

OUTPOST

December 2008—Issue #217

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

Dividing the Nation

Herbert Zweibon

The Jewish community of Hebron is under siege—by its own government. At the end of October I visited the community and spoke to Noam Federman, the father of nine. Coming in the middle of the night the Israel Defense Forces had torn his home down to its foundations, demolishing every piece of furniture, even breaking up the children’s toys.

Since then the situation has only become worse. The government has ruled that an additional 500 Palestinian Authority policemen can deploy in Hebron, ostensibly to crack down on the Hamas infrastructure there. Jewish residents are up in arms. The community’s spokeswoman Orit Struck said what is obvious; “A strong IDF presence is the best defense for Hebron.” She warned that strengthened PA forces would merely be used to attack Jews.

In addition, the Israeli Supreme Court ruled that the residents of Beit Hashalom in Hebron had only three days to evacuate their homes. This is the climax of a long government policy of harassment: although the building was legally purchased (at a highly inflated price) the government first refused residents permission to install windows; when windows finally went in, the government refused to permit outside shades; it still has not allowed electricity to be installed. Calling an emergency meeting Beit Hashalom’s supporters pointed out “It has taken a post-Zionist, post-Oslo Israeli government working hand in hand with a hopelessly politicized judicial system to adopt a racist policy of preventing Jews from buying and holding property in the Jewish homeland.”

These actions are part of a government campaign that goes beyond the Jews of Hebron. Supported by the media and the “intellectual elite” the government has inculcated the derisory notion that the obstacle to peace is not the Arab world, intent on Israel’s destruction in any borders, but the upwards of half a million Jews living beyond the armistice lines of 1949—absent their presence “peace” would follow.

At this year’s annual memorial to Yitzhak Rabin, the government’s effort to divide the nation was

on full display. Writer Naomi Ragen notes that these memorials “have long been hijacked by the left-wing to spew hatred against anyone who disagrees with them” so that people like herself are made to feel excluded from rallies to honor Rabin’s memory. This year the supposed President of all the people, Shimon Peres, cynically furthered political divisions while pretending to deplore them. Claiming deep concern that Israeli society might disintegrate as a result of internal strife, Peres declared “I want to see that segment of the population that was not involved in that terrible evening [the assassination] and did not pull the trigger.” Thus Peres re-enforces what Haifa University professor Steven Plaut calls the Left’s “Big Lie,” namely that a conspiracy of rabbis and the political right lay behind the assassination. Making his own contribution to incitement against the right, Labor head and Defense Minister Ehud Barak referred to his ideological opponents as “weeds,” “cancerous growths,” declaring “We promise you Yitzhak, we will uproot this evil from us.”

Even as it promotes hatred of other Jews—including the very “settlers” who have the faith, courage and dedication to allow Israel to survive and flourish—the government makes endless excuses for the hostile actions of its real Arab enemies, embarking on ever more futile and craven efforts to appease them.

Moreover, as Caroline Glick points out, while the Left sees a distinction between the country and the right-wing, “the international community has used the cover that official Israel provides anti-Zionist activists for their settler-vilifying activities in order to advance the cause of criminalizing Israel as a whole.” In short, displacing Israel’s real enemies with “settlers” won’t make the real enemies go away; it merely strengthens them and makes the state far more difficult to defend and sustain.

Table of Contents

On Vlaams Belang by Diana West	...3
The Mind of Jihad by Andrew Bostom	...5
Deeper Into The Trap by Melanie Phillips	...6
The “Culture of Peace” Conference by David Isaac	...8
20 Reasons Obama is Wrong About Israel	...9
Elections Here, Elections There by Ruth King	...10

From the Editor

A Benighted Knight

Shimon Peres is now Knight Grand Cross of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, the sixth most senior award in the British system. The award immediately rises to first place according to one criterion: it easily boasts the most foolish recipient of any British honor. Future Knights should be embarrassed to be lumped in the category of Israel's Simple Shimon.

A few recent samples from the cornucopia of Israel's Prince of Fools. On Nov. 17, Peres recycled one of his tired "witticisms" to the annual General Assembly of the United Jewish Communities. "Peace is a little bit like marriage. You have to close your eyes and accept what is possible to accept." (Back in May 1977, Peres was quoted in *Jerusalem Report*: "In Argentina, the home of the tango, you know that in order to dance you have to close your eyes and let the romance begin. Peace is a romantic process.") The assembled Jewish leaders laughed and applauded, suggesting they are worthy followers in the game of Shimon Says. (You not only have to close your eyes but shut down your brain to think that "the peace process" has been anything but an unmitigated catastrophe for Israel.)

On October 28 *The Jerusalem Post* offers this surreal gem from Shimon: "We will not cease to negotiate with the Palestinians and help them with all our might in order to establish an independent Palestinian state...never in the past 100 years have we been closer to peace than we are today."

Topping it off, speaking to the British Houses of Parliament (in the wake of the Grand Cross business) Peres declared that "the way in which Great Britain ran the Mandate" had "inspired the state of Israel." Of course, the way Great Britain ran the Mandate was to close Palestine—which it was "mandated" to make the Jewish National Home—to Jewish immigration when the need for escape from Europe was most acute, dooming millions to their death.

"Pacifist" Spain

If there were a Most Distinguished Order for Hypocrisy, this year's prize should go to Spanish Prime Minister Jose Luis Zapatero and his government. Zapatero, who calls himself a "convinced pacifist" argues that Islamic terrorists are misunderstood and can only be defeated through dialogue.

Zapatero's appointments as Minister of Defense are cut from the same cloth. His first defense minister Jose Martinez, announced: "I am a minister of defense and I would rather be killed than to kill." He promptly issued orders to Spanish troops in Afghanistan prohibiting them from using lethal force on Taliban fighters (rendering the troops virtually useless).

Zapatero's Minister of Defense #2, Jose Anto-

nio Suarez, decided it was his job to demilitarize the Spanish military and make it into an NGO-like humanitarian organization. He purged senior ranks of officers who refused to give up the notion that its function was to defend the country.

Minister of Defense #3, Carme Chacon, declared: "I am a pacifist woman and the Army is also pacifist."

Sounds pretty consistent, you may say. But then there's weapon sales. According to the government's own figures Spanish arms sales have skyrocketed by over 130% during Zapatero's tenure so that Spain is now the world's eighth largest supplier of weapons. And what a collection of recipients! Spanish weapons go to such exemplars of "pacifism" as China, Cuba and Iran. Spain's biggest-ever arms deal is with Venezuela's fire-breathing dictator, Hugo Chavez. Responding to critics, Zapatero declared that the 1.7 billion euro deal was a "business transaction with pacific weapons." Orwell could not have done better. Spain is also the largest exporter of weapons to sub-Saharan Africa, where the most brutal wars in the world are waged.

(Thanks to Soeren Kern, Senior Fellow for Transatlantic Relations at the Madrid-based Strategic Studies Group for the report on which this draws.)

Settlers from Brooklyn

From Martin Kramer (who also exposed Edward Said's phony claims of a Jerusalem childhood):

"Here is a quick aside about a passage in Christopher Hitchens's overwrought and over-written defense of Rashid Khalidi [the venomously anti-Israel professor in Columbia's Middle East Department]. Hitchens announces that the Khalidi family 'holds a celebrated house and position in the city [of Jerusalem] since approximately the time of the Crusades. I have had the honor of being invited to this very house. If Rashid chooses to state that he doesn't care to be evicted from his ancestral home in order to make way

(Continued on Page 12)



Zapatero

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

1751 Second Ave. (at 91st St.)

New York, NY 10128

tel (212) 828-2424 / fax (212) 828-1717

E-mail: afsi@rcn.com web site: <http://www.afsi.org>

On Vlaams Belang

Diana West

Editor's note: In the global arena, where Israel's friends can be counted on one hand, it is important to know why Israel, which considers a terrorist enabler like Abbas a partner in negotiations, would eschew the participation of a political party like Belgium's Vlaams Belang in a conference on jihad that was scheduled to take place in the Knesset. So we asked the prominent journalist Diana West who has written extensively about Vlaams Belang and the Islamization of Europe to clarify for us who is involved in the party and what are its goals.

Outpost: The "Facing Jihad Conference" organized by Geert Wilders and Arieh Eldad and scheduled to take place in Israel has been postponed by Eldad ostensibly due to the unexpected advent of Israeli elections. One of the obvious participants in a conference of political actors who oppose *jihad* and Islamization is the Belgian/Flemish party Vlaams Belang. However, according to media reports, it was disinvited on the grounds it is a racist, anti-Semitic organization.

Could you explain what Vlaams Belang is and given that their statements have been so pro-Israel, why their invitation should be controversial, particularly in Israel?

Diana West: The routinely, reflexively lodged charges against Vlaams Belang turn on two cartoonishly false charges: one, that the party is anti-Semitic, and two, that it is neo-Nazi. Having interviewed many prominent members of the party at length and on several occasions both in the US and in Belgium, I can categorically dismiss both charges as being false even if they have also been effective in caricaturing the party in the mind (and I use the term loosely) of the mainstream.

Vlaams Belang, which means "Flemish Interest" in Dutch, is a party organized around two main principles. The first is independence for Flanders from the Belgian state, which is an ill-matched alliance of French-speaking Walloons and Dutch-speaking Flemish. The second principle is Vlaams Belang's staunch and courageously outspoken—i.e., hyper-politically incorrect—opposition to the Islamization of Belgium, and by extension, of all Europe. These two principles make Vlaams Belang doubly, if not triply revolutionary in its relationship to the ruling establishment in Belgium, which includes the government and media (which without exception may be described as Left-wing).

Not only does Vlaams Belang, as a secessionist party, oppose the Belgian government, it also opposes the Belgian government's politically correct and expedient alliance with and orientation toward Islamic interests, which has created a kind of dominant political atmosphere best described as Islamosocialist. Given the additional fact that Brussels is also the

"capital of Europe," Vlaams Belang's nationalist political drive to break up Belgium also carries an implicit threat against the continued unity of the softly but increasingly totalitarian European supstate known as the European Union.

So where do the anti-Semitic, neo-Nazi charges come from? Let's start by acknowledging

that Dutch is a Germanic language, and, in our age and culture, any Germanic-accented politicians decried as "right-wing" may trigger an almost atavistic prejudice—although when these same right-wing, Germanic-style-accented politicians were born around the 1960s (or later) we need to think a little deeper. There is also the historical fact that, like much of continental Europe, Belgium was occupied by Germany twice in the 20th century, and both

times, there were Flemish separatists who worked with and allied with Germany. Such alliances with first the Kaiser's and then Hitler's Germany were in no way unique to the Flemish, some of whom also opposed such collaboration.

As we know, countless other Europeans collaborated in various ways, including many who emerged as lionized leaders on the Left in the post-WWII period, most prominently UN Secretary General Kurt Waldheim and French President Francois Mitterand. One of the now practically sainted founders of the EU, Paul-Henri Spaak, was a strong supporter of Nazi strictures on Belgian's press—even before Belgium was invaded in 1940. Today, however, it is only the patriotic parties on the political right that still carry a stigma, at least in the eyes of the regnant European Left.

Combine this backstory with the postmodern if wholly inaccurate and dangerous narrative depicting Muslims in Europe (who, through demographics alone, are bringing de facto spheres of *sharia* into Europe) as the "new Jews." Opposition to Islamic immigration, opposition to Islamic law are without exception depicted through the prisms of the Left as being the "right-wing" politics of hate and exclusion just like the Nazis.

In very real terms, then, this Nazi-caricature of a politically popular, anti-Islamization party such as Vlaams Belang becomes a political bludgeon with

This Nazi-caricature of a politically popular, anti-Islamization party such as Vlaams Belang becomes a political bludgeon with which the Left tries to neutralize it.

which the Left tries to neutralize it. Even so, Vlaams Belang has garnered more votes in Flanders than any other party for some years now. Indeed, it is only kept from a leadership role in the government by a "cordon sanitaire" formed against it by the rest of Belgium's political parties.

Outpost: Who is Filip DeWinter and why is he being tarred as a "racist" and what are his feelings with respect to Israel?

Diana West: Filip Dewinter, 46, is the leading politician of Vlaams Belang. I have met him on several occasions now. I can honestly say I only wish the U.S. had candidates of his strength, purpose and calibre. I know of no American politician who understands the historic sweep of the *jihād* as Dewinter does, and who is so forthright, outspoken and active in his stand against it. As far as the completely spurious and thoroughly deranged charges against him of anti-Semitism and crypto-Nazism go, they are, well, spurious and thoroughly deranged. Last summer I asked him to explain his stand against Islamization. He replied:



Filip Dewinter

"It's a global struggle for our values, for our European way of life, for our civilization. That's why I think it is also a European struggle; that is, it's not only about a mosque two blocks away—no! It's about our survival as a European nation and as a civilization. And I recognize those values, that civilization, also over there in Israel. It's the only country in occupied territory, the vanguard of Europe in occupied territory, that is sharing those same values. And that's why it's so important to support Israel."

I asked him to expand on the term "occupied territory." What he meant, he told me, was not at all the conventionally Leftist and loaded meaning--territory occupied by Israel since Israel's 1967 war of survival against her Arab *jihād*ist neighbors. No, what he meant was territory occupied by Islam since the Muslim wars of conquest and expansion began more than 1,000 years ago. Such lands include Northern Africa, Asia Minor, and the Middle East--all of which used to be mainly of Christian and other faiths, including, where Israel is concerned, of course, Jewish.

Here is something I wrote on first meeting Dewinter and then Vlaams Belang chairman Frank Vanhecke in March 2007:

Without attracting much attention, representatives of the Belgian political party Vlaams Belang recently visited Washington, D.C. Frank Vanhecke and Filip Dewinter hoped to meet members of Congress; but Congress was in recess. They hoped to engender some understanding of their program to reverse the Islamization of Belgium; but the media were strip-mining the tinsel life and tawdry times of Anna Nicole Smith.

Maybe they should have known that Tabloid America doesn't care about the likely transformation of

Europe into an Islamic continent, let alone the fate of a French- and Dutch-speaking country of 10 million people. And while Literary America does write books about the transformation—*While Europe Slept* by Bruce Bawer, *The War for the West* by Tony Blankley, and *America Alone* by Mark Steyn come to mind—Political America has yet to acknowledge or even notice this colossal, epoch-defining shift now taking place.

Why don't our leaders face it? This may be one of those questions our children will ask some day. But if such natural curiosity isn't expressed until the next generation, the civilizational struggle for Europe will certainly have been lost. Better to question our politicians now. Better to examine the issue today.

Europe, as we may readily observe, is very far along in an accommodation with its still-increasing Muslim immigrant population that is resulting not in the Europeanizing of Islam, but rather the Islamizing of Europe. As Bernard Lewis declared in 2004, Europe will have an Islamic majority by the end of the 21st century at the latest. As Vlaams Belang's Dewinter recently put it, "We are becoming foreigners in our own land."

Such tragic pronouncements turn conversation with Vlaams Belang into a kind of political free verse—sadly evocative but rooted in a desperate reality that should shake American complacency. That is, "foreigners in our own land" is poetry; Mohammed as the most popular boy's name in Brussels for six years running is implacable fact. The idea that "We are living on a dying continent but we are not dead yet," as Dewinter has explained, is metaphorical. His citation from Libyan dictator Muammar Qaddafi that "Allah is mobilizing Muslim Turkey to add...50 million more Muslims" to the European Union augurs world-class revolution.

Is such a revolution desirable? After writing nearly incessantly about Islamization since Sept. 11, I won't surprise anyone by saying no—not if freedom of conscience, religious equality or women's rights are your bag (not to mention the glorious representational artworks Europe's museums are stuffed with). Besides, the strategic implications for the United States are, in a word, bleak.

In multiculturally totalitarian Belgium, however, you make such judgments at your own risk. Vlaams Belang, a conservative, free-market party that stands for Flemish secession from the French-speaking part of Belgium and opposes continued immigration, now stands trial in a Belgian court for a comment—a comment!—Dewinter made in 2005 to a New York publication, *The Jewish Week*. When asked why Belgian Jews should vote for a party that espouses "xenophobia," Dewinter replied: "Xenophobia is not the word I would use. If (it) absolutely must be a 'phobia,' let it be 'Islamophobia.' Yes, we're afraid of Islam. The Islamization of Europe is a frightening thing."

If it is convicted of the "crime" of "Islamophobia" ("1984," anyone?), the party would lose its state funding. In a country that effectively prohibits private political fund-raising, Vlaams Belang—the largest party in Belgium—would ultimately cease to exist. And so, too, would free speech in the center of Europe.

Before I met Vlaams Belang's Frank Vanhecke and Filip Dewinter in Washington, I believed Europe's rush to Islamize itself was a stampede, its transformation all but inevitable. Now, I think these men have at least earned Europe the benefit of the doubt. Studying their various statements and interviews, I found no evidence to support the crude slanders to which they are continually subjected in the me-

dia for being a right-wing party opposed to the massive Islamic immigration now transforming traditional European culture. Indeed, their statements on Israel are more supportive than any European party I know of. As Vanhecke put it in a recent speech, "They call us 'intolerant' because we oppose intolerance. They call us 'fascists' because we oppose Islamofascism. They call us 'the children of holocaust perpetrators,' because we oppose Islamists who are preparing a new holocaust against the Jews."

America must start paying attention to Europe. And to Vlaams Belang.

Diana West is a nationally syndicated columnist and author of The Death of the Grown-Up.

The Mind of Jihad

Andrew Bostom

Laurent Murawiec's *The Mind of Jihad* (Cambridge University Press, 2008, 352 pages, \$17.95) joins the large array of books that have been written since 9/11 on *Jihad*—its history, its roots in Islam, its relevance to politics and strategy and, most daunting, its future.

For supporters of a safe Israel the subject of jihad is particularly relevant: geographically, since the state is a spit of land surrounded and dwarfed by Moslem Arab countries; demographically, since it has a large and increasingly aggressive Arab Moslem population; and globally, since the United Nations and other international bodies are controlled by Moslems to whom the very existence of Israel is religious and political anathema.

While the flurry of books on *Jihad* is welcome, too many "instant scholars" promote the false notion that Islamic nations were introduced to racism and hatred of non-Moslems, most particularly local Christians and Jews, by Western ideologies such as Nazism and Marxism.

Unfortunately, Laurent Murawiec's *The Mind of Jihad* falls into this category. Thus Murawiec declares: "Most of the ugly repertoire of modern Arab and Muslim anti-Semitism came from the Soviet Union with only the racial-biological component added by the Nazis." Despite the inclusion of some fascinating texts, letters, speeches, and anecdotes, Murawiec's study ignores classical (and still omnipresent) doctrines and practices of *jihad* war, such as the licit taking of infidel *harbi* (from *dar al harb*, the unvanquished non-Muslims "lands of war") non-combatant life and property, and even more fundamentally, the goal of submitting the world to Islamic Law.

In addition, Murawiec grafts "millenarian Gnostic" motifs onto the unrelated, uniquely Islamic institution of *jihad* war. He mistakes transient, tactical alliances between (primarily) Bolsheviks/Communists and *jihadists* for the existence of some "shared vision"—as if the stark differences between the goals of creating *Sharia*-based governments (and ultimately, a global Caliphate), and a centralized, international system of atheistic, Communist bureaucracies were immaterial.


Murawiec shows scant understanding of the principles of *jihad* war, which long antedated the twin totalitarian evils of the past century. Ibn Hudaib, a 14th century Granadan Muslim author of an important treatise on *jihad* war described those principles, including the allowable tactics which facilitated the violent, chaotic Islamic conquest of the Iberian peninsula and other parts of Europe: "It is permissible to set fire to the lands of the enemy, his stores of grain, his beasts of burden—if it is not possible for the Muslims to take possession of them—as well as to cut down his trees, to raze his cities, in a word, to do everything that might ruin and discourage him [being] suited to hastening the Islamization of that enemy or to weakening him. Indeed, all this contributes to a military triumph over him or to forcing him to capitulate."

These repeated attacks, indistinguishable in motivation from modern acts of jihad terrorism, including the horrific 9/11/01 attacks in New York and Washington, DC, the Madrid bombings on 3/11/04, and those in London on 7/7/05, were in fact designed to sow terror. The 17th century Muslim historian al-Maqqari explained that the panic created by the Arab *jihadist* horsemen and sailors, at the time of the Muslim expansion in the regions subjected to those raids and landings, facilitated their later conquest: "Allah thus instilled such fear among the infidels that they did

Too many "instant scholars" promote the false notion that Islamic nations were introduced to racism and hatred of non-Moslems by Western ideologies such as Nazism and Marxism.

not dare to go and fight the conquerors; they only approached them as suppliants, to beg for peace."

The principle of *jihad* described by Ibn Hudayl and al-Maqqari, to terrorize the enemies of Muslims as a prelude to conquering them, is rooted in the Koran (for example, verses 8:12, 8:60, and 33:26). Contemporary validation of this principle is provided in the mainstream Pakistani text on jihad warfare by Brigadier S.K. Malik, originally published in Lahore in 1979. Laurent Murawiec, in a chapter entitled "*Jihad as Terror*," concludes his meditation on contemporary *jihadism* with a discussion of this very treatise. Murawiec states the obvious—Malik's profound, overriding indebtedness to classical *jihad* theory and practice, including *jihad* terrorism. But in the end, Murawiec is betrayed by his book's preceding illogical narrative. Thus Malik's modern primer on Islamic *jihadism* becomes for Murawiec, a treatise written, "in pure Gnostic fashion, with a strong dose of Leninist voluntarism, or Nietzschean *Wille zur Macht*. [Will to Power]."



Moreover, the orthodox Pakistani Muslim ideologue Sayyid Abul Ala Maududi is central to Murawiec's thesis. Maududi was an influential friend of Ayatollah Khomeini and Sayyid Qutb (the latter was also Osama bin Laden's hero). A prolific Koranic commentator, and essayist, Maududi's ideas were firmly rooted in classical Islamic formulations of *jihad* and the nature of Muslim societies, culminating in his rendition of how a contemporary Islamic State should function under the *Sharia*. Yet for Murawiec, Maududi, a pious, traditional Muslim, whose doctrines are consistent with

those of a multitude of Islamic revivalists, must have been nurtured on Lenin. Writes Murawiec: "...[it is] as if Lenin's *The State and Revolution* had become [his, i.e. Maududi's] bedtime reading."

Contra Murawiec, writing in 1980, J.B. Kelly, the great modern historian of the Arabian Gulf, viewed the aroused spirit of *jihad* in the Gulf during the 1960s and 1970s—fomented by Faisal b. Abdul Azziz's implacable hatred for Israel and the complementary doctrines of the *jihadist* Muslim Brotherhood—as merely a return to the region's deep Islamic roots, following a brief dalliance with "revolutionary" ideologies:

"Yet for all the anathematizing of Arab revolutionary movements by Muslim conservatives, it is extremely doubtful whether these movements are au fond anti-Islamic or irreligious. Marxist dogma sits very lightly and uncomfortably upon the few semi-educated peninsular Arabs who have ostensibly adopted it. Their thoughts and their lives are still shaped by Islam, they themselves are fundamentally Muslim. Nor could it be otherwise, since...Islam is the only real source of moral and intellectual guidance available to Arabs of the peninsula. The present evidence of Islamic revivalism, therefore, may be a more significant indication of the drift of events in the Gulf than sporadic troublemaking by self-styled Marxist revolutionaries."

The only Marxist philosopher I admire—i.e., Groucho—is credited with this joke which casts Murawiec's flawed analysis in the appropriate light:

"Q: What do you get when you cross an insomniac, an agnostic, and a dyslexic? A: Someone who stays up all night wondering if there is a Dog."

Andrew Bostom is an MD and author of The Legacy of Jihad and The Legacy of Islamic Anti-Semitism

Deeper Into The Trap

Melanie Phillips

Within a few days of the American presidential election, Iran was already testing Obama with Ahmadi-nejad slyly offering him his congratulations. Obama gave a guarded, pro-forma reply that Iran had to stop supporting terror and that its development of nuclear weapons was unacceptable, without saying what he would do to bring 'change' to Iran. In response, Ali Larijani, Speaker of Iran's parliament, pointedly did not deny that Iran was developing nuclear weapons. The ball is now once again in Obama's court, and the impression strengthens that Iran is looking forward to running ever bigger rings around America.

In America, where I currently am, I hear amplification of this analysis. The point missed by many is that, contrary to the view that Obama represents an abrupt break with the warmongering Bush, the said warmonger effectively tore up his own doctrine sometime around the middle of his second term. The key is Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, and the way she

has effectively hijacked American policy in the Middle East.

In order to counter the increasing power of Iran, Rice wanted to form a coalition with Arab states such as Egypt, Jordan and Saudi Arabia, which regard Iranian power as a mortal threat to themselves. Their price was the 'peace process' towards the creation of a Palestinian state. These 'moderates' never for a moment expected this would actually result in a Palestinian state—indeed, they would find such a development distinctly unappealing because it would be a proxy of Iran and thus increase still further Iranian control in the region. But the 'peace process' helped them in various ways: it weakened Israel, gave them a place at the global top table and furnished them with a plausible line to sell to their own home constituencies.

There were those within the Bush administration who viewed this with alarm. They argued that the U.S. should be bolstering 'moderate' Palestinians by helping develop the institutions of a free society such as a free press and the rule of law, building economic strength and easing the lives of ordinary Palestinians—but not complicating all this by a political overlay

which effectively rewarded terror by pressuring Israel to give up yet more land for Hamas/Iran to colonize. These voices were ignored. Rice was determined to force a political settlement.

The result is that the US has fallen into a trap. Far from peeling off moderate Palestinians from Hamas, Egypt and Saudi Arabia are trying hard to repair the breach between Fatah and Hamas. These putative allies of America are treading a fine line: playing the U.S. along ostensibly in a common front against Iran, but at the same time doing nothing to act against Iran—indeed, on the basis that the US is weak and will not act against Iran, even taking care to keep their own lines to Iran well and truly open.

So America has not only gained nothing, not only weakened the Israeli front line but given Iran what it needs most of all—the invaluable gift of time for it to bring its nuclear weapons program to fruition. The result has been that, even before the election, more and more voices in Washington were to be heard saying that America probably could live with a nuclear Iran after all. Unable or unwilling to control Rice through his own incompetence and weakness, Bush was already halfway to Obama's position.

We will not know how Obama's foreign policy will develop until we know his full team and particularly who gets State and Defence. But all the evidence to date suggests that he will throw Israel's security under the bus while appeasing the enemies of the free world.

The appointment of Rahm Emanuel as his chief of staff, the reputed bruiser whose role is to crush with extreme ruthlessness all opposition to Obama's programme, tells us very little—even though he is a former Israeli with a father who was in the Ir-gun. So what? So was the father of Israel's foreign minister Tzipi Livni, the woman who has done so much to weaken Israel by seeking to give away Israeli assets to Palestinian leaders who say they will never accept Israel as a Jewish state, as well as strengthening the Syrians by talking to them.

Rahm Emanuel himself was involved in the catastrophic Oslo appeasement process, which led directly to the second *intifada* and helped fuel the rise of Hamas. What is little understood in a western world in thrall to the noxious narrative of Jewish control over the American agenda is that American Jews are overwhelmingly liberal or on the left—and Jews on the left who support Israel often espouse policy positions which threaten to destroy it, thus making themselves the useful idiots for Israel's enemies. Indeed Israel's own politicians on the left, including the current Prime Minister—who has now said that Israel should revert to the pre-1967 'Auschwitz' borders, a remark which

caused even *Haaretz* to choke on its falafel—have gone down precisely the same suicidal road.

In similar vein the prominent Oslo veteran Dennis Ross, who is currently desperately jostling for a place in Obama's foreign policy team, is a friend of Israel—and yet he appears to have learned nothing from a process which led directly to the deaths of thousands of Israelis and the current impasse. He appears to be incapable of thinking outside the box marked 'peace process'. But unlike the pursuit of true peace, the 'peace process' creates more violence through arousing expectations which are not met and through strengthening the men of violence by rewarding and thus incentivizing terror. And meanwhile Palestinian children are still taught to hate Jews and told that one day Israel will be destroyed—and the Islamists in the region continue to multiply and divide into ever more extreme and murderous groups and factions.

According to CNN, the Iranian Speaker Larijani said that U.S. behavior toward Iran "will not change so simply" but Obama's election showed internal conditions in the United States have shifted.

The Iranians are amongst the most shrewd and sophisticated strategists around. They can see that the election of Obama is a signal of American weakness. The question no one can currently answer, however, is whether President Obama will now repudiate his history and turn through sheer force of circumstances into a centrist and war leader—which would be remarkable but by no means unprecedented—or will remain true to his radical past. Upon the answer to that question, the ability of the free world to defend itself against the onslaught now depends.

Melanie Phillips is a British journalist, columnist, and editor. She is the author of Londonistan. This article appeared on the blog of the Spectator (UK) on November 12.

AFSI Books (postage included in price)

The Aaronsohn Saga by Shmuel Katz—special price: \$15.00

Farewell Israel: Bush, Iran and The Revolt Of Islam—Documentary Written by Joel Gilbert. 14.95

Order from:
Americans For A Safe Israel
1751 Second Ave (at 91st Street)
New York, N.Y. 10128

All the evidence to date suggests that Obama will throw Israel's security under the bus while appeasing the enemies of the free world.

The “Culture of Peace” Conference

David Isaac

It's a curious thing when the leader of a country that prevents public (and even private) practice of other faiths calls for an interfaith conference. But that's just what Saudi King Abdullah bin Abdul-Aziz did last month at the UN.

Having Saudi Arabia lead an interfaith dialogue is like having the Godfather run a police training seminar. That didn't stop over 75 member states from falling over themselves in praise of the Saudi king's leadership at the “Culture of Peace” conference.

Israel was represented by our favorite Chelmite, former vice president of the Socialist International Shimon Peres. A mainstay of international Orwellian events, he can always be counted on to steal the spotlight for stupidity.

Of the Saudi peace plan—which demands that Israel abandon Judea, Samaria, the Golan, half of Jerusalem and permit Palestinian Arab “refugees” to flood the country—Peres said that it “provides hope to the people and inspires confidence in the nations.” This statement would be correct if he meant Arab people and Arab nations.

In his speech Peres proclaimed, “In order to change the world we have to change ourselves.” It became clear that's something the Arabs won't do. Saudi Foreign Minister Al-Faisal, responding to a reporter's question about how a country could call for religious tolerance when it didn't practice it at home, replied: “To say from the beginning, ‘You have to transform yourself into something which you aren't now, or nothing else can be achieved’ is I think carrying the argument too far.”

What's amusing about this answer, aside from its obfuscation, is that al-Faisal all but admitted his country is intolerant. Not that the Saudis need to come out and say it. A religious police that goes around whipping people pretty much speaks for itself, as do government-employed imams praying for the death of Jews and Christians.

“Discussing religions runs counter to the spirit of both the Madrid and New York conferences. We have agreed on not touching on beliefs,” the Saudi foreign minister said. No wonder. If your ideology says convert or die, it's best to leave it off the table. Otherwise, the conference would quickly descend into a highly unusual occurrence at the UN—an honest discussion—with frank questions, like: “What is it about Islam that makes it the world's most intolerant religion?” and “Could it have something to do with the Muslim belief that the world is divided into two parts, the

House of Islam and the House of War?”


Once such questions were asked and answered, member states might come to surprisingly sane conclusions, with the American ambassador turning to the Columbian ambassador and blurting, “What the hell are we doing at an interfaith conference led by Saudi Arabia?” and the Columbian ambassador replying, “Que estamos—estupido?”

Another “interfaith” highlight at the conference was the Palestine Authority prime minister's claim that Jerusalem was holy to two religions—Islam and Christianity, conveniently leaving out Judaism. “Jerusalem is home to the third most holy place to Islam, the place where Muhammad rose to the heavens, and the place where Jesus, the Christian, was resurrected,” he proclaimed.

So if the Arabs don't want to change their behavior or their beliefs, nor even acknowledge Judaism's ties to Jerusalem, why throw an interfaith conference at all? Seems like a lot of effort to repeat the same canards, only now forced to pay lip service to the need for a “dialogue among religions, cultures and civilizations.” Why not stay at home, enjoy the harem, whip some Hindu servants and blame the Zionists for spilling babaganoush on your dishdashah?

Two members of the US Commission on International Religious Freedom, Donald H. Argue and Leonard A. Leo, have shed some light on what the Saudis are really after. In an article in *The Christian Science Monitor*, they reveal, “Saudi King Abdullah, who initiated this week's special session, is quietly enlisting the leaders' support for a global law to punish blasphemy—a campaign championed by the 56-member Organization of Islamic Conference that puts the rights of religions ahead of individual liberties. If the campaign succeeds, states that presume to speak in the name of religion will be able to crush religious freedom not only in their own country, but abroad.”

There's evidence that the Saudis might succeed. Asked about the initiative by Saudi Arabia for a resolution to ban the defamation of religion, UN General Assembly President Miguel d'Escoto Brockmann said that the defamation of religion should be banned as a form of intolerance. “No one should try to defame Islam or any other religion,” he said. (It creates a potential problem for Moslem imams, who can't get through their day without attacking Judaism. Perhaps they'll solve the problem by declaring that Judaism isn't a religion, much the same way anti-Semites like to say Jews aren't a people.)



"Such prohibitions [against defamation of religion] have already been used in some countries to restrict discussion of individuals' freedom vis-a-vis the state, to prevent criticism of political figures or parties, to curb dissent from prevailing views and beliefs, and even to incite and to justify violence," say Argue and

Leo.

In short, it would mean an end to much well-deserved criticism of Islam. Maybe that night away from the harem was worth it after all.

David Isaac is a writer living in California.

20 Reasons Why Barack Obama Is Wrong About Israel And The Saudi Peace Plan

Hugh Fitzgerald

"Barack Obama is to pursue an ambitious peace plan in the Middle East involving the recognition of Israel by the Arab world in exchange for its withdrawal to pre-1967 borders, according to sources close to America's president-elect."

This might work:

1. If Islam did not exist.
2. If the doctrines that are inculcated into the minds of Muslims were not so clear, so consistent, and so deeply imbedded.
3. If instead of being told that they had a duty to remove all obstacles to the spread and dominance of Islam all over the world, Muslims were told that they should accept unbelievers as equals and not try to subjugate them under *Sharia*.
4. If in the minds of Muslims the recapture of territory deemed to have once been part of *Dar al-Islam* were not at the top of the list. It is at the top of the list because land that had once become part of *Dar al-Islam* and is then repossessed by non-Muslims constitutes an even greater and permanent affront to Muslims than the fact that parts of the world have as yet never been conquered by Islam, when Believers know (for they are taught) that the whole world belongs to Allah, and to the Believers, the "best of peoples" (Qur'an 3.110).
5. If there were anything in the historical record to suggest that these deep beliefs were not taken permanently to heart. They explain not merely the uncompromising attitude toward Israel, but a great many other attitudes. The notion that if Kashmir were yielded to Muslim rule, that the pressure on India from Muslims in Pakistan, Bangladesh, and within India, including acts of terror, would do more than at most temporarily diminish, is also false.
6. If there were some evidence that in past negotiations and "treaties," Muslim Arabs had ever shown themselves willing to stick to such treaties and not, as Majid Khadduri notes, always and everywhere regard such treaties with Infidel states or peoples as made to be broken (on the model of Al-Hudaibiyya).
7. If the Israelis in particular had any evidence save for a few words that the difference between the Fast Jihadists of Hamas and the Slow Jihadists of Fatah were differences on ultimate goals and not merely on tactics and timing.

8. If the re-establishment of the Jewish commonwealth in modern Israel were not the incredible achievement it is. This commonwealth has been built in what was a dusty backwater of the Ottoman Empire. Despite every effort by the local Muslim Arabs to destroy it, Israel managed to be built and to thrive, and to offer an example. Israel is an example of an advanced polity in the midst of darkness, not least in its treatment of minorities. (Compare the treatment of non-Muslim and non-Arab minorities everywhere in Arab-dominated land, from Kurds and Berbers and Copts and Assyrians to black African Christians, pagans, and even Muslims).

9. If Israel did not have a perfect right to hold onto what was after 1948 the "West Bank." This is because of the express terms of the Mandate for Palestine. That Mandate was set up for the establishment of the Jewish National Home.

10. If that territory, seized by the Jordanians, had not then come into the possession of Israel by force of defensive arms in the Six-Day War, so that Israel's claim is reinforced by all the ordinary rules of territorial adjustment after a successful war of self-defense. See how the map of Europe was rewritten after each of the two last world wars. Start with Italy's claim to the Alto Adige, which was once the Sudtiroil and 98% ethnic German. It was awarded to Italy, and quite rightly.

11. If Israel had the vast financial resources of the Muslim Arabs, who have received more than eleven trillion dollars since 1973 alone, because of an accident of geology.

12. If Israel did not need to hold onto the heights of Judea, the traditional invasion route.

13. If the history of the Jews had not been written in Judea and Samaria and the loss of that territory would not deal an incalculable blow to Israeli morale.

14. If the local Arabs really were the "Palestinian people," not an entirely factitious construct invented out of the local Arabs for propagandistic reasons after the Six-Day War. See Zuhair Mohsein, see a thousand others.

15. If Israel did not depend on the aquifers under the "West Bank."

16. If the Arab leaders, even the leaders of Fatah, did not make clear to their own people that what they were smilingly saying to the Americans and the rest of the West could not possibly change their real intentions.

17. If Mahmoud Abbas himself had not shown, like Arafat, but far more plausibly and cunningly, with a

great show of no-one-here-but-us-mild-mannered accountants, those true intentions on so many occasions.

18. If the Arabs had any ability to grasp the very idea that smaller peoples had the right to their own states, not mere *dhimmi*-states that could be dispensed with if the non-Muslims managed not to show the proper *dhimmi* attitude. How long would it take the Arabs to find that anything at all, including the "treatment of Arabs" in a state reduced to what even Abba Eban once called "the lines of Auschwitz," could be used as a pretext to fight against that rebellious *dhimmi*-state.

19. If the Arabs were willing to start treating other non-Arab and non-Muslim peoples (those Berbers, those Kurds, those Assyrians, those Maronites, those black Africans in Darfur and the southern Sudan) not only with semi-decency, but as if they too had a right to their own autonomy or states.

20. If there were not every reason for the well-informed to recognize that an insidious game was being played, one that could be played only because so many in power have not bothered to find out what it is they need to know in order to think carefully about the fate of Israel and indeed the fate of the entire world, given that Islam now spreads its tentacles deep into Western Europe.

Given the worldview that Islam inculcates, it is madness and cruelty and wickedness for those who presume to make policy in this area to continue to ignore the real history of the Middle East, and the history of the Jews, and the history of how all the non-Arab and non-Muslim peoples are treated by the Arabs, and have been treated over the past 1350 years.

Above all, it is madness for anyone to be kept on in a policy-making position who still has not bothered to study the impact of Islamic doctrine. Yet they still have not bothered to do so, so long now after the 9/11/2001 attack. That day should have led those whose duty it is to instruct and to protect us to hit the books, that is, the texts of Islam—the Qur'an, the Hadith, the Sira—and the studies of Islam by the hundreds of great Western scholars who wrote in the age (roughly, 1870-1970) before the Great Inhibition set in.

Instead, these leaders have not known where to turn. They have been greatly impressed with the smiling diplomats and accommodating and gracious and so-generous Arab hosts—from Prince Bandar to the "plucky little king" Hussein of Jordan, now replaced by the same slightly less-attractive, but still plausible (Deerfield! a beautiful wife! perfect English!) son. Then there are the assorted smoothies who have managed to persuade the Americans that if only, if only, that pesky little Israel were put out of its misery, and brought kicking and screaming to make the deal that—as the James Bakers and Edward Djerijians and even the most exhausted, end-of-our-mental-tether Israelis seem to think might be possible—"everyone knows the broad outlines of."

But those "everyones" are wrong. Those "everyones" do not know. They do not understand, the texts, tenets, attitudes, atmospherics of Islam. That is what they do not know, and that, I'm afraid, is just about everything that, in an intelligent and well-run polity, they would be required to know.

This is adapted from an article that appeared on Jihad Watch, November 16.

Elections Here, Elections There

Ruth King

Ninety five percent of the seventy five percent of American Jews who voted for Barack Obama are praising the nomination of Rahm Emanuel as proof of the new President's affinity for Israel.

Poof! There go the deeply disturbing associations with Farrakhan, Khalidi, Reverend Wright, Bill Ayers, Bernardine Dohrn and other assorted villains in the Obama circle.

Rahm is, by all accounts, deeply concerned about Israel in spite of his misguided enthusiasm for Oslo. Nonetheless, his appointment, seen by many as a reassurance to Jewish supporters, is a political distraction since as Chief of Staff his principal role will be to steer the President's policies through Congress.

As candidate, Barack Obama set forth one of his major goals: "Once I'm elected, I want to organize a summit in the Muslim world, with all the heads of state, to have an honest discussion about ways to bridge the gap that grows every day between Muslims and the West."

And who is more suited to bridge that gap than his former adviser Robert Malley, the director of the Middle East/North Africa Program at the International Crisis Group which maintains offices in Syria, Iraq, Lebanon, and Egypt?

Malley has a string of credentials. He was Special Assistant to President Clinton for Arab-Israeli Affairs, former Assistant to then National Security Sandy Berger (of stuffed hosiery fame), and Director for Democracy, Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs at the National Security Council Advisor (whatever that is). He has also been friend, confidante and counselor to President-elect Obama.



Robert Malley

Malley was fired as Obama's Middle East adviser after news broke of his meetings with, and affinity for, Hamas. However, it appears that he is again "fired up" to recommend a very hard line with Israel. It is rumored that he has "outlined" the "new direction" of American policy in the Middle East as envisaged by the president elect and delivered a message to Bashar

Assad.

Only a week after Obama's election Malley opined on the BBC that Israel should return to the 1949 lines, praising Tony "Blur"'s heated peroration on the necessity for utmost speed in bringing about the two state (dis)solution of "the conflict." For Mr. Blair all the worlds' ills--the economy, global hot air, terrorism, menopausal hot flashes, hurricanes--will subside as soon as Israelis and Arabs kiss and make up. For Malley they will subside when Israel disappears.

Resolving "conflicts" is Malley's chief game as director of the Middle East/North Africa Program at the International Crisis Group. The Group's statement of purpose on the Middle East is deceptively mild: "Crisis Group's work in Israel, the occupied territories and Israel's Arab neighbours is focused on new and more comprehensive political and diplomatic strategies to address the sources of conflict, and deal with the main factors within Israel and Arab societies hindering the achievement of sustainable peace."

Dig a little deeper and see the notables on their board including Zbigniew Brzezinski, George Soros, HRH Turki al-Faisal of Saudi Arabia, Kofi Annan, Samantha Power, Wesley Clark--none of them known as supporters of Israel. Even among that group Malley is a blackbelt propagandist against all things Israeli and has a long list of on-the-record lectures and articles hostile to Israel.

It may be genetic. His father, the late "revolutionary journalist" Simon Malley, was a key figure in the Egyptian Communist Party, and was, most probably, on the Soviet payroll. He is described this way by Ed Lasky of *The American Thinker* website: "He [Simon Malley] wrote thousands of words in support of struggle against Western nations. In Paris, he founded the journal *Afrique Asie*; he and his magazine became advocates for 'liberation' struggles throughout the world, particularly for the Palestinians. Simon Malley loathed Israel and anti-Israel activism became a crusade for him."

Like father, like son.

Malley has disputed the assertion by Dennis Ross (no great defender of Israel and Fatah guide to congress) that Arafat, the most frequent visitor to Clinton's White House, walked away from a "good deal." His pal Yasser, Malley explained in an op-ed, was a reasonable negotiator and a perfectly decent man who was hoodwinked and repeatedly tricked by the duplicitous Israelis.

Oddly enough, in spite of Malley's claim that Ross prevaricated, the latter wrote a strong column of support for Malley when Obama sacked him. Well, harassing Israel is thicker than water and offers a putative job in a new administration.

For starters here are the recommendations the International Crisis Group sent to President Bush

and Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice on the Annapolis Conference of November 2007--when Malley was openly working with Barack Obama. The Group proposed two states, based on the lines of June 4, 1967, with minor, reciprocal, and agreed-upon modifications as expressed in a 1:1 land swap; Jerusalem as home to two capitals, with Jewish neighborhoods falling under Israeli sovereignty and Arab neighborhoods under Palestinian sovereignty; special arrangements for the Old City, providing each side control of its respective holy places and unimpeded access by each community to them; a solution to the refugee problem that is consistent with the two-state solution, addresses the Palestinian refugees' deep sense of injustice as well as provides them with meaningful financial compensation and resettlement assistance; security mechanisms that address Israeli concerns while respecting Palestinian sovereignty.

The letter, incidentally, was also signed by Paul Adolph Volker, Chairman of the Federal Reserve under Presidents Carter and Reagan (1979-1987), who has become a close economic adviser to Barack Obama. Paul

Adolph Volker, who is six foot seven inches tall, has no problem stooping low. He whitewashed Kofi Annan's role in the United Nations "Oil for Food" scandal in April 2004, when he was appointed to head an inquiry by--you guessed it--Kofi Annan.

So here we have a bleak scenario for American/Israel relations; a President who is lukewarm at best when it comes to Israel's legitimate concerns, surrounded by advisers with an overt anti-Israel bias; a fractured and impotent American Jewish community which has put concern for Israel on the back burner; increased acceptance of the Arab/Moslem narrative of the history of Palestine; and worst of all--an American body politic grown indifferent to national security or defense.

And now the election in Israel is coming up. Olmert, whose shameless appeasement of the Arabs has weakened and dispirited Israel, is leaving office in disgrace. And eager to replace him is Tsipi Livni, Olmert with lipstick. Nor does Benjamin Netanyahu, who abandoned Hebron while Prime Minister, inspire much confidence. In spite of the ominous signs from the incoming U.S. administration, in Israel there is not a single viable candidate who has the guts to call for terminating Oslo, terminating negotiations and insisting on Jewish sovereignty in Judea, Samaria and Golan.

On the contrary, here is the real rub. The recommendations to the Annapolis conference issued by Malley's group are endorsed by an alarming number of politicians, academics, journalists and "intellectuals" in Israel.

Are Israelis stupid or ignorant or delusional about Arab/Moslem intentions? The elections will give an indication. It does not bode well. •

And eager to replace him is Tsipi Livni, Olmert with lipstick.

(Continued from page 2)

for some settler from Brooklyn who claims to have God on his side, I think he has a perfect right to say so.'

"Let us dispense with the typically English schoolboy enchantment with assumed Arab aristocracy. Rashid Khalidi was himself born and raised in... Brooklyn. Here is testimony from a witness: 'I lived in Brooklyn and watched young Rashid and his brothers grow, even held him as an infant while listening to his father, Ismail, talk about Palestine and diplomatic issues he dealt with.' On the maternal side, Rashid's roots in Brooklyn go back a good ways: 'His grandmother,' he is reported to have told an audience, 'who immigrated to America from Lebanon was a member of First Unitarian Church in Brooklyn.' His mother and father married in that church, and he attended Sunday school there.

"So were Khalidi to give up the familiar pleasures and privileges of Columbia University for the rigors of Jerusalem, wouldn't he also be a settler from Brooklyn?"

Sharia Finance

The U.S. Treasury has hosted a forum entitled "Islamic Finance 101," in its words, "to educate staff from U.S. banking regulatory agencies, Congress, Department of Treasury, and other parts of the Executive Branch." A rightly livid Brigitte Gabriel (author of *Because They Hate: A Survivor of Islamic Terror Warns America*) explodes: "Everything in me wants to shout from the highest house top, 'Will enough Americans wake up in time?'" Gabriel explains what *sharia* banking is: "*Sharia* banking was created by radicals like

Sheik Qaradawi, a terrorist who today is banned from entering the United States and Great Britain. Who today leads international Islamic Finance agencies. How does he describe *Sharia* Finance? 'I like to call it *Jihad* with money, because God has ordered us to fight enemies with our lives and our money.'"

As Frank Gaffney of the Center for Security Policy points out, the Treasury's idea seems to be to secure Wahhabi money in exchange for conforming to the Islamist economic agenda. And thanks to the extraordinary authority the Treasury now has over the financial sector thanks to the TARP program, it is in a position to impose its own embrace of *Sharia* on the U.S. financial sector. Gaffney observes that there is a lesson to be drawn from England. "Earlier this year, the head of the Church of England, Archbishop of Canterbury Rowan Williams, provoked a brief but intense firestorm of controversy with his declaration that it was 'unavoidable' that *Sharia* would be practiced in Britain. Largely unremarked was the reason he gave for such an ominous forecast: The U.K. had already accommodated itself to *Sharia*-compliant Finance." In other words, *sharia* compliant finance is a wedge for those seeking to insinuate *sharia* into Western societies. And indeed there are now at least five *Sharia* courts to hear (to start) family law cases. Polygamists in the U.K. can get welfare for each of their wives (as long as the additional marriages were performed overseas).

We may not have arrived there yet, but the Treasury's movement is clearly in the wrong direction. As Gaffney sums up, "Inexorably, it becomes the turn of non-Muslims to accommodate themselves to ever more intrusive demands from the Islamists. It is known as submission, or *dhimmitude*." •

Americans For A Safe Israel
1751 Second Ave. (at 91st St.)
New York, NY 10128

Non-Profit
Organization
U.S. Postage