

## CHAPTER

# 15

### **THE MORAL CASE FOR REDRAWING THE BORDERS**



**T**hough acting morally, in and of itself, is not necessarily in a state's self-interest when the question at hand involves another state's situation, living by international moral norms does serve the betterment of humanity and benefits all states. This is so because agreed moral norms across boundaries means less conflict between states. Satisfactorily solving this seemingly intractable Arab/Muslim-Israeli conflict may be thought of in terms of cold political and economic realities, but any solution has a better chance of permanence if it is embraced poetically in the heart of the people of the world.

This is why the truthful teaching of history matters. In many parts of the Arab and Islamic world, so much hatred towards Israel exists because the masses have been taught, and accept as true, a warped version of history. Anyone who accepts the truth of this fabricated history will conclude that Jews, Israel and the West have completely wronged

Palestinians, Arabs, and Islam. It is hard enough to establish a grass roots international moral consensus regarding how to solve a geopolitical dispute when the facts are agreed upon. But when layers of intentional obfuscation are accepted by many to be true, and are then added to the mix, it is nearly impossible to reach an international consensus.

Recall President Ronald Reagan's approach to the Soviet Union, and the flack he took for it. Only in hindsight has a strong moral consensus about the Soviet system been reached.

In a speech at Notre Dame, Reagan called Communism "a sad, bizarre chapter in human history." He told the British House of Commons that the march of freedom and democracy "will leave Marxism-Leninism on the ash heap of history."<sup>1</sup>

Ronald Reagan's theory of the cold war was simple. One day, in 1977, when many people were still deriding him as a right wing extremist war monger, he shared this theory with Richard Allen, who went on to become Reagan's national security adviser. His theory was this: we win and they lose. Allen claims to have been flabbergasted. And why shouldn't he have been? He had worked for Nixon and Goldwater and heard a great deal about détente and the need to manage the Cold War. He had never heard a leading politician put the goal so starkly.<sup>2</sup>

Reagan's goal was simply stated. It was a case of right and wrong that set aside any temptation to give into moral relativism, to allow for the possibility that both systems served humanity equally well, but just from different perspectives.

Today, and for over half a century, in confronting the hostility hurled toward Israel and Jews from all the Arab and radical Islamic dominated states, the choice is not between war and peace, it is between fight and surrender. It is not a