

OUTPOST

November 2010—Issue #237

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

A History Lesson for Friends

Herbert Zweibon

It is axiomatic that America and Israel are each other's most valuable and dependable ally, with shared national defense and security concerns. It is encouraging that the midterm elections will bring a crop of national security conservatives to Washington, who, with minor exceptions, have stated warm support for Israel. It is discouraging, however, that so many echo the mantra of a "two-state solution."

It does not make sense to be a national security hawk and yet endorse a policy which weakens—and could destroy our only democratic ally in the Middle East.

One suspects all too many of our incoming legislators accept the politically correct but historically absurd notion that the Arab-Israel conflict began in 1967 when Israel conquered the West Bank and can be solved by returning to the Arabs of Palestine what was taken from them in war.

Do they know that Jordan is an Arab Palestinian state carved out of 82% of the land promised to the Jews for their state in all of Palestine? Are they even aware that Jordan illegally annexed Judea and Samaria (the so-called West Bank) and East Jerusalem after Israel's war of Independence in 1948, and this was recognized only by two states, Pakistan and England? Any bets?

Have they looked at a map? Do they see Israel's narrow waist in the old Green Line (to which the peace processors would have her return) and how easily her population centers could be overrun?

Would these legislators dream of giving up strategically valuable portions of our southern states to accommodate enemies whose stated intention was to destroy America? Well, that answers itself.

These are patriots and decent people who have been misled by a biased media and academy and Jewish organizations and yes, the bludgeoned-by-Obama Israeli Prime Minister, all peddling the perverse illusion that this tiny territory would satisfy the blood lust of Israel's enemies.

It is not only Ahmadinejad that threatens Israel with genocidal jihad. Shmuel Katz put it best: the conflict indeed has a root cause and it is "the determination of the entire Arab nation, under the inspiration of Islam, to rule over the whole area from the Persian Gulf to the Atlantic Ocean and the southern border of Turkey to the southern border of the Sudan." The Arabs' liquidationist designs are rooted in Arab history and woven into the very fabric of the Islamic faith.

The absurdity of the "two-state solution" is only underlined by the fact that there are now two Muslim mini-states within Israel, one of them run by Hamas, which has its designs on the Fatah-run mini-state and makes no pretense of interest in any "solution" short of Israel's annihilation.

A few legislators seem to understand. Rep. Trent Franks of Arizona issued the following statement on Sep. 25, 2010:

"A few months ago, the Administration chastised Israel for building homes in Jerusalem, despite the fact that Jerusalem is not a settlement, but the capital of the nation of Israel, which was founded and built by the ancient people of Israel 3000 years ago....Indeed, it is highly ironic and bewildering that Israel has received more open rebuke from the Obama administration for plans to build houses in Jerusalem than the Iranian regime that threatens Israel with annihilation has received for building a secret uranium enrichment facility to produce nuclear weapons. As Israelis celebrate their ability to resume construction on the thousands of dwellings that have sat unfinished throughout this moratorium, I urge President Obama to at long last embrace, rather than alienate, the most vital ally America has in the world."

It is our urgent hope that incoming legislators will echo those words.

Table of Contents

Two Courageous Voices: Wilders & Freysinger	...3
Lessons Of The Holocaust by Menachem Begin	...6
Vanishing Christians by Daniel Greenfield	...6
Temple Beth Meshuga by Don Feder	...8
it's the Jihad, Stupid by Ruth King	..11

From the Editor

A Band of Brothers

"Those who can make you believe absurdities can make you commit atrocities." So wrote Voltaire, words strikingly applicable to the nutty vilification of Israel rampant in Europe. Fortunately there are a few sane voices, even among elites, some of them now joined in the Friends of Israel Initiative led by former Spanish Prime Minister Jose Maria Aznar. A reception in the British Parliament in July attended by 250 Parliamentarians, journalists, think tank analysts and others launched the British Initiative to bring "reason and decency" back to the discussion about Israel.

One of the speakers was historian Andrew Roberts, from whose speech we quote here:

"When during the Second World War, the island of Malta came through three terrible years of bombardment and destruction, it was rightly awarded the George Medal for bravery: today Israel should be awarded a similar decoration for defending democracy, tolerance and Western values against a murderous onslaught that has lasted twenty times as long.

"Jerusalem is the site of the Temple of Solomon and Herod. The stones of a palace erected by King David himself are even now being unearthed just outside the walls of Jerusalem. Everything that makes a nation state legitimate—bloodshed, soil tilled, two millennia of continuous residence, international agreements—argues for Israel's right to exist, yet that is still denied by the Arab League.

"We owe to the Jews, wrote Winston Churchill in 1920, a system of ethics which, even if it were entirely separated from the supernatural, would be incomparably the most precious possession of mankind, worth in fact the fruits of all wisdom and learning put together.

"The Jewish contribution to finance, science, the arts, academia, commerce and industry, literature, philanthropy and politics has been astonishing relative to their tiny numbers. Although they make up less than half of one percent of the world's population, between 1901 and 1950 Jews won 14% of all the Nobel Prizes for Literature and Science, and between 1951 and 2000 Jews won 32% of the Nobel Prizes for Medicine, 32% for Physics, 39% for Economics and 29% for Science. This, despite so many of their greatest intellects dying in the gas chambers. Civilization owes Judaism a debt it can never repay and support for the right of a Jewish homeland to exist is the bare minimum we can provide. Yet we tend to treat Israel like a leper on the international scene merely for defending herself.

"I recently visited Auschwitz-Birkenau. Walking along a line of huts and the railway siding where their forebears had been worked and starved and beaten and frozen and gassed to death, were a group of Jewish schoolchildren, one of whom was carrying over his shoulder the Israeli flag, a blue star of David

on white background. It was a profoundly moving sight, for it was the sovereign independence represented by that flag which guarantees that the obscenity of genocide will never again befall the Jewish people, to whom the rest of Civilization owes so much. I said at the start that I was speaking to you as an historian and so I say: No people in History have needed the right to self-defense and legitimacy more than the Jews of Israel and that is what we in the Friends of Israel Initiative demand here today."

A Methodist Preacher Sues

David Hallam, a courageous Methodist preacher, has sued his church in protest at the resolution passed at its national Conference calling for a boycott of some Israeli goods.

Hallam, a former Labor Member of Parliament, said: "What I object to is money which I am putting on the collection plate on a Sunday being used to fund a political campaign against the Jewish state. The Methodist Church seems to think it has a God-given right to tell Jews how to run their affairs. It is very disturbing we are getting involved in a territory where we don't have any members or churches."

Hallam's lawyer, Paul Diamond, will argue that the church, by singling out Israel, rather than other countries with worse human rights records, is being deliberately prejudiced against the Jewish state and that the resolution is in breach of European human rights law and a wide-ranging European Union directive on racism.

Should the action be successful, it could end similar boycott campaigns against Israel.

Canada Stands Tall

That's the title of an article by David Warren in *The Ottawa Citizen*. Warren writes that he is proud to be a Canadian because Prime Minister Harper has stood up for principle, refusing to sell out Israel—the price exacted by the bloc of Arab and Islamic states—to win a coveted seat on the UN Security Council.

One might add that, shamefully, the U.S. made no effort to campaign on behalf of Canada, telling her diplomats not to get involved. •

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>

Two Courageous Voices in Europe

Editor's note: Below are excerpts from speeches by Dutch Parliamentarian Geert Wilders and by Oskar Freysinger of the Swiss People's Party, who led the successful referendum in Switzerland against building minarets. The complete texts can be read at www.andrewbostom.org/blog/2010/10/03/. Wilders trial (for "inciting hatred" against Moslems) has taken a bizarre turn. The judges in the case have been dismissed and at this writing the case is scheduled to start all over again—despite the fact the prosecution has called for Wilders' acquittal! Freysinger could not even find a hotel room in which to speak.

Nonetheless there are signs that the political elite, who have hitherto shrugged off all protests against the Islamization of Europe as indefensible "racism," are finally beginning to listen. Not long after Wilders spoke, Angela Merkel dramatically reversed course. In a landmark speech to the youth wing of her Christian Democrat Union party, Merkel declared Germany's attempt to build a multi-cultural society has "utterly failed." Although Merkel's party expelled Rene Stadtkewitz for merely inviting Wilders to speak, Merkel herself now spoke in words that echo Wilders: "We feel bound to the Christian image of humanity—that is what defines us. Those who do not accept this are in the wrong place here."

It is urgent that elites listen to the warning voices of those who represent the best of Western ideals—people like Geert Wilders—lest frustration at the failure to listen leads to the triumph of ugly xenophobic nationalist demagogues who represent Europe at its worst.

Geert Wilders in Berlin, October 2, 2010

Dear Friends,

I am very happy to be here in Berlin today. As you know, the invitation which my friend René Stadtkewitz extended to me, has cost him his membership of the CDU [Christian Democrat Union] group in the Berlin Parliament. René, however, did not give in to the pressure. His dismissal prompted René to start a new political party. I wish him all the best. Germany, too, needs a political movement to defend German identity and to oppose the Islamization of Germany. Chancellor Angela Merkel says that the Islamization of Germany is inevitable. She wants the Germans to adapt to this situation.

My friends, we should not accept the unacceptable as inevitable without trying to turn the tide. It is our duty as politicians to preserve our nations for our children.

Dear friends, tomorrow is the Day of German Unity. Tomorrow exactly twenty years ago, your great nation was reunified after the collapse of the totalitarian Communist ideology. Germany is the largest democracy in Europe. Germany is Europe's economic powerhouse. The wellbeing and prosperity of Germany is a prerequisite for the wellbeing and prosperity of Europe.

Today I am here, however, to warn you of looming disunity. Germany's national identity, its democracy and economic prosperity, is being threatened by the political ideology of Islam. In 1848, Karl Marx began his Communist Manifesto with the famous words: "A specter is haunting Europe—the specter of communism." Today, another specter is haunting Europe. It is the specter of Islam. This danger, too, is political. This insight is not new.

I quote from the bestselling book and BBC television series *The Triumph of the West* which the renowned Oxford historian J.M. Roberts wrote in 1985: "Although we carelessly speak of Islam as a 'religion', that word carries many overtones of the special history

of western Europe. The Muslim is primarily a member of a community, the follower of a certain way, an adherent to a system of law, rather than someone holding particular theological views."

The American political scientist Mark Alexander writes: "One of our greatest mistakes is to think of Islam as just another one of the world's great religions. We shouldn't. Islam is politics or it is nothing at all, but, of course, it is politics with a spiritual dimension...which will stop at nothing until the West is no more, until the West has...been well and truly Islamized."

These are not just statements by opponents of Islam. Islamic scholars say the same thing. Abul Ala Maududi, the influential 20th century Pakistani Islamic thinker, wrote: "Islam is not merely a religious creed [but] a revolutionary ideology and jihad refers to that revolutionary struggle...to destroy all states and governments anywhere on the face of the earth, which are opposed to the ideology and program of Islam."

The prerequisite to understanding political danger is a willingness to see the truth, even if it is unpleasant. What is wrong with modern Western man that we make the same mistake over and over again?

There is no better place to ponder this question than here in Berlin, the former capital of the evil empire of Nazi Germany and a city which was held captive by the so-called German "Democratic" Republic for over forty years.

When the citizens of Eastern Europe rejected Communism in 1989, they were inspired by dissidents such as Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, Václav Havel, Vladimir Bukovsky, and others, who told them that people have a right, but also an obligation, to "live within the truth." Solzhenitsyn added, however, that "truth is sel-



dom sweet; it is almost invariably bitter.” Let us face the bitter truth: We have lost our capacity to see the danger and understand the truth because we no longer value freedom.

Politicians from almost all establishment parties today are facilitating Islamization. They are cheering for every new Islamic school, Islamic bank, Islamic court. Islam or freedom? It does not really matter to them. But it does matter to us. The entire establishment elite—universities, churches, trade unions, the media, politicians—are putting our hard-earned liberties at risk. They talk about equality, but amazingly fail to see how in Islam women have fewer rights than men and infidels have fewer rights than adherents of Islam.

Are we about to repeat the fatal mistake of the Weimar Republic? Are we succumbing to Islam because our commitment to freedom is already dead? No, it will not happen. We are not like Frau Merkel. We do not accept Islamization as inevitable. We have to keep freedom alive. And, to the extent that we have already lost it, we must reclaim it in our democratic elections. That is why we need political parties that defend freedom. To support such parties I have established the International Freedom Alliance.

One of the things we are no longer allowed to say is that our culture is superior to certain other cultures. We are indoctrinated on a daily basis, in the schools and through the media, with the message that all cultures are equal and that, if one culture is worse than all the rest, it is our own.

Our contemporary leftist intellectuals are blind to the dangers of Islam. The same leftist people who turned a blind eye to Communism then, turn a blind eye to Islam today. They are using exactly the same arguments in favor of détente, improved relations, and appeasement as before. They argue that our enemy is as peace-loving as we are, that if we meet him halfway he will do the same, that he only asks respect and that if we respect him he will respect us. We even hear a repetition of the old moral equivalence mantra. They used to say that Western “imperialism” was as bad as Soviet imperialism; they are now saying that Western “imperialism” is as bad as Islamic terrorism.

It is an insult to tell us that we are guilty and deserve what is happening to us. We do not deserve becoming strangers in our own land.

I am very happy to be here in Berlin today to give this message which is extremely important, especially in Germany. Whatever happened in the past, it is no excuse for punishing the Germans today. But it is also no excuse for you to refuse to fight for your own identity. Your only responsibility is to avoid the mistakes of the past. It is your duty to stand with those threatened by the ideology of Islam, such as the State of Israel and your Jewish compatriots. The Weimar

Republic refused to fight for freedom and was overrun by a totalitarian ideology, with catastrophic consequences for Germany, the rest of Europe and the world. Do not fail to fight for your freedom today.

It is not up to me to define Germany's national identity. That is entirely up to you. I do know, however, that German culture, like that of neighboring countries, such as my own, is rooted in Judeo-Christian and humanist values. Every responsible politician has a political obligation to preserve these values against ideologies which threaten them. A Germany full of mosques and veiled women is no longer the Germany of

Goethe, Schiller and Heine, Bach and Mendelssohn. It is important that you cherish and preserve your roots as a nation. Otherwise you will not be able to safeguard your identity; you will be abolished as a people, and you will lose your freedom. And the rest of

Europe will lose its freedom with you.

Oskar Freysinger: in Brussels, October 9, 2010

To preface, allow me to note that at the end of this first decade of the 21st century, questions and debate have become a challenge in the EU.

First, the Diamant Conference Center in Schaerbeek closed its doors to me under pressure from the mayor and the police and then it was the turn of the Crowne Plaza Hotel to deny me a room. Its owner had at least the courtesy, after having first accepted and then rejected the conference, to express his embarrassment. “However,” he advised us, “you will not find any hotel room in Brussels prepared to welcome you, as political pressures are too great.” He didn't know how right he was, because the owner of a third venue, who originally gave his approval, recanted just this morning.



Oskar Freysinger

This is why Europe is running adrift: Not because of fanatics who occupy the land, but because of cowards who let them do it.

I am, however, happy with the outcome, which sees me now speaking in French in a Flemish parliament hall thanks to Philip Dewinter [of the *Vlaams Belang* party].

Intolerance and censorship are now the preserve of those who have only the words “openness” and “tolerance” on their lips. Paradoxically, our fight for freedom is also conducted for them and their children, despite the fact they are trying to muzzle us.

Is Islam a threat? If yes, in which areas and in which ways? These are questions I will try to answer without any animosity toward Muslims as individuals,

because they are often the first victims of a pitiless dogma leaving them little choice in managing their lives.

In the universal design of radical Islam, all the world regions that were once Muslim should be Muslim again. Every place where a minaret is visible and each region which can be seen from a minaret must become Islamic. Faced with this demand, we understand that this building, frequently underestimated by the Europeans, plays a much bigger role than is commonly attributed to it.

A 21-meter-high minaret is currently under construction in Poitiers, a city where Charles Martel put the Saracens to flight in 732. Speakers will be installed. But they have promised the public that they will remain silent. So why have they been installed? The fact is that in many places where the construction of a minaret was authorized, the voice of the muezzin sounds now several times a day. This applies, for example, in Grenada, Bosnia, Oxford, London, New Delhi, and even in Lhasa, the capital of Tibet. Resistance occurs elsewhere, and for understandable reasons: the purpose of this movement is to install Islamic norms worldwide, and the minarets are only the visible—and often loud—manifestation of this invasion. The Islamic Council of Great Britain made clear in March 2008: “The call to prayer will become an integral part of life in Britain and Europe.” But this call announces the following principle five times a day: “Allah is greatest. I testify that there is no God but Allah. I testify that Muhammad is the messenger of Allah. Come to prayer. Come to felicity. Allah is greatest. There is no other true God but Allah.” Alongside this profession of faith, the bells of our churches are remarkably neutral—especially since they serve mainly to indicate the time.

The free exercise of religious practices is only permitted in national and international law within the limits of the law. Restrictions are quite possible. Article 9 paragraph 2 of the European Convention on Human Rights and Article 36 of the Federal Constitution permit a limitation of religious freedom if this restriction is in the public interest and is appropriate to the situation. For this reason, the [Swiss] Federal Council and Parliament were forced to admit that the initiative against minarets is not against the law and should therefore be submitted to the people.

However, we now find that the government cares little for the clearly expressed will of citizens in the vote that followed, as it does not intend to oppose the construction of a minaret in Langenthal under the false pretext that the building application was filed before November 29, 2009. Yet on the evening of the vote, the Minister of Justice said that the people’s will would be respected and that minarets will no longer be built in Switzerland. Even worse is the government’s

response to the European Court of Human Rights affirming that “the recent decisions of the Federal Court are examples admitting the primacy of international treaties (and a federal law) against a provision of the Constitution.” Thus, direct democracy and universal suffrage are giving way to a “democracy of judges.” In this way, the system can silence the people by declaring democracy undemocratic and the political process illegal wherever they contradict the orthodoxy of globalization.

Respect for ourselves and caution should encourage us to prevent the spread of laws in our land

which are opposed to the Swiss legal system. As noted by the European Court of Human Rights, *Sharia* is incompatible with our conception of law, particularly in the areas of marriage law, human rights and criminal law. The acceptance of the veil by Muslim teachers or segregated swim-

ming lessons for Muslim children are examples of concessions justified by the tolerance of foreign cultures, which seem unimportant, but in fact open Pandora’s Box in terms of law.

The higher the number of immigrants coming from countries with a pronounced clan structure, the more problems our society has. The biggest problem of modern European states is the fact that uncontrolled immigration and the weakening, even removal, of external borders causes the emergence of many internal borders, sometimes invisible.

If we refuse to seek answers to such problems, if we make them taboo in order not to deal with them, the EU, a promising area of freedom, is likely to become a region of societies in conflict.

Finally, it is hoped that Islam may reform itself in the years to come and that it goes through a sort of Enlightenment, which puts a definitive end to fanatical Islamism. As this is not yet the case, we have a duty to protect our state against all forms of subversion. It is not acceptable that our liberal principles of rule of law are being used as the instruments for its disintegration.

This also concerns the freedom and security of Muslims themselves, especially those who truly seek to integrate with us. Let me remind you of the sad fate of the Imam of Drancy Chalgoumi Hassan, who has argued publicly for banning the full veil in France. Since then, all the prayers he leads are disrupted. The 43 believers he had collected in 2009 at the conference of imams in France to promote the “dual cultural and Republican mission of the imams” exempted themselves one after the other. Now Chalgoumi is increasingly isolated and lives under state protection, threatened for a few words spoken against fundamentalism and anti-Semitism. To fight against the excesses of Islam in Christian lands is perhaps above all to protect Muslims from their “brothers.” •

A 21-meter-high minaret is under construction in Poitiers, a city where Charles Martel put the Saracens to flight in 732.

Menachem Begin on the Lessons of the Holocaust

In May 1981, then prime minister Menachem Begin, addressing 30 young American Jewish leaders visiting Israel, was asked what he thought the lesson of the Holocaust was.

"I believe the lessons of the Holocaust are these.

First, if an enemy of our people says he seeks to destroy us, believe him. Don't doubt him for a moment. Never pause to wonder what the world will think or say. Do all in your power to deny him the means of carrying out his satanic intent.

Second, when a Jew anywhere is threatened, or under attack, do all in your power to come to his aid. Never pause to wonder what the world will think or say. The world will never pity slaughtered Jews. The world may not necessarily like the fighting Jew, but the world will have to take account of him.

Third, a Jew must learn to defend himself. He must forever be prepared for whenever threat looms.

Fourth, Jewish dignity and honor must be protected in all circumstances. The seeds of Jewish destruction lie in passively enabling the enemy to humiliate us. Only when the enemy succeeds in turning the spirit of the Jew into dust and ashes in life, can he turn the Jew into dust and ashes in death. During the Holocaust it was after the enemy had humiliated the Jews, trampled them underfoot, divided them, deceived them, afflicted them, drove brother against brother, only then could he lead them, almost without resistance, to the gates of Auschwitz. Therefore, at all times and whatever the cost, safeguard the dignity and honor of the Jewish people.

Fifth, stand united in face of the enemy. We Jews love life, for life is holy. But there are things in life more precious than life itself. There are times when one must risk life for the sake of rescuing the lives of others. And when the few risk their own lives for the sake of the many, then they, too, stand the chance of saving themselves.

Sixth, there is a pattern to Jewish history. In our long annals as a nation, we rise, we fall, we return, we are exiled, we are enslaved, we rebel, we liberate ourselves, we are oppressed once more, we rebuild, and again we suffer destruction, climaxing in our own lifetime in the calamity of calamities, the Holocaust, followed by the rebirth of the Jewish State.

So, yes, we have come full circle, and with God's help, with the rebirth of sovereign Israel we have finally broken the historic cycle: no more destruction and no more defeats, and no more oppression – only Jewish liberty, with dignity and honor. These, I believe, are the underlying lessons to be learned from the unspeakable tragedy of the Holocaust."

The Vanishing Christians of the Middle East

Daniel Greenfield

The Synod of Bishops for the Middle East is meant to address the decline of Christians in the Muslim world. The reason for the decline is obvious. It is the willingness to discuss that reason which is at issue.

Christians in the Middle East are a minority in a Muslim region. Even the more moderate Muslim countries, such as Egypt, marginalize Christians and routinely deprive them of basic civil rights. Egypt is an American ally and nearly 10% of the country is Christian, yet that 10% live as second-class citizens, discriminated against and constantly subject to violence.

The rising tide of Islamization has made it more dangerous than ever to be a non-Muslim in a Muslim country, in ways that range from everyday discrimination to terrorist attacks. But the West is suffused by a narrative which insists that Islam is tolerant

and promotes tolerance. Such a false narrative makes it extremely difficult to address or recognize the problem.

Meanwhile growing Muslim migration into Europe raises questions about the future of Christianity even in the West. If Christians are denied basic civil rights even in moderate Muslim countries, what will their fate be if France and Germany go the way of Byzantium? The fact that Christians do not generally enjoy equal rights in the Muslim world suggests that they would also not enjoy such rights in Eurabia. The root of the problem lies in Sharia, Islamic law, which treats non-Muslims and women as second-class citizens.

Protecting Christians in the Muslim world requires working to replace laws based on Islamic jurisprudence with laws based on objective secular standards that treat all religions equally. But this is likely to prove impossible. The governments of countries like Egypt are already under pressure by Islamists, who gain popular support by accusing them of being puppets of the West and disloyal to Islam.

The real problem underlying it all is Islam. The question is what can be done about it.

Perhaps a first necessary step would be triage. The Catholic Church should consider the impact of importing the conditions already prevalent in the Muslim world into Europe, and take a firm stand against Muslim immigration in the name of Christian civil rights.

Such an action would empower marginalized European parties battling against the erosion of Europe's traditional character. It would also provide the Catholic Church with some leverage that it could employ with the Muslim world, demonstrating that it is capable of affecting the conditions of Muslims in the West, just as they are capable of affecting the conditions of Christians in the East.

But so far the Vatican has made no move in this direction. The Synod acknowledges that the problem exists, but its clergy are often part of the problem. The addresses to the synod still focus heavily on Israel, despite the fact that Israel is a tiny strip of land in the region. Turkey's steep Christian decline, going from 20 percent Christian in the early 20th century to 0.2 percent now, could not even be remotely traced to anything involving Israel, as the two countries have been allies until recently. Instead it comes down to the Turkish persecution of Christians. An issue that has to be addressed, particularly in the era of Erdogan and his radical Islamist AKP party.

Michel Sabbah, the Archbishop of Jerusalem, will be arriving to promote calls for a boycott of Israel in support of creating a Muslim Palestinian state. This will not serve the cause of Christian civil rights, as the Palestinian Authority has overseen a dramatic decline in the Christian presence, notably in Bethlehem. It would put Christians under Muslim authority, which would undermine one of the few places in the Middle East where indigenous Christians are not being repressed. *Kairos Palestine* [a document formulated by Christians in Bethlehem to be submitted to the Vatican] does not promote Christian civil rights; it promotes Arab Nationalism.

The very fact that *Kairos Palestine* demands "an independent Palestinian state with Al-Quds as its capital" telegraphs that this is a document driven by a Muslim agenda, not a Christian one. Al Quds is the Islamic name for Jerusalem, not the Christian one. The Biblical Latin name for Jerusalem was Hierosolyma, the Biblical Greek name for it was Hierousalem. The Pre-Islamic Arabic name for it was Uršalaym. When a supposed Christian document replaces the traditional name for Jerusalem with the Islamic Al

Quds, it demonstrates that its worldview is Islamic, not Christian.

Unsurprisingly *Kairos Palestine* actually defends Islamic terrorism, and even promotes the cause of Hamas. The document repeatedly describes terrorism as "resistance". It blames the international community for the separation of Gaza and the civil war between Hamas and Fatah, "since it refused to deal positively with the will of the Palestinian people expressed in the outcome of democratic and legal elections in 2006" (1.5.1). Those would be the elections which Hamas won. Quite disturbingly, *Kairos Palestine*

actually appears to endorse an Islamist Hamas government--despite the persecution of Christians by Hamas.

And the collaboration continues. In Lebanon, Michel Aoun, who returned from exile to side with Hezbollah terrorists, claimed that Islamic extremism had nothing to do with

the dwindling presence of Christians in the Middle East. Aoun demanded that the Catholic Church, "halt attempts to demonize Islam, the religion of more than one billion...and to call for examining the essence and religious text of Islam only, away from the acts of terrorist groups which Muslims consider themselves victims of just like the rest of the world."

This last is particularly laughable, as Aoun betrayed Lebanese Christians by signing a deal with Hezbollah, a Shiite terrorist organization backed by Iran. Hezbollah's goal is to create an Islamic state. In Hezbollah's 1985 message to Christians, it stated, "We call upon you to embrace Islam so that you can be happy in this world and the next. If you refuse to adhere to Islam, maintain your ties with the Muslims and don't take part in any activity against them." Which is a roundabout way of saying, "Submit or we'll destroy you."

Nor is Aoun misled about what he's doing. In a 2002 interview, he described Hezbollah as a terrorist group under Syrian control and said that Christians had been turned into second-class citizens. A few years later, he cut a deal with that same organization, and now promotes the Islamist agenda. If Aoun helps Hezbollah take over, the Christian presence in Lebanon will be destroyed.

Despite those like Sabbah or Aoun, there are Middle Eastern Christian clergy who continue to fight for civil rights. But they have to walk a fine line, because what they can say is governed by the laws of the Muslim world. Speaking out can have legal consequences for them and deadly consequences for their followers. The statements they do make are careful and couched in ambiguous terminology. A necessity in a region where Muslim outrage quickly translates into

***Kairos Palestine* actually appears to endorse an Islamist Hamas government—despite the persecution of Christians by Hamas.**



Michel Aoun

Michel Sabbah

church burnings and murders. And this gives Islamist apologists like Aoun and Sabbah a free hand to tell the one-sided Islamist tale.

The Synod so far includes the usual calls for dialogue with Muslims and Jews, the usual comments about the importance of the Peace Process, which would only accelerate the decline of Christians in the Middle East, and limited mentions of the dangers of Islamism. But if the Catholic Church hopes to preserve Christianity in the Middle East, it will have to take a far more active role than that.

Middle Eastern Christians are taking any chance they can get to leave for Europe and America where they will be able to enjoy freedom of religion. The Vatican is concerned over this exodus, yet it is inevitable. The Jews fled the Muslim world in the same way. Few people will remain persecuted, if they can find another way out. The only way to reverse that exodus is to forcefully work against persecution and discrimination. Most Middle Eastern Christians have deep ties to the region; they do not want to leave. But creating a safe space for them will require more than

just dialogue, but a demonstration that the Muslim world must respect the rights of Christians.

The Catholic Church has demonstrated before that it has the power to impact politics in the West. It may be time for it to begin telling the real story of Christians in the Middle East, and countering the Islamist narrative that Sharia promotes tolerance. And to take a strong position against Muslim migration to Europe until the Muslim demonstrates a willingness to grant full legal equality to Christians under their rule.

Standing up for oppressed Christians around the world would be a meaningful and moral act that could actually make a difference and prevent the fall of Europe. It would not be without its risks. Such a move would alienate American and European liberals and increase attacks on Christians in the short term. However it is the only step that has any chance of checking the Islamization of Europe and the de-Christianization of the Middle East.

Daniel Greenfield blogs as Sultan Knish. This appeared on his blog of October 13.

Temple Beth Meshuga

Don Feder

In response to the rising tide of anti-Semitism, here and abroad, courtesy of the Religion of Peace, liberal Jews (Temple Beth Meshuga) have pledged to fight Islamophobia, the phobia the left loves to hate.

We're told that anti-Muslim hysteria has reached a fevered pitch. Daisy Khan, wife of Imam Rauf, point-man for the Ground Zero Mosque, says it's "like a metastasized anti-Semitism." What, that serious? "It's not even Islamophobia; it's beyond Islamophobia. It's (gasp) hatred of Muslims!"

Are Muslims being lynched by rampaging mobs? Are imams kidnapped and tortured to death? Are cars filled with Muslim civilians ambushed, and pregnant women shot to death at close range?

Much worse, my friends. This uber-bigotry is epitomized by opposition to a mosque—excuse me, a cultural center—built near the spot where 2,752 Americans were murdered by Muslim hijackers, in the name of Islam, nine years ago. Will the horror never end?

But, not to worry, Jewish liberals are here to save the day.

The Jewish Telegraph Agency reported that officials of several Jewish organizations met with their knee-jerk counterparts of other faiths "in an emergency summit ... that denounced anti-Muslim bigotry and called for a united effort by believers of all faiths to



David Saperstein

reach out to Muslim Americans."

The unintentionally hilarious Rabbi David Saperstein of Reform Judaism's Religious Action Center (*Mother Jones* with a schmear) argued that Jews "have been the quintessential victims of religious persecution...and we know what happens when people are silent....We have to speak more directly to the anti-Muslim bigotry in America today."

This is fascinating. They don't have to speak out about anti-Catholic bigotry (like crucifixes submerged in jars of urine, funded by NEA grants), or anti-

evangelical bigotry (like commentators who compare born-again Christians to Nazis), but "anti-Muslim bigotry," this they have to fight tooth and nail. If Catholic bishops plotted to blow up New York synagogues and evangelicals butchered Jewish residents of Judea and Samaria, then perhaps Saperstein would defend them too.

The Anti-Defamation League—which believes that a cross on public property is a clear and present danger to Jewish survival—announced that it had organized an Interfaith Coalition on Mosques to respond to instances of "anti-Muslim bias" generated by attempts to build houses of Allah in the United States. Having briefly deviated from the party line [in saying the Ground Zero mosque was "insensitive" to the families of 9/11 victims], Foxman now is furiously doing penance to the gods of political correctness, with his campaign against jihadophobia.

The crisis of Islamophobia exists entirely in



Abraham Foxman



Mad Magazine



Nancy Fuchs-Kreimer

the minds of liberals. ("American Muslims Ask, Will We Ever Belong," whined a headline in the September 6th *New York Times*). Does the *Times* know, or care, that in 2008, there were roughly ten times as many hate crimes against American Jews as Muslims—many of the former perpetrated by the latter? Of all religious-based hate crimes documented by the FBI that year, 65.7% were anti-Semitic and only 7.7% anti-Muslim.

In April, Tel Aviv University released a study on the worldwide rise of anti-Semitism. According to the report, the number of anti-Semitic attacks (arson, assaults, vandalism) more than doubled between 2008 and 2009—increasing from 559 incidents to 1,129. For some curious and inexplicable reason, the growth of anti-Semitism parallels Muslim migration. In Western Europe, physical attacks on Jews are reaching Kristallnacht proportions.

Sweden is rarely thought of as a hotbed of Jew-hatred. That was before the invasion of Allah's legions. A March 29 story in *The Washington Times* ("Hate Crimes Force Jews Out of Malmo") noted that of 115 bias-crimes in Sweden's third largest city, reported in 2009, 52 were anti-Semitic, this notwithstanding that Malmo's Jewish population numbers fewer than 700 (half of what it was two decades ago) in a general population of 280,000. Thus, Jews represent less than .0025% of the city, but account for 45% of all hate crimes. Could that have something to do with Malmo's 60,000 Muslims?

Malmo Rabbi Shneur Kesselman says: "In the past five years I've been here, I think you can count on your hand how many [anti-Semitic] incidents there have been from the extreme right. In my personal experience, it's 99% Muslim." Jewish resident Marcus Eilenberg, whose survivor grandparents found shelter in Malmo in 1945, says Jews there are confronting "a degree of hate that none of us—except those who survived the Holocaust—had experienced before."

Let us hope that no one is challenging the construction of mosques in Malmo.

If asked for an example of supposedly rampant Islamophobia, Islam's useful idiots point to the Ground Zero Mosque. "Rabbi" Nancy Fuchs-Kreimer, director of multi-faith studies at the Deconstructionist Rabbinical College (which is to Judaism what Unitarianism is to Christianity) sniffs: "The proposal for the 'mosque at Ground Zero' that turns out to be not a mosque and not at Ground Zero has brought to light this simple fact: We Americans need to know a whole lot more about Muslims and their religion." On that we can agree.

When naïfs like Rabbi Nancy say we need to know more about Islam, they mean the Hans Christian Andersen (religion-of-peace-and-tolerance, jihad means a spiritual struggle) version, which bears no

relation to the real thing.

Today, Islam is the greatest threat to the survival of the Jewish people, both in Israel and the Diaspora. Besides the Jewish state being in the sights of nuclear-armed Iran, the Palestinians make no secret that establishing Jihadistan in the West Bank and Gaza will be a step toward the obliteration of the rest of what Islamicists call the Zionist entity.

From the meanest mosque in Gaza to the Grand Mosque of Mecca—from Muslim heads of state to imams on Egyptian television—anti-Semitic propaganda and agitation comes almost exclusively from the Muslim world.

Ahmadinejad's response to threats by a Florida pastor to burn a Koran? It's a Zionist conspiracy. ("The Koran burning will bring about Israel's annihilation."). Hasn't he heard of liberal Jews' campaign to counter Islamophobia?

The late Saudi King Faisal gave copies of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* to his guests. Outside of religious texts, *Mein Kampf* is one of the most popular books in the Arab world.

When he met with John Paul II in 2001, Syrian President Bashar al-Assad informed the Pope that Jews "try to kill the principles of all religions with the same mentality with which they betrayed Jesus Christ."

In a 2003 address to the Organization of the Islamic Conference (the most powerful body in the Muslim world), former Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad said "Jews rule the world by proxy. They get others to fight for them." Earlier this year, Mohammad revealed that the Jews of Europe had "always been a problem." That's why "they had to be confined to ghettos and periodically massacred. But they still remained, they thrived... held whole governments to ransom." Eventually, he'll get around to blaming the Jews for global warming. ("They poisoned the ozone layer.")

And how were Mahathir Mohamad's earlier remarks received by the representatives of 57 Muslim countries which comprise the Organization of the Islamic Conference? Not a word of dissent. "Very correct" and "A very wise assessment" were typical responses.

Speaking on Egypt's Al-Nas TV on December 29, 2009, Muslim cleric Muhammad Hussein Yaaqub warned his fellow religion-of-peaceniks: "The Jews are our enemies. Allah will annihilate them at our hands. This is something we know for certain." There followed a recitation of the Koran's kill-the-Jews verses. The Koran—that's, you know, the book they study in mosques.

Morton Klein, National President of the Zionist Organization of America, puts it succinctly: "Hatred of

Ahmadinejad's response to threats by a Florida pastor to burn a Koran? It's a Zionist conspiracy. Hasn't he heard of liberal Jews' campaign to counter Islamophobia?

Jews is widespread throughout the Muslim world. It is taught in the schools and preached in the mosques.”

This torrent of Jew-hatred is acted upon—regularly, and in the most horrific ways.

- While the Jewish left was having its emergency summit to combat Islamophobia, Hamas gunmen ambushed a car on the outskirts of Hebron, killing four Jewish residents of Bet Haggai, including a pregnant woman. After riddling the car with bullets from their automatic weapons, the assassins approached the vehicle and shot its passengers at point-blank range. When contacted by *The Weekly Standard*, Imam’s Rauf’s Park51 group refused to comment on the murders. (“We are an apolitical community center. Please allow us that respect.”). In Gaza, meanwhile, 3,000 peace-loving Palestinians, the left’s favorite victims, took to the streets to celebrate the slaughter of pregnant Jewish women.

- In signing the Daniel Pearl Press Freedom Act in May, President Obama (who has pledged to fight what he calls misrepresentations of Islam) blathered, “Obviously, the loss of Daniel Pearl was one of those moments that captured the world’s imagination, because it reminded us of how valuable a free press is”—as if Pearl was John Peter Zenger. Daniel Pearl was ritualistically murdered because he was a Jew (a confession he was forced to make on tape, before his head was sawed off) not because he was a journalist. Videotapes of the atrocity were a hot-selling item throughout the Muslim world.

- From an Islamic perspective, killing a Jew is good—but torturing him to death is a special treat. When Ilan Halimi, a Parisian Jew, was kidnapped by a Muslim street gang calling itself “the Barbarians,” he was tortured over the course of three weeks. Flesh was cut from his body. He was burned with acid and cigarettes. Finally, flammable liquid was poured over Halimi and he was set on fire. When the police found him, he had burns over 80% of his body. But don’t ask Imam Rauf to condemn this atrocity. He’s “not a politician,” and “terrorism is a very complex issue.”

- When Muslim terrorists of the Lashkar-e-Taiba attacked Mumbai in December 2008, they spe-

cifically targeted the few Jews in the city. After seizing the Mumbai Chabad House, they murdered Rabbi Gavriel Noach Holtzberg and his wife, Rivka (pregnant six months), but not before they were brutally tortured. A mortician who examined the bodies said he was “traumatized.”

- Closer to home, in 1994, a Lebanese cab driver opened fire on a van carrying Hasidic students on the Brooklyn Bridge, killing a 15-year-old. In 2002, a permanent U.S. resident from Egypt opened fire at the EL Al ticket counter at LAX, fatally shooting an airline security officer. In 2006, Naveed Afzal Haq killed a woman and wounded five others at the Jewish Federation building in Seattle. In 2009, four Muslim converts were arrested for plotting to blow up two New York-area synagogues. At their arraignment, Asst. U.S. Attorney Eric Snyder said, “These were people who were eager to bring death to Jews.” The foregoing scratches the surface.

By all means, let us have more mosques in the United States, more Saudi-trained imams, more spokesmen for “moderate” Islam like Imam Rauf, and more spiritual strugglers like the Muslim shrink at Ft. Hood who killed 13 of his fellow soldiers in cold blood. Why should Europeans have all the fun?

Liberals are naturally unstable. The Jewish left’s latest craze—monitoring opposition to the construction of mosques, speaking out “more directly against anti-Muslim bigotry”—should land them on a suicide-watch. (Keep sharp objects away from them. Confiscate belts and shoelaces.)

In the midst of a world war against Jews, Jewish liberals want to ensure that no one is mean to the pogromists’ cheering section and recruiting center. Islam is the religion of peace they cry, as Jewish families bury the victims of peace.

Saperstein, Rabbi Nancy, Foxman and friends—call them the Society for Voluntary Jewish Extinction.

Don Feder is a former Boston Herald writer who is now a political/communications consultant. He also maintains his own website, DonFeder.com.

The Shmuel Katz website provides a searchable archive of his articles and a weekly blog by David Isaac applying Shmuel’s insights to current events.



AFSI Books (postage included in price)

The Jewish Wars—Reflections By One Of The Belligerents by Edward Alexander—special price: \$10.00.

The Aaronsohn Saga by Shmuel Katz—special price: \$15:00

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

It's the Jihad, Stupid

Ruth King

Israel's "settlers" are often described as "Jewish, ultra-orthodox, right wing, messianic, fanatics." Contrast this with the description of Israel's Arab antagonists. Even terrorists are "militant, radicalized, frustrated, displaced, occupied and disenfranchised." No mention that they are Muslims or of the Koranic-driven hatred which informs their unrelenting war against any sovereign Jewish presence within what they view as the Moslem Arabian Caliphate.

Many of Israel's stalwart supporters, in their zeal to reach an illusory peace, brush aside the bitter history of Islamic hatred of Jews. This air-brushing has a long history. Orientalists (among whom Jews played a prominent role) wove romantic fables of a great and golden era of Arab/Moslem/Jewish comity.

Who remembers that in January 1956, under the regime of supposedly secular nationalist Gamal Abdel Nasser, the Grand Mufti of Egypt Sheikh Hasan Ma'moun issued the Fatwa of Al-Azhar? It was reprinted in full in Egypt's leading government-controlled paper *Al-Ahram*. It pulled no punches:

"Jews have taken a part of Palestine and there established their non-Islamic government and have also evacuated from that part most of its Muslim inhabitants...It is the duty of the Muslims therein to repulse the attack by force until the country has been liberated and restored to the Muslim owners. In this case the Jihad is the duty of all Muslims, not just those who can undertake it. And since all Islamic countries constitute the abode of every Muslim, the Jihad is imperative for both the Muslims inhabiting the territory attacked and Muslims everywhere else because even though some sections have not been attacked directly, the attack nevertheless took place on a part of the Muslim territory which is a legitimate residence for any Muslim.

"Muslims cannot conclude peace with those Jews who have usurped the territory of Palestine and attacked its people and their property in any manner which allows the Jews to continue as a state in that sacred Muslim territory...they should exert every effort until the country is purified from the vestiges of those aggressors and despots....Everyone knows that from the early days of Islam to the present day the Jews have been plotting against Islam and Muslims and the Islamic homeland."

That's bracing isn't it? And it was written months before the Sinai War, during a period when no Jews lived in the "West Bank" and Jordan was busy trashing and desecrating a Jew-free East Jerusalem.

Fast forward to the Hamas Charter, Articles 7 and 15 which also could not be more specific: Here's Article 7: "The Day of Judgment will not come about until Moslems fight the Jews (killing the Jews), when the Jew will hide behind stones and trees. The stones and trees will say O Moslems, O Abdulla, there is a

Jew behind me, come and kill him." And here is Article 15: "The day that enemies usurp part of Moslem land, jihad becomes the individual duty of every Moslem. In face of the Jews' usurpation of Palestine, it is compulsory that the banner of jihad be raised."

Not one Moslem nation has denounced the Hamas charter. None of the cheerleaders for the "peace process" mention it. The war is a "conflict" over 2000 square miles rather than one side's effort to wipe out the other side under the banner of Islam.

Prophet and scholar Bat Ye'or, who predicted Islamic subjugation of Europe in what she called Eurabia, explained the basis of the Arab war against the Jews of Palestine:

"Israel represents the successful national liberation of a *dhimmi* civilization. On a territory formerly Arabized by the jihad and the *dhimma*, a pre-Islamic language, culture, topographical geography, and national institutions have been restored to life. This reversed the process of centuries in which the cultural, social and political structures of the indigenous population of Palestine were destroyed. In 1974, Abu Iyad, second-in-command to Arafat in the Fatah hierarchy, announced: 'We intend to struggle so that our Palestinian homeland does not become a new Andalusia.' The comparison of Andalusia to Palestine was not fortuitous since both countries were Arabized, and then de-Arabized by a pre-Arabic culture."

In 1954, Bernard Lewis, considered by many to be the greatest living scholar of Islam, in a lecture entitled "Communism and Islam" [*International Affairs*, Jan. 1954], noted:

"Both offer an exhilarating feeling of mission, of purpose, of being engaged in a collective adventure to accelerate the historically inevitable victory of the true faith over the infidel evil-doers. The traditional Islamic division of the world into the House of Islam and the House of War, two necessarily opposed groups, of which the first has the collective obligation of perpetual struggle against the second, also has obvious parallels in the Communist view of world affairs. There again, the content of belief is utterly different, but the aggressive fanaticism of the believer is the same."

Again, in 1976, before Camp David and many years before Oslo, Lewis, in an article on the jihad being waged against the Christians of Lebanon, focused on the neglected role of Islam: "We are prepared to allow religiously defined conflicts to religious eccentrics...but to admit that an entire civilization can have religion as its primary loyalty is too much...This is reflected in the present inability, political, journalistic, and scholarly alike, to recognize the importance of the factor of religion in the current affairs of the Muslim world...If our political, journalistic, and scholarly 'elites' ever arrive at this understanding, perhaps they will grasp the accompanying vocabulary of the Muslim

combatants and their spokespersons, in the context of the jihad against Israel. 'Resistance' means a genocidal jihad, whose 'justice' amounts to the violent restoration and forcible maintenance of *dhimmitude* for those surviving Jews (and Christians) in a vanquished Israel."

How then could Lewis have endorsed Camp David and Oslo, the "hudnas" (temporary truces) between Israel and its enemies? Could he truly have believed that Muslims would abandon the genocidal jihad, shelve Moslem ideology and centuries of anti-Semitism to accommodate a "two state solution?" Did he not fear a return to *dhimmitude*? Perhaps not.

Here is what Lewis had to say on the subject of *dhimmitude*:

"The *dhimma* on the whole worked well. The non-Muslims managed to thrive under Muslim rule, and even to make significant contributions to Islamic civilization. The restrictions were not onerous, and were usually less severe in practice than in theory. As long as the non-Muslim communities accepted and conformed to the status of tolerated subordination assigned to them, they were not troubled."

Ann Lambton, a scholar who co-edited studies on Islam with Lewis, had a very different view:

"As individuals, the *dhimmis* possessed no rights. Citizenship was limited to Muslims; and because of the superior status of the Muslim, certain juristic restrictions were imposed on the *dhimmi*....The humiliating regulations to which [*dhimmis*] were subject as regards their dress and conduct in public were not, however, nearly so serious as their moral subjection, the imposition of the poll tax, and their legal dis-

abilities. They were, in general, made to feel that they were beyond the pale." (*State and Government in Medieval Islam*, Oxford, 1981).

Why did Lewis champion the myth of Islamic "democracy" and coexistence with the Jewish people? Speaking at a conference in December 2007 entitled "Fighting for Democracy in the Islamic World" he made this remarkable claim: "The authoritarianism present in the Middle East is not part of Arab and Muslim tradition, but has been imported from Europe."

Because Bernard Lewis is trusted and, in fact, revered, he could have warned Israel and its supporters to avoid the suicidal concessions that have led to the present impasse. But, for unfathomable reasons, he took the road more travelled by the multiculturalists and appeasers. Many years later, when the damage was done, Lewis called Oslo "a mistake." No explanation.

In an earlier *Outpost*, I wrote words with greater validity than ever. "Geography has dictated that Israel lives in the belly of the Moslem Arab beast and because of its large and potentially seditious Arab population, the beast also lives in Israel's belly. The failure to understand jihad is Israel's most colossal—it may well be fatal—blunder."

For the foregoing material and research I am indebted to Dr. Andrew Bostom, whose The Legacy of Islamic Anti-Semitism-From Sacred Texts to Solemn History is the essential text in the study of Islamic hatred of Jews. The great scholar of Churchill, Martin Gilbert, has recently written a history of Jews in the Islamic world in Ishmael's House. He calls Bostom's book "a fascinating and disturbing voyage of historical discovery...It is magnificent." •