and it wouldn't make a damned difference to them. [The

Hezbollah leader Sayyed Hassan] Nasrallah was perfectly honest on this. He said he's firing the rockets into occupied Israel. The occupied settlements of occupied Palestine. It is not a conflict about this or that territory; it is a conflict about Israel's very existence. And to them, any Israeli sovereignty over any piece of land is anathema.'

This should concern everybody, not only in the West but also in the East, Netanyahu argued, because the extremists are trying to recreate the old Islamic empire of yore. To them, 'Israel is simply the first forward position of the hedonistic, corrupt infidel civilisation that has to be overcome to afford their view of the resurgence of Islam.' On that note, Netanyahu bade me farewell and jumped out of the car, leaving me to collect my mobile phone and to ruminate on just how depressing our world has become.

Allister Heath is associate editor of The Spectator and deputy editor of the Business.

The Spectator, 22 Old Queen Street, London, SW1H 9HP. All Articles and Content Copyright ©2007 by The Spectator (1828) Ltd. All Rights Reserved

<http://www.spectator.co.uk/the-magazine/features/24522/bush-wont-allow-iran-to-go-nuclear.shtml>

From www.danielpipes.org | Original article available at: www.danielpipes.org/article/1012

[Appeasement and] Why Europe Balks

by Daniel Pipes
New York Post
January 28, 2003

Leading French politicians made some remarkably defeatist pronouncements last week. Rejecting any U.S. military action against Iraq, President Jacques Chirac said that "War is always the admission of defeat, and is always the worst of solutions. And hence everything must be done to avoid it." Foreign Minister Dominique de Villepin put it more emphatically: "Nothing justifies envisaging military action." To all this, the German chancellor beamed with approval.

In response, U.S. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld dismissed France and Germany as "old Europe." The *Post* blasted them as the "Axis of Weasel." Cartoonist Tony Auth dubbed them the "Axis of Annoyance." An even better name would be "Axis of Appeasement." "Appeasement" may sound like an insult, but it is a serious policy with a long history - *and* an enduring appeal highly relevant to today's circumstances.

Yale historian Paul Kennedy defines appeasement as a way of settling quarrels "by admitting and satisfying grievances through rational negotiation and compromise, thereby avoiding the resort to an armed conflict which would be expensive, bloody and possibly very dangerous." The British Empire relied heavily on appeasement from the 1860s on, with good results - avoiding costly colonial conflicts while preserving the international status quo. To a lesser extent, other European governments also adopted the policy.

Then came 1914, when in a fit of delirium nearly all Europe abandoned appeasement and rushed into World War I with what Yale historian Peter Gay calls "a fervor bordering on a religious experience." A century had passed since the continent had experienced the miseries of war, and their memory had vanished. Worse, thinkers such as the German Friedrich Nietzsche developed theories glorifying war.

Four years (1914-18) of hell, especially in the trenches of northern France, then prompted immense guilt about the jubilation of 1914. A new consensus emerged: Never again would Europeans rush into war. Appeasement looked better than ever. And so, as Adolf Hitler threatened in the 1930s, British and French leaders tried to buy him off. Of course, what worked in colonial wars had utterly disastrous results when dealing with an enemy like the Nazis.

This led to the policy of buying off totalitarian opponents being discredited. Throughout the Cold War, it appeared the Europeans had learned a lesson they would never forget. But forget they did, soon after the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991.

In a brilliant [Weekly Standard essay](#), Yale's David Gelernter recently explained how this happened. The power of appeasement was temporarily hidden by World War II and the Cold War, but with the passage of time, "The effects of the Second World War are vanishing while the effects of the First endure."

Why? Because, writes Gelernter, the First World War is far more comprehensible than the Second, which is "too big for the mind to grasp." Politically and spiritually, it feels increasingly as though World War II never took place.

In fact, Gelernter argues, "It's the 1920s all over again," with that era's visceral loathing of war and readiness to appease totalitarian dictators (think of North Korea, Iraq, Syria, Zimbabwe and others).

He finds today's Europe "amazingly" similar to that of the 1920s in other ways too: "its love of self-determination and loathing of imperialism and war, its liberal Germany, shrunken Russia and map of Europe crammed with small states, with America's indifference to Europe and Europe's disdain for America, with Europe's casual, endemic anti-Semitism, her politically, financially and masochistically rewarding fascination with Muslim states who despise her and her undertone of self-hatred and guilt."

Gelernter proposes that 1920s-style self-hatred is now "a dominant force in Europe." And appeasement fits this mood perfectly, having grown over the decades into a worldview "that teaches the blood-guilt of Western man, the moral bankruptcy of the West and the outrageousness of Western civilization's attempting to impose its values on anyone else."

Which brings us back to the unwillingness of "old Europe" to confront Saddam Hussein. World War II's lesson (strike before an aggressive tyrant builds his power) has lost out to the '20s attitude ("nothing justifies envisaging military action").

This self-hating weakness will lead again to disaster, no less than it did leading up to World War II. The United States finds itself having to lead the democracies away from the lure of appeasement. Iraq is a good place to start.

Syria Joins the Axis of Evil

By [John R. Bolton](#)

Posted: Tuesday, September 25, 2007

ARTICLES

[Wall Street Journal](#)

Publication Date: September 25, 2007



Senior Fellow John
R. Bolton

The six-party talks on North Korea's nuclear weapons program are set to resume on Sept. 27 in Beijing. Since the last session, a raft of "working group" meetings and Democratic People's Republic of Korea propaganda events have purportedly shown "progress" in implementing the Feb. 13 agreement to eliminate the North's nuclear capabilities. On Oct. 2, South Korean President Roh Muh-hyun will travel to Pyongyang to embrace Kim Jong Il. Mr. Roh hopes to boost political allies in a close presidential race against opponents of his appeasement policies.

But this entire diplomatic minuet has been reduced almost to insignificance by news from an unexpected place: the Middle East. A dramatic and apparently successful night-time Israeli air attack on Syria, whose details remain extraordinarily closely held, has increased the stakes. North Korea immediately condemned the raid, an action that raises this question: What is it about a raid in Syria that got Kim Jong Il's attention?

Israel's specific target is less important than the fact that with its objection to the raid, North Korea may have tipped its hand. Pyongyang's interest in the raid may be evidence of secret nuclear cooperation between the regime and Syria. There is much still unknown about a potential North Korea project in Syria, such as whether it was a direct sale of technology or equipment to the Syrians, a stand-alone facility or some sort of joint venture. In any case, the threat to Israel of such a project would be acute, perhaps existential--which is why it would risk all-out regional war to strike pre-emptively.

Even if we "only" have evidence of continued North Korean ballistic missile cooperation with Syria, that alone should keep the North on the U.S. list of state sponsors of terrorism.

Outsourcing strategic programs is nothing new for North Korea. For years, Pyongyang has been an aggressive proliferator of ballistic-missile technology, especially to the Middle East. In 1998, North Korea conducted a successful Taepo Dong missile launch and shortly thereafter gained an enormous propaganda boost by announcing a moratorium on launch-testing from its territory. But it didn't halt missile development and benefited greatly from Iran's ballistic missile program. Sharing data made eminent sense since both countries used the same basic Scud technology. Having successfully worked this shell game in ballistic missiles, it should come as no surprise that North Korea would try it again in the nuclear field.

Iran's increasing hegemony over Syria makes Syrian-North Korean cooperation in nuclear matters unlikely without its consent. Although Iran's involvement here is murky, its incentive to conceal its own nuclear program raises the possibility of a three-way deal. Most chillingly, the United States and Israel must now ask whether the Iranian and North Korean nuclear challenges can be resolved in isolation from one another.

Until more details become public, debate over the full extent of Syrian-North Korean cooperation will continue. What the Israeli attack highlights, however--even if it does not prove conclusively for now--is that North Korea is a global threat.

If the North is engaging in nuclear cooperation with Syria, the Feb. 13 agreement should be terminated. How much more evidence of mendacity do we need before we wake up? In fact, the Feb. 13 agreement is now merely a slogan. Its deadlines and its "actions for actions" mantra have disappeared, lost in a "process" of endless meetings and working groups. This "process" is inherently favorable to Kim Jong Il because it enables the North's legendary ability to trade the same obligation multiple times for tangible rewards, whether or not it performs.

Even if we "only" have evidence of continued North Korean ballistic missile cooperation with Syria, that alone should keep the North on the U.S. list of state sponsors of terrorism. Syria--and its senior partner, Iran--are both long-time denizens of that same list of state sponsors of terrorism. Can we really delist North Korea when it partners with other terrorist states in the most destructive technologies?

Moreover, where are Syria's ballistic missiles--and its weapons of mass destruction--aimed? With American forces at risk in Iraq, no increase in the threats they face is acceptable, especially given Syria's record on Iraq to date. Syria remains at war with Israel and with Lebanon's Cedar Revolution. No one concerned about Israel's security or Lebanon's democracy should countenance giving North Korea a pass on the terrorism issue.

If the evidence is uncertain or mixed, the State Department will, unfortunately, desperately cling to "the process." If so, to protect the U.S. from the national security risk and international humiliation of another Pyongyang diplomatic triumph, we must insist on real dismantling of the North's nuclear program and a broad, deep and lasting verification mechanism. Moreover, what was once a subsidiary verification issue--North Korean outsourcing off the Peninsula--now assumes critical importance.

When will real verification experts from across our government finally receive a significant role? As one verifier said recently, "we'll know what's really going on when U.S. physicists start talking to [North Korean] physicists." State's diplomats should welcome this assistance, although traditionally they view the arrival of verifiers into arms control negotiations the same way Al Capone saw Elliot Ness and "The Untouchables." Of course, beyond negotiations, we need the concrete verification itself, which is barely a mirage in the six-party talks.

Developments in Syria should have brought the administration up short. Instead, the State Department has accelerated its efforts to declare "success," a deeply troubling and dangerous sign. This reflects a cultural problem at State, where "zeal for the deal" too often trumps the substance of the deal itself.

President Bush stands at a dispositive point regarding his personal legacy on North Korea. Until now, one could say with a straight face, if not entirely accurately, that implementing the Feb. 13 agreement was the State Department's responsibility. No longer. The Israeli strike and the possible Syrian-North Korean nuclear cooperation associated with it have presidential consequences. Further concessions to the North can now be laid only at the White House door, just as only the president can bring a tougher, more realistic attitude to the issue. That would be a real legacy.

John R. Bolton is a senior fellow at AEI.

http://www.aei.org/publications/filter.all.pubID.26862/pub_detail.asp

A tale of two hostages

By Caroline B. Glick

<http://www.JewishWorldReview.com> | Exalting at her liberation by the Colombian military last week, former hostage Ingrid Bentancourt exclaimed, "This is a miracle, a miracle! We have an amazing military. I think only the Israelis can possibly pull off something like this."

Bentancourt's statement made thousands of Israelis wince.

Held hostage in the Colombian jungles for six years by the narco-terror group known as the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia or FARC, Bentancourt, a dual Colombian-French citizen who was a Colombian senator and presidential candidate at the time she was abducted, obviously had not heard the news about the "new Israel." Her statements were based on her historical memory of the "old Israel."

She didn't know that the "new Israel" doesn't fight terrorists. The "new Israel" views fighting terrorists as an exercise in futility. Its leaders and military chiefs alike repeat endlessly the mantra that there is no military victory to be had, only a political accommodation.

She didn't know that the week before she was rescued, the "new Israel" made a deal with Hizbullah to release five senior Lebanese terrorists, an unknown number of Palestinian terrorists and hundreds of bodies of dead terrorists in exchange for the bodies of IDF reservists Eldad Regev and Ehud Goladwasser who were murdered by Hizbullah two years ago.

The "new Israel" is the Israel that maintains one-sided "ceasefires" with Hamas and is poised to make a deal with Hamas by which it will release up to a thousand Palestinian terrorists in exchange for IDF hostage Gilad Shalit.

No, Betancourt, was thinking of the "old Israel" — the Israel that electrified the world when it sent its commandos thousands of miles to free its hostages in Entebbe 32 years ago. It was that memory of Israeli heroism that doubtless gave hope to Bentancourt and her fellow hostages as they languished in FARC captivity in the jungle, malnourished, ill-treated and terrorized. The Entebbe rescue allowed them to fantasize that one day, they too would be rescued and their tormentors would be brought to justice. And last week, their dreams came true.

Betancourt had reasons beside her plight as a hostage to associate Colombia's struggle with Israel's. At the time she was abducted, both countries faced similar political and military challenges and at the time both countries seemed to be embarking on similar paths to surmount them.

When Betancourt was kidnapped in April 2002, Colombia had just disavowed a failed strategy of appeasing FARC. To bring FARC to the negotiating table, former president Andres Pastrana agreed to transfer control over a swathe of Colombian territory the size of Switzerland to FARC. Rather than reciprocate this peace offering with one of its own, FARC used its safe haven to increase its recruitment of terrorists and intensify its kidnapping campaign and drug trafficking operations. For nearly four years, Pastrana refused to disavow the phony "peace process" in spite of repeated FARC attacks. It was only in February 2002, after FARC hijacked an airliner and kidnapped its fifth lawmaker in a year that Pastrana finally repudiated his appeasement drive.

Similarly, in 2002, Israel was in the grips of an unprecedented Palestinian terror campaign with suicide bombings going off almost daily. Then prime minister Ariel Sharon had been elected the previous year to replace the discredited Ehud Barak as premier after the latter's appeasement strategy at Camp David had failed and Israel's eight-year-old Oslo appeasement strategy had fallen apart. When Betancourt was taken

prisoner, Sharon had just launched Operation Defensive Shield with the express purpose of defeating the Palestinian terror networks in Judea and Samaria.

What Betancourt didn't know was that since her abduction, Israel and Colombia have gone their separate ways. Under President Alvaro Uribe who was elected after her capture, Colombia has moved steadily toward full victory over FARC. On the other hand, Israel has abandoned victory as a strategic concept for contending with its enemies.

Israel's abdication of its struggle against its terrorist enemies was as swift and unmistakable as it was inexplicable. Rather than following up Israel's military defeat of the Palestinian terror machine in Judea and Samaria in 2002 with a similar operation in Gaza or with a political offensive against the PLO which Defensive Shield exposed as the central engine behind the Palestinian terror war, Sharon opted to withdraw from the fight and return to the discredited policy of appeasement which Israeli voters twice rejected.

First Sharon accepted the so-called Roadmap to Peace in 2003. Predicated on the false assumption that the Palestinians are interested in peace with Israel and can be appeased into accepting statehood and Israel's right to exist, the Roadmap precludes any Israeli option for victory.

When the Palestinians refused to end their support for Israel's destruction in spite of the Roadmap, Sharon abandoned appeasement for peace and opting instead for surrender for "quiet." His unilateral surrender of Gaza demoralized Israeli society, weakened Israel's democratic institutions and propelled Hamas and Iran to power in Gaza. Rather than recognize that the move had been a strategic catastrophe which called into question Israel's ability to act as an ally in the US-led war on terror, Sharon launched Kadima as a new political party dedicated entirely to appeasement and capitulation.

After Ehud Olmert replaced Sharon as premier in November 2005, he brought Kadima to victory in the March 2006 elections by pledging to expand Sharon's "capitulation for quiet" strategy to Judea and Samaria. When Israel's neighbors responded to that agenda with war from Lebanon and Gaza, Olmert and his colleagues were forced to return to their previous appeasement for peace agenda. But their refusal to countenance the option of victory over Israel's implacable foes remains the order of the day.

In contrast, the Uribe government in Colombia has never veered from its single-minded goal of defeating FARC both militarily and politically. With US assistance, Uribe has rebuilt Colombia's military into a highly competent counter-insurgency force. His counterinsurgency has brought both defeat and demoralization to FARC's doorstep. FARC's guerilla force which numbered 18,000 just a few years ago, has been reduced by an estimated 50 percent.

Busy with their own survival, FARC's remaining forces have been unable to conduct any sustained operations against the Uribe government or rank and file Colombians in recent years. Restored security has brought economic growth and prosperity. And both have stabilized the Uribe government. Like the Palestinians, FARC enjoys the support of the international Left and leftist governments. In FARC's case, Venezuelan leader Hugo Chavez has been the terror group's primary military, financial and political backer.

Ecuador, led by Rafael Correa's Chavez-allied leftist government, has also become a major sponsor of FARC. In March, Uribe risked regional war in order to defeat FARC by raiding a FARC base on the Ecuadoran side of the border. The raid was immensely successful. FARC's deputy commander Raul Reyes was killed and his computers — carrying massive intelligence information — were seized. As Ecuador cut off diplomatic relations and Chavez deployed troops to his border with Colombia, Uribe stalwartly defended the raid. He defended the raid even as the French government attacked him claiming that Reyes had been their negotiating partner in their quest to secure Betancourt's release.

Israel's governments have systematically prevented the publication of information regarding Fatah's leadership role in the terror war, and its ties to Iran, and Syria. They have also refused to take any action against Israeli organizations and politicians bankrolled illegally by foreign governments. In contrast, Uribe moved quickly to use the information exposed by Reyes's computers to discredit Chavez, FARC and their Colombian and foreign sympathizers. Reyes's files showed that neither FARC nor Chavez nor pro-Chavez Colombian Senator Piedad Cordoba were negotiating Betancourt's release in good faith.

Understanding that she was their most powerful bargaining chip against the Uribe government, in their internal discussions, all three attested to their opposition to her release. Uribe's release of the information decreased French pressure for a deal. Chavez was further discredited and Bogota's prosecutor opened a criminal probe against Cordoba on treason-related charges. According to media reports, the Ecuador raid also provided the Colombian military with actionable intelligence it needed to move forward with its plans for last week's rescue mission. That is, each successful raid paved the way for the next achievement.

The Israeli media's response to the Colombia rescue mission has been to inflate the "Israeli role" in the mission. Numerous reports have been published in the local press about the fact that the Colombians hired retired IDF generals Yisrael Ziv and Yossi Kupperwasser to help them build up their counter-terror capabilities. Far from obscuring the yawning gap between Colombia and Israel, these reports bring Israel's abandonment of the fight into sharp relief. They show clearly that Israel's decision to capitulate has nothing to do with an inability to fight to victory.

It is a failure of will rather than a failure of capacity that has brought Israel to its current cowed and humiliated condition where its media argues over how many terrorists should be exchanged for Shalit and ignores completely the very notion that he can be rescued. And of Israel could attempt to rescue him.

While success is never assured, it is a fact that just as Colombia was able to find and rescue Betancourt and her fellow hostages in the jungle, so Israel could, if it dared, conduct a competent operation aimed at rescuing Shalit in Gaza. Like Colombia it could acquire the intelligence necessary to plan and carry out such a raid. Like Colombia, its forces are competent to succeed in such an endeavor.

Until last week's raid, one of the main sources of pressure on the Uribe government was Betancourt's family. Her mother and her children met frequently with Chavez and railed against Uribe in their eagerness to see her released. Speaking of her experience and of her rescue in Paris this week, Betancourt, who over the years tried to escape five times, was clear that she preferred freedom to slavery, even if it came only in death.

As French philosopher Andre Glucksmann wrote in City Journal, it was freedom, not life that she held most sacred. And while she understood her family's actions, she clearly did not embrace their pacifism as she praised Uribe for rescuing her despite the risk that the mission would fail and she and her fellow hostages would be killed. It is hard to imagine that as a soldier, Shalit feels any differently from Betancourt. Why should we assume that he prefers live as a slave than die in a quest for freedom? It is a travesty, that in their inexplicable abandonment of honorable struggle against murderous foes in favor of dangerous appeasement, Olmert and his colleagues have denied Shalit the respect due a warrior and have denied the IDF the right to fight for Israel's freedom.

Every weekday JewishWorldReview.com publishes what many in Washington and in the media consider "must reading." Sign up for the daily JWR update. It's free. Just click [here](#).

JWR contributor Caroline B. Glick is the senior Middle East Fellow at the Center for Security Policy in Washington, DC and the deputy managing editor of The Jerusalem Post. Comment by clicking [here](#).

<http://www.jewishworldreview.com/0708/glick071108.php3>

A War Worth Fighting

Revisionists say that World War II was unnecessary. They're wrong.

Christopher Hitchens
NEWSWEEK

Updated: 3:36 PM ET Jun 14, 2008

Is there any one shared principle or assumption on which our political consensus rests, any value judgment on which we are all essentially agreed? Apart from abstractions such as a general belief in democracy, one would probably get the widest measure of agreement for the proposition that the second world war was a "good war" and one well worth fighting. And if we possess one indelible image of political immorality and cowardice, it is surely the dismal tap-tap-tap of Neville Chamberlain's umbrella as he turned from signing the Czechs away to Adolf Hitler at Munich. He hoped by this humiliation to avert war, but he was fated to bring his countrymen war on top of humiliation. To the conventional wisdom add the titanic figure of Winston Churchill as the emblem of oratorical defiance and the Horatius who, until American power could be mobilized and deployed, alone barred the bridge to the forces of unalloyed evil. When those forces lay finally defeated, their ghastly handiwork was uncovered to a world that mistakenly thought it had already "supped full of horrors." The stark evidence of the Final Solution has ever since been enough to dispel most doubts about, say, the wisdom or morality of carpet-bombing German cities.

Historical scholarship has nevertheless offered various sorts of revisionist interpretation of all this. Niall Ferguson, for one, has proposed looking at the two world wars as a single conflict, punctuated only by a long and ominous armistice. British conservative historians like Alan Clark and John Charmley have criticized Churchill for building his career on war, for ignoring openings to peace and for eventually allowing the British Empire to be squandered and broken up. But Pat Buchanan, twice a candidate for the Republican nomination and in 2000 the standard-bearer for the Reform Party who ignited a memorable "chad" row in Florida, has now condensed all the antiwar arguments into one. His case, made in his recently released "Churchill, Hitler and the Unnecessary War," is as follows:

- *That Germany was faced with encirclement and injustice in both 1914 and 1939.*
- *Britain in both years ought to have stayed out of quarrels on the European mainland.*
- *That Winston Churchill was the principal British warmonger on both occasions.*
- *The United States was needlessly dragged into war on both occasions.*
- *That the principal beneficiaries of this were Joseph Stalin and Mao Zedong.*
- *That the Holocaust of European Jewry was as much the consequence of an avoidable war as it was of Nazi racism.*

Buchanan does not need to close his book with an invocation of a dying West, as if to summarize this long recital of Spenglerian doomsaying. He's already opened with the statement, "All about us we can see clearly now that the West is passing away." The tropes are familiar—a loss of will and confidence, a collapse of the desire to reproduce with sufficient vigor, a preference for hedonism over the stern tasks of rulership and dominion and pre-eminence. It all sounds oddly ... Churchillian. The old lion himself never tired of striking notes like these, and was quite unembarrassed by invocations of race and nation and blood. Yet he is the object of Buchanan's especial dislike and contempt, because he had a fondness for "wars of choice."

This term has enjoyed a recent vogue because of the opposition to the war in Iraq, an opposition in which Buchanan has played a vigorous role. Descending as he does from the tradition of Charles Lindbergh's America First movement, which looked for (and claimed to have found) a certain cosmopolitan lobby behind FDR's willingness to involve the United States in global war, Buchanan is the most trenchant critic of what he considers our fondest national illusion, and his book has the feel and stamp of a work that he has been readying all his life.

But he faces an insuperable difficulty, or rather difficulties. If you want to demonstrate that Germany was more the victim than the aggressor in 1914, then you must confine your account (as Buchanan does) to the very minor legal question of Belgian neutrality and of whether Britain absolutely had to go to war on the Belgian side. (For what it may be worth, I think that Britain wasn't obliged to do so and should not have done.) But the rest of the kaiser's policy, most of it completely omitted by Buchanan, shows that Germany was looking for a chance for war all over the globe, and was increasingly the prisoner of a militaristic ruling

caste at home. The kaiser picked a fight with Britain by backing the white Dutch Afrikaner rebels in South Africa and by butchering the Ovambo people of what is now Namibia. He looked for trouble with the French by abruptly sending warships to Agadir in French Morocco, which nearly started the first world war in 1905, and with Russia by backing Austria-Hungary's insane ultimatum to the Serbs after the June 1914 assassinations in Sarajevo. Moreover, and never mentioned by Buchanan at all, the kaiser visited Damascus and paid for the rebuilding of the tomb of Saladin, announced himself a sympathizer of Islam and a friend of jihad, commissioned a Berlin-to-Baghdad railroad for the projection of German arms into the Middle East and Asia and generally ranged himself on the side of an aggressive Ottoman imperialism, which later declared a "holy war" against Britain. To suggest that he felt unjustly hemmed in by the Royal Navy's domination of the North Sea while he was conducting such statecraft is absurd.

And maybe a little worse than absurd, as when Buchanan writes: "From 1871 to 1914, the Germans under Bismarck and the Kaiser did not fight a single war. While Britain, Russia, Italy, Turkey, Japan, Spain, and the United States were all involved in wars, Germany and Austria had clean records." I am bound to say that I find this creepy. The start of the "clean record" has to be in 1871, because that's the year that Prussia humbled France in the hideous Franco-Prussian War that actually annexed two French provinces to Germany. In the intervening time until 1914, Germany was seizing colonies in Africa and the Pacific, cementing secret alliances with Austria and trying to build up a naval fleet that could take on the British one. No wonder the kaiser wanted a breathing space.

Now, this is not to say that Buchanan doesn't make some sound points about the secret diplomacy of Old Europe that was so much to offend Woodrow Wilson. And he is excellent on the calamitous Treaty of Versailles that succeeded only—as was noted by John Maynard Keynes at the time—in creating the conditions for another world war, or for part two of the first one. He wears his isolationism proudly: "The Senate never did a better day's work than when it rejected the Treaty of Versailles and refused to enter a League of Nations where American soldiers would be required to give their lives enforcing the terms of so dishonorable and disastrous a peace."

Actually, no soldier of any nation ever lost so much as a fingernail in the service of the League, which was in any case doomed by American abstention, and it's exactly that consideration which invalidates the second half of Buchanan's argument, which is that a conflict with Hitler's Germany both could and should have been averted. (There is a third Buchanan sub-argument, mostly made by implication, which is that the democratic West should have allied itself with Hitler, at least passively, until he had destroyed the Soviet Union.) Again, in order to believe his thesis one has to be prepared to argue that Hitler was a rational actor with intelligible and negotiable demands, whose declared, demented ambitions in "Mein Kampf" were presumably to be disregarded as mere propaganda. In case after case Buchanan shows the abysmal bungling of British and French diplomacy—making promises to Czechoslovakia that could never have been kept and then, adding injury to insult, breaking those promises at the first opportunity. Or offering a guarantee to Poland (a country that had gleefully taken part in the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia) that Hitler well knew was not backed by any credible military force.

Buchanan is at his best here, often causing one to whistle at the sheer cynicism and stupidity of the British Tories. In the Anglo-German Naval Agreement of June 1935, for example, they astounded the French and Italians and Russians by unilaterally agreeing to permit Hitler to build a fleet one third the size of the Royal Navy and a submarine fleet of the same size as the British! Not only was this handing the Third Reich the weapon it would soon press to Britain's throat, it was convincing all Britain's potential allies that they would be much better off making their own bilateral deals with Berlin. Which is essentially what happened.

But Buchanan keeps forgetting that this criminal foolishness is exactly the sort of policy that he elsewhere recommends. In his view, after all, Germany had been terribly wronged by Versailles and it would have been correct to redraw the frontiers in Germany's favor and soothe its hurt feelings (which is what the word "appeasement" originally meant). Meanwhile we should have encouraged Hitler's hostility to Bolshevism and discreetly rearmed in case he should also need to be contained. This might perhaps have worked if Germany had been governed by a right-wing nationalist party that had won a democratic vote. However, in point of fact Germany was governed by an ultra-rightist, homicidal, paranoid maniac who had begun by demolishing democracy in Germany itself, who believed that his fellow countrymen were a superior race and who attributed all the evils in the world to a Jewish conspiracy. It is possible to read whole chapters of Buchanan's book without having to bear these salient points in mind. (I should say that I intend this observation as a criticism.) As with his discussion of pre-1914 Germany, he commits important sins of omission that can only be the outcome of an ideological bias. Barely mentioned except in passing is the Spanish Civil War, for example, where for three whole years between 1936 and 1939 Germany and Italy lent

troops and weapons in a Fascist invasion of a sovereign European nation that had never threatened or "encircled" them in any way. Buchanan's own political past includes overt sympathy with General Franco, which makes this skating-over even less forgivable than it might otherwise be.

On the one occasion where Spain does get a serious mention, it illustrates the opposite point to the one Buchanan thinks he's making. The British ambassador in Berlin, Sir Neville Henderson, is explaining why Hitler didn't believe that Britain and France would fight over Prague: "[Hitler] argued as follows: Would the German nation willingly go to war for General Franco in Spain, if France intervened on the side of the Republican government? The answer that he gave himself is that it would not, and he was consequently convinced that no democratic French government would be strong enough to lead the French nation to war for the Czechs."

In this instance, it must be admitted, Hitler was being a rational actor. And his admission—which Buchanan in his haste to indict Anglo-French policy completely fails to notice—is that if he himself had been resisted earlier and more determinedly, he would have been compelled to give ground. Thus the whole and complete lesson is not that the second world war was an avoidable "war of choice." It is that the Nazis could and should have been confronted before they had fully rearmed and had begun to steal the factories and oilfields and coal mines and workers of neighboring countries. As Gen. Douglas MacArthur once put it, all military defeats can be summarized in the two words: "Too late." The same goes for political disasters.

As the book develops, Buchanan begins to unmask his true colors more and more. It is one thing to make the case that Germany was ill-used, and German minorities harshly maltreated, as a consequence of the 1914 war of which Germany's grim emperor was one of the prime instigators. It's quite another thing to say that the Nazi decision to embark on a Holocaust of European Jewry was "not a cause of the war but an awful consequence of the war." Not only is Buchanan claiming that Hitler's fanatical racism did not hugely increase the likelihood of war, but he is also making the insinuation that those who wanted to resist him are the ones who are equally if not indeed mainly responsible for the murder of the Jews! This absolutely will not do. He adduces several quotations from Hitler and Goebbels, starting only in 1939 and ending in 1942, screaming that any outbreak of war to counter Nazi ambitions would lead to a terrible vengeance on the Jews. He forgets—at least I hope it's only forgetfulness—that such murderous incitement began long, long before Hitler had even been a lunatic-fringe candidate in the 1920s. This "timeline" is as spurious, and as sinister, as the earlier dates, so carefully selected by Buchanan, that tried to make Prussian imperialism look like a victim rather than a bully.

One closing example will demonstrate the corruption and prejudice of Buchanan's historical "method." He repeatedly argues that Churchill did not appreciate Hitler's deep-seated and respectful Anglophilia, and he continually blames the war on several missed opportunities to take the Führer's genially outstretched hand. Indeed, he approvingly quotes several academic sources who agree with him that Hitler invaded the Soviet Union only in order to change Britain's mind. Suppose that Buchanan is in fact correct about this. Could we have a better definition of derangement and megalomania than the case of a dictator who overrules his own generals and invades Russia in wintertime, mainly to impress the British House of Commons? (Incidentally, or rather not incidentally, it was precisely that hysterical aggression that curtain-raised the organized deportation and slaughter of the Jews. But it's fatuous to suppose that, without that occasion, the Nazis would not have found another one.)

It is of course true that millions of other people lost their lives in this conflict, often in unprecedentedly horrible ways, and that new tyrannies were imposed on the countries—Poland, Czechoslovakia and China most notably—that had been the pretexts for a war against fascism. But is this not to think in the short term? Unless or until Nazism had been vanquished, millions of people were most certainly going to be either massacred or enslaved in any case. Whereas today, all the way from Portugal to the Urals, the principle of human rights and popular sovereignty is at least the norm, and the ideas of racism and totalitarianism have been fairly conclusively and historically discredited. Would a frightened compromise with racist totalitarianism have produced a better result?

Winston Churchill may well have been on the wrong side about India, about the gold standard, about the rights of labor and many other things, and he may have had a lust for war, but we may also be grateful that there was one politician in the 1930s who found it intolerable even to breathe the same air, or share the same continent or planet, as the Nazis. (Buchanan of course makes plain that he rather sympathizes with Churchill about the colonies, and quarrels only with his "finest hour." This is grotesque.) As he closes his argument, Buchanan again refuses to disguise his allegiance. "Though derided as isolationists," he writes, "the America First patriots kept the United States out of the war until six months after Hitler had invaded

Russia." If you know anything at all about what happened to the population of those territories in those six months, it is rather hard to be proud that America was neutral. But this is a price that Buchanan is quite willing to pay.

I myself have written several criticisms of the cult of Churchill, and of the uncritical way that it has been used to stifle or cudgel those with misgivings. ("Adlai," said John F. Kennedy of his outstanding U.N. ambassador during the Bay of Pigs crisis, "wanted a Munich.") Yet the more the record is scrutinized and re-examined, the more creditable it seems that at least two Western statesmen, for widely different reasons, regarded coexistence with Nazism as undesirable as well as impossible. History may judge whether the undesirability or the impossibility was the more salient objection, but any attempt to separate the two considerations is likely to result in a book that stinks, as this one unmistakably does.

URL: <http://www.newsweek.com/id/141501>

© 2008

September 10, 2007, 6:00 a.m.

Today's Defeatists

The 21st-century cut-and-run.

By Donald Kagan

Observers of today's fierce partisan conflict between those demanding immediate or rapid abandonment of the war in Iraq at any, or almost any, price, and others who refuse to give up the fight, might think this a rare event in American history, but it is not unprecedented. In the two World Wars of the 20th century, to be sure, the country was essentially united and fought on to victory without much dissension. In the Korean War, however, there was considerable division, and a new administration that itself had not begun the war accepted a draw — a draw that has demanded a commitment of troops ever since and presents a serious threat to this day. In the Vietnam War, deep and violent dissension at home was, perhaps, the major element in compelling the United States to accept a humiliating defeat. In neither war were the American military forces defeated and driven from the field. It was the political victory of enemies of the administration and the war it has undertaken that brought defeat.

DEFINING THE DEFEATIST

The results of the recent change in leadership and strategy in Iraq have made it plain that the war there is not lost nor is defeat inevitable. And yet, the war's opponents, even as the situation improves, have rushed to declare America defeated. They offer no plausible alternative to the current strategy and take no serious notice of the dreadful consequences of swift withdrawal. They seem to be panicked by the possibility of success and eager to bring about withdrawal and defeat before events make it too late.

In their embarrassment they, not their critics, have raised the question of their patriotism. However that question may be resolved, such people surely deserve to be called defeatists. My dictionary defines "defeatism" as "the attitude, policy or conduct of a person who admits, expects, or no longer resists defeat." The term appears to have been invented during the First World War in France during a dark moment when victory seemed remote or impossible. It was also applied to some in Britain in 1940 who thought that Hitler's forces were irresistible and argued for a negotiated peace with the Nazis. In light of the positive results of recent American efforts in Iraq, it seems an appropriate description of those who have already declared the war lost and their cooperators, even as it is clear that the military tide has turned.

Since the attacks of 2001 American and allied forces have driven out the Taliban regime that provided a haven for al Qaeda in Afghanistan. They have dethroned the murderous dictator Saddam Hussein from Iraq, from which he had launched wars against his neighbors, terrorized and brutalized his own people and threatened the security of the entire region. These were valuable and important steps, but they have not brought an end to the struggle. Both wars continue, and ultimate success still seems distant and difficult. The costs and length of the struggle, have made the war and the government conducting it unpopular. Opponents of the war in Iraq, as we have seen, have declared America already defeated and demand an immediate or early withdrawal of our forces, regardless of the horrendous consequences of such an irresponsible action.

In this they have been typical of citizens of democracies engaged in long painful wars that do not promise swift victory. For example, on the eve of the Peloponnesian War Pericles told the Athenians that "men are not moved by the same feeling when they are already at war as when they make the decision to fight but change their minds in the face of misfortunes," and so it turned out. The Athenians were suffering and the strategy for victory was not working, so defeatists and those who had opposed the war from the first demanded peace at once. As Thucydides tells us, "they began to find fault with Pericles, as the author of the war and the cause of all their misfortunes, and became eager to come to terms with Sparta, and actually sent ambassadors there, who did not however succeed in their mission. Their despair was now complete and all vented itself upon Pericles."

Thucydides, in response, called for patriotism in time of trouble: "Since a republic can support the misfortunes of private citizens, while they cannot support hers, it is surely the duty of everyone to be forward in her defense.... the apparent error of my policy lies in the infirmity of your resolution, since... your mind is too much depressed to persevere in your resolves.... Cease then to grieve for your private afflictions, and address yourselves instead to the safety of the republic." Ultimately, the Athenians continued the fight, recovering from what seemed certain defeat until the enemy offered a peace they could accept.

AMERICAN PRECEDENT

So it was, too, in the midst of America's Civil War. As late as 1864, after three years of fearful casualties, victory for the Union forces was not in sight. Lincoln was determined to continue the fight to restore the integrity of the Union and to abolish slavery. Original opponents of the war were joined by great numbers who were simply weary, and others who were ready to seek peace at any price, which was for some the persistence of slavery and for others the dissolution of the Union. One English friend of the Union cause expected such politicians to compromise with the South in order to take it back, slavery and all. Such an event would be shameful, he said, but still "it would leave the question to be settled by a similar process of blood by another generation." (Civil War quotations are from [Copperheads](#), by Jennifer L. Weber.)

In 1864 Lincoln changed generals, and undertook a more aggressive strategy, but the war continued to drag on. A hostile newspaper, wrote, "that perhaps it is time to agree to a peace without victory." Like Pericles, Lincoln was assailed by attacks on his policies and by personal vituperation. At the Democratic convention in August 1864 a speaker told a crowd in the streets that Lincoln and the Union armies had "Failed! Failed!! FAILED!!! FAILED!!!!" The loss of life 'has never been seen since the destruction of Sennacherib by the breath of the Almighty and still the monster usurper wants more men for his slaughter pens."

The Democratic convention was dominated by the anti-war faction whom the Republicans called "Copperheads," after the poisonous snake. According to their best historian, they were "consistent and constant in their demand for an immediate peace settlement. At times they were willing to trade victory for peace. One persistent problem for [them] was their refusal or reluctance to offer a realistic and comprehensive plan for peace." Pressed by the Copperheads, the Democrats nominated a rabidly antiwar candidate for vice president and adopted a platform that called the war a "failure," and demanded "immediate efforts" to end hostilities...." Their platform statement would permit abandonment not only of emancipation, but of the most basic war aim, reunion. Even New York's Republican Party boss declared that Lincoln's reelection was widely regarded as an "impossibility...The People [were] wild for Peace." At the end of August defeat for the Republicans and the Union cause seemed inevitable, but Lincoln refused to seek peace without victory, saying that he was not prepared, to "give up the Union for a peace which, so achieved, could not be of much duration."

No one would have predicted that within a matter of months the war would end with a total victory for the Union forces, slavery abolished and the Union restored, but events took an unexpected turn. A series of Union military victories changed the course of the war. The Democrats, having declared or predicted defeat were, as one historian has written: "Tarred as traitors, regardless of their actual positions on the war, Democrats were ... roundly thrashed in November. In fact, the stench of treason clung to the Democrats for years; nearly a generation would pass before another Democrat, Grover Cleveland, occupied the White House."

Such an outcome would have seemed inconceivable in the summer of 1864. Before the change in military fortunes Lincoln was under siege, especially from northern Democrats, who had opposed the war from the beginning or turned against it when it did not bring swift and easy victory. By 1864 they had a powerful investment in defeat, for a Union victory would bring them political disaster, and their rhetoric reflected their anxiety. One New York Copperhead wrote, "There is death at the heart of this glory& greatness. This war is murder and nothing else. And every man who gives a dollar or moves his finger to aid is an aider & abettor of murder." Northern military setbacks and casualties emboldened the Copperheads, the defeatists of that day. The *Boston Pilot*, a Copperhead paper, wrote, "It begins to look to many folks in the North that the Confederacy perhaps can never really be beaten, that the attempts to win might after all be too heavy a load to carry, and that perhaps it is time to agree to a peace without victory."

Even some of the president's supporters were ready to abandon him and his policies. Henry J. Raymond, editor of the *New York Times* and chairman of the Republican party, wrote that throughout the country people were convinced "that we need a change, that the war languishes under Mr. Lincoln and that he cannot or will not give us peace.... The country is tired & sick of the war & is longing for peace." Copperheads directed the most violent personal attacks on the man who stood in their way. "God's curse is upon the land," wrote a Pennsylvania publisher on the day Lincoln had designated for prayer. "Does it become us to acknowledge the truth, and pray for forgiveness of God for any and every part we may have taken in upholding the sins and abominations of this wicked administration ... to put on sack-cloth and retrace our steps[?]. . . Oh, God, give us Peace! . . . Stop this bloody hell-devised carnage." Another Copperhead took to calling Lincoln the "widow maker" or the "orphan maker." He said any man who voted for Lincoln was "a traitor and a murderer." If Lincoln was reelected, "we trust some bold hand will pierce his heart with dagger point for the public good."

In the minds of the Copperheads, the abolitionists held the place now occupied in the minds of today's defeatists by the neoconservatives. What prevented peace, the Copperheads insisted was the influence of that small but unduly powerful corps of ideologues known as the abolitionists. It was, they further insisted, "fanatical abolitionism" that started the war. Lincoln, they thought, had become its captive and deceived the people into an unnecessary and unwise war. Now he refused to abandon that war, ostensibly fought to preserve the Union, but really the result of an abolitionist plot to end slavery. In the summer of 1864 the defeatists gained control of the Democratic convention and adopted a platform that charged the Republican administration with violating the Constitution, claiming that it had been "disregarded in every part, and public liberty and private right alike trodden down [and] the material prosperity of the country essentially impaired." "It accused them of using "extraordinary and dangerous powers" "not found in the Constitution. They called the war a "failure," and for "immediate efforts" "to end hostilities."

The administration's political troubles did not escape the enemies of the Union. Many Confederates looked forward to a Democratic victory in November, expecting that it would bring them what they wanted. A clerk in the Confederate War Department wrote: "everything depends upon the result of the Presidential election in the United States. We rely some little on the success of the peace party." When the Democrats disbanded on the last day of August there was good reason to believe that the Copperheads had won the day, that the administration of Lincoln would be out of office and that the victorious Democrats would agree to a peace that might leave the enemies of the Union in control of an independent, slave-holding Confederacy.

In November, however, Lincoln crushed his opponent, winning the Electoral College by a count of 212 to 21 and losing only three states. Who could believe that only two months earlier nearly everyone, including Lincoln himself, was sure he would lose? The change in strategy and in the leadership of the army had snatched victory from what had seemed certain defeat, and military success brought a political revolution.

PAYING THE POLITICAL PRICE

Perhaps it is fear of a similar outcome that explains recent comments by antiwar Democrats. Rep. James Clyburn, said that a positive report on developments in Iraq from Petraeus might divide the Democrats in Congress, who would "want to stay the course, and if the Republicans were to stay united as they have been, then it would be a problem for us," and Rep. Nancy Boyda, shaken by the optimistic testimony of Gen. Jack Keane, just returned from a visit to Iraq, said: "And I just will make some statements more for the record based on what I heard from — mainly from General Keane. As many of us — there was only so much that you could take until we in fact had to leave the room for a while. So I think I am back and maybe can articulate some things — after so much of the frustration of having to listen to what we listened to."

Lincoln remains an American icon and hero for many reasons, not the least of which is his steadfastness and determination in the face of difficulty. Threatened with political defeat and personal humiliation, he would not abandon the integrity and security of his country nor would he abandon its most treasured principle, freedom, to escape his troubles.

The high price paid by the Democrats after the Civil War, on the other hand, is not surprising, since they failed to end the war they opposed, and their predictions of defeat were overwhelmed and discredited by military victory. But the war in Vietnam shows that even when it is successful, defeatism may have its dangers. The armed forces of the United States did not lose the war in Vietnam. The homefront gave way just when a new strategy and new leadership was turning the tide of battle in favor of the U.S. Defeatists and the media depicted military victories as defeats. Defeatists, inside and outside the government, had prevented the employment of all necessary means for victory, as the Copperheads of the 1860s could not. Finally, they were able to cause so much disruption and disaffection at home as to force a disgraceful and dishonorable defeat that failed to achieve the primary goal of the war — self-determination and freedom from brutal Communist rule for the South Vietnamese — and left America's friends and allies to be butchered and enslaved.

Although Americans were tired of and disgusted with the war and eager to end it, they were not pleased by its outcome and its consequences. Their distrust of the Democratic Party, seen as the home of the defeatists who were unwilling to defend American interests, was a major factor in the victories of seven out of ten Republican presidents in the elections beginning in 1968. Even the two Democrats who won in that period, Jimmy Carter and Bill Clinton, were perceived as distinct from the defeatists, and one of them ran to the right of his Republican opponent on defense and foreign affairs.

Victory in the war Americans confront today is not certain. If it comes it will arrive only after long and hard effort, but it is well to remember that the United States has lost war only when it has chosen to fight no longer. There are defeatists aplenty among us today, and they too, shout that the war has been lost, that the government that conducts it is stupid and incompetent, that the war is not necessary and that our leaders lied to us in bringing it on, that nothing terrible will ensue if we abandon the fighting. They, too, bewail the casualties incurred in the war and proclaim their support for the troops even as they delay voting a budget to sustain the military. Such stratagems may work so long as a war goes badly. But what if the current president has found his Grant and a better strategy?

Like the Copperheads of the Civil War, today's defeatists have a huge investment in defeat and live in dread of success in the field, which could turn into disaster at the polls. In this, they would do well to understand that they are at odds with most of the American people, who are tired of the war and deplore the casualties and expense that goes with it. They want peace, but not one that is an illusion and will not last. Nor do they want a peace at any price that will bring fearful consequences and disgrace. If the defeatists have their way that is the kind of peace we will get; the American people will know whom to blame and will not quickly forget.

— Donald Kagan is the [*Sterling Professor of Classics and History*](#) at Yale University.

National Review Online - <http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=M2QyYWlzMmY1Mzk2ZDA0OThlM2M5NjRiN2Q3MDliMTc=>

Sacrificing clarity on the altar of appeasement



Brigitte Gabriel

Opinions are like.....noses. Everyone has one. As someone whose life has been greatly impacted by Israel, I am an outspoken supporter and advocate for Jewish issues and Israeli security. My outspokenness creates a few storms now and then.

With the Internet amplifying publicly voiced opinion, comments can be swirled around through instant e-mail communication seeding the most dark and foreboding storm clouds. Most of the sleet, hail and lightening I get comes from the Jewish community... usually after I have said something extolling their virtues. Most remarkable was my statement at a Duke University counter Palestinian Solidarity Movement rally in 2004 where I said the difference between Israel and the Arab world "is the difference between civilization and Barbarism." The comment went worldwide. The president of Hillel apologized to the Arabs and Palestinians up one side and down the other.

I recently was asked my opinion about Barack Obama and boy what a tempest it has caused. And this time the maligning from my Hebrew friends comes for pointing out that a presidential candidate has deeply troubling connections to an anti-Semite? So?

The adverse precipitation came last week from the United Jewish Communities (UJC), who took strong exception to my answering question posed by a woman about Barrack Obama. The UJC's published comments, headlined by some as "slamming" Brigitte Gabriel, cast doubt on my legitimacy and my efforts to support the Jewish nation and fight the rise of Islamofascism. I think you will find, as others have commented to me, that they are doing a disservice to one of Judaism's ally in its fight as a people and Israel as a nation.

Here are the facts.

I was honored to be the guest speaker at the West Palm Beach Lion of Judah's luncheon on February 4th in Florida. My presentation, like many I have given to Jewish Federations in both Canada and the US, as well as countless non Jewish organizations and churches, focused on the humanitarian qualities of Israel who rescued my family and other Christians from the Jihad against us by Muslim extremists in civil war torn Lebanon. I warned the audience about the rise of Islamofascism throughout the world and here in America. I encouraged them to get involved, support the Lion of Judah and make a difference. The 350 women present gave me a standing ovation. After lunch and the Q&A they bought up every available copy of my New York Times best seller, "Because They Hate." I felt no hostility or heard any derogatory remarks during the greetings and exchanges of encouragement given me while signing 200 books.

That was the good part.

It was during the Q&A that a woman asked my opinion as to whether or not Obama was anti-Semitic, her words. Knowing how sensitive political issues are considering my audience, I prefaced my answer by saying, "I want to make something very clear before I answer this question. I am neither a Republican nor a Democrat. I am an independent who came to this country as a fresh slate and was not raised in a home in America that influenced me to vote either Republican or Democrat. So my answer to you will be as a terrorism expert and not as someone who is trying to influence you about any party." I then repeated what I had said at a similar Federation event in Boca Raton the previous week.

I discussed Obama's long association with the controversial Rev. Jeremiah A. Wright, Jr. of the Southside Chicago Trinity United Church. Obama has frequently referred to Wright as his 'spiritual adviser'. Wright has peculiar Black Racist, anti-Israel, anti-Semitic views. Wright's Church magazine, The Trumpet, has honored Nation of Islam Minister Louis Farrakhan, promoted anti-Israel divestment efforts, and visited Libyan strongman, Mummar Ghaddafi.

My view is supported by the following facts:

The Trumpet honored Minister Farrakhan at a banquet for his devotion to "truth." The magazine quoted Obama's "spiritual mentor," Rev. Wright, as praising Farrakhan for his "astounding and eye-opening" analysis of the "racial ills of this nation," a "perspective" that is "helpful and honest."

Minister Farrakhan, who regularly calls Jews "bloodsuckers," said in a March, 2007 Al Jazeera interview:

"The real anti-Semites are those who came out of Europe and settled in Palestine, and now they call themselves the true Jews, when in fact, they converted to Judaism."

On January 15th, Senator Obama publicly distanced himself from the comments of Minister Farrakhan. Obama asserted:

"I decry racism and anti-Semitism in any form and strongly condemn the anti-Semitic statements by Minister Farrakhan."

Even with Obama disavowing the Farrakhan award by his Church's magazine I take great exception that he did not take the ultimate step of leaving Pastor Wright's church and continuously supports him.

I appreciate what ADL executive director Foxman said in an interview with the Jewish Week:

'This must be just a first step. He's distanced himself from his pastor's decision to honor Farrakhan. He has not distanced himself from his pastor. I think that's the next step. One can now expect from Sen. Obama that he confront his minister. Ultimately, said Foxman, if Obama is unable to influence Wright to alter his stands, I think he has an obligation to leave.'

Conveniently, about the same time in January, Rev. Wright announced his 'retirement' from his Trinity Church pulpit in May of this year.

My opinion as to Obama having anti-Semitic views and characteristics is further influenced by the fact that Mr. Obama employed and still employs Nation Of Islam members and Farrakhan followers on his staff; his positions on the Israeli security fence; his comments on Yasser Arafat.

Coming from a highly sensitive viewpoint concerning the future and safety of Israel in a sea of worldwide anti-Israel bias, propaganda and media negativity, I see no difference between anti-Semitic and anti Israel. I see them both in the same. To your western ears, anti-Semitic may seem a harsher term by which it appears I am being judged.

In my opinion actions speak louder than words. It is important to watch what people do instead of what they say because talk is very cheap especially when you are raising funds and running for president! We are who we associate with. If Obama did not agree with his pastor he wouldn't be praising him as his mentor. There are very troubling things in Obama's past, present and his affiliations that he must answer and clarify. However that is just a relative issue compared to the real concern about Obama's wanting to meet with the avowed Holocaust denying enemy of Israel, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad to address his "grievances."

My remarks in both Boca Raton and Palm Beach are my own and while not representing the views or policies of the Federations should not be used to malign my message of anti-Islamofascism and pro-Israel support in the eyes of world Jewry. Shame on those who are using the auspices of the UJC in crying foul for something contrary to their personal politics. It is not lost on me that Rep. Robert Wexler (D-FL), whose district covers part of Palm Beach County, is a national surrogate in the Obama campaign. So perhaps both the Palm Beach Federation and national UJC didn't want to appear supportive of my views because it might offend Rep. Wexler and ultimately Sen. Obama.

The JTA article quoted me as saying: "Obama was an anti-Semite. No Jews should support him. Jews should vote for Hillary Clinton." These sentences, which appear as a direct quote, are simply a sloppy cut and paste job of statements I made about Obama and Clinton at two different events.

Were my criticisms of Sen. Obama off the mark? Am I raising pertinent questions that the Jewish community needs answers to? Witness these comments from American Jewish Committee (AJC) executive director David Harris presenting the views of South Floridians with whom he had recently spoken concerning Obama:

What are his relations with Wright? Why does he have former National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski (viewed as cool toward Israel) on his foreign policy team?

Harris went on to say:

“You could sum up the concerns as ‘does Obama feel Israel in his kishkas?’ ” Harris commented using the Yiddish word for guts.

“And does he have the steel and spine for the tough moments or believe diplomacy is the be-all and end-all of international relations?”

Such worries have surfaced in Israel, where Danny Ayalon, a former ambassador to the United States, has described Obama’s candidacy as cause for “concern.”

I am concerned as well. What should have been a positive outcome to my appearance at the West Palm Beach Federation event has been yanked from the hands of the local federation’s control and spread as a negative across the world. From 350 attendees to millions. Now even more can continue asking the questions I and director Harris have raised. Meanwhile the topic has been converted into a slanderous campaign against me by certain factions of the left wing of the Jewish press. In effect, a messenger in support of Israel is being unfairly and gratuitously maligned for my straightforwardness. I have and will always have my antennae up about issues that may adversely affect Israel and homeland security.

Since 2003 I have done much to support Israel: speaking at Duke on the Eve of the Palestinian solidarity convention, speaking at Columbia concerning problems by Arab professors against Jewish students, going on television defending Israel during the war between Hezbollah and Israel, creating and mobilizing a national grass roots organization to stand with and defend Israel, and writing a New York Times best seller, the first one by an Arab pro Israel changing hearts and minds of non Jews and gathering support for Israel throughout the world.

To let all the above go unnoticed; to bad mouth and condemn someone who is laying her life on the line while Israel has few friends; and to stand up and support the Jewish people is such a shame. And being “slammed” is the return I get simply because someone asked for my personal opinion about Obama?

I am glad to say that since this Obama brouhaha, I have received three different invitations from Jewish organizations across the country in less than a week.

The Jewish leadership of the UJC and JTA went out of their way to publicly malign the only pro Israel Arab/Terrorism Expert with such media reach. Last year I reached over one hundred million Americans with my pro Israel message as a non Jew, something not one Jewish organization has even come close to.

With actions like these from the Jewish leadership is it any wonder why the Arabs and Palestinians were able to re-write history while the Jews failed miserably in the PR department.”

Brigitte Gabriel is the best selling author of “Because They Hate”, Middle East commentator and founder of American Congress for Truth

[American Congress for Truth](http://www.americancongressfortruth.org/)

<http://www.southernwolf.net/modules.php?name=News&file=article&sid=335>

<http://www.margaretthatcher.org/speeches/displaydocument.asp?docid=106363>

1986 Apr 16 We
Margaret Thatcher
HC S: [US bombing of Libya]

Motion made, and Question proposed, That this House do now adjourn.—[Mr. Donald Thompson.]

Mr. Speaker

Before we start on this important debate, I must tell the House that I have received an intimation from 46 Back Benchers that they hope to take part if they catch my eye. No fewer than 10 of them are Privy Councillors.

I propose to follow my normal practice of calling Privy Councillors alternately with Back Benchers. I hope that the House will think that that is fair.

I also propose to apply the 10-minute rule limit on speeches between 6 o'clock and 8 o'clock. I hope that those called before and after that time will bear that limit broadly in mind.

The Prime Minister (Mrs. Margaret Thatcher)

My statement yesterday explained the Government's decision to support the United States military action, taken in self-defence, against terrorist targets in Libya.

Of course, when we took our decision we were aware of the wider issues and of people's fears. Terrorism attacks free societies and plays on those fears. If those tactics succeed, terrorism saps the will of free peoples to resist.

We have heard some of those arguments in this country: "Don't associate ourselves with the United States," some say; "Don't support them in fighting back; we may expose ourselves to more attacks," say others. Terrorism has to be defeated; it cannot be tolerated or side-stepped. When other ways and other methods have failed—I am the first to wish that they had succeeded—it is right that the terrorist should know that firm steps will be taken to deter him from attacking either other peoples or his own people who have taken refuge in countries that are free.

Before dealing with that central issue, and the evidence that we have of Libyan involvement, I wish to report to the House on the present position, as far as we know it. There have been reports of gunfire in Tripoli this lunchtime, but we have no further firm information.

The United States' action was conducted against five specific targets directly connected with terrorism. It will, of course, be for the United States Government to publish their assessment of the results. However, we now know that there were a number of civilian casualties, some of them children. It is reported that they included members of Colonel Gaddafi's own family.

The casualties are, of course, a matter of great sorrow. We also remember with sadness all those men, women and children who have lost their lives as a result of terrorist acts over the years—so many of them performed at the Libyan Government's behest.

We have no reports of British casualties as a result of the American action or of any subsequent incidents involving British citizens in Libya. I understand that telephone lines to Libya are open and that people in the United Kingdom have been able to contact their relatives there.

As I told the House yesterday, since May 1984 we have had to advise British citizens choosing to live and work in Libya that they do so on their own responsibility and at their own risk. Our consul in the British interests section [876] of the Italian embassy has been and will remain in close touch with representatives of the British community to advise them on the best course of action.

Mr. Eric S. Heffer (Liverpool, Walton)

The right hon. Lady referred to the killing of innocent children and then to terrorist attacks on innocent people in various parts of the world. I think that she and I may have been brought up in the same Christian tradition. Does she remember that two wrongs do not make a right?

The Prime Minister

Had the hon. Gentleman been listening, he would have realised that I was trying to tackle that argument in part, when I said that terrorism thrives on a free society. The terrorist uses the feelings in a free society to sap the will of civilisation to resist. If the terrorist succeeds, he has won and the whole of free society has lost.

We are most grateful for the work of the Italian authorities, as our protecting power, on behalf of the British community in Libya.

In this country, we have to be alert to the possibility of further terrorist attacks—so, too, do our British communities abroad. Our security precautions have been heightened, but it is, of course, the technique of the terrorist not just to choose obvious targets. Members of the public should therefore be ready to report to the police anything suspicious that attracts their attention. We have also taken steps to defend our interests overseas, seeking from foreign Governments enhanced protection for British embassies and communities. The United Nations Security Council met twice yesterday and resumes today. With some significant exceptions, first international reactions have been critical, even to this carefully limited use of force in self-defence, but I believe that we can be pretty certain that some of the routine denunciations conceal a rather different view in reality.

Concern has been expressed about the effects of this event on relations between East and West. The United States informed the Soviet Union that it had conclusive evidence of Libyan involvement in terrorist activities, including the Berlin bomb, that limited military action was being taken and that it was in no way directed against the Soviet Union.

We now hear that Mr. Shevardnadze has postponed his meeting with Mr. Shultz planned for next month. I must say that that looks to me rather like a ritual gesture. If the Soviet Union is really interested in arms control it will resume senior ministerial contacts before long.

Right hon. and hon. Members have asked me about the evidence that the Libyan Government are involved in terrorist attacks against the United States and other Western countries. Much of this derives, of course, from secret intelligence. As I explained to the House yesterday, it is necessary to be extremely careful about publishing detailed material of this kind. To do so can jeopardise sources on which we continue to rely for timely and vital information.

I can, however, assure the House that the Government are satisfied from the evidence that Libya bears a wide and heavy responsibility for acts of terrorism. For example, there is evidence showing that, on 25 March, a week before the recent Berlin bombing, instructions were sent from Tripoli to the Libyan people's bureau in East Berlin to conduct a terrorist attack against the Americans. On 4 [877] April the Libyan people's bureau alerted Tripoli that the attack would be carried out the following morning. On 5 April the bureau reported to Tripoli that the operation had been carried out successfully. As the House will recall, the bomb which killed two people and injured 230 had exploded in the early hours of that same morning. This country too is among the many that have suffered from Libyan terrorism. We shall not forget the tragic murder of WPC Fletcher by shots fired from the Libyan people's bureau in London just two years ago tomorrow. It is also beyond doubt that Libya provides the Provisional IRA with money and weapons. The major find of arms in Sligo and Roscommon in the Irish Republic on 26 January, the largest ever on the island, included rifles and ammunition from Libya.

There is recent evidence of Libyan support for terrorism in a number of other countries. For instance, only three weeks ago intelligence uncovered a plot to attack with a bomb civilians queueing for visas at the American embassy in Paris. It was foiled and many lives must have been saved. France subsequently expelled two members of the Libyan people's bureau in Paris for their involvement.

Sir John Biggs-Davison (Epping Forest)

My right hon. Friend mentioned the considerable arms find by the Garda in County Sligo. Does she recall that they also unearthed a very large supply of small arms ammunition in boxes with Libyan army markings?

The Prime Minister

I am grateful to my hon. Friend. I do recall that piece of evidence.

On 6 April an attempt to attack the United States embassy in Beirut, which we know to have been undertaken on Libyan Government instructions, failed when the rocket exploded on launch.

It is equally clear that Libya was planning yet more attacks. The Americans have evidence that United States citizens are being followed and American embassies watched by Libyan intelligence agents in a number of countries across the world. In Africa alone, there is intelligence of Libyan preparations for attacks on American facilities in no fewer than 10 countries.

There is other specific evidence of Libyan involvement in past acts of terrorism, and in plans for future acts of terrorism, but I cannot give details because that would endanger lives and make it more difficult to apprehend the terrorists. We also have evidence that the Libyans sometimes chose to operate by using other middle east terrorist groups.

But we need not rely on intelligence alone because Colonel Gaddafi openly speaks of his objectives. I shall give just one instance. In a speech at the Wheelus base in Libya in June 1984, he said:

"We are capable of exporting terrorism to the heart of America. We are also capable of physical liquidation and destruction and arson inside America."

There are many other examples.

Mr. Tony Banks (Newham, North-West)

I am grateful to the Prime Minister for giving way. Why is she prepared to support United States aggression against Libya but is not prepared to support United States economic sanctions against Libya?

The Prime Minister

If the hon. Gentleman will contain himself in patience, I shall come to that. [878]

Yesterday, many hon. Members referred to the need to give priority to measures other than military, but the sad fact is that neither international condemnation nor peaceful pressure over the years has deterred Libya from promoting and carrying out acts of terrorism.

Mr. Robert N. Wareing (Liverpool, West Derby)

rose—

The Prime Minister

No, I must carry on at the moment. I am on a new point about non-military measures about which I have been asked, and I must proceed through this evidence carefully.

In 1981 the United States closed the Libyan people's bureau in Washington and took measures to limit trade with Libya. Later, in January this year, the United States Government announced a series of economic measures against Libya. They sought the support of other Western countries. We took the view, together with our European partners, that economic sanctions work only if every country applies them. Alas, that was not going to happen with Libya.

In April 1984 we took our own measures. We closed the Libyan people's bureau in London and broke diplomatic relations with Libya. We imposed a strict visa regime on Libyans coming to this country and we banned new contracts for the supply of defence equipment and we severely limited Export Credits Guarantee Department credit for other trade.

Over the years, there have been many international declarations against terrorism, for example, by the economic summit under British chairmanship in London in June 1984; by the European Council in Dublin in December 1984; and finally by the United Nations General Assembly in December 1985. All those meetings adopted resolutions condemning terrorism and calling for greater international co-operation against it.

Indeed, the resolution of the United Nations General Assembly unequivocally condemns as criminal all acts, methods and practices of terrorism. It calls upon all states, in accordance with international law, to refrain from organising, instigating, assisting or participating in terrorist acts in other States. After the Achille Lauro incident, the Security Council issued a statement condemning terrorism in all its forms everywhere.

But while resolutions and condemnation issued from those cities, in others more terrible events—bombings, hijackings and kidnappings—were happening or were being planned. They are still being planned.

It was against that remorseless background of terrorist atrocities, and against the background of the restrained peaceful response, that the case for military action under the inherent right of self-defence to deter planned Libyan terrorist attacks against American targets was raised.

President Reagan informed me last week that the United States intended to take such action. He sought our support. Under the consultation arrangements which have continued under successive Governments for over 30 years, he also sought our agreement to the use of United States aircraft based in this country. Hon. Members will know that our agreement was necessary.

In the exchanges which followed, I raised a number of questions and concerns. I concentrated on the principle of self-defence, recognised in article 51 of the United Nations charter, and the consequent need to limit the action and to relate the selection of targets clearly to terrorism. [879]

There were of course risks in what was proposed. Many of them have been raised in the House and elsewhere since the action took place. I pondered them deeply with the Ministers most closely concerned, for decisions like this are never easy. We also considered the wider implications, including our relations with other countries, and we had to weigh the importance for this country's security of our Alliance with the United States and the American role in the defence of Europe.

As I told the House yesterday, I replied to the President that we would support action directed against specific Libyan targets demonstrably involved in the conduct and support of terrorist activities; further, that if the President concluded that it was necessary, we would agree to the deployment of United States aircraft from bases in the United Kingdom for that specific purpose.

Mr. Andrew Faulds (Warley, East)

Will the right hon. Lady give way?

The Prime Minister

No, Sir.

The President responded that the operation would be limited to clearly defined targets related to terrorism, and that every effort would be made to minimise collateral damage. He made it clear that, for the reasons I indicated yesterday, he regarded the use of F111 aircraft from bases in the United Kingdom as essential.

There are, I understand, no other F111s stationed in Europe. Had we refused permission for the use of those aircraft, the United States operation would still have taken place; but more lives would probably have been lost, both on the ground and in the air.

It has been suggested that, as a result of further Libyan terrorism, the United States might feel constrained to act again. I earnestly hope that such a contingency will not arise. But in my exchanges with the President, I reserved the position of the United Kingdom on any question of further action which might be more general or less clearly directed against terrorism.

Mr. Faulds

Will the right hon. Lady give way?

The Prime Minister

No. This point is particularly important.

Moreover, it is clearly understood between President Reagan and myself that, if there were any question of using United States aircraft based in this country in a further action, that would be the subject of a new approach to the United Kingdom under the joint consultation arrangements.

Many hon. Members have questioned whether the United States action will be effective in stopping terrorism

Mr. Faulds

Will the right hon. Lady give way on that point?

The Prime Minister

Many hon. Members—

Mr. Faulds

rose—

Mr. Speaker

Order. The hon. Gentleman knows that he must resume his seat if the Prime Minister does not give way.

The Prime Minister

Many hon. Members have questioned whether the United States action will be effective in stopping terrorism or will instead have the effect of quickening the cycle of violence in the middle east. [880]

Let us remember that the violence began long ago. It has already taken a great many lives. It has not been so much a cycle of violence as a one-sided campaign of killing and maiming by ruthless terrorists, many with close connections with Libya. The response of the countries whose citizens have been attacked has not so far stopped that campaign.

Mr. Wareing

Will the Prime Minister give way on that point?

The Prime Minister

I will give way to the hon. Gentleman later. Please may I continue with this point?

Mr. Faulds

Why not give way to me?

The Prime Minister

Indeed, one has to ask whether it has not been the failure to act in self-defence that has encouraged state-sponsored terrorism. Firm and decisive action may make those who continue to practise terrorism as a policy think again. I give way to the hon. Member for Liverpool, West Derby (Mr. Wareing).

Mr. Wareing

Would the Prime Minister agree that if her argument is correct we should all be feeling very much safer? Can she therefore explain why, for the first time since the early days of my election to the House, I was asked this morning—as all hon. Members have been asked—for my pass and my car was searched in order to ensure our safety? Am I to feel safe now as a result of this attack?

The Prime Minister

I would have hoped that the hon. Gentleman would see the wisdom of taking heightened precautions. It would have been folly not to do so.

It has also been suggested that the United States action will only build up Colonel Gaddafi's prestige and support in the Arab world. In the very short term, one must expect statements of support for Libya from other Arab countries—although one is entitled to ask how profound or durable that support will be. But moderate Arab Governments, indeed moderate Governments everywhere, have nothing to gain from seeing Colonel Gaddafi build up power and influence by persisting in policies of violence and terror.

Their interest, like ours, lies in seeing the problems of the middle east solved by peaceful negotiation, a negotiation whose chances of success will be much enhanced if terrorism can be defeated.

Mr. A. J. Beith (Berwick-upon-Tweed)

rose—

The Prime Minister

I shall not give way now.

Let me emphasise one very important point. A peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israel question remains our policy and we shall continue to seek ways forward with moderate Arab Governments. Indeed, I shall be seeing King Hussein later this week to discuss this very matter.

Mr. Beith

To what extent does the Prime Minister think that Colonel Gaddafi's capacity to mount attacks of terrorism has been reduced by the measures taken by the United States?

The Prime Minister

I believe that his capacity and the will of the people to do so have been impaired by the actions that have taken place.

The United States is our greatest ally. It is the foundation of the Alliance which has preserved our security and peace for more than a generation. In defence of liberty, our liberty as well as its own, the United States

[881] maintains in Western Europe 330,000 service men. That is more than the whole of Britain's regular forces. The United States gave us unstinting help when we needed it in the South Atlantic four years ago. The growing threat of international terrorism is not directed solely at the United States. We in the United Kingdom have also long been in the front line. To overcome the threat is in the vital interests of all countries founded upon freedom and the rule of law.

Terrorism exploits the natural reluctance of a free society to defend itself, in the last resort, with arms. Terrorism thrives on appeasement. Of course we shall continue to make every effort to defeat it by political means. But in this case that was not enough. The time had come for action. The United States took it. Its decision was justified, and, as friends and allies, we support it.

Copyright © Margaret Thatcher Foundation 2008. All Rights Reserved.

[Transcript of the Rally](#) NATIONAL SOLIDARITY RALLY WITH ISRAEL
U.S. CAPITOL, WASHINGTON, D.C.
1:00 P.M. EDT
MONDAY, APRIL 15, 2002

Arafat is nothing more than Osama bin Laden with good PR.

Text of Netanyahu's address at 4/15/02 D.C. Rally

MR. NETANYAHU: At this very hour, the entire nation of Israel is silent. The Jewish state is commemorating the 20,000 soldiers who gave their lives to defend the state of Israel and the thousands of civilians struck down by the forces of terror in our long battle for freedom. Just a few months ago, America too lost thousands of its citizens to terrorist savagery. And we stand here today to honor these fallen sons and daughters of liberty.

But I've also come here today, my dear friends, to give thanks, to thank all of you for standing up for the Jewish state when so many outside America stood silent -- (applause) -- to thank the American people and their government for remembering the difference between freedom and tyranny, between right and wrong, between good and evil, to thank President Bush for boldly declaring that terrorism, the deliberate attack on civilians, is never justified; it's always evil -- (applause) -- and for bravely charting a course that will lead the free world to victory.

No greater friend of Israel has ever been in the White House, and no president has ever championed a cause that was more just. Israel and the United States are today fighting the same battle, waging the same war, confronting the same evil. Like the United States, Israel did not seek this war. It was forced on us by a savage enemy that glorifies in a culture of death, a culture where murderers are called martyrs and where suicide is sanctified.

My friends, an enemy that sends children to die and to kill other children is an enemy that cannot be placated. (Applause.) An enemy that openly preaches the destruction of our state is not a partner for peace. (Applause.) With such evil, there can be no negotiations and no concessions -- (applause) -- because the only way to confront -- to fight such evil is to confront it. The only way to defeat it is to destroy it. (Applause.) And once terror is defeated, I believe other Palestinians will come to the fore with whom we will forge a genuine and lasting peace.

Now, I don't want you to be fooled by the apologists of terror. They tell us that the way to end terror is to appease it, to meet or give in to the terrorists' demands -- because -- listen to their argument -- because, they tell us, the root cause of terrorism -- did you ever hear that? -- the root cause of terrorism is the deprivation of national and civic rights.

Well, let's examine that proposition. If that were the case, then in the thousands of conflicts and struggles for national and civil rights in modern times, we would expect to have found endless examples of terrorism. But guess what: We don't.

Mahatma Gandhi did not use terrorism in fighting for the independence of India. (Applause.) The peoples of Eastern Europe did not resort to terrorism to bring down the Berlin Wall. (Applause.) But one other example; one other example. Martin Luther King did not resort to terrorism in fighting for equal rights for all Americans. (Applause.) In fact, speaking in this city, in this very place, four decades ago, Martin Luther King preached a creed that was the very opposite of terrorism -- not violence, non-violence; completely the opposite.

So now we must ask ourselves, why did all these people pursue their cause without resorting to terror? Because they believed in the sanctity of each human life, because they were committed to the ideals of liberty, because they championed the values of democracy; simply put, because they were democrats, not terrorists. That's why. (Applause.)

But, you see, those who practice terrorism do not believe in these ideals. In fact, they believe the very opposite. They believe that the cause they espouse is so all-encompassing, so total, that it justifies anything and everything. They believe that it allows them to break any law, to discard any moral code, to trample all human rights into the dust. They believe that their cause permits them to indiscriminately murder and maim innocent men and women. They believe that it lets them blow up a bus full of babies.

My friends, there's a name for the mindset that produces this evil. It is called totalitarianism. Indeed, this is the root cause of terrorism. The root cause of terrorism is the totalitarian mindset, a tyranny that systematically brainwashes the minds of its subjects, to suspend all moral constraints for the sake of a twisted cause. And this is why, from its inception, totalitarianism has always been wedded to terrorism, from Lenin to Stalin to Hitler to the ayatollahs to Saddam Hussein to Osama bin Laden to Yasser Arafat. (Applause.)

My friends, I want you to listen to me carefully, because I want to say something else. It is not merely that the goals of terrorists do not justify the means they use. It is that the means that they choose tell you what their real goals are, because those who target the innocent will never protect freedom and human rights.

And how can we see that? We can see that clearly every time terrorists come to power. Those who fight as terrorists rule as terrorists, setting up dark dictatorships, whether in Iraq or in Iran or in Afghanistan or in Arafatistan. (Applause.)

And indeed, Yasser Arafat is the quintessential terrorist. Both his means and his goals are illegitimate. Arafat pursues a goal of pocide, the destruction of a state, by employing the means of suicide, suicide and mass terror. Arafat does not want a Palestinian state next to Israel. He wants a Palestinian state instead of Israel. (Applause.)

But my friends, any time that Israel was confronted with an Arab leader who was genuinely interested in peace and delivered a message of peace to his own people in Arabic, every time we were confronted with such a leader, we made peace.

Menachem Begin made peace with Egypt's Anwar Sadat, and Yitzhak Rabin made peace with Jordan's King Hussein. (Applause.) But five Israeli prime ministers have been unable to make peace with Arafat. Do you know why? For a simple reason: Because Arafat does not want peace. (Applause.)

Now, let me show you the difference between one leader and another. Until the day I die, I will not forget the day that King Hussein came with me to visit the bereaved families of seven young Israeli school girls, 12 years old, gunned down by a deranged Jordanian soldier. He knelt before the families, before the mothers and fathers. He was weeping. There were tears streaming down his eyes and he said, "Please, please forgive me. Please forgive me."

Now, contrast that to Yasser Arafat. Do you know what he does? He glorifies these mass killers. He calls public squares after them. He names buildings, streets in their honor. He has suicide kindergarten camps. He has suicide universities. He has suicide museums. For God's sake, this is the man who pays the checks. He signs the checks for the explosives of the suicides. He is a terrorist, if there ever was one.

Now, you may remember that many right here, right here in this town, and many in Israel, many in Washington and many in Jerusalem, had hoped, at the beginning of the Oslo accords, that Arafat would prove to be a statesman, a Palestinian King Hussein. Instead he's proved to be a Palestinian Saddam Hussein. (Applause.)

And I ask you, what do you do with Saddam Hussein? Do you negotiate with him? Do you make concessions to him? Do you appease him? No, exactly. You do the same thing to him that the U.S. just did to the Taliban. You defeat him.

America rightly defeated the Taliban. And today, in an historic mission that deserves the support of civilized peoples and nations everywhere, President Bush is courageously leading the free world to dismantle Saddam's regime before it acquires nuclear weapons. (Applause.)

Well, if we're to end terror and begin peace in our own part of the world, Israel must too now dismantle Arafat's regime, a mission also worthy of support from all foes of terror and all friends of liberty.

I think that garnering this support is much easier now than it was a year ago. I think that the face of Palestinian terror has finally been unmasked. The people of this great nation are not fooled by Yasser Arafat and the con artists he employs on American television. Americans know that Yasser Arafat is nothing more than Osama bin Laden with good PR. (Applause.) Americans know that if it looks like a duck, it walks like a duck, it talks like a duck, it's a terrorist. (Applause.)

Today, gathered in the capital of liberty, we send a powerful message to the entire world. To those in Europe who 60 years ago did nothing to prevent the slaughters of millions of Jews and who today side with the mass killers who seek to destroy the Jewish state, we send this message: History's shame will once again fall on you. (Applause.)

To the anti-Semites of the world, we send a message of defiance. The Jewish people are not afraid. We will roll back the savage assaults, those assaults that you direct against us. We will courageously stand up to you and to all other enemies. And to the terrorists and terror regimes that support them, we send a warning: The free world, led by President Bush, has awoken to your evil. Terror will be given no quarter, no peace, until it is wiped out from our world. (Applause.)

My friends, I want to congratulate all of you on the largest rally in support of Israel in Israel's history. (Applause.) I want to assure you that standing tall, standing proud, we will win this war. We will secure our states and we'll preserve our liberty. And in defending the Jewish state, all of you here today in Washington, Jews and non-Jews alike, are defending the cause of liberty, a cause that has once again made America, Israel and the defenders of freedom the last, best hope on earth. We shall win.

Thank you very much, all of you, and God bless you. (Applause.) Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you. (Applause.)

<http://www.netanyahu.org/arisnotmorth.html>