



Jerusalem or al-Quds?: The European Union's Choice

Bat Ye'or*

The overwhelming effect of the international campaign of defamation and delegitimization of Israel does not easily allow identifying where the blows come from, nor its original source. Yet the operations and strategic center of this widespread war that seeks to replace Jerusalem with al-Quds is the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), which brings together Muslim countries and those with a Muslim majority.

Created in 1969, this gigantic multinational religious organization declares that it is rooted in the Koran and Sunna. It includes a large number of subsidiary committees as well as various organizations embracing theological, legal, and political sectors. Since 2000, the OIC stated in many documents that its mission is to speak for the Ummah, the worldwide Muslim community, which also includes those Muslims who emigrated to the West. It claims to be their protector, with a particular responsibility toward those living in Europe, since they are exposed to the immoral customs and ideas of non-Muslims. The OIC constantly castigates these customs and ideas as "Islamophobia," making every effort to have it penalized in the international courts and by European governments. Countless international networks of multiculturalism, pro-immigration, and anti-Zionism, financed by European governments and the European Union, are totally devoted to it and act as its sounding board within Western societies. Those promoting the line blaming the West and the victimization of the Palestinians feed from its sap. In Europe its lobbies spread its arguments, and benefit in the universities and at the international level from maximum media exposure as they

operate with the tacit approval of European governments and churches, which provide them with unofficial, opaque financing.¹

This Euro-OIC cooperation takes place through countless dialogue networks, partnerships, and associations that preach diversity and multiculturalism and that generally invoke the noble motives of “peace, justice and human rights.” Drawn from human rights platitudes, these ideals incorporate the principles of Jihad and dhimmitude, imperceptible for a European public unaware of them.

The subversion of the language and the twisting of its meaning are particularly apparent in the OIC’s declarations. For example, the foreign ministers of the member states of the OIC, meeting in New York in September 2008, reiterated in their final communiqué “their commitment to the noble principles of peace, humanism and tolerance” to democracy and transparency, while most of their governments are among the cruelest and most corrupt dictatorships. They declared that the challenges of the 21st century required the solidarity of the OIC member states, rallying round the values of Islam.² Yet, no country that applies *shari’a* applies democracy and religious freedom as understood in the West. Less than three years later, the Arab masses were rising against the repression of the regimes represented by those same ministers, whose empty speeches slip into ready-made phrases to seduce Western leaders.

So while these governments promote genocidal jihad against Israel and never condemn the massacres of their non-Muslim and Muslim subjects, their foreign ministers emphasize the paramount importance of protecting cultural and religious diversity, greater freedom of speech, and mutual tolerance and understanding between peoples of different cultures and religions in order to advance the harmony of peace, freedom, and legal rights (§11). The final communiqué gave assurances that “this diversity should not be a source of conflicts; but rather a source of mutual enrichment and dialogue between the religions, cultures and civilizations.” Despite the respect expressed for diversity, tribal wars, fanaticism, suicide bombings, and religious hate provoked by the governments of these ministers have been rampant throughout the countries of the OIC, including Turkey, which occupies Kurdish lands and part of Cyprus.

1. On this subject, see the files prepared by Gerald Steinberg, NGO Monitor, <http://www.ngomonitor.org/index.php>, and the French detailed file “Souveraineté sous condition. L’ampleur du soutien des gouvernements étrangers à des organisations politiques en Israël,” in *Controverses*, no. 15 (Paris: Editions de l’Eclat, November 2010), 227-323.

2. “Final Communiqué of the Annual Coordination Meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the OIC Member States,” United Nations Headquarters, New York, September 26, 2008, OIC/ACM-08/FC/FINAL, §4.

The conference called for the immediate freeing of the Libyan Abdul Baset Ali al-Megrahi, convicted of the murder of 270 people in the terrorist attack that exploded on board Pan Am flight 103 over the village of Lockerbie in Scotland on December 21, 1988. The conference also declared its complete solidarity with Omar Hassan al-Bashir, president of Sudan, who, according to the OIC, was unjustly accused by the International Criminal Court (2009 and 2010) of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide as part of the Khartoum regime's jihad wars in Sudan. The intangible and sacred nature of jihad explains the disagreements between justice based on the principles of Western jurisprudence and those based on the criteria of *shari'a* that govern the OIC. Allowing for the European Union's policy of globalization and cross-cultural mixing, which has erased the historical, theological, and legal specificities of the Muslim world, these distinctions are hardly noticed by Europeans. Hence, the conference, basing itself upon the sanctity and laws of jihad, which promote striking fear in the heart of infidels by sudden and indiscriminate attacks, insisted that terrorism totally contradicts the peaceful nature and teachings of Islam, which exhorts tolerance, forgiveness, and non-violence (§135). Such position assumes that infidelity being itself, in essence, an aggression against Islam, Muslim defense is called "resistance" rather than "terrorism."

These few comments introduce us to the ambiguities of human rights, its abuse of language, and the cracks in justice through the willful ignorance of the inherent contradictions in different and even opposing ethical systems.

In its anti-Israel obsession, the OIC is supported and often inspired by the strategies of the pro-Islamists and senior European Union diplomats, only too happy to make available their skills and their countless anti-Israel platforms. After the OIC declared that the Palestinian question was the supreme cause of the Muslim world,³ Europe also hastened to adopt this path. This provides for the Palestinization of the cultural, social, and above all political life of Europe. This OIC position was repeated at its meeting in New York in 2008, where the Foreign Ministers of the member states, referring to Jerusalem, "*reaffirmed* the centrality of the cause of al-Quds al-Sharif for the entire Islamic Ummah,"⁴ thereby releasing among European Union strategists the motor for a delegitimization campaign against Israel.

3. The Islamic Conference summit meeting in Mecca (January 1981) declared that, "The Palestinian should be viewed as the paramount issue of the Muslim nation"; cf. extracts from the summit in Bat Ye'or, *Eurabia: The Euro-Arabic Axis* (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2005), app. 4, 84.

4. "Final Communiqué," §20 (italics in the original).

For three decades, Europe, servilely imitating the OIC, has effectively created for itself a major problem that is eating away and destroying it. This pathology is Palestine, which it made the hub of its international policy, transforming it into a symbol of peace and universal harmony in a world that would not know “justice” until its coming. The only obstacle to this paradise is the Machiavellian Israel, the oppressor and usurper of Palestine, whose purity as a peaceful victim is the harbinger of global justice. For forty years this logic has governed perceptions of the Israeli-Arab conflict. Any argument that contradicts it provokes a pathological hatred, while Palestinian-European correctness, totally resistant to both evidence and reason, rejects its author as a pariah.

Europe does not yet dare use armed force against Israel, whose existence it claims to defend, while advising it to commit suicide. Europe fights Israel with the infamous Nazi weapons of delegitimization, defamation, propaganda, hatred, and attempts to destroy its economy through boycotts, disinvestment, and sanctions (BDS). Toward this goal it encourages an international campaign of incitement to hatred by financing anti-Israel NGOs and lobbies. Europe claims that Jewish existence in its ancestral homeland, Judea, and in Samaria is an “occupation,” a colonization. Israel has in this way become a state that is occupying its own historical homeland; in Orwellian language, propagandists speak of “the Israeli occupation of Palestinian land” that is called Judea, and not of the ethnic and religious cleansing of Jews from their homeland through wars, expulsions, dispossession, and the dehumanizing ruling of dhimmitude. Euro-jihadists invoke “Palestinian resistance”—not a terrorism that has spread throughout the planet. The European Union has used every stratagem to force Israel to self-destruct in the name of Palestine, which would lead to an era of “justice and peace” in the world in the same way the charnel houses of Auschwitz were meant to purify humanity from Jews.

I want to recall here the three main steps that led to the Palestinization process of Europe, in line with the desires of the OTC:

1. The *Declaration of the Nine* in November 1973, where for the first time the European community decided that part of the Jordanian people were an Arab Palestinian people, distinct from the Jordanians. It recognized Arafat—arch-terrorist and henchman of Egypt—as their sole President for Life, and demanded that Israel withdraw to the indefensible 1947-48 armistice lines. France had concocted this position several years earlier and had succeeded in imposing it on the Community of Nine, notwithstanding the reservations of certain countries, including Holland, that deemed it immoral. On the Arab side, this initiative followed the conditions laid down by the Arab League for accepting a European rap-

2011]

JERUSALEM OR AL-QUDS?

1905

prochement policy. On the European side, it continued the traditional antisemitic, anti-Zionist policy of World War II set by those who conceived and carried out the Shoah, and their collaborators, discreetly maintained in their positions in the postwar period. Within this setting the unofficial Euro-Arab dialogue started.⁵

2. The *London Declaration* in June 1977, reaffirming with even greater authority the same position as that of the Nine, who had been vexed by the Israeli-Egyptian Peace Treaty (1977-79), which—despite all their efforts—they were unable to derail.
3. The *Venice Declaration* in June 1980, particularly severe toward Israel and offered as a consolation to the Arab countries furious at Egypt's defection and Europe's failure. Faced with the reduced oil supply as a result of the Khomeini revolution of 1979, Europe tried to convince the Arabs to increase production. The moral of the transaction: Israel versus oil required that the State of Israel be demonized.

These declarations were issued to mitigate Palestinian international terrorism in Europe, to protect European interests in the Middle East, and to delete the black pages of colonization of Arab countries. Even though these three declarations were purported to be highly moral, they in fact punished Israel for not having let itself be overwhelmed by the armies of three Arab countries that sought to eliminate it in 1967—Egypt, Syria, and Jordan, allied to Arab bands within the country. These countries continued Nazi European antisemitic policy, justified solely by European economic and oil interests. Such were the foundation and motives behind the European policy toward Israel. Posing as a *doxa* based upon morality and peace, Europe, wrapped in a specious ethic, tried to impose it lock, stock, and barrel upon Israel.

The Venice Declaration of June 1980 anticipated that of the Islamic summit in Fez in September 1980 and of the OIC meeting in Mecca in January 1981, which bound Muslim countries to impose a political and economic boycott on countries with embassies in al-Quds al-Sharif, Jerusalem

5. We note in particular Walter Hallstein, an officer in the Wehrmacht, who under Konrad Adenauer reached the very highest positions of state and had a leading influence in the Foreign Ministry. He became first president of the European Commission (1957-67) and remained an influential politician until his death in March 1982; Hans Globke, co-author of the Nuremberg racist laws, a minister of Chancellor Adenauer and his *eminence grise* in the postwar period. On the French side, Vichy ministers and diplomats quietly continued their career in postwar France.

1906 JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY OF ANTISEMITISM [VOL. 3:1901

for Jews and Christians. This Mecca Islamic summit recommended the following:

- Confirming commitment of the Islamic states to the Liberation Arab al-Quds to become the capital of the independent Palestinian state, and rejecting any situation that may prejudice full Arab sovereignty over the city.
- Confirming the commitment of Muslim states to utilize all their potentialities to oppose the Israeli decision to annex al-Quds; endorsing the decision to impose a political and economic boycott on those states that recognized the Israeli decision, contributing to its implementation; or setting up embassies in al-Quds al-Sharif.
- Inviting all countries to respect international legitimacy by abstaining from dealing with the Israeli occupation authorities in any form that may be construed by these authorities as amounting to implicit recognition or acceptance of the *status quo*, imposed by their declaring that al-Quds to be the unified and eternal capital of the Zionist entity, and in particular inviting all countries to refrain from:
 - a) signing any agreement in al-Quds al-Sharif;
 - b) paying any official visits to al-Quds;
 - c) conducting any formal talks in al-Quds.⁶

This OIC declaration, in January 1981, called to support the al-Quds Committee and to ratchet up the struggle for the liberation of the Palestinians from Zionist colonialism and occupation. Was that not precisely what Europe was saying to Israel, a colonialist, occupying people, thereby refuting its own roots? Was it not providing political, legal, international, and financial support to the Palestinian terrorist jihad against Israel?

This political link between the OIC and the European Union did not only appear in the context of the Israeli-Arab conflict but also in internal European politics concerning the massive Muslim immigration into Europe, which started in the years 1974-75. It was then that a joint European-Arab cell, the Parliamentary Association for Euro-Arab Cooperation (PAEAC), was established with the task of passing on the political demands from the Arab League countries to the European community and to monitor their implementation within Europe. At the Euro-Arab dialogue session held in Tunis February 10-12, 1977, the Arab delegation had proposed a joint Euro-Arab cell for political consultations.⁷ In a leaflet prepared in 1994, at the

6. The Conference of the Islamic Summit in Mecca (January 1981), cf. Bat Ye'or, *Eurabia*, 288.

7. *Documents D'Actualité Internationale, Ministère des Affaires Etrangères*, Paris, nos. 16-17 (1977):319-324, §11.

2011]

JERUSALEM OR AL-QUDS?

1907

time of PAEAC's breakup in the official political body of the Barcelona Declaration, PAEAC prided itself on having obtained the Venice Declaration of 1980. Opening the way toward Eurabia, PAEAC's networks proclaimed in Europe the grandeur of Muslim civilization, promoted the spread of Arab culture, advocated for changes in teaching in schools and universities, and called for special deference and respect toward immigrants and their culture, blasphemy laws, sex segregation, censorship, and harsh anti-Zionist policy. These networks imposed multiculturalism and its politically correct lethal framework. Such framework developed rapidly into a multi-communitarianism, recalling the regimes installed in the conquered territories of the Arab and Turkish caliphates founded on jihad and dhimmitude.

The terms of settlement of an immigration that was to profoundly transform Europe and the Nine's policy toward Israel were jointly discussed in the summaries of the biannual, unofficial meetings of PAEAC (the Euro-Arab dialogue), co-chaired by an Arab and a European, and sponsored by the General Secretary of the Arab League and the European Commission. This cooperation between Europe and the OIC resulted from innumerable networks bringing these two bodies together at every level over decades. That is how the OIC succeeded—without too much effort, it is true—to Palestinize the European political, cultural, and media sectors and to Islamize its demography, culture, universities, and policies. As is clearly evident from the sessions' documents, both cultural dynamics were interrelated.

Although Eurabian networks pretend that this whole issue is another conspirational theory, references to this policy exist in numerous sources, not least in the French minister for foreign affairs, in OIC texts, and in U.S. academia.

What does Palestinization mean? First, it means creating a people as a substitute for Israel, which takes over its history and therefore its legitimacy. From whence comes the delegitimization of Israel, an intruder state in the region and in history? The Palestinization of history denies Israel's identity and its cultural and historic rights within its homeland, including Judea, Samaria, and Jerusalem.⁸ For the OIC, this process is part and parcel of Islamic theology, which regards the Bible as simply a falsified version of the Koran. According to Islam, biblical history is Islamic history, and the biblical characters we see represented in churches are all Muslim prophets who have virtually no connection with the facts reported in the Bible.

This context explains the Islamization of the Jewish and Christian religious heritage, an approach that involves denying the identity of these

8. See this attempted subversion of history jointly undertaken by Europe and the OIC in Bat Ye'or, *Europe: Globalization and the Coming of the Universal Caliphate* (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2011).

two religions, since Christianity views itself as emerging from Judaism, whose scriptures it adopted. If the Bible is an Islamic account, Christianity and not just Judaism are both falsifications of Islam. The negation of biblical history, with which Europe has assiduously linked itself by claiming that Israel is a colonizing intruder in its own homeland—that is to say, challenging the historic rights of the Jews to their own homeland—also negates Christian history and confirms the Koranic interpretation refuting the historicity of both Torah and Gospels.

Hence, if there was never a history of Israel or of the Gospels, but only the history of Ibrahim, Ishmael, Issa—the Koranic Jesus—if all the biblical kings and prophets were Muslim, in what religious belief is the West rooted? Would it not be in the Koran? That is the logical conclusion of Europe's choice, when, furious at the return of the Jews to Jerusalem in 1967, it deliberately decided to chase them out and attribute their heritage to those who, by a war invasion, had illegitimately occupied it since 1948, expelling and dispossessing all its Jewish inhabitants. In a nutshell, if the Israelis are foreign colonialists, occupiers of their own country, it means they have no past, no history; and if Judaism is just a tissue of lies, the same applies to Christianity. If Israel never existed in the past, then its modern restoration is just a colonial deception on territory to which it has no historical, religious, or cultural claims, and so its destruction is justified. But if history testifies to the contrary, then Europe becomes willingly responsible for the abominable crime of genocide—wiping out the past existence of a people in order to remove its current legitimacy and its human, religious, cultural, and historical rights—not to mention the participation, organization, and financing by European nations and the European Commission of an international campaign of incitement to hatred for the dismembering of Israel.

The Palestinization of Europe is not just its theological Islamization through Palestinianism, the ideology for Israel's demise by disclaiming a people's territorial sovereignty, history, and culture, in conformity with the jihadist worldview. Palestinianism is also a paranoid obsession to hound Israel while claiming such hounding is for its own good. By proclaiming that the Palestinian cause is the cause of peace and justice, Europe expends great effort, energy, and violence in sending Israel back behind the 1948 lines it knows are indefensible. Hundreds of thousands of books, accusations, and speeches subvert the facts and impose this policy.

Since its 1981 symposium, the OIC's requests have not changed: Expulsion of Israel from all the territories that were annexed and occupied by Jordan until 1967, including Jerusalem; refusal to renounce or abandon a single inch of these territories; recognition of total Palestinian national sovereignty; the rejection of any situation that would harm Arab sovereignty

2011]

JERUSALEM OR AL-QUDS?

1909

over al-Quds al-Sharif; endorsement of the Arab Palestinian people's inalienable rights, including the rights of return, self-determination, and the establishment of an independent Palestinian state. The Mecca summit (1981) recommended:

- Stressing the commitment to liberate all the Palestinian and Arab territories occupied since the 1967 aggression, including Holy Al-Quds al-Sharif; no renouncing or relinquishment of any part of these territories or impairment of the full national sovereignty over these territories [*sic*].
- Rejecting any situation that would prejudice [*sic*] Arab sovereignty over al-Quds al-Sharif.
- Pledging to recover the national inalienable rights of the Palestinian Arab people, including their right to return to self-determination and to the establishment of an independent Palestinian state on their national soil, led by the Palestine Liberation Organization, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people [*sic*].⁹

There followed the detailed announcement of the action plan to boycott Israel, the setting of an international defamation campaign, and the continuation of the OIC offensive by any and all means. This same anti-Israel strategy has been repeated and maintained in all its details in the documents of the OIC and reaffirmed at its 2008 New York meeting and thereafter.

HUMAN RIGHTS FOR EVERYONE—EXCEPT ISRAELIS

Europe is not saying anything else, having chosen al-Quds over Jerusalem. On December 6, 2010, a large group of former heads of state and commissioners of the European Union—that is, those who obeyed the OIC's orders and perhaps even encouraged, promoted, and strengthened them—sent a letter to the current leaders of the European Union reminding them of the decisions that they had taken concerning Israel and requesting them to oblige Israel to comply with them.¹⁰

It is no surprise to note that the European Union is poaching on the OIC's preserve—adopting its policies, locking up and ghettoizing Israel within its indefensible 1948 armistice lines, and proceeding with the Islamization of Judea, Samaria, and Jerusalem. These leaders, while they acknowledged the enormous sums paid to the Palestinian Authority to build

9. Extracts of this conference are in Bat Ye'or, *Eurabia*, 285.

10. Andrew Rettman, "Former EU Leaders Challenge Ashton on Israel," <http://euobserver.com/9/31477>, December 10, 2010. Cf. also <http://www.dhimmitude.org/eurabia/EU-Anti-Zionist-Campaign-Unveiled.pdf>. A comparison of this letter with sections 20-27 of the 1981 Mecca Islamic Conference proves their similarity.

1910 JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY OF ANTISEMITISM [VOL. 3:1901

another state within this area, demanded that the European Union require Israel to cede to the second Palestinian state—the first one being Jordan, with 78% of the League of Nations' Palestine—100% of the territories that had been liberated from illegal Jordanian occupation in 1967, with Jerusalem—that is, al-Quds—as its capital. The signatories recalled that for decades (in fact since 1973), the European Union had supported and financed the new state's institutions and infrastructure, which it was busy building on Israel's flank. In order to force Israel to follow their dictates, the signatories forcefully demanded a boycott campaign, sanctions, and reprisals against the Jewish state, because, as they claimed without further explanation, Europe has a vital interest in the creation of a Palestinian state. What is involved, claim the signatories, is the European Union's credibility and good diplomatic and commercial relations with the Arab world. This implies that the European Union is constrained to help in the demise of Israel in not failing its commitments to the Arab world, thereby preserving its good relations with it.

The BDS campaign against Israel—required by the signatories of this letter—is based upon two pillars: the OIC, and the one carrying out its nefarious deeds: the European Union, which under the cover of human rights has launched an international campaign of incitement to hatred against Israel, based upon deceitful allegations it had concocted itself, while denying human rights to Israelis. The names of the signatories to this letter will enter history as the founders of the Palestinization of Europe. Among them we can mention European Union functionaries Romano Prodi, Javier Solana, Chris Patten, and Benita Ferrero-Waldner; among heads of state and former ministers, Richard von Weizsäcker (former German federal president, 1984-94), Helmut Schmidt, and the former British minister in the Blair government, Clare Short. The French are the most numerous on the list: Hubert Védrine, Hervé de Charrette, Roland Dumas, Lionel Jospin, Jean-François Poncet.

PALESTINIAN–NAZISM CONNECTION: DE-JUDAIZING CHRISTIANITY

In a large number of documents going back to the 1970s, the OIC recommends cooperation with churches in the fight against Israel. This emerged in particular from a conference held in Amman in 2004 as part of the Muslim-Christian dialogue. The official theme was the protection against Israel of Muslim and Christian holy places in Palestine. The purpose of the Amman conference was to establish a global strategy for the re-Islamization of Jerusalem, because, as one of the lecturers explained, Jerusalem is central in the spiritual edifice of the Jewish Zionist entity, and its

2011]

JERUSALEM OR AL-QUDS?

1911

expulsion would make this entire spiritual edifice and the Zionist entity come tumbling down like a pack of cards.

At th Amman conference, the speakers emphasized the major importance of Muslim-Christian solidarity in the fight to seize al-Quds and to drive Israel out of it. Their proposals envisaged a whole range of schemes, including the adoption of the Muslim and Christian holy sites in al-Quds by every mosque, church, and monastery, and by Muslim and Christian institutions worldwide. They recommended a large-scale, joint Muslim and Christian media global campaign in the United Nations, the United States, and international NGOs to expose Israel's falsehoods. Promoting al-Quds would be done through films, television, songs, and festivals, under the supervision of a special Muslim and Christian cell that would be working with all the appropriate means.

Within this context is the Kairos Palestine declaration of 2010, which brands Israel, using the terms occupation of Arab lands, colonization, and apartheid; while conversely, Palestinians are innocent victims resisting the occupation and aspiring only to security, justice, and peace. The Kairos declaration, hardly surprisingly, condemns all Christian theology that is based upon the Bible or on biblical faith or history that would legitimize Israel. Understand if you can . . . What would remain of Christian theology, faith, or history if you get rid of Israel and the Bible? Would Christian Palestinianism be the camouflage of Nazism, which had planned to de-Judaize Christianity? The document ends with a call to people, businesses, and countries to take part in the boycott, disinvestment, and sanctions campaign against Israel. This request is in line with the demands of the OIC and similar to the letter of the European former leaders, who are the ones responsible for the current Eurabian situation.

What are the consequences of the choice of al-Quds by Europe for its identity, the criteria for assessing its own history, and its immigration policy? The Europe that chose al-Quds and rejected Jerusalem is rejecting its own basic identity. It is denying the Bible, which is not merely a religious text that states various values, but also a chronicle of the coming of Jesus and Christianity, which for Christians is its culmination. If there had not been a Jewish people, nor biblical history or geography, there would not be Christianity either. Accordingly, Judaism and Christianity are just a huge aberration, and what remains are the Koran and the Muslim Jesus, whose eschatological mission is the destruction of Christianity.

The choice of al-Quds replaces the Bible with the Koran. Europe knows that the OIC has decided to move its head office from Jeddah to al-Quds. The OIC is deemed the most suitable institution to represent the world caliphate, its mission being to work to root the universal Ummah in

1912 JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY OF ANTISEMITISM [VOL. 3:1901

the Koran and Sunna. What church could remain in al-Quds? By seeking to destroy Israel, the Church is destroying its own very existence.

With such a disavowal of its own roots and identity, should we still be surprised that Europe has sold off its peoples cheaply on their own territory? In the same way that the European Union has not ceased to harass Israel and to challenge its roots and rights, it has dragged to court those courageous Europeans who have asserted their own identity, rights, and freedoms. Transposing its anti-Israeli policy to Europe, the European Union wants to create a *tabula rasa* of historical nationalisms and of the privileges of sovereign states to transfer to the United Nations—dominated by the OIC—the world governance of human rights. The essential rights of Europeans to security, their history, and freedom of expression are disproved, rebutted, and dismissed by the OIC under the guise of Islamophobia and its vehement request for European multiculturalism. Rooted in the civilization of jihad and dhimmitude, Islamophobia imposes its own criteria through its European and UN go-betweens in its new Western empire. So while Europe prides itself on creating universal, humanitarian governance,^{11,12} on the international scene, the OIC is implementing a Koranic order of Islamic human rights.

The OIC's domination of the United Nations was recently illustrated by the *Goldstone Report*. On its Web site, the OIC states its support for this report, which contains accusations of war crimes allegedly committed by Israel in the Gaza Strip in January 2009. *Goldstone*, according to the Web site, was adopted by the Human Rights Council in Geneva with the support of the Islamic group, which continues to defend it on the sidelines of the UN General Assembly so that it will be referred to the Security Council. The OIC has reaffirmed its wish to see its content adopted by the international community as an international document.

With the repudiation of Israel, the European Union is repudiating itself. It is putting the emphasis on the Greco-Roman heritage and eliminating that of Christianity to please the OIC and Muslim migrants. When its bodies named it, they eliminated its biblical and therefore Jewish basis, as if Christianity had arisen in the world out of nowhere. This identity repression is just one more concession to Islam and its culture that is hostile to Jews and Christians, an issue that has been neither recognized nor repudiated. To throw Judaism (Israel) and Christianity (the West) into the dustbin of his-

11. Mathieu Bock-Côté, "L'empire européen universel contre le Souverainisme américain," in *Controverses: L'Europe, amie d'Israël?* no.16 (Paris: Editions de l'Eclat, March 2011), 91.

12. http://www.oic-oci.org/topic_detail.asp?t_id=5154&x_key=.

2011]

JERUSALEM OR AL-QUDS?

1913

tory is to remove human, historical, religious, cultural, and national rights from Jews and Christians.

The destruction of Israel will let Europe free itself from its own identity, one of the central objectives of Nazism. It flaunts itself as global, multicultural, and Islamic—deterritorialized in the vision of Sweden's former PM Carl Bildt—acculturated and without a past, reduced to being just an ungrateful beneficiary of Islamic cultural superiority and an empty space in which to welcome the immigrants and to subsidize their requirements while financing their economic development in their own countries. As in days gone by, when Byzantine princes paid tribute to the Turks to stop them invading their lands, today Europe has to pay a ransom to Muslim Mediterranean countries to protect itself from their invasion. The world governance the European Union seeks to obtain through the elimination of European national sovereignties and cultures leads it to favor Muslim immigration, a factor for interbreeding, rapprochement, and merger of Europe into the OIC fold. Today, parties on the left are promoting the policy of the OIC and of the Alliance of Civilizations: open up Europe to let young people from Africa and Asia have two- to five-year stays in the European Union and finance their businesses when they go back home. Will Europeans be able to support their fragile economy together with those of Africa and Asia? Are they unaware that they have become the dhimmis of the OIC, governed by their ministers in its service?

Eurabia and Palestinianism come from the same rejection and the same policy applied to the destruction of the nation-state and the manifestation of the spirit and culture of peoples condemned to extinction in the globalized, humanitarian utopia. Their points in common are the war against Israel; the de-Judaization of Christianity; the de-Christianization of Europe; and the joint European Union-OIC policy to strengthen UN's global governance that the OIC aims to monopolize. This suicidal approach is specific to Europe; it does not exist in China or in India—even less in Muslim countries.

Systematically pursued over decades by Europe's chancelleries, this policy requires an infrastructure, bodies, and screening of recruitment in the political, media, and cultural sectors, which have consistently purged any disturbing element. The Palestinization of politics since 1973 led to state control over culture and the media and the development of a single, authoritarian thinking, dictated for the entire European Union by a conclave of commissioners making arbitrary decisions.

EUROPE GOES TO WAR

Europe, it is true, has renounced internal wars, but only to become the mercenaries of the OIC. With its armies, networks, and financing in the billions, it supports the Muslim advance into Europe, the Middle East, and Africa, in the name of a version of human rights that is challenged by *shari'a* and politically tainted, since it refuses equal rights for non-Muslims. Provided with a mandate by the United Nations, which is to say by the OIC, Europe in the name of "the right to protection" can finally go to war to defend its allies' interests. That is why it is helping the Muslim Brotherhood rise in Egypt, supporting Islamist elements in Libya, and trying to replace Israel with the caliphate, after having destabilized Europe.

With the anarchic uprisings of the Arab Spring (March 2011), most European countries and the United States, led by France and its foreign minister, Alain Juppé, have become involved in Arab and African tribal conflicts, invoking the "right of interference" and the "right of protection." These rights, however, as we have said, are applied selectively, because they are never invoked to protect Christians against persecution in Egypt, Iraq, Turkey, Algeria, Sudan, Nigeria, Bangladesh, Indonesia, or Pakistan; they are also not used to protect sailors arbitrarily taken hostage by the Somalis. Europe would find it grotesque and indecent to invoke these rights against the spread of anti-Israeli hatred, calls for genocide against the Jews, against the deluge of rockets launched from Gaza into Israel, or against the hideous crimes perpetrated by its Palestinian allies against Israeli civilians. Nor has it reacted to the Islamization of the biblical holy places in Hebron, both Jewish and Christian, by UNESCO, acting on orders of the OIC. Yet this approach is a serious breach of the religious and historical rights of Jews and Christians, and contradicts human rights.

It is evident that those Europeans wishing to restore the essential values that caused the flowering of their civilization can only proceed through the destruction of occult mechanisms grafted, without their knowledge, by those promoting Eurabia onto the recovery of the Nazi heritage and pursued in the postwar period by its servants within the political and diplomatic systems, as has been recently investigated by German historians and journalists. What in the 1970s seemed to be just a little ritual dance about the hopes for the disappearance of Israel and the French infatuation with Arafat, carried out by a corps de ballet of European politicians and diplomats, has proven today to be a hell for Europe. These days of Passover's commemoration remind us that Israel, in its march from slavery to freedom, gave to humanity the principles of equality, unalienable human dignity, and man's individual responsibility. Against this message of freedom and man's basic and imprescriptible rights, the supporters of totalitarianism and of the dehu-

2011]

JERUSALEM OR AL-QUDS?

1915

manizing system of dhimmitude strain unremittingly to replace the right to life by the granting of tolerance to exist in infamous dhimmitude.

*Bat Ye'or is an Egyptian-born British writer on Jews and Christians living under Islamic governments. Her several books include *Islam and Dhimmitude*, *Eurabia*, and her most recent work, *Europe Globalization and the Coming of the Universal Caliphate* (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2011). She is married to David Littman.

