The Killing of Hostages

Prof Sattar Kassem

I am an Arab who feels greatly sorry for the killing of the Korean innocent hostage, and regrets the hard-feelings that have been developing between Arabs and Koreans. I hoped all the time the Iraqi Arabs wouldn't kill their hostage, but the unfortunate has happened. I truly extend condolences to the bereaved family. This sorrow extends to other innocent hostages of different nations.

However, governments of several nations chose to neglect warnings not to send troops to Iraq and thought that the American invitation was the only sound of reason. Instead of conducting a scientific assessment of the situation in Iraq, nations, for one reason or another accepted the American arguments. Sending troops to Iraq, as described by the South Korean president, is an endeavor to help the Iraqi people. Heads of states that still have troops in Iraq don't explain how they reached such a conclusion, but it is evident that they put so much "trust" in the American explanations.

It was pointed out from the very beginning that states have no stake in the war on Iraq and don't need to pay price for losing the friendship of so many Arabs. Here I am talking about the ordinary people who are besieged by both external acts of degradation and internal policies of alienation, and thinking of tools and methods toward the achievement of freedom. These ordinary people have never been happy with Saddam, but also un-deceived by the rosy rhetoric of the US. But the official American reasoning apparently was much more convincing than the reasoning of those who have reason.

Although they sound unfamiliar and unpopular, I think that the following points must be brought out:

First: at the time most peoples of the world have been startled by the pictures of American soldiers torturing Iraqi prisoners, many governments participating in the war on Iraq reiterate their intensions to keep their troops in Iraq or deploy more. Why? What logic or good argument do these governments have to defend this position? Is it the defense of a collapsing American claim of establishing democracy in Iraq? Probably it was understood at the very beginning that peoples were unaware of the evil intensions of the Americans in Iraq, but no excuses remained actually after the ruthless and savage American practices in Iraq. The whole argument of defending democracy has been smashed inside the wall of American prisons in Iraq and by the indiscriminate military attacks against Iraqi people and property.

Second: It was warned that the real war in Iraq will start after the official war ends. The official war was against Saddam, and the Iraqis were reluctant to fight Saddam's war. The war of the Iraqi people and the Arabs and Moslems started afterwards. Now it is a war for Iraq, for the liberation of Iraq from American occupation. I personally wrote on several occasions that there will be fierce resistance in Iraq and it will gain impetus as

time passes. The reason is that Arabia including Iraq is on the verge of a bloody revolution toward freedom due to bad governance and external intervention.
It is meaningless here to blame the external elements that are taking part in the Iraqi ongoing resistance because, according to these elements and hundreds of millions of Moslems and Arabs, the war against the Americans and their allies is the same war regardless of the place. Fighting the Americans, according to them, in Afghanistan, in Iraq or in the Arabian Peninsula is one war although different fronts. And they simply argue that they have the right to attack a nation on its mainland if its soldiers fight them on their mainland. Spain experienced this, and I think some other nations will suffer similar attacks.
Is that terrorism? An answer either way isn't helpful. We are talking here about conflicting parties who try to use all possible means at their disposal to win the war. Which party is a terrorist or which is using legitimate means remains a matter of academics. In the political realm, definitions are subjective, and those who are described by the Americans as terrorists give the Americans the same description. In this scope, everybody is a terrorist and everybody is fighting terrorism.

Third: The Americans are very much hated in Arabia. The American government is viewed by the overwhelming majority of the Arabs as the source of evil and exploitation. There are historical, political and economic roots for these hard-feelings that we don't need to delve into here. That is why so many Arabs and Moslems thought America, by coming to Arabia, has made itself an easier military target. Instead of Arabs going to New York, America came to Baghdad.
Here appears the fallacy of or the self-deceptive American argument that looks at the Arabs as many peoples. In as far as Arab governments are concerned, there are many Arab states and many Arab peoples, but for the Islamists and the Pan Arabs there is only one nation. That is why it is widely considered that any American aggression, military or economic, direct or indirect against any Arab people is an aggression on the whole nation. The Americans should have learned this lesson pretty well in Palestine and in Iraq, and other nations need to keep this in mind before siding with the Americans.

Forth: It has been warned that Arab governments don't represent the Arabs, and those who seek the friendship of the Arabs shouldn't think of governments as an appropriate channel. Arab governments are despotic and receive support from the US. The friends of our Arab governments are actually unfriendly to the people. That is why the understanding of Arab needs and aspirations shouldn't be sought through official meetings or diplomatic deliberations; rather, they must be tracked in the Arab street and the banned parties and organizations.

Fifth: the US and the backing governments should explain how they have been serving the interests of the Iraqis. The American president keeps saying that he freed the Iraqis, and Iraq is a better place now than before. How? The public opinion pulls show that he is talking wishful thinking rather than facts. In other words, those nations such as Korea need to verify the nice things they have been furnishing for the Iraqis. Democracy hasn't flourished, security has deteriorated and jobs are still, to an extent, unavailable.

Sixth: why the US and the backing nations don't act against other Arab dictators if they are really interested in democratizing Arabia?

The War in Iraq is fierce and goes beyond all imaginable war tactics, and is expected to gain more intensity and savagery. The Americans are losing their temper and brains, while the Iraqis see it a matter of freedom or slavery. There is so much determination from the side of the Iraqis and their supporters to defeat the Americans. A major step, according to Iraqi strategists, toward such an end is to strip America from its allies in Iraq, and to isolate it from the Iraqi public. That is why the Iraqis have been intentionally attacking targets belonging to states that have troops in Iraq. Some states such as Spain and Honduras pulled out their troops, while others such as Korea keep talking about sending more troops. Due to that, fighters consider attacks on property and innocent people as legitimate as long as they serve a desirable end. This is no different from the Americans who shoot indiscriminately or exert torture to squeeze out information.

The war in Iraq is a war of ends not morals. The US understands the grave consequences of a defeat, while the Arabs see victory as their chance toward freedom from external domination and internal regimes. Both sides are determined, and both have an overriding purpose that surpasses innocence and basic personal rights. But we shouldn't overlook a major difference: the Americans are motivated by greed and Zionism while the Arabs are motivated by integrity.

I am strongly confident that the Arabs seek the friendship of all nations, and I am sure that the overwhelming majority in Arabia feel very sorry for the killing of the hostages. It is unacceptable to kill a hostage, but the governments are responsible for that. I don't see what interest Korea or Poland has in taking part in a dirty war, or how any state is threatened by the Iraqis and the Arabs. These states are mercenary who sacrificed principle for expedience, and I don't think that they care that much about their citizens or the interests of their own people.