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New Local Publication: HABARI Connection
HABARI Connection is on the move. While still forming an organization of community leaders, HABARI Connection is looking forward to its next fun community event, the Health and Beauty Expo in MAY. Staying true to the mission, HABARI Connection hosts a Financial Success Seminar and Minority Job Fair, Health and Beauty Expo, as well as participates in the Community Court Watch. With a growing number of community supporters, this is an organization to watch.

U.S., Israel, and the Middle East
Lebanese girls from the village of Shaara in front of their destroyed home (Left), and an Israeli peace demonstration (Right).
The United States, Israel and the Middle East

by Kenneth M. Cuno

This is a slightly revised version of the remarks I prepared for an October 26 public forum sponsored by AWARE Presents, on “What Should be the U.S. Policy in the Middle East? The Confrontation of Israel with its Neighbors.”

I’d like to begin with some observations about the way that we in the U.S. discuss Israel and the Middle East. All too often our discussions are unproductive due to the rhetorical moves we make, and so I’m going to mention some examples before discussing our policy.

For a long time I’ve been bothered by the way we use the terms “pro-Israel” as opposed to “pro-Arab” or “anti-Israel.” We need to stop thinking and speaking in these simplistic terms, which imply that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is a zero-sum game. To label someone or some idea as pro-Israel or anti-Israel implies that the existence of the State of Israel is at stake. It isn’t. Israel is by far the strongest power in the Middle East, and the majority of the Arab states are now eager to normalize relations, as soon as a satisfactory Israeli-Palestinian settlement is reached. The issue is Israel’s boundaries, not Israel’s existence. The real existential question is the Palestinian question—the question of whether they will achieve self-determination in a territorially viable state, which is their right. The “pro-Israel” or “pro-Arab” or “anti-Israel” dichotomy only serves the interests of those who see some advantage in promoting the conflict. A good example of that is the ongoing campaign to smear academic Middle East Studies programs and even academia as a whole as “anti-Israel.” Another sterile exercise is the “blame game.” We who are interested in a just political settlement need to stop playing that game, debating who is at fault, who is the aggressor, who “started it,” and so forth. There is plenty of blame on both sides for the continuing conflict. Both sides are guilty, to paraphrase the late Abba Eban’s words, of almost never missing an opportunity to miss an opportunity for peace and normalization. However, it is an asymmetrical situation, in which the Palestinians have had much less control over events, and less influence over the public debate. Here are a couple examples of the blame game. Some of Israel’s “new historians” have implied that in the early 1950s Ben-Gurion missed an opportunity by not responding to secret peace “feelers” from Egypt and Syria. Well, maybe, but we have no way of knowing what might have happened if he had. Arafat was also blamed for “rejecting peace” at Camp David 2000. But in actuality the Israeli-American offer was unacceptable. An inability to agree is not the same thing as “rejecting peace.”

“Peace” is another problematic term. Maybe we should stop kidding ourselves that the parties in this conflict are seeking peace: Between Israelis and Palestinians the conflict has always been about land. Nowadays Israelis are divided between those who would accept a state within boundaries based on the June 4, 1967 frontiers and those who want to annex part or all of the Occupied Territories, either out of security concerns or nationalist irredeemers. The Palestinians are also divided between those who support a two-state solution based on the June 4, 1967 boundaries and nationalistic irredeemers who want to liberate “all of historic Palestine.” The nationalistic irredeemers on both sides are delusional and dangerous, but they are in the minority. They can be underdetermined, but not the result of a just settlement.

Finally, there are a number of terms in usage that I would lump together under the heading of “political fundamentalism.” Fundamentalist discourse uses catch words in place of terms “pro-Israel” as opposed to “pro-Arab” or “anti-Israel.”

Terrorism is the targeting of civilians or non-combatants for political ends. It is a strategy, albeit an ugly, reprehensible one. Terrorism is practiced by virtually everyone, because it is effective, at least some of the time. We should not be天花dropping terrorism, but we should remember that terrorism is not an ideology, and no organization or state is essentially a “terrorist” organization or state. Nor is any religion. There are Muslim terrorists (and others), but there is no such thing as “Islamic terrorism.”

Arab and Muslim objections to Israel are not due to an inherent anti-Semitism. Arab and Muslim anti-Semitism is a product of the Arab-Israeli conflict, not a root cause of it. Holocaust denial in the Arab and Muslim world is motivated by the misperception that Israel was created and is supported by the West in compensation for the Holocaust. On the Israeli side there is nakba denial—Palestinians refer to their uprooting and dispersal in 1948, as the nakba or “disaster.” Nakba denial is not denial of the event itself but denial of any Israeli responsibility for it. In that view, the Palestinians are “run away,” they were “ordered” to run away, they weren’t there to begin with, and besides they started it. Israeli nakba denial springs from the same source as Arab Holocaust denial, namely an unwillingness to accept any legitimacy to the other side’s case.

Similar to the accusation that Arabs or Muslims are inherently anti-Semitic is the charge that Zionism is a form of racism or that Israel is a racist “apartheid state.” Again, this is political fundamentalism. The equation of Zionism and racism was cooked up by the Arab states in the early 1970s in the hope of isolating Israel as a “pariah state” like the white regime in Rhodesia (today’s Zimbabwe). The connection is very clear if one reads the UN General Assembly resolution of 1974. The absence of any racial doctrine in the foundational Zionist texts is equally clear. On the other hand, there is a mixture of de jure and de facto discrimination against non-Jewish (mainly Palestinian) citizens in Israel that is analogous to racial discrimination in the U.S. half a century ago. The term “apartheid” is more appropriate to the situation in the West Bank, which is why Israelis on the left will use this term— not to condemn Israel as a whole but to warn against the direction they see their country going in.

As for U.S. policy toward Israel and the Arab-Israeli conflict, our policy has not been consistently the same, but has evolved in zigs and zags. Approximately 40 years ago Israel became a strategic ally of the U.S. Before then and since, though, the U.S. made periodic attempts to reconcile the two sides—and to reconcile our Israeli alliance with our Arab alliances—by mediating the conflict and working toward a settlement. Starting in the 1960s that policy of mediation was occasionally abandoned in favor of relying on Israel as a strategic asset in our efforts to dominate the Middle East and to exclude the influence of rivals. This was the strategy during the Nixon administration’s first term and during much of the Reagan administration. It was a Cold War, anti-Soviet policy. Throughout those decades, whether mediating the conflict or not, the U.S. had an overall “status quo” strategy seeking “stability.”

I maintain that the policy of the current Bush administration is exceptional in its revisionist goals and its militancy. It is “revisionist” in its stated goal of changing the political order in the Middle East. Regime change has been the avowed policy toward Iraq, Iran, Syria, and the Palestinian Authority, and traditional allies (though not Israel) have also been pressured to change their political systems. It is

Continued on page 3
Vilifying Israel
By An Anonymous Israeli From Our Community

In the recent conflicts in the Middle East, the Israeli point of view is rarely covered, especially by independent media. I think there are a lot of misconceptions and information gaps.

Let's start with a few brief facts. Israel is about 3/5 of 1/6th the size of Illinois. Lebanon is even smaller. Israel was created in the late 1940s. Lebanon, Jordan, Syria and Iraq became independent from Britain and France at about the same time. They were previously controlled by the Ottoman Empire for about 500 years. The borders drawn by Britain and France are behind much of the current conflict in the region.

Israel has been involved in 3 major wars in which at least 8 neighboring countries directly supplied troops at one point or another (the three other Israel-Lebanon wars are not considered major wars). Two of the major wars occurred before the West Bank and Gaza strip were part of Israel and Egypt respectively. Between the creation of those countries and 1967 there was no Palestinian uprising. Palestinians have been kept in refugee camps without the right to work, or to resolve their future, for about 60 years. The reviews of the history of these nations.

Israel has about 6 million people of which more than 1 million are Palestinians. Since the 1940s, more Jews fled Arab countries than Palestinians fled Israel. For many, Israel now is not just Jews live in the whole Arab and Muslim worlds combined.

After the fall of the Ottoman Empire, modern Greece and Turkey were formed. A mass population exchange occurred where Christians fled from Turkey to Greece and Muslims fled from Greece to Turkey. No permanent refugee camps were formed.

The Gaza Strip and West Bank were formed in 1967, after the mass migrations of the Nakba. No permanent refugee camps were formed. Palestinians should not be held in camps without jobs or recourse. Keeping them in camps is further colonization by reinforcing the lines that the British decided in the 1940's when designations such as Palestinian, Jordanian, Lebanese and Syrian were determined.

As a panel in the Urbana City Council chambers on Oct 26, it was suggested that as a part of a settlement the US should need to open its borders to some of these Palestinians. As an ideal this certainly sounds good. However, I am not sure that it will work. The reason is that having a third party accept responsibility continues the cycle of avoiding the responsibility of Arab countries. In the end, Arab countries such as Lebanon, Jordan, Egypt and Syria are held to a lower standard than say India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Greece and Turkey. Why are these four countries (and other Arab countries) not responsible for refugees?

I think the solution (beyond a cynical proposal of handing religion) actually starts here, with the people that read this newspaper, the people that judge the situation and criticize the actors. The first priority is the application of human rights equally throughout the world. People should not be kidnapped, killed, or threatened based on their opinions or even pictures they took (the Canadian-Iranian journalist Zahra Kazemi was tortured and killed by the Iranian police for simply taking a picture of a prison). Nobody should be subjected to this: not Palestinians, Israelis, Iranians, Kurds, Iraqis, Africans etc. People who deny these basic rights, who incorporate vigilante groups in their midst, or who do not speak up against these practices should be denied legitimacy. They should not be necessarily labeled terrorist, but violators of human rights.

Ironically, Israel itself has decent human rights within its borders, especially compared with the other countries in the region (please see freelomb.org). Human rights should be encouraged and parties that abide by human rights should receive a positive judgment and be rewarded with more legitimacy, especially in UN (this philosophy should not just apply to this conflict).

Note being a theocracy, monarchy, democracy, dictatorship, oligarchy or whatever is irrelevant in this scheme. The essence of cultures should not be changed, but people everywhere in the world deserve to feel safe and to be allowed to express themselves.

Since its creation in the 1940's Israel has been constant- ly vilified, more than Greece, Turkey, India, Pakistan, Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon or Iraq. American Jews and Jews in general have also often been vilified. My simple question is why, and what makes Israel so different? Is it that Israel's refugees are Jewish? Is it that some of Israel's refugees also came from Europe?

Unless all parties are held to the same standards of human rights and unless the Western view of Muslim and Arab countries changes from blameless victims to part of the problem, nothing will change. Excuses to continue fighting will always be found.

Journalist Myron Schenker, writer for the News-Gazette, found little fault in Garrett’s offenses and failed to mention the threatening comments allegedly made by Garrett or his record of domestic abuse. She raised no serious questions about repercussions of Garrett’s plea.

Do Mary Garrett and Kellums feel safe at night knowing that Garrett has a personal vendetta against them? What message does this send to other cops who might also abuse their power? Are police above the law in Champaign County?
What You Got To Go Through To File A Police Complaint In Champaign.

By Brian Dolinar

Following on the heels of a similar proposition in Urbana, the Champaign police department is currently considering a citizen police review board. Just the mention of such an oversight has provoked reprimals from the Mayor, the News-Gazette, and their local law-and-order constituents. The News-Gazette has already began editing against a police review board. An editorial ran on October 11, 2006 titled, "Police review board plan raises problems." The editorial says a review board will be a "tough sell to people who have long viewed police either with suspicion or fear." Of course, many leaders in the African American community have supported the formation of a police review board. The suggestion is that nothing can (or should) be done to improve police relations in the black community. Filing a complaint is a relatively simple act, according to the News-Gazette. A citizen police review board would "do nothing except duplicate an existing discipline process." This sentiment was echoed by another editorial in the News-Gazette from local citizen Michael Cook who said that Champaign police already has an "effective complaint process." Champaign police chief R.T. Finney has expressed his interest in a police review board if it would bring more oversight has provoked reprisals from the Mayor, the News-Gazette, and their local law-and-order constituents. Co-founder of VEYA (Visionaries Educating Youth and Adults) Martel Miller has had a different experience. It is the story of, as Miller says, "What you got to go through to file a police complaint in Champaign." On September 22, 2006, following a hip hop show by Ludacris, there were several after-parties. One was at the to a house, a black fraternity on 1st Street. A young black man who will remain unidentified said he tried to get into the party but it was too crowded as he decided to leave. As he was walking out, police outside told him he could not go. He tried to explain that his car was across the street. They told him if he crossed the street he would be arrested. As soon as he stepped into the street, police arrested him for jaywalking. Usually jaywalking is a ticketable offense, but they arrested the young man, handcuffed him, and put him in back of the squad car. Next the police pulled the young man from out of the car. When Sergeant Crane saw the whole incident the young man was then taken to jail and bailed out the next day. The day after the incident, Martel Miller got a call from the young man who explained how he was abused by Champaign police. Miller told him to go file a complaint at the Champaign police department. On September 24, the young man went down to the police station to file a complaint. He was met by Sergeant Matt Crane who got into an argument with him. The Sergeant would not let him file a complaint and threw him out of the police station. Miller received a second call that day from the young man who said he had been refused the right to file a complaint. Miller decided to go down to the station with the young man and try to file a complaint for a second time. They gave the young man a typed-written complaint to someone at the dispatch window and asked for a superior officer. Sergeant Crane came out with another Sergeant and 3 additional officers. As soon as Sergeant Crane saw the young man, he started yelling at him and tried to kick him out again. Miller interrupted and said, "This man is a citizen. He has a right to a file a complaint." The Sergeant began arguing with Miller. "The next thing I know," Miller says, "the Sergeant is trying to put me out of the police station." Miller then pulled out his cell phone and called Mayor Miller. On October 19, Miller received a summary of his complaint. "When you file a complaint the police station machine to file a complaint is a problem with his police. The Mayor's answering machine was on and Miller left a message. The Sergeant then stepped in to talk to Miller and diffuse the situation. Miller decided to leave but said he would be back to file his own complaint against Sergeant Crane. On September 26, Miller went back down to the Champaign police department and delivered a typed-written complaint to Lieutenant Yohnka (See side bar). The Lieu- tenant told Miller that his complaint "wasn't detailed enough." He wanted Miller to dictate a complaint and Lieu- tenant Yohnka would write it out. Miller asked if he could have a copy of the Lieutenant's typed up complaint. Yohnka said, "No." Miller was given a form to sign agreeing to the truthful- ness of a complaint that he still had not seen. The form said the complaint was unfounded, Miller could be held liable. Miller currently has a $13 million law suit against Champaign for an incident in 2004 when police seized his video equipment and charged him with felony evadecrapping for videotaping police work. He is already suspicious of Champaign police and knows how they will manipulate the law to save their own ends. Miller asked Lieutenant Yohnka to fax the complaint to a lawyer the he and he agreed. But Miller said Yohnka only faxed two blank sheets of paper. Miller called Yohnka on the phone and Yohnka flatly told him he could not have a copy of the complaint. On September 26, Miller received a summary of his com- plaint, but not the entire document. He issued a Freedom of Information Act, but it was denied. According to Miller, the Champaign police are now rewriting the policy on fil- ing a complaint. Miller says the message is: "When you file a complaint the Champaign police decide if they are going to take a complaint or not. They will write one down for you, but you can not see a copy of that complaint. So you don't ever know what your complaint is. They say this complaint process is fair to the citizen." September 26, 2006
Now, the Real Battle Begins

By Robert Naiman

CHAMPAIGN-URBANA VOTES TO WITHDRAW FROM IRAQ AND IMPEACH BUSH-CHENEY

The election defeats of Republicans on Tuesday, with Democrats taking control of the House and Senate for the first time since 1994, have been widely described as a referendum on the unpopular war in Iraq. Certainly, most Americans told pollsters before the election that they expected a Democratic victory to result in withdrawal from Iraq (see, for example, “With Iraq Driving Election, Voters Want New Approach,” Adam Nagourney & Megan Thee, New York Times, November 2, 2006) and most Americans told pollsters before the election that the U.S. should set a timetable for withdrawal from Iraq, 61% in a Newseum poll (see “Most Americans Want Timetable for Iraqi War,” Angus Reid Global Monitor – Polls & Research, November 2, 2006.)

However, now that the election is over and the Democrats have won, while everyone concedes that the unpopularity of the war was a main driver of the Democrats’ victory, the battle lines are being drawn over whether the election victory means that the U.S. should withdraw from Iraq. George McGovern, the former senator and Democratic presidential candidate, is presenting a plan for removing U.S. troops from Iraq by June. Meanwhile, Iraq’s president says that he has been reassured by Democratic leaders that they have “no plans for a quick withdrawal of U.S. forces,” AP reports.

So the battle is over whether the elections mean “withdrawal” or a yet to be determined “change of course.” This was predicted, and that’s what makes the actual referenda that passed on Tuesday calling for withdrawal so important. There were referenda in Wisconsin, Massachusetts, and Illinois, including Champaign-Urbana and Springfield. All of the 58 local ballot initiatives on withdrawal were successful.

CHAMPAIGN-URBANA: ORDERLY AND RAPID WITHDRAWAL

Champaign:
In order to halt the continuing loss of human life and resources necessary to meet human needs at home, shall the U.S. commence a humane, orderly, rapid and comprehensive withdrawal from Iraq?
Yes 9888 (58%) No 7104 (42%)

Urbana:
Shall the voters of Cunningham Township call upon the U.S. government to commence an orderly and rapid withdrawal of all U.S. Military from Iraq while providing financial support for Iraq security?
Yes 5729 (65%) No 3029 (35%)

CHAMPAIGN-URBANA: IMPEACHMENT

Champaign:
Shall our representative to the U.S. House of Representatives be asked to support the impeachment of George W Bush and Richard Cheney for misleading our nation to war with Iraq?
Yes 7877 (46%) No 9140 (54%)

Urbana:
Shall the voters of Cunningham Township ask our representative to the U.S. House of Representatives to support articles of impeachment to remove George W Bush and Richard Cheney from office?
Yes 5171 (59%) No 3614 (41%)

CHAMPAIGN-URBANA: NATIONAL GUARD MOBILIZATION

Shall the Governor of Illinois, to the extent of his authority, resist any further federal mobilization of Illinois National Guard Units for service in Iraq?
Yes 4812 (60%) No 3154 (40%)

In many Republican precincts in Champaign—as judged by the vote in the Secretary of State’s race—the majority voted in favor of withdrawal from Iraq. In 32 of Champaign’s 38 precincts and in 22 of Urbana’s 23 precincts a majority voted in favor of withdrawal.

As we were tallying the votes at the County building, Republican Rep. Tim Johnson gave a press conference on his victory in the Congressional election. He acknowledged that the US position in Iraq was a “quagmire” and that Americans would not tolerate the status quo for another two years.

In the spring the Urbana City Council passed a resolution in favor of withdrawal. At the time, peace activists claimed that the council was reflecting majority sentiment in Urbana. This completes the argument.

Illinois Cities Vote to Withdraw From Iraq:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township/City</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%Yes</th>
<th>%No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Chicago (95%)</td>
<td>389,257</td>
<td>93,048</td>
<td>512,405</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Cook (88%)</td>
<td>349,051</td>
<td>182,149</td>
<td>531,200</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora Township</td>
<td>9,601</td>
<td>5,225</td>
<td>14,826</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beryvn Township (90%)</td>
<td>5,816</td>
<td>2,371</td>
<td>8,187</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Township</td>
<td>23,859</td>
<td>15,955</td>
<td>49,814</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champaign Township</td>
<td>9,888</td>
<td>7,104</td>
<td>16,992</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham (Urbana) (100%)</td>
<td>5,729</td>
<td>3,029</td>
<td>8,758</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downers Grove Township (95%)</td>
<td>24,269</td>
<td>19,830</td>
<td>44,099</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva township (100%)</td>
<td>4,928</td>
<td>4,208</td>
<td>9,136</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Park township (98%)</td>
<td>13,405</td>
<td>4,175</td>
<td>17,580</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside township (95%)</td>
<td>3,164</td>
<td>1,971</td>
<td>5,135</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeKalb township</td>
<td>5,060</td>
<td>3,617</td>
<td>8,677</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteside County</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 844,238 342,868 1187,106 71 29

Ten Referenda also Passed in Wisconsin:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town/City</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%Yes</th>
<th>%No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boscobel</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox River</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>1,378</td>
<td>3,460</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Delton</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>4,499</td>
<td>3,191</td>
<td>7,690</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee (98%)</td>
<td>111,805</td>
<td>44,101</td>
<td>155,906</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine</td>
<td>11,064</td>
<td>7,048</td>
<td>18,112</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Milwaukee</td>
<td>4,390</td>
<td>3,733</td>
<td>8,127</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viroqua</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>1,541</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wauwatosa</td>
<td>13,106</td>
<td>9,725</td>
<td>22,831</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 149,124 70,874 219,998 68 32

Now, we need to make these results stick, by raising them at every opportunity with Representative Johnson and Senators Durbin and Obama, and by using every opportunity to get them into local media, especially letters to the editor. Let these words be on everyone’s lips: 61% of Champaign-Urbana’s voters said they want an “orderly and rapid withdrawal” from Iraq.

Unique and Progressive: That’s Rentertainment

by Darrin Dndr

That’s Rentertainment owner Geoff Merritt likes to keep a low profile (“I’ve never been keen on being photographed,” he replied when asked for a mug shot). But like his store on 6th and John in Campustown, the humble exterior belies a rich eclecticism to be discovered within. Geoff’s passion for the un-ordinary (and independent media and art, and against corporate colorization of the mind and of the planet. Of course, maybe you’re just in the mood for a bad kung-fu movie.

by Darrin Dnda

That’s Rentertainment owner Geoff Merritt likes to keep a low profile (“I’ve never been keen on being photographed,” he replied when asked for a mug shot). But like his store on 6th and John in Campustown, the humble exterior belies a rich eclecticism to be discovered within. Geoff’s passion for the un-ordinary (and independent media and art, and against corporate colorization of the mind and of the planet. Of course, maybe you’re just in the mood for a bad kung-fu movie.
In 1979, a popular revolution in Iran toppled a ruthless dictator backed by the United States and replaced him with a regime that gave supreme political authority to a traditionally-trained scholar of Islam, something unprecedented in the modern history of Iran. The Islamic revolutionaries at first supported the dominant Western commitment to the establishment of Israel on Arab land, led to the emergence of "revolutionary" socialist regimes in the 1950s and 60s: Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Algeria, South Yemen and Libya all followed socialist economic reforms—a socialism, however, that was defended by state-appointed religious spokesmen as “Islamic,” to distinguish it from communism. Industries were nationalized, the power of the old aristocracy was broken through reforms distributing their lands to peasants, and the government became the main employer of all those who earned wages. Despite the description of their policy as “Islamic,” these regimes imposed very strict controls on the religious establishment. Religious institutions were also nationalized, and religious scholars were instructed to teach that Islam is socialist. Islamic institutions were to serve government policy, rather than the other way around. The Suez Canal crisis of 1956 made Gamal Abdul Nasser of Egypt a hero not only in the Arab world, but throughout the Third World, as a symbol of resistance to imperialism.

The Impact of Israel

But the presence of a Jewish state created by European fiat on Arab land and at the cost of Arab dispossession remained a symbol of Arab subjugation and humiliation. In spring 1967, Egypt, Syria and Jordan planned a joint attack on Israel, which the Israelis prevented by air strikes on all three countries. Arab defeat in the Sixth Day War of June 1967 was swift and total: Jordan lost the West Bank and east Jerusalem, Syria lost the Golan Heights, and Egypt lost the Sinai Peninsula and Gaza Strip. The defeat prompted many Arabs, especially in Egypt, to ask why God had allowed them to suffer such a defeat. The Quran promised Muslims that, with divine assistance, they could defeat a force ten times larger than themselves, yet a small country had defeated three larger and more populous Muslim countries. Was God punishing them for subordinating religion to secular ideologies? The religious revival had begun.

The religious revival also encompassed Egypt’s ancient Coptic Christians. One estimate has eight percent of the country’s population. Every year at Easter time, some Copts would make a pilgrimage to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in east Jerusalem, where Jesus is said to have been buried. But in spring 1968, all of Jerusalem was under Israeli occupation. President Nasser of Egypt had declared that theosis of the Virgin Mary holding the infant Jesus was sighted on a church dome in a Cairo suburb, and returned every night for two and a half years, attracting millions of Egyptians, including Muslims, who also revered Jesus as a prophet born from a virgin. When the government asked the Coptic pope to comment on the miracle, he said that Mary had come to comfort the Egyptians in their sorrow and to assure them that Jerusalem would return to Arab rule.

Islam’s Rooting Identity in Morality

The religious revival in the Middle East may have been part of a worldwide phenomenon of renewed interest in religion in the 1970s and 80s. Anxiety over the apparent breakdown of the family and a rise in crime led to a public discussion of morality as much here in the U.S. as in the Muslim world. In the Middle East, the religious revival, which began in the most Westernized parts of the Muslim world, was part of a search for a more authentic cultural identity; people felt they had lost their moral moorings through blind imitation of the West, which was seen as characterized by soulless materialism and crass individualism. Many who were troubled by corruption and immorality felt that the solution lay in making the Sharia the law of the land.

Because Muslims see Islam as promoting kindness and justice, and are often unfamiliar with the specifics of traditional Islamic law, their endorsement of the Sharia does not necessarily mean an endorsement of stonings, beheadings, and the seclusion of women; people want religion because they want justice and morality rather than a society that runs on patronage and bribery. The movement to make Islam the organizing principle of society and politics is called Islamism. Islamists cover a broad spectrum from simple piety to radical militancy, but all agree with the slogan of the Muslim Brotherhood of Egypt that “Islam is the answer.” The election of Islamist politicians in Algeria, Jordan, and Palestine does not necessarily indicate approval of Islamic radicalism: just as the recent Democratic electoral victory demonstrated public disapproval of the war in Iraq, so Islamists are sometimes elected as an alternative to an existing political elite that is regarded as ineffective and corrupt. Another reason for Islamist electoral victories, as in Pakistan in 2002 and Iran in 2005, is that existing authorities disallowed the candidacy of many non-Islamist candidates.

The Role of American Christian Fundamentalists

American Christian fundamentalism also plays a role in Middle Eastern politics: although Israel is a secular state founded as a homeland for Jews rather than a truly “Jewish” state, many Americans see Israel as the fulfillment of God’s promises to Abraham; indeed, American Christians are often more zealous Zionists than Israeli Jews. President Bush’s religious ardor is matched by the zeal of Iran’s President Ahmadinejad. Ahmadinejad feels called to prepare for the return of the twelfth Imam and, who, after an absence of centuries, will return as the Mahdi, a messianic figure who will defeat God’s enemies and fill the world with justice—a belief not unlike Christian expectations of the second coming of Christ. Until the Mahdi returns, the Shia’s expect an increase in worldly turmoil and moral deterioration—just as many Christians believe regarding the return of Christ. Bush has also claimed that God told him to invade Iraq. The implications of such certainty of divine calling, and the belief that chaos is an inevitable precursor to divine rescue, raise disturbing questions regarding such leaders’ willingness to place world security at risk beyond all reason.

Western Models: Attraction and Repulsion

Except for Saudi Arabia, which was never colonized and has been dominated by the 1920s by the rigidly fundamentalist ideology of Wahhabism, Muslim-majority states that acquired independence in the twentieth century looked to Western political systems as the model of modern statehood. Turkey, recognized as a republic in 1923, declared itself secular, avoiding all references to Islam in its constitution and patterning its laws after European codes. Other Muslim-majority states imposed very strict controls on the religious establishment, making pilgrimage impossible. In April 1968 an apparition of the Virgin Mary holding the infant Jesus was sighted on a church dome in a Cairo suburb, and returned every night for two and a half years, attracting millions of Egyptians, including Muslims, who also revered Jesus as a prophet born from a virgin. When the government asked the Coptic pope to comment on the miracle, he said that Mary had come to comfort the Egyptians in their sorrow and to assure them that Jerusalem would return to Arab rule.
New York City IMC Responds to the Death of Brad Will


New York City

Brad Will was killed on October 27, 2006, in Oaxaca, Mexico, while working as a journalist for the global Indymedia network. He was shot in the torso while documenting an armed paramilitary assault on the Popular Assembly of the People of Oaxaca, a fusion of striking local teachers and other community organizations demanding democracy in Mexico.

The members of the New York City Independent Media Center mourn the loss of this inspiring colleague and friend. We want to thank everyone who has sent condolences to our office and posted remembrances to www.nyc.indymedia.org. We share our grief with the people of our city and beyond who have lost seven of their neighbors to this life. We can only imagine the pain of the people of Oaxaca who have lost seven of their neighbors to this fight, including Emilio Alonso Fabian, a teacher, and who now face an invasion by federal troops.

All we want in compensation for his death is the only thing Brad ever wanted to see in this world: justice.

• We, along with all of Brad's friends, reject the use of further state-sponsored violence in Oaxaca.

• The New York City Independent Media Center supports the demand of Reporters Without Borders for a full and complete investigation by Mexican authorities into the killing of journalists killed in action, or the much longer list of those killed in recent years by troops defending entrenched, unjust power in Latin America. Still, those of us who knew Brad know that his work would never have been completed. From the community gardens of the Lower East Side to the Movimento Sem Terra encampments of Brazil, he would have continued to travel to where people who make this world a beautiful place are resisting those who would cause it further death and destruction. Now, in his memory, we will all travel those roads. We are the network, all of us who speak and listen, all of us who resist.

The New York City Independent Media Center
www.nyc.indymedia.org
4 W 43rd St., Suite 311
New York, N.Y. 10036
USA / EEUU
212-221-0521

WILL FAMILY STATEMENT

November 8th, 2006

The family of Brad Will has issued the following statement:

“‘We understand that two of the group of five allegedly involved in Brad's murder have been arrested in Oaxaca. We applaud this action but also note that the other three implicated directly in the crime remain at large. We urge that efforts immediately be expanded to find and arrest all of those involved in all recent killings there. We call for the creation of an independent federal Mexican commission to ensure a fair and just investigation and trial. And we urge an inquiry into the extent to which high-level officials in the state government of Oaxaca have been involved in both Brad's murder and other human rights violations. We also condemn and seek an immediate end to the illegitimate arrests and ongoing harassment of the press corps in Oaxaca. And we wholeheartedly agree with Reporters Without Borders' call for Oaxaca state governor Ulises Ruiz Ortiz to be summoned before the new prosecutor general-level of officials to unite and to demand justice for this dead compañera. Marcos issued this call especially to all of the alternative media, and free media here in Mexico and in all the world. Indymedia was born from the Zapatista vision of a global network of alternative communication against neoliberalism and for humanity. To believe in Indymedia is to believe that journalism is either in the service of justice or it is a cause of injustice. We speak and listen, resist and struggle. In that spirit, Brad Will was both a journalist and a human rights activist. He was a part of this movement of independent journalists who go where the corporate media do or stay long after they are gone. Perhaps Brad's death would have been prevented if Mexican, international, and US media corporations had told the story of the Oaxacan people. Then those of us who live in comfort would not only be learning now about this 5 month old strike, or about this 500 year old struggle. And then Brad might not have felt the need to face down those assassins in Oaxaca holding merely the ineffective shields of his US passport and prensa extranjera badge. Then Brad would not have joined the fast-growing list of journalists killed in action, or the much longer list of those killed in recent years by troops defending entrenched, unjust power in Latin America. Still, those of us who knew Brad know that his work would never have been completed.

From the community gardens of the Lower East Side to the Movimento Sem Terra encampments of Brazil, he would have continued to travel to where the people who make this world a beautiful place are resisting those who would cause it further death and destruction. Now, in his memory, we will all travel those roads. We are the network, all of us who speak and listen, all of us who resist.”

By The family of Brad Will willcomm@aol.com

Oaxaca Teach-in and Fundraiser

Thursday, Nov. 16, 7 pm, At the Independent Media Center
Broadway and Elm at the old post office in downtown Urbana

Hundreds of thousands have conducted a mass strike in Oaxaca, Mexico, supporting striking teachers, and calling for Governor Ruiz of the state of Oaxaca to step down. Several dozens have been killed by paramilitary and federal troops, including beloved New York Indymedia journalist Brad Will.

There will be video footage and discussion about what is happening in Oaxaca. We will pass the hat to send financial support to IMC Mexico to help with coverage of events.
The U.S., Israel, and Lebanon: Historical Roots and Patterns of Conflict

by David Green

The destructive and lethal forces unleashed this past summer by the United States and Israel upon Lebanon are not surprising in light of their historical roots in at least four patterns of conflict. First, the unwillingness of Israel and its American patrons to resolve the question of the Palestinian refugees and provide for a viable Palestinian state, but rather the exploitation of this conflict to intimidate other Arab states in the region, especially Lebanon. Second, Israeli territorial ambitions in southern Lebanon, especially regarding water, as well as the economic challenge posed to Israel by a peaceful and thriving Lebanon as a center of finance and tourism. Third, Israel’s doctrine of massive and illegitimate pre-emptive strikes in pursuit of its objectives, has led to the establishment of a deterrent force that would necessitate good faith negotiation. Fourth, Israel’s military alliance with the U.S., and its willingness to serve American interests in the latter’s efforts to dominate the region’s energy resources, as defined more recently by both neoconservative and neoliberal doctrines that have engendered the destruction of not only Lebanon but Afghanistan, Iraq, and Gaza, and have also justified the increased concentration of wealth and economic inequality in both Israel and the U.S.

The Palestinian Question

Palestinian refugees have resided in Lebanon since the 1948 war. After the 1967 war, Israel continued bombing refugee camps in southern Lebanon. Ron David (Arabs and Israel for Beginners) quotes London Guardian correspondent Irene Beeson (writing in 1978) that “Israel’s incursions and towns and villages in South Lebanon... have been repeatedly savaged by the Israeli armed forces since 1968.” In 1970, PLO leadership was driven from Jordan to Lebanon. After the 1973 war, Yasser Arafat began to signal that he would accept a two-state solution to the Palestinian problem, building on an interpretation of UN resolution 242 that called for the formation of a Palestinian state comprising the West Bank and Gaza. According to Noam Chomsky (Middle East Illusions), “The issue turned the UN Security Council in January 1976, with a resolution incorporating the language of UN 242 but abandoning its rejectionism, now calling for a Palestinian state alongside Israel. The resolution was supported by the entire world, including the major Arab states, the PLO, Europe, the nonaligned countries, and the Soviet Union, which was in the mainstream of international diplomacy throughout.”

Israel refused to attend the UN session. Instead, it bombed Lebanon once again, killing more than 50 villagers in what it called a preventive strike, presumably retaliation against UN diplomacy. The United States vetoed the resolution, as it did again in 1980. Chomsky (The Fateful Triangle) documents that Israel’s invasion of Lebanon in 1982, long-planned and killing 20,000 Lebanese, mostly civilians, grew out of a fear of a peaceful resolution: “The PLO was gaining respectability thanks to its preference for negotiations over terror. The Israeli government’s hope, therefore, was to compel the stricken PLO to ‘return to its earlier terrorism,’ thus ‘undercutting the danger of negotiations.’ As such, this was a ‘war for the (illegal) settlements.’

The background for the recent American-Israeli destruction of Lebanon was, of course, Israel’s relentless starving and bombing of Gaza (with American weapons), beginning in its current intensified form after the election of Hamas early this year, with an escalation well before Israeli’s kidnapping of two Palestinian civilians on June 24th, followed the next day by the capture of an Israeli soldier which “precipitated” full-scale Israeli bombardment. While Hezbollah’s capture and killing of Israeli soldiers two weeks later must also be seen in the context of six years of border violations, withdrawal from South Lebanon in 2000 (with a ratio of ten to one in favor of Israeli violations), it was arguably also a response in solidarity with the Palestinians in response to Israel’s assault on Gaza. Both Hamas and Hezbollah have legitimacy as religious, populist, and nationalist movements in a Middle East dominated by American-approved authoritarian regimes. As such, they threaten American-Israeli hegemony if they become viable democratic actors and legitimate negotiating partners.

Israeli Ambitions in and Competition with Lebanon

Israel’s long-term territorial ambitions are discussed in the diaries of the second Israeli Prime Minister, Moshe Sharett (1954-56), in accounts of conflicts with his predecessor David Ben-Gurion. These diaries form the basis for Livia Rokach’s ‘Israel has given birth to an established Church.’ But the religious element in the Middle East is rapidly developing into a secular Jewish-Israeli conscript and impoverished American “volunteer” will come to see no parallels to the Service Unit 101, under orders from Moshe Dayan, responding to the murder of an Israeli mother and her two children by infiltrators into Israel by blowing up 45 houses and killing 69 civilians, two-thirds of them women and children. Israel’s implementation of this policy based on a racist “language of force” (directed at Arabs who stand accused of understanding no other) does not necessarily require a clear provocation, as in 1982, when the assassination of the Israeli ambassador in London by the Abu Nidal group (sworn enemies of the PLO) provided the pretext for a long-planned invasion into Lebanon, literally a “war against peace” to drive out the PLO, which had scrupulously observed a truce for nearly one year. Nor does the intervention have to have been an Israeli military operation, for which invaded and occupied peoples have paid the highest price.

Regarding the specifics of U.S. support for Israel’s invasion of Lebanon, Stephen Zunes writes: “There is increasing evidence that Israel instigated a disastrous war on Lebanon largely at the behest of the United States. The Bush administration was set on crippling Hezbollah, the radical Shiite political movement that maintains a sizable block of seats in the Lebanese parliament. Taking advantage of the country’s democratic opening after the forced departure of Syrian troops last year, Hezbollah defied U.S. efforts to democratize the region on American terms. The populist party’s unwillingness to disarm its militia as required by UN resolution—and the inability of the pro-Western Lebanese government to force them to do so—led the Bush administration to push Israel to take military action.”

Retoric and Reality in the “War on Terror”

As American and Israeli efforts to control events in the Middle East become increasingly problematic, there are increased efforts to re-icast the conflict in terms of a “clash of civilizations” between “Judeo-Christian” and “Islamo-fascists.” Such propaganda is obviously intended to invoke both Nazi Germany and the Cold War, reframing power-driven conflicts over land and resources as an essentialized global conflict of culture and religion. But the ironies inherent in this propaganda may portend changes in violent historical patterns. The Bush and Olmert administrations have proved to be corrupt and delusional, the relations between their rhetoric and reality evokes none other than fascist propagandists and Pravda. Hezbollah and Hamas have proved to be incorruptible popular movements, unrelated to al-Qaeda, that rightly stand in opposition to the Palestinian Authority, the government of Lebanon, and Israel. Meanwhile, the religious subplot in the secular Jewish State evokes Jacob Talmon’s 1955 assertion (quoted by Chomsky in Middle East Illusions) that “the Rabbinite (in Israel) is rapidly developing into a firmly institutionalized church imposing an exacting discipline on its members. The State... has given birth to an established Church.” But the religious Jew stays at home or in the illegal settlements while the secular Jew is conscripted to fight in an American/Israeli war for oil and hegemony that targets civilians and infrastructure, and now invites serious retaliation against his community. One possibility to be hoped for is that the secular Jewish-Israeli conscript and impoverished American “volunteer” will come to see no future in all of this, and realize that their respective states are also (and just as fundamentally) at war against their own citizens.