Ideas have consequences.

What Is Wrong With These People?

We don't mean the terrorists: we know what is wrong with them. We mean the media.

Here's what happened **in chronological order**:

- The terrorist organization Hamas sent a suicide murderer to Israel to perpetrate one of the biggest and most vicious **bombings** that Israel has ever suffered. It killed eighteen innocent civilians on their way back from a Bar Mitzvah celebration, including five children. It maimed, blinded or scarred over a hundred more, about forty of them children.
- The Israel Defence Forces killed a senior Hamas leader and his two bodyguards.
- Hamas and the other terrorist organizations declared that in retaliation for this act, they are now ending their ceasefire.

The media reported the latter statement as fact:

- **Reuters**: *Israel Kills Hamas Leader, Militants Abandon Truce*
- **BBC**: Palestinian militants have called off their truce and vowed to take revenge for the killing by Israel of one of their leaders in Gaza.
- **CNN**: *Palestinian militant groups Thursday declared an end to their temporary cease-fire with Israel shortly after a senior Hamas leader was killed in an Israeli missile attack in Gaza.*
- **Associated Press**: Palestinian militants called off a tattered two-month-old truce on Thursday after an Israeli helicopter killed a senior Hamas political leader with a volley of missiles.

What could possibly make all these major news organisations (we could not find a single exception) think that blowing up a bus full of Jews isn't "breaking the cease fire"?

Fri, 08/22/2003 - 22:08 | **permalink**

No this time it was Sharons fault

After the Hamas and other terrorist organisations didnt atack israel anymore sharon didnt stopp the atacks on the terrorist, so now they feel offended again, that was not very clever. Those terrorist belong death, but it was the wrong time. Both sides are wrong.

by a reader on Sat, 08/23/2003 - 01:23 | **reply**

Try Fox News...

...for a little bit better coverage. For example, they refuse to use the term "suicide bomber" and instead use "homicide bomber".

Pat

<p style="text-align:center">by Pat on Sat, 08/23/2003 - 04:32 | reply</p>

Suicide or homicide?

'For example, they refuse to use the term "suicide bomber" and instead use "homicide bomber".'

Charles Johnson wrote in a recent post on LGF that suicide bomber is a better term and I agree with him (not that I want to get hung up,use whatever terms you like). Suicide bomber captures the strangely perverse nature of what the Islamonazis are doing. It isn't necessary for them to die in order to kill people they could just plant a bomb, walk away and blow it up safely from a good distance away. Instead they choose to destroy themselves as well. This is spectacularly perverse and evil in a way that just isn't captured by the term homicide bomber. It's a bit like calling the kamikazes fighter pilots. Lastly, it is important for the War on Terror to understand that Islamic terrorists are willing to destroy themselves, we can't afford to think 'no they wouldn't do that cause they'd be killed too,' when contemplating some heinous act the fact is they would do precisely that and worse if at all possible.

<p style="text-align:center">by Alan Forrester on Sat, 08/23/2003 - 13:22 | reply</p>

Even Ha'aretz did it

"Hamas ends hudna after assassination"

<p style="text-align:center">by a reader on Sat, 08/23/2003 - 22:40 | reply</p>

Re: Try Fox News...

Pat:

Fox News picked up the Associated Press story, including the passage we quoted above:
http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,95303,00.html.

<p style="text-align:center">by Editor on Sat, 08/23/2003 - 22:47 | reply</p>

I know, I know...

I didn't claim that they were perfect, I just said "...for a little bit better coverage.".

I just got back from visiting my right-wing in-laws in Isreal and they

refused to watch CNN, whereas they could at least tolerate Fox
News. As I said, it is a little bit better.

Pat

what to call them

i like suicide murderer myself. i think it better captures the idea
they are evil murdering fucks, while keeping the suicide aspect. the
use of a *bomb* doesn't seem important enough to have priority
over these other 2 aspects of what they do, IMO

-- Elliot Temple
http://curi.blogspot.com/

It will never end, but I find...

It will never end, but I find it fascinating that everyone that kills an
American or Jew now is labeled as a 'terrorist.'

If another country invaded the U.S. and tried to set up a puppet
government while having their armed soldiers all over the place,
would I be a terrorist if I did whatever it took to try to kill them? If
by blowing myself up or planting bombs to kill enemy soldiers I was
able to build on the momentum of the occupying force's home
populace being against the occupation, would I not have a
reasonable purpose in what I was doing?

Is the U.S. always right?

The killings will continue in Isreal, Iraq, Afghanistan, etc. And the
cowboy refuses to 'back down,' so it is going to continue as long as
he's in office. It is because he sees any action other than staying in
Iraq and thumbing our noses at the enemy as 'backing down' that
we are going to get nowhere.

Terrorists

I think the way we're using "terrorist" here is to refer to people who
intentionally target innocents in order to change the minds of other
people to lead to political change.

If you did that, you'd be a terrorist.

Gil

Fox News idiocy

On FoxNews, the craziest things are said in (dis)respect to civil

liberties. Recently, a commentator said that someone with an unfavorable picture of George W. Bush in his place of business should be investigated by the FBI, and that we might have to "bruise the rights" of Middle Easterners and they should just "indulge us" because terrorists hide among them.

Once Neil Cavuto (sp?) complained about the Spiderman movie, saying it was anti-business in that the bad guy was a businessman. He said that the comics were overwhelmingly anti-business and he challenged anyone to think up a single good example of a businessman portrayed in the comics in a good light. I responded with a pithy email: "I can think of one obvious example: Batman." No reply.

FoxNews is not a liberty friendly media source. They are anti-immigrant and rabidly pro-drug war. Bill O'Reilly is a dimwit fascist who can dish it out but can't take it. They're suing Al Franken for his use of the words "fair and balanced," for God's sake!

And they have Geraldo.

Interventionists should consider all the flaws of FoxNews when giving them praise for being so "good" on the war.

Fox News idiocy?

> a commentator said that someone with an unfavorable picture of George W. Bush in his place of business should be investigated by the FBI

Just how "unfavorable" was this picture? Complete the following sentence: "Well OK, it was more than unfavorable, it incited..."

> they should just "indulge us" because terrorists hide among them.

No, they should not "indulge" us. They should actually embrace measures to find those terrorists who hide among them, even when this gives them extra inconvenience. They should do this not as a favor to us but because it is right.

> he challenged anyone to think up a single good example of a businessman portrayed in the comics in a good light. I responded with a pithy email: "I can think of one obvious example: Batman." No reply.

Well here's your reply: Batman is not a busnessman. He is a playboy living on inherited wealth, which he spends selflessly, epitomizing what left wingers imagine rich people ought to do. He never earns anything, because earning is exploiting and epitomizes what left wingers hate rich people for.

> rabidly pro-drug war

Yeah that's bad.

And they have Geraldo.

Ewwww. Yeah you have a point there.

by a reader on Fri, 08/29/2003 - 02:55 | **reply**