

OUTPOST

April 2009—Issue #221

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

To Weaken Our Enemies

Herbert Zweibon

The importance of making energy plentiful and keeping prices down for the revival of our economy is obvious—the biggest stimulus has not come from Congress but the fall in the price of oil. Our energy policy also has a crucial impact on our international political standing, our ability to prevail against the forces arrayed against us (and yes, this administration to the contrary, messages of goodwill to the likes of Ahmadinejad and Assad will merely solidify their contempt).

By increasing our domestic supply of energy—coal, nuclear, oil, gas—we can put pressure on our outright enemies and those who wish us ill, so many of them concentrated in countries dependent on oil sales to satisfy the needs of their population. The collapse in the price of oil has made the leadership in these countries vulnerable: we should be seizing the opportunity to hasten their decline through developing our own resources so that when the economic situation improves they do not quickly find themselves in the driver's seat once again. For example, using the stimulus package to invest in a new nuclear plant rather than another rail line to Las Vegas would have made a lot more sense—instead of pork, Congress could have provided some beef.

Merely in the short period since oil prices collapsed, the impact on two of the countries posing grave threats to our interests has been enormous. Chavez, who depends on billions in oil income to bribe his supporters with free medical care, apartments, subsidized food, has seen his oil income halved—even the state oil company has run up millions of unpaid bills to contractors. His ability to do mischief outside his borders will surely be curtailed as he struggles at home. In Iran, where 80% of the country's earnings come from oil, unemployment is high and inflation is running at 30%, the deputy central bank governor said that if oil fell below \$60 a barrel (it is around \$50 at this writing) Iran would have big problems.

Russia's President Medvedev has already promised to begin "a large scale rearming" in 2011 in

response to what he calls the threat of NATO. But this too depends on oil money and Russia is experiencing a rapid withdrawal of funds by investors while its foreign reserves, built up in the heyday of high prices, have fallen dramatically. Yet if oil prices rise, Russia will surely make good on its promises.

So what is the Obama administration doing to keep up the pressure on the hostile oil producers? On every energy front it is doing the opposite of what needs to be done. The administration has declared war on fossil fuels. Interior Secretary Ken Salazar has canceled leases for energy exploration on 77 parcels of federal land in Utah, some of them in or near the Green River Formation, an oil rich region that according to the Energy Department's Argonne National Laboratory has 800 billion recoverable barrels, three times greater than the proven oil reserves of Saudi Arabia. The Obama administration has announced the project for a depository for nuclear waste in Yucca Mountain is done for, a death sentence for nuclear energy unless we reprocess the uranium, which is most unlikely. Cap and trade is on the drawing board, a huge energy tax on all fossil fuels, especially coal, our chief energy resource.

Instead money is to be flung at non-existent pie-in-the-sky alternatives. Rhetoric is Obama's answer to everything. Our industrial machine is to be run on rhetoric, the rhetoric of alternative energy. Our enemies are to be won over with rhetoric, on the assumption that a failure of respect and brotherhood on the part of this country are all that separate us and them.

The only possible effect of all this will be to drive oil prices higher for those with real energy to sell, not pipe dreams, and to vastly increase the threat to the welfare of this country and the civilized world. •

Table of Contents

First They Take Jerusalem by David Solway	...3
Climate Change & The Peace Process by R.J. Isaac	..4
Bridges TV Press Release by Couscous Baklava	...8
The Knesset Lesson by Barry Silverberg	...8
A Human Rights Tragedy by Anne Bayefsky	...10
Reflections on Passover & Beyond by Ruth King	...11

From the Editor

Shame on the AJC

The American Jewish Committee's formerly sensible David Harris lashes out at the trio of outstanding champions of Israel, the indefatigable Anne Bayefsky of *EyeontheUN*, *Jerusalem Post* columnist Caroline Glick and British journalist Melanie Phillips, author of *Londonistan*. Unable to defend the AJC's disgraceful behavior in undercutting the efforts of Israel and others (like Bayefsky) to persuade Western countries to boycott Durban II, Harris resorts to personal disparagement of his critics--what his targets call "ad feminam" attack.

On the most charitable interpretation, the AJC's decision to participate as a member of the US delegation in the Durban II preparatory committee was, as former World Jewish Congress leader Isi Leibler puts it, a "blunder." Leibler notes that the AJC was "irresponsible in encouraging the perception that a body totally controlled by the Islamic Conference and rogue states, and even chaired by Libya, with Iran and Cuba serving as deputy chairs, could possibly be anything other than an instrument for promoting evil." To make matters worse, "the US delegation, including the AJC representative, actually sat on its hands while vicious demonizations of Israel took place."

Compounding its folly, for the last two years the AJC has been urging the U.S. to seek membership on the UN Human Rights Council. As the formidable feminine trio of critics observe: "By joining the UN Human Rights Council, the Obama administration will be legitimizing a body dedicated to the delegitimization of Israel. It is shameful that the AJC has chosen to join this cynical and sinister process, whose outcome can only be to weaken Israel and strengthen her enemies."

In other words the American Jewish Committee has been providing Jewish cover for Durban's anti-Israel and anti-Semitic hatefest and will be providing cover for the equally vicious actions of the UN Human Rights Council. Supporters of Israel who belong or donate to the AJC should be giving Harris an earful.

Simple Shimon, Yet Again

As the Obama administration gears up for massive new pressures against Israel, Israel's President Shimon Peres goes into paroxysms of sycophancy. Meeting with "our very dear Hillary" he declares that President Obama "was elected by the Americans, but chosen by the rest of the world." He sees "no contradiction between the positions taken by the United States and the positions taken by us." As for Hamas: "We didn't want to attack Hamas before, and even now they continue to fire. We don't know the reasons why they are doing it; we don't know the cause that they want to achieve." Hamas daily reiterates that Israel's destruction is the cause it wants to achieve, but for Peres these are mere words without

meaning.

Peres is equally cavalier when it comes to Iran. Asked about Ahmadinejad's vows to obliterate Israel Peres shrugs: "So we hear another speech and another speech...we have been hearing these speeches for 4,000 years." The last head of state to make such speeches was one Adolf Hitler.

My Name is Tristan Anderson

The terror-groupies of the International Solidarity Movement (ISM) almost had another cause célèbre in one Tristan Anderson. Protesting the construction of a separation barrier at the town of Naal'in, Anderson was critically injured, hit in the head by a tear gas canister. Six years ago, engaged in another anti-Israel protest, ISM activist Rachel Corrie was accidentally killed by a bulldozer.

It looks like Anderson, receiving the best care in an Israeli hospital, will survive. Even if he had been a full-fledged martyr, he might not have received the same hagiography bestowed on Corrie, the worldwide media outpouring, even a play (*My Name is Rachel Corrie*). Trouble is, the 37 year old native of Oakland, California has a history. A friend of Haifa University economics professor Steven Plaut wrote to Plaut: "I live in Berkeley and am aware of this character... he sat in a tree on campus for two years and dropped buckets full of human waste on the heads of police who were trying to get him down. He is a professional troublemaker and is an embarrassment to Berkeley."

Anderson was tree-sitting (and waste-dropping) to protest the construction of an athletic center on campus. When the tree-sit (which will apparently make the Guinness Book of World Records for its length) ended in September 2008, Anderson was at loose ends, and the International Solidarity Movement presented what must have looked like a golden opportunity for his specialized talents.

The Gaza Donors

Daniel Pipes aptly describes as "surreal" the Egyptian government-hosted "International Conference" (continued on page 12)

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>

First They Take Jerusalem—Then Everything Else

David Solway

In the so-called “war on terror,” which is really a war of attrition between two competing civilizations, the dilemma that confronts us is that we don’t have the time to wait for a possible Islamic Enlightenment: we are not living in the 18th century but in the calamitously weaponized 21st. The crisis we are now facing does not allow for that species of adjournment we call diplomacy or the illusion of “dialogue” with an interlocutor who does not abide by its formative assumptions.

On the one hand, Western diplomacy is a Rube Goldberg machine that engages tortuous complexities to produce insignificant results. On the other, Middle Eastern “dialogue” is a variant of a form of communication that resembles what literary critic Clayton Koelb called “lethetic fiction,” in which speakers do not believe what they are saying and do not suppose that the untruth spoken is merely a surface behind which some sort of truth lies hidden. The truth is off to the side, part of another taxonomy of discourse; the purpose of “dialogue” is to keep it there. There is no doubt whatsoever, for example, that Iran is plying a nuclear filibuster and that terror-sponsoring Syria is a past master at stalling. But time is running out.

What the situation cries out for today are deeply educated and farsighted statesmen and courageous national leaders. Democracies are notoriously slow, fractured, and cumbersome in reacting to threatening events and are thus always at an initial disadvantage against their enemies — this is why intelligent and determined leaders are needed, those who are capable of foresight and not, like Maginot Line generals, only of hindsight.

Instead, our fate is now in the hands of one-dimensional, small men and women without vision, knowledge of history, or the courage to act, except insofar as they are prospecting for votes. It is not only, as Joe Klein contends in *Politics Lost*, that the political process has been trivialized by the burgeoning tribe of “marketing professionals, consultants, and pollsters,” but that the subjects of the “pollster-consultant industrial complex” are themselves devoid of moral and intellectual substance to begin with.

Indeed, some may even be devoid of valid legal identity: the evidence that President Obama’s birth certificate, as posted on his website, is a forgery is frankly disturbing. One would hope otherwise; nevertheless, Obama, who appears to be all things to all men and nothing in himself, seems like a virtual media projection, a kind of William Gibson “Idoru,” who blurs the lines between the real and the simulated, charac-

ter and rhetoric, being and seeming. As he himself wrote in *The Audacity of Hope*, “I serve as a blank screen on which people of vastly different political stripes project their own views.”

What we have here is only the latest UFO to bedazzle large numbers of true believers: an Unidentified Flying Obama the electorate swears by. A man without a discernible core identity has been given a free pass by a majority of bedazzled Americans whose need for a messiah has induced them to embrace a state of excitable fatuity and comfortable ignorance.

The American public seems at times casually indifferent to the complexities of their own politics. This fact was recognized by Nihad Awad, executive director of the Council on American-Islamic Relations, who in a 1993 meeting in Philadelphia said: “When I speak with the American, I speak with someone who doesn’t

know anything.” Add to this sorry spectacle of political vapidness and acedia the editorial vaporizings of a philistine press, the parlous state of journalistic ethics, and the rites of left-wing academic indoctrination, and we have, to put it mildly, a big problem.

Yet it does not take a mantic expertise to discern the probable future should we continue to sit back, swallow the sedatives of standard political thinking, and let events take their course. The secular democracies of the West are under sentence; the benefits they have enjoyed, however intermittently, of peace, prosperity, and common egalitarian values are in grave danger of subsidence. As Will Durant wrote in *The Story of Civilization*, “eternal vigilance is the price of civilization. A nation must love peace, but keep its powder dry.”

This is what all too many in the West, including its power-holders and influence-peddlers, refuse to understand. Broadly speaking, a cultural distance of 1,000 years separates Western man from Islamic man (or, as some will prefer, “Islamist man”), although the distance is closing fast as Western man (or, as some will prefer, “European man”) regresses toward the naivety of the child and the infancy of thought. We really do seem to have lost the plot. For we are truly in a war, different from any war we have fought in the past, waged on many different fronts from fifth-column infiltration to an expanding demographic to incendiary physical assault to “dark web” terror attacks on basic cyber infrastructures to the introduction of Sharia-compliant finance in the fiduciary world, but a real war nevertheless that will persist well into the century.

In its militant dimension, it is a war that is once again approaching our shores—9/11 was only the opening salvo—and which will have real conse-

Western diplomacy is a Rube Goldberg machine that engages tortuous complexities to produce insignificant results.

quences in physical suffering, civil disruption, cultural prostration, and economic breakdown. It is not a war we can spend on the golf course while our soldiers take casualties on foreign battlefields. It is a war that, in the long term, we may well lose if we do not awaken to the peril which confronts us.

It is not by the pricking of our thumbs that some of us fear a generations-long tumult but by a sober study of the historical archive, the absorption of the relevant literature, and an informed and common-sense alertness to the current scene. Those of us who insist that we are not facing a significant external threat to our nation, culture, and civilization but only adjustments, however unsettling, to a new world order have simply not read the signs, the literature, the proclamations, or the entrails. And those of us who are sounding the alarm will naturally be accused by the droves of sleepwalkers shuffling in the public domain of exaggeration and even of war-mongering in our turn. As Proverbs 26:13-14 tells us, even when there is a lion in the streets, the slothful man turns upon his bed.

But when these contemporary Rip Van Winkles are finally jarred awake by events, they will likely

find themselves living and dying in a very different world from the one in which they fell asleep. We are now challenged as never before as the 21st century unfolds toward the seismic event of civilizational conflict between a messianic world-faith and a secular world-view. The modern, secular state is centered on the idea of a "social contract" between man and state; the Islamic system of governance is inherently medieval, built around the concept of a man-God relationship. There are no atoms of compatibility between two such global systems of culture and belief.

Let us listen to the music before we have to face it. We have the authority of the major players in the Islamic world, from Hamas chieftain Mahmoud Zahar to Iranian president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, that a different political anthem is coming our way. For the theme song of the Islamic adversary may be regarded as a modification of the famous Leonard Cohen lyric: first we take Jerusalem, then we take New York.

This article appeared March 18 in PajamasMedia. David Solway is a Canadian poet and essayist. His most recent book is The Big Lie: On Terror, Antisemitism, and Identity.

Climate Change, Israel and the Peace Process

Rael Jean Isaac

While at first glance these three may not seem tightly connected, there are strong links between them. The most obvious impact on Israel of the efforts to combat climate change is in the way it strengthens Middle Eastern (and other hostile-to-Israel oil producers), much to Israel's detriment. The Obama administration is intent on making coal vastly more expensive (through a major tax increase called cap and trade), abolishing nuclear energy (by ending the development of long term nuclear waste facilities) and preventing the energetic development of U.S. oil supplies, offshore or on land. It plans to fill our energy needs with fantasy "alternatives" that do not yet exist. As Czech President Vaclav Klaus (the only prominent politician to take a rational stand) asks, "When, in previous history, has a civilization abandoned existing technologies before the successors have been developed?" The only result can be to drive up the price of oil and with it, the West's eagerness to appease Israel's enemies.

But there is another less obvious link. Man-made global warming, like the peace process, has become an article of faith, immune to evidence or any kind of realistic analysis. Yes, there are dissenters (we will sample dissent from global warming orthodoxy below) but their impact is minimal, as policy makers and the mainstream media obsessively proclaim a supposed "overwhelming consensus," treating dissenters, however well-informed, as if they were relics of the flat earth society. Like the consensus that a Middle

East peace process exists and needs to be assiduously pursued, the uniformity on climate change reminds us of the permanent human truth behind the tale of the emperor's new clothes—just because he's naked doesn't mean there can't be a consensus that he's clothed.

In the case of the peace process, readers of *Outpost* do not need to be reminded that it is a sham. In truth there is only an obliterate-Israel process, with the Arab states, the "moderate" Palestinian Authority and "extremist" Hamas and Hezbollah united in their goal of eliminating Israel as a Jewish state and varying little in their demands or indeed their rhetoric (out of direct earshot of Western politicians).

When it comes to global warming, the most basic and essential questions are considered heresy, to be ridiculed or shouted down, not answered. Is there global warming? If so, are the computer models on which alarmist predictions of future climate change based reasonable? Would global warming on balance be harmful? Given the dramatic changes of climate over millennia (it was only ten thousand years ago that Long Island was covered by ice a mile thick), is it likely that humans are responsible for whatever changes in climate are occurring, and is their contribution, if any, large enough to warrant the huge economic price demanded by the effort to limit it?

Below are excerpts from two articles and a speech.. The first, by Weather Channel founder John Coleman answers the question "How did the climate change frenzy start? How did its doomsday scenario come to capture the public imagination?" The second deals with what is happening now, as British journalist Christopher Booker reports on how the orthodox preach to the vast assembly of the converted while the

dissenters, with far better scientific credentials, struggle to gain a hearing through the pioneering efforts of the Heartland Institute. Finally we offer an excerpt from the speech Vaclav Klaus gave last year at the first Heartland Institute conference, emphasizing the social consequences of the ill-considered rush to combat the alleged menace of “global warming.”

From John Coleman:

The Amazing Story Behind the Global Warming Scam

The key players are now all in place in Washington and in state governments across America to officially label carbon dioxide as a pollutant and enact laws that tax us citizens for our carbon footprints.

How did we ever get to this point where bad science is driving big government to punish the citizens for living the good life that fossil fuels provide for us?

The story begins with an Oceanographer named Roger Revelle. After World War II he became the Director of the Scripps Oceanographic Institute in San Diego. He greatly expanded the Institute's areas of interest and among others hired Hans Suess, a noted chemist from the University of Chicago. Suess was very interested in the traces of carbon in the environment from the burning of fossil fuels. Revelle co-authored a scientific paper with Suess in 1957—a paper that raised the possibility that the atmospheric carbon dioxide might be creating a greenhouse effect and causing atmospheric warming.



Roger Revelle

Next Revelle hired a Geochemist named David Keeling to devise a way to measure the atmospheric content of carbon dioxide. In 1958 Keeling published his first paper showing the increase in carbon dioxide

in the atmosphere and linking the increase to the burning of fossil fuels. These two research papers became the bedrock of the science of global warming, even though they offered no proof that carbon dioxide was in fact a greenhouse gas. In addition they failed to explain how this trace gas, only a tiny fraction of the atmosphere, could have any significant impact on temperatures.

Back in the 1950s, when this was going on, our cities were entrapped in a pall of pollution left by the crude internal combustion engines and poorly refined gasoline and from the uncontrolled emissions from power plants and factories. As a result a strong environmental movement was developing to demand action.

Government heard that outcry and set new environmental standards. New reformulated fuels were developed, as were new high tech, computer controlled, fuel injection engines and catalytic converters. By the mid seventies cars were no longer signifi-

cant polluters. New fuel processing and smoke stack scrubbers were added to industrial and power plants and their emissions were greatly reduced as well.

But an environmental movement had been established and its funding and very existence depended on having a continuing crisis issue. Roger Revelle's research at the Scripps Institute had triggered a wave of scientific inquiry. So the concept of uncontrollable atmospheric warming from the increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide from the burning of fossil fuels became the cornerstone issue of the environmental movement.

Revelle and Keeling used this new alarmism to keep their funding growing. Other researchers with environmental motivations and a hunger for funding climbed aboard.

In the 1960s this global warming research came to the attention of a Canadian born United Nation's bureaucrat named Maurice Strong. Strong organized a World Earth Day event in Stockholm, Sweden in 1970. From this he developed a committee of scientists, environmentalists and political operatives from the UN to continue a series of meetings.

Strong developed the concept that the UN could demand payments from the advanced nations for the climatic damage from their burning of fossil fuels to benefit the underdeveloped nations—a sort of CO2 tax. But he needed more scientific evidence to support his primary thesis. So Strong championed the establishment of the United Nation's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (UN IPCC). This was not a pure, “climate study” scientific organization, as we have been led to believe. It was an organization of one-world government UN bureaucrats, environmental activists and environmentalist scientists who craved UN funding so they could produce the science they needed to stop the burning of fossil fuels.



Maurice Strong

Over the last 25 years the IPCC has been very effective. Hundreds of scientific papers, four major international meetings and reams of news stories about climatic Armageddon later, it has made its points to the satisfaction of most governments and even shared in a Nobel Peace Prize.

In the meantime Roger Revelle moved to Harvard University.. It was there that Revelle inspired one of his students. This student would say later, “It felt like such a privilege to be able to hear about the readouts from some of those measurements in a group of no more than a dozen undergraduates. Here was this teacher presenting something not years old but fresh out of the lab, with profound implications for our future!” That student was Al Gore. He thought of Dr. Revelle as his mentor and referred to him frequently, relaying his experiences as a student in his book *Earth in the Balance*, published in 1992.

So there it is. Roger Revelle was indeed the grandfather of global warming. His work had laid the foundation for the UN IPCC, provided the anti-fossil fuel ammunition to the environmental movement and sent Al Gore on the road to his books, his movie "An Inconvenient Truth," his Nobel Peace Prize and a hundred million dollars from the carbon credits business.

But Roger Revelle was having second thoughts. In 1988 he wrote two cautionary letters to members of Congress. He wrote, "My own personal belief is that we should wait another 10 or 20 years to really be convinced that the greenhouse effect is going to be important for human beings, in both positive and negative ways."

And in 1991 Revelle teamed up with Chauncey Starr, founding director of the Electric Power Research Institute and Fred Singer, the first director of the U.S. Weather Satellite Service, to write an article for *Cosmos* magazine. They urged more research and begged scientists and governments not to move too fast to curb greenhouse CO2 emissions because the true impact of carbon dioxide was not at all certain, and curbing the use of fossil fuels could have a huge, negative impact on the economy, jobs, and our standard of living. Considerable controversy still surrounds the authorship of this article. However, I have discussed this collaboration with Dr. Singer and he assures me that Revelle was considerably more certain than he was at the time that carbon dioxide was not a problem.

Al Gore has dismissed Roger Revelle's *mea culpa* as the actions of a senile old man. From 1992 until today, Gore and most of his cohorts have refused to debate global warming and when asked about us skeptics, they insult us and call us names.

Yet I am totally convinced there is no scientific basis for any of it. Global Warming: It is a hoax. It is bad science. It is high-jacking public policy. It is the greatest scam in history.

From Christopher Booker

Nobody Listens To The Real Climate Change Experts

Considering how the fear of global warming is inspiring the world's politicians to put forward the most costly and economically damaging package of measures ever imposed on mankind, it is obviously important that we can trust the basis on which all this is being proposed. Last week two international conferences addressed this issue and the contrast between them could not have been starker.

The first in Copenhagen, billed as "an emergency summit on climate change" and attracting acres of worldwide media coverage, was explicitly designed to stoke up the fear of global warming to an unpre-

cedented pitch. As one of the organizers put it, "this is not a regular scientific conference: this is a deliberate attempt to influence policy."

What worries them are all the signs that when the world's politicians converge on Copenhagen in December to discuss a successor to the Kyoto Protocol, under the guidance of the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), there will be so much disagreement that they may not get the much more drastic measures to cut carbon emissions that the alarmists are calling for.

Thus the name of the game last week was to win headlines by claiming that everything is far worse than previously supposed. Sea level rises by 2100

could be "much greater than the 59cm predicted by the last IPCC report." Global warming could kill off 85 per cent of the Amazon rainforest, "much more than previously predicted." The ice caps in Greenland and Antarctica are melting "much faster than predicted." The number of people dying from heat could be "twice as many as previously predicted."

None of the government-funded scientists making these claims were particularly distinguished, but they succeeded in their object, as the media cheerfully recycled all this wild scare-mongering without bothering to check the scientific facts.

What a striking contrast this was to the second conference, which I attended with 700 others in New York, organized by the Heartland Institute under the title "Global Warming: Was It Ever Really A Crisis?" In Britain this received no coverage at all, apart from a sneering mention by *The Guardian*, although it was addressed by dozens of expert scientists, not a few of world rank, who for professional standing put those in Copenhagen in the shade.

Led off with stirring speeches from the Czech President Vaclav Klaus, the acting head of the European Union, and Professor Richard Lindzen of MIT, perhaps the most distinguished climatologist in the world, the message of this gathering was that the scare over global warming has been deliberately stoked up for political reasons and has long since parted company with proper scientific evidence.

Nothing has more acutely demonstrated this than the reliance of the IPCC on computer models to predict what is going to happen to global temperatures over the next 100 years. On these predictions, that temperatures are likely to rise by up to 5.3C, all their other predictions and recommendations depend, yet nearly 10 years into the 21st century it is already painfully clear that the computer forecasts are going hopelessly astray. Far from rising with CO2, as the models are programmed to predict they should, the satellite-measured temperature curve has flattened out and

Gore and most of his cohorts have refused to debate global warming and when asked about us skeptics, they insult us and call us names.

then dropped. If the present trend were to continue, the world in 2100 would not in fact be hotter but 1.1C cooler than the 1979-1998 average.

Yet it is on this fundamental inability of the computer models to predict what has already happened that all else hangs. For two days in New York we heard distinguished experts, such as Professor Syun-Ichi Akasofu, former director of the International Arctic Research Center, Dr Willie Soon of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics and Professor Paul Reiter of the Pasteur Institute, authoritatively (and often wittily) tear apart one piece of the scare orthodoxy after another.

Sea levels are not shooting up but only continuing their modest 3mm a year rise over the past 200 years. The vast Antarctic ice-sheet is not melting, except in one tiny corner, the Antarctic Peninsula. Tropical hurricane activity, far from increasing, is at its lowest level for 30 years. The best correlation for temperature fluctuations is not CO2 but the magnetic activity of the sun. (For an admirable summary of proceedings by the Australian paleoclimatologist Professor Bob Carter, Google "Heartland" and "Quadrant").

As I said in my own modest contribution to the conference, there seems little doubt that global warming is leading the world towards an unprecedented catastrophe. But it is not the Technicolor apocalypse promised by the likes of Al Gore. The real disaster hanging over us lies in all those astronomically costly measures proposed by politicians, to meet a crisis which in reality never existed.

From Czech President Vaclav Klaus
***Speech on March 4, 2008 to Heartland Institute:
From Climate Alarmism to Climate Realism***

Each one of us has his or her experiences, prejudices and preferences. The ones that I have are – quite inevitably – connected with the fact that I have spent most of my life under the communist regime. A week ago, I gave a speech at an official gathering at the Prague Castle commemorating the 60th anniversary of the 1948 communist putsch in the former Czechoslovakia. One of the arguments of my speech there went as follows: "Future dangers will not come from the same source. The ideology will be different. Its essence will, nevertheless, be identical – the attractive, pathetic, at first sight noble idea that transcends the individual in the name of the common good, and the enormous self-confidence on the side of its proponents about their right to sacrifice the man and his freedom in order to make this idea reality." What I had in mind was, of course, environmentalism and its currently strongest version, climate alarmism.

This fear of mine is the driving force behind my active involvement in the Climate Change Debate and behind my being the only head of state who in

September 2007 at the UN Climate Change Conference, only a few blocks away from here, openly and explicitly challenged the current global warming hysteria. My central argument was – in a condensed form – formulated in the subtitle of my recently published book devoted to this topic which asks: "What is Endangered: Climate or Freedom?" My answer is clear and resolute: "It is our freedom." I may also add "and our prosperity."

What frustrates me is the feeling that everything has already been said and published, that all rational arguments have been used, yet it still does not help. Global warming alarmism is marching on. The insurmountable problem as I see it lies in the political populism of its exponents and in their unwillingness to listen to arguments.

What I see in Europe (and in the U.S. and other countries as well) is a powerful combination of irresponsibility, of wishful thinking, of implicit believing in some form of Malthusianism, of cynical approach of those who themselves are sufficiently well-off, together with the strong belief in the possibility of changing the economic nature of things through a radical political project.

This brings me to politics. As a politician who personally experienced communist central planning of all kinds of human activities, I feel obliged to bring back the already almost forgotten arguments used in the famous plan-versus-market debate in the 1930s in economic theory (between Mises and Hayek on the one side and Lange and Lerner on the other), the arguments we had been using for decades—till the moment of the fall of communism. Then they were quickly forgotten. The innocence with which climate alarmists and their fellow-travelers in politics and media now present and justify their ambitions to mastermind human society belongs to the same "fatal conceit." To my great despair, this is not sufficiently challenged—neither in the field of social sciences, nor in the field of climatology. Especially the social sciences are silent.

The climate alarmists believe in their own omnipotence, in knowing better than millions of rationally behaving men and women what is right or wrong, in their own ability to assemble all relevant data into their Central Climate Change Regulatory Office (CCCRO) equipped with huge supercomputers, in the possibility to give adequate instructions to hundreds of millions of individuals and institutions and in the non-existence of an incentive problem (and the resulting compliance or non-compliance of those who are supposed to follow these instructions).

We have to restart the discussion about the very nature of government and about the relationship between the individual and society. Now it concerns the whole mankind, not just the citizens of one particular country. It is not about climatology. It is about freedom.



Vaclav Klaus

Bridges TV Press Release, February 15

Dear Friends:

My name is Couscous Baklava and I have been at Bridges TV since November of 2004. I am writing to you as the newly appointed interim General Manager. Previously, I held a number of subservient female roles in business development.

Forgive us for not being able to reach out to you sooner, as we were trying to deal with the shocking event that took place in our offices on Feb. 12. The good news: Aasiya's head has been found! It's a lovely head, shaped like a cassava, and we were very fortunate that it rolled behind the refrigerator, which kept it from decomposing too badly. Praise be to Allah.

At Bridges TV, all the staff members are deeply shocked and saddened by Aasiya's murder and subsequent arrest of Muzzammil "Mo" Hassan, or, to those of us who knew him, "the gentle giant." Mr. Hassan dedicated the last years of his life to projecting a positive image of Muslims through this television station. He was always telling us to stay "on message." For Mr. Hassan to go "off message" in such dramatic fashion is difficult to explain.

Many of you in the press have asked us if Mr. Hassan beheaded his estranged wife because he was following Sharia law. Nothing could be further from the truth! Yes, Aasiya filed for a divorce the week before, BUT there is nothing in Sharia law about beheading women WHO ASK FOR A DIVORCE!!! Sorry, sometimes I feel like I'm TALKING TO A WALL and it makes me a little CRAZY.

Friends have suggested this is an example of domestic violence in its most extreme form. Though we believe this is closer to the truth, it doesn't go far enough in explaining Mr. Hassan's behavior. Mr. and Mrs. Hassan got along admirably.

We often remarked how solicitous she was to his moods and how she did everything in her power to, in her words, "not set him off." The time she spilled coffee on Mr. Hassan's tie during their morning commute and, of her own volition, leapt out of the still moving vehicle and walked the remaining nine miles to work was the stuff of legend. Indeed, given the obvi-

ous affection they felt toward one another we find it next to incredible that Mr. Hassan would execute his beloved.

It's true that evidence points in Mr. Hassan's direction—Aasiya's call to her sister in South Africa who heard her speaking to Mr. Hassan and then "something that sounded like her sister struggling to breathe," the restraining order Aasiya had taken out against her husband, the reports of domestic abuse, and the instructional video series, "How to Behead Your Wife In Three Short Easy Strokes" found on Mr. Hassan's bed stand.

The question on all our minds is Why? What drove Mr. Hassan to commit this heinous act? Could it be that our detractors are right? Is there something wrong with Islam? It was during a sleepless night as I pondered this question that the answer was granted to me. It was there before me at the foot of my bed on a flickering television screen. The late, late, late news had it all—

Western civilization in its true colors—the shootings, the stabbings, the rapes, the murders.

It's obvious to us now what happened. Poor Mr. Hassan. In his efforts to bridge the religion of peace, justice and kindness that is Islam and the violent, merciless and backward civilization of the West, he simply went mad. Mr. Hassan was forced to watch the evening news every night in order to keep track of anti-Muslim bias. The violent, gun crazy, drug-besotten American culture finally proved too much for him and he snapped. We should have known our "gentle giant" wouldn't be able to cope with all that violence. If only we'd have been more thoughtful. We'd have been able to act sooner to help him in his moment of crisis!

We will gather in the parking lot at 5 p.m. to ululate. Members of the press are invited to participate.

Sincerely,

Couscous Baklava

This press release was sent to us by David Isaac, a writer in California who found it on the web.



The Gentle Giant

The Knesset Lesson

Barry Silverberg

Teacher: Today we'll talk about, 'how the Israeli electoral system works.'

Pupil: That's great. We made aliyah from Vancouver and I'm really confused.

Teacher: Let's start with the results of the elections.

Pupil: OK. Who got the most votes?

Teacher: Tzipi Livni, head of the Kadima party, with 28 seats.

Pupil: So Ms. Livni won, right?

Teacher: No, she lost. It doesn't look like she'll be able to get enough partners to form a majority government.

Pupil: What about Bibi Netanyahu?

Teacher: He got 27 seats. As the leader of the right, he may form a coalition of 65 right wing party seats.

Pupil: Then he won, I guess.

Teacher: No, Avigdor Lieberman (Israel is Our Home) won.

Pupil: How many seats did he get?

Teacher: 15.

Pupil: So how did he win?

Teacher: That's the way politics in Israel works.

Pupil: It's confusing with three major parties!

Teacher: What, three? Who told you three? There's also the Labor Party. They once were the largest party in Israel, and ruled for the first 30 years. Today they have 13 seats.

Pupil: Four parties? How do you ever get anyth-

Teacher: Stop interrupting me! Four? Who told you four? There's also Shas.

Pupil: What's Shas?

Teacher: Ultra-orthodox Moroccans. They appeared on the scene some twenty years ago and they have around 12 seats today.

Pupil: How bewildering. What are the main issues that divide the parties?

Teacher: The crucial issue is the 'territories' that Israel gained during the 1967 War. If you believe that these areas are an integral part of Israel and that Jews should continue to live there, you are on the 'right'. If you believe that Israel should withdraw from these territories, or make some kind of compromise, then you are on the 'left'.

Pupil: I read that Bibi supported the retreat from Gaza and the expulsion of 10,000 Jews. His party must be really far left. Right?

Teacher: Right. I mean, no, he's on the right. His Likud party has always been Right.

Pupil: What about Lieberman?

Teacher: He says that there's too much power in the hands of rabbis. He wants secular marriage and religious freedom.

Pupil: So he's the extreme left. Right?

Teacher: Wrong! Wrong! Wrong again! He's way right. Extreme left is "Meretz." Their slogan is "We won't compromise."

Pupil: That makes them radical right, right?

Teacher: You have snow for brains, I see. Wrong; LEFT! They refuse all compromise, unless, of course, it is with Arabs. Some of them actually believe that the Jewish state should not exist.

Pupil: I'm getting dizzy. So, all 120 Knesset seats will be taken by these six parties. That's really a lot.

Teacher: You're kidding me, right? What, six? Who told you six? You've forgotten National Religious Parties: The Jewish Home Party, for Jewish settlement of Judea and Samaria, and the National Union, who are really really absolutely for Jewish settlement of Judea and Samaria. Then there are also ultra orthodox Ashkenazim. Some of them actually believe that the Jewish state should not exist.

Pupil: Like Meretz, correct?

Teacher: Corr...- what, are you crazy? Stop blathering and let me finish: There are also three parties exclusively for Arabs.

Pupil: Let me guess: Some of the Arabs actually believe that the Jewish state should not exist.

Teacher: Now you're catching on.

Pupil: I can't catch on to anything. I've had it! This is too much for me! No country has twelve separate parties!

Teacher: What twelve? Who told you twelve? Where are you going? We've just started. There's the Male Rights Party, so all those divorced men whose wives got custody can take their kids out of the house. There's the Pensioner's Party, to help the elderly get more often out of the house. There's the Handicapped



Party, who want to get out of the house and have a place to go. And there's For-the-Kids'-Sake Party, which is trying to put kids taken out of their non-functional households back into the house. Of course you can't overlook "Hadash."

Pupil: (glazed eyes): That means 'new.'

Teacher: Very good. They want a new system: Communism. Then we have 'The Strong Israel party. They promise to fight organized crime. Unfortunately, Kadima is organized crime. There's also Tsomet--

Pupil: STOP! STOP!

Teacher: Very good. Stop for the Tsomet party. The name means 'intersection.'

Pupil: NO! STOP STOP!! I can't take any more.

Teacher: You must listen! What about 'Leader?'-- to curb the monopoly of the banks? The 'Light' Party? The 'Responsibility Party?' the 'Noodleman Renewal Russian Party?'

Pupil: (writhing on floor): No, this cannot be real. Make it stop!

Teacher: The Green Party to save the environment.

Pupil: (weaker) Nooooooooooooooooooooo.

Teacher: The Leftist Religious Green Party, who are in favor of territorial compromise as long as we first separate the territory into glass, plastic and organic.

Pupil: Noooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooo!

Teacher: The Green Leaf party fighting to legalize cannabis.

Pupil: Noo!

Teacher: And most important, The Green Leaf Senior/Holocaust Survivor Merger Party, who will fight for the right to smoke their old cannabis and get more reparations at the same time.

Pupil: (is now lying motionless on the floor).

Teacher: What's the matter with him? We've only gone through the first 28! Hey, get up! There's a lot more to do! (sighs) .What do you expect a Canadian kid to know about democracy!

NOTE: The above is based on a true political system. In the Israeli elections held on Feb 10, there were THIRTY SEVEN separate lists (parties)! Not one party mentioned above is made up; no matter how much they look it, it is all (unfortunately) true.

Barry Silverberg is an Israeli writer from Canada.

A Sham Engagement—The U.S. Participates In A Human-rights Travesty

Anne Bayefsky

Engagement—the centerpiece of the Obama administration's foreign policy—is currently making its debut in the heart of the U.N. human-rights world in Geneva. And U.S. diplomats have become sitting ducks on a firing range.

U.S. representatives are participating, for the first time, in a session of the U.N. Human Rights Council. This is the second half of a policy decision that the administration unveiled. The U.S. would attend the Council, but remain on the sidelines in the U.N.'s Durban II "anti-racism" conference.

Obama's real agenda is to join the Council as a full member. Elections take place in May, and the campaign to get the U.S. to run has now reached fever pitch. Rooting for this is a motley crew of current Council members and human-rights lowlifes pining for good-guy credentials, together with U.N. personnel, State Department officials, U.S.-U.N. ambassador Susan Rice, and NGO representatives.

The Council is the U.N.'s lead human-rights body. It was created in 2006 out of the ruins of the U.N. Human Rights Commission. At the time, the U.S. proposed making the actual protection of human rights a criterion for membership in the "reformed" agency. When the idea was rejected as a gross interference with the entitlements of human-rights abusers, the U.S. refused to participate in or to pay for the Council—until, that is, the arrival of President Obama.

Understanding the Council is a no-brainer. It is divided into five regional groups, with the African and Asian regional groups together forming the majority. The Islamic bloc holds the balance of power because it has successfully elected a majority to each of the African and Asian regional groups. The Western bloc controls a mere 7 of 47 seats.

Electioneering is in the air, and U.S. officials apparently have instructions to grin and bear it. The State Department announcement justifying the U.S. participation claimed: "We . . . will do more to . . . advance human rights if we are part of the conversation." That would assume that the conversation was about advancing human rights, not setting them back. Here is some of what has passed for human-rights conversation at the Council since the newly minted U.S. engagement strategy.

Iranian foreign minister Mottaki called for the elimination of "the illegitimate Zionist regime."

Saudi Arabia's Human Rights Commission chairman Bandar bin Mohammed al-Aban told those assembled that "the kingdom continues a consistent policy of promoting and consolidating principles of justice and equality among all members of society." He didn't mention that another Saudi woman was just arrested for being behind the wheel of a car.

The Egyptian minister for legal and parliamentary councils Mufid Shehab said it was paramount that

"freedom of expression should not lead to abuse of religions and religious standpoints....Opinions cannot be expressed freely if this affects...religious sensibilities."

Cuba's justice minister Maria Esther Reus González ranted about U.S. "plans for global domination," "wars of pillage and conquest," and "twenty long years . . . of blockade and aggression." (A Council decision of 2006 takes Cuba's human-rights record permanently off the table.)

Sudan's justice minister Abdel Daiem Zumrawi gave an account of his country's positive "endeavors in Darfur"—also known as genocide.

The "Palestine Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs" Ahmad Soboh spoke warmly of "the outstanding progress" of the Human Rights Council as compared with the Commission. Over 40 years, 30 percent of all the country condemnations made by the Commission were directed at Israel. The Council has already directed over 50 percent of all condemnations at Israel.

In the context of all of this human-rights shop-talk, U.S. representative Mark Storella was excited to be a part of it all. He declared: "It is my great pleasure to be here today . . . We look forward to participating in the Council's deliberations and working closely with you in the coming weeks and throughout the year... As President Obama said in his recent address to a joint session of the United States Congress, 'In words and deeds, we are showing the world that a new era of engagement has begun.'"

This kind of ingratiating language is not harmless. It has the tangible effect of leading other countries to believe there is no downside to using the Council to criticize the U.S., rather than to work with it. By Friday, the Cuban and Venezuelan delegations had mounted verbal attacks on various alleged U.S. violations of international law and human rights. In response, no right of reply was exercised by U.S. diplomats. Engagement is apparently a one-way street.

At Friday's session, one NGO had the audacity to mention Muslim incitement to religious hatred of Jews—in books flogged in the halls of the U.N. itself. The speaker was interrupted by the Council chair and ruled out of order. No comment from U.S. diplomats.

The U.N. has promised a five-year review of Council operations in 2011. If "engagement" stands for anything other than drivel, the administration should leverage future participation against demands for changes during the review. The membership of the world's greatest democracy ought not be taken for granted by the U.N.—it should be earned. If the current form of "engagement" sloganeering takes precedence, all genuine human-rights victims will lose.

This is an edited version of Anne Bayefsky's March 11 article in EyeOnTheUN.org.

Reflections On Passover And Beyond

Ruth King

On April 8th, Jewish people throughout the free world gather to celebrate Passover and retell the inspiring story of the Exodus from Egypt and slavery. I hope that many families will also remember those Jews in Moslem/Arab nations oppressed by modern Pharaohs, Ayatollahs and Mullahs.

It is also incumbent to remember Passover 1943 in the Warsaw Ghetto when unarmed, starving and freezing Jews rose up in rebellion against the Nazis. With fists and forks and knives and home-made arms and explosives they held off the Nazis for over one month, forcing them to call in reinforcements.

And finally, let us recall that five years later in 1948, the second Exodus brought Jews--tattered, traumatized, broken in body but not in spirit, to the land of Israel. Against all odds, they revived an ancient language, took up arms and defied relentless enemies to create a thriving democracy. After millennia of prayer it was "this year and every year and forever....in Jerusalem." This is usually the final chapter in the celebration of Passover, where the assembled say "let us eat."

But there is another aspect of Passover not mentioned in the festivities. It is the story of Moses leading the Jews to their promised land, wandering for forty years. During this odyssey Moses would receive the Ten Commandments—the first written law and inspiration for Jews and Christians wishing to live in a just and moral society.

The Decalogue, as the Commandments are known, remain the guiding spiritual light, and, in fact, constituted the basic rules of conduct for the founding fathers of America. On the steps of the United States Supreme Court, near the top of the edifice there is a row of great jurists and law-makers who each face the center where Moses is in full frontal view holding the tablets of the Ten Commandments.

While the "shalt nots"...adultery, murder, false witness, theft, and coveting of a neighbor's spouse and possessions are clearly law for a decent society, it is the Second Commandment that is the most relevant to the survival of Judaism. It is a Commandment against idolatry...the worship of false idols, cults, images, ideas and objects.

"You shall not make for yourself an idol, whether in the form of anything that is in heaven above or that is on earth beneath or that is in the water under the earth. You shall not bow down to them or worship them."

Alas, throughout the Diaspora and in Israel itself too many Jews worship a series of idols--they worship at the cult of pacifism, prepared to cede secu-

arity and patrimony to hardened and determined enemies; too many came under the spell of Marxism which imprisoned and killed millions in spite of its promises of equality and freedom; too many made idols of criminals and terrorists such as Arafat and company; too many are wed to misleading fantasies about man-made climate change; too many worship chimerical "multi-culturalism" while eschewing their own nationality and history and destiny; too many have abandoned reason in bowing to the cult of political correctness.

This idolatry and its fallout tormented the late eminent philosopher and rabbi Emil Ludwig Fackenheim. He was a Holocaust survivor who went to Canada, received a Ph.D from the University of Toronto with a dissertation on Medieval Arabic Philosophy in 1945 and served as professor of philosophy in Toronto from 1948 until 1984 when he emigrated to Israel.



Emil Fackenheim

Fackenheim insisted that it was imperative for Jews after the Holocaust to survive and continue a Jewish life and issued his own plea for what he called the 614th Commandment (a total of 613 commandments were codified by Rabbi Simon Kahira in the eighth century):

"... we are, first, commanded to survive as Jews, lest the Jewish people perish. We are commanded, secondly, to remember in our very guts and bones the martyrs of the Holocaust, lest their memory perish. We are forbidden, thirdly, to deny or despair of God, however much we may have to contend with him or with belief in him, lest Judaism perish. We are forbidden, finally, to despair of the world as the place which is to become the kingdom of God, lest we help make it a meaningless place in which God is dead or irrelevant and everything is permitted. To abandon any of these imperatives, in response to Hitler's victory at Auschwitz, would be to hand him yet other, posthumous victories."

During Fackenheim's last interview in 2000 he was asked "Do you think Israel can ever come to the point where it doesn't have to be in a state of resistance?" His answer:

I think it will be a very long time. But I would say this. Will the time ever come when we can say Hitler's shadow is gone? I think, yes, it will come when Israel is accepted in peace with its neighbor states. But it doesn't look like it will happen soon.

He might have added that peace may come when the people of Israel and Jews in the world finally reject false idols.

(Continued from page 2)

ence for the Reconstruction of Gaza” in Sharm El-Sheikh. The conference, attended by delegations from no less than 71 states and 16 regional, international and financial organizations, exceeded its target goal of raising \$2.8 billion, producing pledges of \$4.5 billion. When added to the previously committed funds, this means the total grant for Gaza and the Palestinian Authorities comes to \$5.2 billion to be disbursed over two years.

Pipes writes: “Why my disbelief at this spectacle: I wonder if those eminentoes and worthies really believe that warfare in Gaza is a thing of the past, and that the time for construction is nigh?” In fact since the January 18 ceasefire, rockets have been sailing into Israel daily, with 12 fired at Sderot on March 1 alone. Pipes asks “What the hell are the donor countries doing, getting in the middle of an on-going war with their high-profile supposed reconstruction effort?” And he provides the answer: “My best guess: this permits them subtly to signal Jerusalem that it better not attack Gaza again, because doing so will confront it with a lot of very angry donor governments—including, of course the Obama administration.”

Bottom line: However deep the world recession, when it comes to money for Hamas, the sky’s the limit.

Israel Apartheid Week

In the March *Outpost* Ruth King wrote of the way American Jewish organizations devote their energies to “progressive” causes unconnected (or outrightly hostile) to Jewish interests while failing to act when a response to threats is urgently needed.

A recent case in point: Israel Apartheid Week has been launched at campuses around the country. As Edward Alexander points out “There have never been apartheid laws in Israel. Jews and Arabs use the same buses, clinics, government offices, universities, theaters, restaurants, soccer fields and beaches. All citizens of Israel, regardless of religion or ethnic origin, are equal before the law.” Alexander notes that “the blackening of Israel’s name on university campuses is the sordid work of a grotesque alliance between political ‘progressives’ and reactionary Islamic fundamentalists.”

But where are the large well-funded Jewish organizations? Blog host Martin Solomon notes that even in Boston—a major university center with large Jewish student bodies—the planned demonstrations drew no response from the organized leadership. Solomon notes that many grassroots activists “feel the local mainstream organizations are next to useless.” He recently did an analysis of email alerts sent out by the Boston Jewish Community Relations Council and found that fully 37 percent had nothing to do with Jews or Israel involving “such important Jewish issues as global warming, tuition discounts for illegal aliens, immigration issues, affordable housing, labor issues, opposition to tax cuts—you get the picture.”

Solomon asks: “Is ‘Israel’ just a marketing tool to perpetuate big salaries and generous perks while these same pitchmen work assiduously behind the scenes to undermine the work of the smaller organizations and local activists who actually *fight*?” He observes caustically: “Can you imagine groups whose public priorities are purported to be Jews and Israel actually being ruled by fears of appearing too ‘particularistic’? Believe it.” •

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

Non-Profit
Organization
U.S. Postage