

BBC Tells Truth about Arafat

This is a highly significant story. Not because it is news (to anyone whose head has not been buried deeply in the sand – or elsewhere – for the last decade), but because of who is reporting it: the **BBC**:

Palestinian Authority funds go to militants

The Palestinian Authority, headed by Yasser Arafat, is paying members of a Palestinian militant organisation which has been responsible for carrying out suicide attacks against Israeli soldiers and civilians, a BBC investigation has found.

A total of up to \$50,000 a month is being sent to members of the al-Aqsa Martyrs' Brigades, an armed group that emerged shortly after the outbreak of the current Palestinian intifada, a BBC Correspondent programme reveals.

Let us hope that these revelations, from this source, have at least as salutary an effect on world opinion – and on US Government opinion in particular – as the **Karine A incident**.

Sat, 11/08/2003 - 03:53 | [digg](#) | [del.icio.us](#) | [permalink](#)

A Paying Membership

It is worthwhile to consider how and why the Middle East greases palms. No pun intended. In a nomadic, non-democratic hierarchy of tribes, loyalties run on deferences, tribal alliances, and money. There is an old phrase in the english language, "blood money". There must certainly be an equivalent in aramaic and the root languages of the Middle East and in all old cultures of the world because that is the way tribal control has been maintained from generation to generation since ancient times. Blood money. Words reveal thoughts and thoughts reveal beliefs about how the world always works. Violence or peace breeds around tribal handshakes, and these are symbols of deference just like words. Follow the blood money, follow the handshakes, follow who watches whose back, and see the subtleties of control. The way control over people is maintained in such societies is by the most simple alliances of power symbolized by money and handshake relationships. If a high

priority is placed not losing tribal power, there will be a paying membership. A paying deferential membership represents the thoughts, beliefs, and intentions of a man in his tribe. In tribal memberships multiplied a man represents how both he and his society see the world.

by a reader on Sat, 11/08/2003 - 14:37 | [reply](#)

It works the same way in Europe, N. America

Dear Reader,

- > It is worthwhile to consider how and why the Middle East
- > greases palms. No pun intended.

Palm tree oil is very greasy. Since it is worthwhile to consider the how and why of Middle East palm greasing, perhaps you'd be willing to consider how, say, defense contracts are allocated in the military industrial complex of the USA? Or would that not be worth doing, since it would challenge your notions of Western democracies having moral superiority?

- > In a nomadic, non-democratic hierarchy of tribes, loyalties
- > run on deferences, tribal alliances, and money.

Whereas in Europe or the USA, loyalties run on deferences, tribal alliances, and money. Or were you thinking all that deference to the royal family in the UK was something vastly different from the deference to, say, the Saudi royals? Were you thinking that the "our thing" or "cosa nostra" was operating on some other basis?

What is Western democracy but a sham where the votes are counted selectively if at all? There is so much evidence for vote fraud in the USA that nobody with any sense ought to take it seriously. Even groups which have no history of finding conspiracies under every floorboard, such as the Texas Republican Party, have reported hundreds of instances of vote fraud and abuse. E.g., in 1998 that party reported 206 instances, none of which have ever been resolved by the authorities. The evidence of the new Diebold voting machines casting up to 16,000 "negative votes" in certain audited precinct voting is really cool stuff.

- > There is an old phrase in the english language, "blood money".

Indeed. It is a very old tradition in all clan societies. The English had clans before they were conquered by the Romans, and retained many of these important traditions after the Romans went away and before the Norman conquest.

Blood money refers to the money paid to avoid a blood feud. It refers to the compensatory concept of justice, which is different

from the punishment concept. Under compensatory law, a person is

fined the equivalent of an eye if his crime harmed a victim's eye, the equivalent of a tooth if his crime harmed a victim's tooth, and so forth. Mosaic law worked out a detailed set of these fines and other compensation issues, along with fundamentals of common law justice such as rights of the accused, etc.

- > There must certainly be an equivalent in aramaic and the root
- > languages of the Middle East and in all old cultures of the
- > world

Indeed. Such as the old culture of Europe, which was Celtic before the Romans came with their roads and their gladii to replace the European system of clan rule, largely rule by judges or kritarchy, with the Roman legislative rules (and the corruption which naturally followed).

- > because that is the way tribal control has been maintained
- > from generation to generation since ancient times. Blood money.

Actually, blood money refers to the payment of compensation for a killing which is made, in part, to avoid a blood feud in which the offended clan goes and kills someone from the killer's clan in retribution. Blood money can be a fairly sophisticated tool for avoiding conflict.

- > Words reveal thoughts and thoughts reveal beliefs about how
- > the world always works.

That would appear to be true of, say, your words.

- > Violence or peace breeds around tribal handshakes,

Whereas violence and peace breed around executive handshakes in your much vaunted Western sham democracies.

- > and these are symbols of deference just like words.

So, if you are contemptuous of words as symbols of deference, why are you using words?

- > Follow the blood money, follow the handshakes, follow who
- > watches whose back, and see the subtleties of control.

The interesting thing about clan society is that it is inherently unstable politically. I don't think any differently of Western sham democracies, of course. Clan society is not a culture of hierarchy or control, any more than your Western sham democracies.

Rather, in a clan society each individual forms and breaks alliances to suit his own best interests. The notion that there is a government which should be respected is very foreign to clan participants. The government, to people raised in a clan society, is obviously just some individuals. If they are members of the same clan, they will naturally be expected to wash each other's hands. The notion that such favoritism is unexpected or corrupt is a very Western notion, and one that has not changed the nature or extent of nepotism.

- > The way control over people is maintained in such societies is

- > by the most simple alliances of power symbolized by money
- > and handshake relationships.

And how is that any different from how control is maintained in, say, a society like Washington, DC? Don't the power brokers shake hands and exchange money? Isn't the military industrial complex famous for the ways in which it can allocate subcontracts among the Congressional districts to divide the pork barrel?

- > If a high priority is placed not losing tribal power, there
- > will be a paying membership.

Can you not think of corollaries in party politics?

- > A paying deferential membership represents the thoughts,
- > beliefs, and intentions of a man in his tribe. In tribal
- > memberships multiplied a man represents how both he and
- > his society see the world.

I think much the same is true of chosen affiliations (rather than inherited ones) such as party political membership.

Regards,

Jim
<http://www.awdal.com/>

by [planetaryjim](#) on Tue, 11/11/2003 - 05:04 | [reply](#)

Commentary on Greasy Palms

You assume alot about my notions. Sounds like Arafat is just one of the Texas good old boys. Assume what you will, it makes interesting commentary.

by a reader on Tue, 11/11/2003 - 06:49 | [reply](#)

Moral detergent acts swiftly on palm grease

Planetary Jim,

Please accept that in addition to loyalties and mafia-style 'friendships', there is such a thing as the rule of law.

Aren't some rules better than others? Isn't the difference to do with morality and better traditions?

If the USA is no different from the Middle East, howcome more people want to live there? Howcome immigrants who settle in America become like other Americans within a generation or two, but, say, Europeans working in the Middle East retain their culture?

And if you think that the answer is solely to do with wealth, power, and military might, please tell us how the excess wealth was generated in the first place.

by [Tom Robinson](#) on Tue, 11/11/2003 - 23:34 | [reply](#)

excess wealth

clearly it was stolen

- curi

by a reader on Fri, 11/14/2003 - 17:44 | [reply](#)

Copyright © 2007 Setting The World To Rights