LE GÉTAWAY + VOLUME MAX

VERY OFFENSIVE

The Middle East: pretty much fucked

Suspend your disbelief and embrace the final solution: flooding the place out, just like old times



PHINEAS TRAFALGAR

poin

Alright, look. This issue here is pretty simple actually: the Middle East conflict is all about semantics—or, more specifically, anti-semantics. And of all the scandalizing Jewspiracies floating around these days, that the status quo can be allowed to persist is easily the worst. The second worst being that they control the media, but that's beside the point.

All we have to do is draw up a relief map that defines the path to tolerance and acceptance, and we'll be on the road to peace in no time.

For years, the two warring factions have oscillated between conflict and resolution, which has produced a never-ending cycle of repeating violence. Such antediluvian notions of tribal warfare have no place in an era of WMDs and suicide bombers pose a very real threat to us in America.

That said, completely flooding the place worked once already, so who's to say it wouldn't do the trick a second time? If nothing else, it would be sure to stir things up—in a nonviolent way, of course—and with any luck, it would create a suspension of hostilities.

Of course, there have been many a cease-fire in this region in the past, but never to any avail. We need something more permanent; something with staying power. Arguably, if you stirred the region up long enough, you'd have a final solution. But given the mechan-

ics of this process, peace talks would

inevitably break down.

At the most elementary level, it all boils down to a matter of chemistry, because when it comes to these two agents, it's like mixing water and oil. Luckily, oil floats on top of water, so in the case of a flood, the greasier of the two would come out on top. Moreover, any voice of dissent will be conveniently drowned out, and waves of international aid will be available in the case of any subsequent humanitarian crises that should arise.

Above all else, it's imperative that we stem the tide of insurgency and civil warfare before it's too late. We must act quickly to resolve this bitter conflict before it runs over into surrounding areas, thereby inciting the Domino Effect—which, if the Cold War taught us anything, totally happens with communists.

The last thing we need here is more debate on the subject. The more dilly-dallying and flip-flopping that we do here, the more suicide bombers and rocket launchers will go off. Flooding the place out is clearly the best solution to the Middle East crisis, and anyone who dares disagree with me is deluging themselves.

Come on, people, enough is enough—I say we just nuke these bastards and get it over with



KIMBLE

counterpoint

If there's one thing that history's taught us, it's that you should always wrap your tool when getting down with some freaky chick you picked up in the bar. But if there are two things that history's taught us, it's also that Jews and Arabs hate each other—especially when they're stuck next to each other arbitrarily on a piece of barren desert.

For years, us Westerners sent in a few token UN troops, silently hoping that the problem would just sort of, you know, play itself out. Come on, admit it, the thought crossed your mind too: you thought that maybe, with any luck, they'd eventually just kill each other off themselves.

Despite what appears to be their damndest efforts, however, very little has changed. Far from one side exterminating the other, the median age in the Gaza strip is hovering somewhere around 15 years, meaning there's a whole 'nother generation of violent rebels pupating as we speak.

Everything seems to be in place for self-extermination: military occupation, deep-seated hatred, religious zeal-otry, suicide bombings, irrationality.

And yet, these two groups have still managed to persist up to this point. Therefore, it's time that we learned another lesson from the Americans and settled this thing once and for all,

A few well-placed warheads could put an end to everyone's troubles—not least those of us out here in the West. And from what I hear, death by atomic explosion is quick and painless. Radiation? Well, that's another story altogether, but look at Japanese: all their old people are still alive, so it can't be that bad, can it?

Think about it: who has the most nukes? The US. Who has the most to lose from Middle East conflict? The US. Put two and two together, and what you get is a big-ass hole in the ground and one less group of crazy, intolerant militants bent on cramming their beliefs down everyone's throat.

To be sure, the US also has a vested interest in the whole Israel thing, but what with their smart-bombs and other hifalutin' technology, you'd think they'd be able to save the bits that they want to keep for themselves.

Still, why leave even a seed of doubt in this Edenic garden of ethnic cleansing? Sometimes, you just gotta kill the ones you love along with the ones you hate, as it will often work out for the better in the end, or something.

In conclusion: forget about giving peace a chance—warm up the nukes, bitches!

We can thank Arthur Balfour for this pickle



RED GREEN

moot point

What I want to know is, what British Foreign Secretary Arthur James Balfour was smoking in 1917 when he proclaimed that His Majesty's government "view[ed] with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people"? Did he really think that the region's existing inhabitants would be okay with that? He didn't anticipate that maybe, just maybe, they would wage war to wipe this young state off the map?

We should hardly be surprised. British policy in the Middle East has always exhibited all the sensitivity of Michael Richards at a NAACP meeting, from the time that they decided to replace the Ottoman Empire with a bunch of states established during a game of pin-the-arbitrary-border-on-the-region-without-regard-for-ethnic-or-cultural-sensitivities.

You two can preach your superficial ideas all you want, but the truth is that no talk of modern Middle Eastern policy and the solutions to the most complex geopolitical issue facing the world today would be complete without a rant against elements of early twentieth century British foreign policy.

