

MEIR SHEETRIT

Member of Knesset. Former Interior Minister of Israel.

I believe that if we felt secure in our different countries, we would not be here talking about it. What is security? Is it the capability to protect yourself against invasion by other countries? I am not sure the definition of security remains the same in the 21st century. Security is not only physical existence. It would be security of access to food, clean water, electricity, or health services. Is this less important than physical security? It is almost of the same importance. This is because part of the problem is the question of what creates insecurity.

What makes us insecure? The US would say that it was very secure on the 10th September 2001, but this changed the next day. I am connecting the issue to food, water and energy because poverty is a very fertile ground to manipulate people towards extremism and fundamentalism. This has been used very well by terror organisations. The world is different today, because the big powers are paper tigers which cannot fight guerrilla organisations without destroying everything. That is why superpowers are not effective in fighting these small groups, and it cannot be done by any country on its own.

Creating some kind of global governance might be the only effective way of fighting terrorism, but it is not a serious possibility. I do not know why countries should tolerate a UN where there is an automatic veto against any majority decision. It is strange that the Security Council includes countries like Lebanon or Iran, or that the Human Rights Council contains a majority of countries which have no human rights, and that they are judging countries which make some mistakes sometimes. I agree that we have to change this situation.

Terrorism is no longer about small groups of people fighting against big powers. It involves international networks, very sophisticated and well funded, manipulating democracies and using them against themselves. They are willing to do everything possible in order to achieve the goal of imposing Islamic fundamentalism on the world. I am sorry to see that democracies have failed even to define what terrorism is. The definition of terrorism is achieving political goals by violence, but this definition has not been accepted, and nobody deals with it in that way. We have failed to fight against terrorism because we are fighting with our hands tied behind our backs. Democracies have limitations imposed by morality and justice, whereas they can kill hundreds of people by bombing the World Trade Centre. Many countries do not understand and try to find justifications for terrorist acts, whereas there can be no justification.

Democracies that do not understand this will lose that war. We have been living in terror for the last 60 years. I was the Israeli Minister for Justice on 11th September 2001, and I called the US Attorney General to suggest a convention in Washington to create some kind of covenant to ratify laws in order to fight terrorism. For example, there could be laws to make it much more

difficult for terrorists to move from country to country, or an international arrest warrant. He said that it was a good idea, but such a covenant was not possible, and every country has to fight on its own, and often they hope that if they concede enough to terrorists they will stay quiet. It is not working.

We will not remain as democratic states if we are not united, especially if we are fighting terrorism. The strange thing is that leaders of countries with no democracy or human rights such as Iran can call for the destruction of Israel or deny the Holocaust and nobody cares. North Korea has developed nuclear weapons in defiance of the nuclear proliferation treaty. The same is true of Pakistan. Iran is a very good example, because it is a huge threat to the free world and to moderate Arab countries. That is why Saudi government came up with a peace initiative for the Middle East, and, in order to finish on a positive note, I am among those who are urging that this initiative be followed. It may be a basis for regional governance and for regional peace. Palestine is afraid to sign a peace agreement with Israel without the support of moderate Arab leaders.

Saudi Arabia did not come up with this initiative because they have suddenly become Zionists, but because they understand, along with other moderate Arab countries, that a nuclear Iran is a big threat to their existence, and that the only way to isolate Iran may be to make peace with Israel. When you consider that the Middle East purchased weapons in the amount of USD200 billion in the last decade, you have to wonder what could be done with that money to alleviate poverty in the region. We could use it for food, clean water, and health services instead of war. This is the only chance we have to attain peace in the region, and if the Arab League is willing to do so, why should we just have peace with Palestine when we can have it with all 34 moderate Arab countries? We should adopt that initiative, follow it up and support it, because that is the only way to give Palestine the confidence to sign an agreement with Israel and create peace in the Middle East.