

OUTPOST

October 2004—Issue #171

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

Herbert Zweibon has turned over this page to the following article by Joseph Farah because it focuses on an important initiative that AFSI has worked for and endorses.

No to Another Terror State

Joseph Farah

Collectively, we don't often get a chance to sound off in a meaningful way on the major issues of the day.

I don't know about you, but those public-opinion pollsters never call me.

But there is an opportunity right now to weigh in on one of the greatest and most important issues of our time – whether the world should create a Palestinian Arab state.

A group called Global Israel Alliance (www.globalisraelalliance.com) is attempting to mobilize opposition to this misguided plan now, prior to the November elections. If the turnout is high enough, the organizers believe it might help reverse U.S. support for the so-called Mideast "roadmap."

What's wrong with the idea of creating a Palestinian Arab state?

There are many reasons to oppose the creation of what would certainly be another breeding ground and support base for Islamic terrorism. But I want to focus on just one.

One of the great untold stories of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is that the Palestinian Authority's official policy is to demand all Jews get out of the country they are attempting to create.

In any other part of the world, this kind of racist, anti-Semitic effort at ethnically cleansing a region would be roundly condemned by all civilized people. Yet, because most people simply don't understand the clear, official plan by the Arab leaders to force out all Jews from the new Palestinian state, Arafat retains a degree of sympathy, even political support, from much of the world.

Think about what I am saying: It is the official policy of the Palestinian Authority that all Jews must

get off the land! Why is the United States supporting the creation of a new, racist, anti-Semitic hate state? Why is the civilized world viewing this as a prescription for peace in the region?

Is there any other place in the world where that kind of official policy of racism and ethnic cleansing is tolerated – even condoned?

Why are the rules different in the Middle East? Why are the rules different for Arabs? Why are the rules different for Muslims?

Would America consider it acceptable if the new Iraqi government said the few Jews remaining in Iraq would have to leave? Would America consider it acceptable if the new Iraqi governing council said Christians would have to go?

Of course not. So why – even before a Palestinian state is created – do we accept as a fait accompli that Jews should be forced off their land in the coming state of Palestine?

Why are U.S. tax dollars supporting the racist, anti-Semitic entity known as the Palestinian Authority?

While the Arabs do not even believe Jews have the right to live in the Palestinian state, the Israelis, on the other hand, offer full citizenship rights to Arabs in the Jewish state.

What a contrast!

In fact, as I have said many times, nowhere in the Middle East do Arabs experience more freedom than in Israel.

So, sound off. Participate in the referendum. Make your voice heard.

There's still time to stop the creation of another terror state in the Middle East.

Joseph Farah is founder and editor of WorldnetDaily in which this appeared on September 22, 2004.

On Jihad Against Israel by Hugh Fitzgerald	...3
How Strong Is The Arab Claim? by L. Auster	...4
John Quincy Adam on Jihad by A. Bostum	...6
Two Speeches by Ruth King	...9
Our Partial War by Rachel Neuwirth	..10

From the Editor

Stahl-gate

With all the focus on the bogus documents on Rather's 60 Minutes segment, another media scandal has gone all but unnoticed: Leslie Stahl's report which portrayed AIPAC as the conduit of Pentagon secrets to Israel. As Joel Mowbray has pointed out in "The Spies Who Aren't" (*FrontPageMagazine.com*, Sept. 17), the whole story is essentially a smear (a policy paper, resembling an op-ed, containing no sources or methods, simply advocating tougher diplomacy in dealing with Iran was apparently mishandled by Larry Franklin, a low-level Iran analyst at the Pentagon). The damage caused by this story will remain long after the story has dissolved: many in the public will believe that Jewish officials in the Pentagon are disloyal (never mind that Franklin is a Catholic) and AIPAC is a transmission belt for spies.

It is the more remarkable that Stahl (and the liberal 60 Minutes) would lend herself to this particular kind of canard. Historically the supposedly nefarious Jewish lobby has been the whipping boy of the far right. Indeed Mowbray reports that one of those purportedly interviewed for hours by the FBI in connection with this case is "Stephen Green...a free-lance writer on a two-decade long quest to prove that Paul Wolfowitz, Doug Feith, and other Jews are actually embedded Israeli spies". In promoting this spurious case, Stahl and 60 Minutes have allied themselves with the anti-Semitic far right with results that may be with us long after the Burkett memos are forgotten.

Reagan vs. Bush

President Bush makes no secret of his admiration for Ronald Reagan. When it came to the Soviet Union Reagan was unwilling to tolerate the endless pursuit of failed policies and embarked on radically new ones, even if they affronted the conventional wisdom. Reagan turned his back on detente, on the notion that the Soviet Communist empire must be accommodated and at best contained. To the surprise not only of pundits but most of his own administration, the evil empire (the very term sent frissons of horror through the media and academic establishment) collapsed.

The war on terror (really against Islamic jihad) has clearly made President Bush rethink long accepted policies on the Middle East -- but has not affected his policy on Israel. The pursuit of failed policies continues, the notion that "territories for peace" will produce peace remains unchallenged. In his UN speech on September 24 the President promised a return to the "roadmap," the most recent variation on the inevitably failed theme. Why can the President not say that the first order of business is for the Arabs to show their willingness to live in peace with Israel? That the first order of business is to put an end to the

Arab refugee issue by resettling the so-called refugees in Arab states? Now there's a way to shake up business as usual in the Middle East.

Dan Rather Peres

While it is hard, outside of the realm of psychosis, to compete with Shimon Peres in embracing delusions, Dan Rather is coming close. After the documents on Bush's National Guard service had been exposed as crude computer forgeries, he told Howard Kurtz of the *Washington Post* that if they proved to be false he wanted to be the one to break the story and subsequently, after being forced to apologize for the documents on-air, told a Texas newspaper that he still believed them to be real. Actually one of Peres' silly aphorisms, newly come to light, could be invoked here. In a new book in honor of the late General Benny Peled, the general quotes Peres saying: "A lie is like a half a brick. It flies further."

Spain Promotes Eurabia

Bat Yeor, the famed historian of *dhimmitude*, has coined the term Eurabia to describe what she asserts is a decision arrived at decades ago by European leaders to throw in their lot with the Arabs in order to achieve greater influence in the world. In the most recent manifestation of this mindset, the new Spanish prime minister Jose Zapatero (brought to power by Arab terror, as the Madrid train bombings persuaded voters to choose the candidate promising to take Spanish troops out of Iraq) has called for "an alliance of cultures" rather than a war on terror. Zapatero says he has asked UN Secretary General Kofi Annan to set up a group to study the creation of "an alliance of civilizations" which would "have as its fundamental objective to deepen political, cultural and education relations between those who represent the so-called Western world and, in this historic moment, the area of Arab and Muslim countries." And what would be on the first item on the agenda of this "alliance of civilizations"? Zapatero says "the international community must combat terrorism rationally by dealing with its roots in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict."

Translation: The "alliance of civilizations" will devote itself to extirpating the Jewish state.

Outpost

Editor: Rael Jean Isaac

Editorial Board: Herbert Zweibon, Ruth King

Outpost is distributed free to
Members of Americans For a Safe Israel
Annual membership: \$50.

Americans For a Safe Israel

1623 Third Ave. (at 92nd St.) - Suite 205
New York, NY 10128
tel (212) 828-2424 / fax (212) 828-1717

On *Jihad* Against Israel

Hugh Fitzgerald

The relentless *Jihad* against Israel -- against, rather, any Infidel sovereign state within the Dar al-Islam -- always included imposition of the Shari'a as part of its intended goal. Imposition of the Shari'a was, in fact, demanded as early as 1920 by a group of Arab notables in the former Ottoman territories that were quite properly assigned to Mandatory Palestine (i.e. all of Western Palestine, while Eastern Palestine went to form part of the Emirate of Transjordan).

Nor was there any doubt that this was a *Jihad* directed at Infidels throughout the Mandatory period; curiously, it was some British officers, rather than the Palestinian Jews, who recognized the Islamic grounds for opposition to the Jews and the restoration of a Jewish Commonwealth. It is also true that a few Israelis, early in the history of the state, had the wit to recognize the problem. One of these was Dr. A. Carlebach, whose analysis published in *Ma'ariv* (Oct. 7, 1955) would have been lost to history, one suspects, but for the fact that it is reprinted, amusingly and quite incomprehensibly, in Edward Said's preposterous *The Question of Palestine*. Fortunately for us, Said often provides quotes from various European and Zionist sources that are so deadly, so convincing, particularly in the light of all we have learned about Islam over the past few years, that as a work of propaganda it no longer serves its purpose. Here is what Said quoted from Carlebach, and what Said obviously thought was self-evidently absurd, but we read it now with quite a different frame of mind:

"These Arab Islamic countries do not suffer from poverty, or disease, or illiteracy, or exploitation; they only suffer from the worst of all plagues: Islam. Wherever Islamic psychology rules, there is the inevitable rule of despotism and criminal aggression. The danger lies in Islamic psychology, which cannot integrate itself into the world of efficiency and progress, that lives in a world of illusion, perturbed by attacks of inferiority complexes and megalomania, lost in dreams of the holy sword. The danger stems from the totalitarian conception of the world, the passion for murder deeply rooted in their blood, from the lack of logic, the easily inflamed brains, the boasting, and above all: the blasphemous disregard for all that is sacred to the civilized world...their reactions -- to anything -- have nothing to do with good sense.

"They are all emotion, unbalanced, instantaneous, senseless. It is always the lunatic that speaks from their throat. You can talk 'business' with everyone, and even with the devil. But not with Allah...This is what every grain in this country shouts. There were many great cultures here, and invaders of all kinds. All of them -- even the Crusaders -- left signs of culture and blossoming. But on the path of Islam, even the trees have died.

"We pile sin upon crime when we distort the

picture and reduce the discussion to a conflict of borders between Israel and her neighbors. First of all, it is not the truth. The heart of the conflict is not the question of the borders; it is the question of Muslim psychology.....Moreover, to present the problem as a conflict between two similar parts is to provide the Arabs with the weapon of a claim that is not theirs. If the discussion with them is truly a political one, then it can be seen from both sides. Then we appear as those who came to a country that was entirely Arab, and we conquered and implanted ourselves as an alien body among them, and we loaded them with refugees and constitute a military danger for them, etc. etc...one can justify this or that side -- and such a presentation, sophisticated and political, of the problem is understandable for European minds -- at our expense.

"The Arabs raise claims that make sense to the Western understanding of simple legal dispute. But in reality, who knows better than us that such is not the source of their hostile stand? All those political and social concepts are never theirs. Occupation by force of arms, in their own eyes, in the eyes of Islam, is not at all associated with injustice. To the contrary, it constitutes a certificate and demonstration of authentic ownership. The sorrow for the refugees, for the expropriated brothers, has no room in their thinking. Allah expelled, Allah will care. Never has a Muslim politician been moved by such things (unless, indeed, the catastrophe endangered his personal status). If there were no refugees and no conquest, they would oppose us just the same."

Now when Said put this into his little work of propaganda, back in 1979, the invented "Palestinian people" and their "legitimate rights" were in full swing. In 1979, the front of *dhimmi*s, those islamochristians such as Hanan Ashrawi, were already in evidence, on campuses, before church groups, disguising the nature of the *Jihad* against Israel which cannot be assuaged, cannot be sated, and is not a matter of borders.

But something has changed: other Muslim attacks, in America, in Russia, in Europe, and other Muslim cries against Infidels, and other Muslim behavior, including the demand that European peoples yield to Muslim demands, have caused many, and should cause many more, to read the words written above, with a new understanding and a new appreciation.

Hoist by his own petard, is Edward Said -- he bothered to quote just a bit too much, and nowadays we do not scorn those he assumed we would scorn, but see the truth of their remarks, and the scorn of the good and intelligent reader is reserved for Said's own text. Quite something.

This article by Hugh Fitzgerald, a frequent contributor to Outpost, was posted on JihadWatch.

How Strong Is the Arab Claim to Palestine?

Lawrence Auster

There is a myth hanging over all discussion of the Palestinian problem: the myth that this land was "Arab" land taken from its native inhabitants by invading Jews. Whatever may be the correct solution, let's get a few things straight:

As a strictly legal matter, the Jews didn't take Palestine from the Arabs; they took it from the British, who exercised sovereign authority in Palestine under a League of Nations mandate for thirty years prior to Israel's declaration of independence in 1948. And the British don't want it back.

If you consider the British illegitimate usurpers, fine. In that case, this territory is not Arab land but Turkish land, a province of the Ottoman Empire for hundreds of years until the British wrested it from them during the Great War in 1917. And the Turks don't want it back.

If you look back earlier in history than the Ottoman Turks, who took over Palestine in 1517, you find it under the sovereignty of yet another empire not indigenous to Palestine: the Mamluks, who were Turkish and Circassian slave-soldiers headquartered in Egypt. And the Mamluks don't even exist any more, so they can't want it back.

So, going back 800 years, there's no particularly clear chain of title that makes Israel's title to the land inferior to that of any of the previous owners. Who were, continuing backward:

The Mamluks, already mentioned, who in 1250 took Palestine over from:

The Ayyubi dynasty, the descendants of Saladin, the Kurdish Muslim leader who in 1187 took Jerusalem and most of Palestine from:

The European Christian Crusaders, who in 1099 conquered Palestine from:

The Seljuk Turks, who ruled Palestine in the name of:

The Abbasid Caliphate of Baghdad, which in 750 took over the sovereignty of the entire Near East from:

The Umayyad Caliphate of Damascus, which in 661 inherited control of the Islamic lands from:

The Arabs of Arabia, who in the first flush of Islamic expansion conquered Palestine in 638 from:

The Byzantines, who (nice people - perhaps it should go to them?) didn't conquer the Levant, but, upon the division of the Roman Empire in 395, inherited Palestine from:

The Romans, who in 63 B.C. took it over from:

The last Jewish kingdom, which during the Maccabean rebellion from 168 to 140 B.C. won control of the land from:

The Hellenistic Greeks, who under Alexander the Great in 333 B.C. conquered the Near East from:

The Persian empire, which under Cyrus the Great in 639 B.C. freed Jerusalem and Judah from:

The Babylonian empire, which under Nebu-

chadnezzar in 586 B.C. took Jerusalem and Judah from:

The Jews, meaning the people of the Kingdom of Judah, who, in their earlier incarnation as the Israelites, seized the land in the 12th and 13th centuries B.C. from:

The Canaanites, who had inhabited the land for thousands of years before they were dispossessed by the Israelites.

As the foregoing suggests, any Arab claim to sovereignty based on inherited historical control will not stand up. Arabs are not native to Palestine, but are native to Arabia, which is called Arab-ia for the breathtakingly simple reason that it is the historic home of the Arabs. The territories comprising all other "Arab" states outside the Arabian peninsula including Iraq, Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, Egypt, Tunisia, and Algeria, as well as the entity now formally under the Palestinian Authority were originally non-Arab nations that were conquered by the Muslim Arabs when they spread out from the Arabian peninsula in the first great wave of *jihad* in the 7th century, defeating, mass-murdering, enslaving, dispossessing, converting, or reducing to the lowly status of *dhimmitude* millions of Christians and Jews and destroying their ancient and flourishing civilizations. Prior to being Christian, of course, these lands had even more ancient histories. Pharaonic Egypt, for example, was not an Arab country through its 3000 year history.

The recent assertion by the Palestinian Arabs that they are descended from the ancient Canaanites whom the ancient Hebrews displaced is absurd in light of the archeological evidence. There is no record of the Canaanites surviving their destruction in ancient times. History records literally hundreds of ancient peoples that no longer exist. The Arab claim to be descended from Canaanites is an invention that came after the 1964 founding of the Palestine Liberation Organization, the same crew who today deny that there was ever a Jewish temple in Jerusalem. Prior to 1964 there was no "Palestinian" people and no "Palestinian" claim to Palestine; the Arab nations who sought to overrun and destroy Israel in 1948 planned to divide up the territory amongst themselves. Let us also remember that prior to the founding of the state of Israel in 1948, the name "Palestinian" referred to the Jews of Palestine.

In any case, today's "Palestine," meaning the West Bank and Gaza, is, like most of the world, inhabited by people who are not descendants of the first human society to inhabit that territory. This is true not only of recently settled countries like the United States and Argentina, where European settlers took the land from the indigenous inhabitants several hundred years

ago, but also of ancient nations like Japan, whose current Mongoloid inhabitants displaced a primitive people, the Ainu, aeons ago. Major "native" tribes of South Africa, like the Zulu, are actually invaders from the north who arrived in the 17th century. One could go on and on.

The only nations that have perfect continuity between their earliest known human inhabitants and their populations of the present day are Iceland, parts of China, and a few Pacific islands. History is very sketchy in regard to the genealogies of ancient peoples. The upshot is that "aboriginalism", the proposition that the closest descendants of the original inhabitants of a territory are the rightful owners, is not tenable in the real world. It is not clear that it would be a desirable idea, even if it were tenable. Would human civilization really be better off if there had been no China, no Japan, no Greece, no Rome, no France, no England, no Ireland, no United States?

Back to the Arabs.

I have no problem recognizing the legitimacy of the Arab's tenure in Palestine when they had it, from 638 to 1099, a period of 461 years out of a history lasting 5,000 years. They took Palestine by military conquest, and they lost it by conquest, to the Christian Crusaders in 1099.

Of course, military occupation by itself does not determine which party rightly has sovereignty in a given territory. Can it not be said that the Arabs have sovereign rights, if not to all of Israel, then at least to the West Bank, by virtue of their majority residency in that region from the early Middle Ages to the present?

To answer that question, let's look again at the historical record. Prior to 1947, as we've discussed, Palestine was administered by the British under the Palestine Mandate, the ultimate purpose of which, according to the Balfour Declaration, was the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine. In 1924 the British divided the Palestine Mandate into an Arabs-only territory east of the Jordan, which became the Kingdom of Trans-Jordan, and a greatly reduced Palestine Mandate territory west of the Jordan, which was inhabited by both Arabs and Jews.

Given the fact that the Jews and Arabs were unable to coexist in one state, there had to be two states. At the same time, there were no natural borders separating the two peoples, in the way that, for example, the Brenner Pass has historically marked the division between Latin and Germanic Europe. Since the Jewish population was concentrated near the coast, the Jewish state had to start at the coast and go some distance inland. Exactly where it should have stopped, and where the Arab state should have begun, was a practical question that could have been

settled in any number of peaceful ways, almost all of which the Jews would have accepted. The Jews' willingness to compromise on territory was demonstrated not only by their acquiescence in the UN's 1947 partition plan, which gave them a state with squiggly indefensible borders, but even by their earlier acceptance of the 1937 Peel Commission partition plan, which gave them nothing more than a part of the Galilee and a tiny strip along the coast. Yet the Arab nations, refusing to accept any Jewish sovereignty in Palestine even if it was the size of a postage stamp, unanimously rejected the 1937 Peel plan and nine years later they violently rejected the UN's partition plan as well. When the Arabs resorted to arms in order to wipe out the Jews and destroy the Jewish state, they accepted the verdict of arms. They lost that verdict in 1948, and they lost it again in 1967, when Jordan, which had annexed the West Bank in 1948 (without any objections from Palestinian Arabs that their sovereign nationhood was being violated), attacked

Israel from the West Bank during the Six Day War despite Israel's urgent pleas that it stay out of the conflict. Israel in self-defense then captured the West Bank. The Arabs thus have no grounds to complain either about Israel's existence (achieved in '48) or about its expanded sovereignty from the river to the sea (achieved in '67).

The Arabs have roiled the world for decades with their furious protest that their land has been "stolen" from them. One might take seriously such a statement if it came from a pacifist people such as the Tibetans, who had quietly inhabited their land for ages before it was seized by the Communist Chinese in 1950. The claim is laughable coming from the Arabs, who in the early Middle Ages conquered and reduced to slavery and penury ancient peoples and civilizations stretching from the borders of Persia to the Atlantic; who in 1947 rejected an Arab state in Palestine alongside a Jewish state and sought to obliterate the nascent Jewish state; who never called for a distinct Palestinian Arab state until the creation of the terrorist PLO in 1964, sixteen years after the founding of the state of Israel; and who to this moment continue to seek Israel's destruction, an object that would be enormously advanced by the creation of the Arab state they demand. The Arab claim to sovereign rights west of the Jordan is only humored today because of a fatal combination of world need for Arab oil, leftist Political Correctness that has cast the Israelis as "oppressors," and, of course, good old Jew-hatred.

Lawrence Auster is the author of Erasing America. This appeared in FrontPageMag.com on August 30.

When the Arabs resorted to arms in order to wipe out the Jews and destroy the Jewish state, they accepted the verdict of arms. They lost that verdict in 1948.

John Quincy Adams on *Jihad*

Andrew G. Bostom

As this country's leaders struggle to come to grips with Islamic *jihad* -- still reluctant to use the term, they prefer the nebulous "war on terror"-- it is important to note that an early U.S. President possessed a remarkably clear understanding of the challenge posed by Islam to Western civilization.

I have reviewed little known essays dealing with this subject by John Quincy Adams, written after his Presidency and before his election to Congress in 1830 (Chapters X-XIV, pp. 267-402, in *The American Annual Register* for 1827-28-29, New York 1830). The contributions of the second Adams, thus far less recognized than those of his father John Adams, particularly in shaping U.S. foreign policy, are being rediscovered. In 1949 the distinguished Yale diplomatic historian Samuel Flagg Bemis wrote:

"Adams grasped the essentials of American policy and the position of the United States in the world more surely than any other man of his time. He availed himself of matchless opportunities to advance the continental future of his country and the fundamental principles for which it stood in the world.... Even if John Quincy Adams was not to have another great career, as a crusader against the expansion of slavery, [his] first and mighty achievement, of no less than continental proportions, in laying the foundations of American foreign policy, would have been great enough for one lifetime."

In an era untouched by cultural relativism, Adams, convinced of the truth and moral superiority of Christianity, had no hesitation in drawing a harsh contrast between Jesus and Christianity, and Muhammad and Islam.

"And he [Jesus] declared, that the enjoyment of felicity in the world hereafter, would be reward of the practice of benevolence here. His whole law was resolvable into the precept of love; peace on earth -- good will toward man... On the Christian system of morals, man is an immortal spirit, confined for a short space of time, in an earthly tabernacle. Kindness to his fellow mortals embraces the whole compass of his duties upon earth, and the whole promise of happiness to his spirit hereafter. THE ESSENCE OF THIS DOCTRINE IS, TO EXALT THE SPIRITUAL OVER THE BRUTAL PART OF HIS NATURE [Capitals in original]."

Of Muhammad and Islam, he writes:

"Adopting from the sublime conception of the Mosaic law, the doctrine of one omnipotent God; he

connected indissolubly with it, the audacious falsehood, that he was himself his prophet and apostle. Adopting from the new Revelation of Jesus, the faith and hope of immortal life, and of future retribution, he humbled it to the dust by adapting all the rewards and sanctions of his religion to the gratification of the sexual passion. He poisoned the sources of human felicity at the fountain, by degrading the condition of the female sex, and the allowance of polygamy; and he declared undistinguishing and exterminating war, as a part of his religion, against all the rest of mankind. THE ESSENCE OF HIS DOCTRINE WAS VIOLENCE AND LUST; TO EXALT THE BRUTAL OVER THE SPIRITUAL PART OF HUMAN NATURE (Capitals in original)... Between these two religions, thus contrasted in their characters, a war of twelve hundred years has already raged. The war is yet flagrant... While the merciless and dissolute dogmas of the false prophet shall furnish motives to human action, there can never be peace upon earth, and good will towards men."

Adams concluded solemnly,

"As the essential principle of his [Muhammad's] faith is the subjugation of others by the sword; it is only by force, that his false doctrines can be dispelled, and his power annihilated."

John Quincy Adams lucidly described the permanent Islamic institutions of *jihad* war and *dhimmitude*. Regarding *jihad*, Adams observes,

"...he [Muhammad] declared undistinguishing and exterminating war, as a part of his religion, against all the rest of mankind... The precept of the Koran is, perpetual war against all who deny, that Mahomet is the prophet of God... the faithful follower of the prophet, may submit to the imperious necessities of defeat: but the command to propagate the Moslem creed by the sword is always obligatory, when it can be made effective."

And Adams captured the essential condition imposed upon the non-Muslim *dhimmi* "tributaries" subjugated by *jihad*, with this laconic statement,

"The vanquished may purchase their lives, by the payment of tribute."

Adams also reported on the religiously rooted pattern of bad faith in negotiations -- the false promises of "peace," the saying of one thing in the language of "foreigners," another in Arabic -- that Israel has belatedly discovered, at great cost, and the rest of the world has yet to confront. Writes Adams:

**Regarding Jihad,
Adams observes
"The precept of
the Koran is perpetual war
against all who
deny that Mahomet is the
prophet of God."**

"..The commands of the prophet may be performed alike, by fraud, or by force. Of Mahometan good faith, we have had memorable examples ourselves. When our gallant [Stephen] Decatur had chastised the pirate of Algiers, till he was ready to renounce his claim of tribute from the United States, he signed a treaty to that effect: but the treaty was drawn up in the Arabic language, as well as in our own; and our negotiators, unacquainted with the language of the Koran, signed the copies of the treaty, in both languages, not imagining that there was any difference between them."

Adams continues:

"Within a year the Dey [Muslim ruler of Algiers] demands, under penalty of the renewal of the war, an indemnity in money for the frigate taken by Decatur; our Consul demands the foundation of this pretension; and the Arabic copy of the treaty, signed by himself is produced, with an article stipulating the indemnity, foisted into it, in direct opposition to the treaty as it had been concluded. The arrival of Chauncey, with a squadron before Algiers, silenced the fraudulent claim of the Dey, and he signed a new treaty in which it was abandoned; but he disdained to conceal his intentions; my power, said he, has been wrested from my hands; draw ye the treaty at your pleasure, and I will sign it; but beware of the moment, when I shall recover my power, for with that moment, your treaty shall be waste paper. He avowed what they always practiced, and would without scruple have practiced himself. Such is the spirit, which governs the hearts of men, to whom treachery and violence are taught as principles of religion."

Adams assails the subterfuges of the Ottoman Sultan in his dealings with Russia. The Sultan, he writes, prepared for war while pretending, so as to gain time, peaceful intentions. He had the Ottoman Grand Vizier send a letter to the Russian Prime Minister declaring "the Sublime Porte has at all times no other desire or wish than to preserve peace and good understanding" while at the same time another state paper was issued, addressed by the Sultan to his own subjects--this was the *Hatti Sheriff* of the 20th of December, sent to the Pashas of all the provinces, calling on all the faithful Mussulmen of the empire to come forth and 'fight for their religion, and their country, against the infidel despisers of the Prophet. The comparison of these two documents with each other, will afford the most perfect illustration of the Ottoman faith, as well as of their temper towards Russia."

Adams continues:

"The *Hatti Sheriff* commenced...'It is well known (said the Sultan) to almost every person, that if the Mussulmen naturally hate the infidels, the infidels, on their part, are the enemies of the Mussulmen: that Russia, more especially bears a particular hatred to Islamism, and that she is the principal enemy of the Sublime Porte.' This appeal to the natural hatred of the Mussulmen towards the infidels, is in just accordance with the precepts of the Koran. The document does not attempt to disguise it, nor even pretend that the enmity of those whom it styles the infidels, is any other than the necessary consequence of the hatred borne by the Mussulmen to them--the paragraph itself, is a forcible example of the contrasted character of the two religions. The fundamental doctrine of the Christian religion, is the extirpation of *hatred* from the human heart. It forbids the exercise of it even towards *enemies*. There is no denomination of Christians, which denies or misunderstands this doctrine....The unqualified acknowledgement of a duty does not, indeed, suffice to insure its performance. Hatred is yet a passion, but too powerful upon the hearts of Christians. Yet they cannot indulge it, except by the sacrifice of their principles and the conscious violation of their duties. No state paper from a Christian hand, could, without trampling the precepts of its Lord and Master, have commenced by an open proclamation of hatred to any portion of the human race. The Ottoman lays it down as the foundation of his discourse."

The Arabic copy of the treaty, signed by himself is produced, with an article stipulating the indemnity, foisted into it, in direct opposition to the treaty as it had been concluded.

Adams notes that the Sultan's pronouncement to his subjects continued:

"...all infidels are but one nation...This war must be considered purely a religious and national war. Let all the faithful, rich or poor, great or little, know, that to fight is a duty with us; let them then refrain from thinking of arrears, or of pay of any kind; far from such considerations, let us sacrifice our property and our persons; let us execute zealously the duties which the honor of Islamism imposes on us -- let us unite our efforts, and labor, body and soul, for the support of religion, until the day of judgment. Mussulmen have no other means of working out salvation in this world and the next."

But then, writes Adams, when the Russians got wind of this declaration "summoning the whole Ottoman nation to arms against Russia, the Sultan now thinks proper to say, that it was only a proclamation which the Sublime Porte, for certain reasons, circulated in its states; an internal transaction, of which the Sublime Porte alone knows the motives, and that

the language held by a government to its own subjects cannot be a ground for another government to pick a quarrel with it...that if Russia had conceived suspicions, from the Sultan's address to his subjects, she might have applied amicably to the Porte to ascertain the truth and clear up her doubts."

Adams assails the phony "moral equivalence" the Western powers, above all England, applied to the Islamic Ottomans and their victims (shades of the approach of modern Western statesmen to the multitude of conflicts on what Samuel Huntington aptly termed "Islam's bloody borders").

An early anti-imperialist, Adams was a strong advocate for the liberation of Greek Christians, like Christians in the Balkans and the Black Sea lands of Russia, then suffering under the strictures of *dhimmitude* within the Ottoman Empire. Wrote Adams:

"Those provinces are the abode of ten millions of human beings, two thirds of whom are Christians, groaning under the intolerable oppression of less than three millions of Turks. Those provinces are in some of the fairest regions of the earth. They were Christian countries, subdued during the conquering period of the Mahometan imposture, by the ruthless scymetar [sic] of the Ottoman race; and under their iron yoke, have been gradually dwindling in population, and sinking into barbarism. The time of their redemption is at hand."

Adams assails the phony "moral equivalence" the Western powers, above all England, applied to the Islamic Ottomans and their victims (shades of the approach of modern Western statesmen to the multitude of conflicts on what Samuel Huntington aptly termed, "Islam's bloody borders") and the moral cowardice that put the status quo above liberty. Writes Adams:

"In the king's [George IV] speech, at the opening of the session of Parliament, on the 29th of January, he said that, 'for several years a contest had been carried on between the Ottoman Porte, and the inhabitants of the Greek provinces and islands, which had been marked on each side, by excesses revolting to humanity.' Still more extraordinary was it to the ears of Christendom to hear a British king, in a speech to his parliament, style the execrable and sanguinary head of the Ottoman race, his ancient ally; and denominate a splendid victory, achieved under the command of a

British admiral, in the strict and faithful execution of his instructions, an untoward event. But the last member of the paragraph from his majesty's speech...to those accustomed to the mystifications of royal speeches and diplomatic defiances, explained these apparent disparities. He declares the great objects to which all his efforts have been directed, and of which...he will never lose sight, are the termination of the contest between the hostile parties; the permanent settlement of their future relations to each other, and maintenance of the repose of Europe, upon the basis on which it has rested since the last general peace."

In all the documents "issuing from the profound and magnanimous policy of the British warrior statesman," writes Adams,

"nothing is more remarkable than the more than stoical apathy with which they regard the cause, for which the Greeks are contending; the more than epicurean indifference with which they witness the martyrdom of a whole people, perishing in the recovery of their religion and liberty."

Given the global struggle with *jihad* terror, perhaps it is time for John Quincy Adams remarkable series of essays to be read by contemporary U.S. diplomats and politicians, and heeded.

Andrew G. Bostom, MD, MS has written extensively on jihad, and is the editor of a forthcoming collection of classical essays and primary source documents entitled, The Legacy of Jihad.

**Now Available from Americans
For A Safe Israel:**

Battleground: Fact and Fantasy in Palestine
Shmuel Katz—\$5.95

Lone Wolf: A Two-Volume Biography of Vladimir Jabotinsky—by Shmuel Katz—\$50.00
(new members—membership dues plus \$25)

Let us know if your library would like a copy of *Lone Wolf*. We will send a free copy to any library that wishes to acquire it.

Dubious Allies: The Arab Media's War of Words Against America
compiled by Jeff Daube and Rael Jean Isaac -\$5.95

Shimon Says: Shimon Peres in His Own Words—edited by Roger Gerber and Rael Jean Isaac \$3.95 (non-members: \$4.95)

Order from:

**Americans For a Safe Israel
1623 Third Ave., #205
New York, N.Y. 10128**

A Tale Of Two Speeches

Ruth King

On November 10th, 2001, two months after the terrorist attacks on America, President Bush addressed the United Nations. His words soared with eloquence and resolve.

“And the people of my country will remember those who have plotted against us. We are learning their names. We are coming to know their faces. There is no corner of the earth distant or dark enough to protect them. However long it takes, their hour of justice will come.

“This threat cannot be ignored. This threat cannot be appeased. Civilization, itself, the civilization we share, is threatened. History will record our response, and judge or justify every nation in this hall. For every regime that sponsors terror, there is a price to be paid. And it will be paid. The allies of terror are equally guilty of murder and equally accountable to justice.”

He then challenged the United Nations:

“And, finally, this struggle is a defining moment for the United Nations, itself. And the world needs its principled leadership. It undermines the credibility of this great institution, for example, when the Commission on Human Rights offers seats to the world's most persistent violators of human rights. The United Nations depends, above all, on its moral authority -- and that authority must be preserved.”

Three years and two wars and thousands of victims of terrorism later -- in Indonesia, Madrid, Turkey, Russia, Israel -- the United Nations has not a shred of the “moral authority” which President Bush evoked in 2001. The UN has sidestepped virtually every binding resolution on Iraq, ignored genocides in Rwanda and Sudan, ignored its responsibility to isolate and punish states that harbor terrorists, squandered and misappropriated millions in humanitarian funds. Steeped in corruption, it continues to focus one half of its entire agenda on excoriating Israel. As Andrew C. McCarthy has written in *National Review Online* (September 16), “the risible, anachronistic, dysfunctional and quite likely criminal enterprise known as the United Nations is an international calamity that is doing far more harm than good.”

Nonetheless, in September, President Bush went to the belly of this beast to promote and defend his mission in Iraq. Assembled were the usual cast of despots and their emissaries, the sullen and spiteful representatives of “old” Europe who have derided and thwarted our war against terrorism, the assorted enablers of militant Islam's agenda, and, of course, Kofi Annan, the Secretary General, who only days earlier had called our mission in Iraq “illegal.” And as Victor Davis Hanson has pointed out in the *Wall Street Journal*, the President “offered not blood and iron -- other than an obligatory ‘the proper response is not to retreat but to prevail’ -- but Wilsonian idealism, concrete

help for the dispossessed, and candor about past sins. The president wished to convey a new multilateralist creed that would have made a John Kerry or Madeleine Albright proud.”

Also the President described terrorists as “enemies of freedom,” a naive euphemism. Fidel Castro and several of the dictators of Eastern Europe can be called enemies of freedom. Barbaric Islamic terrorists and their supporters stretch the definition of “evil.”

But it was worse than that. In this UN speech, the President, rather than confronting the jackals, joined them. Incredibly he excoriated Israel, the only country, apart from the Sudan, criticized in his speech. Much of what makes the UN so morally odious is its obsession with using Israel as international whipping boy. And now President Bush applies the whip himself? Israel, said the President, “should impose a settlements freeze, dismantle unauthorized outposts, end the daily humiliation of the Palestinian people, and avoid any actions that prejudice final negotiations.”

It is especially unseemly for the President to make this statement at the United Nations. The President could indeed have properly mentioned Israel -- to praise it for its exemplary restraint even in the face of threats and attacks. To praise it for its protection of the rights of its Arab citizens. Mr. Bush defends the Patriot Act and all efforts to interrogate and search possible suspects. Why then does he call Israel's necessary security measures “humiliating?” Is it worse to be questioned and searched than to feel a terrible fear every single time your child rides a bus, or you or a family member goes to a movie or pizzeria or a cafe?

What the President did was to pander to the Arab and Moslem enemies of America who insist that the Arab-Israel conflict is the “root cause” of Islamic terrorism even though the President knows that Islamic terrorists (who beheaded a second American hostage even as the President made his speech) are faith driven barbarians for whom Israel is merely a rehearsal stage for the greater *Jihad*. On November 8th, 2001, in a speech to firemen, policemen and postal workers in Atlanta, Georgia, President Bush had said:

“We are the target of enemies who boast they want to kill, kill all Americans, kill all Jews and kill all Christians.”

At the U.N. on November 10th, 2001 the President had said,

“... there is no such thing as a good terrorist. No national aspiration, no remembered wrong can ever justify the deliberate murder of the innocent. Any government that rejects this principle, trying to pick and choose its terrorist friends, will know the consequence.”

I like George Bush. I want him to succeed. But America and Israel deserve more from him than was given at that sorry speech on September 21, 2004.

Our Partial War Against Terror

Rachel Neuwirth

Claims that America is engaged in a total war against terrorism are greatly exaggerated. President Bush cannot selectively fight some terrorists, while ignoring or even supporting other kinds of terrorists, and still claim to be fighting a War on Terror. Bush cannot declare that we oppose all who practice terrorism, including all their supporters, in theory, and then employ a double standard in practice. We cannot say that the 9/11 bombers are terrorists, but that those who blow up buses in Israel are not terrorists because they are engaged in a political process, as was claimed by Secretary of State Colin Powell. This double standard has been a long-term element in U.S. policy, and is not limited to the current Bush Administration and the equivocation in its so-called war on terror.

President Bush is seeking Osama bin Laden, dead or alive. But at the same time President Bush is protecting Yasser Arafat, the father of modern terrorism, by demanding that Israel not harm him or even exile him. On 9/11 bin Laden caused the death of 3,000 Americans plus the wounding of many more. Since the Oslo Accords of 1993, Arafat has killed about 1,300 Israelis and wounded upwards of 7,000. In proportion to population, this is the U.S. equivalent of 70,000 dead and 380,000 wounded, many of those horribly so.

And yet Arafat's Palestinian Authority receives some \$200 million in American aid annually plus the promise of another Arab state at Israel's expense, if only Arafat pretends to favor peace for a short while. This appeasement of terrorism harms America's national security as well as being wrong in principle.

American double standards are clearly revealed in the history of Yasser Arafat and his consistent coddling by U.S. officials, which began in the 1960s.

Arafat officially began his terror career in 1959 when he formed the Fatah organization, with its "constitution" explicitly calling for the destruction of Israel. In 1968, he succeeded in taking over the Palestine Liberation Organization, an organization set up by the League of Arab States, whose "covenant" also declared the destruction of Israel to be its goal. These declarations of total war were made years prior to the 1967 Six-Day War and Israel's acquiring those territories now in dispute. During the 1960s he was already hijacking airliners. In 1970 he tried to seize control over Jordan and was only driven back after a blood-

bath known as Black September, in which thousands were slaughtered. He then moved to Lebanon where he instigated a long civil war in which over 100,000 were killed in a country of only about three million. His thugs attacked residential neighborhoods using women and children as human shields, a tactic he used later in his *intifada* against Israel. Lebanese Christians suffered greatly and many were forced to flee to other countries.

Forcible U.S. opposition to Arafat's crimes was notably absent, but when Israel responded to cross border attacks with a counteroffensive against the PLO and Syrian occupiers of Lebanon, the U.S. suddenly found its voice and demanded an Israeli withdrawal. The U.S. intervened to rescue Arafat when Israel was close to defeating him, bringing him to safety in Tunisia, where he continued his war of terror against Israel.

In 1972, Arafat's PLO slaughtered 11 Israeli athletes at the Munich Olympics, marring international games dedicated to world peace, without generating an adequately forceful response from the U.S. Perhaps Arafat was becoming confident about U.S. tolerance towards terror, because in 1973 he got away with the kidnap-murder of two American diplomats in Khartoum, Sudan. Ambassador Cleo Noel and George Curtis Moore were murdered

on direct orders from Arafat. The CIA even taped Arafat giving the order to his thugs. Yet the U.S. did nothing, not even publicly fingering Arafat for this act of aggression against the United States, carried out on the grounds of a supposedly sacrosanct diplomatic mission.

In 1978, Jimmy Carter's administration began writing speeches for Arafat to give, containing expressions such as 'no more terrorism' and 'peace with Israel,' in return promising U.S. recognition for the PLO. Even then, it took Arafat ten years before he reluctantly muttered the soothing words demanded of him by the State Department. Immediately, the U.S. began pressuring Israel to begin negotiations with the PLO.

During the Clinton years Arafat was the most frequent foreign guest at the White House and received some \$100 million in annual aid, even while he continued his terror campaign against Israel. He received the Nobel Peace Prize for simply signing his name to the Oslo Accords -- after which he violated every one of its provisions, and launched a massive

We cannot say that the 9/11 bombers are terrorists, but that those who blow up buses in Israel are not terrorists because they are engaged in a political process as was claimed by Secretary of State Colin Powell.

new terrorist *intifada*. George W. Bush stopped the visits, but doubled the aid to \$200 million, again sending mixed signals.

About a year ago three American representatives were slaughtered in Gaza by terrorists linked to Arafat. They were traveling to a refugee camp to recruit candidates for an education program in the U.S., an act of American generosity. Under U.S. pressure Arafat went through the motions of looking for the killers but refused genuine cooperation with U.S. authorities. Arafat has won out again. He defied the U.S., allowed the killers to go free, and suffered no reprisals at all from the U.S. -- not even a cut-off of aid. His popularity among his depraved followers has been boosted by his success in committing aggression against the U.S. and getting away with it.

According to a news report in *WorldNetDaily*, the FBI is finally opening an investigation into the 1973 case of Arafat's killing of American diplomats. Will Arafat be tried for killing these two Americans? Don't bet on it, because he has already killed over 100 Americans with impunity, many of them American Jews visiting Israel.

Continuing U.S. funding of Arafat alone makes a mockery of Bush's claims to be fighting terrorism. But there are many more instances of hypocrisy. A few examples:

The Saudis have long supported terrorism by their funding of *madrassas*, which are Islamic schools that teach an extreme form of Islam. They also funded terrorist cells in other countries. Egypt, too, supports terrorism, but mainly against Israel. Egypt has long been complicit in allowing Arab terrorists to smuggle weapons into Gaza via tunnels between the Egyptian side of the boundary into the Gaza side. This violates Egypt's peace treaty with Israel, which has enabled Egypt to receive about \$2 billion in annual military and economic aid, along with U.S. weapons and training since 1978. There are U.S. personnel in the Sinai to monitor Egyptian compliance with the peace treaty. How come these American monitors are blind to these flagrant violations by Egypt? Meanwhile, the government-controlled Egyptian media spews a constant torrent of anti-Israeli, anti-Jewish and even anti-American invective with impunity while Egypt continues to receive billions in U.S. aid.

Egyptian dictator Gamal Abdul Nasser, during the 1960s, used poison gas in Yemen in his attempt to expand his power in the region. The U.S. was busy courting him and other dictators as part of our cold war policies, and it was easy to ignore flagrant human

rights violations. (We also largely ignored Saddam's gassing of the Iraqi Kurds in the 1980s.)

In our so-called war on terror we also lack the intellectual honesty to even name the enemy, although there are small signs that this may finally be changing. The enemy is not terror, but those who practice terror: the *Jihadists* and Islamic extremists.

Why does the U.S. refuse to seek a U.N. declaration against Islamic terrorism? The likely reason is that it would be opposed in the U.N. by the large Islamic block and their supporters. If so, it is still worthwhile to expose the U.N. for its moral bankruptcy. But the State Department prefers to perpetuate its pretense of the U.N.'s moral credibility.

We also fail in other respects.

First, we have not properly defined what we stand for. The Islamic enemy cites examples of Western decadence as justification for their 'holy war.' Simply saying that we stand for 'freedom' and 'free enterprise' has limited value because for many religious Muslims those terms may seem foreign. It suggests that we are simply imposing our system upon them by force.

Surely the U.S. information agencies can do a better job of communicating the alternative that America's principles of freedom, openness, the rule of law, respect for human rights, equality, and tolerance present to the peoples of the Islamic world, and their manifest superiority to the hatred, intolerance, lawlessness and

cruelty of the Islamist fanatics.

In addition, we have failed to cultivate responsible Islamic clerics and intellectuals. There are Muslims who understand very well the sickness that prevails in so many Islamic societies. It is their voices that need to be heard, boldly challenging the extremists on a religious basis, point for point. They must show the way out of this dead end and back towards an enlightened form of Islam. Such actually existed for a time centuries ago, when there was true creativity and a lively interchange of ideas across different cultures. Once Muslims hear from devout and learned men and women of their own faith that human rights, the rule of law, and respect for other religions and cultures are not incompatible with their Islamic heritage, most will eventually reject the teaching of the hatemongers among them. Why not use our information forums and financial resources to help the courageous and lonely Muslim moderates to get an enlightened message to their own people?

However, our own leaders act as if they are unaware of this battle of ideas, and instead allow the extremists to have access to the highest levels of our

The government controlled Egyptian media spews a constant torrent of anti-Israel, anti-Jewish and even anti-American invective while Egypt continues to receive billions in U.S. aid.

Reserve the date: December 5th
AFSI National Conference
Islam's War Against Israel and America
Marriott Marquis Hotel in New York City

government. Grover Norquist is a conservative activist who used to be involved in economic issues, but recently has been using his influence to help Muslims with radical and even pro-terrorist ties to gain access to high Administration officials. This in turn has allowed the Council on American Islamic Relations (CAIR) to help place Islamists among those selecting clerics for Muslim inmates in our prisons and soldiers in our military and to demand all manner of rights and concessions for Muslims in America while playing the role of victims of discrimination.

The final question is what have we gained by compromising on terrorism in the interest of expediency, by weakening our loyal ally, Israel, while pandering to Israel's Arab enemies? Except for Israel, how many countries in the world can we count as true and staunch allies? When Tony Blair leaves power, Britain may become like Germany. The same is true for allies such as Italy and Australia, where the current political leadership faces strong public opposition to support of the war in Iraq.

Defending ourselves effectively requires moral

clarity. We can at least draw the boundary line between civilized conduct and outright barbarism, and insist that others observe this basic standard. We must reject the thinking expressed by the unfortunate words of our very own Secretary of State, Colin Powell, that "one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter." We must be consistent, even if it is embarrassing to ourselves at times. By being honest we will astonish our enemies, amaze our friends, and win grudging respect for our integrity. We can then speak more effectively and directly to the peoples of the world and over the heads of their governments and a biased media.

Even if it is beyond our power to be the world's policeman, the United States, as a superpower, is more free than other nations to speak the truth without having to fear reprisals from powers stronger than ourselves. Unless we do so, we will have seriously compromised our self-declared "war on terror."

Rachel Neuwirth is a California based writer.



Americans For A Safe Israel
1623 Third Ave. (at 92nd St.) - Suite 205
New York, NY 10128

Non-Profit
Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
New York, N.Y.
Permit No. 9418