



الترجمة الإعلامية



السنة الرابعة

قسم الإعلام



الجمهورية العربية السورية

منشورات جامعة دمشق

مركز التعليم المفتوح

قسم الإعلام

الترجمة الإعلامية

الدكتور

مروان قبلان

جامعة دمشق ١٤٢٧-١٤٢٨ هـ
٢٠٠٦-٢٠٠٧ م

Damascus University



محتويات الكتاب

الموضوع	الصفحة
- مقدمة الكتاب.....	7
الفصل الأول:	
- الترجمة الإعلامية من الإنجليزية إلى العربية.....	11
- تدريبات.....	109
الفصل الثاني:	
- الترجمة الإعلامية من العربية إلى الإنجليزية.....	143
- تدريبات.....	235
الفصل الثالث:	
- ترجمة نصوص خاصة بالإعلام من الإنجليزية إلى العربية.....	251
- قائمة بمراجع الكتاب.....	371



مقدمة

أشرنا في كتاب الترجمة الاعلامية للسنة الثالثة إلى أن بعض الباحثين يميلون إلى اعتبار الترجمة أحد فروع العلوم الانسانية و نحن ننحو إلى تأييد هذه الفكرة نظراً إلى التطور الكبير الذي طرأ على هذا الميدان الفكري و الثقافي الذي أخذت معظم جامعات العالم بتدريسه وفق اصول و مناهج تكاد تصبح اليوم ذات معايير موحدة. من جهة أخرى، أخذت الترجمة تتجه بشكل متزايد نحو التخصص بسبب التشعب الهائل في ميدان المعرفة. لذلك لا يمكن القول بأن كل من أتم بلغة أخرى غير لغته الأصلية يستطيع الترجمة منها و إليها لأن الترجمة تحتاج إلى معرفة واسعة بالمواضيع الاختصاصية التي يجري نقلها بين اللغات. فالشخص الذي يترجم مراجع طبية قد يكون غير قادر على ترجمة نصوص أدبية و العكس صحيح. هذا يفترض بشكل تلقائي أن هناك أنواعاً للترجمة تختلف باختلاف الهدف منها و الأسلوب المستخدم فيها و المادة التي تجري ترجمتها.

أما من حيث الهدف فقد أشرنا إلى وجود أنواع عديدة للترجمة أهمها: الترجمة الحرفية، و الترجمة المباشرة، و الترجمة التلخيصية، و الترجمة التفسيرية، و الترجمة الحرة، و ترجمة المعاني. و قد تناولنا هذه الأنواع جميعاً بشيء من التفصيل في كتاب السنة الثالثة الذي يمكنك الرجوع إليه. كما قدمنا تطبيقات لهذه الأنواع من الترجمة في متن هذا الكتاب من خلال النماذج التطبيقية حيث يلاحظ الطالب أحياناً وجود اضافة أو نقص في النص المترجم أو تعديل في الفقرات و العناوين و هو أمر شائع في عمليات الترجمة بحسب الغرض.

يهدف هذا الكتاب إلى تعميق معارف الطالب بقواعد و أصول الترجمة بين اللغتين العربية و الإنجليزية في الاتجاهين و قد راعينا فيه أن يكون استكمالا لكتاب السنة الثالثة في الترجمة الإعلامية لطلاب قسم الإعلام في التعليم المفتوح.

يقسم الكتاب إلى ثلاثة فصول رئيسة تحتوي جميعا على نماذج تطبيقية لنصوص جرت ترجمتها من الانكليزية إلى العربية و بالعكس. و الغرض من ذلك هو وضع الطالب ما أمكن في أجواء عملية الترجمة و الأصول و القواعد التي تحكمها. كما قمنا بترجمة المفردات الصعبة في النصوص التدريبية حتى يتمكن الطالب من إغناء قاموسه الخاص ببعض الكلمات التي تستخدم في حقل السياسة و الإعلام. و لتحقيق ذلك راعينا تنوع النصوص التي جرى اختيارها من مجموعة من الصحف المرموقة لعدد من الكتاب المعروفين باللغتين العربية و الإنجليزية.

عرضنا في الفصل الاول مجموعة من النماذج التطبيقية لنصوص صحفية منشورة في عدد من الصحف العالمية جرت ترجمتها من اللغة الانكليزية إلى العربية. بالمثل، عرضنا في الفصل الثاني مجموعة من النماذج التطبيقية لنصوص صحفية منشورة جرت ترجمتها من اللغة العربية إلى الانكليزية.

اما الفصل الثالث فقد خصصناه لترجمة نصوص صحفية خاصة بالإعلام بغرض مساعدة الطالب و تعويده على المفردات الإعلامية المتداولة في اللغة الانكليزية.

نرجو من الله أن نكون وفقنا في تقديم مادة مفيدة و غنية تساعد الطالب في تطوير لغته الأجنبية و تمكنه من التعامل مع ما قد يقع بين يديه من نصوص بعمق و كفاية.

د. مروان قبلان



الفصل الأول

الترجمة الإعلامية من الانجليزية إلى العربية



الترجمة الإعلامية من الإنجليزية إلى العربية

مقدمة:

يهدف هذا الفصل إلى تنمية خبرات الطالب و مهاراته في مجال ترجمة النصوص الإعلامية من اللغة الانجليزية إلى العربية. كما يسعى إلى إغناء قاموسه الشخصي من المفردات و المصطلحات المستخدمة في لغة الإعلام و السياسة.

و لتحقيق ذلك قمنا بتقديم مجموعة من النصوص المختارة لعدد من كبار المحللين في مجموعة من الصحف العربية و العالمية. و قد تم وضع هذه النصوص على شكل نماذج تطبيقية جرى اختيارها على أساس وضوح الأفكار و حداثة إضافتها إلى اللغة السليمة الخالية من الأخطاء ما أمكن. و في حال وجدت مثل هذه الأخطاء فقد جرت الإشارة إليها بغرض الاستفادة منها و تجنباً لوقوع الدارس فيها عند قيامه بعملية الترجمة. و للتأكيد على جملة من الفروق الأساسية في الترجمة بين اللغتين الانجليزية و العربية قمنا بإضافة بعض الأسئلة التوضيحية إلى النصوص الخمس الأولى في هذا الفصل. كما قمنا بوضع مجموعة من التدريبات البسيطة على الترجمة يهدف تطبيق و استخدام القواعد و المفردات التي تعلمها الطالب خلال دراسته للنماذج التي يحتوي عليها هذا الفصل.

أولاً: النماذج التطبيقية:

قمنا في هذا القسم باختيار عشر مقالات باللغة الانجليزية لكتاب معروفين و ترجمتها إلى اللغة العربية أو نقل ترجمات الصحف العربية لها. و قد قمنا في الحالة الأخيرة بالإشارة إلى الجهة التي قامت بعملية الترجمة حيث راعينا النقل الأمين للنص الانجليزي و ترجمته العربية. و قد أتبعنا النصوص الخمس الأولى كما ذكرنا

بمجموعة أسئلة الغرض منها توضيح بعض الفروق المهمة في الترجمة بين اللغتين
العربية و الانجليزية.

نموذج (1)

الأصل الانجليزي:

Israel and the US are losing the War

Patrick Seale, *Gulf News*

04/08/2006

In a word of wise advice to dumb political leaders, Denis Healey, a former British defence secretary, used to say, "When you're in a hole, stop digging!"

The US and Israel are in a deep and dangerous hole. They urgently need to "stop digging" before the hole swallows them up.

They are fighting, and losing, on three fronts Iraq, Lebanon and Palestine. It seems that this is not enough for the more insane

and hysterical among them who are clamouring to extend the war to Syria and Iran, and to the whole of what they like to call the "Islamo-Fascist" world.

Israel denies it is involved in the Iraq war. But, in fact, it is as much part of that conflict as the US is now part of the wars in Lebanon and Palestine. Israel participated in the strategic planning for the Iraq war, which was designed to remove any threat to it from the east.

Its neo-con friends in Washington egged America on to fight and fabricated the phoney intelligence which persuaded a gullible president that smashing Iraq was necessary for America's security.

Three years later, the US is up to its neck in the Iraqi quagmire, squandering billions of dollars and losing men at the rate of about one a day, but without the good sense or the will to hoist itself out of the hole.

The wars in Iraq, Palestine and Lebanon are all inter-linked, with US abuses in Iraq providing a model for Israel's indiscriminate violence against civilians, and its breach of international humanitarian law.

Israel is merely doing what the US pioneered. When the world's superpower creates conditions of international anarchy by destroying the checks and balances of the international system, lesser powers feel free to follow suit.

Fantasy

The pro-Israeli ideologues in Washington are still apparently driven by the fantasy that the entire Middle East can be restructured by military force to suit US and Israeli interests.

And the US president, worried about the looming mid-term elections in November, is too stubborn and too ignorant to call a halt to this madness.

The wars in Lebanon and Palestine are US-Israel wars, pre-planned jointly and waged in close strategic coordination.

The Israelis do the fighting while the US provides the funding, the weapons and the political and diplomatic cover. It has delayed a ceasefire to give Israel time to "finish the job".

But the wars are not going their way. In both Lebanon and Gaza, Israel might achieve some tactical gains like this week's

commando raid on Baalbek but a strategic victory is almost certainly unattainable.

Hezbollah and Hamas are not conventional armies which can be wiped out on the battlefield, nor are they "terrorist organisations" with no claim to recognition or respect.

They are national resistance movements deeply rooted in the local population whom they represent and whose rights and lives they seek to defend against Israel's repeated aggressions.

In Lebanon, Israel's immediate war aim appears to be to drive Hezbollah and the local civilian population out of a 30 kilometre wide stretch up to the Litani River, in the hope that an international force will then step in to disarm Hezbollah and protect Israel from further rocket attacks. This is a pipedream.

Occupying south Lebanon will not protect Israeli forces from further guerrilla attacks, such as that that drove them out in 2000, and no country will send troops to fight Hezbollah on Israel's behalf.

As the French have made clear, an international force can be deployed only with the consent of all the parties, Hezbollah included, and only when peace is restored.

The moral and political cost to Israel of this ethnic cleansing and state terrorism is exceedingly high. Israel's contempt for Arab life and the laws of war has eroded the legitimacy it managed to achieve in its brief 58 years of existence. Thousands, perhaps tens of thousands, of outraged and radicalised Arabs are itching to attack it.

This is the fundamental contradiction at the heart of Israel's policy. By seeking to restore its dented deterrent capability by brutal means by demanding the freedom to attack its enemies while denying them the freedom to hit back Israel has created a host of bitter and vengeful enemies.

Its vulnerability to asymmetrical warfare will be increased not reduced by its pitiless campaigns on both fronts.

Unattainable

The wider US and Israeli aim of destroying Hezbollah and removing all trace of Syria or Iranian influence from Lebanon, is another unattainable fantasy.

For historical, confessional and social reasons, because of a dense network of family and other ties, and because of shared strategic and security interests, Syria and Iran will always have

far greater sway in Lebanon than Israel or the US can ever hope to have.

Whatever military surprises the next week or two may bring, it is already clear that hatred for Israel and disillusion with America will know no bounds, while Hezbollah will emerge stronger from the battle.

By setting themselves impossible aims, Israel and the US have guaranteed their own failure.

The United States is now at an important crossroads in its dealings with the Arab and Muslim world. Will it sink deeper into hostility or can it find the wisdom to correct its aim?

There are experienced men in Washington who know what needs to be done, men like Brent Scowcroft, national security adviser to Presidents Gerald Ford and George Bush senior, and Zbigniew Brzezinski, President Carter's national security adviser but their voices are not heard in George W. Bush's White House.

The problems of the region must be tackled frontally and together, because they are interlinked.

- The Israeli-Palestinian conflict must be resolved with the creation of an independent Palestinian state based on the 1967 borders.
- The Israeli-Syrian conflict must be resolved with the return to Syria of the Golan.
- Lebanon must be rebuilt with a massive injection of aid and international guarantees for its future security.
- The US must start a bilateral dialogue with Iran aimed at restoring diplomatic relations and recognising Iran's regional interests and security fears.
- Israel must give up its vain ambition to dominate the region militarily and should instead, safe within its 1967 borders, conclude peace treaties with the entire Arab world based on mutual respect and good neighbourliness.

Is this utopian vision the greatest pipedream of all? In the meantime the killing goes on and everyone is a loser.

إسرائيل و أمريكا تخسران الحرب

باتريك سيل، غلف نيوز

2006/08/04

كان دينيس هيلي، وزير الدفاع البريطاني السابق، يقدم نصيحة حكيمة للزعماء السياسيين المعاندين بقوله: «حين تكون في حفرة توقف عن الحفر»... واليوم نرى أميركا وإسرائيل في حفرة عميقة وهما بحاجة ماسة إلى التوقف عن الحفر قبل أن تبتلعهما الحفرة. إنهما يقاتلان ويخسران على ثلاث جبهات: العراق، لبنان وفلسطين. وكان ذلك وحده لا يكفي فهناك بين حكام الدولتين من يدفعه الجنون إلى حد المطالبة بتوسيع رقعة الحرب لتشمل سورية وإيران وكل ما يسمونه بالعالم «الإسلامي الفاشي». أجل إن إسرائيل تنكر أن لها دخلاً في حرب العراق، غير أنها في الواقع طرف في هذا النزاع شأنها شأن أميركا في حربي لبنان وفلسطين. فلقد شاركت في التخطيط الاستراتيجي لحرب العراق لأن من شأنها أن تبعد أي تهديد يأتيها من الشرق. وقام أصدقاؤها المحافظون الجدد بالترويج للحرب ولفقوا معلومات سرية لإقناع الرئيس الساذج بأن ضرب العراق ضروري لأمن أميركا.

وبعد ثلاث سنوات ما زالت أميركا غارقة حتى الرأس في المستنقع العراقي، تبدد بلايين الدولارات وتخسر رجالها بنسبة واحد في اليوم من دون أن يدعوها التفكير السليم أو تدعوها الإرادة إلى الخروج من الحفرة.

وهناك رابط واضح بين الحروب في العراق وفلسطين ولبنان، وهو التعسف الأميركي الذي اتخذته إسرائيل نموذجاً للعنف العشوائي ضد المدنيين وخرق

المعاهدات الدولية الخاصة بالشؤون الإنسانية. وما تفعله إسرائيل هو مجرد اتباع الدولة الرائدة أميركا. ذلك أن الدول العظمى حين تخلق الظروف لانتشار الفوضى العالمية وتدوس على أسس النظام الدولي وتوازناته واستقراره، فإنها تشجع الدول الأصغر على أن تحذو حذوها. فالعقائديون المؤيدون لإسرائيل في واشنطن ما زالوا مدفوعين بخيالهم بأنه يمكن إعادة هيكلة الشرق الأوسط كله بواسطة القوة العسكرية ليتناسب مع المصالح الأميركية والإسرائيلية، ويأتي ذلك في وقت نجد فيه الرئيس بوش يدفعه القلق والخوف من نتائج الانتخابات النصفية في تشرين الثاني (نوفمبر) المقبل إلى الاصغاء إلى هذا الهراء الجنوني ويمنعه عناده وجهله من التصدي إلى هذا الجنون.

وما الحربان في لبنان وفلسطين سوى حربين تقوم بهما أميركا وإسرائيل بتخطيط مشترك وبتنفيذ قائم على تنسيق استراتيجي متين، فالإسرائيليون يخوضون القتال وأميركا تقدم التمويل والسلاح والغطاء السياسي والديبلوماسي، وهي عارضت وقف إطلاق النار لتمنح إسرائيل الوقت الكافي لانتهاء المهمة.

غير أن رياح الحرب لا تجري كما يشتهون. فقد تحقق إسرائيل بعض المكاسب التكتيكية في لبنان وغزة - كما حصل هذا الأسبوع في هجمة الكوماندوس على بعلبك - غير أن النصر الاستراتيجي يكاد يستعصي تماماً على الانجاز. فـ «حزب الله» و «حماس» ليسا جيشين تقليديين يمكن الحاق الهزيمة بهما في ميدان الحرب، كما أنهما ليسا «منظمتين إرهابيتين» تفتقران إلى الاعتبار والاحترام. إنهما حركتا مقاومة وطنية ذات جذور عميقة في الأوساط الشعبية التي يمثلانها و يدافعان عن حقوقها ضد الأعمال العدوانية الإسرائيلية المتكررة.

ويبدو أن الهدف الفوري لإسرائيل من حربها في لبنان هو طرد «حزب الله» والسكان المدنيين المحليين إلى مسافة 30 كيلومترا حتى نهر الليطاني، أملا في أن تدخل القوات الدولية بعد ذلك لتجردهم من سلاحهم وتحمي إسرائيل من الهجمات الصاروخية... وهذا حلم ووهم.

فاحتلال جنوب لبنان لن يحمي القوات الإسرائيلية من هجمات حرب العصابات - كذلك التي أجبرتها على الانسحاب عام 2000 - ولن تقوم أي دولة بإرسال قواتها لتحمي إسرائيل من «حزب الله». فالقوات الدولية، كما أوضحت فرنسا، لا يمكن نشرها إلا بموافقة جميع الأطراف، بما فيها «حزب الله»، وفقط بعد أن يعود السلام. وتقوم إسرائيل في هذه الاثناء بقصف قرى الجنوب وتدميرها وزرع الرعب والهلع بحيث يضطر السكان إلى النزوح شمالا، هذا إذا نجوا من الموت ولم يدفنوا تحت انقاض بيوتهم.

ولا شك أن الثمن الأخلاقي والسياسي الذي ستدفعه إسرائيل لعمليات التطهير العرقي وإرهاب الدولة التي قامت بها سيكون غاليا جدا. فاحتقار إسرائيل لحياة العرب ولقوانين الحرب أفقدها الشرعية التي استطاعت الحصول عليها خلال 58 سنة من وجودها. وهناك الألوف بل عشرات الألوف من العرب الراديكاليين الغاضبين يتطلعون إلى مهاجمتها.

ذلك هو التناقض الأساسي في صلب السياسة الإسرائيلية. فهي إذ تحاول أن تعيد قواتها الردعية إلى ما كانت عليه بالوسائل الوحشية فتطالب بحرية مهاجمة أعدائها وتنكر على هؤلاء حرية مهاجمتها إنما تخلق العديد من الأعداء الألداء المتعطشين إلى الانتقام. وأما هشاشة وضعها في حرب غير متكافئة فسوف تزداد بفعل حملاتها الشرسة على الجبهتين وليس العكس.

وأما هدف اميركا واسرائيل الأكبر من القضاء على «حزب الله» ومحو كل أثر للنفوذ السوري أو الإيراني في لبنان، فهو مطلب خيالي أبعد منالاً يتبخر أمام الوقائع المحلية. فلسورية وإيران أسباب تاريخية ودينية واجتماعية ذات صلة بشبكة من الروابط العائلية والمصالح الأمنية والاستراتيجية المشتركة، ولذا فإن اسرائيل أو اميركا لا يمكن أن تأملا يوماً بمزاحمة نفوذ سورية وإيران.

وأياً كانت المفاجآت الحربية التي يمكن أن تأتي بها فترة الاسبوع أو الاسبوعين القادمة فإن ما أصبح واضحاً هو أن كراهية اسرائيل وخيبة الأمل من اميركا لن يكون لهما حدود، هذا في حين أن «حزب الله» سيخرج من المعركة أقوى مما كان. ولأن اسرائيل واميركا رسمتا للحرب أهدافاً صعبة المنال فقد ضمننا بذلك فشلاً محققاً.

وتجد اميركا اليوم نفسها على مفترق طرق مهم في تعاملها مع العالمين العربي والاسلامي. فإما أن تزداد غرقاً في الأعمال الحربية أو تكتشف الحكمة لتصحيح الهدف. وهناك ساسة محنكون في واشنطن يعرفون ما ينبغي فعله، رجال من أمثال برنت سكاوكرافت، مستشار الأمن القومي في عهد الرئيس جيرالد فورد والرئيس بوش الأب، وزبغنيو بريجنسكي مستشار الرئيس كارتر. غير أن أصواتهم غير مسموعة في البيت الأبيض في عهد جورج دبليو بوش.

ولقد خلق هذا الأخير لنفسه، بفضل «الحرب الشاملة على الارهاب» وبفضل تأييده المطلق لاسرائيل العديد من الأعداء. فليس في التاريخ الحديث رئيس اميركي نال من اللعنات ما ناله. ويبدو أن اميركا غير قادرة حتى على ضبط جموح عملياتها اسرائيل كما تبين لوزيرة الخارجية كوندوليزا رايس في الاسبوع الماضي حين وعدها رئيس حكومة اسرائيل ايهود اولمرت بوقف القتال لمدة 48 ساعة ولكن

جيشه استمر في القصف كأن شيئاً لم يكن. ولقد قالت لشمعون بيريس ان وقف القتال يمكن ان يتحقق خلال ايام فرد عليها «بل خلال اسابيع». فأين هي اذن زعامة اميركا الكونية الشاملة؟ لقد سقطت إلى الدرك الأسفل وتحولت على حد قول رجب طيب اردوغان رئيس الحكومة التركية إلى «ثقافة عنف».

والرئيس بوش يواجه اليوم خيارين، فإما ان يستمر في دعم اسرائيل في حربها الكارثيتين في لبنان وفلسطين وربما امتدادهما إلى سورية وايران أو ان يوقف هذا الجنون ويثبت زعامته في السلام. انها فرصته الوحيدة لإنقاذ رئاسته من القشل الذريع. عليه ان يلقي بثقل اميركا الكبير وهيبته الشخصية في البحث عن حل اقليمي شامل. انه امر قابل للتحقيق وما زال لديه الوقت ليفعل. ولكن لا بد له كي ينجح، من أن يتخلص من المستشارين الذين عرضوا اميركا للخطر. فمشاكل المنطقة لا بد من معالجتها جميعها لأنها متشابكة:

1- لا بد من حل النزاع الفلسطيني - الاسرائيلي وانشاء دولة فلسطينية مستقلة على اساس حدود 1967.

2- حل النزاع بين سورية واسرائيل على اساس إعادة الجولان.

3- يجب إعادة بناء لبنان بضخ الكثير من المساعدات وبضمانات دولية لأمنه.

4- على اميركا ان تبدأ حواراً مع ايران بهدف إلى عودة العلاقات الدبلوماسية والاعتراف بمصالح ايران الاقليمية ومخاوفها الأمنية.

5- على اسرائيل ان تتخلى عن طموحها العبثي للهيمنة على المنطقة عسكرياً وان تعتمد عوضاً عن ذلك إلى عقد معاهدات سلام مع العالم العربي بأسره على أساس حدودها عام 1967 وعلى أساس الاحترام المتبادل وحسن الجوار.

فهل هذه الرؤية الطوباوية مجرد أحلام وردية؟ وأما الوضع الراهن فليس سوى استمرار القتل وخسارة لكل الأطراف.

اسئلة عن النص:

- 1- اقرأ النصين الانجليزي والعربي وحدد نوع الترجمة المستخدمة.
- 2- حدد ثلاث جمل اسمية في النص الأصلي و بين الفروق في ترجمتها العربية.
- 3- حدد ثلاث جمل استخدم فيها المبني للمجهول في النص الأصلي و قارنها بترجمتها العربية.
- 4- حدد معاني الكلمات التالية في النص الأصلي مستعينا بالترجمة العربية:

resistance, represent, defend, aggressions, disarm, rocket attacks, occupy, protect, guerrilla attacks, troops, deployed, consent, parties, restored.

'How can we stand by and allow this to go on?'

Robert Fisk, *The Independent*

31/07/2006

They wrote the names of the dead children on their plastic shrouds. "Mehdi Hashem, aged seven - Qana," was written in felt pen on the bag in which the little boy's body lay. "Hussein al-Mohamed, aged 12 - Qana," "Abbas al-Shalhoub, aged one - Qana." And when the Lebanese soldier went to pick up Abbas's little body, it bounced on his shoulder as the boy might have done on his father's shoulder on Saturday. In all, there were 56 corpses brought to the Tyre government hospital and other surgeries, and 34 of them were children. When they ran out of plastic bags, they wrapped the small corpses in carpets. Their hair was matted with dust, most had blood running from their noses.

You must have a heart of stone not to feel the outrage that those of us watching this experienced yesterday. This slaughter was an obscenity, an atrocity - yes, if the Israeli air force truly

bombs with the "pinpoint accuracy" it claims, this was also a war crime. Israel claimed that missiles had been fired by Hizbollah gunmen from the south Lebanese town of Qana - as if that justified this massacre. Israel's Prime Minister, Ehud Olmert, talked about "Muslim terror" threatening "western civilisation" - as if the Hizbollah had killed all these poor people.

For only 10 years ago, this was the scene of another Israeli massacre, the slaughter of 106 Lebanese refugees by an Israeli artillery battery as they sheltered in a UN base in the town. More than half of those 106 were children. Israel later said it had no live-time pilotless photo-reconnaissance aircraft over the scene of that killing - a statement that turned out to be untrue when *The Independent* discovered videotape showing just such an aircraft over the burning camp. It is as if Qana - whose inhabitants claim that this was the village in which Jesus turned water into wine - has been damned by the world, doomed forever to receive tragedy.

And there was no doubt of the missile which killed all those children yesterday. It came from the United States, and upon a fragment of it was written: "For use on MK-84 Guided Bomb BSU-37-B". No doubt the manufacturers can call it "combat-

proven" because it destroyed the entire three-storey house in which the Shalhoub and Hashim families lived. They had taken refuge in the basement from an enormous Israeli bombardment, and that is where most of them died.

I found Nejwah Shalhoub lying in the government hospital in Tyre, her jaw and face bandaged like Robespierre's before his execution. She did not weep, nor did she scream, although the pain was written on her face. Her brother Taisir, who was 46, had been killed. So had her sister Najla. So had her little niece Zeinab, who was just six. "We were in the basement hiding when the bomb exploded at one o'clock in the morning," she said. "What in the name of God have we done to deserve this? So many of the dead are children, the old, and women. Some of the children were still awake and playing. Why does the world do this to us?"

Yesterday's deaths brought to more than 500 the total civilian dead in Lebanon since Israel's air, sea and land bombardment of the country begun on 12 July after Hizbollah members crossed the frontier wire, killed three Israeli soldiers and captured two others. But yesterday's slaughter ended more than a year of mutual antagonism within the Lebanese government

as pro-American and pro-Syrian politicians denounced what they described as "an ugly crime".

Thousands of protesters attacked the largest United Nations building in Beirut, screaming: "Destroy Tel Aviv, destroy Tel Aviv," and Lebanon's Prime Minister, the normally unflappable Fouad Siniora, called US Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and ordered her to cancel her imminent peace-making trip to Beirut.

No one in this country can forget how President George Bush, Ms Rice, and Tony Blair have repeatedly refused to call for an immediate ceasefire - a truce that would have saved all those lives yesterday. Ms Rice would say only: "We want a ceasefire as soon as possible," a remark followed by an Israeli announcement that it intended to maintain its bombardment of Lebanon for at least another two weeks.

Throughout the day, Qana villagers and civil defence workers dug through the ruins of the building with spades and with their hands, tearing at the muck until they found one body after another still dressed in colourful clothes. In one section of the rubble, they found what was left of a single room with 18 bodies inside. Twelve of the dead were women. All across

southern Lebanon now, you find scenes like this, not so grotesque in scale, perhaps, but just as terrible, for the people of these villages are terrified to leave and terrified to stay. The Israelis had dropped leaflets over Qana, ordering its people to leave their homes. Yet twice now since Israel's onslaught began, the Israelis have ordered villagers to leave their houses and then attacked them with aircraft as they obeyed the Israeli instructions and fled. There are at least 3,000 Shia Muslims trapped in villages between Qlaya and Aiteroun - close to the scene of Israel's last military incursion at Bint Jbeil - and yet none of them can leave without fear of dying on the roads.

And Mr Olmert's reaction? After expressing his "great sorrow", he announced that: "We will not stop this battle, despite the difficult incidents [*sic*] this morning. We will continue the activity, and if necessary it will be broadened without hesitation." But how much further can it be broadened? Lebanon's infrastructure is being steadily torn to pieces, its villages razed, its people more and more terrorised - and terror is the word they used - by Israel's American-made fighter bombers. Hizbollah's missiles are Iranian-made, and it was Hizbollah that started this war with its illegal and provocative raid across the border. But Israel's savagery against the civilian

population has deeply shocked not only the Western diplomats who have remained in Beirut, but hundreds of humanitarian workers from the Red Cross and major aid agencies.

Incredibly, Israel yesterday denied safe passage to a UN World Food Programme aid convoy en route to the south, a six-truck mission that should have taken relief supplies to the south-eastern town of Marjayoun. More than three quarters of a million Lebanese have now fled their homes, but there is still no accurate figure for the total number still trapped in the south. Khalil Shalhoub, who survived amid the wreckage in Qana yesterday, said that his family and the Hashims were just too "terrified" to take the road out of the village, which has been attacked by aircraft for more than two weeks. The seven-mile highway between Qana and Tyre is littered with civilian homes in ruins and burnt-out family cars. On Thursday, the Israeli Army's Al-Mashriq radio, which broadcasts into southern Lebanon, told residents that their villages would be "totally destroyed" if missiles were fired from them. But anyone who has watched Israel's bombing these past two weeks knows that, in many cases, the Israelis do not know the location in which the Hizbollah are firing missiles, and - when they do - they frequently miss their targets. How can a villager

prevent the Hizbollah from firing rockets from his street? The Hizbollah do take cover beside civilian houses - just as Israeli troops entering Bint Jbeil last week also used civilian homes for cover. But can this be the excuse for slaughter on such a scale?

Mr Siniora addressed foreign diplomats in Beirut yesterday, telling them that the government in Beirut was now only demanding an immediate ceasefire and was not interested any longer in a political package to go with it. Needless to say, Mr Jeffrey Feltman, whose country made the bomb which killed the innocents of Qana yesterday, chose not to attend.

الترجمة العربية:

كيف يمكننا ان نسمح باستمرار ذلك؟

روبرت فيسك، الاديب

2006/07/31

على اركانهم النابولية كتبوا اسماءهم: "مهدي هاشم 7 سنوات - قانا" بهذه الكلمات التي كتبت بقلم ناشف' ختم الكيس النابولي الذي يستقر بداخله جسد الطفل. "حسين المحمد 12 عاماً - قانا"، "عباس الشلهوب عام واحد - قانا".

وما ان قام الجندي اللبناني بحمل جسد عباس الصغير حتى استرخى على كتفه تماماً كما رفعه والده على كتفيه يوم السبت. وفي مشفى الطيرة الحكومي التقت الجثث الـ 56 بينها 34 طفلاً. وهناك تم إخراج الأجساد الصغيرة من الأكياس النايلونية ولفها بالسجاد. كانت شعورهم ملبدة بالغبار وأنوفهم مدماة.

ليس الا لمن كان قلبه من حجر ان لا ينتابه شعور الغضب الذي يعتلج في صدورنا ونحن نشاهد ما حدث يوم أمس. إن هذه المجزرة وحشية وفاحشة. نعم إذا كانت القوات الإسرائيلية الجوية تضرب أهدافها حقاً بالدقة المدروسة التي تزعمها فإن ما ارتكبته يوم أمس هو جريمة حرب أخرى.

إسرائيل زعمت بأن حزب الله أطلق صواريخه من قانا في جنوب لبنان - وكان هذه الكلام يبرر هذه المجزرة. ورئيس الوزراء الإسرائيلي إيهود أولمرت تحدث عن تهديد الإرهاب الإسلامي للحضارة الغربية - وكان حزب الله هو من قتل كل هؤلاء الناس المساكين.

ويجب ان نتذكر بأنه منذ عشر سنوات وفي قانا نفسها كان هذا المكان موقعاً لمجزرة شبيهة بالحالية، فقد قتل يومها 106 لاجئ لبناني على يد إسرائيل وذلك بعد ان التجأوا إلى مركز للأمم المتحدة في تلك البلدة. وكان نصف تلك الضحايا من الأطفال. ويومها قالت إسرائيل بأنه لم يكن لديها أية صور حية تبثها طائرات استطلاعية في مكان الجريمة. ولكن ثبت فيما بعد زيف هذه التصريحات عندما عثرت الاندبندنت على شريط فيديو يظهر تماماً وجود طائرة استطلاع فوق المعسكر المحترق.

يبدو أن قانا التي حول فيها المسيح الماء إلى خمر، حسب اعتقاد قاطنيها، قد وقعت عليها لعنة العالم وحكم عليها بالكوارث إلى الأبد. وليس هناك أي شك حول مصدر

تلك القنابل التي استهدفت وقتلت الأطفال يوم أمس، فقد كانت من الولايات المتحدة وقد كتب على أحد أشلائها: "قنابل موجهة للاستخدام MK-84 BSU-37-B". وليس هناك شك أبداً في أن باستطاعة مصنعها الآن أن يشيروا إليها على أنها "فعالة" وذلك لأنها دمرت المبنى المؤلف من ثلاثة طوابق بأكمله الذي كانت تعيش فيه عائلة شلهوب وهاشم. فقد لاذوا بملجئه من القذائف الإسرائيلية المروعة، ولكن معظمهم مات هناك.

اسئلة عن النص:

- 1- حدد جملة شرطية في النص الأصلي و قارن زمن الفعل المستخدم فيها مع زمن الفعل المستخدم في الترجمة العربية.
- 2- حدد ثلاث جمل تحوي صفة و موصوف في النص الأصلي و قارن ترتيبها مع الترجمة العربية.
- 3- حدد معاني المفردات التالية في النص الأصلي مستعينا بالترجمة العربية:

a heart of stone, outrage, slaughter, obscenity, an atrocity, pinpoint accuracy, war crime, missiles, fired by, gunmen, justify, massacre, threatening, refugees, artillery battery, sheltered, reconnaissance aircraft, damned, doomed, tragedy.

All Wars are Different: Lebanon, Israel and the Maturing of the "Greater West Asian Crisis"

Fred Halliday, *The Guardian*

22/08/2006

All wars are different, but some are more different than others, or so it would seem in the aftermath of the most recent war between Israel and its neighbours. For all that this war, unexpected, but long brewing, and explosive in its consequences, immediate and long term, bears similarities to other conflicts in the recent history of the region, it is in some very important respects different from, and more than, any of these: it is more than an Arab-Israeli war of the kind seen on five previous occasions since 1948; it is more than another chapter in the wars of Lebanon, which began in 1975-6 and lasted to 1990; it is more than, but most certainly linked to, the wars that have in different parts of the region ensued from the Iranian revolution of 1979, in Lebanon, as in Iraq.

The first problem this war poses is that of evaluating how far the distinct conflicts of the region are interrelated. 'In the Middle East people always mix everything up with everything else'. This, familiar, complaint, heard as much in the region as outside it, has been often heard in recent decades as politicians and commentators in the Middle East seek to put events of individual countries or sub-regions into some broader regional, when not global, context.

Such arguments have long been part of the rhetoric of the region: thus the different phases of the Arab-Israeli conflict, the Iran-Iraq wars, revolution in Yemen, civil war in Sudan or Algeria, not to mention oil prices, sundry assassinations, and the rise of Islamist parties and guerrilla groups are all seen part of some broader pattern, if not 'plot', 'conspiracy' or agenda. Saddam when he invaded Kuwait in 1990 talked of 'linkage' between this event and the Palestinian intifadha that had broken out three years before, while the late King Fahd of Saudi Arabia saw the Iraqi occupation of his neighbour as part of a 'Hashemite Encirclement', including Iraq, Jordan, the PLO and Yemen.

The problem is that this time 'it', assimilation of individual countries and events to a broader and determinant regional

pattern, is to a considerable measure true: it is not possible to understand what is happening today, let alone what will happen between Lebanon and Israel, or in Iraq or Afghanistan, or indeed in Turkey and Libya, without seeing these events in the broader regional and, to a considerable degree, global context, understanding the latter to include US policy on the one hand, and the shifting interests and power of the new states, Russia, India and China, on the other. The 'Linkage' of Persian Gulf to Arab-Israeli conflict, of hitherto almost insulated Turkish politics from the Arab world, of long remote Afghanistan to the politics of Iran and the Arab states, and of Pakistan to the Middle East as a whole has, in recent, years, become a reality. It is reality of states, who look at each others' nuclear and other programmes and react accordingly; it is a reality for the opposition and military groups who operate in different states of the region, and, very importantly in an age of satellite TV, for public opinion; and it is a reality of the outside world, particularly the USA and Europe, who are trying to contain and manage, with almost no success, the tensions in the region. The result is what can be seen on the wide, necessarily very wide, screen on which individual wars and crises can be set, that of the new 'Greater West Asia'.

The political character and extent of 'regions' is not fixed in time: the scopes of 'Europe' and 'the Mediterranean' have, for example, altered in recent decades. Few have noticed how, in some respects, the Middle Eastern 'region' has shrunk in recent decades: the affairs of Ethiopia and Eritrea, once seen as part of the Middle East, and involving as they did the Arabs and Israel, are no longer so connected. But the contrary process, of expansion, has been stronger: in effect, since the mid-1990s, a new region, not just a Middle East but a 'Greater West Asia' has emerged, with the result that what appear as individual conflicts - the US invasion of Iraq in 2003, the crisis in Afghanistan, the current Israeli-Lebanese war - are connected, and feed off each other.

This change is evident in the new pan-Islamic consciousness that ties Arab with non-Arab causes and is also evident, with at times dramatic effect, among young Muslims living in Europe. But is also reflected in the language of US strategy: Bush has talked of a 'Greater Middle East Initiative', one of the great damp squids of all time, but his 'Greater Middle East', while it includes Afghanistan, as for the purposes of his 'War on Terror' it must, symptomatically excludes the country more responsible than any for spreading terrorism, Islamic

fundamentalism, nuclear proliferation and base, greedy, corruption across the region, the 'rogue state' par excellence, Pakistan. If future historians want to know why Iran decided to go ahead with its nuclear programme it is in considerable measure because of the Pakistani decision to explode nuclear weapons in 1998; if they want to know who organised, promoted, funded and, indeed, still protests the Taliban and Al Qaida, the answer is the same.

For these reasons, this war is different. It is not just the sixth Arab-Israeli war, a revival of the Lebanese civil war, or an internationalisation of the second Palestinian Intifadha, let alone another outbreak of the 'Global War Against Terrorism', although it is all of the above: rather it is an episode, by far the least bloody, of another, broader and more protracted conflict, one that has multiple centres - Afghanistan, Iraq, now Lebanon, that involves a rapidly shifting coalition of regional states with political and social movements, and which has, we can now see with the hindsight of over two decades, been in train since the late 1970s, and in particular since the two strategic detonations of 1979, the Iranian revolution of February and the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan in December.

The originality of the most recent Lebanese conflict is, in several respects, evident enough. First, the major protagonists on the Arab side are not states, but an armed political group, an organisation that will prove much more difficult to negotiate with, and to reach any binding ceasefire or other agreement with, than was the case in earlier wars: in the one earlier Arab-Israeli war in which significant non-state forces were involved, that of 1948-9, these latter were simply smashed, and dispersed, in the overrunning of Palestinian society by the newly established Israeli state, and only emerged two decades later as an independent force. Secondly, insofar as states are involved on the side of Hizbullah, as they most certainly are, in the case of Syria and Iran, they will pursue their involvement in a way quite different to the Arab states in earlier conflicts.

Given the passions and interests involved, and the new complexity of events, it is hardly surprising that few ready solutions or even stopgap measures are available: this one looks set to run and run. It is a new and indeed more interactive Middle East, but not the one many had hoped to see. Pointless now to ask who has won, and who has lost: this game is much longer than the four weeks just past in southern Lebanon.

تباين نزاعات المنطقة و نشوء "أزمة غرب آسيا الكبرى"

فريد هالدي، الغارديان

2006/08/22

الحروب كلها متباينة بيد أن بعضها أكثر اختلافاً من الآخر أو هكذا على الأقل تبدو الأمور في أعقاب الحرب الأخيرة بين إسرائيل و جيرانها. غير أن هذه الحرب التي كانت تلوح في الأفق منذ فترة طويلة، والمتفجرة بتبعاتها الأنية أو الممتدة على المدى الطويل، تتشاطر بعض القواسم المشتركة مع نزاعات أخرى هزت المنطقة في التاريخ الحديث. مع ذلك، تُعتبر هذه الحرب في نواح عدة مهمة مختلفة تمام الاختلاف عن هذه النزاعات. فهي أولا أكثر من مجرد حرب عربية إسرائيلية من النوع الذي شهدناه في الحروب الخمس الماضية منذ العام 1948. إنها أكثر من مجرد فصل جديد يُضاف إلى الحروب التي اندلعت على أرض لبنان منذ العامين 1976/1975 حتى العام 1990. إنها حتى أكثر من تلك الحروب التي اندلعت في أنحاء مختلفة في هذه المنطقة، في لبنان كما في العراق، بعد الثورة الإيرانية في العام 1979، رغم أنها ولا شك متصلة بها اتصالاً وثيقاً.

تتمثل المشكلة الأولى التي تطرحها هذه الحرب في تحديد مدى تشابك النزاعات البارزة في المنطقة. ففي الشرق الأوسط، كثيراً ما يخلط الأشخاص الأمور بعضها ببعض. في العقود الأخيرة، غالباً ما تنأى إلى مسامعنا هذا التذمر المألوف في المنطقة وخارجها، في حين يسعى المعلقون والسياسيون في الشرق الأوسط إلى

وضع الأحداث التي تطرأ في الدول أو المناطق غير الإقليمية في إطار إقليمي أوسع وأكثر شمولية، إن لم يكن في إطار عالمي.

ولطالما كانت مثل هذه الحجج جزءاً لا يتجزأ من الكلام المنمق السائد في المنطقة. وعليه، يُنظر إلى المراحل المختلفة من الصراع العربي - الإسرائيلي، والحرب الإيرانية - العراقية، والثورة اليمنية، والحرب الأهلية في السودان أو الجزائر، ناهيك عن أسعار النفط والاحتلالات المتعددة، ونشوء الأحزاب الإسلامية والمجموعات المختلفة، يُنظر إليها كلها على أنها جزء من نمط أوسع إن لم نقل من «مخطط» أو «تواطؤ» أو أجندة معينة. بهذا المعنى «ربط» صدام اجتياحه الكويت عام 1990 بالانتفاضة الفلسطينية التي كانت انطلقت قبل ذلك بثلاثة أعوام.

لكن المشكلة تكمن هذه المرة في دمج دول وأحداث منفصلة بنمط إقليمي حاسم وأوسع نطاقاً، وهذا صحيح إلى حد كبير. فنحن عاجزون عن فهم ما يحدث اليوم فضلاً عن التطورات الأخرى المرتقبة في المستقبل بين لبنان وإسرائيل أو في العراق وأفغانستان أو بالطبع في تركيا وليبيا إن لم نضع هذه الأحداث والتطورات في الإطار الإقليمي الأوسع أو إلى حد كبير في الإطار العالمي الذي يشمل السياسة الأميركية من جهة، والمصالح والسلطات المتقلبة للدول الجديدة مثل روسيا والصين والهند من جهة أخرى. فربط منطقة الخليج بالنزاع العربي - الإسرائيلي، والسياسات التركية التي كانت حتى الآن معزولة عن العالم العربي، وربط أفغانستان هذا البلد النائي بسياسات إيران والدول العربية، وبباكستان بالشرق الأوسط برمته، أصبح واقعا ملموساً على مدى السنوات القليلة الماضية. فهذا هو واقع الدول التي تتحرك بناءً على برامج الدول الأخرى، نووية كانت أم غير نووية. وهذا هو واقع المعارضة والمجموعات العسكرية التي تُنشط في دول مختلفة في المنطقة، والأهم من ذلك في عصر الفضائيات، هذا هو واقع الراي العام. هذا هو

الواقع السائد في العالم الخارجي ولا سيما في الولايات المتحدة الأميركية وأوروبا اللتين تحاولان احتواء التوتر وإدارته من دون أن تلقى جهودهما أي نجاح يُذكر. والنتيجة، ها نحن نستشف الآن على الشاشة الكبيرة، الكبيرة جداً، حيث تُصور الأزمات والحروب الفردية، معالم «غرب آسيا الكبرى» الجديدة.

فالطابع السياسي وحدود «المناطق» غير محددة في الزمن. فعلى سبيل المثال، تبدّلت معالم «أوروبا» و «البحر الأبيض المتوسط» في العقود المنصرمة. وقلة هم الذين لاحظوا كيف تقلصت منطقة «الشرق الأوسط» في نواح معينة في العقود الأخيرة. فشؤون إيريتريا واثيوبيا التي كان ينظر إليها في ما مضى على أنها جزء من الشرق الأوسط وبالتالي من العرب وإسرائيل لم تعد مترابطة إلى هذا الحد. بيد أن عملية التوسيع المعاكسة كانت أكثر قوة. والواقع أنه منذ منتصف التسعينات، برزت منطقة جديدة ليست «الشرق الأوسط» فحسب بل «غرب آسيا الكبرى». ونتيجة لذلك، يتبين أن الأحداث التي تُصور للوهلة الأولى على أنها مجرد تطوّر منفصل، مثل الاجتياح الأميركي للعراق في العام 2003 والأزمة في أفغانستان، والحرب الإسرائيلية - اللبنانية الراهنة، إنما هي شديدة الترابط وتغذي بعضها بعضاً.

ويتجلى هذا التغيّر بوضوح في الوعي الإسلامي الجديد الذي يربط القضايا العربية بأخرى غير عربية. كما يظهر مع تأثير درامي أحياناً في صفوف الشبان المسلمين الذي يعيشون في أوروبا. لكنه ينعكس أيضاً في لغة الإستراتيجية الأميركية. فقد تحدث بوش عن «مبادرة الشرق الأوسط الكبير» الأكثر إحباطاً على الإطلاق. بيد أن الشرق الأوسط الكبير الذي ينادي به، الذي ضمّ إليه أفغانستان بداعي «الحرب على الإرهاب»، يستثني بصورة صارخة البلد المسؤول أكثر من غيره عن نشر الإرهاب والأصولية الإسلامية، وانتشار الأسلحة النووية، والجشع، والفساد

المستشري في المنطقة، أي باكستان. فإذا رغب المؤرخون في المستقبل بمعرفة السبب الذي حدا بإيران إلى المضي قدماً في برنامجها النووي، فهو يُعزى إلى حد وثيق إلى قرار باكستان القاضي بتفجير أسلحة نووية في العام 1998. وإذا أرادوا معرفة من نظم «طالبان» والقاعدة ورعاهما، ثم مولهما، رغم احتجاجاته المتكررة، فالجواب هو نفسه لم يتغير.

لهذه الأسباب تُعتبر هذه الحرب الأخيرة مختلفة. فهي ليست بكل بساطة الحرب السادسة بين العرب وإسرائيل، أو إعادة إحياء للحرب الأهلية اللبنانية، أو تدويلاً للانتفاضة الفلسطينية الثانية، ناهيك عن حرب عالمية أخرى ضد الإرهاب - على الرغم من أن هذه الحرب هي كل ما أشير إليه سابقاً. على العكس، هي حلقة - قد تكون الأقل دموية على الإطلاق - من نزاع آخر شامل وطويل يتركز على عدة محاور أي أفغانستان والعراق والأن لبنان، ويشتمل على تحالف سريع التغير يجمع الدول الإقليمية بالحركات السياسية والاجتماعية، في اتجاه كان يتواصل، كما نستشف حالياً بعد عقدين من الزمن، منذ أواخر السبعينات ولاسيما منذ الهزتين الإستراتيجيتين عام 1979، أي الثورة الإيرانية في شباط (فبراير) وتدخل الاتحاد السوفياتي في أفغانستان في كانون الأول (ديسمبر).

وتبرز السمات التي تميز النزاع اللبناني الأخير في نواح عدة. أولاً، ليست الأطراف العربية المتناحرة دولا بل مجموعة سياسية مسلحة، أو منظمة سيكون من الصعوبة بمكان التفاوض معها والتوصل إلى وقف مُلزم لإطلاق النار أو أي اتفاق آخر خلافاً لما كان عليه الحال في الحروب السابقة. ففي الحرب السابقة بين العرب وإسرائيل، تناحرت قوى لا تنضوي تحت لواء الدولة. أما في العامين 1948/1949، فقد سُجِّت هذه القوى ببساطة قبل أن تُشكَّتها دولة إسرائيل الحديثة العهد آنذاك في المجتمع الفلسطيني لتبرز مجدداً بعد عامين كقوة مستقلة. وثانياً، في

ما يتعلق بالدول المساندة لـ «حزب الله»، مثل سورية وإيران، فستسعى من جهتها إلى مواصلة تدخلها بطريقة لم تعهدها الدول العربية في نزاعات سابقة.

اسئلة عن النص:

- 1- حدد ثلاث جمل استخدم فيها الحاضر المستمر في النص الأصلي و قارنها بترجمتها العربية.
- 2- حدد ثلاث جمل استخدم فيها الماضي المستمر في النص الأصلي و قارنها بترجمتها العربية.
- 3- حدد معاني المفردات التالية في النص الأصلي مستعيناً بالترجمة العربية:

poses, evaluate, distinct, interrelated, sub-regions, broader context, rhetoric, phases, mention, sundry assassinations, guerrilla groups, broader pattern, plot, conspiracy, agenda, linkage.

America has thrown all caution to the winds

Marwan Kabalan, *Gulf News*

04/06/2004

In a discussion on moral choices in foreign policy, Robert Jackson, a prominent American scholar in international politics, identified three main considerations that guide military intervention on the international arena. They are, he wrote: "The devotion to one's own national interests and the well being of his citizens; respect for the legitimate interests and rights of other states and for international law; and respect for human rights and for common morality". All these considerations, American officials insist, have guided their decision to intervene militarily in Iraq in 2003.

If we verify these claims, however, we find that most of them are untrue. The first consideration, for example, would oblige the Bush administration not to intervene militarily unless there is a case of national interest or national security and then not to

involve the country and its citizens in any undue risks or engagements abroad.

The emphasis here, for any statesman, is to give priority to the safety and security of his people and not to those of other states. These considerations are to be placed morally prior to any international commitments undertaken or any sympathies felt for countries trapped by endemic problems, such as, ethnic cleansing, mass killings, oppression, military rule, massive human rights violations and civil wars.

Justifiable action

Such considerations would make humanitarian action justifiable only if there were no significant risks to the national interest or costs to the population of the intervening country. President Bush, who persistently claims he intervened militarily in Iraq to make America a safer place, did not respect the first rule of engagement.

He did not, for example, find weapons of mass destruction and long-range missiles - once claimed to have posed a significant threat to mainland America. He did not make the Middle East a better place - a vital interest for the US, and above all, he did

not make Americans feel safer after the overthrow of Saddam Hussain.

Americans are getting killed almost daily in Iraq and their interests are being targeted nearly everywhere. No doubt, they were safer before the invasion of Iraq.

The second consideration is related to the norms of international law. The obligations of states are part and parcel of the rights and duties they obtain from mutual recognition as sovereign members of the international community.

Refrain from intervening in the internal affairs of other states is, therefore, part of a state's duties in international society and is essential to gain the acceptance and respect it desires for itself.

As a consequence, it is necessary for states, in the absence of an over-arching authority with coercive power, not only to abide by the agreements made with other states but also to act in accordance with these agreements. This is an obligation to international society as well as to a state's own citizens.

Military intervention, under these conditions, becomes acceptable, where it is undertaken, only in agreement with

international law and in consensus with international society, such as under a UN mandate. The Bush administration did not respect these obligations and went to war in Iraq against the will of the international community and in violation of the UN Charter.

The third consideration is concerned with human rights and common morality. A statesman, it is assumed, is an ordinary human being and, hence, shares solidarity and universality with the rest of humanity. He is also better placed to assist and defend other human beings from threats to their lives or dignity. There is, therefore, an obligation to do whatever possible to preserve justice and to protect human rights, especially where it can be done at little sacrifice to oneself. This is, essentially, the humanitarian factor for intervention.

Yet, if we examine US policy in the light of this factor, we can hardly find a shred of truth in it. For decades, the US government has turned a blind eye to the suffrage of Iraqis under Saddam; and when the humanitarian factor was raised in recent years, it was used to further strategic interests, not to protect Iraqis. Furthermore, the newly revealed pictures of US soldiers humiliating, abusing and mistreating naked Iraqi prisoners have made a sad ending to a false story.

A year on after the invasion of Iraq, it can be argued with almost absolute certainty that the US military intervention was driven solely by ideological and structural factors related to the position of the US as a hyperpower.

Independent variables

These two factors are the independent variables par excellence in the US decision to intervene militarily in Iraq. The other factors – security, morality and respect for human rights – were employed only when they seemed to serve the ideological faith and consolidate the hyperpower status of the US.

الترجمة العربية:

امريكا القت بمصداقيتها إلى الريح

مروان قبلان، غلف نيوز

04/06/2004

في ندوة حول المعايير الأخلاقية في السياسة الخارجية حدد روبرت جاكسون، و هو أكاديمي أمريكي متخصص في السياسة الدولية، ثلاثة اعتبارات تحكم التدخل العسكري على الساحة الدولية هي حماية المصلحة الوطنية و حقوق المواطن،

احترام الحقوق الشرعية للدول الأخرى و للقانون الدولي، و احترام حقوق الإنسان و القيم الأخلاقية العامة. يزعم المسؤولون الأمريكيين أن هذه الاعتبارات الثلاثة هي التي دفعتهم إلى اتخاذ قرار غزو العراق عام 2003.

لكن إذا قمنا بدراسة هذه المزاعم نجد أنها لا تتمتع بأي درجة من المصداقية. فالاعتبار الأول، على سبيل المثال، يلزم إدارة الرئيس جورج بوش بعدم التدخل عسكرياً في أي مكان من العالم ما لم يخدم هذا التدخل المصالح الأمنية و الوطنية للولايات المتحدة، كما يلزمه بتجنب توريط بلاده في مخاطر غير ضرورية على الساحة الدولية حيث تكون الأولوية في هذا المجال هي لضمان أمن و سلامة حياة مواطنيه و مواطني الدول الأخرى و تقديم الأمر أولوية على ما عداه من التزامات دولية أخرى أو أي مشاعر عطف اتجاه المشاكل التي تعاني منها دول أخرى. بناء على ذلك فإن الرئيس الذي يزعم باستمرار بأنه تدخل عسكرياً في العراق لجعل أمريكا أكثر أمناً و أماناً لم يحترم هذا الالتزام الأول الذي يحكم التدخل العسكري. فهو لم يجد أسلحة دمار شامل في العراق و لا صواريخ بعيدة المدى ادعى يوماً أن العراق يمتلكها و يخطط لاستخدامها لضرب الشواطئ الأمريكية كما أنه لم يجعل منطقة الشرق الأوسط أو حياة الأمريكيين أكثر أمناً و استقراراً نتيجة الإطاحة بنظام الرئيس العراقي صدام حسين. فالأمريكيون يقتلون بأعداد كبيرة كل يوم في العراق كما أصبحت المصالح الأمريكية أكثر عرضة للاستهداف في مناطق كثيرة من العالم. بالنتيجة أن غزو العراق لم يحقق الأمن لأمريكا بل عرضها لمزيد من المخاطر.

الاعتبار الثاني مرتبط بالقانون الدولي. إن التزامات الدول هي جزء من الحقوق و الواجبات التي تتمتع بها نتيجة الاعتراف بها ككيانات مستقلة ذات سيادة و عضو في المجموعة الدولية. و يعتبر الامتناع عن التدخل في الشؤون الداخلية لدول

أخرى واحدة من أهم الواجبات التي يجب أن تحترمها كل دولة قبلت بأن تكون جزءاً من المجتمع الدولي. لذلك من الضروري في ظل غياب سلطة دولية ملزمة تمتلك الأدوات اللازمة لفرض القانون الدولي أن تحترم كل دولة الالتزامات التي وافقت عليها و أخذت على عاتقها تنفيذها. بموجب هذه التعهدات يصبح التدخل العسكري مقبولا فقط بما يتفق مع متطلبات القانون الدولي و بما يتوافق مع روح ميثاق الأمم المتحدة. إن إدارة الرئيس بوش لم تحترم تعهداتها في هذا المضمار حيث قررت غزو العراق ضد إرادة المجموعة الدولية و في خرق واضح لميثاق الأمم المتحدة.

الاعتبار الثالث يرتبط بحقوق الإنسان و المعايير الأخلاقية الدولية النازمة لها. إن صانع القرار هو إنسان من حيث المبدأ يهتم بالقضايا الإنسانية بشكل عام كما انه يتمتع بحكم موقعه بقدرات و امكانيات للدفاع عن القضايا الإنسانية المرتبطة بالحياة و الكرامة. و هو لذلك لديه التزام أخلاقي للقيام بكل ما هو ممكن لإقامة العدالة و حماية حقوق الإنسان. هذا هو تحديداً العامل الإنساني في التدخل العسكري. لكن إذا تفحصنا السياسة الأمريكية في ضوء هذا العامل نجد أن لا علاقة لها بذلك من قريب أو بعيد. فالإدارة الأمريكية تستخدم حقوق الإنسان وسيلة و أداة لخدمة مصالحها الاستراتيجية و هي تتغاضى عن انتهاكاتها عندما تتطلب مصالحها ذلك أيضاً. إضافة إلى ذلك فإن الصور التي عرضتها شاشات التلفزة العالمية حول الانتهاكات الخطيرة التي تعرض لها العراقيون في سجن أبو غريب و غيره من المعتقلات و الإهانات التي يتعرض لها المعتقلون في غوانتانامو كلها تشير بوضوح إلى كذب الادعاءات الأمريكية المتعلقة بالدفاع عن الديمقراطية و حقوق الإنسان.

اسئلة عن النص:

- 1- ابحث عن أدوات الربط في النص الأصلي و قارنها بترجمتها العربية.
- 2- حدد معاني المفردات التالية في النص الأصلي مستعيناً بالترجمة العربية:

moral choices, scholar, identified, guide, military intervention, arena, devotion, legitimate interests, international law, common morality, considerations, verify, claims, oblige, national security, involve, undue risks, statesman, international commitments, undertaken, sympathies, trapped, endemic problems, ethnic cleansing, mass killings, oppression, military rule, massive human rights violations, civil wars.

نموذج (5)

الأصل الانجليزي:

Israel's Political Turmoil

Sir Cyril Townsend, *The Guardian*

24/08/2006

For over twenty years I have been amazed by the foolishness of Israel's senior politicians, almost irrespective of party, and have

wondered how much they really reflect the true thinking of those they represent.

They have come to believe, after being massively supplied with military equipment by the United States, that might is right and that overwhelming force can solve all their security problems. They do not believe they have to negotiate seriously with their neighbours, and do believe they can fix the future borders of the State of Israel without regard to the opinion of their neighbours. They think an absurd and hideous Wall costing over \$700m, to separate West Bank Arabs from Israel, will protect them from the wrath of the Palestinians, whom they continue to oppress with great cruelty.

For just over a month, Israel's defence forces, the fourth strongest on the globe, did battle with Hezbollah. Israeli public opinion was in favour of resolute and decisive action to remove the present and future threat of Hezbollah. Today many Israelis complain this was the worst campaign fought by their State since it was founded in May 1948.

Although Israel fought Hezbollah before its withdrawal from Lebanon six years ago, it still does not seem to understand it or to have worked out how to confront it.

Prime Minister Ehud Olmert and his Cabinet colleagues gave the public totally unrealistic expectations and are now paying the price. The defence chiefs hopelessly misjudged the use of air power against such an enemy, which does not have the military infrastructure of a state, such as military airfields, storage depots and barracks. At one stage it was announced Israeli tanks would advance to the Litani River; in reality skirmishes with Hezbollah's suicide fighters only a few miles over the border continued until the ceasefire on 14th August.

Prime Minister Ehud Olmert experienced astonishingly high poll ratings at the outbreak of hostilities but is now down to an approval rating of only 43%. Amir Peretz, the Defence Minister, should resign according to 57% of those asked in a poll. Under such pressure, he has sensibly appointed a committee of inquiry, under the Chairmanship of a former army chief. According to The Times (17th August) this inquiry will examine:- "...the military state of readiness before and during the 34-day conflict, amid allegations that it was ill-prepared, had bad intelligence about Hezbollah's capabilities and was too timid in launching a large-scale ground campaign."

The newspaper Yediot Ahronoth reported that 70% of those asked believed that Israel should not have accepted a ceasefire.

Maariv said that 53% were against a ceasefire on the given terms. The anger and frustration in Israel, where some half a million people fled their homes, was also demonstrated by a call by some two-thirds of those consulted for Sheikh Hassan Nasrallah, the leader of Hezbollah, to be assassinated even if this meant the conflict being restarted. 63% wanted Iran's nuclear facilities to be destroyed - which is alarming bearing in mind Iran's likely retaliation and the total disregard of international law. There can be no doubt that Israelis are well aware their country did not come out well from this conflict.

Ariel Sharon, when Prime Minister, boldly created the Kadima party at the end of 2005, and it gained 28 seats in the 120-seat Knesset in the last General Election. But it looks possible it might now splinter apart as quickly as it came together. It is expected that some of those who crossed over to Kadima from Likud will make their way back again. The name of Shaul Mofaz, the previous Defence Minister, is mentioned in this context.

Kadima claims to want to build on the foundations laid by Ariel Sharon, in particular his plans to remove 70,000 Jewish settlers from occupied Arab land. (170,000 would remain!) The mood in Israel is such that withdrawing settlers looks

unlikely in the foreseeable future. This raises the obvious question: what is Mr Olmert going to do as Prime Minister?

Binyamin Netanyahu, Leader of the Opposition Likud Party, has felt free to attack the Government following the passing of UNSCR 1701 and the ceasefire: "It must be said honestly, there were many failures. Failures in identifying the threat, failures in preparing to meet the threat, failures in the management of the war, failures in the management of the home front."

The present ceasefire is extremely fragile, and Hezbollah has stated baldly that it is not going to disarm. Hezbollah's fighters have concealed their weapons; the old description in Ireland was to put the pike back under the thatch. They have slipped back to their villages.

Against such a background there is a big temptation for Ehud Olmert to find an excuse to have another major go at Hezbollah.

الاضطراب السياسي في اسرائيل

سيريل تاونسند، الغارديان

2006/08/24

على مدى أكثر من عشرين عاماً، أذهلني تهور السياسيين الإسرائيليين الكبار، بغض النظر عن انتماهم الحزبي، وتساءلت عن مدى حقيقة كونهم يعكسون رأي من يمثلون.

بعد أن وفرت لهم الولايات المتحدة كمّاً هائلاً من العتاد الحربي، باتوا يعتقدون أن الجبروت هو الصواب وأن القوة العارمة قادرة على حل المشاكل الأمنية كافة. وهم لا يرون أنه يتوجب عليهم التفاوض بجدية مع جيرانهم، بل يؤمنون أنهم يستطيعون تثبيت الحدود المستقبلية لدولة إسرائيل من دون أن يابهاوا لرأي جيرانهم. وهم يعتقدون أن جداراً سخيلاً وشنيعاً يفصل عرب الضفة الغربية عن إسرائيل وتفقو كلفته 700 مليون دولار سيحميهم من غضب الفلسطينيين الذين لا يزالون يتعرضون للاضطهاد من قبلهم بكم كبير من الوحشية.

وطيلة شهر ونيف، ثابر الجيش الإسرائيلي، الذي يحتل المرتبة الرابعة عالمياً من حيث القوة، على محاربة «حزب الله»، وكان الرأي العام الإسرائيلي مؤيداً لحرب حاسمة وحازمة تزيل الخطر الحالي والمستقبلي الذي يشكله هذا الحزب. أما اليوم، فيشكو عدد كبير من الإسرائيليين معتبرين أن هذه الحرب كانت أسوأ حملة عسكرية شنتها دولتهم على الإطلاق منذ أن تأسست في العام 1948.

ومع أن إسرائيل سبق وحاربت «حزب الله» قبل انسحابها من لبنان منذ ست سنوات، فهي على ما يبدو لم تفهمه أو تتوصل إلى طريقة ناجعة لمواجهته.

وقد عرض رئيس الوزراء ايهود أولمرت وزملاؤه في مجلس الوزراء على الرأي العام توقعات بعيدة كل البعد عن الواقع، وما هم اليوم يدفعون الثمن. فالمسؤولون عن الدفاع الجوي فشلوا إلى حد بعيد في استخدام القوات الجوية لمحاربة عدو لا يتمتع ببنية عسكرية على غرار تلك الموجودة لدى أي دولة، من مطارات حربية ومستودعات تخزين وتكنات. وقد أعلن أولمرت في إحدى المراحل أن الدبابات الإسرائيلية ستقدم إلى نهر الليطاني. والواقع هو أن الاشتباكات مع المقاتلين الانتحاريين في «حزب الله» على بعد أميال قليلة من الحدود بقيت مستمرة حتى وقف إطلاق النار في 14 آب (أغسطس).

وكان رئيس الوزراء أولمرت قد جمع كما مذهلا من الأصوات المؤيدة في استطلاعات الرأي التي أجريت لدى اندلاع الحرب، لكن شعبيته تراجعت راهنا وهبطت نسبة التأييد إلى 43% فقط. ويرى 57% ممن شملهم الاستطلاع أنه يتوجب على وزير الدفاع عمير بيرتس أن يستقيل. وتحت وطأة هذه الضغوط، عمد بيرتس إلى تعيين لجنة تحقيق برئاسة قائد سابق للجيش. وبحسب ما ورد في صحيفة «ذي تايمز» البريطانية في 17 آب (أغسطس) سيتناول التحقيق النقطة التالية: «الجهوزية العسكرية للدولة قبل وخلال حرب الـ 34 يوما، وسط مزاعم عن وجود ثغرات في الاستعداد ونقص في المعلومات الاستخباراتية حول قدرات حزب الله، فضلا عن التردد الشديد في شن حملة برية واسعة النطاق».

وأفادت صحيفة «يديعوت أحرونوت» أن 70% ممن شملهم الاستطلاع يرون أنه كان يتوجب على إسرائيل ألا تقبل بوقف إطلاق النار. أما «معاريف» فنقلت أن

53% اعترضوا على وقف إطلاق النار بصيغته الحالية. وقد انعكس الغضب والإحباط في إسرائيل، حيث اضطر حوالي نصف مليون مواطن إلى ترك منازلهم والهرب، من خلال مطالبة زهاء ثلثي المستطلعين باغتيال زعيم «حزب الله»، السيد حسن نصرالله، حتى لو أدى ذلك إلى إشعال فتيل الحرب مجدداً. كما عثر 63% ممن شملهم الاستطلاع عن رغبتهم في تدمير المنشآت النووية الإيرانية، وهو أمر مثير للقلق إذا أخذنا بالحسبان الانتقام الإيراني الممكن والتجاهل التام للقانون الدولي. وما من شك أبداً في أن الإسرائيليين يدركون تماماً أن بلادهم لم تبَل حسناً في الحرب.

وكان أرييل شارون قد أطلق بجرأة حزب «كديما» في نهاية العام 2005، أثناء تبوؤه منصب رئيس مجلس الوزراء، وفاز حزبه بـ28 مقعداً من أصل 120 في الكنيست في الانتخابات العامة الأخيرة. ولكن يبدو أن الحزب مُهدّد بالتفكك بالسرعة نفسها التي شهدت قيامه، ومن المتوقع أن يعود الذين انضوا تحت لواء الحزب أدراجهم إلى المكان الذي أتوا منه، ويتردّد اسم شاؤول موفاز، وزير الدفاع السابق، في سياق هذه العملية.

يدعي حزب كديما عزمه على إرساء الأسس التي وضعها أرييل شارون، وخصوصاً في ما يتعلق بخطة القائمة على نقل 70 ألف مستوطن يهودي من الأراضي العربية المحتلة (والحفاظ على 170 ألف مستوطن في أماكن وجودهم)، ويوحي الجو العام في إسرائيل بأن عملية نقل المستوطنين مستبعدة في المستقبل القريب، ما يدعو إلى التساؤل وطرح سؤال منطقي حول ما سيفعله أولمرت بصفته رئيساً للوزراء.

وقد سمح رئيس حزب الليكود المعارض، بنيامين نتنياهو، لنفسه بانتقاد الحكومة عقب إصدار قرار مجلس الأمن رقم 1701 وتنفيذ وقف إطلاق النار، وصرح قائلا: «لا بد من القول صراحة أن أخطاء كثيرة حصلت: أخطاء في رصد الخطر وأخطاء في طريقة الاستعداد لمواجهة الخطر، وأخطاء في إدارة الحرب وأخطاء في إدارة الجبهة الداخلية».

إن وقف إطلاق النار الحالي في غاية الهشاشة وقد أعلن «حزب الله» بكل جراءة أنه لن ينزع سلاحه، فمقاتلو الحزب أخفوا أسلحتهم؛ وبحسب المقولة الأيرلندية القديمة، عادت الحية لتختبئ تحت التبن، وعاد المقاتلون وتسللوا إلى قراهم.

على خلفية مماثلة، نرى أن اليهود أولمرت يتوق إلى إيجاد عذر لتبرير مواجهة كبيرة أخرى مع «حزب الله».

اسئلة عن النص:

- 1- حدد ثلاث جمل استخدم فيها الحاضر التام في النص الأصلي و قارنها بترجمتها العربية.
- 2- حدد ثلاث جمل استخدم فيها الماضي التام في النص الأصلي و قارنها بترجمتها العربية.
- 3- حدد معاني العبارات التالية في النص الأصلي مستعينا بالترجمة العربية:

Ceasefire, given terms, frustration, fled, demonstrated, consulted, assassinate, nuclear facilities, alarming, retaliation, general election, splinter apart, crossed over.

نموذج (6)

الأصل الانجليزي:

Consequences of the Lebanon war

Patrick Seale, *Gulf News*

18/08/2006

Who won and who lost? It would appear that the Tehran-Damascus-Hezbollah axis has emerged more confident from the Lebanon war, while the United States and Israel look politically weaker, morally tarnished and acutely vulnerable to guerrilla warfare.

Israel's war on Lebanon was not a "just war". The capture of two Israeli soldiers on July 12 which Hezbollah hoped to

exchange for Lebanese prisoners held in Israeli jails for nearly 30 years cannot serve to justify the destruction of Lebanon.

Brutal, wanton and hugely disproportionate, the war was pre-planned with Washington. It was waged to destroy Hezbollah and install in Beirut a government submissive to Israel and the United States. But it was also waged to weaken Hezbollah's sponsors, Iran and Syria, and perhaps expose them to attack in turn. It has achieved the exact opposite.

An immediate consequence of the war has been to increase the stature of Hezbollah and its charismatic leader, Hassan Nasrallah.

Although its fighters must soon withdraw from the border areas as Israel moves out and the Lebanese army and a beefed up Unifil gradually move in it is highly unlikely that Hezbollah, as an armed political movement, will be dismantled, or even disarmed at least not in the near future.

Israel has failed to do the job and neither the Lebanese government nor anyone else is willing or able to attempt it.

Hezbollah's domestic opponents will seek to blame it for having provoked the massive damage to Lebanon's infrastructure and the killing of over one thousand civilians.

A million refugees are now streaming home in deplorable conditions to their shattered towns and villages.

As the main representative of a community of some 1.4 million people, Hezbollah is bound to play a major role in rebuilding southern Lebanon, the Beka'a valley and the southern suburbs of Beirut, devastated by Israeli bombardment.

Far from reining in Hezbollah as Israel and the United States demand the Shiite community may now demand a greater say in the country's affairs. Lebanon's institutions may have to be adjusted to take account of the new realities of power.

Another consequence of the war is that it has sharply reduced the likelihood of an attack on Iran or Syria. Washington's neocons, such as Michael Ledeen of the American Enterprise Institute, William Kristol of the Weekly Standard and other such fanatics, continue to call stridently for the violent overthrow of the regimes in Damascus and Tehran, but neither Israel nor the US would seem to have the stomach for it.

Deterrent capability

Before the Lebanon war, Iran may have hesitated about the wisdom of building a nuclear weapon. Today, it must surely be racing to acquire the deterrent capability which nuclear weapons can provide. In the aftermath of the Lebanon war, it is hard to see how, or by whom, Iran's nuclear programme could be interrupted, let alone ended.

The American press continues to speculate about an American strike to destroy Iran's facilities, but most experts rule out any such dangerous adventure. US President George W. Bush may be ignorant and stubborn, but he is not insane.

Yet another result of the war has been to bring Syria in from the cold. Politicians and commentators in the US and Europe and even Israel's Defence Minister Amir Peretz have remarked on the need to involve Syria in any permanent settlement of the region's conflicts.

The war has brought to international attention the two preconditions for a lasting peace in Lebanon. They are the return of the Golan to Syria and the recognition that Syria has a legitimate interest in preventing a hostile foreign power

establishing its influence over Lebanon, as this would constitute an intolerable threat to Syria's national security.

Bush and President Jacques Chirac of France have, for their different reasons, attempted to exclude Syria altogether from Lebanese affairs.

Israel's Foreign Minister Tsipi Livni has followed suit, saying this week that "Syria must understand that Lebanon is taking off ... in a different direction without them".

These are vain hopes, contradicted by the situation on the ground. It is Israel that must keep out of Lebanese affairs, and stay out.

Prime Minister Ehud Olmert's "unilateralism" inherited from Ariel Sharon but which he hoped to extend is another victim of the conflict.

The unilateral withdrawal from Gaza, while maintaining Israel's cruel siege, has led to missile attacks on Israeli towns in the Negev.

The attempt to destroy the democratically-elected Hamas government has led to something like war. Although some 200

Palestinians have been killed in the last six weeks, there is no sign that Hamas is ready to surrender.

Meanwhile Olmert's so-called "convergence plan" a land grab on the West Bank without reference to, or negotiations with, the Palestinians seems moribund.

Will the Olmert government fall? Will the debacle benefit the Right or the Left? Will the chief of staff, Air Force General Dan Halutz, be forced to go, as several Israeli commentators are demanding?

There is as yet no sign that Israel is ready to confront the real questions raised by the Lebanon war. Will it press on with its West Bank expansion and refuse to withdraw from the Golan, or will it be persuaded to negotiate with the Palestinians and Syria on the basis of the land-for-peace formula of Security Council Resolution 242 of 1967?

Will it seek to restore its absolute military superiority over the entire Arab region or will it accept some form of a balance of power or at least a balance of deterrence?

The answer to these questions will determine whether Israel can live in peace and security in the region or whether it will

have to face a more or less permanent insurrection by its helpless neighbours.

How long will the present truce last? A lot will depend on whether opinion in Washington and Israel is ready to accept and digest the geopolitical lessons of the war.

الترجمة العربية:

الدروس الجيو-سياسية من حرب لبنان

باتريك سيل، غلف نيوز

2006/08/18

في التساؤل عن الرابع والخاسر في حرب لبنان يبدو أن محور طهران - دمشق - «حزب الله» خرج أكثر ثقة وارتياحاً في حين بدت أميركا وإسرائيل أضعف على الصعيدين السياسي والمعنوي، وتشكوان من هشاشة فعلية على صعيد حرب العصابات.

والواقع أن حرب إسرائيل على لبنان لم تكن «حرباً عادلة». فاختطاف جنديين إسرائيليين يوم 12 تموز (يوليو) كان يأمل «حزب الله» بمبادلتها بسجناء لبنانيين يقعون في السجون الإسرائيلية منذ ثلاثين سنة لا يمكن أن يبرر تدمير لبنان.

لقد كانت هذه الحرب الوحشية المفرطة في عدم تناسبها معدة سلفاً مع واشنطن. وكان الغرض منها القضاء على «حزب الله» وإقامة حكومة لبنانية تخضع لإسرائيل وأميركا. وكان الغرض منها أيضاً إضعاف حليفي «حزب الله» إيران وسورية وربما تعريضهما لهجوم. وإذا بها تحقق العكس تماماً.

وكان من النتائج الفورية لهذه الحرب أن ازدادت شعبية «حزب الله» وزعيمه السيد حسن نصرالله. ومع أن مقاتليه سوف ينسحبون قريباً من منطقة الحدود - في الوقت الذي تنسحب فيه إسرائيل ويحل الجيش اللبناني محلها تدريجياً، مدعوماً بقوات المراقبة الدولية - إلا أنه من المستبعد جداً أن يفكك «حزب الله» كحركة سياسية مسلحة أو أن يُجرد من سلاحه في المستقبل القريب. فلقد أخفقت إسرائيل في أداء هذه المهمة ولن تستطيع الحكومة اللبنانية أو أي جهة أخرى محاولة تحقيق ذلك.

وقد يسعى خصوم «حزب الله» في الداخل إلى توجيه اللوم له لتسببه في إلحاق الكثير من الأذى بالبنية التحتية اللبنانية وفي قتل ما يزيد عن ألف مدني. فهناك مليون نازح يعودون الآن إلى ديارهم وقراهم المدمرة.

ومن المفروض أن يلعب «حزب الله»، بوصفه ممثلاً لطائفة تعد مليون واربعمائة ألف نسمة، دوراً رئيسياً في إعادة إعمار جنوب لبنان ووادي البقاع وضواحي بيروت الجنوبية التي دمرتها الغارات والمدفعية الإسرائيلية.

وأما الطائفة الشيعية، فبدلاً من أن تلجم «حزب الله» - كما تطالبها إسرائيل وأميركا بذلك - فإنها سوف تطالب بدور أكبر له في إدارة شؤون الدولة. وقد يتطلب الأمر إعادة النظر في المؤسسات اللبنانية بحيث تؤخذ الوقائع الجديدة في الاعتبار.

ولا شك أن من نتائج حرب لبنان تضاول احتمال شن أي هجوم على إيران أو سورية. فالمحافظون الجدد في واشنطن أمثال مايكل لدين ووليام كريستول وغيرهما من المتعصبين ما زالوا يدعون بشراسة لقلب نظامي الحكم في طهران ودمشق بالقوة. ولكن لا إسرائيل ولا أميركا تملكان الجرأة على ذلك.

القدرة الرادعة

وقد تكون إيران قبل حرب لبنان تشكك إلى حد ما في الحكمة من امتلاك السلاح النووي. ولكنها اليوم ستسعى حثيثا للحصول على هذه القدرة الردعية التي يمكن أن يوفرها السلاح النووي. ومن الصعب أن نتصور، بعد حرب لبنان، كيف يمكن أن يوقف برنامج إيران النووي أو يلغى، ومن يجرؤ على ذلك.

وما زالت الصحافة الأميركية تتساءل عن إمكانية توجيه ضربة للمرافق الإيرانية ولكن معظم الخبراء يستبعدون حصول هذه المغامرة الخطرة. فقد يكون الرئيس جورج بوش جاهلا أو عنيدا ولكنه ليس مجنونا.

ومن نتائج حرب لبنان أيضا إعادة سورية إلى اللعبة بعد أن جرى استبعادها. فالسياسيون والمراقبون في أميركا وأوروبا - بل وحتى وزير الدفاع الإسرائيلي عمير بيرتس - نوهوا بالحاجة إلى إدخال سورية في أي تسوية دائمة لنزاعات المنطقة. وفتت الحرب الانتباه إلى الشرطين المسبقين للسلام الدائم في لبنان، وهما إعادة الجولان إلى سورية والاعتراف لها بمصلحة مشروعة في منع أي دولة معادية من بسط نفوذها في لبنان، الأمر الذي يشكل تهديدا مرفوضا لأمن سورية القومي.

وحاول الرئيس بوش والرئيس شيراك، كل منهما لأسباب مختلفة، أن يخرجاً سورية كلياً من الشؤون الخاصة بلبنان. وتبعتهما تسيبي ليفني وزيرة خارجية إسرائيل إذ قالت هذا الأسبوع «أن على سورية أن تفهم أن لبنان ينطلق باتجاه مختلف، بعيداً عنها». وهذه الآمال عقيمة لأنها تتناقض مع الواقع على الأرض، والأصح هو القول إن على إسرائيل ألا تتدخل في الشؤون اللبنانية وأن تبقى خارجاً.

وأما في إسرائيل فالطبقة السياسية غارقة في البحث عن كبش فداء لحرب أدت إلى المساس بسمعتها كدولة لا يمكن أن تقهر عسكرياً والمساس بقدرتها الردعية. ولعلها ذاقَت عينة مما تعانيه أميركا في العراق.

وهناك بالإضافة إلى ذلك عواقب أخرى للحرب على المدى البعيد ما زال الرأي العام الإسرائيلي لم يدركها بعد، كالتساؤل عن الغرض من جدار العزل الباهظ التكاليف الذي وصفته محكمة العدل الدولية في لاهاي بأنه غير قانوني، والذي يجعل حياة الفلسطينيين في غاية البؤس، ما دامت الصواريخ تستطيع التحليق من فوقه.

ومن نتائج الحرب أيضاً نزعة إيهود أولمرت لاتخاذ قرارات الانسحابات الأحادية الجانب التي ورثها عن شارون وكان يأمل بتوسيعها، والتي أصبحت إحدى ضحايا الحرب. فالانسحاب الانفرادي من غزة، مع بقاء الحصار القاسي عليها أدى إلى توجيه الصواريخ إلى المدن الإسرائيلية في النقب. كما أدت محاولة نسف حكومة «حماس» الديمقراطية إلى حالة تشبه الحرب. ومع أن هناك نحو 200 فلسطيني قتلوا خلال الأسابيع الستة الأخيرة فليس هناك ما يشير إلى أن «حماس» مستعدة للاستسلام. وأما مشروع أولمرت المسمى بخطة التجميع والقاضي بالاستيلاء على

أراض في الضفة الغربية من دون الرجوع أو التفاوض مع الفلسطينيين فيبدو أنه في طريقه إلى الزوال.

ويدور التساؤل في إسرائيل حول سقوط حكومة أولمرت وما إذا كان الفشل العسكري سوف يكون لصالح اليمين أم اليسار، وما إذا كان رئيس الأركان الجنرال دان هالوتس سوف يضطر إلى الاستقالة كما طالب بذلك العديد من المعلقين الإسرائيليين. فقاته لم تستطع خلال 34 يوما إيقاف سيل صواريخ «حزب الله» في حين ارتكبت قواته الجوية جرائم حرب.

ولا يبدو حتى الآن ما يشير إلى أن إسرائيل مستعدة لمواجهة الأسئلة الحقيقية التي طرحتها حرب لبنان. فهل تمضي في التوسع في الضفة الغربية وترفض الانسحاب من الجولان أم تقتنع بضرورة التفاوض مع الفلسطينيين وسورية على أساس صيغة الأرض مقابل السلام التي تضمنها قرار مجلس الأمن 242 لعام 1967؟ وهل ستسعى إلى بسط نفوذها العسكري على سائر المنطقة العربية أم تقبل بنوع من توازن القوة أو على الأقل توازن الردع؟

لعل الإجابة على هذه التساؤلات هي التي ستحدد ما إذا كانت إسرائيل تستطيع العيش بسلام وأمن في المنطقة أم أن عليها أن تواجه حركات التمرد والعصيان الدائمة من جانب جيرانها السني الطالع.

وأما الدول الغربية فقد كان لموقفها من الأزمة أسوأ الأثر. فأميركا فازت بقسط وافر من الكراهية والاحتقار، إذ بتأجيلها وقف إطلاق النار طوال شهر حتى تتمكن إسرائيل من إكمال مهمتها، وجهت ضربة قاتلة لمجلس الأمن، فاثارت غضب الأمين العام كوفي أنان.

فقلما حظي زعيم عالمي بقدر من السخرية التي حظي بها الرئيس جورج بوش حين أكد أن الأزمات العديدة، سواء في أفغانستان أم في العراق أم في لبنان أو غزة، ما هي سوى صراع بين الإرهاب والحرية. ذلك أن مفهومه للحرية لم يكن مردوده سوى الموت، وهو حين استخدم عبارة «الفاشية الإسلامية» التي استعارها من الليكوديين، أثار استنكار العالم الإسلامي، وطالبه خمسون نائباً في البرلمان المصري بالاعتذار. وهو بكل أسف ليس الزعيم القادر على تصور خطة جريئة لسلام شامل أو على تطبيق مثل هذه الخطة في منطقة هي أحوج ما تكون إليها.

وأما في بريطانيا فقد عادت سياسة توني بلير بالتبعية العمياء لأميركا عليه بالخزي والعار وأدت سياسته إلى تعريض البلاد للخطر نتيجة لموقف غاضب من طرف جزء من السكان المسلمين.

وأما فرنسا فكان موقفها أفضل بكثير. فرغم أنها بدأت بالوقوف إلى جانب أميركا إلا أنها سارعت إلى تصحيح الهدف كي تأخذ بالاعتبار الاعتراضات اللبنانية والعربية، الأمر الذي أتاح لها أن تفاوض على الحل الوسط الأخير مع أميركا الذي انتهى إلى تبني قرار مجلس الأمن رقم 1701.

وختاماً نتساءل إلى أي أمد تستمر الهدنة الحالية؟ ذلك يتوقف على مدى استعداد واشنطن وإسرائيل لتقبل الدروس الجيو - سياسية للحرب وهضمها.

The Guns of August

Richard Holbrooke, *The Washington Post*

10/08/2006

Two full-blown crises, in Lebanon and Iraq, are merging into a single emergency. A chain reaction could spread quickly almost anywhere between Cairo and Bombay. Turkey is talking openly of invading northern Iraq to deal with Kurdish terrorists based there. Syria could easily get pulled into the war in southern Lebanon. Egypt and Saudi Arabia are under pressure from jihadists to support Hezbollah, even though the governments in Cairo and Riyadh hate that organization. Afghanistan accuses Pakistan of giving shelter to al-Qaeda and the Taliban; there is constant fighting on both sides of that border. NATO's own war in Afghanistan is not going well. India talks of taking punitive action against Pakistan for allegedly being behind the Bombay bombings. Uzbekistan is a repressive dictatorship with a growing Islamic resistance.

This combination of combustible elements poses the greatest threat to global stability since the 1962 Cuban missile crisis, history's only nuclear superpower confrontation. The Cuba crisis, although immensely dangerous, was comparatively simple: It came down to two leaders and no war. In 13 days of brilliant diplomacy, John F. Kennedy induced Nikita Khrushchev to remove Soviet missiles from Cuba.

Kennedy was deeply influenced by Barbara Tuchman's classic, "The Guns of August," which recounted how a seemingly isolated event 92 summers ago -- an assassination in Sarajevo by a Serb terrorist -- set off a chain reaction that led in just a few weeks to World War I. There are vast differences between that August and this one. But Tuchman ended her book with a sentence that resonates in this summer of crisis: "The nations were caught in a trap, a trap made during the first thirty days out of battles that failed to be decisive, a trap from which there was, and has been, no exit."

Preventing just such a trap must be the highest priority of American policy. Unfortunately, there is little public sign that the president and his top advisers recognize how close we are to a chain reaction, or that they have any larger strategy beyond tactical actions.

American support for Israel is essential, as it has been since the time of Truman; if Washington abandoned Jerusalem, the very existence of the Jewish state could be jeopardized, and the world crisis whose early phase we are now in would quickly get far worse. The United States must continue to make clear that it is ready to come to Israel's defense, both with American diplomacy and, as necessary, with military equipment.

But the United States must also understand, and deal with, the wider consequences of its own actions and public statements, which have caused an unprecedented decline in America's position in much of the world and are provoking dangerous new anti-American coalitions and encouraging a new generation of terrorists. American disengagement from active Middle East diplomacy since 2001 has led to greater violence and a decline in U.S. influence. Others have been eager to fill the vacuum. (Note the sudden emergence of France as a key player in the current burst of diplomacy).

American policy has had the unintended, but entirely predictable, effect of pushing our enemies closer together. Throughout the region, Sunnis and Shiites have put aside their hatred of each other just long enough to join in shaking their fists -- or doing worse -- at the United States and Israel.

Meanwhile, in Baghdad, our troops are coming under attack by both sides -- Shiite militias and Sunni insurgents. If this continues, the U.S. presence in Baghdad has no future.

President Bush owes it to the nation, and especially the troops who risk their lives every day, to reexamine his policies. For starters, he should redeploy some U.S. troops into the safer northern areas of Iraq to serve as a buffer between the increasingly agitated Turks and the restive, independence-minded Kurds. Given the new situation, such a redeployment to Kurdish areas and a phased drawdown elsewhere -- with no final decision yet as to a full withdrawal from Iraq -- is fully justified. At the same time, we should send more troops to Afghanistan, where the situation has deteriorated even as the Pentagon is reducing U.S. troop levels -- which is read in the region as a sign of declining U.S. interest in Afghanistan.

On the diplomatic front, the United States cannot abandon the field to other nations (not even France!) or the United Nations. Every secretary of state from Henry Kissinger to Warren Christopher and Madeleine Albright negotiated with Syria, including those Republican icons George Shultz and James Baker. Instead, administration officials refuse direct talks and

say publicly, "Syria knows what it must do" -- a statement that denies the very point of diplomacy.

The same is true of talks with Iran, although these would be more difficult. Why has the world's leading nation stood aside for over five years and allowed the international dialogue with Tehran to be conducted by Europeans, the Chinese and the United Nations?

Containing the violence must be Washington's first priority. Finding a stable and secure solution that protects Israel must follow. Then must come the unwinding of America's disastrous entanglement in Iraq in a manner that is not a complete humiliation and does not lead to even greater turmoil. All of this will take sustained high-level diplomacy -- precisely what the American administration has avoided in the Middle East. Washington has, or at least used to have, leverage over the more moderate Arab states; it should use it again.

And we must be ready for unexpected problems that will test us; they could come in Turkey, Pakistan, Egypt, Jordan or even Somalia -- but one thing seems sure: They will come. Without a new, comprehensive strategy based on our most urgent national security needs -- as opposed to a muddled version of

Wilsonianism -- this crisis is almost certain to worsen and spread.

الترجمة العربية:

مدافع آب

ريتشارد هولبروك، الواشنطن بوست

2006/08/10

لا ريب في أن حربي لبنان والعراق على وشك التحول إلى أزمة واحدة، و سلسلة من ردود الافعال على وشك الظهور في العالم الاسلامي من القاهرة إلى بومباي. والوضع في الشرق الاوسط على حافة الانفجار. فتركيا تتحدث بصراحة عن خطط لاجتياح شمال العراق وحل الأزمة الكردية. وسورية قد تنزلق إلى حلبة الحرب بجنوب لبنان. وتعاني مصر والسعودية من ضغوط الاسلاميين الذين يطالبون بحكوماتهم بدعم «حزب الله». وتتهم أفغانستان باكستان بإيواء أعضاء من «القاعدة» و «طالبان». وتنوي الهند معاقبة باكستان بزعم انها وراء تفجيرات بومباي.

وشأن فوضى الشرق الاوسط والعالم الاسلامي شأن الجمر تحت الرماد. فاشتعال الشرق الاوسط قد يهدد الاستقرار العالمي. ولم يشهد العالم تهديداً مماثلاً منذ أزمة الصواريخ الكوبية في 1962، المواجهة النووية الوحيدة بين القوى العظمى. وعلى رغم خطورتها، كانت الأزمة الكوبية بسيطة. فهي دارت بين قائدين فضلا

الدبلوماسية على الحرب. ونجح جون كينيدي في حمل نيكيتا خروتشيف في إزالة الصواريخ السوفياتية من كوبا. والحق أن كينيدي كان متأثراً برواية باربرة توشمان "مدافع أب" التي لاحظت كيف ان حادثة صغيرة - عملية اغتيال قام بها اراهابي صربي قبل 92 عاما - ادت إلى اشعال الحرب العالمية الاولى، بعد سلسلة من ردود الافعال التي فشل أطراف النزاع في حسمها في الشهر الاول من الحرب. على السياسة الأميركية تفادي مثل هذا المنزلق الخطر. ولكن، مع الأسف، لم يدرك الرئيس الاميركي وكبار مستشاريه خطورة الوضع، ولم يقدموا استراتيجية حل تتجاوز الأعمال الحربية التكتيكية.

على واشنطن الدفاع عن إسرائيل دبلوماسياً أو عسكرياً، إذا اقتضى الأمر؛ لكن في المقابل عليها إدراك مسؤوليتها عن تدهور مكانة الولايات المتحدة في العالم. لقد أدى غياب الولايات المتحدة عن دبلوماسية الشرق الأوسط، منذ عام 2001، إلى تنامي الحركات الارهابية، وضعف النفوذ الأميركي، ما حمل فرنسا على التقدم لملء الفراغ على الساحة الدولية. كما أسهمت السياسة الأميركية في توحيد أعدائها وتكتلهم في جبهة واحدة. فتناسى السنة والشيعية العداء بينهم وتوحدوا في مواجهة الولايات المتحدة وإسرائيل.

يجدر بالرئيس بوش إعادة تقييم سياساته، ونقل القوات الأميركية إلى المناطق العراقية الآمنة في الشمال، والحوول دون مهاجمة الأتراك للأكراد الساعين إلى الاستقلال. وعلى الإدارة الأميركية تعزيز قواتها في أفغانستان، عوض تقليصها. ولا يسع الولايات المتحدة التخلي عن موقعها لمصلحة الدول الأخرى أو الأمم المتحدة. فوزراء الخارجية الأميركيون السابقون تفاوضوا مع سورية، بدءاً بهنري كيسينجر ووارن كريستوفر إلى أبرز الجمهوريين مثل جورج شولتز وجيمس بيكر، ومادلين أولبرايت الديمقراطية. الأمر نفسه يسري على المحادثات مع

إيران، التي تبدو أصعب بعض الشيء. لماذا وقفت الدولة الأولى في العالم على الحياد لأكثر من خمس سنوات، وأتاحت الفرصة للأوروبيين والصينيين والأمم المتحدة أن يتولوا الحوار الدولي مع طهران؟

على واشنطن أن تعطي الأولوية لاحتواء العنف، وأن تجد بعد ذلك حلاً دائماً لأمن إسرائيل. وبعدها، عليها أن تفك ارتباطها الكارثي في العراق، من غير إذلال، على أن لا يؤدي ذلك إلى غرق العراق في دوامة عنف أفظع. وتتطلب هذه الأهداف دبلوماسية عالية المستوى. وهو ما تفادته الإدارة الأميركية في الشرق الأوسط. إن لواشنطن نفوذ قوي لدى الدول العربية المعتدلة وعليها أن تستخدمه. وعليها أن نعد العدة للمشكلات المفاجئة التي تنتظرنا، والتي يمكن أن تصادفها في تركيا أو باكستان أو مصر أو الأردن أو الصومال. وهي آتية لا محالة. ولا شك في أن هذه الأزمات توشك على التفاقم والانتشار، في ظل غياب استراتيجية شاملة قائمة على حاجتنا الأمنية القومية الطارئة، وتكون مختلفة عن الشكل المشوش للسياسة الويلسونية.

Turning to the U.N., Again

Richard Holbrooke, *The Washington Post*

28/06/2006

In a little-noticed announcement in President Bush's news conference on June 14, the day he returned from Iraq, he said that he would send two personal emissaries to New York to consult with U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan on the political and economic future of Iraq. The next day, still with remarkably little public attention, Philip Zelikow, the counselor of the State Department, and Deputy Treasury Secretary Robert Kimmitt met with Annan and his deputy, Mark Malloch Brown, at the secretary general's Sutton Place residence. There was no one else present.

The two presidential envoys asked Annan to use his unique "convening powers" to help organize international meetings that would lead (by this fall, the Americans hope) to the unveiling of a new "Iraq Compact" -- an agreement between the Iraqi government and major international donors that would

commit Baghdad to a series of political and economic reforms in return for substantially more international aid. (Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki called Annan the same day to make an identical request).

This is a good idea -- and quite similar to suggestions from many administration critics. With the battle for Baghdad raging, it remains to be seen whether an Iraq Compact will work -- or even get off the ground -- but it is certainly an important step in the right direction for Iraq and for American policy.

For Annan and the United Nations, Bush's request poses an ironic and difficult challenge. On the one hand, the administration is asking for help on the worst problem it faces, acknowledging, however belatedly and reluctantly, that once again, the United Nations is not only relevant but at times indispensable to the United States. On the other hand, the resentment among the majority of U.N. member states over the way the institution has been treated recently, especially by Washington's current U.N. ambassador, makes any effort to get the United Nations to help the United States far more difficult.

How to treat the United Nations has been a particular dilemma for President Bush, since opponents of the organization form an important part of the administration's core constituency. Internal disagreements over the past five years about whether to support it or abandon it, to use it or bypass it, have both weakened the organization and led to reduced U.S. influence even as more and more intractable issues are thrown into its hands.

The United Nations is facing major budgetary problems caused primarily by American insistence on a six-month budget cycle instead of the normal two-year cycle. It must deal with growing shortfalls in the U.S. contribution to peacekeeping funding, despite Washington's calls for more peacekeepers in Darfur and elsewhere. And it is confronted by a deadlock over rebuilding the headquarters complex in New York -- a deadlock whose main cause is the administration's failure to push Congress for proper funding. (This is particularly difficult to understand, since the U.N. signature building, its 38-story East River office tower -- built in 1950 and never subject to modern safety codes -- is widely acknowledged to be the major building in New York most vulnerable to a terrorist attack. For example, when

the president visits it, the Secret Service closes down FDR Drive beneath it -- but what about the rest of the time?).

Still, even though Annan and the world body have been diminished by Washington, he and his colleagues simply cannot refuse to help on the Iraq matter; it is their responsibility as international civil servants to go where the problems are worst and then to do their best. And, on the basis of private talks with Annan, Malloch Brown and administration officials, I have no doubt that they intend to do just that. In fact, Malloch Brown has already agreed to travel to Baghdad very soon for preliminary meetings that the United Nations and the United States hope will culminate later this year in a high-level conference in the region. As Annan moves into his last six months as secretary general, this would be the right way to end a turbulent decade in that office -- with a genuine contribution to the cause of peace in Iraq.

It is, however, impossible not to note the irony and the implications of what has happened in the past two weeks between Washington and the United Nations. Once again, an administration that has underfunded, undersupported and undermined the United Nations has turned to it, almost in desperation, for help.

The lesson should be clear: Despite the enormously self-destructive actions of many other member states, especially the group of developing nations called the G-77, the United Nations still serves U.S. foreign policy interests in many important ways. Not only Iraq but also Iran, Darfur, Afghanistan and the difficult negotiations just started over Kosovo's final status -- all issues of vital importance to the United States -- have now ended up in the United Nations. To weaken this institution further, as has happened in recent years, serves no clear American national security interest. To strengthen it would make it more valuable to the United States and to every nation that seeks conflict resolution, stability and economic progress. With the maneuvering over the selection of Annan's successor underway, it is time for Washington -- and this must include Congress -- to put behind it a sorry period of confusion and offer the United Nations more support, both financial and political, in return for the things it needs in Iraq and elsewhere.

التحول إلى الأمم المتحدة مرة أخرى

ريتشارد هولبروك، الواشنطن بوست

2006/06/28

في إعلان لم يُلاحظ كثيرا في مؤتمر الرئيس بوش الصحفي في الرابع عشر من يونيو الماضي، أي يوم عودته من العراق، قال: إنه سيرسل مبعوثين شخصيين إلى نيويورك (حيث مقر الأمم المتحدة) للتشاور مع الأمين العام للأمم المتحدة كوفي أنان حول المستقبل السياسي والاقتصادي للعراق. وفي اليوم التالي - وما زال الأمر غير ملحوظ كثيرا أو مهتما به اهتماما عاما - التقى فيليب زيليكو، المستشار بالخارجية الأميركية، ونائب وزير الخزانة الأميركية، روبرت كيमित، مع أنان ونائبه، مارك ماللوخ براون، في مقر إقامة الأمين العام للأمم المتحدة ولم يكن هناك أحد آخر حاضرا.

وقد طلب المبعوثان الرئاسيان من أنان استخدام "مهاراته الفذة في عقد الاجتماعات" في المساعدة في تنظيم اجتماعات دولية تفضي (بحلول هذا الخريف، كما يأمل الأميركيون) إلى كشف النقاب عن "ميثاق جديد للعراق" - اتفاق بين الحكومة العراقية وكبار المانحين الدوليين يلزم بغداد بسلسلة من الإصلاحات السياسية والاقتصادية مقابل مزيد من المساعدات الدولية الجوهرية (وقد اتصل رئيس الوزراء العراقي نوري المالكي بأنان في نفس اليوم ليطلب طلبا مماثلا). وهذه فكرة جيدة - ومشابهة تماما للاقتراحات التي قدمها الكثير من منتقدي الإدارة الأميركية. ومع احتدام معركة بغداد، مازال ينتظر رؤية ما إذا كان "ميثاق العراق"

سينجح ويجدي نفعاً - أو حتى يخفق ويفشل - ولكنها بالتأكيد خطوة مهمة في المسار الصحيح بالنسبة للعراق وكذلك للسياسة الأميركية.

وبالنسبة لأنان والأمم المتحدة، يشكل طلب بوش تحدياً ساخراً وصعباً فمن ناحية، فإن الإدارة الأميركية تطلب المساعدة في أسوأ مشكلة تواجهها، معترفة - وإن كان متأخراً وعلى مضض، مرة أخرى - بأن الأمم المتحدة ليست فقط ذات الصلة ولكن أيضاً لا غنى عنها في بعض الأوقات بالنسبة للولايات المتحدة. ومن ناحية أخرى، فإن مشاعر الكراهية والاستياء بين أغلبية الدول الأعضاء في الأمم المتحدة حول الطريقة التي عوملت بها المنظمة مؤخراً، وخصوصاً من سفير واشنطن ومندوبيها الحالي لدى الأمم المتحدة، تجعل أي جهد أو محاولة لجعل الأمم المتحدة تساعد الولايات المتحدة أمراً أكثر صعوبة.

ومسألة كيفية معاملة الأمم المتحدة كانت معضلة خاصة بالنسبة للرئيس بوش، طالما أن معارضي المنظمة يشكلون جزءاً مهماً من قلب الإدارة الأميركية، فالخلافات الداخلية على مدى الخمس سنوات الماضية حول ما إذا كان يجب دعم المنظمة أو التخلي عنها، وحول استخدامها أو الالتفاف عليها وتجاوزها، أضعفت المنظمة وأدت إلى تأثير أميركي منخفض على السواء حتى في الوقت الذي يوضع فيه المزيد والمزيد من المسائل المعقدة بين يديها.

إن الأمم المتحدة تواجه مشاكل كبرى في الميزانية سببها أساساً إصرار أميركا على دورة ميزانية لستة أشهر بدلاً من دورة ميزانية طبيعية لستينين. وعلى الأمم المتحدة أن تتعامل مع النقص المتزايد في الإسهام الأميركي في تمويل عمليات حفظ السلام، بالرغم من دعاوي واشنطن لمزيد من قوات حفظ السلام في دارفور وأماكن أخرى كما أنها تواجه ورطة وإخفاق تام حول إعادة بناء مجمع المقر في

نيويورك - وهي الورطة التي سببها فشل الإدارة الأميركية في دفع الكونغرس إلى تمويل مناسب.

ومع ذلك، وحتى بالرغم من أن أنان والمنظمة العالمية قد تم التقليل من شأنهما من قبل واشنطن، إلا أنه هو وزملاؤه لا يمكنهم ببساطة أن يرفضوا المساعدة في موضوع العراق؛ فمن مسئوليتهم كموظفين مدنيين دوليين أن يذهبوا إلى حيث تكون المشاكل ثم بذل قصارى جهدهم لحلها. وعلى أساس محادثات خاصة مع أنان، ليس لدي شك في أن ماللوك براون ومسؤولي الإدارة الأميركية ينوون فعل ذلك تماما. وفي الواقع، فإنه قد وافق بالفعل على السفر إلى بغداد قريبا جدا لاجتماعات تمهيدية تأمل الأمم المتحدة والولايات المتحدة في أنها ستتوج في وقت لاحق من هذا العام في مؤتمر ذي مستوى عال في المنطقة. وفي الوقت الذي يمضي فيه أنان نحو ستة أشهر أخرى في منصبه كأمين عام للأمم المتحدة، فسيكون هذا الطريق الصحيح لإنهاء عقد مضطرب في ذلك المنصب - بمساهمة جيدة في قضية السلام في العراق.

ويجب أن يكون الدرس واضحا: بالرغم من الأعمال المدمرة للذات بشكل كبير لكثير من الدول الأعضاء الأخرى، ولاسيما مجموعة الدول النامية التي تسمى "مجموعة ال 77"، إلا أن الأمم المتحدة مازالت تخدم مصالح واهتمامات السياسة الخارجية الأميركية بطرق مهمة كثيرة، ليس فقط فيما يتعلق بقضية العراق، ولكن أيضا قضية إيران ودارفور وأفغانستان والمفاوضات الصعبة التي بدأت لتوها حول الوضع النهائي لكوسوفو - وكلها مسائل ذات أهمية حيوية بالنسبة للولايات المتحدة - قد آلت الآن إلى الأمم المتحدة. إن إضعاف هذه المنظمة لا يخدم الأمن القومي الأميركي، بل إن تقويتها وتدعيمها سيجعلها قيمة أكثر بالنسبة للولايات المتحدة وبالنسبة لكل دولة تسعى إلى حل الصراعات والاستقرار والتقدم الاقتصادي

العالمي. ورغم اقتراب موعد اختيار خليفة لأنان، فإنه حان الوقت بالنسبة لواشنطن - وهذا يجب أن يشمل الكونغرس أيضا - أن تضع خلف ظهرها فترة ارتباك وتشوش مؤسفة وأن تقدم للأمم المتحدة مزيدا من الدعم - ماليا وسياسيا على السواء - في مقابل أشياء تحتاجها في العراق وفي أماكن أخرى.

نموذج (9)

الأصل الانجليزي:

Anti-Americanism's Deep Roots

The Current Wave of Hostility Will Ebb. But This Is About More Than the Iraq War.

Robert Kagan, *The New York Times*

19/06/ 2006

I recently took part in a panel discussion in London about civil conflict and "failed states" around the world, centered on the interesting work of the British economist Paul Collier. The panelists included the son of a famous African liberation-leader-turned-dictator, the former leader of a South American

guerrilla group, a Pakistani journalist, a U.N. official and the head of a nongovernmental humanitarian organization.

Naturally, our reasoned and learned discussion quickly transmogrified into an extended round-robin denunciation of American foreign policy.

The interesting thing was that the Iraq war was far from the main topic. George W. Bush hardly came up. The panelists focused instead on a long list of grievances against the United States stretching back over six decades. There was much discussion of the "colonial legacy" and "neo-colonialism," especially in the Middle East and Africa. And even though the colonies in question had been ruled by Europeans, panelists insisted that this colonial past was the source of most of the world's resentment toward the United States. There was much criticism of American policy during the Cold War for imposing evil regimes, causing poverty and suffering throughout the world, and blocking national liberation movements as a service to oil companies and multinational corporations. When the moderator brought up nuclear weapons proliferation and Iran, the panelists talked about Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

As for "failed states" and civil conflict, several panelists agreed that they were always and everywhere the fault of the United States. The African insisted that Bosnia and Kosovo were destroyed by American military interventions, not by Slobodan Milosevic, and that Somalia was a failed state because of American policy. The Pakistani insisted the United States was to blame for Afghanistan's descent into anarchy in the 1990s. The former guerrilla leader insisted that most if not all problems in the Western Hemisphere were the product of over a century of American imperialism.

Some of these charges had more merit than others, but even the moderator became exasperated by the general refusal to place any responsibility on the peoples and leaders of countries plagued by civil conflict. Yet the panelists held their ground. When someone pointed out that the young boys fighting in African tribal and ethnic wars could hardly be fighting against American "imperialism," the African dictator's son insisted they were indeed. When the head of the NGO paused from gnashing his teeth at American policy to suggest that perhaps the United States was not to blame for the genocide in Rwanda, the African dictator's son argued that it was, because it had

failed to intervene. The United States was to blame both for the suffering it caused and the suffering it did not alleviate.

The discussion was illuminating. There is no question that the Iraq war has aroused hostility toward the United States around the world. And there are many legitimate criticisms to be made about America's conduct of the war. But it is worth keeping in mind that this anger against the United States also has deep roots.

The Iraq war has rekindled myriad old resentments toward the United States, a thousand different complaints, each one specific to a time and place far removed from the present conflict. It has united a diverse spectrum of anti-American views in common solidarity -- the Marxist Africans still angry over American policy in the 1960s and '70s, the Pakistanis still furious at America's (bipartisan) support for the dictator Gen. Mohammed Zia ul-Haq in the 1970s and '80s, the French theoreticians who started railing against the American "hyperpower" in the 1990s, the Latin ex-guerrillas still waging their decades-old struggle against North American imperialism, the Arab activists still angry about 1948. At a conference in the Middle East a few months ago, I heard a moderate Arab scholar complaining bitterly about how American policy had

alienated the Arab peoples in recent years. A former Clinton official sitting next to him was nodding vigorously but then suddenly stopped when the Arab scholar made clear that by "recent years" he meant ever since 1967.

The Iraq war has also made anti-Americanism respectable again, as it was during the Cold War but had not been since the demise of the Soviet Union. People who a decade ago would not have been granted a platform to spout the kind of arguments I heard on this panel are now given star treatment in the Western and global media. Such people were always there, but no one was listening to them. Today they dominate the airwaves, and this in turn is helping produce an increasingly hostile global public opinion, as evidenced in a recent Pew poll.

There are two lessons to be drawn from all this. One is that in time the current tidal wave of anti-Americanism will ebb, just as in the past. Smarter American diplomacy can help, of course, as can success in places such as Iraq. But the other lesson is not to succumb to the illusion that America was beloved until the spring of 2003 and will be beloved again when George W. Bush leaves office. Some folks seem to believe that by returning to the policies of Harry Truman, Dean

Acheson and John F. Kennedy, America will become popular around the world. I like those policies, too, but let's not kid ourselves. They also sparked enormous resentment among millions of peoples in many countries, resentments that are now returning to the fore. The fact is, because America is the dominant power in the world, it will always attract criticism and be blamed both for what it does and what it does not do.

No one should lightly dismiss the current hostility toward the United States. International legitimacy matters. It is important in itself, and it affects others' willingness to work with us. But neither should we be paralyzed by the unavoidable resentments that our power creates. If we refrained from action out of fear that others around the world would be angry with us, then we would never act. And count on it: They'd blame us for that, too.

جذور الكراهية نحو أميركا

روبرت كاغان، نيويورك تايمز

20036/6/22

شاركت مؤخراً في هيئة نقاش بلندن حول النزاع الأهلي و«الدول الفاشلة» في مختلف أنحاء العالم، وركزت المناقشة على العمل الهام للاقتصادي البريطاني بول كولير. وكان بين المشاركين في النقاش، ابن أحد زعماء التحرير الأفارقة المشهورين وقد تحول إلى دكتاتور، زعيم سابق لجماعة حرب عصابات في أميركا الجنوبية، وصحافي باكستاني، ومسؤول في الأمم المتحدة، ورئيس لإحدى المنظمات الانسانية غير الحكومية. ومن الطبيعي ان مناقشتنا المنطقية و العلمية سرعان ما تحولت إلى إدانة للسياسة الخارجية الأميركية.

وكان الملفت للانتباه، أن الحرب في العراق كانت بعيدة عن أن تكون الموضوع الرئيسي. ونادراً ما جاءت سيرة الرئيس جورج دبليو بوش، فيما ركز المشاركون بدلاً من ذلك على قائمة طويلة من المظالم ضد النشاط التوسعي للولايات المتحدة خلال ستة عقود من الزمن. وكان هناك نقاش واسع حول «الارث الكولونيالي» و«الكولونيالية الجديدة»، خصوصاً في الشرق الأوسط وأفريقيا. وعلى الرغم من أن المستعمرات موضوع النقاش كانت تحت حكم الأوروبيين، فإن المناقشين أصرّوا على أن هذا الماضي الكولونيالي كان مصدر معظم الاستياء المنتشر في العالم تجاه الولايات المتحدة. وكان هناك كثير من النقد للسياسة الأميركية خلال

فترة الحرب الباردة لفرضها أنظمة شريرة وخلقتها الفقر والمعاناة في العالم، وإعاقة حركات التحرير خدمة لشركات النفط والشركات المتعددة الجنسيات. وعندما طرح مدير المناقشة موضوع نشر الأسلحة النووية وإيران، تحدث المشاركون حول هيروشима وناغازاكي.

أما بالنسبة لـ «الدول الفاشلة» والنزاعات الأهلية، فقد اتفق عدد من المشاركين على أنها كانت على الدوام وفي كل مكان غلطة الولايات المتحدة. وأصر الأفريقي على أن البوسنة وكوسوفو دمرتا بسبب التدخلات العسكرية الأميركية، وليس بسبب سلوبودان ميلوسوفيتش، وأن الصومال دولة فاشلة بسبب السياسة الأميركية. وأكد الباكستاني على أن الولايات المتحدة هي التي تتحمل اللوم على انحدار أفغانستان إلى الفوضى في سنوات التسعينات. وأصر الزعيم السابق لحرب العصابات على أن معظم، إن لم يكن كل، المشاكل في النصف الغربي، كانت نتاج ما يزيد على قرن من الامبريالية الأميركية.

بعض هذه الاتهامات تحمل مصداقية أكثر من غيرها، ولكن حتى مدير مجموعة النقاش أصبح غاضبا بسبب الرفض العام لوضع المسؤولية على شعوب وزعماء البلدان التي تعاني من الحرب الأهلية. غير أن المشاركين تمسكوا بموقفهم الراسخ. وعندما أوضح أحدهم أن الشباب الصغار الذين يخوضون القتال في حروب قبلية واثنية لا يمكنهم بسهولة خوض القتال ضد «الامبريالية» الأميركية، أكد ابن الدكتور الأفريقي أن الأمر على هذا النحو بالفعل. وعندما توقف رئيس المنظمة غير الحكومية عن هجومه على السياسة الأميركية ليشير إلى أنه ربما لا يتعين توجيه اللوم إلى الولايات المتحدة على أعمال الإبادة الجماعية في رواندا، جادل ابن الدكتور الأفريقي بأنها تتحمل المسؤولية لأنها أخفقت في التدخل. وكان ينبغي

توجيه اللوم إلى الولايات المتحدة على المعاناة التي سببتها والمعاناة التي لم تشارك في تخفيفها.

هذه المناقشة تتميز بالطابع التنويري. فليس هناك شك في ان الحرب في العراق اثارَت العداء تجاه الولايات المتحدة في مختلف أنحاء العالم. وهناك الكثير من النقد المشروع الذي يتعين توجيهه إلى ادارة اميركا للحرب. ولكن يجدر ان نبقى في اذهاننا، ان هذا السخط ضد الولايات المتحدة يتميز بجذور عميقة أيضا. فقد أنعشت الحرب العراقية مشاعر السخط القديمة تجاه الولايات المتحدة. ووجدت طيفا واسعا من الآراء المناهضة لأميركا في حركة تضامن مشترك. فما يزال الماركسيون الأفارقة حانقين على السياسة الأميركية في ستينات وسبعينات القرن الماضي، والباكستانيون ما يزالون غاضبين من دعم أميركا بحزبها للدكتاتور الجنرال محمد ضياء الحق في سبعينات وثمانينات القرن الماضي، وكذلك حال المنظرين الفرنسيين الذين بدأوا النقد الشديد ضد «القوة العظمى» الأميركية في التسعينات، وما يزال رجال حرب العصابات اللاتينيون السابقون يشنون كفاحهم الذي استمر عقودا ضد الامبريالية الشمال اميركية، وما يزال النشطاء العرب ساخطين بسبب حرب 1948.

وفي مؤتمر في الشرق الأوسط عقد قبل أشهر، سمعت باحثا عربيا معتدلا يتذمر بمرارة من أن السياسة الأميركية قد أقصت الشعوب العربية في السنوات الأخيرة. وكان مسؤول سابق في إدارة كلينتون يجلس إلى جانبه ويهز رأسه موافقا، ولكنه توقف فجأة عندما أوضح الباحث العربي انه يعني بـ «السنوات الأخيرة» الفترة منذ عام 1967.

وهناك درسان لا بد من استخلاصهما مما جرى في المناقشة: الأول انه بمرور الزمن سيهبط هذا المد في معاداة اميركا كما حدث في الماضي. ويمكن للدبلوماسية الاميركية الأذكى، بالطبع، أن تساعد على هذا، كما يمكن أن يساعد النجاح في اماكن مثل العراق. ولكن الدرس الآخر ليس الخضوع لوهم ان اميركا ظلت محبوبة حتى ربيع عام 2003، وستعود محبوبة عندما يرحل جورج دبليو بوش عن منصبه. ويبدو أن البعض يعتقدون انه بالعودة إلى سياسات هاري ترومان ودين اشيسون وجون كنيدي سيصبح لأميركا شعبية في مختلف أنحاء العالم. أنا أحب تلك السياسات أيضا، ولكن لا حاجة بنا إلى الضحك على أنفسنا. فقد أثارت أيضا استياء هائلا من جانب الملايين في كثير من البلدان، وهي مشاعر تتقدم الآن إلى الطليعة. والحقيقة هي ان اميركا هي القوة المهيمنة في العالم، وانها ستواجه على الدوام النقد واللوم على ما تفعله وعلى ما لا تفعله.

ولا يتعين على أحد أن يغض النظر عن العداء الحالي تجاه الولايات المتحدة، واستعداد الآخرين للعمل معنا. ولكن يتعين علينا ألا نصاب بالشلل جراء مشاعر السخط التي لا يمكن تفاديها والتي تخلقها قوتنا. وإذا ما أحجمنا عن العمل انطلاقا من الخوف من أن الآخرين في العالم سيكونون ساخطين علينا، فإننا لن نفعل شيئا على الإطلاق. وتاملوا الأمر لتجدوا أنهم سيلومونا على ذلك أيضا.

The 'New Middle East' Bush Is Resisting

Saad Eddin Ibrahim, *The Washington Post*

23/08/2006

President Bush and Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice may be quite right about a new Middle East being born. In fact, their policies in support of the actions of their closest regional ally, Israel, have helped midwife the newborn. But it will not be exactly the baby they have longed for. For one thing, it will be neither secular nor friendly to the United States. For another, it is going to be a rough birth.

What is happening in the broader Middle East and North Africa can be seen as a boomerang effect that has been playing out slowly since the horrific events of Sept. 11, 2001. In the immediate aftermath of those attacks, there was worldwide sympathy for the United States and support for its declared "war on terrorism," including the invasion of Afghanistan. Then the cynical exploitation of this universal goodwill by so-called neoconservatives to advance hegemonic designs was

confirmed by the war in Iraq. The Bush administration's dishonest statements about "weapons of mass destruction" diminished whatever credibility the United States might have had as liberator, while disastrous mismanagement of Iraqi affairs after the invasion led to the squandering of a conventional military victory. The country slid into bloody sectarian violence, while official Washington stonewalled and refused to admit mistakes. No wonder the world has progressively turned against America.

Against this declining moral standing, President Bush made something of a comeback in the first year of his second term. He shifted his foreign policy rhetoric from a "war on terrorism" to a war of ideas and a struggle for liberty and democracy. Through much of 2005 it looked as if the Middle East might finally have its long-overdue spring of freedom. Lebanon forged a Cedar Revolution, triggered by the assassination of its popular former prime minister, Rafiq Hariri. Egypt held its first multi-candidate presidential election in 50 years. So did Palestine and Iraq, despite harsh conditions of occupation. Qatar and Bahrain in the Arabian Gulf continued their steady evolution into constitutional monarchies. Even Saudi Arabia held its first municipal elections.

But there was more. Hamas mobilized candidates and popular campaigns to win a plurality in Palestinian legislative elections and form a new government. Hezbollah in Lebanon and the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt achieved similar electoral successes. And with these developments, a sudden chill fell over Washington and other Western capitals.

Instead of welcoming these particular elected officials into the newly emerging democratic fold, Washington began a cold war on Muslim democrats. Even the tepid pressure on autocratic allies of the United States to democratize in 2005 had all but disappeared by 2006. In fact, tottering Arab autocrats felt they had a new lease on life with the West conveniently cowed by an emerging Islamist political force.

Now the cold war on Islamists has escalated into a shooting war, first against Hamas in Gaza and then against Hezbollah in Lebanon. Israel is perceived in the region, rightly or wrongly, to be an agent acting on behalf of U.S. interests. Some will admit that there was provocation for Israel to strike at Hamas and Hezbollah following the abduction of three soldiers and attacks on military and civilian targets. But destroying Lebanon with an overkill approach born of a desire for vengeance

cannot be morally tolerated or politically justified -- and it will not work.

On July 30 Arab, Muslim and world outrage reached an unprecedented level with the Israeli bombing of a residential building in the Lebanese village of Qana, which killed dozens and wounded hundreds of civilians, most of them children. A similar massacre in Qana in 1996, which Arabs remember painfully well, proved to be the political undoing of then-Prime Minister Shimon Peres. It is too early to predict whether Prime Minister Ehud Olmert will survive Qana II and the recent war. But Hezbollah will survive, just as it has already outlasted five Israeli prime ministers and three American presidents.

Born in the thick of an earlier Israeli invasion, in 1982, Hezbollah is at once a resistance movement against foreign occupation, a social service provider for the needy of the rural south and the slum-dwellers of Beirut, and a model actor in Lebanese and Middle Eastern politics. Despite access to millions of dollars in resources from within and from regional allies Syria and Iran, its three successive leaders have projected an image of clean governance and a pious personal lifestyle.

In more than four weeks of fighting against the strongest military machine in the region, Hezbollah held its own and won the admiration of millions of Arabs and Muslims. People in the region have compared its steadfastness with the swift defeat of three large Arab armies in the Six-Day War of 1967. Hasan Nasrallah, its current leader, spoke several times to a wide regional audience through his own al-Manar network as well as the more popular al-Jazeera. Nasrallah has become a household name in my own country, Egypt.

According to the preliminary results of a recent public opinion survey of 1,700 Egyptians by the Cairo-based Ibn Khaldun Center, Hezbollah's action garnered 75 percent approval, and Nasrallah led a list of 30 regional public figures ranked by perceived importance. He appears on 82 percent of responses, followed by Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad (73 percent), Khaled Meshal of Hamas (60 percent), Osama bin Laden (52 percent) and Mohammed Mahdi Akef of Egypt's Muslim Brotherhood (45 percent).

The pattern here is clear, and it is Islamic. And among the few secular public figures who made it into the top 10 are Palestinian Marwan Barghouti (31 percent) and Egypt's Ayman

Nour (29 percent), both of whom are prisoners of conscience in Israeli and Egyptian jails, respectively.

None of the current heads of Arab states made the list of the 10 most popular public figures. While subject to future fluctuations, these Egyptian findings suggest the direction in which the region is moving. The Arab people do not respect the ruling regimes, perceiving them to be autocratic, corrupt and inept. They are, at best, ambivalent about the fanatical Islamists of the bin Laden variety. More mainstream Islamists with broad support, developed civic dispositions and services to provide are the most likely actors in building a new Middle East. In fact, they are already doing so through the Justice and Development Party in Turkey, the similarly named PJD in Morocco, the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, Hamas in Palestine and, yes, Hezbollah in Lebanon.

These groups, parties and movements are not inimical to democracy. They have accepted electoral systems and practiced electoral politics, probably too well for Washington's taste. Whether we like it or not, these are the facts. The rest of the Western world must come to grips with the new reality, even if the U.S. president and his secretary of state continue to reject the new offspring of their own policies.

الشرق الأوسط الجديد الذي يرفضه بوش

سعد الدين ابراهيم، واشنطن بوست

2006/08/23

بشر الرئيس الأمريكي جورج بوش، ووزيرة خارجيته كونداليزا رايس بميلاد شرق أوسط جديد، وقد سمعت تفصيلات عن هذا المولود الجديد من مسئولين أمريكيين كبار قبل أيام من انفجار الحرب الإسرائيلية على لبنان.

نعم، هناك شرق أوسط جديد، يتشكل بسبب وفي أعقاب هذه الحرب اللبنانية الإسرائيلية، والتي دامت خمسة أسابيع (7/12 - 2006/8/16). وهو أمر طبيعي بعد كل الحروب والثورات، وما أكثرها في منطقتنا خلال الفترة الأخيرة. لكن الشرق الأوسط الجديد الذي يولد هذه الأيام لن يكون شبيهاً لما حلم أو يحلم به جورج وكونداليزا، ولن يكون محباً أو حليفاً للأمريكيين. إنه سيولد عبوساً قمطريراً، غاضباً، ولو إلى حين. ثم حينما يهدأ صراخ هذا الوليد الجديد، وتتكشف ملامحه، سيتضح للجميع أنه إسلامي، وأن جيناته شرق أوسطية أصيلة، وليست هجينية من صلب جورج وكوندي. سيحمل الشرق الأوسط الجديد ملامح حزب الله اللبناني، وحماس الفلسطينية، والإخوان المسلمين المصرية، وحزب العدالة والتنمية التركي، وحزب العدالة والتنمية المغربي. فهذه الحركات والجماعات والأحزاب أثبتت جدارتها اجتماعياً واقتصادياً، قبل أن يعلو صوتها سياسياً، وبشتد ساعدها عسكرياً. فالأبعاد الخدمية لها سبقت الجوانب النضالية أو رافقتها جنباً إلى جنب. وربما كان وسيظل هذا التكامل الإنساني المجتمعي هو الذي جعل محاولات القضاء

عليها غير مجدية بالمرّة. نحن علماء الاجتماع والأحياء ندرك أن الكيانات الحية تستمر في البقاء طالما تكيفت مع بيئتها، وطالما كان لأعضائها وظائف تخدم وتساعد هذا الكيان في البقاء. وهذه الأحزاب والجماعات والحركات تلبّي وظائف هامة لقطاعات كبيرة من أبناء مجتمعاتها. بل أكثر من ذلك نجحت هي حيث فشلت الدولة الوطنية الحديثة، خلال العقود الستة الماضية (1945-2005). لذلك تجذرت هذه الحركات، و التي اتخذت من الإسلام مرجعية وشعاراً، و ستظل موجودة وستنمو سواء أحب ذلك جورج بوش، أو كره. لقد باءت بالفشل محاولات أربعة عهود مصرية (الملك فاروق، عبدالناصر، السادات، ومبارك) في القضاء على الإخوان المسلمين. كذلك باءت بالفشل ثمانون عاماً من الكمالية في تركيا في اقتلاع المرجعية الإسلامية لدى الشعب التركي. أما حزب الله ذو المرجعية الإسلامية الشيعية فقد صمد لربع قرن، أفني فيها، خمسة رؤساء وزراء إسرائيليين (مناحم بيجن، اسحق رابين - بيبى نيتانياهو - أيهود باراك - أرييل شارون). وها هو علي وشك إفناء سادسهم، أيهود أولمرت. كذلك أفني أربعة رؤساء أمريكيين، حاولوا جميعاً، سحقه بمفردهم أو بمساعدة إسرائيل وهم رونالد ريغان، وجورج بوش (الأب)، وبيل كلينتون، وجورج بوش (الابن).

إن الحركات الإسلامية المذكورة استطاعت أن تتجاوز الأمراض السياسية المهلكة في الشرق الأوسط. لقد تغلبت على معضلة اختيار القيادات ومشكلة الفساد. فالإخوان المسلمون، مثلاً، توارد علي قيادتها ستة مرشدين (حسن البنا - حسن الهضيبي - عمر التلمساني - حامد أبو النصر - مأمون الهضيبي وأخيراً مهدي عاكف). وحزب الله توارد على قيادته ثلاثة أمناء، خلال 24 سنة: أي بمعدل زعيم كل ثماني سنوات. ونفس الشيء بالنسبة لحماس خلال العشرين سنة، التي هي كل تاريخها (ياسين و الرنتيسي وإسماعيل هنية) وهذه النزعة في الإحلال والإبدال

السلمي للقيادات هو عملة نادرة، ليس فقط بين رؤساء الدول، بل ورؤساء الأحزاب في عالمنا العربي. فالقذافي في قمة السلطة الليبية منذ 37 عاماً، وعلي عبدالله صالح يتربع على قمة السلطة اليمنية لأكثر من 27 عاماً، ومبارك على قمة الرئاسة المصرية منذ 25 عاماً. و ينطبق الشيء نفسه على الأحزاب العلمانية مثل الوفد، والتجمع، والعمل في مصر، والاستقلال والاتحاد الاشتراكي في المغرب. وعدم تغيير وتبديل القيادات دورياً هو أحد أسباب إصابتها بتصلب الشرايين، وفقر الخيال والإبداع، ونضوب الشجاعة، لذلك انفضت الناس عنها.

أما مشكلة الفساد فقد تجاوزتها الحركات والأحزاب الإسلامية، رغم الزيادة المطردة في مواردها المالية. وذلك بفضل أسلوب الحياة البسيط والمتواضع للقيادات. لقد زار هذا الكاتب قيادات حزب الله وحماس والإخوان المسلمين وحزب العدالة و التنمية المغربي سواء في مكاتبهم أو مساكنهم، خلال العقود الثلاثة الأخيرة. وأشهد أن البساطة والتواضع هما السمتان المشتركتان بينهما جميعاً من لبنان إلى غزة إلى مصر إلى المغرب. كذلك بقيت هذه القيادات في قلب الأحياء الشعبية التي نشأت فيها. لذلك فإن ملاهي الحياة لم تغرهم بالفساد أو الانحراف على الأقل حتى تاريخ كتابة هذا المقال (أغسطس 2006).

إن الغضب العربي والشرق أوسطي هو غضب مثلث ضد إسرائيل والولايات المتحدة والحكام العرب المتواطئين معهما في العدوان على لبنان، وقبله العدوان على حكومة حماس والبنية التحتية في لبنان وغزة. وهذه هي المرة الأولى في تاريخ الصراع العربي الإسرائيلي، التي يرى فيها ثلثمائة مليون عربي ومليار مسلم بشاعة العدوان الإسرائيلي يومياً على شاشات التلفزيون. لذلك فالغضب والإحباط والشعور بالمهانة هو شعور غير مسبوق. لقد نزعت الجماهير العربية ما تبقي من

شرعية أنظمتها الحاكمة، حتى إذا استمرت عاجزة عن إزاحة هذه الأنظمة من كراسي السلطة.

تبقى المسألة الديمقراطية. وهنا تقاطع غريب بين ما يريده جورج بوش وما يمارسه معظم الإسلاميين بالفعل. فحزب الله، وحماس، والإخوان المسلمون، وحزب العدالة والتنمية في تركيا والمغرب قد قبلوا ومارسوا الديمقراطية الانتخابية. بل وربما أجادوها أكثر مما كانت ترغب به الولايات المتحدة. صحيح أنه ما تزال هناك شكوك مشروعة في مدى إيمان أو التزام الإسلاميين بقيم وممارسات الحرية، لكن هذا الشك يتحول إلى يقين في حالة حكامنا الطغاة. وبين شكنا في احترام الإسلاميين للحريات العامة والشخصية من ناحية واليقين في أن غيرهم من الحكام المستبدين قد انتهكوا هذه الحريات فعلاً كما لم يفعل ذلك لا مستعمرين ولا أجانب ولا إسلاميين. والاستثناء الدرامي من هذه الملاحظة هم حركة طالبان في أفغانستان وأنصار حسن الترابي في السودان ومتشددو الثورة الإسلامية في إيران. وأصحاب هذه الاستثناءات الثلاثة أتوا للسلطة بالمنهج الانقلابي العنيف، ولم يأتوا لها بالمنهج السلمي أو الديمقراطي. وشتان ما بين تنظيم القاعدة وحركة طالبان من ناحية وحزب الله وحماس والإخوان من ناحية أخرى. فالأولى، لا تؤمن لا بالديمقراطية ولا بالانتخابات، وتعتبرها أنظمة حكم غريبة مستوردة، تؤدي إلى الانقسام والتشتت. بينما الأخيرة وجدت ضالتها في الديمقراطية. والشاهد أن أنصار بن لادن، والظواهري، والترابي هم في تناقص مستمر، بينما الأنصار والمعجبون بحزب الله وحماس والإخوان هم في تزايد مستمر. وهو ما يعني أن الشرق الأوسط الجديد الذي يساهم في تشييده إسلاميون، من تركيا شرقاً إلى المغرب غرباً، سيكون ديمقراطياً إن أجلاً أو عاجلاً. والله أعلم.

ترجم الخبر التالي مستعينا بمعاني المفردات و ضع عنواناً مناسباً له:

A Russian investigator has said grenades fired by surrounding Russian forces could have triggered the Beslan school bloodbath in September 2004.

Yuri Savelyev's conclusions contradict the official view that bombs planted by the hostage-takers in the school gym went off just before the gun battle.

Mr Savelyev is a member of the Russian parliamentary commission investigating the siege, in which 331 people died.

Many of the victims were children, taken hostage by pro-Chechen militants.

Blast evidence

In an interview with Moscow Echo radio on Monday, Mr Savelyev, a weapons and explosives expert, said that during the investigation, he "discovered that the consequences of those blasts could not at all be explained by the explosions of the home-made devices installed by the rebels".

"Most of the hostages were talking about explosions in a totally different part of the gym from that to which the official investigation referred.

"As a result, I came to the conclusion that these home-made explosive devices installed by the rebels did not explode at all. Those were explosive devices delivered from outside," he said, adding that it could have been "shots fired from grenade-launchers".

He said the explosions killed many of the hostages and dozens more died in the resulting fire.

Many relatives blame their children's deaths on the botched rescue operation, in which fire engulfed the school, in the Russian Caucasus republic of North Ossetia.

A North Ossetian parliamentary commission said the school had been seized because of "failings in the law enforcement bodies".

Row rages on

The head of the commission, Stanislav Kesayev, said he had confidence in Mr Savelyev's conclusions.

"He had more resources than our commission. He relied on his own knowledge as a weapons specialist and mathematician," Mr Kesayev told the radio.

Mr Savelyev's conclusions were published on the website pravdabeslana.ru.

One of his colleagues on the Russian parliamentary commission, Arkady Baskayev, rejected his conclusions.

He said there was "nothing convincing in the trajectory of these special shells" which Mr Savelyev blamed for the explosions.

"This is Mr Savelyev's private opinion, which is not confirmed in any way," he said.

The earlier North Ossetian investigation concluded that grenade launchers, flamethrowers and tank fire had been used during the storming of the school by Russian security forces.

Russia's prosecutor general admitted such equipment had been used, but only after all the children had left the school.

For weeks after the siege Russian officials had denied the use of flamethrowers.

معاني المفردات:

investigator	محقق
grenades	قنابل
triggered	اشعل
bloodbath	حمام دم
contradict	يناقض
hostage-takers	خاطفين
parliamentary	نيابي او برلماني
commission	لجنة
victims	ضحايا
militants	مسلحين
evidence	دليل
weapons	اسلحة
explosives	متفجرات
expert	خبير

consequences	نتائج
blasts	انفجارات
home-made	صناعة منزلية
devices	وسائل
rebels	متمردين
grenade-launchers	قاذفات قنابل
relatives	أقرباء
blame	يلقى المسؤولية
botched	فاشلة
rescue	انقاذ
engulfed	أحاطت
row	جدل
relied on	اعتمد على
mathematician	عالم رياضي
colleague	زميل

trajectory	مسار
shells	قذائف
flamethrowers	قاذفات لهب
tank	دبابة
the storming	الاقحام
security forces	قوات الامن
prosecutor general	المدعي العام
admitted	اعترف
equipment	تجهيزات
siege	حصار

التدريبات

(2)

ترجم الخبر التالي مستعينا بمعاني المفردات المرفقة و ضع عنوانا مناسباً له:

Turkish police say they are hunting two suspects over an explosion in the resort town of Antalya that left three dead and hurt at least 20 on Monday.

The blast came hours after at least 27 people were hurt when bombs exploded in Istanbul and the resort of Marmaris.

A Kurdish militant group linked to the banned PKK party has said it carried out all three attacks.

Security has been tightened on Turkey's Mediterranean and Aegean coasts as police hunt the attacks' perpetrators.

On Monday night, police revealed they had arrested a man in Izmir accused of being involved in a failed plot to bomb the western coastal town.

The Turkish state news agency said the man was from the Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK) separatist group.

It said other people were also detained for helping the suspect and that plastic explosives were seized in the operation.

The Turkish economy is heavily reliant on tourism, which Kurdish separatists have repeatedly threatened to target.

Struck by glass

The authorities have yet to say whether the Antalya blast was caused by a bomb but correspondents say the news that they are hunting for two suspects suggests this was the case.

A police spokesman said 20 people were hurt in the blast, which took place on Monday afternoon in a busy shopping area in the city.

The Dogan news agency said the total number of injured - including those who had suffered light wounds - was 71.

The force of the blast ripped off the facade of a municipal building and badly damaged nearby shops and restaurants and sparked a fire.

Many passers-by were struck by glass and shrapnel.

A Kurdish militant group with links to the banned PKK has claimed responsibility for Sunday's blasts in Marmaris and Istanbul.

"We had warned before, Turkey is not a safe country. Tourists should not come to Turkey," the Kurdistan Freedom Falcons (Tak) said on its website.

On Tuesday, the group also claimed responsibility for the Antalya attack.

Wave of bombings

Most of those injured in Marmaris - including 10 Britons - were on a minibus ferrying local people and holidaymakers along the main street.

Istanbul was also hit by a bomb attack on Sunday night, when a roadside device exploded injuring six Turkish nationals.

Both Marmaris and Antalya are popular with European and Russian holidaymakers.

The attacks are the latest in a wave of similar bombings in Turkey in recent years, blamed on either Kurdish separatists, Islamic militants or left-wing extremists.

Four people - including three foreigners - were killed in an explosion in Antalya in June. Initial investigations suggest a gas canister exploded, but doubt was cast over whether it had been an accident.

معاني المفردات:

hunt	يلاحق
suspects	مشتبه بهم
resort	منفذ بحري/ منتجع
banned	محظور
carried out	نفذ
Mediterranean	البحر المتوسط
Aegean	بحر ايجه
perpetrators	الفاعلين او المنفذين
revealed	كشفت
arrested	اعتقل

accused of

متهم ب

involved

متورط ب

failed

فاشل

plot

مؤامرة أو مخطط

news agency

وكالة انباء

separatist group

جماعة انفصالية

detained

اعتقلوا

seized

صودرت

operation

عملية

reliant on

معتمد على

tourism

سياحة

repeatedly

بشكل متكرر

threatened

هدد

to target

يستهدف

authorities

السلطات

spokesman	ناطق باسم
ripped off	حطم أو اقتلع
façade	واجهة
municipal building	مبنى البلدية
sparked a fire	أشعل نارا
passers-by	المارة
shrapnel	شظايا
claimed responsibility	ادعى المسؤولية
Freedom Falcons	صقور الحرية
holidaymakers	سياح
roadside	جانبى الطريق
extremists	متشددين
initial investigations	تحقيقات اولية
gas canister	قنابل غاز

التدريبات

(3)

ترجم الخبر التالي مستعيناً بمعاني المفردات و ضع عنواناً مناسباً له:

UN chief Kofi Annan has used talks in Jerusalem to demand an end to Israel's air and sea blockade of Lebanon.

Mr Annan, who flew to Israel from a visit to Lebanon, told Defence Minister Amir Peretz the "humiliating" blockade should be lifted as soon as possible.

Mr Annan also said Israel had committed most of the violations reported in the two-week-old truce with Hezbollah.

Earlier, Mr Annan held a meeting with the families of the two soldiers whose capture sparked the crisis, Ehud Goldwasser and Eldad Regev.

Mr Annan has urged Hezbollah to free the two captives speedily, and told the relatives that he would continue to press for their freedom.

Mr Annan had promised to do "everything in his power" to bring about their release, said Benny Regev, Eldad Regev's brother.

Mr Regev also said the UN chief had promised to push for "signs of life" of the captives.

Relatives of a third soldier, Gilad Shalit, who was captured by Palestinian militants in an earlier incident near the Gaza Strip, also attended the meeting.

Fragile ceasefire

Mr Annan's regional tour is aimed at bolstering the fragile ceasefire which ended more than a month of conflict between Israel and Hezbollah.

He flew to Tel Aviv by helicopter after witnessing the scenes of devastation in south Lebanon wrought during the conflict.

Before leaving Lebanon, Mr Annan described Israel's continuing embargo as "a humiliation and an infringement on [Lebanese] sovereignty".

The issue was among the key points raised at his meeting with Mr Peretz, his first with a senior politician after arriving in Israel.

Afterwards, Mr Peretz said he had emphasised to Mr Annan the issue of the transfer of weapons from Syria to Hezbollah, and Israel's concerns about Iran posing a threat.

He also said Israeli troops would remain in Lebanon for "several weeks, no longer than that", and would pull out once the UN's expanded peace force was on the ground in "reasonable" numbers.

Mr Annan said the force would number 5,000 "relatively quickly", to clear the way for the Israeli pullout.

Mr Annan will have talks on Wednesday with embattled Prime Minister Ehud Olmert, who - along with Mr Peretz - has been heavily criticised over the way the military action was conducted.

Unusual visit

The BBC's Matthew Price in Jerusalem says that it is highly unusual to see the UN chief in Israel - with several Security

Council resolutions outstanding against it - and many Israelis view the organisation with suspicion.

But put simply, Israel currently needs the UN, he says.

معاني المفردات:

UN chief	أمين عام الامم المتحدة
to demand	يطالب
blockade	حصار
humiliating	مهين
be lifted	يرفع
previously	سابقاً
concerns	مخاوف
rearming	اعادة تسليح
committed	ارتكب
violations	خروقات

truce

هدنة

capture

أسر او اعتقال

sparked

اشعل

crisis

أزمة

urged

ناشد

captives

أسرى

release

يطلق سراح

fragile

هش

ceasefire

وقف إطلاق نار

regional tour

جولة للمنطقة

bolstering

تعزيز

scenes

مشاهد

devastation

الدمار

wrought

ناجم عن

embargo

حظر

infringement	انتهاك
sovereignty	سيادة
emphasised	شدد
transfer	نقل
posing	تفرض
a threat	تهديد
troops	جنود/قوات
pull out	ينسحب
expanded peace force	قوة سلام موسعة
relatively	نسبياً
embattled	مازوم
criticised	انتقد
Security Council	مجلس الامن
resolutions	قرارات
suspicious	شكوك

ترجم الخبر التالي مستعينا بمعاني المفردات و ضع عناوين فرعية له:

Iran TV debate challenge to Bush

Iran's president has challenged US President George W Bush to a live TV debate on world affairs.

Mahmoud Ahmadinejad accused the US and UK of abusing their "special privileges" and said a debate would let both sides air their views uncensored.

The White House called his suggestion a "diversion" from global concerns over Iran's nuclear programme.

Mr Ahmadinejad was speaking two days before a UN deadline for Iran to halt work on its nuclear programme.

He said Tehran had proposed a framework for further talks but said no-one could stop Iran having a peaceful programme.

"Peaceful nuclear energy is the right of the Iranian nation," he told a news conference.

"The Iranian nation has chosen that [course] based upon international regulations, it wants to use it and no-one can stop it."

He said Iran's response to an incentives package, offered by six nations in exchange for a halt to its nuclear programme, was an "exceptional opportunity" to resolve the dispute.

When asked if Iran would halt enrichment, he said any kind of dialogue "should be based upon the certain rights of the Iranian nation".

"I suggest holding a live TV debate with Mr George W Bush to talk about world affairs and the ways to solve those issues," Mr Ahmadinejad told reporters.

"The debate should be uncensored in order for the American people to be able to listen to what we say and they should not restrict the American people from hearing the truth."

Iran and many other nations "are against America's practices in managing the world", he said, calling such practices unjust.

He accused both the US and UK of taking advantage of their "special privileges", saying he thought they were the "the origin of all disturbances in the world".

And he also questioned their right to a veto in the UN Security Council. "Isn't it time that international relations are founded on democracy and equal rights of the nations?" he went on.

But he did not rule out talks with the US in future, if certain conditions were met.

Mr Ahmadinejad's challenge to President Bush was dismissed by the White House.

"Talk of a debate is just a diversion from the legitimate concerns that the international community, not just the US, has about Iran's behaviour," White House spokeswoman Dana Perino was quoted by Reuters news agency as saying.

Iran has been given until 31 August to halt uranium enrichment - a possible route to nuclear weapons.

Earlier this week, Tehran had offered "serious talks" in response to a package of incentives put forward by the five permanent UN Security Council members and Germany.

Washington has proposed implementing sanctions if Iran fails to meet the deadline, while Russia has said such a move would be premature.

Mr Ahmadinejad said it was "unlikely" the Security Council would take action against Iran, and said "sanctions are not an issue".

"We have said everything in our response. I think the time to use the instrument of the Security Council has expired," he said.

معاني المفردات:

challenged

تحدى

debate

مناظرة

world affairs

شؤون العالم

accused

اتهم

abusing

إساءة استخدام

special privileges

امتيازات

uncensored

بدون رقابة

a diversion

تشويش الانتباه

global

عالمي

deadline

موعد نهائي

to halt

لإيقاف

nuclear programme

برنامج نووي

propose

يقترح

a framework

إطار عمل

peaceful

سلمي

energy

طاقة

nation

أمة

news conference

مؤتمر صحفي

regulations

ضوابط

incentives package

رزمة حوافز

in exchange

في مقابل

exceptional opportunity

فرصة نادرة

to resolve

يحل

the dispute

النزاع

enrichment

تخصيب

dialogue

حوار

to restrict

يقيّد

managing the world

إدارة العالم

unjust

غير عادل

origin

أصل

disturbances

اضطرابات

questioned

شكك

veto

حق النقض

rule out

استبعد

conditions

شروط

dismissed

رفض

legitimate	مشروع
community	مجتمع
route	طريق
to offer	يعرض
permanent	دائم
implementing	فرض
sanctions	عقوبات
premature	سابق لأوانه
unlikely	غير محتمل
instrument	أداة

(5)

ترجم الخبر التالي مستعينا بمعاني المفردات:

Dozens killed in Iraq oil blast

At least 27 people, possibly many more, have been killed by an explosion at a disused oil pipeline in southern Iraq.

A police spokesman said people had been siphoning fuel from the pipeline in an industrial zone south of Diwaniya, 130km (80 miles) south of Baghdad.

Casualty reports varied widely - one put the death toll at 74. Police said a huge fire was hampering rescue efforts.

In a separate development, police found more than 20 bodies at two sites in Baghdad. All the victims had been shot.

Officials say the cause of the blast in Diwaniya is still being investigated.

Witnesses told Reuters the explosion happened at about 2300 local time (1900 GMT) on Monday, when a large group of people were taking fuel from two pools.

A unnamed police source quoted by Reuters news agency said 50 people had been killed, while AFP quoted a health official saying 74 died. However, the provincial governor put the toll at 27.

Some people were left horrifically injured by the blast. "Some of the wounded have burns on 75% of their bodies," Hamid Jaafi, a health official in Diwaniya told Reuters.

He said that besides those confirmed dead, relatives said dozens of people were still missing.

Government officials said the pipeline, which used to carry petrol to the capital, had been out of operation since 2003.

But a defence ministry official said it still held residues of fuel and residents often cut holes in it to siphon off petrol, which is in short supply despite Iraq's wealth of oil deposits.

Security operation

After the bodies were found in Baghdad, police said the victims had been bound and shot, and some bore signs of torture. Their identities are not known.

Eleven of the bodies were found near a school in a southwestern district of the capital. At least 10 other bodies were dumped behind a Shia mosque in the west of the city.

The deaths come at a time when US and Iraqi security forces are engaged in a new security operation aimed at reducing the level of violence in the city.

Also on Tuesday, insurgents killed two Shia militiamen in the city of Baquba north of Baghdad.

Iraqi police told the AFP news agency the militiamen were killed in an attack on the office of radical cleric Moqtada Sadr.

The US military in Iraq announced on Tuesday that two US soldiers died in Iraq - one in fighting in Anbar province and the second from injuries sustained in a vehicle accident.

معاني المفردات:

disused

غير مستخدم

fuel

وقود

industrial

صناعي

zone

منطقة

casualty

ضحايا

varied

مختلفة

death toll

حصيلة القتلى

hampering

عرقل

witnesses

شهود

pool

بحيرة

quoted

اقتبس منه

provincial governor

حاكم المنطقة

horrifically

مخيف

burns

حروق

confirmed	مؤكد
missing	مفقود
out of operation	خارج الخدمة
defence ministry	وزارة الدفاع
residues	بقايا
residents	قاطنين أو سكان
holes	ثقوب
to siphon	يستجر أو يسحب
supply	امدادات
wealth	ثروة
deposits	احتياطات
signs	علامات
torture	تعذيب
identities	هوياتهم
district	منطقة

dumped

مهمل

engaged

مشغول ب

reducing

تخفيض

level

مستوى

violence

عنف

insurgents

متدربين

militiamen

رجال الميليشيا

cleric

رجل دين

to announce

يعلن

sustained

تعرض ل

vehicle

آلية

accident

حادث



الفصل الثاني

الترجمة الإعلامية من العربية إلى الانجليزية



الترجمة الإعلامية من العربية إلى الانجليزية

مقدمة:

الترجمة عملية ذات اتجاهين تتطلب الإلمام بتفاصيل اللغة المنقول عنها كما اللغة المنقول إليها. تناولنا في الفصل السابق موضوع الترجمة من اللغة الانجليزية إلى العربية حيث قدمنا نماذج مختلفة و أجرينا بعض التدريبات عليها.

في هذا الفصل نركز على موضوع الترجمة من العربية إلى الانجليزية بهدف تنمية خبرات الطالب و مهاراته في مجال ترجمة النصوص الإعلامية من اللغة العربية إلى الانجليزية. كما نسعى إلى إغناء قاموسه الشخصي من المفردات و المصطلحات المستخدمة في هذا المجال.

و كما فعلنا في الفصل السابق قمنا بتقديم مجموعة من النصوص المختارة لعدد من المحللين في مجموعة من الصحف العربية. و قد تم وضع هذه النصوص على شكل نماذج تطبيقية اضعنا إلى النماذج الخمس الأولى منها بعض الاسئلة التوضيحية. كما قمنا بوضع مجموعة من التدريبات البسيطة على الترجمة بهدف تطبيق و استخدام القواعد و المفردات التي تعلمها الطالب خلال دراسته للنماذج التي يحتوي عليها هذا الفصل.

أولاً: النماذج التطبيقية

اتبعنا في هذا القسم نفس الاسلوب المستخدم في الفصل السابق حيث قمنا باختيار عشر مقالات باللغة العربية لكُتاب معروفين و ترجمتها إلى اللغة الانجليزية مع مراعاة النقل الأمين للنص العربي. و قد أتبعنا النصوص الخمس الأولى، كما

ذكرنا، بمجموعة اسئلة الغرض منها توضيح بعض الفروق المهمة في الترجمة بين اللغتين العربية و الانجليزية.

نموذج (1)

الأصل العربي:

وجهة نظر اقتصادية – العراق و تحديثات الإعمار

عامر نبال التميمي، الحياة

2006/08/16

منذ سقوط النظام العراقي السابق، يتساءل المرء عن مدى قدرة العراقيين على إنجاز مشروع اقتصادي تنموي يأخذ في الاعتبار إمكانات إعادة الإعمار وإصلاح أوضاع القطاعات الاقتصادية الأساسية وعلى رأسها قطاع النفط.

ولا شك في أن المعضلة الرئيسة اليوم هي صعوبات الوضع الأمني، وغياب الاستقرار وانعدام الانسجام بين القوى السياسية الأساسية، على رغم تشريع دستور وإجراء الانتخابات. وحال الغياب الأمني إلى عدم تدفق الأموال إلى العراق، وتخوف الشركات من الاستثمار هناك. ومما فاقم الأمور تعطل عمليات الإنتاج النفطي والإخفاق في رفعه إلى مستويات معقولة أو تقليدية.

كما أن ما يزيد الأمور تعقيداً هو عدم توصل المجموعات السياسية إلى إستراتيجية واضحة تجاه التنمية الاقتصادية بعد كل الخراب الذي ورثته البلاد طوال ربع القرن

الماضي. وعلى السياسيين أن يعوا بداية أن صياغة فلسفة اقتصادية مقنعة تظل أساسية في تحديد هوية الاقتصاد العراقي على مدى السنوات والعقود المقبلة، ولا شك في أن انتهاج فلسفة اقتصادية تعتمد على دور واسع للدولة لم يعد ممكناً في ظل الإمكانيات المالية المحدودة المتاحة للحكومة، وبعد أن أصبح صعباً تبني مثل هذه الفلسفة بعد التحولات الهيكلية في الاقتصاد العالمي وتعزيز قيمة العولمة والمنافسة الحرة ودور آليات السوق الحرة في التنمية الاقتصادية، والتي أصبحت متبناة من دول كثيرة حتى تلك التي كانت تعتمد الأنظمة الاشتراكية أو أنظمة رأسمالية الدولة.

لذلك، فإن اعتماد فلسفة الاقتصاد الرأسمالي تظل أساسية وملحة إذا أراد العراقيون أن تتدفق رؤوس الأموال على بلادهم، ومن ثم تتمكن من اللحاق بركب الحضارة واتساع العلاقات الاقتصادية الدولية بما يعزز القدرات الإنتاجية وعمليات التصدير وتحديث الانتاجية بما يتوافق مع مستجدات العصر الحديث. ويأمل الاقتصاديون ورجال الأعمال في منطقة الخليج العربي، وفي الكويت تحديداً، أن يوفق البرلمان العراقي في اعتماد قانون استثمار متوافق مع مبادئ العولمة الاقتصادية بما يعزز قدرتهم على الولوج إلى مختلف القطاعات الاقتصادية في العراق، بما في ذلك قطاع النفط وقطاع المرافق والبنية التحتية.

وتشير التطورات على الساحة العراقية إلى أن هناك توجهاً داخل الحكومة نحو الانفتاح وتحرير الاقتصاد. ولا بد من الإشارة هنا إلى أن قطاع النفط يجب أن يحظى باهتمام بارز نظراً لأهميته لكافة القطاعات هناك، وعلى الحكومة أن تعمل على تعزيز الإنتاج من حقول النفط لكي يصل إلى المستوى السابق، الذي اعتمد من «أوبك» منذ زمن طويل، وهو 3.4 مليون برميل يومياً والعمل على رفع الإنتاج

بعد التوصل إلى اتفاقات مع شركات النفط العالمية والإقليمية إلى مستويات تتوافق مع قدرات العراق وحجم مخزونه الطبيعي.

يضاف إلى ذلك أن هناك إمكانات في قطاع الصناعات التحويلية من طريق تخصيص ملكية شركات صناعية كثيرة مملوكة من الدولة، تعمل في الصناعات الغذائية والإنشائية، وخصوصاً صناعات الإسمنت. وهناك أيضاً القطاع السياحي حيث يمكن تخصيص الفنادق المملوكة من الدولة وتحديثها وتطوير خدماتها من شركات متخصصة قادرة على توفير الأموال اللازمة.

وعند الحديث عن إعادة الإعمار في العراق وإنجاز مشروع تنموي، على المرء أن يتطرق إلى مسألة المديونية العراقية، ولا أعني هنا قضية التعويضات الناتجة من احتلال الكويت، فهي مسألة تعود إلى قرارات الأمم المتحدة، بل الديون التي نتجت من إستدانة العراق في ظل النظام السابق، وخصوصاً إبان الحرب العراقية الإيرانية. هذه الديون وإن كانت تتجاوز الآن أكثر من 130 بليون دولار، بعد تراكم الفوائد والمتأخرات، والتي هي قيد الدراسة من أجل إعادة جدولتها أو خفض قيمتها من الدول والمؤسسات الدائنة يمكن، أيضاً، أن يتحول جزء منها إلى حقوق ملكية لمستثمرين يتولون شراءها، وتكون حقوق الملكية هذه في عدد من الشركات العراقية العاملة في القطاعات الأساسية وبذلك يتم تحقيق عملية التخصيص بما يتوافق مع تطوير هذه الشركات ومن دون الإضرار بالمصالح الوطنية.

قد يتصور عدد من السياسيين أن عمليات التخصيص والانفتاح ستعني التنازل عن السيادة الوطنية في القطاعات الأساسية في الاقتصاد العراقي. وهناك تحفظات قد تكون وجيهة. إلا أن التمسك بالطروحات التقليدية قد يضر المصالح العراقية في شكل كبير ويعطل عمليات إعادة الإعمار، ويحرم البلاد تدفقات استثمارية هامة.

ويجب أن تلعب الأمم المتحدة، من خلال منظماتها المتخصصة، دوراً أساسياً في معالجة المفاهيم والتوجهات السياسية التي ستحكم العمل الاقتصادي في العراق بما يساعد على إنجاز مشروع تنموي متميز، بافتراض توافر الأوضاع السياسية والأمنية الملائمة والمواتية.

الترجمة الانجليزية:

Challenges of Rebuilding Iraq

Amer Ziab el-Tamimi, *Al-Hayat*

16/08/2006

Since the fall of the Saddam regime in Iraq, I have been wondering whether the Iraqis will be able to carry out an economic development project, taking into consideration the prospects of rebuilding and rehabilitating the major economic sectors, on top of which comes the oil sector.

Undoubtedly, the main problem today is the difficult security situation. There is no harmony among the main political powers in the destabilized country, even after elections and the legislation of a new constitution. This state of insecurity has obstructed the flow of money and foreign investments into

Iraq. The situation worsened with the stoppage of oil production and the government's failure to lift it to reasonable or usual levels.

What made things even more complex is the failure of the political groups to draw a clear economic development strategy to make up for the devastation the country witnessed over the past 25 years. The Iraqi politicians must be aware that formulating a convincing economic philosophy is necessary to give shape to the Iraqi economy over the coming years and decades. It is definitely impossible to follow an economic philosophy that depends on the role of the government in light of the current limited financial resources it has. Other factors that make it impossible to adopt such a philosophy include the structural transformations of the world's economy, the augmented importance of globalization and free competition, and the growing role of free market mechanisms in economic development - which many States have adopted, even those which used to be socialist or capitalist.

Therefore, it is necessary for the Iraqis to adopt the philosophy of capital economy if they want foreign capitals to flow into their country, which will help it keep up with modern civilization and enhance its international economic relations to

boost its productivity and exports. Economists and businessmen in the Arab Gulf region, and especially Kuwait, hope the Iraqi parliament will pass a new investment law in line with the economic principles of globalization, which should grant them access to the different economic sectors in Iraq, including oil, utilities and infrastructure.

The latest developments in Iraq reflect a direction within the government toward openness and freeing the economy. It should be noted here that the oil sector should receive the most attention because of its major importance to all other sectors. The government must boost production of its oilfields to reach its former OPEC-approved level of 3.4 billion bpd. Production should be increased, especially after the government has reached deals with international and regional oil firms to levels that suit the potentials of Iraq and the volume of its natural oil reserves.

In addition, there are many possibilities in the sector of manufacturing industries through privatizing some State-owned industrial firms in the fields of complementary and construction industries, especially the cement industry. Also, in the sector of tourism, there is the possibility of privatizing, modernizing and improving the services of State-owned hotels.

When speaking of rebuilding Iraq and carrying out an economic development project, one should address the question of Iraqi debts. I do not mean here the debts that resulted from the invasion of Kuwait, which is a UN affair. What I mean is the debts arising from the former regime's borrowing during the war with Iran. Iraq's creditors are currently mulling the rescheduling or even the write-off of the \$130-billion debt - the figure includes accumulated interests. But this debt could be resold to investors as proprietary rights in a number of Iraqi companies in major fields. This way the privatization process could go on in line with the process of developing these companies and without any harm to the national interests.

Some politicians may believe that privatization and freeing the economy would mean conceding national sovereignty in the country's major economic sectors. There are some reservations that seem reasonable. However, sticking to traditional reasoning could harm the Iraqi interests greatly and hinder the rebuilding process. It could also deny the country significant investment flows. The UN, through its specialized organizations, must play its role in formulating the concepts and basic attitudes that will govern the economic efforts in Iraq

in order to help carry out an outstanding development project - provided that suitable political and security conditions are guaranteed.

اسئلة عن النص:

- 1- حدد ثلاث جمل استخدم فيها الفعل المضارع في النص الأصلي و قارنها بترجمتها الانجليزية.
- 2- حدد ثلاث جمل استخدم فيها الفعل الماضي في النص الأصلي و قارنها بترجمتها الانجليزية.
- 3- حدد معاني المفردات التالية باللغة الانجليزية مستعينا بالترجمة المرفقة:

الصناعات التحويلية، التخصيص، شركات مملوكة للدولة، الصناعات الإنشائية، القطاع السياحي، إعادة الإعمار، مشروع تنموي، مسألة المديونية، قضية التعويضات، قرارات الأمم المتحدة، الديون، الفوائد، المتأخرات، إعادة جدولة الديون، المؤسسات الدائنة، حقوق الملكية، المصالح الوطنية، السيادة الوطنية، تدفقات استثمارية.

نموذج (2)

الأصل العربي:

اقتصاد ما بعد الحرب

كمال القيسي، الحياة

2006/08/17

تؤدي الحروب إلى ارتفاع كلفة الحياة ووقف الأنشطة الاقتصادية والاجتماعية بسبب تحويل الموارد إلى النشاط العسكري. كما تؤدي الحروب جميعها، من دون استثناء، إلى التضخم لأن الأموال المتاحة تطارد سلعا قليلة، وتحويل الموارد إلى استخدامات عسكرية ما يدفع إلى ارتفاع كلفة العمل وخفض الأرباح. وللحروب أعراض جانبية على النشاط الاقتصادي من خلال الاستعدادات للحرب وارتفاع الطلب على مستلزماتها، ما يقود إلى خفض البطالة وزيادة معدلات الدخل والاستهلاك. إلا أن تمويل الحروب يكون مصدره خفض الإنفاق على البرامج الاقتصادية والاجتماعية وزيادة الضرائب والاقتراض، مع ما له من آثار سلبية على الاقتصاد والرفاهية العامة في المدى القصير والبعيد، من خلال فقدان جزء كبير من الناتج المحلي الإجمالي، وكذلك على التوازن الديموغرافي والاجتماعي للبلد وصعوبة إيجاد الاستثمارات اللازمة وتوظيفها. بعبارة أخرى، تؤدي الحروب إلى وقف تنمية البلدان وتطورها نظراً لفقدان سيطرتها على المصادر المادية والبشرية واستقرار الأمن. وكما هو معروف أن الاستقرار الاقتصادي والاجتماعي وضمنان الأمن، شروط مسبقة يجب توافرها قبل تحقيق تنمية مستدامة.

كما ان الانتقال من الحرب إلى السلام والحفاظ عليه يعتبر مهمة غاية في التعقيد نظرا لأن المشاكل الاقتصادية والإنسانية التي تعقب الحرب تكون أكثر إرباكا من اقتصاد الحرب، وتحتاج إلى سيطرة للدولة أكبر مما كانت عليه الحال في زمن الحرب.

إن أهم ما تفرزه الحرب هو دمار رأس المال البشري وتضاعف الكلفة الإنسانية والاجتماعية، بحيث ان أدوات التحليل المالي والمحاسبي تقف عاجزة عن تقدير الكلفة الحقيقية للحرب وما تولده من آثار نفسية وتدهور في البنى التحتية للصحة العامة والتعليم وتدمير شبكات الماء والصرف الصحي وتلوث البيئة. وللظروف التي ستواجهها حكومة البلد الخارج من الحرب دور كبير في رسم شكل المسارات المطلوبة في مواجهة شبكة المشاكل الناجمة ومدى توافر مستلزماتها، ومن تلك الظروف على سبيل المثال لا الحصر: هل خرج البلد من الحرب منتصرا أم كان ضحية لها؟ هل في إمكانه مواجهة خسائره في الأرواح والممتلكات والبنى التحتية والسلع والخدمات والتعافي منها؟ هل في إمكان البلد أن ينهض في شكل مستقل معتمداً على موارده المحلية الوطنية، أم عليه الانحناء لقوى عظمى مستغلة لتتيح له مساعدة المؤسسات الإقليمية والدولية التابعة لها؟ هل في إمكان الدولة في أعقاب الحرب الحفاظ على السيطرة الأمنية والاقتصادية والاجتماعية أم أنها ستخسرهما لمصلحة قوى أخرى؟ كيف سيكون وضع المالية العامة في نهاية الحرب؟

وعند انتهاء الحرب، على الدولة إيجاد الحلول الناجعة لثلاث مشاكل مالية: وقف تمويل الحرب وخفض ضرائب ومساعدات الحرب تدريجاً. تمويل إعادة البناء والإعمار الذي يعتمد على حجم ما أحدث من الدمار، وقدرة الحكومة والقطاع الخاص على البناء بالاعتماد على المصادر الذاتية للبلد وما يمكن أن يجمع من منح

ومساعدات وقروض إقليمية ودولية. تسوية قروض الحرب في شكل لا يعوق عملية الإعمار والبناء.

في الأونة الأخيرة تعرضت ثلاث دول عربية (فلسطين، لبنان، العراق)، إضافة إلى دول أخرى في العالم النامي لحروب، ما أدى إلى توسع دائرة العنف وضياح الحقوق وارتفاع عدد الجرائم المنظمة، ودفع بالتالي منظمات ومؤسسات دولية عدة إلى إبداء «قلقها» حول التكاليف السياسية والإنسانية والاقتصادية المتصاعدة، وعجز تلك الدول عن مقابلتها. لذا ففي عام 1997 أنشأ البنك الدولي وحدة "الاعمار و منع نشوب النزاعات" لدعم قدرته على تقديم العون للبلدان المتضررة من الصراعات والنزاعات ومساعدتها خلال المرحلة الانتقالية في الوصول إلى الأمن المستدام ودعمها في تحقيق التنمية الاقتصادية الاجتماعية. وللوصول إلى ذلك يقوم البنك بتحليل الأسباب البينية لفهم جذور المشكلة والنتائج الناجمة عنها.

وما حدث في لبنان هو انتهاك صارخ للشرعية الدولية، ما يستوجب الإدانة الدولية لإسرائيل وتجريمها على الدمار المتعمد والمخطط له بدفعها التعويضات اللازمة. كما تجب المطالبة بتجريمها عن الخسائر في الاقتصاد بسبب توقف الحياة خلال فترة الحرب و «التكاليف المستقبلية». اللازمة لإعادة التوازن النسبي الذي كانت عليه هياكل البلد الاقتصادية والمالية والاجتماعية قبل الحرب وتعطيل مرحلة الانطلاق نحو تنمية شاملة. ونرى أن يقوم لبنان بالتنسيق مع الدول الصديقة كافة ومجموعة الدول الأوروبية للضغط على الأمم المتحدة في إصدار قرار إدانة وتشكيل لجنة خاصة بتعويضات الحرب (على غرار لجنة حرب الخليج 1991) والدعوة إلى مؤتمر للمانحين لتقديم المنح والمساعدات والتسهيلات المالية وضمن أن إعلان الدول بالمساهمة بتطابق والتزامها بالدفع.

Post-War Economy

Kamal el-Kalissi, *Al-Hayat*

17/08/2006

Wars raise the cost of living and disrupt economic and social activities because resources are transferred into military activities. All wars, without exception, cause inflation, because there are only few goods as against the money available. Allocation of resources for military uses raises the cost of work and reduces profits.

Wars do have side effects on economic activity. Preparation for wars and the rising demand for war supplies cut down unemployment, and drive up the income rates and consumption. However, financing wars necessitates less spending on economic and social programs, more taxes and borrowing. This negatively affects the economy and public welfare in the short and long terms. A significant ratio of the gross domestic product (GDP) is lost, as well. It also affects the demographic and social balance of the country. Moreover, necessary investments become hard to obtain and utilize.

In other words, wars stop any further development in countries. In wartime, countries lose control over material and human resources, and they become unstable. It is well known that economic and social stability and a guaranteed security are all prerequisites for sustainable development.

The processes of moving from war to peace and preserving that peace are extremely complex. Post-war economic and humanitarian problems are always more disruptive than the war economy. The country needs a kind of control mechanism that is more comprehensive than that during wartime.

The most important consequence of war is the destruction of human resources, and the rise of humanitarian and social cost. The tools of financial analysis and accounting fail to estimate the real toll of war. They fall short of calculating the psychological effects, the deterioration of public health, education, the destruction of water and sanitation networks, as well as environmental pollution.

The government of a country emerging from the war faces a set of circumstances which play a great role. They dictate the methods needed to face up to the resulting problems and to

utilize the range of necessary tools available. These circumstances include, but are not limited to, the following:

Is the country a victor or victim of the war?

Is it able to absorb the loss of lives, property, infrastructure, goods and services and then restore the situation to normal?

Is it able to independently revive, relying on its national resources, or has it to submit to a superpower that could make available the assistance of regional and international bodies affiliated to it?

Will the country, in the aftermath of war, be able to maintain its security, economic and social control, or will it give it up to another power?

How will the country's financial situation be, as a whole, when the war ends?

At war's end, the country should decisively tackle these three financial issues:

- Stop financing the war, and gradually cut down taxes and war financial allocations.

- Finance reconstruction. Reconstruction will depend on the amount of destruction. It will also rely on the ability of the government and the private sector to rebuild the country with its own resources. It would be affected by any possible regional and international grants, aids or loans.
- Clear war debts in a way that does not impede reconstruction. Recently, three Arab countries (Palestine, Lebanon and Iraq), in addition to other developing countries, entered wars. This spread violence, lost people and countries their rights and raised the number of organized crimes. Several international organizations and institutions, in turn, voiced 'concern' about the rising political, humanitarian and economic toll. They were also concerned because all these countries could not face these costs. In 1997, the World Bank established The Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction Unit of the World Bank, to further its ability to offer support to the countries affected by conflicts and disputes. It also aims at helping these countries to sustain security in an interim stage, and to materialize their socio-economic development. To that end, the Bank analyzes the target environment to understand the roots of the problem and its subsequent results.

What happened in Lebanon is a flagrant violation of international legitimacy. It requires an international condemnation of Israel. Israel should be criminalized for its intentional, premeditated devastation and should pay reparations. It should also pay indemnities to make up for the economic loss incurred as a result of the disruptive atmosphere during wartime. It should bear the 'future costs' necessary to bring the country back to the relative economic, financial and social balance it had before the war. It should also account for the obstacles it has thrown in the way of comprehensive development. I believe that Lebanon should coordinate with all friendly, and EU, States to press the UN for a condemnation resolution. The UN should establish an ad hoc compensation commission (similar to that of the 1991 Gulf War). It should also call upon the Donors Conference to provide financial grants, assistance and facilities. Moreover, it should ensure that the announced contributions of these States are made good by actual payments.

اسئلة عن النص:

1- ابحث عن صيغ نفي في النص العربي و لاحظ ما يقابلها في النص

الانجليزي.

2- حدد معاني العبارات التالية باللغة الانجليزية مستعينا بالترجمة المرفقة:

تحويل الموارد، التضخم، ارتفاع كلفة العمل، خفض الأرباح، أعراض جانبية، ارتفاع الطلب، خفض البطالة، زيادة معدلات الدخل، خفض الإنفاق، زيادة الضرائب، الاقتراض، الرفاهية العامة، الناتج المحلي الإجمالي، التوازن الديموغرافي، المصادر البشرية، تنمية مستدامة، اقتصاد الحرب، أدوات التحليل المالي، البنى التحتية، الصحة العامة، تلوث البيئة.

نموذج (3)

الأصل العربي:

لا يتوقع حرباً أهلية... روبرت فيسك: ما يحدث في لبنان اليوم مثال على الانتهازية الغربية

عزة طويل، الحياة

2006/07/31

روبرت فيسك مراسل صحيفة "الانديبنندنت" البريطانية في الشرق الأوسط، يستقر في بيروت، ومنها ينطلق نحو فلسطين والعراق والكويت وإيران... وصولاً إلى أفغانستان.

بعد كتابه «ويلات وطن» الذي اعتبره القراء الأكثر مكاشفة وجراً في مقاربة الموضوعات الشائكة، تصدر بعد أيام في بيروت الترجمة العربية لكتابه الجديد «الحرب الكبرى تحت ذريعة الحضارة».

لمناسبة صدور الكتاب الجديد التقينا روبرت فيسك الذي قال: «حين شرعتُ في تأليف كتابي هذا، كنت أظن أنني سأخوض في موضوع العجز عن تخطي التاريخ والهرب منه، على قاعدة أن كل ما نعانیه وما سوف نعانیه إنما هو نتاج ما قام به أهلنا وأسلافنا. لم أكن قد ولدت بعد، زمن وعد بلفور ولا يوم عقدت معاهدة سايكس بيكو، لكنني أعيش وفي كل لحظة من حياتي نتاجهما. نحن الأوروبيين والأميركيين نعتقد أن بوسعنا أن نصفق الباب خلف التاريخ ونجاوله. ففي نهاية الحرب العالمية الثانية، مات أدولف هتلر وكذلك موسوليني فأنشأنا الأمم المتحدة ثم الاتحاد

الأوروبي. إذا نحن لا نكفّ عن صفق الأبواب ونستمرّ نتغاضى عن التاريخ ونجاوزه. نحن في هذا على النقيض تماماً من الشرق أوسطيين. أعرف صديقاً فلسطينياً نجا من مجزرة صبرا وشاتيلا وتمكن بأعجوبة من البقاء على قيد الحياة. وحين استيقظ في صباح اليوم التالي ليجد نفسه وسط ركام الدم والدمار والموت الذي خلفته المجزرة، سقطت في نظره كل الفواصل الزمنية وظنّ أن وعد بلفور حدث في الليلة الماضية.

ويصف كتابه بأنه "شهادات حية"، هو تمثيل لكل ما رأيته بأم العين على مدار الأعوام الثلاثين المنصرمة. إنه كتاب عن إسرائيل وفلسطين، وبعضه تضمّن مراسلات جرت بيني وبين شاب فلسطيني حاول أن يقنع صديقه الحامل بوضع قبلة على متن طائرة. وقد أطلقت على هذا الفصل، وهو الخامس في الكتاب، عنوان «الفتاة والطفل والحب». في فصل آخر، أتيت على ذكر حنان عشاوي وباسر عرفات حيث تبرز الصورة السينة لهذا الأخير على حقيقتها. كذلك شارون الذي أظهرته مجرم حرب لا يملئ عليه أحد ما يفعله.

حين أنهيت كتابي، أدركت أنه تمثيل تاريخي للتعذيب والمعاناة والمجازر ولانعدام الحق والعدل.

سألناه عن مصطلح «الحضارة» باعتباره مفردة ملتبسة في عنوان كتابه «الحرب الكبرى تحت ذريعة الحضارة»، حيث يمكن اعتبار الحضارة ذريعة تتلطى بها الحرب الكبرى.

أجاب: بصدق، لا أستخدم على الإطلاق مفردة «الحضارة»، واعتماداً على هذا المصطلح في عنوان كتابي إنما أتى من باب السخرية فقط، والعنوان بجملته عبارة عن كلمات محفورة على ميدالية كانت لأبي، وهي إحدى ميداليات الشرف في

الحرب العالمية الأولى. من هنا مصدر سخريتي. لا أؤمن بالحضارات (مع التشديد على صيغة الجمع). يقول الإمام علي بن أبي طالب: «الناس صنفان: إما أخ لك في الدين وإما نظير لك في الخلق». لقد أمضيت ثلاثين عاماً في العالم المسلم، والمسلمون جزء من بيروت. في الحقيقة، لا يستوقفني الاختلاف الديني شخصياً. أنا لا أفكر في ديانة الآخرين، فسانقي مثلاً ومديرة منزلي وكل من يحيطون بي ينتمون إلى طوائف مختلفة، هم سنة ودروز وشيعة و... أعرف ديانة كل منهم تماماً كما أعرف لون عيونهم، لكن ذلك لا يعني لي شيئاً. أنا خارج الديانات ولا أؤمن بالحضارات، والفكرة القائلة إن الصراع موجود دائماً حيث تتواجد الاختلافات الدينية أو التنوعات الدينية فكرة لا تقنعني في الأساس.

هل شاهدت فيلم "Kingdom of Heaven"؟ إنه يتحدث عن الحملات الصليبية. لقد شاهدته في سينما Dunes في شارع فردان، وبالطبع كان الجمهور من غالبية مسلمة. حين توالى المشاهد الدموية المروعة للصليبيين بتيابهم المغطاة بدماء المسلمين، يتهاون لاغتصاب شقيقة صلاح الدين وقتلها، كنت أتلفت حولي شمالاً ويميناً لأرصد ردود الأفعال، لكنني أدركت أن الجمهور يرى إلى هذه المشاهد التي حصلت بالفعل باعتبارها مشاهد من تاريخ مضى. قرابة نهاية الفيلم، مرّ مشهد آخر ظهر فيه صلاح الدين وهو يطأ أرض القدس بعد سقوطها ويدخل كنيسة تعرضت للقصف المدفعي فيرى تمثال المسيح المصلوب ملقياً إلى الأرض، فيلتقطه ويعيده إلى مكانه على المذبح. حينها، هبّ الجمهور من مكانه واقفاً وشرع بالتصفيق. لذا، من فضلك لا تحدثني عن الحضارات.

سألناه: في آذار (مارس) 2006، في مقابلة أجرتها معك World Today، توقعت أزمة سياسية كبرى في الشرق الأوسط. إلى أي مدى تقاطعت توقعاتك هذه مع ما يحدث الآن في لبنان؟

أجاب: في العام 1993، أنجزت فيلماً للسينما بعنوان «من بيروت إلى البوسنة»، عرض على شاشتي القناة الرابعة البريطانية وقناة Discovery في الولايات المتحدة، يتحدث عن الأسباب التي ستدفع بالمسلمين إلى كراهية الغرب. وقد التقطنا مشاهد الفيلم في لبنان خصوصاً جنوبه، وفي غزة والضفة الغربية وفي إسرائيل ومصر والبوسنة وبولندا وكرواتيا. وفي العام ذاته، دخلت مسجداً تلتهمه النيران، في البوسنة كنا نصور المشهد. حينها، قلت في الخلفية الصوتية للفيلم إنني كلما رأيت بشاعة كهذه، يمثل أمامي مباشرة الشرق الأوسط حيث أعيش. ما قلته حينها وبدقة: أتساءل عما يحضره العالم الإسلامي لنا، ربما عليّ إنهاء كل تقرير لي بعبارة: انتبهوا!

وعثرت على شريط مصور آخر لمقابلة أجريتها مع تلفزيون CBC الكندي في تورونتو، حيث خلص محوري إلى القول: يبدو أن الأمور تتحسن في الشرق الأوسط، ولا سيما بعد معاهدات السلام التي عقدها مع إسرائيل دول عربية من مثل الأردن ومصر. كان جوابي حينها: لا، ذلك ليس صحيحاً، فأنا أؤكد أن انفجاراً ما سيحصل وأنا على يقين من ذلك.

في وسع من يعيش في الشرق الأوسط ولا سيما إن كان غريباً، أن يشتم الأحداث ويستبقها، وأعترف بأنني لا أتذكر بالضبط ما الذي دفعني إلى قول ما قلته آنذاك، لكنني كنت بالطبع على حق، أليس كذلك؟

وحول ما يحدث في لبنان الآن قال:

ما يحدث هو مثال فاقع آخر عن الانتهازية الغربية، التهكم الأميركي، الوحشية الإسرائيلية وخيانة الغرب المستمرة للبنان. كما أنه مثال على سهولة استثثار جماعة واحدة في لبنان بالقرارات المصيرية من دون استشارة الآخرين. كذلك سهولة إقحام

هؤلاء الآخرين في الدراما والفوضى والتشويش. ما يثير الانتباه حقاً أن جيفري فيلتمان، السفير الأميركي في لبنان، الذي أمضى العام الماضي يشيد بسلوك السنيورة ويعتبره ديموقراطياً للغاية، صرّح إثر خطاب السنيورة بأنه فصيح ومؤثر، وهذا في رأي أكثر التصريحات التي سمعتها إثارةً للشفقة عن لسان سفير أميركي في وقت كهذا. ذلك أن فيلتمان أوقع نفسه في مأزق، فهو يصف الخطاب بأنه رائع، ما يضمن بطريقة غير مباشرة انتقاداً لإسرائيل. لذا اعتقد أنه سيرسل إلى منغوليا عما قريب ليستمتع بدوره كسفير لأميركا هناك. وفي ذلك أيضاً، عكس فيلتمان درجة عالية من الجبن لدى الولايات المتحدة، وخوف هذه الأخيرة من توجيه أي نقد لإسرائيل، في أي سياق كان، فضلاً عن انتقاء أي تعاطف مع اللبنانيين أو إظهار حد أدنى من الاحترام لهم.

في فترة سابقة، كتبت أن اللبنانيين باتوا اليوم شديدي الشبه بالغربيين، فأنتم (أي اللبنانيين) تشبهوننا، تعيشون بيننا في لندن أو باريس، تنطقون بصورة ممتازة بالعربية والإنكليزية والفرنسية، كما أنكم الشعب الأكثر ثقافة في المنطقة. نحن نحترمكم ونسعى لأن نكون أصدقاءكم، نشارككم طعامكم، نجالسكم ونستمع بصحبتكم، وثمة الكثير من الغربيين والغربيات الذين تزوجوا من لبنان، إنما حين يتعلق الأمر بإسرائيل، سرعان ما نتخلى عنكم ونخون ثقتكم، وهذا ما نفعله اليوم. كل هذه السفن والبوارج الغربية التي تحتشد اليوم في مياه البحر الأبيض المتوسط لم تأت لحمايتكم، بل لحماية رعاياها وهم في معظمهم لبنانيون بالطبع من حملة الجنسيتين. والمفارقة ما حصل عند وصول هذه السفن إلى الشواطئ اللبنانية، حين بدأ مراسلو المحطات التلفزيونية يصطادون كل من لهم عيون زرقاء وشعر أشقر. علماً بأن ثمة تقصداً متعمداً من قبل الغرب للإيهام بأن عمليات الإجلاء تستهدف

الأجانب أو المولودين في الغرب، فهم حتى حين أتوا لإنقاذكم، رفضوا إظهار ذلك إعلامياً على شاشات التلفزة.

وعن رأيه في موقف بوش حيال العدوان على لبنان وإصراره على عدم وقف إطلاق النار، وموقف الأمم المتحدة أيضاً، يقول: إنه أمر مثير للشفقة إلى أقصى الحدود. بوش يريد أن يجسّد القوة والسلطة لكنه على الأرض لا يعكس سوى الضعف السياسي. بوش لا يحارب حتى من أجل بلده. هو لم يفعل ذلك في حرب فيتنام، فلا يتوقع أحد منه أن يساند بلداً كـلبنان. لقد تحول هو وبلير إلى بوق لمصالح إسرائيل وسياستها.

جون بولتن، السفير الأميركي في الأمم المتحدة، تهاوى هو الآخر، واعتقد أنه بات الآن في حاجة إلى علاج طبي ضروري. كذب بولتن وناق حين قال: كيف يمكن وقف إطلاق النار في لبنان الذي أجريت فيه الانتخابات بديموقراطية، في ظل وجود الإرهابيين. والدليل على نفاقه أن اتفاقاً لوقف إطلاق النار تم في العام 1990 وبرعاية الأمم المتحدة بين إسرائيل وحكومة ياسر عرفات الذي تعتبره إسرائيل إرهابياً، وقد نجح هذا الأمر واستمر لعامين. لكن إسرائيل ما لبثت أن خرقت هذا الاتفاق في العام 1992 بذريعة أن عرفات كان وراء اغتيال سفيرها في لندن، وهذا بالطبع لم يكن صحيحاً، فصدام حسين هو من كان وراء هذا الاغتيال. بولتن لا يعرف شيئاً عن تاريخ بلده، هو رجل منهار ومتهاو، وكفى أن تراقبيه لتدركي ذلك.

حيث توجد أميركا

ذكر فيسك في كتابه أن الولايات المتحدة وضعت مخططاً جغرافياً كاملاً للمنطقة. فما هو هذا المخطط وما هي حدوده؟

اجاب عن السؤال بسؤال آخر. بطريقة ما، أميركا موجودة، وعبر مواقع عسكرية مختلفة، في أفغانستان، كازاخستان، أوزباكستان، باكستان، الأردن، تركيا، مصر، إسرائيل، البحرين وغيرها، فماذا يفعلون هناك؟ وما الهدف من هذا التمرکز المتلطي خلف ستار ما؟ يمكن البدء من غرينلاند وصولاً إلى بريطانيا، ألمانيا، البوسنة، يوغوسلافيا، واليونان التي تتقاطع مع تركيا. إذا من حدود الصومال صعوداً إلى القطب الشمالي، ثمة تمرکز أميركي مستتر، فما الهدف من ذلك؟ ألا تجدین في هذا جواباً عن السؤال؟

لا حرب أهلية في لبنان

لم تتوقع حرباً أهلية في العراق، فهل تتوقع حرباً أهلية ثانية في لبنان، لا سيما أن ثمة الكثير مما يقال حول ذلك اليوم. في رأيك، هل سيضعف اللبنانيون مرة أخرى؟ يجيب: «كنت مخطئاً في شأن العراق على ما يبدو. أما في لبنان، فلا أعتقد أن ثمة مجالاً لحرب أهلية ما دام الجيش متماسكاً. قد تحاول إسرائيل تسليح بعض الأحزاب السياسية في لبنان. مع ذلك، أرى أن اللبنانيين قد نضجوا بعد حربهم الأهلية الطويلة الماضية. بعد اغتيال الرئيس الحريري، وبومذاك كنت على مسافة 400 متر من مكان الانفجار، اعتقدت للوهلة الأولى أن أشباح القوات المشتركة للحرب الأهلية اللبنانية ستعود إلى الظهور من جديد. لكن الأيام مرت ولم يحصل ذلك. نجا لبنان من حرب أهلية أخرى. خلال الحرب اللبنانية، هاجر الشباب اللبناني إلى الغرب. قصدوا جنيف وباريس ولندن وتعلموا في هارفرد وليون وعادوا بتفكير أكثر نضجاً وصراحاً بأنهم لا يريدون حرب أهلية مرة أخرى.

Robert Fisk: No Civil War is Looming....The Current Events in Lebanon Reflect the West Opportunism

Azza Tawil, *Al-Hayat*

31/07/2006

From ~~Beirut~~, where he has chosen to settle down, Robert Fisk, the ~~Middle~~ East correspondent of the British "Independent", sets ~~out for~~ Palestine, Iraq, Kuwait, Iran, reaching Afghanistan.

Following "~~Pity the Nation~~," widely perceived as the most courageous and outspoken book approaching the thorny issues, the Arabic translation of Fisk's new book, "The Great War for Civilization: The Conquest of the Middle East" will come out in few days in ~~Beirut~~.

On this ~~occasion~~, "*Al-Hayat*" met Robert Fisk, who said: When I first embarked on writing this book, I feared I would simply ponder on our failure to overcome and evade history, especially that everything we suffered from in the past, as we will in the future, is but the outcome of our fathers and forefathers' deeds. I wasn't born when Balfour Promise was made and Sykes-Picot

Agreement concluded. But I endure in every moment of my life the repercussions of both events. We, the Europeans and Americans, believe we can surmount history, slamming the door behind the past. At the end of World War II, when Adolf Hitler and Mussolini passed away, we set up the United Nations then the European Union. So, we keep on slamming doors, overlooking and disregarding history in sharp contrast with the people of the Middle East. A Palestinian friend of mine had miraculously survived Sabra and Shatila massacres. When he woke up the next day amidst blood, destruction, death and debris - the remnants of the massacre- he lost all touch with time and thought that Balfour Promise was made the past night. Fisk describes his book as "firsthand testimonies", an embodiment of all what I have beheld with my own eyes over the past 30 years. It's a book about Israel and Palestine, enclosing in the 5th chapter "The Girl, the Baby, and Love" some of my correspondences with a Palestinian young man who tried to convince his pregnant girlfriend to plant a bomb on an airplane. In another chapter, I mentioned Hanan Ashrawi, unveiled Yasser Arafat's real wickedness, and depicted Sharon as an obstinate war criminal taking none's commands.

When I finished my book, I realized it was a historical illustration of torture, suffering, massacre, and injustice.

We asked him then about the ambiguous word, "civilization," in the title of his book, "The Great War for Civilization," whereby civilization can be meant as a pretext to the Great War.

Frankly, he replied, I have never used this word. But this time it came out of irony. I was inspired with this title from the words inscribed on one of my father's WWI honor medals. Here lies my irony. I do not believe in civilizations - and I insist on the plural form. Imam Ali Ibn Abi Talib says that people are of two types: brothers either in their faith or peers in morals. I spent 30 years in the Muslim world; the Muslims are also part of Beirut. In truth, religious differences do not interest me personally. I do not care for others' religions. For instance, my driver, housekeeper, and all people around me belong to different sects -Sunnite, Druze, Shiite... I know the exact faith of each one of them as I know the color of their eyes, but this means nothing to me. Religions are not a matter of concern to me and I do not believe in civilizations. Even more, the idea stating that conflict arises where religious differences prevail does not convince me in the first place. Have you watched

"Kingdom of Heaven" on Crusades? I have in Dunes cinema, Verdun, where the audience was mostly Muslim. When the horrible bloody scenes rolled depicting the Crusaders with their Muslim blood-tainted clothes poised to rape then kill Salah Eddine's (Saladin) sister, I looked around in an attempt to observe the audience reactions. But, to the public, these scenes belong to a bygone history. By the end, another scene appeared - Saladin reached Jerusalem after its collapse, entered a bombarded church where he picked up a crucifix then placed it back on the altar. At this, the audience burst in applause. So, if you please, don't talk to me about civilizations!

In March 2006, in an interview with World Today, you portended a major political crisis in the Middle East. To what extent have your predictions met with the current developments in Lebanon?

In 1993, he answered, I finished the movie "From Bosnia to Beirut" on the reasons behind the Muslims' hatred of the West. Later aired on the British Channel 4 and the American Discovery, it was mostly filmed in Lebanon, mainly the South, in Gaza, the West Bank, Israel, Egypt, Bosnia, Poland, and Croatia. In the same year, I entered a fire-consumed mosque. We were then shooting in Bosnia. So, I said in the background

that whenever I behold such atrocities, I instantly flash back to the Middle East where I live. I exactly said: I wonder what the Muslim world is concocting for us. Maybe I must end all my articles with the expression: Watch out!

I have also come across another videotape for my interview with the Canadian CBC station in Toronto. My interlocutor ended up saying: Things are apparently getting better in the Middle East, especially after the peace treaties some Arab States like Jordan and Egypt have concluded with Israel. I answered at that time: No, that's not true. I am quite certain that an outbreak will rock the region.

Every Middle East inhabitant, particularly a Westerner, can sniff out and anticipate events. Frankly, I do not remember what prompted me to say so at that time but I was certainly right, wasn't I?

With respect to the current events in Lebanon, he said:

They constitute another blatant example of the Western opportunism, the American hypocrisy, the Israeli barbarism, and the West's continuous betrayal of Lebanon. Interestingly, the US ambassador in Lebanon Jeffrey Feltman, engrossed last year in hailing Siniora's highly democratic conduct, described

the speech as eloquent and impressive in one of the most pathetic declarations I have ever heard from a US ambassador in such times. Feltman has certainly got himself in trouble. By describing the speech as wonderful, he implicitly criticized Israel. So, in my view, he will be soon dispatched to Mongolia where he will serve as an ambassador to the United States. In addition, Feltman mirrored the US as coward, afraid of criticizing Israel in any context, and devoid of compassion and respect for the Lebanese.

I have previously likened the Lebanese to the Westerners. You, the Lebanese, resemble us. You live amongst us in London or Paris; you master Arabic, French, English; you are in sum the most cultivated people in the region. We respect you and yearn to be your friends, to share your food and company. Many westerners, males and females alike, have married Lebanese. But when it comes to Israel, we instantly abandon you and betray your trust as is the case nowadays. All these western warships massing in the Mediterranean waters are not here to protect you but to protect their expatriates, mostly Lebanese of dual nationality. Paradoxically, when the battleships reached the Lebanese shores, reporters started chasing all foreigners with blue eyes and blond hair in line with the West's deliberate

attempt to suggest that foreigners or citizens born in the west are the only ones evacuated. So, even when they came to save you, they concealed it.

Regarding Bush's stance on the assault against Lebanon, his refusal of a ceasefire as well as the UN stand, he says that it is pathetic to the largest extent. Bush, in his intention to embody power and strength, only represents political weakness. Bush does not fight, not even for his own country. He has not fought in Vietnam so nobody expects him now to support a country like Lebanon. He and Blair are but mouthpieces of Israel's interests and policies.

In the same vein, John Bolton, the US ambassador to the UN, has tumbled and is in desperate need of medical treatment. Bolton lied when he said: How can we, in the presence of terrorists, reach a ceasefire in Lebanon, where democratic elections were held? To prove his lies, I will just refer to the 1990 ceasefire reached under the UN auspices between Israel and Yasser Arafat, the terrorist in the eyes of Israel. It worked for two whole years before Israel breached it in 1992 alleging that Arafat was behind the murder of its ambassador in London. But the truth is, Saddam Hussein was behind that

assassination! In short, Bolton totally ignores his country's history. He is careless. Watch him and you'll find out!

Where the US is present

You said in your book, Mr. Fisk, that the United States devised a geographical plan for the region. What is it and what are its limits?

He met this question with another one. "In some way", he noted, "the US is present, thanks to its military positions, in Afghanistan, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Pakistan, Jordan, Turkey, Egypt, Israel, Bahrain, and others. What are the Americans doing there? What goal does this disguised presence serve? Let's start from Greenland to Britain, Germany, Bosnia, Yugoslavia, and Greece near Turkey. In a nutshell, there is a disguised US presence stretching from Somalia's borders up to the North Pole. Why? Don't you find in this a reply to your question?"

No civil war looming in Lebanon

You haven't portended a civil war in Iraq. Do you expect a second one in Lebanon amid the boiling news on the issue? Do you believe that the Lebanese will waver again?

I was apparently wrong about Iraq. But in Lebanon, I do not think that a civil war will erupt so long as the army remains united. Israel may try to arm some Lebanese political parties. Still, the Lebanese have grown mature after their long civil wars. When Hariri was assassinated, I was 400 meters away from the blast area. I thought at first sight that the specters of the joint forces of the Lebanese civil war will resurface. But the days slipped by and nothing of the like occurred. Lebanon was spared another civil war. During the Lebanese civil war, the youth emigrated to the West, to Geneva, Paris, London, and studied in Harvard and Lyon and came back with a ripper thinking. They definitely don't want their parents' war to recur.

اسئلة عن النص:

- 1- ابحث عن صيغ تانيث في النص العربي و لاحظ ما يقابلها في النص الانجليزي.
- 2- استخرج معاني الكلمات التالية من النص الانجليزي و ضعها في جمل من تأليفك:

البوارج الغربية، تحتشد، رعاياها، وقف إطلاق النار، السفير الأميركي في الأمم المتحدة، انتخابات ديموقراطية، برعاية الأمم المتحدة، خرق الاتفاق، محاولة اغتيال.

الأصل العربي:

"هجوم" السلام العربي و أوهامه

مروان قبلان، الحياة

2004/01/13

المح الرئيس جورج بوش في خطابه الذي ألقاه في حفل العشاء السنوي لمعهد (أميركان انتربرايز) يوم 26 فبراير (شباط) الماضي إلى انه سيسعى إلى تحريك ملف الصراع العربي- الإسرائيلي فور إنهاء عدوانه على العراق. وقد لفت الانتباه أن توقيت العرض جاء قبل أيام قليلة من انعقاد مؤتمر القمة العربية في شرم الشيخ لمناقشة الأزمة العراقية. و كأنما أراد الرئيس الأمريكي الإيحاء للزعماء العرب بأن الطريق إلى القدس يمر عبر بغداد. ورغم أن هذا الطرح كان أسخف ما وقعت عليه الأسماع إلى حينه إلا أن أحدا من العرب لم يستنكره علنا. و الآن و بعد تسعة أشهر على سقوط بغداد و تربع بوش على عرش العراق تنطلق دعوات عربية من هنا و هناك لاستئناف مفاوضات السلام في حين تصر أطراف عربية أخرى على ضرورة مساعدة الأمريكيين على تنفيذ وعدهم بالضغط على شارون من خلال وقف الانتفاضة و التهينة للعودة إلى طاولة المفاوضات. يؤسفنا ان نقول لهؤلاء جميعا ان "وعد بوش" جاء بليل -محاه النهار - و ان أملهم تأسس على وهم و ان إغماض العين عن رؤية الحقيقة لا ينفي وجودها و لذلك أسباب:

أولها: أن شارون يقود أكثر حكومات إسرائيل تطرفا و عنصرية و أن هذه الحكومة إن كانت راغبة في شيء فهو دفن العملية السلمية و فرض وقائع جديدة على

الأرض. تضع العرب أمام خيار القبول بشروط إسرائيل أو ضرب رأسهم في الجدار. و مع حرصنا على عدم الإغراق في تفاصيل الداخل الإسرائيلي إلا أنه يتوجب لفت الانتباه إلى أن حكومة شارون ليست بالطارئ على الحياة السياسية الإسرائيلية إنما تعكس مدى التحول الذي طرأ على المجتمع الإسرائيلي خلال السنوات العشر الماضية و هو أمر لا تتحمل الانتفاضة الفلسطينية المسؤولية عنه كما يحلو للبعض أن يجادل. فالتحول في تركيبة المجتمع الإسرائيلي بدأ منذ فتح الاتحاد السوفيتي السابق أبواب الهجرة اليهودية عام 1989 حيث وصل إلى إسرائيل أكثر من مليون مهاجر حاملين معهم منظومة فكرية مشبعة بالعداء اتجاه العرب و الإسلام. و قد شكل هؤلاء القاعدة الانتخابية العريضة لليمين الإسرائيلي خلال التسعينات. ففي حين انضم بعضهم إلى الليكود شكل آخرون أحزاب لا تقل عنصرية مثل حزب المهاجرين الروس و حزب إسرائيل بعليا. و قد غوّض هؤلاء حزب الليكود تحديدا عن قاعدة دعمه التقليدية التي كانت قائمة على تأييد اليهود الشرقيين الذين أخذوا يهجرون الأحزاب العلمانية و يصوتون بشكل متزايد للأحزاب الدينية مثل حزب شاس.

السبب الثاني و ربما الأكثر أهمية في جعل محاولة إحياء المفاوضات ضرب من العبث هو أن الإدارة الأمريكية تقف بقوة وراء شارون و حكومته و هي فعلت كل ما يضمن إعادة انتخابه ابتداء من إغماض عينيها عن حملته المسعورة على الفلسطينيين إلى الموافقة على تعديلاته على "خريطة طريق" إلى إرجاء البدء بالتفاوض عليها إلى ما بعد الانتخابات الإسرائيلية إلى غيرها من الخدمات. و لبيان مدى الدعم الذي يحظى به شارون في واشنطن و مدى التطابق في طريقة تفكير اليمينيين الإسرائيليين و الأمريكيين نترك تصرفات و تصريحات المسؤولين الأمريكيين تتحدث عن نفسها. فقد يكون صدفة أن شارون و بوش جاءا إلى السلطة

بفارق أسابيع قليلة إلا أنه ليس صدفة أبدا أن تكون العلاقة بينها حميدة . هذا الحد. فخلال العامين الماضيين استقبل بوش شارون سبع مرات - بمعدل مرة كل ثلاث أشهر تقريبا- و هو شرف لم يحظى به أي زعيم في العالم بما في ذلك اقرب حلفاء أمريكا - طوني بليز. و الأدهى من ذلك وجود شبه إجماع على دعم شارون في أوساط الحكومة الأمريكية، داخل الحزبين الكبيرين في الكونغرس و في دوائر الإعلام - المحافظ بشكل خاص.

ففي شهر نوفمبر 2001 وقع 88 عضو في مجلس الشيوخ الأمريكي على خطاب موجه إلى الرئيس بوش طالبوه فيه بمنع وزير الخارجية كولن باول من توجيه أي انتقاد لإسرائيل خلال كلمة كان مقررا إلقاؤها في جامعة لويزيانا كما ناشدوا بوش تقديم دعمه المطلق لحملة شارون العسكرية ضد الفلسطينيين. و من بعض ما جاء في هذا الخطاب: "في الوقت الذي نعتقد فيه أن الشعب الأمريكي لن يغفر لنا أبدا عدم ملاحقة الإرهابيين بكل ما أوتينا من قوة، نجد بعض أركان الإدارة يطالبون شارون بضبط النفس بعد كل هجوم إرهابي". و لم يكن بوش ليخيب آمال الموقعين على الخطاب عبر التجاوب الكامل مع مطالبهم فحسب بل قام و لأول مرة في تاريخ الصراع العربي- الإسرائيلي بنقل ملفه من الخارجية إلى البنتاغون حيث أوكله إلى اليمينيين لمساعدتي وزير الدفاع بول وولفيتز و دوغلاس فيث. و حتى يحرم الخارجية من الاضطلاع بأي دور في هذا الصدد قام بتعيين أعتى صقور اليمين الأمريكي اليوت ابرامز مستشارا للرئيس لشؤون الصراع العربي - الإسرائيلي. و الجدير ذكره أن فيث و بالمشاركة مع ريتشارد بيرل و آخرون كانوا اعدوا تقريرا في العام 1996 بعنوان (Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm) طالبوا فيه رئيس الوزراء الإسرائيلي في ذلك الوقت بنيامين نتنياهو بالتخلص من عملية السلام بأي طريقة. و في عام 1997 كتب فيث

مقالا في مجلة (Commentary) الفصلية المعروفة بولانها لإسرائيل طالب فيه نتنياهو بإعادة احتلال أراضي الحكم الذاتي الفلسطيني بغض النظر عن ثمن الدم الذي يتوجب دفعه.

و في تحليل أسباب التعاطف الأعمى الذي يحظى به شارون في أوساط الإدارة الأمريكية يرى ستيفن زونيس - أحد أبرز الأكاديميين الأمريكيين المطلعين على ملف الصراع العربي - الإسرائيلي - ان مفهوم هذا الصراع بالنسبة لبوش و دوائر اليمين الجديد ليس سياسي بل ديني و يتركز حول حق إسرائيل المقدس في هذه الأرض. و قد كرر الجمهوريون هذا الرأي في أكثر من مناسبة حيث اعتبر ريتشارد ارمي أحد أبرز زعماءهم في مجلس النواب أن القانون الدولي لا ينطبق على الأراضي المحتلة لأن القانون الذي يحكم هذه المسألة وضع قبل 3 آلاف سنة من قبل سلطة إلهية لا ترقى إلى شرعيتها أي سلطة وضعية. و جاء في كلمة ألقاها السيناتور الجمهوري عن أوكلاهوما جيمس اينهوف في كانون الأول 2001 خلال اجتماع لمجلس الشيوخ و الكلام ينقل بحرفيته بعد الترجمة: "إن ملكية الضفة الغربية تعود لإسرائيل لأن الله وعد النبي إبراهيم بها. إن إسرائيل الحق في هذه الأرض لأن الله قال كلمته. هذه ليست معركة سياسية إنها امتحان لما إذا كانت كلمة الله حق أم لا أو فيما إذا كان وعد الله سينفذ أم لا".

الدعم الأمريكي لسياسات شارون لا يقتصر على دوائر الكونغرس المعروف تقليديا بقربه من اليمين الإسرائيلي بل أصبح أحد السمات البارزة للسياسة الأمريكية التي كانت تفضل دائما التعامل مع العمل على التعامل مع الليكود. لا بل إن إدارة بوش ذهبت في تأييد شارون أبعد كثيرا مما ذهب إليه بعض الإسرائيليين. و بالإشارة إلى ما حدث في جنين في نيسان (أبريل) 2002 لوحظ أن الموقف الإسرائيلي كان أكثر مرونة من الموقف الذي تبنته الولايات المتحدة في مجلس الأمن عشية مناقشة

مشروع إرسال لجنة لتقصي الحقائق إلى المخيم. و قد شعرت الولايات المتحدة بحرج شديد عندما أعلن شيمعون بيريز و دون سابق تنسيق مع واشنطن على ما يبدو عن موافقة إسرائيل على استقبال اللجنة و ذلك في الوقت الذي كان يبذل فيه السفير الأمريكي إلى الأمم المتحدة جون نغروبونتي كل جهد ممكن لمنع تبني مجلس الأمن لمشروع القرار. و عندما تراجعت إسرائيل و بدأت تضع العراقيل أمام إرسال اللجنة بعثت كونداليزا رايس إلى شارون رسالة موجهة من بوش تقول ترجمتها الحرفية كما نشرتها صحيفة سان فرانسيسكو كرونيكل بتاريخ 30 نيسان 2002 "لا داعي للقلق فنحن معك حتى النهاية". و كان هذا أيضا ما قصده بوش عندما تحدث عن "رؤيته" لمشروع إقامة دولة فلسطينية في حزيران 2002. إذ يعتقد الرئيس الأمريكي و أركان حكمه أن شكل، حجم، موقع، والوضع القانوني و السياسي للدولة الفلسطينية العتيدة هي أمور عائد تقديرها إلى حكومة شارون.

و قد بلغ حجم التأييد الأمريكي لشارون درجة اخذ يثير معها قلقا داخل إسرائيل حيث راح عدد من المعلقين الإسرائيليين يشككون من أن الحب الأمريكي يكاد يصيب دولتهم في مقتل. فقد صرح الكاتب الإسرائيلي جدعون ساميت بأن الولايات المتحدة بدعمها الأعمى لحكومة ليكود تعرض أمن إسرائيل و وجودها لخطر جسيم و انه بدلا من تهدئة الأمور عن طريق ممارسة ضغوط على شارون لبدء مفاوضات مع الفلسطينيين فإن العم سام يكتب مسودة لقصة مستوحاة من حياة الغرب الأمريكي لشعب جيد ضد شعب شرير تجب إبادته. أما ناشطة حقوق الإنسان الإسرائيلية جيل سيفرسكي فاشتكت من أن حركات السلام الإسرائيلية تجد نفسها مضطرة لبذل جهد مضاعف لإقناع الإسرائيليين بضرورة التفاوض مع الفلسطينيين مرة في مواجهة طروحات شارون و المرة الثانية في مواجهة طروحات بوش. و تخلص سيفرسكي إلى القول أن بوش تحول إلى جزء من

المشكلة بدل أن يكون جزءا من الحل و أن عليه أن يقرر إما أن يكون مع السلام أو مع شارون، إذ لا يمكنه أن يكون مع كليهما. و قد ذهب بعض الإسرائيليين إلى القول بأن الرأي العام الإسرائيلي يبدو أكثر تقبلا لإيجاد حل مع الفلسطينيين من الحكومة الأمريكية. ففي استطلاع للرأي جرى في أيار 2002 أعرب 60% من الإسرائيليين عن اعتقادهم بأنه لا يوجد حل عسكري للصراع مع الفلسطينيين في حين أعرب 59% منهم عن استعدادهم للانسحاب إلى حدود 1967 وإخلاء الكتل الاستيطانية الرئيسية في الأراضي المحتلة إذا ترافق ذلك بضمانات أمنية أمريكية. لكن بوش لم تعجبه الفكرة على ما يبدو و ذلك لتعارضها مع معتقداته الدينية على ما يذهب إليه جدعون ساميت الذي خلص إلى أنه مع هذا النوع من الأصدقاء فإن إسرائيل ليست بحاجة إلى أعداء. فهل يحتاج وسطاء وقف الانتفاضة و دعاة استئناف التفاوض أكثر من هذا دليلا على خداع النفس و العيش في عالم وهم.

الترجمة الانجليزية:

The Arab Peace "Attack" and its Illusions

Marwan Kabalan, *Al-Hayat*

13/01/2004

President Bush had indicated in his speech at the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) dinner that he intends to divert his attention to the Middle East to push forward the peace negotiations between the Arabs and Israelis. He also pointed

out that the timing of his proposal came prior to the Arab Summit in Sharm El-Sheik, where the Arabs attending this summit plan to discuss the Iraqi dilemma. Bush also intended to convey to the Arabs that the road to Jerusalem passes through Baghdad. Despite this cynical proposal, none of the Arabs have criticized or condemned it publicly. Today, nine months after the fall of Baghdad, many Arabs hope to continue peace negotiations with the Israelis, while others insist on helping the Americans to exert pressure on Sharon, by calling off the Intifada and preparing for the return to the table of peace negotiations. I am sorry to say that "Bush's proposal" is nothing but a bluff, and the hope was based on illusions. This is because:

First: Sharon heads the most radical and racist government Israel has ever witnessed. This government intends to bury the peace process and to implement a new reality on the ground, leaving the Arabs with no alternative but to accept the Israeli terms. It should be mentioned that Sharon's government represents the total change within the Israeli society during the last 10 years, which is something that the Palestinian Intifada is not responsible of; as others might claim otherwise. This alteration started when the former Soviet Union opened the

doors in front of the Jewish immigrants in 1989, when nearly one million Jewish immigrants immigrated to Israel; most of them carrying ideologies and sentiments that detested the Arabs and Islam. These people were the building block in the Israeli ballots that supported the right wing in Israel in the 1990s.

Second: which is more important, is the fact that the American administration strongly supports Sharon, and this administration did all it can to reelect Sharon by neglecting his aggressive policies against the Palestinians; agreeing to amend the Roadmap and postponing its implementation until after the Israeli elections. The declarations of many of the American officials clearly indicate the total biasness of the U.S. towards Israel and the support that Sharon retains from the current American administration. During the last two years, Bush and Sharon met 7 times; an average of once every three months, knowing that no leader in the world, including Tony Blair, America's staunchest ally, has had that honor. In November 2001, 88 members of the U.S. senate signed a letter sent to President Bush asking him to stop the strong criticism of Israel by U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell, and they asked Bush to fervently support Sharon's military aggression towards the

Palestinians. Bush did not want to disappoint those who signed the letter; he transferred the Arab- Israeli file from the State Department to the Pentagon, and entrusted it to Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz and Douglas Feith. To prevent the State Department from any intrinsic role, Bush appointed his administration's most prominent "hawk" Elliot Abrams, as his assistant to the Arab-Israeli conflict. It should be mentioned that Feith, and Richard Perle had previously prepared a report in 1996 under the title of "Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm Clean," asking the then Israeli PM Benjamin Netanyahu to abandon the peace process.

In 1997, Feith wrote a commentary in the "Commentary magazine" (a magazine known for its strong ties with Israel), asking Netanyahu to reoccupy the lands in the Palestinian territories. While analyzing the reason behind the strong support Sharon is receiving from the American administration, Steven Zoenus a prominent American academic observed that the paradigm of this conflict, according to Bush and the neo-cons is no longer political. It is religious because it pertains to Israel's right for Jerusalem. The Republicans have constantly reiterated this, on more than one occasion, whereby Richard Aramy an important Republican Party, activist and a member

of the U.S. congress, said that the "west bank belongs to Israel because God promised Abraham its ownership. Israel has the right to retain this land because it is God's word. This is not a political battle, it is a test of whether God's words are right or wrong, and whether God's words will be implemented or not."

American support to Israel is not restricted to Congress; it had become a feature of American policies, which felt more comfortable in dealing with the Labor Party in Israel rather than Likud. With regards to what happened in Jenin in April 2002, it has been noted that the Israeli attitude was more lenient than the American attitude in the Security Council when the latter decided to send a fact-finding mission to this camp. The U.S. felt totally embarrassed when Shimon Perez announced, without prior cooperation with the Americans, that he would welcome the mission, while the U.S. ambassador to the UN was trying hard to veto this Resolution. U.S. National Security Advisor Dr. Condoleezza Rice sent a letter from President Bush to Sharon, which was published in the San Francisco Chronicle, in which Bush said, "there is no need to fear, we are with you all the way." This strong American support to Israel has been a major concern inside Israel, and many Israeli writers commented that this strong American love

would lead to the destruction of Israel. Many claim that Bush has become part of the problem, instead of becoming part of the solution, and that he has to decide between supporting peace and supporting Sharon; for he cannot support both.

Some observers claim that this Israeli society is willing to compromise with the Palestinians to find an answer to the current problem. In a poll conducted in May 2002, 60 % of the Israelis revealed that there cannot be a military answer to their problems with the Palestinians, and 59% of the Israelis revealed that they are willing to withdraw to the borders of 1967 and to evacuate the settlements in the occupied territories, if this would be accompanied by American guarantees. Bush, however, did not like the idea because this conflicted with his religious beliefs. Do we really need mediators to stop the Intifada in light of all this and in light of the world of fantasies and illusions we live in?

اسئلة عن النص:

- 1- اقرأ النصين العربي و الانجليزي و لاحظ ما اذا تم اختصار جمل او عبارات معينة خلال عملية الترجمة.
- 2- استخرج معاني الكلمات التالية من النص الانجليزي و ضعها في جمل من تأليفك:

مجلس الشيوخ الأمريكي، انتقاد، إدارة بوش، مساعد وزير الدفاع، صقور اليمين الأمريكي، مستشار الرئيس، أراضي الحكم الذاتي الفلسطيني، حق مقدس، الجمهوريون، مجلس النواب الأمريكي، القانون الدولي، أراضي محتلة، سلطة إلهية.

نموذج (5)

الأصل العربي:

أزمة الفلسطينيين من يحلها؟

ماهر عثمان، الحياة

2006/08/25

يشير الاضراب الذي اعلنت نقابة العاملين في الوظيفة العمومية في فلسطين انها ستطبقه اعتباراً من بداية الشهر المقبل إلى مدى تدهور الوضع الاجتماعي للفلسطينيين، خصوصاً بسبب عدم تسلم موظفي السلطة رواتبهم منذ تسلم حكومة

«حماس» مهماتها في 30 آذار (مارس) الماضي. وكان واضحاً منذ فوز «حماس» في الانتخابات العامة بغالبية مقاعد المجلس التشريعي ان اسرائيل ستجعل حصارها للسلطة الفلسطينية مالياً واقتصادياً وسياسياً اشد من ذي قبل، وهذا ما حصل فعلاً.

وقد ادركت حكومة «حماس» انها لن تستطيع تصريف امور الحكم وتلبية احتياجات الفلسطينيين، خصوصاً دفع رواتب الموظفين، في ظل الحصار الاسرائيلي والدولي الخانق واشترطت الرباعية الدولية واسرائيل عدم التعامل معها او السماح بوصول المساعدات إلى حكومتها الا اذا لبثت الشروط الثلاثة المعروفة، اي الاعتراف بحق اسرائيل في الوجود ونبذ العنف والاعتراف بالاتفاقات السابقة بين السلطة الفلسطينية واسرائيل. ومن هنا فقد دعا منذ البداية حركة «فتح» والفصائل الاخرى إلى تشكيل حكومة وحدة وطنية ولكن «فتح» قررت انها لا تستطيع الدخول في ائتلاف مع «حماس» بسبب الفارق الكبير بين برنامجيهما السياسيين.

كان برنامج «فتح» هو برنامج رئيس السلطة محمود عباس، وهو يدعو إلى المفاوضات وسيلة وحيدة لإنهاء الصراع مع اسرائيل وتحقيق هدف اقامة الدولة الفلسطينية المستقلة وعاصمتها القدس ضمن حدود الرابع من حزيران (يونيو) 1967، اي حدود الهدنة للعام 1949 التي اشار اليها الرئيس الاميركي جورج بوش غير مرة على رغم انه ناقض ذلك باعطائه اسرائيل ضوءاً اخضر بضم الكتل الاستيطانية الكبرى الثلاث في الضفة الغربية، الامر الذي يمزق الوحدة الجغرافية للضفة.

اما «حماس» فقد رأت الجمع بين التفاوض والكفاح المسلح رافضة الاعتراف باسرائيل ما لم تعترف الدولة العبرية اولاً بحقوق الشعب الفلسطيني خصوصاً حقه

في العودة. وعموماً، لم تعط «حماس» اجابات ازاء الشروط الدولية يمكن للمشرطين اعتبارها مرضية. وقد عملت اسرائيل، قبل خطف الجندي الاسرائيلي شاليت ولكن خصوصاً بعد خطفه، على اعتقال وزراء «حماس» ونوابها ورؤساء البلديات المنتمين اليها او القريبين منها اضافة إلى استهداف نشطانها بالقتل والاغتيال.

في غضون ذلك، لا يوجد ما يبشر بإمكان تحقيق تقدم في حل الازمة التي يواجهها الشعب الفلسطيني اجتماعياً واقتصادياً وسياسياً. اذ بينما تواصل اسرائيل غاراتها الجوية وقصفها المدفعي على قطاع غزة يومياً وتستمر في حملات الاعتقال والاغتيالات الميدانية في الضفة الغربية ما زالت حركتا «حماس» و «فتح» عاجزتين عن تشكيل حكومة وحدة وطنية على اساس وثيقة التفاهم الوطني التي عرفت باسم وثيقة الاسرى.

ان هذا وضع خطير للغاية بالنسبة إلى الفلسطينيين وأسوأ ما فيه، عدا ما يعانيه الناس بسبب توقف مداخلهم وبطش قوات الاحتلال بهم وانفلات الوضع الامني في قطاع غزة، هو عدم قدرة الفلسطينيين على وضع اسرائيل في موقف يضطرها إلى التفاوض معهم من اجل اقامة دولتهم في اقرب موعد ممكن.

ان «حماس» الفائزة في الانتخابات لا يمكن لومها على ذلك الفوز او اتهامها بعرقلة اي امكانية للتفاوض مع اسرائيل. فقد رفضت اسرائيل التفاوض مع رئيس السلطة عباس واعتبرت سلفه الراحل ياسر عرفات غير ذي صلة، ودرجت منذ ذلك على التصرف في حقوق الفلسطينيين ومصير اراضيهم احادياً كما يحلو لها من دون رادع.

ولا يكمن حل الازمة الفلسطينية الداخلية في ان تحل السلطة الفلسطينية نفسها لتعود اسرائيل، قوة الاحتلال، المسؤولية الاولى والاخيرة عن شؤون الفلسطينيين ولا في استقالة حكومة «حماس» او تنحي رئيس السلطة المنتخب هو الآخر شعبياً.

ولا يمكن العثور على الحل الا بالعثور على سبب الازمة الحقيقي الاصيلي الكامن وراء شقاء الفلسطينيين وعذاباتهم، الا وهو الاحتلال الاسرائيلي البغيض الذي ينبغي ان ينهض المجتمع الدولي بمهمة انهاءه. ومن المؤكد ان الصراع على السلطة بين «فتح» و «حماس» لا يخدم مصالح الشعب الفلسطيني.

الترجمة الانجليزية:

Who Solves the Palestinian Crisis?

Maher Othman, *Al-Hayat*

25/08/2006

The strike that the Palestinian Union of State Employees said it will stage as of next month reflects the deteriorating living standards of the Palestinians, especially as the Palestinian Authority (PA) employees have not received their salaries since the Hamas-led government took office on March 30. After Hamas won a majority in the Palestinian Legislative Council (PLC), it was clear that Israel was going to tighten its

financial, economic and political siege on Palestine. This is what really happened.

The Hamas-led government realized that it would not be able to manage the State's affairs and meet the needs of the Palestinians, especially paying the late salaries, under the tight Israeli and international siege. The International Quartet and Israel banned dealing with or delivering aid to the Palestinian government unless it meets the three well-known conditions: recognize Israel, renounce violence, and commit to the previous agreements between the PA and Israel.

Therefore, Hamas called, from the very beginning, on the Fatah movement and other Palestinian factions to join a national unity government. But Fatah decided not to join a government with Hamas due to the big difference in their political programs.

Fatah had the same political program as PA President Mahmoud Abbas. It called for negotiations as the only means to end the conflict with Israel and establish an independent Palestinian State, with Jerusalem as its capital within the pre-1967 War border, that is, the border of the 1949 truce. Although US President George Bush has repeatedly cited this

truce, he gave Israel the green light to annex three major settlement blocs in the West Bank, tearing apart the geographical integration of the Bank.

In contrast, Hamas said that it would negotiate, but that it would keep the armed struggle. It refused to recognize Israel unless the Jewish State recognizes the Palestinian people's rights, especially the right to return. In any case, Hamas did not give any response to the international conditions that could satisfy the international community. Even before Soldier Gilad Shalit's capture, Israel detained Hamas' ministers, MPs and heads of municipalities. It also adopted a policy of assassination against Hamas activists.

As yet, there has been no sign of progress towards a solution for the social, economic and political crises that the Palestinians are currently suffering. Israel continues its air-raids and artillery bombardment on the Gaza Strip everyday. It also continues its detention and assassination campaigns in the West Bank. Meanwhile, Hamas and Fatah are still at odds over the formation of a national unity government based on the national reconciliation document known as the 'prisoners' document'. This is a very dangerous situation for the Palestinians. The people are suffering because of their frozen

salaries, the aggression of the occupation forces, and the deterioration of security in the Gaza Strip. But the worst part is their incapacity to force Israel to negotiate the establishment of their State as soon as possible.

Nobody can blame Hamas for winning the elections or accuse it of obstructing negotiations with Israel, which refused to negotiate with PA President Mahmoud Abbas, and which considered his late predecessor, Yasser Arafat, as irrelevant. When it comes to the rights and fate of the Palestinians, Israel has become accustomed to act as unilaterally as it wishes.

The solution of the internal Palestinian crisis is not to disband the PA, which would mean that Israel, the occupier, would be the only one responsible for the Palestinians' affairs. The solution is not for the Hamas-led government to quit or the democratically-elected PA President, Mahmoud Abbas, resign, either.

We cannot find a solution unless we find the real cause of the crisis and suffering of the Palestinians. The cause is the abominable Israeli occupation, which the international community should act to bring an end to. Meanwhile, the

Fatah-Hamas dispute over authority is not in the best interests of the Palestinian people.

اسئلة عن النص:

- 1- ابحث عن مختصرات استخدمت في النص الانجليزي و لاحظ ما يقابلها في النص العربي.
- 2- استخرج معاني العبارات التالية من النص الانجليزي و ضعها في جمل من تأليفك:

تصريف امور الحكم، الحصار الاسرائيلي الخانق، الرباعية الدولية، نبذ العنف، الاعتراف بالاتفاقات السابقة، حكومة وحدة وطنية، ائتلاف حكومي، برنامج سياسي، السلطة الفلسطينية، مفاوضات، وسيلة وحيدة، الكتل الاستيطانية الكبرى، الوحدة الجغرافية للضفة.

نموذج (6)

الأصل العربي:

لورا بوش استثناء!

جهاد الخازن، الحياة

2005/06/07

السيدة الأميركية الأولى لورا بوش افضل سفيرة لبلادها في الخارج من المسؤولين في الإدارة الذين يزيدون من سوء الصورة الأميركية في الخارج بدل ان يحسنوها. وقد رايتها في مؤتمر عند البحر الميت، ولاحظت كيف كسبت كل جمهور جلست معه بصدقها وبساطتها، وبما تعطي من انطباع بأنها تحس بمشكلات الآخرين.

عادت السيدة بوش إلى الولايات المتحدة، وقد بقيت في ذاكرتي عبارة لها عن الاضطرابات التي تبعت اخبار تدنيس القرآن الكريم في قاعدة غوانتانامو، فهي قالت: «لا تستطيعون ان تحملوا نيوزويك مسؤولية كل شيء». وكانت تقصد ان خبر المجلة الذي اثار موجة مستمرة من الاحتجاجات الإسلامية ليس وحده سبب العداء للولايات المتحدة، فهناك السياسة الأميركية نفسها، وهي سياسة يشعر كثيرون من العرب والمسلمين بأنها ضدهم.

تذكرت كلام السيدة بوش وأنا أقرأ في الصحف الأميركية الكبرى في نهاية الأسبوع ان وزير الدفاع دونالد رامسفيلد ذهب إلى سنغافورة حيث وبخ الصين بسبب إنفاقها الدفاعي. وأفهم ان توبخ اندورا الصين، اما الولايات المتحدة فأنا اجد توبيخها غريباً، ولا استعمل صفة اخرى لأنني مهذب، فالإدارة الأميركية الحالية رفعت كل

سنة إنفاقها العسكري، والكونغرس أقر في 22 من الشهر الماضي موازنة قياسية أخرى بلغت 491 بليون دولار، أو ما يزيد على الإنفاق العسكري في بقية العالم مجتمعاً، ثم ذهب رامسفيلد بعد أيام لينتقد انفاق الصين. بل ان الولايات المتحدة تنفق على حربها في أفغانستان والعراق ما يزيد على موازنة أي دولة أخرى أو دول، فقد أقر الكونغرس 45 بليون دولار للعمليات العسكرية وحدها بعد ان كان أقر قبل ذلك 82 بليون دولار لنفقات النزاع كلها هذه السنة. وقد «ضيعت» سلطات الاحتلال 8.8 بليون دولار في العراق بحسب تقارير رسمية أميركية.

كل هذه الأرقام القياسية لم تمنع رامسفيلد من ان يقول ان الإنفاق العسكري الصيني يهدد التوازن الأمني الدقيق في آسيا، ومن ان ينتقد ما وصفه بأنه توسيع الإنفاق على التسليح، ومن ان يزيد: «طالما ان لا دولة تهدد الصين، فماذا يبرر هذا الاستثمار المتزايد؟».

نسأله بدورنا طالما ان لا تهدد أي دولة الولايات المتحدة فلماذا تنفق ما يزيد على بقية العالم مجتمعاً على التسليح؟ هل تهددها سورية أو العراق؟ أو السودان أو كوريا الشمالية؟ الإنفاق على مكافحة الإرهاب مبرر، ولكن أرقام موازنة الدفاع الأميركية تظل قياسية، حتى من دون حساب الإرهاب ونفقاته.

لو بقي وزير الدفاع الأميركي في البنتاغون، بدل الذهاب إلى الشرق الأقصى، ولو فكر قبل ان يصرح، لربما كان طلع بشيء مقنع، فاليابان قد تشكو من زيادة الإنفاق العسكري الصيني، والهند قد تفعل، غير ان الولايات المتحدة آخر بلد يحق له طرح الموضوع. ثم انني أتذكر ان وزيرة الخارجية الدكتورة كوندوليزا رايس زارت الصين في آذار (مارس) وقالت ان العلاقات معها افضل مما كانت منذ سنوات. وكان هذا هو أيضاً رأي كولن باول قبلها.

رامسفيلد وبّخ الصين، و وزارة الخارجية الأميركية وبّخت المملكة العربية السعودية والكويت وقطر والإمارات العربية المتحدة بسبب «الاتجار بالبشر»، مع انني ارى ان المقصود من العبارة سوء معاملة العمالة الأجنبية الوافدة، وعدم توفير حماية قانونية كافية للخدمات والصغار في بلدان حليفة للولايات المتحدة وتشترك معها في الحرب على الإرهاب.

أخجل، كمواطن عربي، من سوء معاملة الخدم في بعض البلدان العربية، وأجد ذلك مستغرباً من شعوب متدنية دينها السماح بنهاها بوضوح كامل عن إساءة معاملة العدو، ناهيك عن خادمة صغيرة لا تملك وسيلة للدفاع عن نفسها في بلد غريب.

كنت سأقبل النقد لو صدر عن بلد اسكندنافي، او عن منظمة العفو الدولية او أي من جماعات حقوق الإنسان في الشرق او الغرب. اما ان يصدر عن طرف اميركي...

نشرت الصحف الأميركية التوبيخ للحلفاء فيما كانت تنشر اخبار تحقيق اميركي رسمي يؤكد الإساءة إلى القرآن في معتقل غوانتانامو، وفيما كنت أقرأ عن مزيد من القتل والدمار في العراق، وعن تفاصيل جديدة (كل يوم تفاصيل جديدة) عن تعذيب السجناء والمعتقلين من قاعدة باغرام في أفغانستان إلى غوانتانامو و سجن ابو غريب بينهما.

ثمة صور جديدة عن التعذيب في العراق، وثمة تفاصيل جديدة عن موت معتقلين أفغان تحت الضرب في القاعدة الجوية. وكان الرئيس حميد كرازي ذهب إلى واشنطن ليطالب العدالة للمعتقلين الأفغان وفرض سيطرة حكومته على العمليات العسكرية الأميركية في بلاده، إلا انه وقع اتفاقاً يعطي القوات الأميركية حرية الحركة كاملة.

في غضون ذلك، أكد الرئيس بوش في آخر مؤتمر صحافي له في حديقة البيت الأبيض أن الوضع في العراق يتحسن باستمرار على رغم أنه تكلم مع خلفية الشهر الماضي الذي قتل فيه 80 جندياً أميركياً ونحو ألف عراقي، وكان نائبه ديك تشيني سبقه في حديث تلفزيوني إلى القول أن التمرد في العراق، و أنا اسميه إرهاباً، «يلفظ أنفاسه الأخيرة».

هذا ببساطة ليس صحيحاً، والولايات المتحدة تحتاج إلى أن تسترد صدقيتها حول العالم، خصوصاً بين العرب والمسلمين. غير أنها لن تفعل ذلك من دون أن تتخذ خطوات إيجابية، تشمل تغيير أو تعديل السياسات التي أوقعت بين الولايات المتحدة و شعوب كثيرة حول العالم. وهي لو بدأت بالامتناع عن توبيخ الآخرين على انفاقهم العسكري، و هي تنفق أكثر منهم، أو على معاملتهم العمالة الوافدة، وهي تنتهك حقوق السجناء وتسيء إلى القرآن الكريم، لربما وجدت أن الشعوب الأخرى أصبحت أكثر تقبلاً لموقفها من الحرب على الإرهاب.

السيدة لورا بوش سفيرة طيبة لبلادها في الخارج، لأنها كانت صادقة مع نفسها ومع الآخرين، واكتسبت ثقتهم، أما الوزير رامسفيلد فلم يفعل سوى تسليط الضوء على أزمة مستمرة مع الصين سببها ليس مجرد الإنفاق العسكري، بل الصادرات الصينية إلى الأسواق الأميركية، والفائض الهائل لمصلحة الصين، مع محاولة الإدارة اقناع بكين بالحد من بعض الصادرات لحماية الإنتاج الأميركي المحلي.

وما سبق كله لا ينفي أن الانتقاد الأميركي لوضع العمالة الأجنبية في البلدان العربية صحيح، وعلينا إصلاح الوضع من دون ضغط أميركي أو نقد. والمشكلة كلها أن الولايات المتحدة ليست قدوة صالحة لتبناها.

Laura Bush an Exception

Jihad Al Khazen, *Al-Hayat*

07/06/2005

The first lady Laura Bush is the best ambassador among administration officials impairing the image of the U.S. abroad instead of improving it. I have seen her at the Dead Sea forum and noticed how she won the public over with her honesty, simplicity and the impression of compassion that she projects.

Mrs. Bush returned to the U.S. with one of her phrases, still resonating in my head, about the riots that followed the news about the desecration of the Koran in Guantanamo Bay. She said: "You cannot hold Newsweek responsible for everything". What she meant was that the magazine's news article, which triggered an ongoing wave of Muslim protest, is not the only reason behind the anti-Americanism. There is also the American policy itself, a policy, which many Arabs and Muslims feel is directed against them.

I recalled the words of Mrs. Bush while reading a major U.S. newspaper reporting the U.S. Secretary of Defense, Donald

Rumsfeld's trip to Singapore, where he reprimanded China for its defense-related expenditure. I would understand it if Andorra was the one who addressed the blame, but I find it weird for the U.S. to be the blaming party. I am not using another word because I have manners; the American administration raises its defense budget annually. Just on the 22nd of last month, the Congress approved a record budget, amounting to 491 billion dollars: a figure exceeding the military expenditure of the rest of the world put together. Shortly afterwards, Rumsfeld reprimands China. Moreover, the U.S. expenditure on its war in Afghanistan and Iraq exceeds the budget of any other state or group of states. The Congress allocated \$45 billions for military operations alone, after previously approving \$82 billions for conflict expenses this year. In addition, the occupation forces "lost track" of \$8.8 billions in Iraq, according to official American reports.

All these record numbers did not prevent Rumsfeld from saying that Chinese military expenditure threatens the delicate military balance in Asia, and from criticizing the so-called extension of armament expenditure, wondering: "Since China is not threatened by any country, what could justify this increasing investment?"

In turn, we ask Mr. Rumsfeld: "Since the U.S. is not threatened by any country, why is it spending more than the rest of the world on armament?" Is it threatened by Syria or Iraq, Sudan or North Korea? Spending on fighting terrorism is justifiable, but the figures in the U.S. defense budget are still high, even when discounting terrorism and its expenses.

If the Secretary of Defense remained in the Pentagon instead of going to the Far East, if only he took a minute to think before speaking, he might have succeeded in uttering a more convincing discourse. Japan may complain from increasing Chinese military expenditure, and so might India, but the U.S. is the last country to have that right. Furthermore, I recall that Secretary of State, Dr. Condoleezza Rice, visited China in March and said that relations between the two countries are better than they used to be in the past years. Colin Powell thought so too.

Rumsfeld reprimanded China; the State Department reprimanded Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Qatar, and the UAE for "trafficking in human beings", although I think that what is meant by the expression is the mistreatment of foreign workers and the lack of sufficient legal protection for minor female

housemaids coming from U.S. ally countries and partners in the war on terrorism.

As an Arab citizen, I am ashamed of the mistreatment of housemaids in some Arab countries. I find it bizarre coming from a pious population whose religion clearly forbids the mistreatment of enemies, let alone a defenseless young maid in a foreign country.

I would have accepted the criticism if it came from a Scandinavian country, Amnesty International, or any human rights organization in the East or the West. But, coming from an American party...

The American newspapers published the news of the reprimand along with other news about an official American investigation, confirming the desecration of the Koran in Guantanamo camp. As I was reading more news about destruction and murder in Iraq, and new details (daily new details) about torture from Bagram airbase, to Guantanamo and Abu Ghuraib, some new photos about torture in Iraq are released, in addition to new details about Afghan detainees beaten to death in the American airbase. President Hamid Karazai visited Washington soliciting justice for Afghan

detainees and control over U.S. military operations in his country. Instead, President Karzai signed an agreement that gives U.S. forces an absolute free hand.

In the meantime, President Bush stated, in his last press conference on the White House lawn, that the situation in Iraq is constantly improving, despite the fact that his words came after 80 American soldiers and about one thousand Iraqis were killed last month. Vice president Dick Cheney said earlier in a TV interview that insurgency in Iraq - and I call it terrorism - "is in the last throes".

That is simply untrue. The U.S. needs to regain its credibility around the world, especially among Arabs and Muslims. It will not succeed without adopting some positive steps, which include changing or amending the policies, which drove a wedge between the U.S. and many peoples around the world. The U.S. should start refraining from reprimanding others for their military expenditure - while it is spending more- or for mistreating foreign workers - while it is violating prisoners' rights and desecrating the Koran- it might find that other peoples are becoming more receptive to its position in the war on terrorism.

Mrs. Laura Bush is a good ambassador for her country, because she was sincere to herself and to others. She gained their trust, while Secretary Rumsfeld did nothing but bring a longstanding crisis with China to the front, a crisis that goes beyond military spending alone, to include Chinese exports to American markets and the massive surplus favoring China, while the American administration attempts to convince Beijing to reduce some of its exports to protect the local American production.

The above does not negate the fact that American criticism of the foreign workers situation in some Arab countries is true. We ought to launch a reform process without American pressure or criticism. The problem is that the U.S. is not a good example to follow.

الأصل العربي:

الإرهاب في أوروبا

عبدالله اسكندر، الحياة

2005/07/12

الأرجح ان خلايا محلية تنفذ تكليفا عاما بارتكاب عمليات ارهابية في كل مرة يتسنى لها فيها ان تضرب، وفي اي مكان في العالم، ومنها الاعتداءات الارهابية الأخيرة في لندن وقبلها في السعودية والدار البيضاء ومدريد وبالي. وليست التبريرات «جهادية» أو «تكفيرية» أو «ثارية»، سوى الأوجه المتعددة للتكليف العام الذي يتعامل مع العالم كما حدده بن لادن، اي فسطاطين: فسطاط «القاعدة» وفسطاط كل ما عداها.

نجحت هذه الاستراتيجية في أوروبا، على الأقل مؤقتا نتيجة اعتداءات لندن، في ان تجعل هاجس التفجيرات التي تستهدف قتل أكبر عدد من الناس هماً عاماً للحكومات والأفراد، وفي ان تجعل المسلمين في أوروبا يشعرون بأنهم متهمون حتى تثبت براءتهم. وسيمضي وقت طويل، و سيقضي بذل جهود كبيرة قبل استعادة الثقة في إمكان ان يكون المسلم مواطناً في دولة أوروبية.

و مهما جرت محاولات تجميل لعلاقة المسلم الأوروبي بدولته، سيكون مجرد اعتبار ان أفراد الخلايا الارهابية «يتمترسون» في الجاليات الاسلامية التي باتت تحت المراقبة من أجل تفادي مجازر ارهابية جديدة، تمييزاً في التعامل بين

المواطنين. هذا في حال لم تحصل عمليات اعتقال تعسفي واجتهادات من الشرطة يدفع ثمنها أبرياء، أو عمليات ثار ترتبط بمشاعر متراكمة إزاء الجاليات الإسلامية.

قد تكون الخلايا الإرهابية البريطانية وقتت تفجيرات لندن لتتوافق مع قمة الثماني التي استضافها توني بلير، وهو بالتأكيد توقيت سياسي مدروس. وفرض الإرهاب نفسه على جدول أعمال هذا اللقاء، بعدما عاين الرؤساء بأنفسهم المأساة وحجم الأضرار، فأعطى كل منهم توجيهاته لرفع حالات الاستنفار إلى أقصاها في بلده. لكن ثمة توقيتاً قد يكون غير محسوب وهو بدء العطل المدرسية والرحلات الاجتماعية الصيفية، ما يجعل المطارات ومحطات السفر الأوروبية مكتظة في الحالات العادية. ويمكن تخيل حجم المعاناة والمشقة التي يعانيها المسافرون والسياح في ظل الإجراءات الأمنية الاستثنائية في كل أوروبا، احترازاً من عمل إرهابي متوقع. وبات على كل مسافر أن يمضي يوماً كاملاً ربما للقيام برحلة تستغرق في العادة ساعتين أو ثلاث. وفي الصفوف الطويلة التي تخضع للتفتيش غير المعهود والتدقيق في الهويات، يقف المسافرون بانتظام، منتظراً كل منهم دوره، متفهماً إلى أقصى الحدود هذه الإجراءات. لكن في الوقت نفسه تتحدث الألسن عن سبب كل هذه المشقة، مشيرة إلى «القاعدة» والمسلمين.

و للمدعين أن الاعتداءات الإرهابية في مدريد أجبرت الحكومة الإسبانية على سحب قواتها من العراق، يمكن الرد أن رئيس الوزراء ثاباتيرو جعل هذه الخطوة أولوية في حملته الانتخابية، ونفذها فور انتخابه. وللمدعين أن اعتداءات لندن حملت رئيس الوزراء الإيطالي بيرلوسكوني على إعلان انسحاب جزئي من العراق، يمكن الرد أن هذه الخطوة تأتي في إطار التحضير للانتخابات في إيطاليا، حيث تتدهور شعبية رئيس الوزراء. هذا يعني أن مشاركة كل من إسبانيا وإيطاليا في الحرب على العراق لم تحظ بتأييد شعبي من البداية، بدليل التظاهرات الكبرى

التي شهدتها البلدان احتجاجاً على الحرب عشية الغزو. وليست اعتداءات «القاعدة» هي وراء القرارات الأخيرة، وإنما هذه الاعتداءات لا تفهم إلا في إطار القتل المجاني، كلما سنحت الفرصة، بغض النظر عما تخلف من أضرار ومأس تطاول شعوباً آمنة، وبشكل مضاعف المسلمين بينهم.

من غير المحتمل أن يفكر القتل بحياة البشر. لكن الذي حصل في أوروبا تجاوز ما يفكر به هؤلاء، ليتحول إلى هم عربي وإسلامي عام، يضاف إلى الهم المماثل في البلدان العربية والإسلامية. وقد لا يكون كافياً هذه المرة التنديد والاستنكار الضروريين، ولا التبرؤ من القتل وهو ضروري أيضاً. وإنما ينبغي التحرك على المديين القصير والطويل، لكشف أسماء هؤلاء القتلة وملاحقتهم بكل الوسائل الممكنة وتفكيك شبكاتهم من جهة. ومن جهة أخرى، تجفيف منابعهم الفكرية والمادية والبشرية، استناداً إلى الإجماع على أن هذا الإرهاب واحد حتى لو تعددت أشكال ظهوره.

Terrorism in Europe

Abdullah Iskandar, *Al-Hayat*

15/07/2005

It is most likely that local cells are executing a general commandment of committing terrorist operations every time they have the opportunity to strike and at any place in the world; to name a few we could mention the recent terrorist attack in London, and those of Saudi Arabia, Dar Albayda, Madrid and Bali. The justifications of "Jihadist", "expiatory" or "retaliatory" are the various aspects of the same general commandment that is dealing with the world as Bin Laden had determined, i.e. having two canopies: Al Qaeda's and that of everybody else.

This strategy was successful in Europe, at least temporarily, since the London attacks succeeded in rendering the blast targeting as much people as possible, both a governmental and individual concern. It also made the Muslims in Europe feel that they are accused until proven innocent. Long and great efforts need to be exerted before trust be restored and the Muslim be a normal citizen in a European country.

Regardless of the attempts to embellish the relation of the Muslim with his state, the simple fact that the members of the terrorist cells are "taking refuge" within the Muslim communities, which are under surveillance to avoid new terrorist massacres, will constitute discrimination in dealing with citizens. This will be the situation in case no random arrests are performed and no police jurisprudences are issued or acts of vengeance linked to cumulative feelings are committed against innocent Muslim communities.

The terrorist British cells might have chosen the timing of their attacks in London in a way to coincide with the G8 summit, which was hosted by Tony Blair. It is certainly a planned political timing. Terrorism imposed itself on the working agenda of the participants, after the heads of states personally examined the scene of the tragedy and the magnitude of the damage. Accordingly, they gave instructions to increase "alertness" to the maximum level in their respective countries. Still, there is an uncalculated timing: the beginning of the school summer holidays and the summer leisure trips. This reflects in the busy European airports and traveling stations in normal cases. One could only imagine the magnitude of distress and hardship that the travelers and tourists are

suffering due to the exceptional security procedures across Europe, in anticipation of any expected terrorist act. A traveler now has to spend an entire day in a trip that would normally take two to three hours. Travelers are now lined up in long queues, waiting for uncommon inspection procedures and identity inquiry. Each one stands methodically, waiting for his turn, fully understanding the need, yet, questioning the reason of this whole trouble and pointing to Al Qaeda and the Muslims.

To those who claim that the terrorist attacks in Madrid forced the Spanish government to withdraw its troops from Iraq, one could answer that the Spanish Prime Minister Zappatero set the measure as a priority in his electoral campaign and fulfilled his promise when he won the elections. To those who maintain that the London attacks forced Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi to declare a partial withdrawal from Iraq, one could reply that this measure came within the framework of the electoral preparations in Italy, where the popularity of the Italian Prime Minister is deteriorating. This means that the Spanish and Italian participation in the war against Iraq never gained the support of the people in the first place, as reflected by the massive demonstrations against the war on the eve of

the military action. Al Qaeda attacks were not behind the recent decisions. These attacks could only be interpreted within the framework of the free killings, whenever the opportunity occurs, regardless of the damages and tragedies suffered by the people, mainly Muslims.

It is unlikely that these murderers are thinking of the human life. However, what happened in Europe is beyond what these people are thinking of, it had become a general Arab and Islamic concern to include to similar concerns in Arab and Islamic countries. This time, neither reproving and condemning, nor disavowing the casualties is enough, yet necessary. We should act on both the short and long run in order to discover the identity of these murders and run after them with all the possible means in order to unveil the names of these murderers and track them by all possible means to dismantle their networks, on the one hand. On the other hand, we should dry out their intellectual, financial and human resources, based on the consensus that this terrorism is one although it comes in multiple forms.

الأصل العربي:

"شعوب" العراق

زهير قصيباتي، الحياة

2006/08/28

إذا كان أبرز نجاحات مؤتمر زعماء العشائر والقبائل في العراق، تحريم سفك دماء العراقيين، سنة وشيعة، عرباً وأكراداً، والاعتراف بوطاة ما تركته حملات التهجير والتكفير من مثالب قبيح في الوعي «الوطني» لقيمة وحدة البلد، فالأكيد ان لا أحد هناك، يرى نوراً في نهاية نفق التقتيل، بمجرد الاستعداد لجولات أخرى من المؤتمرات والحوارات.

في مقدم هؤلاء رئيس الوزراء نوري المالكي الذي لا يتراجع عن مشروعه للمصالحة، على رغم توجهات أطراف تعتبر شريكة في الحكم، لكنها تصر على تينيسه، لحساب مشاريع أخرى. وهو إذ بدا كمن يدعو العشائر والقبائل إلى دور فشلت في حمايته الأحزاب - ومن ورائها الميليشيات - يراوح الجميع في مكانه امام معضلات تاصّلت، فلا يعترف بأنها أولى الأولويات، فيما التنكيل بوحدة العراق لا يعرف أي هدنة، مثل جولات الذبح على الهوية وحملات التهجير المذهبي والعرقي.

وفي التعبير المبسط عن حال العراقيين إزاء جولات الحوار ومؤتمراته، ولماذا لا تسفر إلا عن صفر - إلا البيانات - يرد ذلك الوصف الأميركي لانعدام الثقة بينهم،

ونزوعهم إلى التمترس وراء مخاوفهم من أي صيغة نهائية للحل. ولعل كثيرين ما زالوا يذكرون ان الأميركي الذي نفسه هو الذي توهم وأشاع أن الحل جاهز بمجرد اجراء انتخابات، وإقرار دستور يطوي مرحلة الحكم الانتقالي. وهو الذي قدم وصفة الفيدرالية، فتحولت أكبر الهواجس والمقاريس في الصراع على «الصيغة النهائية» للعراق الذي يفترض ان يكون «دائماً» بدستور دائم.

في تحريضه على الالتحاق بقطار «الإجماع الوطني»، استعاض المالكي عن الاحتلال الأميركي بـ «النفوذ الأجنبي»، لكنه لم يخطئ في تحديد الأولويات العسيرة، وأكثرها عسراً مواجهة «الإرهاب»، وكوابيس الفتن المذهبية. هناك بات التسليم بالاحتلال واقعاً، والتفكير في كيفية الخلاص منه، أولوية متأخرة لدى العراقيين، متقدمة لدى الأميركيين. العراقيون لانهماكهم في حماية الأحزاب والميليشيات والعشائر من الحروب الأهلية «الصغيرة»، والاستعداد لجولات أخرى، والأميركيون لحسابهم خسائرهم والبحث عن أي مخرج من المستنقع، يمكنهم من ادعاء انجاز صيغة ترضي العراقيين وتبرر الانسحاب الكبير.

وللبحث عن «التعارض» بين الأولويات الأميركية والعراقية، يجدر البحث عن المتراس الكبير في الحروب الصغيرة، ما بين البصرة وبغداد وبعقوبة والناصرية، وتكريت وكركوك. من واشنطن تبدو الفيدرالية صيغة متقدمة لحماية الديموقراطيات، على الطريقة الغربية. أما في بغداد فلا يمكن لأي حزب أو مرجع سياسي أو ديني، إنكار ما جلبته تلك الوصفة من مأس للعراقيين، حين وسعت خنادق التآزر بينهم بمعايير الانتماءات الطائفية والعرقية.

الأكيد ان المالكي كالرئيس جلال طالباني، لا يختبئ وراء شعار المصالحة لتفادي مواجهة حقيقة المازق. والأكيد أيضاً ان زعماء احزاب أو قوى سياسية مثل

عبدالعزیز الحکیم، یدرکون ان ما یسعون إلیه تحت غطاء الفیدیرالیه لن یسهل مشروع المصالحة، وأبسط موجباته تعزیز قبضة الدولة بإحالة الملیشیات على التقاعد. الا یعرف الحکیم وسواه مثلاً ان کثیراً من جرائم القتل على الهوية وحملات التطهیر المذهبی والعرقی، یرتکب باسم تلك الملیشیات، او حتی برعاية منها؟

مع افتتاح مؤتمر زعماء العشائر والقبائل في فندق بابل، كانت رسالة الحکیم إلی بابل الفیدیرالیات انها «افضل ضمانة لشعبنا» في وسط العراق وجنوبه. وبکل بساطة یتحول البلد شعوباً، بینها الشعب «السني» والشعب «الشیعی»... وربما تحتاج عشرات المؤتمرات لتحديد انتماءاتها وهویاتها وولاءاتها، ثم سنین للاتفاق على معايير مصالحها المشتركة مع الجيران في الداخل الذي كان یوماً، بلداً قویاً.

وقد يأتي يوم یصارح فيه المالکی العراقيين - بشجاعته في الدفاع عن المصالحة - بأن وراء الصراع مع الإرهاب الذي بات محلياً بامتياز، صراعاً على رسم حدود الفیدیرالیات، یتحكم بتأجيج أواره من یرون محاسن للملیشیات ویشجعونها على المزيد من «الصمود» لتتحول جیوشاً... ما ان تأتي ساعة تصنیف «شعوب» العراق، لتقسیمه واقتسامه غنائم.

The "Peoples of Iraq

Zuheir Kseibati, *Al-Hayat*

28/08/2006

One of the most outstanding outcomes of the Iraqi tribal chiefs conference is that it has criminalized the killing of Iraqis: Sunnis and Shiites, and Arabs and Kurds. It has also recognized the severe negative impacts of the forced migration and 'takfir' campaigns on the national awareness of the value of integrity. What is certain is that no one there can see light at the end of the tunnel of killing by preparing for other rounds of conferences and dialogue.

One of the chiefs among them is Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki, who is firm in his national reconciliation project, despite the attitude of other parties. These parties, although considered partners in the rule, try to discourage Maliki, because they are in favor of other projects. While he seems to be calling on the tribes to play a role which all other parties and militias have failed to secure, everyone seems to be at a standstill in face of the inherent dilemmas. No one admits that

solving these dilemmas should be the top priority. Meanwhile, the disintegration and division of Iraq knows no peace, seen in the rounds of killing, and sectarian and ethnic immigration.

The American description of the position of Iraqis regarding the rounds and conferences of dialogue that do not yield any results - other than communiqués - is quite simple. The US attributes it to their lack of confidence and their natural fear of any form of solution. Many of us may still remember that the Americans were the ones who imagined and deluded others that the solution would be ready immediately after the elections and the endorsement of a new constitution to end the rule of the interim government. The Americans were the ones who suggested the recipe of federalism, an idea which turned into the biggest fear of the final form of Iraq, which is supposed to always be ruled with a permanent constitution.

In his endeavor to catch the train of national consensus, al-Maliki replaced his reliance on the US occupation with foreign influence. However, he did not fail to define the difficult priorities, the most difficult of which is fighting terrorism and the nightmares of sectarian strife. Then, the occupation became the Iraqis' reality. Driving out the invaders became a second priority for the Iraqis, whereas the Americans were eager to

leave the country. Pre-occupied with preventing small-scale civil wars between parties, militias and tribes, the Iraqi people put their struggle against the occupier at the bottom of their priority list. But the Americans, pre-occupied with assessing their losses and looking for a way out of the quagmire, are eager to reach a solution to satisfy the Iraqis and justify a large withdrawal.

Looking into the contradiction between the US and Iraqi priorities, one should look for the biggest barricade in small wars in Basra, Baghdad, Baquba, Nasseriya, Tikrit and Kirkuk. Washington sees federalism as an advanced solution that would protect democracy in a Western fashion. Meanwhile, no party, or political or religious reference could deny the misery this recipe has brought to the Iraqis. This recipe has widened the gap between them on the basis of ethnic and sectarian affiliations.

I am sure that Maliki, like President Jalal Talabani, is not using the slogan of reconciliation to avoid the crisis. I am equally sure that political parties or forces leaders, such as Abdel Aziz al-Hakim, realize that what they pursue under the umbrella of federalism would not facilitate the reconciliation project, which postulates disbanding the militias in order to strengthen the

State's grip. Does al-Hakim not know that most identity killings and sectarian and ethnic cleansing campaigns are committed in the name of or with the support of these militias?

At the opening of the Iraqi tribal chiefs convention in Babylon Hotel, al-Hakim's message was that federalism was the best safeguard to our people in central and southern Iraq. Basically, this united country becomes divided into peoples: the Sunni people, the Shiite people, etc... These peoples may need tens of conferences to define their affiliations, identities and loyalty. It will therefore take them years to agree on the criteria of common interest among the neighbors in a country that was once a strong, united country.

A day might come when Maliki, brave as he is in defending the reconciliation project, tells the Iraqis that the home-grown conflict with terrorism is a only a conflict over the borders of federal divisions. Then it would be the time to classify the 'peoples' of Iraq, to divide the country and share the loot.

نموذج (9)

الأصل العربي:

المقال.... ادانة صريحة لكل اعتذاري

جهاد الخازن، الحياة

2006/08/28

أبقى مع المؤرخ نورمان فنكلستين وادانته الاعتذاري الإسرائيلي المتطرف الآن ديرشوفيتز يوماً آخر، ولعل من القراء من يذكر ان ديرشوفيتز دافع عن أوجي سيمبسون، وهو والعالم يعرف أنه قاتل، وهو يدافع الآن عن القتل الإسرائيلي بالحماسة نفسها، فلا يفعل سوى أن يؤكد وقوع الجريمة.

وأكمل مترجماً باختصار عن فنكلستين:

الهدف من كتاب ديرشوفيتز «الحرب الوقائية» (يمكن استعمال الاستباقية أو الاجهاضية أيضاً بالمعنى نفسه) هو تبرير هجوم إسرائيلي على المنشآت النووية الإيرانية. ومع ان ديرشوفيتز يحاول أن يبني حججاً قانونية عن النية الجنائية قبل ارتكاب الجريمة، فالواقع أن أمثلة الكاتب كلها مستقاة من التوراة وإسرائيل، وهو يستخدم مثلاً على رأيه الهجوم الإسرائيلي على مصر سنة 1967 وضرب المفاعل النووي العراقي سنة 1981... وهو يقارن ضرب المفاعل بحرب الولايات المتحدة على العراق سنة 2003، ما يغني عن رد.

أما بالنسبة إلى مصر فقد كتب مناحيم بيغن، عضو الحكومة الإسرائيلية سنة 1967، ورئيس الوزراء بعد ذلك، أن إسرائيل «كانت تملك خياراً آخر غير الهجوم». أن تجمعات الجيش المصري في سيناء لا تظهر أن عبدالناصر كان على وشك مهاجمتنا. يجب أن نكون صادقين مع أنفسنا. نحن قررنا الهجوم». وهكذا فالمثل الذي استخدمه ديرشوفيتز، أو حرب 1967، يلغي حجة الحرب الوقائية ولا يدعمها.

ديرشوفيتز يدافع عن ضربة استباقية إسرائيلية للبرنامج النووي لدول أخرى على أنه عمل وقائي، لأن الأسلحة النووية توقع إصابات مدنية كثيرة. غير أنه يزعم أن جيران إسرائيل يعرفون أن إسرائيل لا يمكن أن تسبب المدنيين، مع أن هذا ما فعلته في اجتياح 1982 وفي حرب 2006، حتى وإيهود أولمرت يصف الجيش الإسرائيلي بأنه «أكثر جيش أخلاقي في العالم»:

في أوائل آب (أغسطس) أصدرت منظمة مراقبة حقوق الإنسان تقريراً شاملاً عن انتهاكات إسرائيل لقوانين الحرب في أول أسبوعين من القتال، وهي وجدت أنه خلال أسبوعين فقط قتل 500 لبناني، معظمهم مدنيون، ودمر حوالي 5000 منزل أو أصيب، في الضربات الإسرائيلية من دون وجود هدف عسكري ظاهر، وفي بعض الحالات استهدف الجيش الإسرائيلي عمداً مدنيين لبنانيين. واستنتجت المنظمة أن إسرائيل ارتكبت جرائم حرب.

في المقابل يزعم ديرشوفيتز في مقالات عدة أن إسرائيل «تأخذ خطوات استثنائية للتقليل من الإصابات المدنية». وهو لا يقدم أي دليل على أن إسرائيل تعتمد على معلومات استخبارات دقيقة وقنابل ذكية لإصابة الإرهابيين فقط، فلا دليل سوى كلامه.

هو يقول ان «النوع الجديد من الحرب» في «عصر الإرهاب» يثبت سخر القانون الدولي الحالي وضرورة تغييره، فهو يقوم على قوانين قديمة تتحدث عن جنود نظاميين يتواجهون بعيداً عن المدن، أما الآن فالجيوش الإرهابية، مثل «حزب الله»، تمتزج بالسكان المدنيين الذين يجندون المقاتلين ويمولون إرهابهم ويسهلونه.

وهكذا فديرشوفيتز يستخدم الإرهاب عذراً لتجريد المدنيين من أي حماية في زمن الحرب، ويطلب إعادة كتابة القوانين، ويسخر التفريق بين المدنيين والمقاتلين، ويعتبر كلمة «مدني» غير ذات معنى، مؤكداً أنه في حال منظمات إرهابية مثل «حزب الله» يصبح المدنيون مكملين للإرهابيين (اقطع الترجمة لتعليق سريع هو ان وصف ديرشوفيتز ينطبق على إسرائيل أكثر من أي بلد آخر، فهناك تجنيد إجباري للرجال والنساء، وأي قتل بصاروخ في مدينة هو إما جندي حالي، أو سابق، أو مجند في الاحتياط، أو جندي قادم. وقد كانت هذه دائماً حجة الذين يؤيدون العمليات الانتحارية ضد إسرائيل، وعارضتُ هذا الموقف دائماً، ودعوت وأدعو إلى وقف العمليات الانتحارية لتجنب إصابة مدنيين. وديرشوفيتز في إرهابه يلغي فكرة المدنيين لتبرير قتلهم).

ديرشوفيتز استغل موقعه الأكاديمي للعب دور بارز في حشد التأييد لإسرائيل، وهو زوّر سجل إسرائيل في حقوق الإنسان، وأيد العقوبات الجماعية ضد الفلسطينيين وتدمير قرية فلسطينية أتوماتيكياً بعد أي هجوم، كما دعا إلى تعذيب المعتقلين الفلسطينيين، وأقرّ الاغتيال، وجعل التطهير الإثني قضية غير مهمة.

في الكتاب «الحرب الوقائية» أقر ديرشوفيتز بأن بعض التحريض بالكلام يؤدي إلى نوع من الشر، والمثل على ذلك الحكم بالمؤبد على مذبح حرص الهوتو، وحكم

الإعدام على الدعائي النازي جوليوس سترايكر، فهناك مبرر لقتل مثل هؤلاء، ما يعني أن ديرشوفيتز يجعل من نفسه هدفاً للاغتيال بتحريضه إسرائيل على القتل.

وفيما يهبط ديرشوفيتز إلى درك البربرية، فالدلائل مشجعة على أن قليلين سينضمون اليه.

أتوقف هنا عن الترجمة، وأقول مرة أخرى أنني أتمنى ترجمة المقال كله، وتوزيعه، لأنه إدانة صريحة لكل اعتدائي إسرائيلي من نوع ديرشوفيتز، فجرائم إسرائيل ما كانت لتستمر لولا وجود شركاء في الجريمة يغطون عليها، وينقلون التهمة إلى الضحية.

وفي حين أن أمثال ديرشوفيتز كثيرون، فإن أمثال نورمان فنكلستين أكثر، لذلك يبقى أمل في السلام بين الفلسطينيين والإسرائيليين، وفي الشرق الأوسط والعالم.

الترجمة الانجليزية:

The Article is a Forthright Condemnation

Jihad el-Khazen, *Al-Hayat*

28/08/2006

I will continue with the topic of historian Norman G. Finkelstein, and his condemnation of the extremist apologist, Alan Dershowitz. Perhaps some of my readers remember that

Dershowitz was O. J. Simpson's attorney. He defended Simpson even though he and the whole world knew that Simpson was a murderer. Now, he defends the Israeli aggression with the same enthusiasm, even though, by doing this, he does nothing but confirm that murder was committed.

Here I will continue to review some quotes from Finkelstein's article:

The main thrust of 'Preemption' is to justify an Israeli assault on Iran's nuclear facilities. Although the book purports to the lofty goal of constructing a jurisprudence for criminal intent prior to commission of an actual crime, Dershowitz's range of historical reference is pretty much limited to the Bible and Israel...To justify the Israeli assault on Iran, Dershowitz sets up Israel's attack on Egypt in June 1967 as a paradigm of legitimate preemptive war and its attack on Iraq's nuclear reactor in 1981 as a paradigm of legitimate preventive war...

In early August, Human Rights Watch (HRW) released a comprehensive report on Israel's violations of the laws of war during the first two weeks of the Lebanese war. According to the report, the Israeli strikes, with no apparent military target, killed 500 people, mostly civilians, and damaged and destroyed

about 5000 homes in just two weeks. In some cases, the Israeli army deliberately targeted civilians, and the organization came to the conclusion that Israel had committed war crimes.

In return, Dershowitz has repeatedly alleged in numerous op-ed pieces that Israel takes "extraordinary steps to minimize civilian casualties". However, he offers no evidence that "Israel uses pinpoint intelligence and smart bombs in an effort to target the terrorists". Therefore, there is no proof other than what he says.

He says that the "new kind of warfare" in the "age of terrorism" underscores the "absurdity and counterproductive nature of current international law" and the need to change it. He alleged that the international law is based on "old rules written when uniformed armies fought other uniformed armies on a battlefield far away from cities", whereas nowadays "terrorist armies", such as Hezbollah, "easily blend into civilian populations" that "recruit, finance, harbor and facilitate their terrorism".

Dershowitz now uses the war on terror as a pretext to strip civilians of any protection in times of war. The main target of his "reassessment of the laws of war" has been the fundamental

distinction between civilians and combatants. He ridicules what he deems the "increasingly meaningless word 'civilian'", and asserts that, in the case of terrorist organizations like Hezbollah, civilians add to the numbers of terrorists. (Dershowitz's description applies to Israel more than any other country. It is where men and women are compulsorily recruited. It is where any missile victim in any city is a current, former, reserve or would-be soldier. Those who support suicide attacks against Israel upheld the same reasoning. I have always stood against this stance and called for halting the suicide attacks in order to avoid civilian casualties. A terrorist as he is, Dershowitz calls off the concept of 'civilians' in order to justify the killing of civilians).

Using his academic pedigree, Dershowitz has played a conspicuous, crucial and entirely voluntary public role in rallying such support. For decades, he has grossly falsified Israel's human rights records. He has urged the use of collective punishment, such as the 'automatic destruction' of a Palestinian village after every Palestinian attack. He has covered up Israel's use of torture on Palestinian detainees. He approved of assassination, and dismissed ethnic cleansing as a "fifth-rate issue" similar to "massive urban renewal".

In 'Preemption: A Knife that Cuts Both Ways', Dershowitz observes that "there can be no question that some kinds of expression contribute significantly to some kinds of evil". In this context, he recalls that the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda handed down life sentences to Hutu radio broadcasters for inciting listeners to "hatred and murders". He also recalls the highly pertinent case of Nazi propagandist Julius Streicher. There is reason to kill the likes of these people, which means that Dershowitz should be targeted for killing, just as he has urged Israel to kill. As Dershowitz descends into barbarism, it remains a hopeful sign that few seem inclined to join him.

I will stop quoting at this point. I hope I will be able to translate the whole article into Arabic and distribute it, because it is a condemnation of all Israeli apologists like Dershowitz. Israel's crimes would not have continued without these murder accomplices, who cover up crimes and lay the blame on the victims.

While there are many like Dershowitz, the number of those like Finkelstein is much greater. Therefore, there is still hope for peace between the Palestinians and the Israelis in the Middle East and in the whole world.

الاسرائيليون.... و الفضائح الاخلاقية

جميل النباهي، الحياة

2006/08/28

يبدو أن ظاهرة التحرش الجنسي تجتاح الوسط الإسرائيلي من الوريد إلى الوريد. فالرئيس الإسرائيلي موشيه كتساف متهم بعلاقات جنسية ويبدو أنه متورط، ووزير العدل متهم ويبدو أنه متورط أيضاً.

ويتزامن النباش في الفضائح الجنسية للمسؤولين الإسرائيليين مع فشل الجيش في تحقيق انتصار على «حزب الله»، ثم قبول هدنة لوقف إطلاق النار «غير مرضية» للشارع الإسرائيلي.

وفي إسرائيل اعتادت الصحافة على التركيز على القضايا المشينة التي تشوّه سمعة المسؤولين، وتكشف المستور عن سلوكياتهم وممارساتهم اللاأخلاقية، ولكنها هذه المرة جاءت بفضيحة من رأس الهرم حتى بدأت تنتشر كالنار في الهشيم و«تولول» بين الموظفات وربات المنازل وطالبات المدارس وحراس البيوت.

ها هي موظفة عادية سابقة كانت تعمل في مقر الرئاسة، تتهم الرئيس الإسرائيلي موشيه كتساف بالضغط عليها لممارسة الجنس معه. ثم تتلوها مزاعم فتاة أخرى ضد وزير العدل حاييم رامون، بأنه قبلها بالقوة من دون رضاها. في حين ما زال الرئيس والوزير ينفيان التهمتين عن نفسيهما، ويقدمان المبررات، ويؤكدان أن ساحة القضاء ستنتصر لهما، وما يلوح في الأفق بعكس ما يقولون.

وظهور دعاوى هاتين الفتاتين، جعل فتاة يهودية متدبنة أخرى، في الـ 20 من العمر، تزعم أن رامون مارس ضدها أيضاً الأعمال الفاحشة، مشيرة إلى انه دعاها قبل ثلاث سنوات إلى مكتبه، وحاول تقبيلها بالقوة، كما ذكرت الفتاة لصحيفة «معاريف» أخيراً.

وأما سكرتيرة الرئيس كتساف الشقراء الجذابة، فقدمت معلومات جديدة عن العلاقة بينهما، متهمة إياه بإقامة علاقة جنسية كاملة معها، بعد أن كانت في وقت سابق قدمت اتهاماً ضده بالتحرش الجنسي فقط، وإذا ما ثبتت التهم ضده فإن مستقبل كتساف السياسي سيكون معرضاً للخطر، وقد يتم استبعاده من رئاسة الدولة، وانتخاب رئيس جديد للدولة العبرية وعندها سيلعن الجنس ألف مرة وربما يكره جسد الأنثى ويصفه بـ «الأفعى».

ويتساءل الإسرائيليون والعارفون بالدولة العبرية، عما يحدث للكيان الصهيوني الذي كان يرعب الشرق والغرب، إذ بدا اليوم يعاني من ازمات واتهامات داخلية، ويعيش انهزامات واحباطات نفسية، ويواجه فضائح جنسية، ويسقط أمام أجساد «الفتيات الفاتنات» اللاتي كن في يوم من الأيام جزءاً من لعبته الاستخباراتية لجمع المعلومات من البلدان الأخرى.

هل بدأت الدولة العبرية مرحلة «الشيخوخة» المبكرة، وبدأ رجالها مرحلة «المراقة» المتأخرة، بالوقوع في فخ «جسد الأنثى» والاستسلام للشهوات الجنسية؟

وكانت صحيفة «يديعوت احرونوت» نشرت قبل شهر تقريراً، صورة لرئيس إسرائيل، وهو عابس، وإلى يمينه فتاة شقراء ببنتال «جينز»، وقالت الصحيفة حينها ان كتساف شكاً لدى المستشار القضائي للحكومة، ان موظفته السابقة تحاول

ابتزازه بدفع نصف مليون دولار لقاء تكتمها على شريط تسجيلي لمحادثة «ساخنة» مع الرئيس. فيما يعتبر الرئيس ادعاء الفتاة افتراء على خلفية رفضه إعادتها إلى العمل في مكتبه. فيما قال بعض العاملين في ديوان الرئاسة اثناء التحقيقات، ان الفتاة اعتادت على دخول مكتب الرئيس خلال استراحة الظهيرة والبقاء فيه لساعة أو أكثر من دون ان يجرو أي من الموظفين على الدخول.

ويؤكد القريبون أن وراء «الفضيحة» شخصيات سياسية تخشى عودته إلى حزبه الأم «ليكود»، والمنافسة على زعامته بعدما ينهي ولايته العام المقبل. هل من الممكن أن نرى كتساف في صورة «كربونية» من فضيحة مونیکا لكلينتون؟ خصوصاً أن التقارير الصادرة في إسرائيل تؤكد أن حجم الاتجار بالنساء خلال السنوات الماضية يتصاعد، وتم تهريب ما بين 3000 إلى 5000 امرأة من الخارج إلى إسرائيل لغرض تشغيلهن في «الدعارة».

وعلى ما يبدو أن على الوزراء الإسرائيليين الآخرين الاعتراف بفضائحهم الجنسية، طالما أن الرئيس وقع في قفص النساء الجميلات ثم لحق به وزير العدل، لأن الاعتراف المبكر يلجم الصحافة ولن تكون هناك «مفاجأة» جديدة للشارع، فيما لو ظهرت قوائم فضائحية تحمل أسماء وزراء آخرين في الحكومة الإسرائيلية.

Israelis and Sex Scandals

Jamil Ziabi, *Al-Hayat*

28/08/2006

It seems that sexual harassment is sweeping across the Israeli scene. Israeli President Moshe Katsav, as well as the Minister of Justice, are being accused of sexual affairs and seem to be involved.

The uncovering of Israeli officials' sex scandals coincides with the Israeli army's failure against Hezbollah and the acceptance of the ceasefire truce, which the Israeli masses consider 'unsatisfactory'.

In Israel, the press has grown accustomed to focusing on the topics that ruin the reputation of officials, revealing their secret behavior and unethical practices. But, this time, the scandal comes from the top of the hierarchy. Talk of the scandal has started to circulate among female employees, housewives, schoolgirls and housekeepers.

An ordinary woman, who once worked at the presidential office, is accusing Israeli President Moshe Katsav of sexually harassing her. Another girl followed by accusing Minister of Justice Haim Ramon of forcefully kissing her. The president and the minister are denying the accusations and offer excuses. Both are sure that Justice will support them, but at the same time, there are signs that indicate otherwise.

These two cases allowed another 20-year-old religious Jewish girl to charge Ramon of sexually assaulting her. She recently told the 'Maariv' newspaper that he invited her into his office three years ago and tried to force her to kiss him.

As for President Katsav's blonde, attractive secretary, she provided new information regarding their relationship. She accused him of having sexual intercourse with her, whereas, previously, she had only accused him of molesting her. Katsav's political future will be at stake if he is convicted; he may be impeached. A new president would be elected for the Jewish State. If this were to happen, he would damn sex, of course. He may even come to hate the female body and call it a snake.

The Israelis and those who are familiar with the Jewish State are wondering about what is happening to the Zionist entity which used to frighten the East and West. Now, it is suffering internal crises and accusations. It is suffering defeats and psychological frustration. It is facing sex scandals and is falling before the bodies of beautiful women who were once part of the intelligence game to gather information on other countries. Is the Hebrew State prematurely ageing? Are its men going through midlife adolescence, giving in to the female body and their sexual desires?

A month ago, 'Yediot Ahronot' published a photo of Israel's president. He was frowning, and, on his right, there was a blonde girl in jeans. The newspaper said that Katsav complained to the government's legal advisor that his former employee is trying to blackmail him. She wanted half a million dollars to keep her sexy conversation with the president secret, which was recorded on tape. The president considers this a false claim due to his refusal to give her back her job at his office. During the investigation, some officers at the Presidential Office said that this girl used to enter the president's office during lunchtime and would stay for an hour or more, and that no employee dared to enter during that time.

Those familiar with the situation assert that underlying this scandal are political figures that fear Katsav might return to his original Likud party, and that he might run for party leadership at the end of his term. Are we going to see in Katsav a replica of Clinton's scandal with Monica Lewinsky? Especially given that reports issued in Israel show that the trafficking of women has been on the rise in recent years. Some 3000 to 5000 female were smuggled into Israel for prostitution.

It seems that it would be better for the other ministers to admit their sex scandals, since the president himself has been captivated by beautiful women, and the Minister of Justice followed suit. Early admission will rein in the press, and the street would no longer be surprised if there was a new list of scandals of other Israeli cabinet ministers.

(1)

ترجم الخبر التالي مستعيناً بمعاني المبررات و ضع عنواناً مناسباً له:

قتل ما لا يقل عن ثلاثين شخصاً في انفجار أنبوب للنفط.

ووقع الانفجار عندما كان عدد من الأشخاص يسرقون كمية من النفط المار عبر الأنابيب في المنطقة الصناعية غربى "الديوانية".

وفي نفس المنطقة (الديوانية) التي شهدت طيلة مساء الأحد ويوم الإثنين معارك حامية بين الجيش العراقى وميليشيا "جيش المهدي" التابع للزعيم الشيعي "مقتدى الصدر" وأسفرت عن مصرع ما لا يقل عن ستين شخصاً من الجانبين، بدأت أجواء الهدوء بالعودة.

وقد بدأت عناصر "جيش المهدي" بالانسحاب من مواقعها في بعض أنحاء "الديوانية" وكذلك وحدات الجيش العراقى.

وتم التوصل إلى اتفاق الهدنة بوساطة قادة سياسيين محليين، يتم بموجبها انسحاب الجيش العراقى من المناطق السكنية، وينسحب أنصار الصدر من المناطق التي استولوا عليها خلال القتال في "الديوانية" والذي قتل فيها 40 من عناصر جيش المهدي وما لا يقل عن 20 جندياً من الجيش العراقى.

ويأتى ذلك بينما تواصل القوات الأمريكية والعراقية عملياتها الأمنية في منطقة بغداد لتخفيف حدة العنف هناك.

وفي حادث آخر قتل مسلحون اثنان من أنصار "مقتدى الصدر" في هجوم على مكتبه في مدينة "بعقوبة" شمالي العاصمة.

وقالت الشرطة إن المسلحين استخدموا قذائف مضادة للدروع في مهاجمة المكتب، كما فجروا قنبلة قرب جداره الخارجي.

مقتل جنديين أمريكيين

وفي شأن آخر أعلن الجيش الأمريكي الثلاثاء عن مصرع اثنان من جنوده في العراق.

وقال الجيش الأمريكي إن أحد الجنديين قتل في اشتباك في محافظة "الأنبار" غربي العراق.

أما الجندي الثاني فتوفي متأثرا بجروح أصيب بها في حادث سير تعرضت له عربة "الهافلي" التي كان يستقلها قبل حوالي أسبوع.

جثث

وعلى صعيد أعمال العنف المستمرة، عثرت الشرطة العراقية على إحدى عشرة جثة قرب مدرسة في الضاحية الجنوبية الغربية من بغداد.

ولم تكشف هويات الضحايا الذين قالت الشرطة إن آثار التعذيب بدت على جثثهم، فضلا عن آثار إطلاق نار على رؤوسهم وصدورهم.

زيارة وزير العدل الأمريكي

وفي تطور آخر، بدأ وزير العدل الأمريكي البرتو جونزاليز زيارة إلى العراق. ويعد جونزاليز أحد المسؤولين الرئيسيين عن السياسة الأمريكية المتعلقة بالتعامل مع المساجين وتطبيق القانون في العراق.

ويشمل جدول أعمال جونزاليز الذي كان أحد مستشاري الرئيس بوش، لقاء مع نائب رئيس الوزراء العراقي برهام صالح ومع مسؤولي المحكمة العراقية التي تحاكم الرئيس العراقي السابق صدام حسين ومعاونيه إلى جانب لقاء مسؤولي وزارته العاملين في العراق.

وتعرض جونزاليز لانتقادات كبيرة بسبب إقراره لاستخدام العنف في التحقيق مع المساجين وهو ما أدى وفقا لمنتقديه إلى فضيحة التعذيب في سجن أبوغريب.

معاني المفردات:

explosion

انفجار

pipeline

الأنبوب

industrial Zone

المنطقة الصناعية

militia

ميليشيا

Shiite leader

زعيم شيعي

pullout	الانسحاب
truce	اتفاق الهدنة
locals	محليين
security forces	عمليات امنية
violance	عنف
gunmen	مسلحون
anti-tank grenade	قذائف مضادة للدروع
fire exchange	اشتباك
vehicle incident	حادث سير
victims	ضحايا
Attorney General	وزير العدل الأمريكي
prisoners	مساجين
advisor	مستشار
investigation	تحقيق
his critics	منتقديه

التدريبات

(2)

ترجم الخبر التالي مستعيناً بمعاني المفردات المرفقة:

مقتل فلسطينيين في الضفة وتواصل الغارات على غزة

قتل فلسطينيان في اشتباكات مع قوات إسرائيلية في مخيم بلاطة بالقرب من مدينة نابلس في الضفة الغربية.

وقد تعرّف شهود على الرجلين وقالوا إنهما ينتميان إلى "كتائب شهداء الأقصى"، التابعة لحركة "فتح".

وفي قطاع غزة واصل الجيش الاسرائيلي غاراته الجوية على مدينة غزة.

وقال مسؤولون امنيون فلسطينيون إن عدة أشخاص أصيبوا في هجوم صاروخي على حيّ الشجاعية.

من جهته، قال متحدّث باسم الجيش الاسرائيلي إن الهجمات استهدفت مجموعة من المسلحين.

وقد قُتل ثمانية فلسطينيين حتى الآن في التوغّل الأخير في غزة الذي بدأ يوم السبت بينما قُتل أكثر من مئتي فلسطيني منذ أن بدأت إسرائيل هجوما واسعا على غزة عقب اعتقال مسلحين فلسطينيين لأحد جنودها. احتجاجات على البطالة.

على صعيد آخر، أفادت وكالة الـ"أسوشيتد برس" بأن حوالي 300 فلسطيني عاطلون عن العمل حاصروا مبنى المجلس التشريعي الفلسطيني في مدينة غزة مطالبين بالحصول على معاشات، ما أدى إلى اصطدامهم برجال الشرطة.

وتواجه الحكومة الفلسطينية بقيادة حركة المقاومة الإسلامية -حماس- ضغوطا مالية كبيرة في ظل فرض حصار غربي عليها بسبب سياساتها حول إسرائيل.

وقد انعكس هذا الوضع على الموظفين الرسميين الذين عجزت الحكومة عن دفع أجورهم.

ويوم الاثنين وعد الرئيس الوزراء الفلسطيني إسماعيل هنية بدفع دفعة واحدة بقيمة 100 دولار أمريكي لحوالي 50 ألف عامل.

معاني المفردات:

camp	مخيم
West Bank	الضفة الغربية
witnesses	شهود

Al-Aqsa Brigades

كتائب شهداء الأقصى

Gaza Strip

قطاع غزة

security officials

مسؤولون أمنيون

missile attack

هجوم صاروخي

incursion

توغل

protests

احتجاجات

unemployment

بطالة

besiege

حاصر

Legislative Council

المجلس التشريعي

wages

معاشات

financial pressure

ضغوط مالية

sanctions

حصار

Prime Minister

رئيس الوزراء

التدريبات

(3)

ترجم الخبر التالي مستعيناً بمعاني المفردات المرفقة:

القوات الإيطالية تتجه إلى لبنان

غادرت خمس سفن حربية إيطالية تحمل على متنها أكثر من 2500 جندي إيطالي الموانئ الإيطالية باتجاه لبنان للمشاركة في قوة الأمم المتحدة المزمع نشرها في جنوبي لبنان.

وتشمل المرحلة الأولى من عملية نشر القوة الإيطالية انزال 980 جندي.

وترافق ثلاث سفن انزال وقارب دورية حاملة الطائرات غاريبالدي وغادرت جميعها ميناء برانديزي الإيطالي الثلاثاء ويتوقع وصولها ميناء صور جنوبي لبنان يوم الجمعة القادم.

قيادة القوة

وتمثل المشاركة الإيطالية المساهمة الأكبر في القوة المزمع نشرها جنوبي لبنان والتي سوف تبلغ في النهاية 15 ألف رجلاً.

ويبلغ حجم قوة الأمم المتحدة المنتشرة حالياً في جنوبي لبنان حالياً ألفي عنصر.

وسوف تتولى فرنسا قيادة هذه القوة حتى شهر فبراير/شباط من العام القادم وتليها إيطاليا.

وكان رئيس الوزراء الايطالي رومانو برودي ووزير الدفاع ارتوريو باريزي في وداع القوة الايطالية على متن حاملة الطائرات غاريبالدي، وخاطب برودي القوة قائلا: " ان مهمتكم حساسة وذات اهمية تاريخية" و اضاف " ان شروط نشر القوة الايطالية واضحة لا لبس فيها".

وكانت اسرائيل قد قالت مرارا انها لن تكمل انسحابها من جنوبي لبنان ما لم يتم نشر قوة الامم المتحدة في جنوبي لبنان.

والتزمت الدول الاوروبية بتقديم 7 آلاف رجل للمشاركة في هذه القوة.

واشار برودي بهذه المناسبة ان ايطاليا قد عادت إلى لعب دورها على الصعيد العالمي.

وكان وزير الخارجية الايطالي ماسيمو داليمبا قد صرح بان نشر القوة الدولية في جنوب لبنان يشير إلى نهاية التفرد الامريكي الذي ميز السياسة الامريكية منذ هجمات الحادي عشر من سبتمبر/ايلول 2001.

وصرح داليمبا لصحيفة كويريرا ديلا سيرا الايطالية ان هذه المهمة تشير إلى عودة الامم المتحدة واوروبا للعب دور مركزي على الصعيد العالمي.

معاني المفردات:

warships	سفن حربية
ports	موانئ
UN Force	قوة الامم المتحدة
landing ships	سفن انزال
aircraft carrier	حاملة الطائرات
force command	قيادة القوة
contribution	مساهمة
addressed	خاطب
mission	مهمة
sensitive	حساسة
stated	صرح
American unilateralism	التفرد الامريكي

ترجم الخبر التالي مستعيناً بمعاني المفردات المرفقة:

مقتل 18 مسلحاً في أفغانستان

تقول قوات التحالف في أفغانستان انها قتلت نحو ثمانية عشر شخصا من المشتبه بانتمائهم لتنظيم القاعدة في جنوبي البلاد. ويقول الجيش الاميركي ان قوات التحالف ردت على هجوم لنحو ستين مسلحاً في اقليم ارزوغان قاموا بشن هجوم بالاسلحة الثقيلة والقنابل.

ولم يسفر الهجوم عن أي اصابات ضمن صفوف قوات التحالف على حد روايتها. وفي وقت سابق قتل مدنيان وجندي افغاني في هجوم انتحاري على قافلة عسكرية تابعة لحلف الناتو في مدينة قندهار.

واصدرت وزيرة الدفاع الفرنسية اليو ماري بيانا اعربت فيه عن " العزاء العميق لعائلتي واصدقاء الجنديين المقتولين والامل بالشفاء العاجل للجنديين المصابين".

تطورات ميدانية

واعلنت قوات التحالف الدولي ومسؤولون محليون في أفغانستان يوم السبت إن 29 على الأقل ممن يشتبه أنهم من مقاتلي طالبان لقوا حتفهم في معارك يوم الجمعة بجنوب البلاد.

فقد قالت القوات الامريكية ان 15 مقاتلا من حركة طالبان قتلوا في اقليم اوروزجان من بينهم احد قادة الحركة بعد اشتباكات عنيفة مع القوات الامريكية.

كما قال ناطق باسم الناتو في وقت سابق ان قواته قد قصفت قافلة من السيارات لمقاتلين يشتبه بانتمائهم لحركة طالبان يوم الجمعة.

واضاف الناطق ان هذه المجموعة كانت تتحرك بواسطة قافلة من 12 سيارة بالقرب من بلدة قلعة موسى الواقعة في اقليم هلمند جنوب افغانستان عندما اكتشفتها القوات البريطانية.

وعندها طلبت القوات البريطانية الاسناد المدفعي الجوي وتم قصفها واسفر القصف عن تدمير وتعطيل ثماني سيارات بينما استطاعت ثلاث منها الفرار.

وقد قتل في القصف ما لا يقل 8 من عناصر حركة طالبان حسب مصادر الناتو.

نقلت وكالة الاسيوشيتد برس عن قائد شرطة اقليم زابل قوله مقتل 6 وجرح 12 من مقاتلي حركة طالبان بعد ان اشتبكت معها قوات الشرطة في مركز المقاطة ارجنداب واصيب احد عناصر الشرطة ايضا في الاشتباك.

معاني المفردات:

Coalition Force	قوات التحالف
suspected	المشتبه بهم
province	اقليم
heavy weapons	اسلحة ثقيلة
suicide attack	هجوم انتحاري
NATO	حلف الناتو
condolences	عزاء
speed recovery	شفاء عاجل
aerial bombardment	اسناد مدفعي جوي
escaped	لاذ بالفرار

التدريبات

(5)

ترجم الخبر التالي مستعيناً بمعاني المفردات المرفقة:

معظم الاسرائيليين يريدون استقالة اولمرت

اظهر استطلاع للرأي في اسرائيل للمرة الاولى أن معظم الاسرائيليين يريدون استقالة رئيس الوزراء إيهود أولمرت.

واظهر الاستطلاع الذي أجرته مؤسسة "داهاف" المستقلة أن 63 بالمائة من الاسرائيليين اعتبروا أن على أولمرت الاستقالة بعد انتقادات وجهت إليه بسبب كيفية إدارته للحرب في لبنان.

كما اعتبر معظم المشاركين في الاستطلاع أن على وزير الدفاع ورئيس الأركان أن يستقيل أيضاً.

وكشف الاستطلاع أن ثمة تصاعد ضخم في التأييد لزعيم حزب الليكود اليميني بنيامين نتنياهو.

ووصفت صحيفة يديعوت احرونوت التي نشرت الاستطلاع نتائجه بـ "الزلزال السياسي".

يذكر أن إدارة الحرب بمختلف جوانبها السياسية والعسكرية تعرضت لانتقادات كبيرة في اسرائيل، وذهب الكثير من المعلقين إلى اعتبار الحملة العسكرية فاشلة

بسبب عدم تحقيقها الأهداف التي أعلنها رئيس الوزراء عند بداية الحملة، وهي
انهاء وجود حزب الله واستعادة الجنديين الاسرائيليين اللذين يحتجزهما حزب الله.

لكن الحكومة الاسرائيلية تقول إنها حققت نجاحات سياسية جراء الحملة العسكرية
تمثلت بالقرار الدولي 1701.

معاني المفردات:

opinion poll

استطلاع للرأي

resignation

استقالة

independent

مستقلة

criticisms

انتقادات

war conduct

إدارة الحرب

considered

اعتبر

participants

مشاركين

Chief of Staff

رئيس الأركان

increased

تصاعد

support

تأييد

right-wing party

حزب يميني

political shock

زلزال سياسي

military campaign

الحملة العسكرية

fiasco

فشل

objectives

اهداف

captive soldiers

الجنديين المحتجزين

international resolution

قرار دولي

الفصل الثالث

ترجمة نصوص في الإعلام من الانجليزية إلى العربية



ترجمة نصوص في الإعلام من الانجليزية إلى العربية

مقدمة:

يهدف هذا الفصل إلى تنمية خبرات الطالب و مهاراته في مجال ترجمة النصوص التي تتناول موضوعات اعلامية باللغة الانجليزية. و قد راعينا فيه تزويد الطالب بمجموعة مفيدة من أهم المصطلحات في علوم الإعلام المختلفة لإغناء قاموسه الصحفي حتى يصبح قادراً على التعامل مع أي نص باللغة الانجليزية بكل يسر و سهولة.

و قد تم اختيار النصوص في هذا الفصل بدقة حتى تتفق الغرض منها. لذلك يلاحظ اننا راعينا فيه التنوع لجهة القضايا المتناولة بحيث تمر مع الطالب أغلب المصطلحات التي تتكرر عند تناول مثل هذا النوع من الموضوعات.

النموذج (1)

اقرأ النص التالي و قم بترجمته على مرحلتين مستعيناً بالقاموس:

Miller and the Times Agree to Part Company

Howard Kurtz, *The Washington Post*

10/11/2005

Judith Miller, the New York Times reporter who went to jail as a First Amendment champion in the CIA leak case but wound up being rebuked by her executive editor and some of her colleagues, resigned from the paper yesterday after a controversial 28-year career.

The negotiated agreement over her departure included a letter to the editor, to be published today, in which Miller said she is quitting in part because "I have become the news." Even before she served 85 days in jail last summer for refusing to testify about her conversations with then-vice presidential aide Lewis "Scooter" Libby, Miller wrote, she had "become a lightning rod for public fury over the intelligence failures that helped lead our country to war." Miller, whose prewar stories about whether Iraq harbored weapons of mass destruction were later

disavowed by the Times as inaccurate, said she regretted "that I was not permitted to pursue" the story further.

Executive Editor Bill Keller, in a note to the staff, said, "Judy participated in some great, prize-winning journalism" and "displayed fierce determination and personal courage both in pursuit of the news and in resisting assaults on the freedom of news organizations to report."

Miller remains a likely witness in the perjury and obstruction-of-justice case against Libby. But a Times spokeswoman would not say whether the paper would continue paying her legal bills, saying the severance package was confidential.

Under the settlement, Keller released a letter in which he clarified his earlier criticism of Miller. In an October memo, Keller said Miller "seems to have misled Phil Taubman," the Washington bureau chief, "about the extent of her involvement" in receiving information about CIA operative Valerie Plame. Keller also said he would have been more cautious, and perhaps more willing to compromise with the special prosecutor demanding her testimony, "if I had known the details of Judy's entanglement with Libby."

In yesterday's letter, Keller wrote Miller: "You are upset with me that I used the words 'entanglement' and 'engagement' in reference to your relationship with Scooter Libby. Those words were not intended to suggest an improper relationship. I was referring only to the series of interviews through which you -- and the paper -- became caught up in an epic legal controversy." Keller added that he remains "troubled" by her 2003 conversation with Taubman but that "Phil himself does not contend that you misled him."

Miller, a Pulitzer Prize winner, drew considerable sympathy when she went to jail, rejecting as involuntary a waiver of confidentiality from Libby that was accepted by journalists for NBC, Time and The Washington Post who were subpoenaed in the case. Miller changed her mind after speaking with Libby and was released Sept. 29.

But her limited cooperation with the paper's own reporters -- and the disclosure that she had agreed to describe Libby as a "former Hill staffer" -- led to criticism by Keller and the Times ombudsman.

Harvard media analyst Alex Jones, a former Times reporter, called Miller's departure "inevitable. . . . There was a feeling of

frustration and anger by members of the Times staff about how they felt Judy Miller had in some ways compromised them and their credibility had been compromised by how the New York Times dealt with her." He said the paper still needs to fully explain "what went wrong."

"I don't see any way she could have returned to the paper because she had violated the code of professional journalism in so many ways that I didn't see the staff able to accept her again," said Jay Rosen, a New York University journalism professor. "I don't think her peers understood why she went to prison in the first place and why she left when she left."

Miller wrote that some of Keller's comments unfairly "suggested insubordination on my part," but said she has always "adhered to the paper's sourcing and ethical guidelines."

Miller told The Washington Post yesterday that she did "exactly the right thing" in both going to jail and negotiating her way out. "But I'm moving on," she said. "You can't be as much in the news as I am and go on with reporting as usual."

النموذج (2)

اقرأ النص التالي و قم بترجمته مستعيناً بالقاموس:

Study deals a blow to claims of anti-war bias in BBC news

Matt Wells, *The Guardian*

04/07/2003

Downing Street's complaints about anti-war bias within the BBC appear to be disproved by an academic analysis that shows the corporation displayed the most "pro-war" agenda of any broadcaster.

A detailed study of peak-time television news bulletins during the course of the Iraq war shows that the BBC was more reliant than any of its rivals on government and military sources.

The findings, by academics at Cardiff University, give little support to the deep-rooted suspicions in government circles that lie at the heart of the row with the BBC. Instead, ahead of the report by the foreign affairs select committee into the government's use of intelligence, they give comfort to the corporation.

Over the three weeks of conflict, 11% of the sources quoted by the BBC were of coalition government or military origin, the highest proportion of all the main television broadcasters. The BBC was the least likely to quote official Iraqi sources, and less likely than Sky, ITV or Channel 4 News to use independent (and often sceptical) sources such as the Red Cross.

The study found the BBC placed least emphasis on Iraqi casualties, which were mentioned in 22% of its stories about the Iraqi people. Casualties received most prominence on Channel 4 News, figuring in 40% of its reports about Iraqis. The corporation was least likely to report on the unhappiness of Iraqis about the invasion.

The research, funded by Cardiff University, covers the BBC1 news at 6pm, the ITV Evening News at 6.30pm, Channel 4 News at 7pm and Sky News at 9pm. Channel 4 News was the most questioning of the coalition line, while ITV News used the lowest proportion of coalition sources.

Presenting the findings in the Guardian today, Justin Lewis, deputy head of the school of journalism, media and cultural studies at Cardiff University, says: "Far from revealing an anti-

war BBC, our findings tend to give credence to those who criticised the BBC for being too sympathetic to the government's pro-war stance. Either way, to accuse the BBC of an anti-war bias fails to stand up to any serious or sustained analysis."

The BBC says it received a stream of complaints about its war coverage. Richard Sambrook, the director of news, said in a letter to Alastair Campbell, the director of communications at Downing Street, at the height of the row: "It is our firm view that No 10 tried to intimidate the BBC in its reporting of events leading up to the war and during the course of the war itself."

Mr Campbell chose to fight a public battle on the subject of a BBC story that reported a claim he had "sexed up" an intelligence dossier about Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. He told the foreign affairs select committee two weeks ago that the claim in the BBC report was "a lie". Later in the week, he dismissed the BBC's response as a combination of "weasel words and sophistry".

But the Guardian understands that Mr Campbell had an equally heated row on the eve of war when 139 rebel Labour MPs

voted against the government in a Commons vote on the case for the conflict.

He was furious that the BBC presented the result as a "record rebellion" - which it was - instead of a significant victory for Tony Blair because the rebels did not win the vote.

Some commentators sympathetic with Downing Street's case have supported the claim that the BBC was anti-war: this week the Sun ran a story claiming that senior BBC journalists Jeremy Paxman, John Simpson, Peter Sissons and David Dimbleby were "alarmed" about the effect the row may have on the BBC's reputation for impartiality.

Yesterday, the four sent an open letter to the Sun, attacking its political editor for failing to contact them before running the story. They wrote: "Neither Trevor Kavanagh, nor anyone else from the Sun, has ever sought our opinions on this matter. Had they done so, they would know that we don't indulge in private comment on matters of public debate."

النموذج (3)

اقرأ النص التالي و قم بترجمته على مرحلتين مستعيناً بالقاموس:

Ink Answered With a Call for Blood

Howard Kurtz, *The Washington Post*

08/04/2002

USA Today reporter Jack Kelley wrote a cover story last summer on a dozen extremist Jewish settlers on the West Bank who opened fire on a Palestinian taxi carrying what the group's leader called "Muslim filth."

"I got 3,000 e-mails a day for 10 straight days, including several death threats," Kelley says. "Someone sent a bouquet of white funeral flowers. The message was loud and clear: If you don't play our way, you will suffer the consequences."

Covering the Middle East has long been risky business for foreign correspondents, a danger that was underscored a week ago when Boston Globe reporter Anthony Shadid was shot in the shoulder in an area of Ramallah under Israeli military control. But even those who remain physically safe cannot avoid being wounded by rhetorical fire.

Robin Wright, a Los Angeles Times reporter who has covered the Mideast for more than a quarter-century, says some of her readers "get very angry and sometimes very rude and make all kinds of accusations. . . . I get it from both sides. There's a personal anger."

One recent e-mailer called Wright "brain-dead" for supposedly ignoring America's military and economic support for Israel. Another said her reporting was "patently flawed" and that "if Israel and the Palestinians have a war to fight, let them fight it." A third called her a "terrorist lover."

Lee Hockstader, Jerusalem bureau chief for The Washington Post, says he has "a bulging manila file full of the most venomous hate mail you can imagine, including attacks on the Graham family," which owns The Post, "as well as very personal attacks on me. . . .

"You come here and there's a predetermined group of readers on both sides. From the moment you start typing on your first day, they're sure you must have a bias, no matter who you are, and they're acting to snuff it out. They say you're pro-Israeli or pro-Palestinian. Often their critiques are a reflection of their bias, not yours."

In December 2000, two cars belonging to Hockstader and his wife, clearly marked as press vehicles, were set on fire outside The Post's bureau.

Editorial decisions are constantly second-guessed. Gov. Jesse Ventura and Sens. Paul Wellstone and Mark Dayton were among 350 prominent Minnesotans who signed a full-page ad in the Minneapolis Star Tribune last week, accusing the paper of a "double standard" for not referring to Palestinian suicide bombers as terrorists. Editor Tim McGuire says the word "terrorist" isn't banned but that the paper prefers the more-specific "suicide bomber," since both sides are accusing each other of terrorism.

"We've come to expect that ardent believers on both sides will take issue with what you do," McGuire says. "You have to play it as straight as you can. People who have very strong opinions want things to look their way, and they're not interested in having them down the middle."

Every correspondent quickly learns the pitfalls. As New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman put it in an interview last year: "In the Middle East, everyone wants to own you. If they

can't own you, they want to destroy you. There's no middle ground."

Kelley, who was knocked to the ground last August when a bomb exploded at a Jerusalem pizza parlor he had left seconds earlier, echoes that sentiment. "Both sides see us as being in the pocket of the other," he says. "On every single interview in the West Bank and Gaza, on the Israeli side they ask me, where do my sympathies lie? On the Palestinian side they tell me how cruel Israel has been and how the United States supports Israel. Lately many interviews end with a threat: 'I'll be watching what you write.' "

Television interviews draw the same kind of scrutiny. Detroit News columnist Thomas Bray, writing on OpinionJournal.com, faulted CBS's Lesley Stahl for telling Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon on "60 Minutes" that he was "Goliath" and Yasser Arafat "David."

"Repeatedly, Ms. Stahl asked Mr. Sharon why he 'hated' Mr. Arafat so intensely. And when the prime minister . . . averred that he didn't hate Mr. Arafat but felt strongly about the slaughter of innocents in Israel, she demanded to know if he felt nothing for the killing of Palestinian civilians as well. It

was, in other words, a breathtaking display of the moral equivalence that so deeply infects the media."

CBS spokesman Kevin Tedesco says Stahl was simply presenting the other side: "That's what any good journalist would do, so it wouldn't just be Mr. Sharon in a one-way statement about his country's policy."

Columnist Eric Alterman took the opposite tack on MSNBC.com, listing 60 big-name commentators he says are reflexively pro-Israel:

"Even Ariel Sharon and Benjamin Netanyahu would not be able to complain about the level of support their actions typically receive from the members of the punditocracy. For reasons of religion, politics, history and genuine conviction the punditocracy debate of the Middle East in America is dominated by people who cannot imagine criticizing Israel."

As the violence continues, every paragraph, headline and photo placement will continue to be criticized, sometimes fairly, sometimes not. "I've covered this for so long that I've come to expect it," says Wright of the Los Angeles Times. "It just comes with the territory."

Revolving Door

A reporter for the San Antonio Express-News is raising eyebrows among Texas politicians by writing about his former bosses.

W. Gardner Selby worked for the Democratic state comptroller, John Sharp, from 1995 to 1998. When Sharp left to run for lieutenant governor, Selby stayed on with the Republican comptroller, Carole Keeton Rylander, but was let go in 2000. Now Selby is a political writer whose coverage includes -- yes -- Sharp's second bid for lieutenant governor and Rylander's reelection campaign.

Jennifer Ransom Rice, a spokeswoman for Rylander, says her office has had no problem with Selby. But Sharp's Republican opponent, David Dewhurst, was troubled by a story two weeks ago in which Selby quoted Sharp as criticizing Dewhurst for supposedly ducking appearances with him. "I wish he had included our side," says Dewhurst spokesman Nick Voinis.

After being contacted by The Post, Express-News Editor Robert Rivard decided that Selby "cannot cover his former boss," Sharp, and was not supposed to cover Rylander. "It was

a mistake to send him on such assignments," Rivard says of the Sharp stories.

Selby, who declined to comment, "is a solid reporter with no political agenda, and nothing in any of his stories suggests bias," Rivard says. "Still, we want all candidates to feel they are getting a fair shake."

النموذج (4)

اقرأ النص التالي و قم بترجمته على مرحلتين مستعينا بالقاموس:

The Reporter's Last Take

In an Era of Anonymous Sources, Judy Miller Is a Cautionary Tale of the Times

Lynne Duke, *The Washington Post*

10/11/2005

NEW YORK Judy Miller's fumbling with the tape recorder. It's not even her tape recorder.

"This is off the record," she's saying, her voice high and nasal. She's groping for a button to stop the tape, to take us behind

that cozy curtain called "off the record" where you can dish, spin, vent, manipulate, and all in secret.

Miller's good at it. This is her world.

So here we are last week in a SoHo brasserie called Balthazar, where a parade of Judys appears. Outraged Judy. Saddened Judy. Charming Judy. Wise Judy. Conspiratorial Judy. Judy, the star New York Times reporter turned beleaguered victim of the gossipmongers and some journalists who have made her "sick to death of the regurgitation of lies and easily checkable falsehoods." That's why she's agreed to talk.

But her Treo's vibrating on her hip. It's a friend calling. "My fan club from Paris," she chirps into the phone, in English, before switching to a mix of French and Arabic.

It goes on like this for three hours. She answers questions -- or refuses. She turns the tables, asking about her interviewer's life. She takes calls. She grabs the tape recorder. She waxes eloquent, even in anger. At times, tears well up. There's something frantic about her -- not vulnerable, mind you, for that's the last thing she is.

"Oh. I've got to take this." She's reaching for the phone again.
"It's my lawyer."

For weeks, she'd been in severance talks with the Times. And finally, yesterday, she and her employer of 28 years called it quits.

After all, how could she have remained at a newspaper where her boss, Executive Editor Bill Keller, seemed to have called her a liar and added the innuendo of the word "entanglement" to the lexicon of reporter-source relations? Where she's been vilified in print as a "Woman of Mass Destruction"? Where a lot of people think she used her journalism to help the Bush administration's case for war? Where colleagues were outraged to hear accusations that she abused her embedded status with an Army unit searching for those fabled weapons of mass destruction?

Well, Miller had -- before her resignation -- some pointed, mocking words for her many critics.

"I am so powerful and influential that I take over Army divisions? I run the New York Times newsroom single-handedly? And now I take the country to war? Wow! That

must be one heck of a reporter. I've heard of pushy broads, but this brings the pushy broad to a new level."

Looking for the Truth

She is celebrated and scorned, both famous and infamous. A dogged reporter, winner of the Pulitzer Prize, author of four books, expert on terrorism, confidante of powerful government sources through several White House administrations -- and yet Miller's credibility came to rest on a single question: Does she tell the truth?

For a reporter, that question is devastating in the asking. But to her critics, it is a question long overdue.

Several of Miller's Times colleagues, interviewed before her resignation, expressed bitterness after years of watching her seem to slip-slide away from sanction for questionable behavior, like being too cozy with a particular point of view, being too close to her sources, all of which she denies.

And so Miller's emergence as a pivotal figure in a high government scandal seems, to her critics, a karmic comeuppance. As Miller's role in the CIA leak probe was revealed, a certain schadenfreude took hold in Times

newsrooms both in New York and in Washington, which have been seething over the Miller saga.

In a special prosecutor's quest to find the culprit who leaked the identity of CIA operative Valerie Plame, Miller, 57, wound up spending 85 days in jail earlier this year rather than name the source who mentioned Plame's identity to her. She served time, she said, because she did not believe her source had sufficiently waived the confidentiality agreement between them.

It was all for the sake of the First Amendment rights of journalists, she says -- which prompted eyes to roll among some of her colleagues at the Times, who believe she really went to jail because she needed to resuscitate her professional image. Miller had been battered by earlier allegations of bias in support of the Bush administration's contention, since discredited, that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. (She became so controversial, in fact, that in late 2003 the Times prohibited her from writing about WMD).

"Anybody who thinks that I would have gone to jail as a career move doesn't know jail, doesn't know me." (But yes, she says,

she did keep a jailhouse journal, just in case she decides to do a book.)

After her release from jail, she revealed to a federal grand jury what I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby, then the vice president's chief of staff, had said to her about Plame in three conversations.

Shortly thereafter, on Oct. 28, Libby resigned after the grand jury indicted him for allegedly lying about several Plame-related conversations he'd had with reporters, including Miller.

Miller says she was hurt by Keller's suggestion that there was an "entanglement" between her and Libby.

"I had no personal, social or other relationship with him except as a source," she told the Times.

Now, Miller could become a witness for the prosecution at Libby's trial, which in a way could put her in the dock, too: as the journalist who became a lightning rod for all manner of criticism of the Bush administration, the war, the conduct of journalism.

Building a Reputation

"It's quite conceivable that some people really don't like me," Miller is saying. "That's okay. I don't like everybody. As Bill Safire said, I'm not Miss Congeniality. . . . I suppose people often feel slighted that I don't spend a lot of time schmoozing around the coffee cart, because if I'm talking to my colleagues, I'm not getting the story."

That had been Miller's main mission throughout her journalism career.

Her style is indeed "pushy," as she herself suggested. But would an aggressive, high-decibel male reporter be embroiled in all the controversy in which Miller finds herself? It is a question that some of her friends raise, for they believe that part of the invective swirling around Miller has to do with gender bias.

"A man is tough and hard-driving and a woman is a bitch," says Patricia Cohen, the Times theater editor (and former Washington Post staffer), who is a friend of Miller's.

Others say that Miller's troubles at the Times stemmed in part from poor management decisions about assignments.

For instance, Miller was promoted in the late 1980s to an editing job as deputy Washington bureau chief. And it was a disaster. She ran roughshod over staff so harshly that Max Frankel, then the paper's executive editor, said he "relieved her of that job".

"She was very anxiety-ridden and tough on a lot of people," he says.

(Miller concurs that the promotion was a mistake. "I was ill-suited for it. It's not me. I'm not good at managing other people").

Frankel said Miller flourished, however, as the Times Cairo bureau chief and then a Paris correspondent.

"Judy made her early reputation as a reporter in the Middle East, where you don't work with many people," Frankel says. "You're out alone. You're running a bureau and you're traveling around and you're getting good interviews and lobbying good stories. And she was appreciated for those things."

Indeed, Miller had a large footprint throughout the Middle East in those years. She was on a first-name basis, for instance, with the late King Hussein of Jordan and once ended up in a tractor

alone with Moammar Gaddafi of Libya at the wheel as she attempted to interview him.

Colleagues in the region recall her as hypercompetitive, sometimes disturbingly so.

Youssef M. Ibrahim, who was Middle East regional correspondent for the Times for 10 years beginning in 1986, says Miller tried to steal an interview he'd scheduled in the mid-1980s with Boutros Boutros-Ghali, the Egyptian foreign ministry official who would later become United Nations secretary general.

As Ibrahim recalls it, Miller told him she was "intercepting" the Boutros-Ghali interview, that she had seniority, says Ibrahim, who left the Times in 1999.

They shouted at each other, he says. He is not even sure who hung up on whom. In the end, Ibrahim got his interview -- without Miller present.

"I'm glad he has such an exquisite memory," says Miller. "I don't even remember it. But reporters fight over stories. It is not shocking, at the New York Times or any other newspaper."

Adam Clymer, retired political correspondent for the Times, recalls an episode during the 1988 presidential campaign, when Miller was deputy Washington bureau chief.

Then the political editor based in New York, Clymer was awakened just after midnight one morning by a call from Miller, he says. She was demanding that a story about Democratic candidate Michael Dukakis be pulled from the paper.

The story was too soft, she complained -- and said Lee Atwater, the political strategist for Vice President George H.W. Bush, believed it was soft as well. Clymer said he was stunned to realize that Atwater apparently had either seen the story or been told about it before publication. He and Miller argued, he recalls, and he ultimately hung up on her, twice.

To Clymer, it was an indication of what he and others believe is Miller's main problem.

"She had gotten too close to her sources," he says.

But Miller denies the episode happened.

"I doubt I would have said that," she says sardonically, "because it wouldn't have been a winning argument."

Her former colleagues use all manner of adjectives to describe Miller, but there is consensus among some two dozen people interviewed that she is, indeed, a volatile person.

Volcanic might be the better word. She erupts. She is known to holler at newsroom clerks, to berate hotel staff while on the road, several colleagues said.

Even in her social life, she is known as a charming hostess at dinner parties with her husband, publishing icon Jason Epstein, a founder of the New York Review of Books -- except when there's an eruption and they start sniping at each other. The explosions pass quickly, and they return to their charming selves, says Leslie Gelb, an old friend of Miller's and a former Timesman who has dined at the Miller-Epstein home.

Miller attributes her explosiveness to her heritage -- a brew of Russian Jewish (her father's side) and Irish Catholic (her mother's).

"The thing they had in common was they were volatile," she says of Bill Miller and Mary Theresa Connolly.

And both were entertainers who wanted something different for their children.

Getting Personal

Bill Miller, who died in 2002, once owned and operated a swank nightclub in the 1940s, called Bill Miller's Riviera, high on a cliff in Fort Lee, N.J., where Frank Sinatra, Dean Martin and a young Sammy Davis Jr. played. Later, he was credited with invigorating the lounge acts at several Las Vegas hotels, bringing in Mae West, Louis Prima, Sonny and Cher and -- yes, even Elvis for a long run of sold-out shows.

Connolly had been a dancer in a club owned by Lou Walters (the father of Barbara Walters of ABC News), who introduced her to Bill Miller. The two married, and Judy Miller's childhood took her from Englewood, N.J., to Miami Beach to Vegas to Hollywood, where she studied drama at Hollywood High.

Judy Miller arrived in the nation's capital in 1972, at the age of 24, fresh from the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton, where she received a master's in economics, after her bachelor's degree from Barnard College. She had no prospects, just a hunger to be a journalist,

she says, and quickly began reporting for National Public Radio and the Progressive.

That magazine hired her in 1973 as its Washington correspondent. Miller threw herself fully into the Washington milieu. She was ambitious. She was drawn to powerful people and powerful stories.

She developed a reputation as a strong reporter, and the Times, in the throes of a class action gender discrimination suit, hired Miller in 1977.

Gelb, then a national security writer at the Times, remembers Miller for her "frantic pursuit of stories," he says. "It was kind of endearingly frantic. She was just so driven to go get good stories, and she was working all the time."

She also was fully in the mix of the Washington social scene. Her relationships took on the aspect of legend, stirring controversy and gossip because of her romantic affairs with public officials.

Miller is outraged when asked about it.

"What male reporter would be asked about whom he went out with 25 years ago?" (Well, actually, lots, if the dates were public officials).

First, she lived with Wisconsin Democrat Rep. Les Aspin. Their relationship was well known. They entertained friends together. (Aspin died of a stroke in 1995).

Then, her relationship with Richard Burt, a Times colleague, turned controversial when he left the paper and joined the State Department. Burt declined to speak on the record for this article. News articles of that period say Burt's relationship with Miller was questioned during his Senate confirmation hearings as an assistant secretary of state in 1982 and, in 1989, as a chief U.S. arms control negotiator. Some senators wanted to know whether Burt had passed classified information to Miller during their relationship. Burt denied it.

Miller says neither Congress nor the State Department were her beats during those relationships. But they raised red flags nonetheless for Bill Kovach, who became the Times Washington bureau chief in 1979.

"There were regular stories about Judy Miller's tendency to get too close to sources and develop personal relationships," says

Kovach, founding chairman of the Committee of Concerned Journalists, a media ethics group. Any public official, to his thinking, is a potential source, which is why close relations with them should be shunned.

Kovach talked to Miller about respecting ethical boundaries, he says. He'd asked editors to watch her articles, to check for bias, and found them to be clear. Miller says she does not recall the conversation with Kovach.

In those days, as part of his training in a business he would one day run, Arthur Sulzberger Jr. also worked in the Times Washington bureau. In fact, he was part of the social set of young reporters that included Miller. Sulzberger and his wife shared a summer house on the Eastern Shore with Miller and a beau from the bureau, according to "The Trust," the 1999 book about the Sulzberger family.

Those days were long ago. But there is an abiding perception among some at the Times that Sulzberger, now the Times publisher, has been Miller's behind-the-scenes protector all these years.

Miller herself would not comment on that idea; Sulzberger's office did not respond to a reporter's inquiry.

"I never saw any evidence that he did protect her, but I am very much aware of editors believing they couldn't do much about her because they *thought* he was protecting her," Clymer says.

'Do You Know Judy Miller?'

As a Times reporter, Miller's reputation both preceded and lingered after her -- as a colleague discovered one day in 2001 when he was reporting at the Afghan foreign ministry in Kabul.

Officials there didn't speak great English, and there was much back and forth, until the reporter uttered the words "New York Times," which the officials understood. They started shouting at the reporter, "Do you know Judy Miller? Do you know Judy Miller?"

Turns out, these officials had been on the receiving end of Miller's aggressive reporting when she traveled in Afghanistan in search of al Qaeda training camps.

"This Judy Miller! She was so pushy and she was demanding and pressing us to take her to those al Qaeda camps but we couldn't go and she told us we were covering up" and on and on, the Afghanis yelled at Miller's amused colleague that day.

And he was duly impressed. (He requested anonymity to avoid being drawn into the controversy.)

Even before the 9/11 terror attacks, Miller had been searching for terrorist training camps, for the three-part January 2001 series on al Qaeda, reported with Craig Pyes and written with Stephen Engelberg, that won the 2002 Pulitzer Prize. And she has written books on the Holocaust, on Saddam Hussein, on the rise of radical Islam and on bioterror in her best-selling 2001 book "Germs: Biological Weapons and America's Secret War," written with Engelberg and William Broad, another Times colleague.

People who have worked with her hold her work style in high regard, though they also are aware of her shortcomings in basic human relations.

Miller is a "24/7 operation," the kind of reporter who "would call at 10 in the evening wanting to tell you about an exciting interview she just had," says Engelberg, now managing editor at the Oregonian in Portland.

"She cultivates sources really assiduously," says Claudia Payne, a close Miller friend and also an editor on the al Qaeda series. "She has an incredible sense of decorum. Sources get

greeting cards. They get little trinkets" like Times keychains and the like.

Miller says that after winning the Pulitzer, an editor (she won't say who) told her to "run amok," to bring in more great stories, more prize-winning stories.

That's what gave her the idea to call herself "Miss Run Amok." She says she meant it facetiously. She was quoted in the Times as telling a colleague the title meant "I can do whatever I want." She disputes that statement.

And she did it, this running amok, at the center of a major story of our time.

She was among the key journalists writing of the danger of Iraq's WMD in several articles that quoted Bush administration officials and made the case, now discredited, for the United States' war in Iraq. To be fair, Iraq's possession of WMD was the conventional wisdom of the pre-war period. The Washington Post was among the newspapers reporting that story.

But Miller's work stood out. She relied on a collection of Iraqi defectors whose information proved faulty and whose

credibility in many cases was suspect. And during the war, when other newspeople and experts began realizing that the lack of evidence of Iraq's WMD was likely an indicator that there was no WMD, Miller held out longer and continued to write from the field as if they would be found any day.

In early 2003, as the war began, Miller was embedded with one of the U.S. Army teams whose sole task was to find a WMD. The unit was called Mobile Exploitation Team Alpha, and Miller played a strangely involved role in it, according to Washington Post reports of that time.

She appeared to act as a liaison of sorts between the Army and Ahmed Chalabi of the Iraqi National Congress, one of the exiles she had known for several years, and whose veracity on Iraq's weapons turned out to be suspect.

Several military personnel involved with the weapons hunt told The Washington Post two years ago that they felt Miller had virtually hijacked the team.

She was so invested in Alpha's progress that she wrote a threatening note to military public affairs officials to protest the team's redeployment orders.

"I intend to write about this decision in the NY Times to send a successful team back home just as progress on WMD is being made," she wrote. The team was not redeployed.

A Sense of Mission

There is something about Miller -- something that seems like a crusade, a personal mission, against terror.

To her critics, she's an ideologue. She's often criticized as a neoconservative, because she seems to have bought a policy line from particular sources because of an ideological kinship.

Some point to Miller's relationship just after Sept. 11, 2001, with Benador Associates, a conservative speaker's bureau whose roster at that time included neoconservatives such as Richard Perle, a Reagan-era defense official. Miller says she was connected to Benador only briefly, and her one potential speaking engagement ultimately fell through.

As further evidence that Miller toes a particular line, some point to Laurie Mylroie, Miller's co-author in the 1990 book "Saddam Hussein and the Crisis in the Gulf." Mylroie, a policy pundit, has argued that Iraq was connected to the 1993 World Trade Center bombing and to the attacks of 2001.

Miller, when asked about this, says she does not agree with those theories.

"I am not a neoconservative," Miller says adamantly. She calls herself a centrist.

If she relied on any sources too strongly while covering WMD and the war, she says, it was because she had no reason to distrust them, because they had never lied to her or been wrong. She is talking, she says, about people in the Clinton administration as well as the current Bush administration.

But in her reporting, there was something else on which Miller relied as much, if not more: her personal belief in the danger that Saddam Hussein posed to the world.

It was personal, for she had been detained for a day by Hussein's security forces back in the 1980s, she says. And it was personal because, as she writes in her 1996 book on Islam, "God Has Ninety-Nine Names," an Iraqi source once told her "that I was on a very short list of writers who are considered the regime's 'eternal enemies.' "

No, she says, she wasn't just being fed information by sources.

"I had my own independent knowledge of Saddam Hussein. I was on record in 'Saddam Hussein and the Crisis in the Gulf,' talking about this horrible regime and its use of chemical weapons against its own people. . . . I feared there was nothing he wouldn't do if he had access to such weapons. I was genuinely fearful of what he might do to American forces, to American installations in the Middle East and, if there was an al Qaeda link -- and I didn't know that and I never wrote that -- what he might do in the United States. My own reporting on Iraq made me fearful of Saddam Hussein."

And so fighting him, fighting his terror, became a passion. Fighting chemical and biological threats became a passion. Fighting al Qaeda became a passion.

As she speaks of 9/11's galvanizing impact, her voice rises.

"I hope to God that I'm wrong. I hope to God that not another American ever dies in a terrorist attack. But I would take no comfort. I would be heartsick to have to say I told you so.

"But I will make no apologies for my continuous commitment, my desire to pursue stories about threats to our country," she says emphatically, almost frantically, her crusading eyes brimming with tears.

اقرأ النص التالي و قم بترجمته على مرحلتين مستعيناً بالقاموس:

Long Out of the Kitchen but Still Taking the Heat

Tina Brown, *The Washington Post*

10/11/2005

It's been an unsettling few months for women of a certain age. Between the flameouts of Judy Miller and Harriet Miers, the frantic reentry of Martha Stewart and the sight of former CBS News producer Mary Mapes shaking her gored locks on ABC's "Good Morning America," everywhere you turn there's a power woman either *in extremis* or declaring she's indestructible, which are usually the same thing.

Remember that ludicrous memo that went out from the White House last week calling on administration functionaries to attend compulsory ethics seminars? It was signed by the president's counsel, Harriet Miers. The poor drudge is back in her old job mopping up the mess in the men's rooms, stoically pretending she's not bitter that a stampede of right-wing rhinos just got done stomping her reputation and flattening her future.

Was it always so hazardous for women in the public eye? The speed of the news cycle means that reputation-wrecking has accelerated for everyone, but when a woman is the subject the vortex of venom reaches a spinning climax.

The only plus is that the revved-up cycle shortens the wait for the inevitable Act 2, when yesterday's battered loser is required to emerge from her chrysalis of shame "looking better than ever."

Check out the buff upper arms of erstwhile tackling dummy Arianna Huffington, whose latest operatic comeback arc -- from reviled conservative salonista and scheming political wife to liberal cyberheroine and Web impresaria -- is chronicled in this month's Vanity Fair.

The New York Observer reports that Times punching bag Judith Miller, after a few dazed weeks limping along the beach in Sag Harbor, was rumored to be deep in "strategy sessions" with a kitchen cabinet of powerful Park Avenue gurus, until she resigned yesterday.

After being burned at the stake, a fab new wardrobe, perhaps. Quoth the Observer: "An orange sweater was draped over

Miller's shoulders, and she wore her preferred oversize tortoiseshell sunglasses."

Perhaps we can expect a slick glamour spread of Harriet Miers, 61, in a Versace gown split to the thigh and an eye job, under a blurb that reads, "She's slim. She's free. She's looking hot. Dodging that Supreme Court bullet was the best thing that ever happened to the quiet dynamo from East Texas."

The most depressing thing about the spat between Miller and her colleague/nemesis Maureen Dowd was the tired old debate it kicked off about who's the bigger vamp, Mo or Judy? According to Dowd in a lethal column that put her away, Judy had an unfortunate "tropism" (the lower the blow the loftier the word) for powerful men. Meanwhile, the cover story on Dowd in last week's New York magazine featured a smoldering shoulder shot of the 53-year-old columnist, along with flutters about her "dangerous charm" and "the little black dress with spaghetti straps" she wore on a Letterman show.

Dowd's new book, "Are Men Necessary?," is a fun rant about how women have dialed back their hard-won independence to become alpha geishas servicing the craven weenies of inadequate males, but the elephant in the room is the way

Dowd's promotion for her book turns on an onerous, retrosexual pitch for what hot stuff the author is. The more her PR plays up the flame-haired temptress angle, the scarier and more desperate it feels. It's made me put away for good the long, black, stiletto-heeled Jimmy Choo boots I unwrapped with racy squeals on my 50th birthday and start seriously considering rhinestone reading glasses.

Dowd's hunt for who or what to blame for her vaunted datelessness recalls Bush's correspondents' dinner routine about looking for Iraqi WMD under his Oval Office desk. The thought of Dowd's girls' nights with fellow Times sirens Alessandra Stanley and Michiko Kakutani sounds about as soft and yielding as Macbeth's three witches on a club crawl.

The bummer of it all is that Dowd is right about the female need to use aggression only as a stealth weapon. The hazard of hitting the big five-oh and beyond is an erroneous sense that you've earned the right not to play by the same rules. Once the hormonal brakes come off, it's easy to crash. "I was in the wrong place at the wrong time," Martha Stewart, 64, tells Fortune. "I fell in a hole."

But she dug her hole herself as surely as Mapes and Miller dug theirs. Since women who are smart and aggressive about their work have to conceal it with charm, when they fall on their faces everyone forgets the smarts and the charm and talks only about the aggression. In Mapes's just-released book, "Truth and Duty: The Press, the President, and the Privilege of Power," she comes off as the kind of rip-snorting rodeo rider of the news I would have killed to work with as an editor. Her gallop through such Mapes-produced "60 Minutes II" scoops as securing Karla Faye Tucker's death row interview or tracking down Strom Thurmond's black illegitimate daughter or exposing the atrocities of Abu Ghraib gives us a heart-racing glimpse of a resourceful TV pro in her fearless prime.

But like Miller (and Stewart), Mapes has tunnel vision about her mistakes. The charge-ahead heedlessness that did her in was what made her a great investigative reporter in the first place. In the book she maddeningly dismisses the central delinquency of Rathergate -- that she never sufficiently nailed down the provenance of the incriminating letters slipped to her by former Texas Air National Guardsman Bill Burkett.

Great reporters regularly dive off cliffs, and it's up to their bosses to yank them back. Mapes herself writes that as she

crashed her story over a sleepy Labor Day weekend, she kept wondering why no one at 60 II was aggressively pushing back: "Shouldn't someone be asking me questions? Maybe even yelling a little? I missed the yelling." (Of her previous CBS boss, Jeff Fager).

In the end I can't help warming to Mapes despite her impenitent refusal to eat crow. She saves the real honesty in her book not for the facts of her professional demise but for what the fiasco felt like from the inside -- the whole armpit-soaking, head-bursting horror of what goes down when the journalistic crapola hits the fan and the blogs are on your case and your mouth is dry from a fear of failure.

Yes, Mapes steered CBS News into a brick wall. But as with Miller and the Times, it was the boys in the front office who gave her the steering wheel and failed to keep an eye on the road and a foot on the brakes. I'm left with a real sense that snuffing out firecrackers like Mapes and Miller is a loss to the news business.

When Larry King asked Barbara Bush about the implosion of CBS's story on her son's National Guard service, the former

first lady replied: "In fact, didn't the girl take most of the blame?" She usually does. You got that right, Bar.

نموذج (6)

اقرأ النص التالي و قم بترجمته على مرحلتين مستعيناً بالقاموس:

Did The Press Push Bush?

Howard Kurtz, *The Washington Post*

05/04/2002

During a crime wave a decade ago, the New York Post delivered a screaming front-page message to David Dinkins, the city's new mayor.

"DAVE, DO SOMETHING!" the paper demanded.

The precise nature of the something was unimportant.

That's how the media have been sounding this week – minus the blaring headline – on Bush and the Middle East.

Was the president prodded by the press to wade into the Mideast muck yesterday?

Not that Bush would ever take direction from know-it-all scribes and pundits, but the man was getting hammered big time:

Why wasn't he more engaged?

Why wasn't Colin Powell more deeply involved?

Why didn't he bring the warring parties together like Bill Clinton?

Did he have any responsibility for the rising violence?

These questions were, on some level, unfair, based on an assumption that an American president can push a few buttons and get results in a region where people have been fighting since Biblical times. But they resounded nonetheless as the death toll kept rising.

Bush was much tougher on Arafat rhetorically. But in asking Israel to pull out of the West Bank, he was doing what the Palestinians and their Arab allies want.

Bush may have wanted to avoid risking his prestige in the past by taking a restrained approach, refusing to so much as speak to Arafat. Getting into negotiations with the warring parties

would be so . . . Clintonian. But Bush's hands-off approach became politically untenable.

Now, of course, the president has put himself on the line with his "enough is enough" declaration. So if Powell fails to get results – if the whole process blows up, as it has before – the press will cast it as a failure.

In media land, it doesn't take long for "DO SOMETHING" to become "WHAT WAS HE THINKING?"

Let's go to the videotape.

"President Bush today reversed course and thrust his administration into a central role in the Middle East crisis," the *New York Times* says, "demanding that Israel begin withdrawing from the West Bank and telling Arab nations and Yasir Arafat that they must actively oppose terrorism if they are to have any hope of creating a Palestinian state.

"Mr. Bush said he would send Secretary of State Colin L. Powell to the region next week, putting him in the center of negotiations that have been handled so far by a lower-level envoy. But several of the president's senior aides said the true importance of the speech was that it set Mr. Bush on a course

of acting as a central mediator in the peace effort, a role which until now he went to great lengths to avoid.

"Decades of bitter experience teach a clear lesson,' Mr. Bush said in the Rose Garden. 'Progress is impossible when nations emphasize their grievances and ignore their opportunities. The storms of violence cannot go on. Enough is enough.'

"Shortly after the president's speech, a senior aide to Mr. Arafat told CNN that the Palestinian leader accepted the president's remarks 'without conditions.' In Israel, however, Prime Minister Ariel Sharon said on television that the weeklong military operation in the West Bank would continue. 'Negotiating before terror is subdued will only lead to its continuation,' he said.

"A senior administration official deeply involved in setting the policy said Mr. Bush decided in meetings on Monday and Tuesday that he would have to intervene far more directly because he feared that long-term allies in the region like Egypt and Jordan were facing destabilizing protests."

The Los Angeles Times says Bush's previous approach was a flop: "For more than 14 months, President Bush tried to steer clear of the Arab-Israeli conflict, a seemingly endless tangle

that has consumed serious diplomatic energy from every president since Richard Nixon.

"But conflict avoidance didn't work. The crisis got worse, not better, and was threatening to sink Bush's effort to build a worldwide coalition against terrorism and 'rogue' nations such as Iraq."

The Washington Post sees friction between Washington and Tel Aviv: "In dispatching Secretary of State Colin L. Powell to the Middle East, President Bush has substantially broadened the range of issues up for immediate bargaining and confronted Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon for the first time with unwelcome demands aimed at addressing Palestinian concerns.

"Bush's remarks yesterday included the harshest criticism he has ever directed at Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat. But they were wrapped around a negotiating agenda reflecting the White House's conclusion in the past few days that the Palestinians must be provided more tangible enticements to stop attacks on Israelis so the peace process can resume.

"The president explicitly urged immediate action by Sharon to ease the longstanding blockade on the West Bank and Gaza Strip, which has staggered the Palestinian economy, and made

the clearest demand ever issued by a U.S. president for an end to 'Israeli settlement activity in occupied territories.'

"The insistence on stopping settlement construction is certain to run afoul of Sharon, who has long been a chief patron of Jewish settlers, and is but one of several U.S. demands that could lead to friction with the Israeli government."

Slate's William Saletan says the various Mideast peace plans are something of an illusion:

"The Middle East is going to hell. Palestinians are blowing up Israelis. Israelis are shooting Palestinians. What is the United States doing about it? Not much. But don't worry, says U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell. Eventually, the Israelis will pull out of the West Bank, 'and Tenet and Mitchell will be waiting for them'.

"If you don't know what Tenet and Mitchell are, you need a lesson in the three languages of the peace process: Hebrew, Arabic, and bureaucratic [BS]. Officially, Mitchell refers to an April 2001 list of recommendations for conducting peace talks, and Tenet refers to a June 2001 list of security measures each side must take to halt violence so that talks can proceed. Unofficially, Mitchell and Tenet, like Zinni, Oslo, and Madrid,

are buzzwords designed to create an impression of progress where none exists.

"The theory put forward by Powell, President Bush, the U.N. Security Council, and other peace process exponents is that Zinni will lead to Tenet, which will lead to Mitchell, which will lead to Oslo, which will lead to peace. But the history of the invention of these steps suggests the opposite. Mitchell was created because Oslo failed. Tenet was created because Mitchell failed. Zinni was created because Tenet failed. The peace process is growing ever more complicated not because each stage leads to the next but because it doesn't. . . .

"One problem with this backward road-building is that it fosters what Bush has called, in the context of education, the soft bigotry of low expectations. It makes it easy to say we're getting somewhere when in fact we're getting almost nowhere. For the past week, reporters have asked Bush and his spokesman Ari Fleischer what the Tenet and Mitchell plans have accomplished. Bush and Fleischer keep brushing aside these questions by talking about how close the Zinni mission has brought us to 'getting a chance to get into Tenet.' Getting that far, according to Fleischer, would constitute 'success'".

In a moving dispatch, the *New Republic's* Yossi Klein Halevi provides a glimpse of life in Jerusalem:

"Despite the blur created by the routinization of terrorism, when one atrocity supplants the next with such rapidity that we lose even the ability to mourn, several clarifying moments have emerged from the last 18 months of war. . . .

"And last week there was the seder massacre, which merged mass murder with myth. . . . The attack on the festival of freedom was a taunt--a reminder that we are no longer free in our land. Instead, we are being reghettoized through a gradually constricting siege that has taken from us a precious expression of our sovereignty--our ability to roam freely, to engage in the near-sensuous ritual of possessing the land through tactile exploration.

"The first intifada denied us freedom of movement in the territories and the Arab neighborhoods of East Jerusalem. This intifada has done that for the country as a whole. We are in danger of becoming a nation of agoraphobes. I know Israelis who don't leave their homes except for work and quick forays for groceries. My four-year-old son's baby-sitter won't take the half-dozen children in her care to the park downstairs. The fear

undermines even the refuge of one's own home: One friend, who lives in a Jerusalem neighborhood where a car bomb was recently discovered in the underground garage of an apartment building, lies awake at night worrying that his building is about to explode. During the Gulf war, Shlomo Lahat, the former mayor of Tel Aviv, denounced his city's residents as cowards for fleeing missile attacks; now he has called on Israelis to stay in their homes and avoid public places.

"And the fear has not only forced us into our homes; it has locked us out of our national, communal space. In our dread of public places, notes Israeli journalist Ari Shavit, lies a threat to our collective identity. Striking at a seder--which celebrates the founding of the Jewish people--is an unbearable symbol of the war against the Jewish collective. We are in the grip of an experiment testing how long a society can endure under relentless terrorism before it begins to disintegrate. If the experiment continues unchecked, we will become a completely atomized society--or no longer a society at all."

Has Israel finally gotten the goods on Arafat? Check out this *Philadelphia Inquirer* story:

"Israeli officials said two faxes seized from Arafat's headquarters in Ramallah and signed by him authorized cash payments to 15 men previously identified as terrorists. The men planned or launched recent suicide bombings and other attacks on Israeli civilians, the government said.

"The consequences are very clear,' said Dan Meridor, an official in Sharon's government. 'Mr. Arafat is running a terrorist organization. . . . He is quite deeply involved in paying money to terrorists.'

"Samir Rantisi, a spokesman for Arafat's Palestinian Authority, questioned the authenticity and relevance of the documents, although he stopped short of calling them outright forgeries."

Not relevant? There's a tough sell.

USA Today has an update on safety efforts here at home: "The nation's five largest pilots unions have asked President Bush to intercede personally to let pilots arm themselves aboard commercial jets.

"The appeal to the president, an unprecedented show of solidarity by unions representing 114,000 airline pilots, comes after two top Bush officials said they oppose guns in cockpits.

The unions say the new Transportation Security Administration (TSA) has not moved fast enough to establish a firearms training program for pilots who want to carry guns.

"Some aviation safety experts argue guns would create new hazards, from distracting pilots to accidental discharge or theft. The pilots unions contend a training program would address those concerns and that lethal force is the only certain way to stop hijackers. In a Time/CNN poll conducted weeks after the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, 61% favored allowing pilots to carry guns."

Andrew Sullivan unloads on the Saudis:

"Here's an amazing, splutter-over-your-coffee quote, in the New York Times:

"Prince Bandar bin Sultan, the Saudi ambassador to Washington, told a conference at the University of Oklahoma today that he was frustrated that the Israelis had spurned the Arab peace offer, a plan the administration gave its support. "We're offering the Israelis full, total peace and security in return for ending the military occupation," he said. "You still have the Arab leadership ready to stick its neck out and say, yes, let's have peace," he added. But he warned of dire

consequences if the situation remains unchanged. "I cannot guarantee this down the road, when everybody becomes a suicidal bomber".

"So this guy, who represents a country which has financed Islamo-fascism, gave us the citizens who killed over 3000 people in New York City, now threatens that there will be more suicide bombers, if Israel doesn't capitulate to terror. And he claims that he and the dictatorship he represents were 'sticking their necks out' to offer Israel a plan that would effectively destroy that country's security. Are we on the same planet or what?".

Bush's other proposal yesterday was greatly overshadowed, but here's the Wall Street Journal account:

"President Bush, seeking to regain his free-trade credentials, urged the Senate to act this month to give him the power he needs to negotiate big international trade deals.

"In a speech to foreign diplomats at the State Department, Mr. Bush said he needs Congress to give him trade-negotiating authority now so he can move forward with trade talks on many fronts. In his remarks, Mr. Bush said 'the time of delay must end,' and proposed a deadline of April 22 for a vote on a

trade-authority bill, which would allow Congress to pass or reject, but not amend, large administration trade agreements.

"A defeat on this issue could dash the president's hopes to rebuild his image as a free trader a month after he imposed hefty tariffs on most steel imports. Some Democrats warned Thursday that chances of a major trade bill passing the Senate this year have dwindled. While many Democrats would be willing to grant Mr. Bush's request for so-called fast track trade negotiating authority, they want a hefty package of benefits included in the deal to help American workers".

Sounds familiar.

Now this is delicious. Remember our lead item yesterday about the Bushies spending close to \$1 million on polls, according to a *Washington Monthly* report?

Now comes Salon's Josh Marshall with a hard-hitting follow-up:

"The Bush White House is being accused of being almost as addicted to polls as the Clinton White House was, and the new revelations have the spinmeisters at the Republican National

Committee engaging in a fit of what Republicans usually deride as Clintonian double-talk and obfuscation".

The Washington Monthly piece by Joshua Green, which pegged the "official" polling budget at \$346,000, "didn't go over well with Jim Dyke of the RNC, who promptly called Green to give him a piece of his mind. Dyke was [angry], Green later told Salon, and questioned where Green came up with such a figure. Green said the estimate came from conversations with GOP sources who were unwilling to provide a precise figure. If Dyke disputed Green's numbers, Green asked Dyke to provide the actual figure.

"It's \$731,000," Green recalls Dyke telling him over the phone. "I was like, 'Uh-huh, and isn't that a lot closer to \$1 million than \$346,000?'" That ended the conversation.

"But when Salon contacted Dyke two hours later, the \$731,000 figure was apparently, as Richard Nixon's press secretary Ron Ziegler used to say, 'no longer operative.' . . .

"In recent presidencies it has become customary for the White House to run its polling operation through its party committee, the RNC or the DNC. Bill Clinton's main pollster in the late 1990s was Mark Penn, though Penn actually got paid by the

DNC. But Dyke refused to concede that any of the RNC-funded polling was done for the White House. All Dyke would say was that there was a certain portion of the RNC's polling that 'the White House might or might not have been interested in' and that that category of polling billed out at a mere \$336,000. When I asked Dyke what that meant, he said these were polls 'which may or may not have included a question that the White House may have been interested in'.

"Under persistent and sometimes comical questioning, it eventually emerged that Dyke's 'might or might not' category referred to national polls as opposed to ones that focused on one region or state. Non-nationwide polls didn't count as polls that the White House 'might or might not have been interested in.' In other words, reasoned Dyke, when President Bush's pollster Jan van Lohuizen does a poll of Michigan or Pennsylvania, that's not a White House poll".

We guess it, well, ah, all depends on the meaning of the word poll.

اقرأ النص التالي و قم بترجمته على مرحلتين مستعيناً بالقاموس:

Israel's Anti-Media Offensive Raises Questions

Howard Kurtz, *The Washington Post*

08/04/2002

No matter what you think of the Middle East conflict, this was monumentally dumb.

Israeli troops firing stun grenades and rubber bullets at two dozen journalists awaiting the arrival of U.S. envoy Anthony Zinni?

Is this crazy or what?

Could the Israelis be intent on blowing up their international image?

"There were probably six or seven, it was difficult to count, of these stun grenades going off," CNN's Michael Holmes reported. "One landed under my foot, as I moved away, and went off. I could feel the concussion of it under my foot."

What better way to take the focus off Arafat and suicide bombers than to open fire on the press? This is shooting yourself in a far worse place than the foot.

Israel usually draws sympathetic coverage in the West, although its heavy-handed tactics have prompted more criticism lately. But there may be no better way to generate negative headlines than to literally attack the press, without warning or provocation.

An Israeli writer, Aviv Lavie, has an interesting complaint in the newspaper *Ha'aretz* about how even his own country's reporters are being shut out of Ramallah:

"A journey through the TV and radio channels and the pages of the newspapers exposes a huge and embarrassing gap between what is reported to us and what is seen, heard, and read in the world – not only in the commentaries and analytical pieces, but also in the reporting of the dry facts.

"Israel looks like an isolated media island, with most of the reporters drafted into the cause of convincing themselves and the reader that the government and army are perfectly justified in whatever they do. . . .

"Reporters and commentators get most of their information from the army, and a few also use Palestinian sources whom they regard with great suspicion. Many reporters believed the army was closed off to them for a few days, but as time goes by, they have been proven wrong. Since the journalists aren't on the ground to see firsthand, the soldiers become their eyes, which explains the huge difference between what is reported and broadcast to us, and what the rest of the world sees, particularly the Arab world.

"On Arab TV stations (though not only them) one could see Israeli soldiers taking over hospitals, breaking equipment, damaging medicines, and locking doctors away from their patients. In one interview, a doctor was whispering on a phone, explaining that he had to lower his voice lest the soldier in the next room cut off the conversation. Foreign television networks all over the world have shown the images of five Palestinians from the National Security forces, shot in the heads from close range; one was apparently the manager of the Palestinian Authority orchestra. Some of the networks have claimed they were shot in cold blood after they were disarmed.

"The entire world has seen wounded people in the streets, heard reports of how the Israeli Defense Forces prevent

ambulances from reaching the wounded for treatment. The entire world has heard Palestinian residents saying they can't leave their homes because 'they shoot anyone in the streets.' The entire world has heard testimony by Palestinian families who have been imprisoned in their homes for 72 hours, in some places without electricity or water, and the food is running out. There are also reports of vandalism and looting.

"Maybe it's all mendacious propaganda (though in some cases, the pictures speak for themselves) but Israeli journalists have no way to investigate to find out the truth, whether to deflate the stories, or confirm them. In the absence of that kind of reporting, instead, over and over, we hear the worn out mantras about how 'the civilian population is not our enemy,' and reports on how the army takes such strict care not to harm civilians".

Here at home, conservatives usually applaud a get-tough foreign policy. But the right is not pleased with President Bush's blunt intervention in the Mideast. *The Wall Street Journal* editorial page abandons its usual support of Bush:

"President Bush bowed to pressure from Europe, the Arab world and most of the U.S. media by urging Israel to end its

siege against Palestinian terrorists. This strikes us as a mistake, maybe even a large one, though it all might be redeemed if this helps Mr. Bush refocus the war on terror back on Iraq.

"The immediate concern is that the President's renewed pressure on Israel will be perceived as rewarding terror. While his speech was at least free of the State Department's moral equivalence blather, Mr. Bush demanded that Israel make the larger concessions. He handed Yasser Arafat another tongue lashing but asked Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon to withdraw his troops from the West Bank. In effect the U.S. once again rode to Mr. Arafat's political rescue. . . .

"Mr. Bush has now committed his own prestige to solving the unsolvable Arab-Israeli conflict. While denouncing Mr. Arafat for failing to control terror, the President still props him up as the Palestinian Israelis are supposed to negotiate with."

National Review is also in blame-Arafat mode:

"Responsibility for what is happening rests wholly upon Yasser Arafat and the Palestinians. At Camp David in the days of the Clinton presidency, Arafat could have laid the foundations of a peaceful Palestinian state. Here might have been a rare example of a national liberation movement achieving its ends

through political processes. But so contemptuous was he of Israeli concessions that he was not even prepared to offer any counter-proposals of his own, instead hastening home to launch the current intifada.

"In a career spanning over three decades, he has steadily displayed the Pavlovian response that Palestine means violence. He brought civil war first to Jordan, then to Lebanon, and in the years after the Oslo accords he came to exemplify the bad government, corruption, and failure to modernize of so many of his fellow Muslim-world rulers. In their mold, he rigged the electoral process by which he became president. For his unfortunate people, he has been a disaster.

"The United Nations, international Muslim forums, and European politicians now raise a chorus that Arafat must be protected. Their collective rescue of Arafat condemns Palestinians to endure more of the same, while simultaneously they reveal themselves unmoved by the prospect of dead Jews.

...

"Gen. Zinni and the Mitchell and Tenet plans are so many tokens of good will, perhaps better than nothing but unable to deliver. President Bush and his administration are in no

position to remedy the bad government of Arafat or other Muslim rulers. So far, they are blowing hot and cold. Their pronouncements for or against Israel, for or against Arafat, are confused and confusing to Muslims and the rest of the West awaiting a lead".

The *New York Times* does a scene-setter for the Powell mission:

"Secretary of State Colin L. Powell took off for the Middle East tonight on one of the most urgent and challenging attempts at American peacemaking since the shuttle diplomacy of Henry A. Kissinger in the 1970's.

"Secretary Powell and the advisers on his plane were going with no optimistic illusions about their mission, an enterprise ordered by President Bush with broad implications for his own personal prestige – and for the strategic interests and international standing of the United States.

"'It's going to be a difficult trip,' Secretary Powell said this morning. 'I'm not going to come back at the end of this trip with a peace treaty in hand. I'm not even sure I'll have a cease-fire in hand. But that will be my goal, to try to help both sides

out of this tragic situation in which they find themselves.' He spoke on the NBC News program 'Meet the Press'.

"Even as Secretary Powell spoke, the challenges were heightened. Israel showed no public signs of heeding his and Mr. Bush's calls for a prompt withdrawal from its occupation of Palestinian areas in the West Bank. Palestinian leaders have yet to issue firm demands for an end to the violence that prompted the Israeli military moves."

The *Los Angeles Times* sees black-and-white Bush plunged into a world of gray:

"Since the shock of Sept. 11, President Bush has pursued a sharply focused foreign policy agenda with single-minded zeal: Terrorism was civilization's mortal enemy, he said, and his historic mission was to stamp it out, beginning in Afghanistan and moving on to Iraq.

"'My job isn't to try to nuance,' Bush said recently. 'My job is to tell people what I think. And when I think there's an axis of evil, I say it. I think moral clarity is important.'

"But Bush's one-track agenda appears to have been hijacked by events in the Middle East--and by Arab and European allies

who want less attention to moral clarity and more to the nuances.

"As a result, the president finds himself stepping grimly into the nuance-ridden landscape of the Arab-Israeli conflict. On Saturday, that meant taking the unfamiliar step of scolding Israel for ignoring his plea to withdraw its tanks from the West Bank."

Columnist Charles Krauthammer wants the Palestinian banished:

"What to do with Arafat? Isolating Arafat is no answer, because the isolation must end at some point. Killing Arafat is no answer, because that will make him a martyr. The important thing is to make him irrelevant by expelling him. Let us not hear any more ridiculous talk about Arafat's being the only man who can make peace.

"Can? He had 8 1/2 years to make peace. He has no intention of making peace. He was offered his peace, his Palestine, in July 2000 by Israel and then by the president of the United States. Like the Palestinian leadership of 1947, also offered their own state side-by-side with Israel, Arafat rejected the offer and started a war. . . .

"Why expel him? Because as long as he rules, the Palestinian answer to any offer of peace that genuinely accepts Israel is 'No.' And there will be no one in Palestine who will dare say 'Yes.' (If he does, he dies.) The only hope for any kind of peace is a Palestinian leadership, whether national or local, ready to say yes. And that can only become possible when Arafat has been banished and his rejectionist police state dismantled. . . .

"President Bush offered Arafat yet another olive branch, yet another rescue. This will achieve nothing. This will only postpone the reckoning."

Here's a weird one from *Reason's* Charles Paul Freund: "When Palestinian residents of the besieged West Bank town of Ramallah turned on their TVs over the weekend, what they encountered was neither news nor any of the usual Palestinian Authority programming; they encountered pornographic movie clips.

"Three of the four TV stations in Ramallah, headquarters of Yasser Arafat, had been occupied by Israeli troops. The town's remaining TV station was meanwhile running a crawl at the bottom of the screen explaining that the porn clips were the

work of the occupying forces. 'We urge parents to take precautions,' it read.

"An Israeli army spokesman told Agence France-Press that their forces had nothing to do with such clips, and even blamed Arafat for the footage."

Talk about X-rated warfare.

Want a whiff of hypocrisy? Check out this Wall Street Journal piece: "Four years ago, leaders of the Senate Finance Committee bashed the Internal Revenue Service as heavy-handed and pushed the agency to ease its pursuit of tax dodgers. Audits and penalties, property liens and seizures, declined steadily.

"Now many of the same politicians are prodding the IRS again – to be tougher. And audits and penalties are on the rise.

"The swing of the political pendulum will be on full display Thursday, when the Senate's tax experts hold a hearing designed to boost IRS tax-compliance efforts. . . . A committee press release gives the event this marquee: 'Hearing on Schemes, Scams, and Cons . . . The IRS Strikes Back.'"

Guess they were just kidding last time around.

The politics of personal destruction moves to the Web, in this *Washington Times* piece: "A Republican effort to demonize Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle for political advantage – in the way Democrats once made then-House Speaker Newt Gingrich their election-year Satan – has ignited a campaign fund-raising frenzy with warring Web sites on the Internet.

"A Republican Web site called DumpDaschle.org has raised hundreds of thousands of dollars since last October for radio and TV issue attack advertisements and other political broadsides against the South Dakota Democrat in his home state.

"Democratic political organizers have countered with their own Web site, DaschleDemocrats.org, which has already raised more than \$100,000 to repel the assault and mobilize Democratic faithfuls against 'a right-wing conspiracy.'

"'Despite public calls for a "changed tone in Washington," conservative Republican operatives are engaged in a cynical, coordinated effort to personally malign and politically smear Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle,' said an opening message on the home page of DaschleDemocrats.org."

The *American Prowler* says one top GOPer may be taking a hike: "Someone apparently seriously mulling early retirement is Republican National Committee Chairman Marc Racicot, who RNC staffers say is fed up with a controlling White House that has made political missteps he advised against.

"He wasn't part of the recruitment of Richard Riordan out in California, but Marc was very upset at how that Republican primary was handled. He pressed for the White House to at least talk to [now Republican nominee] Bill Simon before the primary election, but he was ignored,' says a senior RNC aide. 'He's disenchanted with the job, because he feels he's been cut out of most of the political decisions. Those are made by others inside the White House and then handed off to the RNC.'

"Racicot is also said to have felt he should have been consulted more in the decision to bring Mitt Romney back to run for Massachusetts governor."

Finally, here's a case of a journalist taking his lumps. David Copley, publisher of the *San Diego Union Tribune*, explains why the paper published a story on his DUI arrest:

"There were no unusual circumstances attending my arrest; I ran a stop sign, and a San Diego police officer pulled me over.

He and the sheriff's deputies at the jail where I spent the rest of the night couldn't have been more professional. They did their jobs well. I emerged chastised and embarrassed.

"I am not a TV celebrity, nor an elected official, but if anyone must undergo the further humiliation of having his name in the paper, it must be the person who bears ultimate responsibility for publishing the names of others."

نموذج (8)

اقرأ النص التالي و قم بترجمته على مرحلتين مستعينا بالقاموس:

Analyze This! Wall Street's Shame

Howard Kurtz, *The Washington Post*

10/04/2002

This story about Wall Street analysts is getting way underplayed.

Even the new, we've-got-color Wall Street Journal has it in the business section.

It's a full-blown, eye-popping, steam-from-your-ears outrage.

Sometimes we in the press tend to overanalyze things with too much blah blah blah. This story has incredibly incriminating e-mails that tell the tale. E-mail is where we say what we really think, right?

Sure, everyone knew that Henry Blodget and other stock analysts were pumping high-flying stocks of companies that their brokerage firms did business with (though when we made this argument a year and a half ago, some business journalists sniffed there was no need to insist on disclosure every time these overpriced cheerleaders were quoted or interviewed on the tube. No one's making that argument post-Enron).

So now comes the New York attorney general, Eliot Spitzer, with a haul of internal e-mail messages at Merrill Lynch, where Blodget used to work. (Did you buy pets.com or eToys, both of which Blodget pushed? The companies went bankrupt. This isn't some abstract story; real folks lost lots of real money.)

Blodget, by the way, was paid \$12 million last year.

Merrill was touting InfoSpace on its "Favored 15" list of stocks. InfoSpace was selling for \$129 in March 2000; it closed yesterday at \$1.45.

In one e-mail, Blodget told another analyst "can we please reset this stupid price target and rip this piece of junk off whatever list it's on." InfoSpace remained on the recommended list for months.

Other Net stocks, which Blodget's unit had neutral ratings on, were described as "such a piece of crap," "going a lot lower," or a "dog".

One analyst, Kirsten Campbell, told Blodget in a note that she was feeling pressured to start coverage of GoTo.com with a positive rating. "We are losing people money, and I don't like it," she said. She said she had told investment banker Thomas Mazzucco that "the whole idea that we are independent from banking is a big lie." Mazzucco disagreed.

Brokerage houses say their research analysts are objective and not just trying to generate deals for the banking side. Merrill Lynch says in a statement that nothing has been proven by "a limited number of employee e-mails, taken out of context."

"Junk"? "Crap"? Seems to us the context couldn't be clearer. Some of these pros were deliberately recommending garbage.

Here are the *New York Times* and *Washington Post* accounts. The *L.A. Times* and *Chicago Tribune* ran briefs.

Now for our daily visit to the Middle East, where those who said Israel's military operation would stop terrorism turn out to be wrong.

"A suicide bomber exploded a powerful bomb on a bus in northern Israel during rush hour this morning, killing at least 8 people, a day after 13 Israeli soldiers were killed in an ambush in the West Bank city of Jenin," says the New York Times.

"The explosion occurred at about 7:15, as the bus was moving between stops in the Haifa suburbs. At least 14 people were wounded, three seriously. It was the first attack by a suicide bomber since April 1, just after Israel began occupying the West Bank. Israel's leaders had been making the point that their military occupation of the West Bank had routed the terrorists, making such an attack less easily accomplished.

"In Jenin, another Israeli soldier was killed and 12 were wounded at the refuge camp this morning after they were fired

on while searching a building, an army spokesman said. A bullet hit a soldier's grenade, causing it to explode, the army said. . . .

"More than 100 Palestinians have been killed in Jenin, the Palestinian town that has brought the stiffest resistance to the broad Israeli sweep through the West Bank. . . . 'This is a battle for survival of the Jewish people, for survival of the state of Israel,' Prime Minister Ariel Sharon said on Israeli television shortly after news of the ambush."

The Washington Post makes clear the White House has changed its Arafat standard: "Secretary of State Colin L. Powell said today he intends to meet Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat later this week for cease-fire talks that U.S. officials say could swiftly lead to new negotiations over political issues underlying the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

"Powell's statement that a truce agreement would be 'instantly linked' to political discussions showed how far the Bush administration has come in urging resumption of the peace talks that broke down more than a year ago. For weeks, U.S. officials had been insisting, in tandem with Israel, that such

political negotiations could be undertaken only once a truce was in place and being respected.

"Powell's meeting in Cairo today with Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak also revealed continuing differences between American and Arab views about whether political negotiations can proceed at the same time as cease-fire talks. Egyptian officials added their voices to those of Moroccan and Saudi leaders who told Powell on Monday that steps to address Palestinian political concerns cannot be delayed."

National Review editor Jonah Goldberg has some thoughts on a certain Nobel Peace Prize: "'Yes, I wish it were possible that we could recall the prize,' Hanna Kvanmo told the Agence France Press. Ms. Kvanmo serves on the five-member committee that gave Yasser Arafat the 1994 Nobel Peace prize. She's not alone in her sentiments. 'I cannot hide my deep disappointment and despair,' committee member and Oslo bishop Gunnar Staalsett lamented, agreeing that the Peace prize should be withdrawn. Odvar Nordli, former Norwegian prime minister and another committee member, concurred.

"Of course, none of these people are referring to Arafat. They sigh with the contentment of an artist gratified by a work well

completed when they contemplate Arafat's blood-soaked paws stroking the prize: 'Ahhh,' they seem to be saying, 'we at least got that one right.'

"No, Ms. Kvanmo's 'wish' is that Arafat's corecipients, Yitzhak Rabin and Shimon Peres, would return their prizes. Well, not Rabin, since he's dead. But Peres should give it back, say these moral titans, because he has remained in Ariel Sharon's government while it manages to stop kamikaze bombers from blowing up the citizens who elected it.

"My views regarding the European political and intellectual elite have gone from mere contempt to palpable disgust.

"Even the glow of the synagogues burning on soil already well fertilized with the viscera of Jews is paled by the bonfire of hypocrisy now raging in capitals across Europe. Recall last December, when France's ambassador to England, Daniel Bernard, referred to Israel as 'that shi**y little country,' asking, 'Why should the world be in danger of World War III because of those people?'"

The *Los Angeles Times* says cloning is about to burst back into the news: "President Bush will intensify his push today for a comprehensive ban on human cloning, raising the temperature

in a debate that has been smoldering at the crossroads of ethics and science.

"In a speech in the White House Rose Garden, Bush is expected to urge the Senate to ban cloning as a potential method for creating children and as a tool for research into cures for disease.

"But the approaching Senate debate is presenting him with a political challenge even more complex than the emotional battle over stem cell research that divided his administration last summer. . . . Both sides agree that there is no obvious compromise available between those who want to ban all human cloning and those who would permit cloning for medical research while barring it for reproduction."

Slate's Michael Kinsley, who favors therapeutic cloning, questions his own objectivity:

"Not to be coy, it makes a big difference to me. I have Parkinson's disease, for which stem-cell research holds extraordinary and imminent promise. Some might say this is a conflict of interest and I therefore shouldn't write about this topic. Ordinarily, of course, like every professional opinion-peddler, I approach all issues from a perspective of utter

Olympian detachment. It seems more like a bizarre convention than an ethical mandate that a person's views on a subject should be considered less interesting if his life is at stake. But anyone who does feel that way is hereby forewarned.

"Of course the goal of much political opinion writing – on national security, on the economy, on the environment, among other topics – is to convince the reader that everyone's life is at stake, or close to it. Presumably that includes the author's own.

"If you shouldn't write about topics where your own life is at stake in the outcome, no one should write about the war on terrorism. And the doomy opinions of environmentalists should only be published if they are incorrect. (Why? Because if the author is correct in saying that, say, global warming will melt the polar ice caps and drown us all, her life is at stake and therefore she has a conflict of interest).

"But it ought to take more than semi-coherent blather about some 'precautionary principle' to stop a potential miracle in its tracks. On balance, after weighing the arguments on both sides, I think I'd just as soon not give my life for alliteration".

And speaking of cloning: "Widely publicized reports of a woman pregnant with a human clone are extremely dubious,

says the former partner of the physician linked to the report," reports *USA Today*.

"Italian fertility doctor Severino Antinori has been the subject of swirling rumors in the past week after claims that he succeeded in implanting a cloned human embryo in a woman under his care surfaced in a story in a United Arab Emirates newspaper. According to the story, she is eight weeks pregnant.

"But Antinori's former partner, Panos Zavos of the Andrology Institute in Lexington, Ky., says he cut medical links with Antinori at least five months ago and is extremely doubtful that the Italian physician could have pulled off a cloning attempt independently."

Andrew Sullivan (who followed Kinsley as New Republic editor) has a personal interest in the topic: "Kinsley fesses up about how his Parkinson's disease inevitably affects his view of therapeutic cloning. I feel the same way about HIV and drug research. Of course I don't want the government crippling pharmaceutical profits, because it will slow such research and mean I'll probably die a few years sooner than might otherwise occur.

"Does this mean that because I'm HIV-positive, my view should be airily dismissed as too biased? I agree with Mike that this would be a bizarre inference. But the more interesting issue, of course, is whether Kinsley could have written this column with no conflict of interest before he had gone public with Parkinsons. I think that not disclosing such an obviously important piece of background material would have compromised the integrity of such a column.

"But I still believe that the right to privacy – especially about medical matters – would have and should have trumped that conflict of interest as a factor in ethical journalism."

One GOP official went a bit far in gathering political intelligence, reports the *Washington Times*: "Edmund A. Matricardi III, executive director of the Republican Party of Virginia, was indicted yesterday on charges of illegally intercepting two Democratic conference calls discussing the court battle over the state's legislative districts. He resigned hours later.

"He offered [his resignation because] he cares deeply about the party. We take these matters seriously, and Ed acted out of

great loyalty to the party,' said Gary Thomson, chairman of the Republican Party of Virginia."

Also, there was no way an indicted guy could hang onto the job.

"During the calls in question, state Democratic leaders – including Gov. Mark R. Warner – discussed Virginia's legislative districts, which were signed into law last year by Mr. Warner's Republican predecessor, Gov. James S. Gilmore III. Last month, a Roanoke County Circuit Court judge ruled that the districts were racially gerrymandered and unconstitutional, and ordered new districts to be drawn".

The American Prowler weighs in on an overlooked poll:

"Alarm bells went off in Harlem over the weekend, and down in Little Rock too, when the Gallup polling firm released the results of its latest survey late last week of public perceptions of presidents past. 'Clinton tanked,' says a former aide to the president, 'and it bugged him a little bit.' So much so, word out of Little Rock is that the Clinton Library may undertake its own poll to buttress Clinton's belief that he remains one of America's most popular and respected leaders.

"In the latest Gallup 'Retrospective Job Approval Ratings,' Clinton at 51% finished third to last, safely above Lyndon Johnson (39%) and Richard Nixon (34%), but also well below Jimmy Carter and Jerry Ford (60% each). Even more hurtful, George Bush Sr. came in at 69%, and Ronald Reagan at 73%, which rates up there with George Washington. Most hurtful: JFK scored 83%. Despite his best efforts, Clinton remains no John Kennedy.

"A lot of us are sure that President Clinton will rise in the people's affection over time,' says the aide. 'He just needs to settle down. Challenging the results of one poll with another isn't the way to go. It just gives his enemies more ammunition.'"

The annual Pulitzer second-guessing has begun, with this Andrea Peyser column in the New York Post:

"The Pulitzer panel handed its photography award to The New York Times for its series of four pictures of the World Trade Center attacks and overlooked the moving picture by The Record's Thomas Franklin which appeared on Page One of The Post and is also featured on a postage stamp. THE Pulitzer committee yesterday told the City of New York, our selfless

firefighters, 3,000 victims of this nation's bloodiest terror attack, and the American flag to go to hell. Nice work.

"It isn't often that a photograph perfectly captures the courage and pain of a historic event. The Pulitzer-winning image of a fireman cradling a baby mortally wounded in the Oklahoma City bombing comes to mind.

"On Sept. 11, such an evocative picture was taken by a previously unknown photographer from New Jersey. It shows three firemen, faces etched in soot and grief, as they raise an American flag on the smoking ruins of the World Trade Center.

"The first great photograph of the 21st century, taken by Thomas Franklin of The Record of Hackensack, quickly achieved the status of international icon. It's been compared to the 1945 Pulitzer-winning shot of Marines raising the flag on Iwo Jima. And the Pulitzer committee turned up its nose. . . .

"Was it the American flag that spooked the current gaggle of Pulitzer committee members?"

Which brought this missive on Jim Romanesko's *MediaNews*:
"From THOMAS GOETZ, Articles Editor, Wired Magazine:

Andrea Peyser's logic is confounding. How can she condemn the Pulitzer committee for telling 'the City of New York, our selfless firefighters, 3,000 victims of this nation's bloodiest terror attack, and the American flag to go to hell' when the NYTimes won for photos of New York after the Sept 11 attacks? Seems to me the committee was recognizing these same things, but thought the Times photos were, well, better. I know the NYPost likes columnists like Peyser to have a strong opinion. Too bad she lacks a strong argument."

"ANDREA PEYSER RESPONDS: I wonder if Thomas Goetz actually looked at the photographs that were chosen for the Pulitzer and the one that was snubbed. I think the proof of the politics behind the Pulitzer jury's decision is obvious in the pictures. The Pulitzers today represent the best politically correct and left-leaning journalism. It so happens that the best newspaper photograph of the year features an American flag and three white male firefighters. By Pulitzer's standards, that made it a loser."

The day after the Pulitzers are handed out is always more fun.

اقرأ النص التالي و قم بترجمته على مرحلتين مستعينا بالقاموس:

Liberal Media Conspiracy Falls Flat

Howard Kurtz, *The Washington Post*

28/02/2002

Liberal media detractors – you know who you are – take note.

The conventional wisdom is that the mainstream liberal media helps, well, mainstream liberal politicians. That conservatives can't catch a break from the big media companies. That journalists have their thumb on the scale, tilting it to the left.

Those on the right, in this view, have to scramble to get their voices heard but are drowned out by the libs, who don't even know they're libs, since everyone they know in the media is lib.

Maybe so. But there's another theory.

That the conservative press is purely partisan, while the mainstream weenie press is concerned with issues like fairness and balance – and, in fact, often criticized Bill Clinton and other Democrats.

That it's not really an even fight, heavyweight boxers versus high school debaters.

That Democrats are actually hamstrung because they try to play to the major editorial pages, while the Republicans, with knives in their teeth, couldn't care less.

That's the argument mounted by *Washington Monthly* editor Paul Glastris in a piece titled "Why Can't The Democrats Get Tough?"

It's got a great cover – a menacing-looking Joe Lieberman, Tom Daschle and George Stephanopoulos, in muscleman T-shirts, wielding stilettos, chains and truncheons.

First, the premise: "The Bush team can attack Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle (D-S.D.), lose \$4 trillion of the surplus, and meet with campaign contributors whose company stock they own, and Democrats just watch. ... And then there's Enron. Is there any doubt that if the situation were reversed, Republicans would be exploiting the scandal more aggressively? Would they have hesitated, as Democrats have, to frame Enron as a political scandal, or to bombard the White House with subpoenas? Democrats can't afford to go all wobbly, especially now."

Now the media critique: "The difference in partisan intensity also reflects the different media outlets to which the parties play. Democrats in Washington focus incessantly on the establishment press: The New York Times, The Washington Post, Newsweek, CBS, CNN, NPR. That is where their worldview is shaped, and where they look for validation of their ideas and status. Republican leaders are hardly indifferent to the establishment outlets. But they increasingly take their cue from the expanding alternative universe of conservative media: The Washington Times, The Wall Street Journal editorial page, talk radio, Fox News Channel.

"Needless to say, these two media worlds are governed by radically different rules. Yes, there is a certain amount of liberal bias in the mainstream press. But on balance, the big national papers and broadcast networks take seriously the traditional journalistic strictures of fairness, accuracy, and independence of judgement.

"The conservative press, by and large, does not labor under these constraints. It does not pretend to be in the business of presenting all sides fairly, but of promoting its side successfully. 'The conservative press is self-consciously conservative and self-consciously part of the team,' observes

conservative strategist Grover Norquist of Americans for Tax Reform (who, like most conservatives I spoke with, doesn't buy the idea that Republicans fight more ruthlessly than Democrats). 'The liberal press is much larger, but at the same time it sees itself as the establishment press. So it's conflicted. Sometimes it thinks it needs to be critical of both sides, to be nonpartisan.'

"You see this all the time. The editorial pages of The Wall Street Journal and The Washington Times supported or kept silent about the Republican Senate's strategy of blocking votes on Clinton judicial nominees. Now these papers cry foul when Democrat senators try to do the same to Bush. The New York Times and Washington Post editorials, on the other hand, have been consistent in their condemnation.

"But to the conservative press, intellectual consistency is for, well, intellectuals. What's more important is to stiffen the resolve of GOP lawmakers to fight the Manichaeian battle against liberalism. If the mainstream papers want to undermine the will of Democrats with a lot of high-minded consistency, that's their business. Let 'em get medals for fair play. We'll get the federal judiciary.

"The same dynamic plays out among TV pundits.

Conservatives such as Robert Novak, Kate O'Beirne, and Jonah Goldberg are ideological warriors who attempt with every utterance to advance their cause. Their center-left counterparts, people such as Juan Williams, Margaret Carlson, and E.J. Dionne, simply don't have the same killer instinct. While their sympathies are obvious, liberal pundits are at heart political reporters, not polemicists, who seem far more at ease on journalistic neutral ground, analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of both sides, rather than in vigorously defending Democrats."

Maybe James Carville and Paul Begala can help even the score now that they've signed on as co-hosts for "Crossfire."

In the Enron aftermath, Wall Street analysts – the same geniuses who pumped up Webvan, pets.com and other now-worthless stocks – got hammered before Joe Lieberman's committee.

"Wall Street analysts told lawmakers today that they gave independent and objective advice about the Enron Corporation just before its collapse but were fooled by misleading statements from the company", the *New York Times* says.

"Each day there are new allegations in the media concerning Enron about which I previously was unaware,' Curt Launer, managing director of equity research at Credit Suisse First Boston, told the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee.

"Mr. Launer had rated Enron a 'strong buy' until Nov. 28, when he downgraded the company's stock to a 'hold.' Four days later, Enron filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection."

Forget misleading information. The stock was in the toilet by then!

"Another analyst who downgraded Enron was Raymond Niles, senior analyst at Citigroup Salomon Smith Barney. Statements from Enron, he said, 'did not represent the company's true financial condition.' Mr. Niles downgraded Enron from a 'strong buy' to 'hold' on Oct. 25, six days after Enron disclosed that the Securities and Exchange Commission was examining its transactions with outside partnerships.

"Frank Torres, legislative counsel at Consumers Union, said Wall Street 'is pervaded by conflicts of interest that can, and have, corrupted the objectivity of research.'

"Conflicts of interest will exist as long as investment banking, trading and research are permitted to be bundled together in one firm,' Mr. Torres said."

Dick Cheney isn't the only one being asked to cough up documents, says *USA Today*.

"A federal district court has given the Department of Energy less than a month to release thousands of pages of documents detailing the names of energy company officials who met with the agency to consult on President Bush's energy plan.

"Calling the information 'of extraordinary public interest,' U.S. District Judge Gladys Kessler sided with the Natural Resources Defense Council in a lawsuit the environmental group filed in December. It seeks the names of individuals who met with Energy Department officials serving on Vice President Cheney's energy task force, the dates of those meetings and the topics discussed. ,.,.,

"The order, dated last Thursday but released yesterday, could influence a higher-profile lawsuit filed against Cheney last week by Congress' General Accounting Office".

The president of soft money traveled to North Carolina, the *Washington Post* reports:

"In October of 1999, Elizabeth Dole dropped out of the presidential race, blaming the influence of money in politics and the superior fundraising prowess of candidates such as George W. Bush, who enjoyed an '80-to-one' cash advantage.

"'I hoped to compensate by attracting new people to the political process, by emphasizing experience and advocating substantive issues,' she told a room full of tearful supporters then. 'But important as these things may be, the bottom line remains money.'

"It was a different Dole who appeared here today as the warm-up act for her well-financed former rival in a 'Salute to George W. Bush.' She hailed Bush at today's fundraiser as 'our great president' and 'a president to look up to,' and 'a president of strong moral character and faith.' She basked in the extended applause of the contributors to the luncheon fundraiser. 'Jiminy!' she exclaimed. 'You warm the heart.'

"Bush was in town to raise more than \$1 million for Republican office seekers – and Dole was the principal beneficiary of the event, which included \$10,000 table

sponsorships and a presidential photo for those who raised \$30,000."

That California primary next Tuesday is really heating up, as captured by the *Los Angeles Times*: "The three top Republican candidates for governor continued their fight Wednesday over who stands truest to GOP values, bickering over taxes, truth-telling and – improbably – San Francisco Mayor Willie Brown.

"Richard Riordan and Bill Simon Jr. broadcast new ads attacking each other, even as Riordan lamented the campaign's negative tone.

"Bill Jones took to the steps of Los Angeles City Hall to criticize former Mayor Riordan's eight-year residency and to accuse Riordan and Simon of showing up late to the Republican Party. But it was Brown – the liberal Republicans love to hate – who became the subject of the most vigorous finger-pointing after an article in the San Jose Mercury News offered a Simon link to Brown's successful 1999 reelection campaign.

"The newspaper reported that SKS-Simon, a joint venture of Simon's family investment company and a San Francisco developer, gave \$95,000 to an organization that funded a series

of last-minute, pro-Brown election mailers. Simon, asked about the contribution during a campaign stop in Burbank, said he had 'no responsibility for that whatsoever, no knowledge of it, no part in the decision'".

Translation: Fraternization with known Democrats can be deadly in a GOP primary. Riordan is even married to one.

The *Boston Globe* finds another politician in trouble: "As her political problems mount, Acting Governor Jane Swift is struggling to raise money to salvage her candidacy.

"Swift's fund-raising fell off sharply this month, following published polls that showed her popularity plummeting. She raised just over \$90,000, lagging behind four Democratic challengers, according to her official campaign finance reports and aides' estimates. In January, she raised \$187,000.

"Swift's recent fund-raising is strikingly weak for a sitting governor facing a tough political campaign. A Republican governor typically must far outspend a Democrat to win the general election in Democrat-dominated Massachusetts".

Will the revolution be televised? "The U.S. government will finance and host the largest-ever gathering of former Iraqi

military and security officers at a conference to plan the overthrow of Saddam Hussein, U.S. and Iraqi opposition officials said yesterday," says the *Washington Times*.

"Leaders of the Iraqi National Congress (INC), the London-based umbrella group dedicated to Saddam's ouster, said the conference was a sign of the Bush administration's determination to drive the Iraqi dictator from power.

"The conference, expected to be held by the end of next month at a military site in or near Washington, would include some 200 military and security officials from the various opposition groups united under the INC, according to a posting on the group's Web site yesterday."

Seems awfully public for an overthrow plot, doesn't it? What happened to the days when the CIA would plan to send Fidel Castro an exploding cigar?

The *New York Post* has this Enron dispatch from London:

"Everything in Enron's lavish, state-of-the-art London headquarters went on the block yesterday, including the electric train set once used to deliver bonuses to top-performing executives.

"Bankruptcy administrator PricewaterhouseCooper LLC hopes to raise \$21 million through the three-day auction. . . . A look at the thousands of items going under the hammer reveals just how royally executives treated themselves at Enron House, which is located on fashionable Grosvenor Place, overlooking the grounds of Buckingham Palace.

"They had a gleaming high-tech gym to work out in, a ToneZone for aromatherapy, tanning and beauty treatments, and 12 cafes to satisfy their voracious appetites. . . . There are abstract paintings by Phil Morsman and Marilyn Simler and sculptures by Thomas Wilkinson, designer leather chairs and sofas, granite work surfaces and marble-covered garbage bins, a 33-foot maple veneer conference table inlaid with solid walnut, and scores of smaller maple and walnut boardroom tables and executive chairs".

Not too shabby.

The New Republic seems to agree with our Monday column on The Torch:

"The New Republic doesn't often praise New Jersey Senator Robert Torricelli, one of the least likable members of Congress. But if you hear Torricelli complaining about the

campaign finance reform bill that most of his Democratic colleagues are celebrating, hear him out: For once, he's right.

"Torricelli's beef is that the House stripped out a provision he'd added in the Senate requiring broadcasters to charge low rates for political ads in the period leading up to an election. The amendment went to the heart of the campaign finance problem: The exorbitant cost of TV advertising is the reason campaigns are so expensive in the first place. Broadcasters – who, after all, use public airwaves – often show their public spiritedness by jacking up ad rates during election season.

"Unfortunately, members of Congress rarely stand up to broadcasters – especially House members, who can virtually disappear from the public eye if, say, peeved local stations ignore their press conferences. So it was sadly predictable that last week the House stripped Torricelli's amendment in a lopsided vote. And even less surprising that the three major network news programs failed to mention the issue at all."

Finally, *National Review's* Jonah Glodberg goes to the videotape, reliving his "Crossfire" confrontation with potential presidential candidate Al Sharpton:

"GOLDBERG: OK, well, Mr. Sharpton, you claim and you resent when people say that you're not a very serious candidate for a very serious position. As recently as last year, you were claiming that you are didn't even own any of your suits, that you didn't have a credit card.

"SHARPTON: That's a lie. Where did I make that claim, sir?

"GOLDBERG: Well, it was in 'The New York Times.'

"SHARPTON: That's not true.

"GOLDBERG: OK, well in that case.

"SHARPTON: Not true. How could I not own my suits? I mean again, I think.

"GOLDBERG: That's a question a lot of us would like to know.

"SHARPTON: I think you would do yourself and a lot of people service, if you did better research. What you're referring to – never said that. Never said it.

"Now here is the lead from the 12/21/01 New York Times story on Sharpton's explanation (before a judge) as to why he

cannot pay Steven Pagonis (the man he slandered in the Tawana Brawley case) the money a jury says he owes him:

"He says he owns no suits, but has 'access' to a dozen or so. He says he owns no television set because the one he watches in his home was purchased by a company he runs. He says he has no checking accounts, no savings accounts, no credit cards, no debit cards, no mutual funds, no stocks, no bonds, no paintings, no antiques. The only thing he admits to owning is a \$300 wristwatch and a 20-year-old wedding ring.'

"Similar claims have also been reported in the New Yorker and other publications. My only question is, if he's so poor, why doesn't he sue the Times and the New Yorker for libel?"

Let's see that again in slow motion.

نموذج (10)

اقرأ النص التالي و قم بترجمته على مرحلتين مستعيناً بالقاموس:

Press Ethics in Shadows

Howard Kurtz, *The Washington Post*

04/03/2002

Are there times when journalists should hold back secrets involving national security?

The answer, in our view, is absolutely.

What is the point of publishing something that's going to jeopardize American lives, just for the sake of a scoop?

In one recent example, a Wall Street Journal executive asked numerous reporters (us included) not to mention that Danny Pearl was Jewish and his father Israeli while his life hung in the balance. Everyone complied.

The tricky part, of course, is divining what crosses the line, especially with an administration that seems prepared to throw a star-spangled blanket over just about everything this side of Dick Cheney's file cabinet.

On Friday, The Washington Post broke the story of the "shadow government" – 100 or so bureaucrats who live in underground bunkers at two East Coast locations to ensure the continuity of government in case Washington gets burnt to a crisp or everyone keels over from the summer humidity.

Some people probably feel that story shouldn't have been published. But the paper made a point of saying it was not naming the locations or any of the officials involved at the request of the White House.

Yesterday, the *New York Post* published a picture of the entrance to one of the bunkers.

It would probably take terrorists about five minutes to figure out where the place is.

Is running the photo such a fabulous scoop that it's worth endangering the enterprise? We don't get it. Doesn't seem like a close call.

The New York tabloid didn't print the location, but still. "Here's your exclusive first look at one of the two top-secret mountainside bunkers outside Washington that now house a

'shadow' U.S. government in the event of a catastrophic attack," the New York Post says.

"A rotating group of about 100 high-ranking officials, covering every executive-branch department, have been living and working in these underground sites 24 hours a day since Sept. 11.

"As part of the Continuity of Operations plan, the bunkers ensure that the federal government could survive if terrorists attacked the nation's capital with a nuclear bomb."

This is the *Washington Post's* Friday front-pager: "President Bush has dispatched a shadow government of about 100 senior civilian managers to live and work secretly outside Washington, activating for the first time long-standing plans to ensure survival of federal rule after catastrophic attack on the nation's capital.

"Execution of the classified 'Continuity of Operations Plan' resulted not from the Cold War threat of intercontinental missiles, the scenario rehearsed for decades, but from heightened fears that the al Qaeda terrorist network might somehow obtain a portable nuclear weapon, according to three officials with firsthand knowledge. U.S. intelligence has no

specific knowledge of such a weapon, they said, but the risk is thought great enough to justify the shadow government's disruption and expense.

"Deployed 'on the fly' in the first hours of turmoil on Sept. 11, one participant said, the shadow government has evolved into an indefinite precaution. For that reason, the high-ranking officials representing their departments have begun rotating in and out of the assignment at one of two fortified locations along the East Coast."

Hill people don't like finding these things out from the press, *USA Today* says:

"Senate Democratic leader Tom Daschle warned yesterday that a chasm is developing between Congress and the White House over the way he says President Bush is cloaking the war on terrorism in secrecy. His latest example: Lawmakers were not told of secret plans for an emergency shadow government.

"Daschle praised Bush for meeting with congressional leaders on a regular basis but said they are not kept fully informed about the long-term strategy of the war and new battlegrounds of the campaign. . . .

"Daschle told Fox News he doesn't object to Bush's ordering of a backup government but thinks that at least senior members of Congress should have been notified.

"None of us knew about the secret government,' Daschle said. 'Not knowing things as basic as that is a pretty profound illustration of the chasm that exists sometimes with information' about the war".

Daschle was full of news as he raced from one TV studio to the next:

"The Senate's top Democrat says President Bush's bid to allow oil drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) and his nomination of U.S. District Judge Charles Pickering to the 5th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals are dead," says the *Washington Times*.

"In an interview yesterday on NBC's 'Meet the Press,' Majority Leader Tom Daschle of South Dakota said he would require at least 60 votes before allowing ANWR drilling to be the subject of a Senate floor vote.

"Controversial issues always require 60 votes. That's been the way we do things in the Senate from its very inception,'

Daschle told host Tim Russert. Sixty votes would be the number required to stop a filibuster against the proposal.

"Asked if there were 60 votes, the majority leader said, 'There is not'".

Salon's Bryan Keefer examines a GOP counterattack against Daschle:

"As Democrats launch their first criticisms of the Bush administration's war policies, several Republicans and conservative pundits have launched an all-out attack designed to frame virtually any criticism of the war on terrorism as illegitimate."

The South Dakotan said the war on terrorism can't be considered a success and Congress sure would like more information before writing blank checks to expand the effort. "Daschle's comments are noteworthy – Democratic criticism of the conduct of the war has been extremely mild to date. But the points he made are well within the bounds of legitimate debate.

"Senate Minority Leader Trent Lott, R-Miss., however, fired back almost immediately by attacking Daschle's right to criticize the Bush administration's prosecution of the war. 'How

dare Senator Daschle criticize President Bush while we are fighting our war on terrorism, especially when we have troops in the field,' Lott stated. 'He should not be trying to divide our country while we are united.' Sen. Bill Frist, R-Tenn., called Daschle's remarks 'thoughtless and ill-timed.' Meanwhile, Rep. Thomas Davis, R-Va., head of the Republican House Campaign Committee, claimed Daschle's 'divisive comments have the effect of giving aid and comfort to our enemies by allowing them to exploit divisions in our country'.

"Conservative pundits also rallied to the sounds of the battle. Pundit and former Gingrich press secretary Rich Galen claimed that Daschle, Byrd and Sen. Fritz Hollings, D-S.C., 'have decided to declare war on President George W. Bush's handling of the war against terrorists,' while Andrew Sullivan suggested that Daschle's comments marked the start of a campaign 'to undermine the war in order to gain some political traction against the president'.

"Daschle's relatively mild statement, questioning the future conduct of the war and the administration's request for a large increase in defense spending, is the sort elected representatives have every right to make. Yet instead of even addressing Daschle's comments, his critics question their very legitimacy,

suggesting that any criticism of the direction of the war is out of bounds and divisive as long as the war is ongoing. Since the conflict is open-ended and likely to expand, this logic would shut down debate indefinitely".

Time has a huge, and chilling, cover piece about terrorism:

"For a few harrowing weeks last fall, a group of U.S. officials believed that the worst nightmare of their lives – something even more horrific than 9/11 – was about to come true. In October an intelligence alert went out to a small number of government agencies, including the Energy Department's top-secret Nuclear Emergency Search Team, based in Nevada.

"The report said that terrorists were thought to have obtained a 10-kiloton nuclear weapon from the Russian arsenal and planned to smuggle it into New York City. The source of the report was a mercurial agent code-named dragonfire, who intelligence officials believed was of 'undetermined' reliability. But dragonfire's claim tracked with a report from a Russian general who believed his forces were missing a 10-kiloton device. Since the mid-'90s, proliferation experts have suspected that several portable nuclear devices might be missing from the Russian stockpile.

"That made the dragonfire report alarming. So did this: detonated in lower Manhattan, a 10-kiloton bomb would kill some 100,000 civilians and irradiate 700,000 more, flattening everything in a half-mile diameter. And so counterterrorist investigators went on their highest state of alert.

"'It was brutal,' a U.S. official told Time. It was also highly classified and closely guarded. Under the aegis of the White House's Counterterrorism Security Group, part of the National Security Council, the suspected nuke was kept secret so as not to panic the people of New York. Senior FBI officials were not in the loop. Former mayor Rudolph Giuliani says he was never told about the threat. In the end, the investigators found nothing and concluded that dragonfire's information was false. But few of them slept better. They had made a chilling realization: if terrorists did manage to smuggle a nuclear weapon into the city, there was almost nothing anyone could do about it".

The California primary is tomorrow, and the political savants who predicted smooth sailing for Richard Riordan were wrong, as the *Los Angeles Times* reports:

"When leading Republicans cast about last year for a gubernatorial candidate to resuscitate their flagging party, they spoke of finding a different kind of California Republican.

"But now, as the GOP primary winds to a nasty finish, the contest has reverted to a familiar fight over tax-cutting, Reagan-loving and who can best shrink the reach of Sacramento.

"For all their calculations, it now seems the wise men of the GOP--from the White House down--ignored one important element of Tuesday's election: the people who go to the polls . .

"That more than anything else may explain the rocket-ship rise of businessman Bill Simon Jr., the most conservative candidate in the race, and the tumble of former Los Angeles Mayor Richard Riordan, the favored candidate of the party establishment".

John Kerry is running for something – or so this *Boston Globe* piece, filed from New Hampshire, would seem to suggest:

"Waving his Vietnam War credentials like a flag, Senator John F. Kerry last night chastised two top Republicans who had not served in the military for their criticism of Democratic leaders.

"The Massachusetts Democrat, who received three Purple Hearts, a Bronze Star, and a Silver Star in two Navy combat tours, told an audience of New Hampshire Democrats that he had fought to preserve the freedom of speech and the oversight of government actions.

"He contrasted his military service with that of Representative Tom DeLay of Texas and the Senate Republican leader, Trent Lott of Mississippi. Neither served in Vietnam or the military; both got student deferments. Last week both lashed out at comments by the Senate majority leader, Thomas A. Daschle of South Dakota, and Senator Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia, chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

"Lott and DeLay criticized the two Democrats for questioning the exit strategy and means for measuring success in Afghanistan.

"Let me be clear tonight to Senator Lott and to Tom DeLay: One of the lessons that I learned in Vietnam, a war they did not have to endure, and one of the basic vows of commitment that I made to myself, was that if I ever reached a position of responsibility, I would never stop asking questions that make a democracy strong,' Kerry said to an estimated 400 people

attending the New Hampshire Democratic Party's annual 100 Club dinner in Concord."

Slate's David Plotz picks up on the battalion of Clintonistas running for office this year:

"There are two explanations for the epidemic of Clintonian exes, one generous, one ungenerous, both true. The generous explanation is that the Clintonites want to finish what they started. The Clinton team formulated smart, successful public policies, especially domestically. They had a great run, but even after eight years they felt cut short by George W. Bush's election. If they're elected in 2002, they can try to preserve and expand the best ideas of the Clinton years. (That's why it's no surprise that almost all are running as Clinton-aping centrist Democrats).

"The ungenerous explanation is that what Republicans have always charged about the Clinton administration is true: It was the most political presidency in history. Most Republican Cabinet secretaries and top cats happily return to the private sector when they finish their official duties. But the Clinton administration, and the Democratic Party in general, was packed with people who live for politics and governing.

"You get the feeling that some of the Clintonista candidates are running because they can't conceive of doing anything else. [Andrew] Cuomo, [Bill] Richardson, [Janet] Reno, and [Rahm] Emanuel have essentially never worked outside politics/government. [Robert] Reich has been in politics or on its periphery his entire career, too. They could sooner stop eating than quit politics.

"Most of the Clintonista candidates have distanced themselves from their old boss. There are two exceptions: Emanuel, running in the Clinton-country of Chicago, has imported Clinton for fund-raisers and endorsements; and Reich, running in Uber-Democratic Massachusetts, has also tried to link himself to Bill. (There is a funny story about this.) But for others, Clinton the Man (as opposed to Clinton the Policies) remains poison, still defined by Lewinsky, pardons, and impeachment. Bowles, for example, seems to have filed a restraining order to keep Clinton away. North Carolina still detests Clinton, so Bowles pretends he was chief of staff to President Nobody. Clinton rates one mention – in passing – in Bowles' biographical materials. According to Reno's campaign bio, she became attorney general all by herself. New York still likes Clinton, but even Cuomo doesn't risk much association

with him. Cuomo's Web site posts photos of him with two dozen celebrities, including Rosie O'Donnell, the NAACP's Kweisi Mfume, Sens. Ted Kennedy and Joe Biden, actor Billy Baldwin, and Al Gore--but not Clinton".

We told you last week you'd be reading versions of this story hundreds of times.

Finally, the *Wall Street Journal's* Peggy Noonan weighs in on the latest "West Wing" flap -- and makes a disclosure that was probably a tad easier than acknowledging she once did speechwriting for Enron:

"A good little scandal this week and just when we needed it, when things were getting a little slow. 'The West Wing' producer Aaron Sorkin perked things up by telling Tad Friend of The New Yorker that it's good we're 'laying off the bubblehead jokes' about President Bush but let's face it, we're all just 'being polite' and making believe Mr. Bush is a substantial figure. . . .

"I call him Aaron because I know him and I know him because I am an adviser or contributor to 'The West Wing.' I'm not sure which because I can't find the letter of agreement. I am, as far as I know, the only conservative who works on the show,

though maybe there are more. I send Aaron e-mails from New York with ideas and suggestions. About every fourth show someone says something conservative. That's usually me.

"Two weeks ago, for instance, Press Secretary C.J. was talking to Presidential Conscience Tobey about affirmative action. When Tobey pressed C.J. for her views, she said she was the wrong Democrat to ask. She explained that her father had once been denied a job when someone else got it in an affirmative action decision. Tobey nodded and asked, 'How's he doing?' C.J. said, lightly, 'Fine.' In my version, C.J.'s father had suffered. He was an idealist who believed everyone has an equal shot at success in America, a public school teacher who wanted to help kids and was gifted in his work with them; now he saw a less qualified and implicitly less loving person elevated at his expense, and only because he was the wrong color. It left him shattered. The flag on which he'd stood had been pulled from under him, and he never fully regained his balance.

"When Aaron wrote it, C.J.'s father was not a victim of government but a fellow doing fine. In part because that's how Aaron thinks about affirmative action, and it's his show . . .

"But back to what Aaron said about Bush. It is surprising that it caused so much comment, even in a relatively slow news week. Because Aaron Sorkin was only saying what Aaron Sorkin thinks. And Aaron Sorkin thinks the thoughts of a left-liberal. Because he is a left-liberal. And the show he writes and produces each week, the show whose storylines and dialogue he dreams up, reflects his views, utterly.

"No one has every accused 'West Wing' of being a conservative show or a right wing show--no one, ever. That's because it's not. It's a left-liberal show that propounds left liberal ideas through the acting of such left-liberals as the gifted Martin Sheen. I know this. Aaron Sorkin knows it. And you know it too if you're paying attention".

We think Noonan should get one line of dialogue at least every thirs show.



مصادر الكتاب

أولاً: الصحف العربية

الحياة، 2004/01/13

الحياة، 2005/06/07

الحياة، 2005/07/12

الحياة، 2006/07/31

الحياة، 2006/08/16

الحياة، 2006/08/17

الحياة، 2006/08/25

الحياة، 2006/08/28

الحياة، 2006/08/28

الحياة، 2006/08/28

ثانياً: الصحف الأجنبية

Gulf News, 04/06/2004

Gulf News, 04/08/2006

Gulf News, 18/08/2006

The Guardian, 04/07/2003

The Guardian, 22/08/2006

The Guardian, 24/08/2006

The Independent, 31/07/2006

The New York Times, 19/06/ 2006

The Washington Post, 28/02/2002

The Washington Post, 04/03/2002

The Washington Post, 05/04/2002

The Washington Post, 08/04/2002

The Washington Post, 10/04/2002

The Washington Post, 10/11/2005

The Washington Post, 10/11/2005

The Washington Post, 10/11/2005

The Washington Post, 28/06/2006

The Washington Post, 10/08/2006

The Washington Post, 23/08/2006





اللجنة العلمية

د. ريماء الحكيم

د. جمانة الضحاك

د. سوسن جزالري

المدقق الغوي:

د. جمانة الضحاك

حقوق الطبع و الترجمة و النشر

محفوظة لمديرية الكتب و المطبوعات في جامعة دمشق

