
OUTPOST



December 2011—Issue #249

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

41st Year of Publication

Table of Contents		
Editorial – Code Red: Iran	William Mehlman	Page 2
From The Editor	Rael Jean Isaac	Page 3
A Third Miracle	Rita Kramer	Page 5
A View From The Arab Spring	Haim Hariri	Page 7
Condemned By Their Own Press Releases	Rael Jean Isaac	Page 11
Norway Embraces Islamist Tyranny	Bruce Bawer	Page 13
More on AFSI Apaté Awards, 2011	Steven Plaut	Page 16
It's Highly Debatable	Ruth King	Page 18

Code Red: Iran

William Mehlman

“The era of procrastination, half measures, soothing and baffling expediency delays is coming to a close,” Winston Churchill wrote in witness to Adolf Hitler’s brazen 1936 remilitarization of the Rhineland. “In its place, we are entering a period of consequences.”

With the release of the UN International Atomic Energy Agency’s umptieth report on Iran’s passionate pursuit of an atomic bomb—a 1,000-page indictment replete with everything from satellite footage of the steel containers required for nuclear explosives testing to interviews with renegade scientists employed in transitioning Teheran from uranium enrichment to bomb assembly—Western civilization has clearly arrived at another “period of consequences.”

The 1936 response to those consequences – “soothing and baffling expediency delays” ending in 30 million deaths, a fifth of them Jewish, and the devastation of a continent—is being replicated 75 years later, with the Jews, this time in the person of Israel, reprising their roles as coal mine canaries. Over the last 12 months, Iran has enriched 4.5 tons of uranium, more than a third of its entire stockpile. With a little further enrichment—a largely mechanical process at this juncture—the Teheran regime will be in possession of enough fissionable material for three or four nuclear bombs. The technology for arming and firing an actual warhead may still be a year to 18 months beyond its grasp, but if Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei means to stand by his assertion that “the only solution to the Middle East problem is the destruction and annihilation of the Jewish state,” then he has the material at hand for the realization of that objective.



Bret Stephens, in an illuminating discourse on the IAEA report in the *Wall Street Journal* under the heading “Now for a real Iran debate,” makes the point that such a debate needs first to “abandon the conceit that there is a ‘third way’ between allowing Iran’s nuclear drive to proceed effectively unhindered or to use military force to stop it.” There is no “diplomatic grand bargain” in the offing with Teheran, as even Barack Obama must be ready to concede by now. Secondly, Stephens submits, any realistic debate on Iran must perforce recognize that “time is no longer on the West’s side. Further temporizing on our choice of evils means that Iran will get to make the choices for us.” As night follows day, Stephens predicts, the West will find that its “procrastination and half measures” have triggered a “nuclear death spiral involving Saudi Arabia, Turkey and soon-to-be-Islamist Egypt. If you think the Cold War was scary,” he warns, “imagine four or five nuclear adversaries in the world’s most unstable region, each of them at daggers drawn with one another.”

If there is anything more execrable than the West’s failure to act against this budding apocalypse, it is the mixture of delusion, deceit and duplicity behind which it attempt to conceal that failure.

Secretary of State Clinton is reported to be in deep consultation with America’s allies on “further steps” to pressure Teheran, but the report stopped short of specifying the “steps” under consideration. They will almost assuredly not include the one sanction that just might get Ali Khamenei’s serious attention, namely, a frontal assault on the Central Bank of Iran (CBI). There’s a bipartisan bill in the House of Representatives that would compel the White House to clamp the cuffs on the CBI if it were determined that the bank was funding terrorism, nuclear weapons development or Iran’s Islamic Revolutionary Guard. A similar bi-partisan bill is being put together in the Senate.

In assigning Treasury Department Undersecretary for Financial Intelligence David S. Cohen the task of convincing America’s European partners to back a hit on the CBI, effectively shutting the spigot on Iran’s oil exports, the White House appeared to be moving in step with the Congress. But appearances proved highly deceiving. In an about face that left even the normally cheer-leading

Washington Post gasping for breath, the administration dropped its case for sanctioning the CBI with the excuse that eliminating Iran's oil from Western markets would play havoc with the global economy. To which the *Washington Post* replied: "If Iran is to be stopped without the use of military force, the president and the country should be willing to bear some economic pain. The alternative—allowing Teheran to go forward—would be far more costly."

Where deceit is concerned, the prize for public opposition to a nuclear Iran and private financial aid toward that objective must go to Germany. Even as Chancellor Angela Merkel was drum-beating her determination to impose more stringent sanctions on the Islamic republic in the wake of the IAEA revelations, the Marriott Hotel in Hamburg was hosting an "Iran Business Forum" to "jumpstart [German] investment in northwest Iran."

Adamantly opposed to sanctions of any kind on Teheran, Russia's duplicitous, albeit losing effort to prevent the dissemination of the IAEA report can be even better understood in light of revelations that "renegade" Russian nuclear scientists have been in the pay of Teheran for years, instructing their Iranian counterparts on fabricating the high precision detonators essential to triggering a nuclear chain reaction.

Given Mr. Obama's laser-like focus on another four years to "transform" America, he could probably lock up a second term with a U.S. Air Force strike on Iran or a combined U.S.-Israel Air Force operation, cleaning Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's nuclear clock in considerably less than 24 hours. Bye, bye everybody's worst nightmare. The possibility can't be ruled out, but banking on it would be giving hostages to wishful thinking. "While we might aspire to a situation where the righteous work will be done by others," Strategic Affairs Minister and former IDF Chief of General Staff Moshe Ya'alon declared in a recent interview with Israel Army Radio, "Israel must act as if it can depend on nobody to protect it from the Iranian threat but itself."

Those, chiefly in the media, but also among some mainly retired IDF brass, who contend that the price of destroying or derailing Iran's nuclear locomotive is too high, would do well to take a second look at a national poll just released showing that 11 percent of Israelis (600,000 Israeli Jews) would seriously consider leaving the country were Iran to cross the nuclear weapons threshold. What do the nuclear Iran "containment" supporters imagine that 11 percent figure might look like the moment Iran tested its first bomb? Think double, maybe triple, maybe who knows. The point being that Khamenei and his deranged front-man, Ahmadinejad, don't have to drop the bomb. Their mere possession of it could precipitate a massive flight out of Israel.

Given the total failure of the sanctions regime, a preemptive Israeli strike against Iran's nuclear death factories looks like a no-brainer compared to the estimated 1.5 million casualties IDF Research and Development projects would result from an atomic bomb or missile warhead hitting Gush Dan, including greater Tel-Aviv. It is to choose life, however high the cost, over the pit and the pendulum. That's what the Bible reports God advising the Israelites to do, as they stood between Gerizim and Evel, respectively the mountains of life and death. (Deut 30:19)

Choose life. It's still sounds like a pretty good idea.

From the Editor

Israel Develops Cancer Vaccine

In a breakthrough development, Israeli company Vaxil BioTherapeutics has come up with a cancer vaccine, now in clinical trials at Hadassah University Medical Center in Jerusalem. While it is being tested against a specific cancer—multiple myeloma—if it works, its technology could be applied to 90% of all cancers, including prostate and breast cancer, solid and non-solid tumors.

Julian Levy, the company's CFO, explains that in cancer the immune system doesn't know how to protect itself, as it does against an infection or virus. That's because cancer cells are the body's own cells gone wrong. In addition, a cancer patient has a depressed immune system, caused both by the illness and the treatment. The trick is to activate the compromised immune system to mobilize against the threat.

While a traditional vaccine helps the immune system fend off foreign invaders and is given to people not yet sick, Vaxil's vaccine is given to sick people and works more like a drug. Its lead product ImMucin destroys cells that display a specific marker called MUC1 found only on cancer cells. Since they don't attack any cells without MUC1, there are no side effects. ImMucin is seen as a long term strategy—a shot every few months—to prevent a recurrence by ensuring the patient's own immune system keeps the cancer cells under control.

If this vaccine fulfills its promise, will the morally dead Boycotters and Divesters of Israeli products try to block this life-giving drug from reaching cancer patients world-wide?

Harassing Israeli Patriots

Israeli authorities have adopted a sickening double standard in which they tolerate incitement (and worse) against Israel but not legitimate protests by patriotic Israelis. Two recent examples:

Rabbi David Druckman, chief rabbi of the city of Kiryat Motzkin north of Haifa, was hauled in for questioning by police over a letter he, and a number of other rabbis, signed over three years ago opposing employment of Arabs. It was written in the immediate aftermath of the 2008 massacre in the Mercaz HaRav yeshiva in Jerusalem when an Arab terrorist, who had worked as a driver at the yeshiva, murdered eight students and seriously injured many more. Druckman told Arutz Sheva that questioning a rabbi for signing a letter is "unreal," and that he told his police would-be interrogators that he would only cooperate if the police also questioned former Mossad chief Ephraim Halevy who recently said Israel's hareidi-religious Jews are "a bigger existential threat to Israel than Iran and Ahmadinejad" and also questioned "those academics who incite against the State of Israel and against the Jews."

Y (his name is being kept confidential) was surfing on Facebook when he came across a post by far-leftist Dorit Eldar, a lecturer at Tel Aviv University, who complained that several weeks ago she and her friends were blocking the entrance to the Jewish village of Anatot and IDF soldiers conducted what she termed "a pogrom" against her. Y replied to her posting that it was illegal to prevent people from entering their homes.

Y tells what happened next: "Two days later I was in my car when suddenly I got a call from the police asking me to come for questioning. I said I was on my way and I never even thought it had anything to do with what I wrote on Facebook. Seconds after I got off the phone with them I was blocked by a police car that stopped me for questioning. They interrogated me for two hours."

While he was at the police station, detectives went to his home and confiscated his personal computer and cellular phone. Y, who served three years in the IDF, said he does not understand why he was arrested while extreme leftists who speak against IDF soldiers and incite against Jewish residents of Judea and Samaria, are not detained. "I am deeply hurt that the State of Israel is acting against people who truly love the country. It's a disgrace."

Blood Oil

There has been a successful campaign in the West against the sale of "blood diamonds," those that are mined in a war zone and sold to finance an insurgency. EthicalOil.org, a grassroots advocacy organization, has seized upon this principle to advocate the use of "ethical oil" from Canada's oil sands in place of conflict oil from the world's most oppressive regimes. This is an especially adroit strategy

given the moral posturing of assorted global warming fanatics who denounce oil sands for their evil "emissions" without paying any mind to the fact that the alternative is oil with equally wicked "emissions" from oppressive societies whose behavior the West enables by its purchase of that oil.

Saudi Arabia is not amused. Kathryn Marshall, spokesperson for EthicalOil, reports that the Saudis are trying to block the airing of their ads in Canada through "lawfare." The ad first aired in August on the Canadian version of the Oprah Winfrey Network. In September EthicalOil discovered that Saudi Arabia, through Norman Rose, its multinational law firm, tried to revoke the ad's Canadian broadcast clearance. Marshall now plans to expand the campaign to the United States to show Americans, she says, "just how far the Saudi dictatorship is willing to go to keep North America dependent on Saudi oil imports." (We are indebted for this to Diana West's blog of Nov. 15.)

"Secular" Tunisia

Tunisia was supposed to be the success story of the Arab spring, with its reportedly secular, relatively well educated population and largely peaceful revolution. Even the victory in the elections of the Islamist party Ennahda scarcely disturbed Western complacency: it was pronounced a "moderate" Islamic party.

It's looking less moderate by the day. In November Ennahda invited Houda Naim, a Hamas member of the Palestinian Legislative Council in Gaza, to speak at a rally in Sousse, a coastal Tunisian city—the first time a member of Hamas had addressed the Tunisian public. Ennahda's general secretary Hammadi Jebali, expected to become Tunisia's next Prime Minister, declared the occasion "a divine moment in a new state, and in, hopefully, a sixth Caliphate." Jabali also echoed Naim's words, declaring "The liberation of Tunisia will, God willing, bring about the liberation of Jerusalem."

A Third Miracle

Rita Kramer

At sunset on the evening of December 20 Jews everywhere will light the first candle of Chanukah, the festival that commemorates two miracles—and may perhaps foresee a third. The first was the victory of a small band of Jews, led by Judah Maccabee and his brothers, over an army of Hellenists that vastly outnumbered them.

The attempt to replace the monotheistic religion of the Jews with the pagan rites of the Greeks had been defeated by a small guerilla army willing to face death rather than abandon their faith.

The second miracle took place when the victorious Judeans set about rededicating the temple, which had been defiled by their enemies. They found only one small jug of ritually pure oil, just enough to keep the menorah alight for a single day. Yet the candles burned for the entire eight days until more consecrated oil could be found.

Through the centuries that followed the Maccabean victory in 162 BCE, the 25th day of Kislev in the Hebrew calendar has begun the eight-day Festival of Lights, encompassing such traditions as potato latkes fried in oil, games played with a spinning dreidl, and gifts of money or Chanukah gelt.

In my own mid-twentieth-century childhood we few Jewish children in a midwestern urban neighborhood thought of Chanukah as a sort of consolation prize. With the best of intentions our parents' efforts to dramatize the holiday could not compete with the ubiquitous Christmas trees, the window decorations, the department store Santas, the carols and the Christmas music that seemed to be playing everywhere, from silly pop songs to oratorios. And we gave little thought—either because it

was not explained or because we were not listening—to the reason why the lit menorah was placed on a window sill. It made, I thought, a nice reflection, kind of a double set of flames.

In the years that followed, unimaginable meaning came to be associated with flames as nightmare horrors became the fate of the Jews in the countries from which our parents had come, leaving behind families they would never see again. Perhaps to keep their memories alive, we began to attach more importance to repeating the rituals that had bound Jewish families together for centuries. The Seder took on deeper meaning and the Chanukah lights symbolized the hope for the victory of light over darkness.

With the end of the war against the Jews and the establishment of the State of Israel there was reason to hope for an age of light and yet today once again the old forces of darkness, wrapped in new robes, threaten the remaining Jews in their midst.

From Norway down through the map of Europe pockets of intolerance bloom into hatred as once again Jews feel unwanted, unprotected.

It is time for a third miracle. for what seemed to me promised when as a little girl I sang a song most of the words of which I still remember after more than half a century:

He Struck the traitor to the earth,
He raised his sword that all might see.
His voice rang like a battle cry,
All who are faithful follow me!
From near and far all Israel came,
They rallied to his battle cry,
They prayed unto the God of peace
And for their faith went forth to die.
To die, and yet today they live
Far down the centuries? flowing sea,
That upraised sword, that battle cry,
(pause)
All who are faithful follow me!

A Sunday school song for children, trite and hardly literary, but still with the power to move me (especially after that pause). What did it mean? Not only that a fighter named Judas Maccabee had led his small band of followers to a victory against the forces that would rob them of their beliefs but that the faithful would persist, would continue on against the odds.

Those odds seem to be increasing again, and in many communities the injunction to place the menorah in the window in order to make public the miracle no longer seems like a good idea. Better to keep it inside.

Judah Maccabee, where are you now that we need you?



Among Rita Kramer's books are Flames in the Field: The Story of Four SOE Agents in Occupied France and the novel When Morning Comes.

A View From the Arab Spring, Towards the Following Summer

Haim Harari

The phrase “Arab Spring” is a surprisingly appropriate description of current events in the Arab world. It relates not only to the awakening of anger and to the desire for change by the Arab masses, but also to the lack of understanding of the circumstances, by most European and American observers.

Winter in New York, London or Berlin is often accompanied by a mild depression. It is a period when nothing blooms, very little remains green, sunshine is rare and most birds are gone. And then comes the spring, when everything begins to blossom, warmth returns, birds are chirping and life restarts. Alas, in most of the Arab world, winter is a pleasant period relative to what comes next. The winter temperature is quite comfortable and the sun often shines. When spring arrives, the heat returns, heralding an unbearable summer, without one drop of water and a harsh and dry brown-yellow land. The little that was partly green, during the winter, is gone. Indeed, “The Arab Spring” inevitably leads to a difficult and unpleasant summer. The metaphor reflects not only what it purports to describe, but also the mentality gap between its Western authors and the real situation.

Many of the demonstrators in the streets of Tunis, Cairo and Damascus were truly fed up with the corrupt dictators, lack of democracy and absence of freedom. Indeed, democracy is long overdue in the Arab world. But democracy and freedom are not trivial concepts. Democracy is not removing the Shah of Iran and replacing him by a cruel Ayatollah regime. Democracy is not removing the Russian Tsar and replacing him by Stalin and democracy is not electing Hitler. Democracy is not even just an honest election, once every four years. None of the above guarantee the rule of law, freedom of speech, free press, proper judicial system, equality for women, fair treatment of minorities, freedom of religion, equal opportunity and social mobility, to quote just a few basic ingredients of a real democracy.

Achieving any of the above in a society in which all significant organized forces are hostile to each of these concepts, and in which the majority of women are illiterate, cannot happen through street demonstrations. Successful protests in such countries are as good as pressing a “restart” button on a machine which can be controlled, at present, only by one of three previously existing forces. And, if all of these forces are hostile to every single element of democracy, the Arab Spring will indeed lead to a long and harsh summer.



There are 22 Arab states from the west end of North Africa to the Gulf. They are as diverse as the 27 member states of the European Union. Like the EU they have a dominant common religion, coming in two major flavors, and numerous variants for each flavor. Like Europe, they have substantial ethnic and religious minorities and many arbitrary national borders. But, at the same time, all or most Arab states have many things in common. Not last among these features is the total absence of democracy, by any definition that is even remotely acceptable by Western standards.

At the risk of oversimplification, we might observe that, in every Arab country, in different forms and at various levels, there are at most three major organized types of political forces: First, “Royalty” of one sort or another, supported by the military-police-intelligence complex; Second, fanatic political Islam, Sunni or Shiite; and third, tribal forces and rivalries or organized ethnic minorities. In some Arab countries, one of these three types of forces is partly missing. In others, one of the forces appears in more than one flavor (for instance, the extremist Sunni and Shiite Islamic groups in Iraq or in Lebanon).

The first and, until the current “Spring”, the dominant organized force is the military, coupled with the police, intelligence services and related bodies, supporting a ruler, who is either a King (Saudi Arabia, Morocco, Jordan), a Sultan (Oman), an Emir (Kuwait, Qatar, UAE), or a “non-royal quasi-

monarch” who is, in some sense, royalty without a crown (Assad, Ghaddafi, Mubarak). In several cases, the ruling military-backed regime is also tribal or sectarian, controlled by a well defined minority of the population (the Alawites in Syria, the Bedouins in Jordan and the Sunnis in Bahrain).

The second force is extreme political Islam, Sunni or Shiite. The Sunni version is usually the Muslim Brothers or variations on its themes, and the Shiite version is largely inspired, if not directly guided, by Iran’s Ayatollahs, who have an active hand in much of the tumult in the Arab world. Iran and Turkey are, of course, Muslim but not Arab. However, both interfere in a variety of ways in the upheaval of the “Arab Spring”. In a full analogy to a kingdom, which has a king, a prime minister and an army, political Islam is often organized in three layers: the “military wing”, which might be a strong organized force like the revolutionary guard in Iran, or the Hizbullah in Lebanon; the “political wing”, which pretends to be the real leadership but has only limited influence; and the “spiritual leader” who is the actual dictatorial ruler, approximately equivalent to an absolute King, although he is always pretending to play the role of a religious scholar and he never stands for election.



The third force is the old tribal structure, based on family or clan loyalty and surviving in the 21st century in a way of life not unlike that of several centuries ago. Somali, Yemen and, to a large extent Libya, are countries in which such allegiances are extremely strong and tribal forces must be reckoned with. In other countries various private armies may belong to specific religious or ethnic groups, rather than to tribes. This is the case with the Druze in

Lebanon and the Kurds in Iraq.

Needless to say, not every Arab country has significant versions of all of these three forces. Egypt’s dominant forces are, even now, the military and the Islamists, with no other visible organized force, except for the Bedouin tribes in the Sinai. Bahrain has the Sunni monarch and the Iranian inspired Shiite majority. Iraq has Shiite Islamists and secular Shiites, Sunnis of all flavors, Kurds of rival political factions and other smaller minorities. Saudi Arabia exhibits an intricate cooperation of Sunni Islamists, royalty and the military, and, in addition, an awakening Shiite minority, concentrated in the rich northeast oil area of the kingdom. Tunis was a secular dictatorship and Qatar is pursuing a veiled Muslim Brotherhood agenda, while serving as a main American military base.

Such are some of the paradoxes and complexities of the Arab world. There are also Sunni Brothers supported by Shiite fanatics, like the Hamas, which is the Palestinian version of the Muslim Brothers, strongly supported and supplied by its Iranian sponsors.

But almost nowhere in the Arab world can we find any significant organized force, other than the above three dominant flavors: The military based monarchy (or quasi-monarchy), the Islamic extremists and the tribal forces. In particular, there is nowhere in sight a substantial organized force pushing for real democracy. There are individuals, active in weak political parties or in street demonstrations, cheering for democracy. But, whenever one of the three major traditional forces is toppled, its place is taken by another element of this unholy trinity, or by a different version of the same type of force. No street demonstration, facebook driven enterprise or democracy seeking educated youngsters, can change this fact.

A formal election day, in any such country, even if no irregularities are taking place, must inevitably lead to a victory of one of the above, usually the Islamic option. The uneducated rural masses, numerous illiterate voters and even educated, frustrated and hateful young adults are easily incited and influenced by the preachers, and the mosques are the focal points of “guided enlightenment”. Since the Islamic extremists are often the only counterforce to the cruel dictator, they will usually be the winners, if one of the three dominant forces is to be replaced by another.

Even before the “Arab Spring” the Islamists won the election in Algeria, only to be undemocratically toppled by the military. Hamas won the Palestinian election in Gaza and the municipal election in the Palestinian West Bank, and Tunis, a largely secular country with a relatively liberal tradition, has now voted an Islamic party into power. It is clear that, in Egypt, the only force that can replace the military are the Muslim Brothers and any other option is a wishful unrealistic illusion. If the King of Bahrain is removed, an Iranian-inspired theocracy will replace him and, after the American departure, a similar fate is probably waiting for predominantly Shiite Iraq. The most likely replacement of Assad, if he ever ceases to butcher his own citizens, is again an extreme Islamic Sunni group ruling predominantly secular Syria.

On the other hand, in Libya and Yemen, and probably also in the Gulf States, the leading counterweight to royalty and quasi-royalty are the tribal elements. It will be interesting to see whether Libya will now fall in the hands of fanatic Islamists or into an inter-tribal civil war. Neither alternative resembles a beautiful spring, and a third option does not seem to be in the cards. Lebanon, created by the colonial powers as a Christian enclave, is already largely in the hands of the Shiite Islamists and Qatar, an Emirate, is collaborating actively, willingly or under duress, with the Muslim Brothers everywhere, using its *Al Jazeera* as an instrument of propagating unrest.

Most European and American observers, those who think that spring is the beginning of a good period, observe the Islamists through the distorted lenses of Western culture. There are a few truths, which are not transparent to most of these commentators.



The first such truth, which is clear to militant Islam, is that all that is necessary is to incite against the regime and collect the fruits. There are two ways to eat fresh fruits from a tall tree: You may climb a ladder and pick the fruits actively, or you can lie under the tree in the storm and wait for the fruits to fall into your hands, and they will reach you because there is no one else around to enjoy them. Some of them might be rotten, but they will be yours. Even though there are very few fruit trees in the desert, this last option is the one preferred by the Islamic parties. They are always present in the street demonstrations, but they rarely take the lead. They know that an angry demonstrator is a powerful weapon against a military or dictatorial regime, and if the anger prevails, political Islam will win by default and will pick the falling fruits. The Western TV viewer sees secular youth roaming the streets in demonstrations in Cairo or Tunis, with no major visible Islamic influence, and is surprised when suddenly the first post-revolution election leads to an Islamic government.

The second truth is that, once an election is declared, the real movers and shakers, namely the preachers, the Ayatollahs and the “Spiritual Leaders”, will never run for office. They are allegedly selected by God, not elected by people. It is their disciples, sometimes their puppets, invariably wearing more moderate masks, who will run for office. In this way, secular voters, educated women and others are coerced to vote for what will then become a very ugly version of the religion. It is this façade that leads to amazing remarks in Washington such as “the Muslim Brothers in Egypt are not of a uniform extreme nature”.

The third truth is that, once in power, the private armies of extreme Islam are not conventional at all. They are not interested in planes or tanks. Their primary weapon is ruthless terror against civilian populations, and the leading tools are car bombs, explosive devices, suicide murders, rockets and, eventually, perhaps, weapons of mass destruction. We see it in Iraq, in Somali, in the Palestinian areas, and in the Muslim, non-Arab, Afghanistan and Pakistan. The division of labor between the Iranian army and the revolutionary guard, or between the Lebanese army and the Hizbullah, serve as models for Hamas and future Muslim Brotherhood regimes.

The fourth and final truth is that an election of an extremist Islamic regime is not a victory for democracy, even if a real majority voted for it. It is usually the first and last free election in such a country, just as in Fascist or Communist regimes, which are sometimes elected democratically and

perpetuate their totalitarian regime thereafter without regard to any democratic principles or human rights.

Western observers view much of the above with the naïve eyes of those who believe that removing a dictator is a guarantee for freedom, that religious leaders cannot be murderous and that a winning candidate in an election is indeed the real ruler. They also have the illusion that public declarations bear a close relationship to true plans and views. None of these are common practices in the struggle between the two leading undemocratic forces of the Arab world: ruthless kings and dictators and even more ruthless political Islam.

The relation of Israel to the events in the Arab world is entirely asymmetric. Israel, its conflict with the Palestinians and any actions it takes, are either totally irrelevant or have a very minor impact on events in the Arab world. But the scorching Arab Summer that will probably follow the Arab Spring may create serious problems for Israel. It is clear that the protesters in Bahrain, Tunis and Yemen, and even those in Cairo and Damascus, could not care less about the Palestinians and are not spending a minute thinking about Israel.

After the fall of Mubarak, the Egyptian Muslim Brothers tried to mobilize the masses for “a march of a million” against Israel. The attendance was meager and the great march fizzled. This was followed by a fierce attack on the Israeli Embassy, by a relatively small group, with no great visible interest from the demonstrating masses. The protests are entirely an internal affair of each Arab State, with no relation to the Israeli-Palestinian dispute. On the other hand, any power grab by the Muslim Brothers, an organization historically created with the active help of the Nazis, and committed to the annihilation not only of Israel but of the entire Jewish people, will not be good news for Israel. This topic requires a separate analysis, and we will not dwell on it here.

The attitude of the Obama regime has been baffling. One might understand and applaud an idealistic American attitude based on the principles of supporting freedom, justice and democracy everywhere. One could also understand a less honorable, but pragmatic, American policy of supporting its friends in the Arab world, regardless of their attitudes towards freedom and democracy. But there is no explanation, either idealistic or pragmatic, for a policy which works against dictatorial friends of America and does not oppose, in any significant way, dictatorial foes of America.

The Obama government gave a significant boost to Hizbullah during its first months in office, by returning its ambassador to Syria in the midst of a tense election campaign in Lebanon. The U.S. did not utter a word in support of the serious anti-government street demonstrations in non-Arab Iran. The U.S. was active in removing Mubarak in Egypt, sending a shattering message to all its other Arab allies in the region. It reprimanded the pro-American King of Bahrain, host to the main American naval base in the Gulf, who was fighting against Iranian sponsored agitation of his Shiite citizens.

The Obama administration helped to destroy the ruthless Ghadafi, a man who only a few years earlier was elected as the chair of the United Nations Human Rights Commission, and was a “born again” friend of America and the West. On the other hand America did not lift a finger against the murderous Assad. It also did not utter a word when U.S. allies Turkey and Qatar started, immediately after the election of President Obama (and never earlier), to support the terrorist Hamas, which is the Palestinian branch of the Muslim Brothers. The complete American departure from Iraq is a clear invitation to Iran to swallow this Shiite-dominated country, and the Turkish-Iranian coalition seems to be making preparations for marching into the oil rich Kurdish north of Iraq, with not one visible step taken by America or Europe to prevent such a dangerous move.

The excitement about the “first democratic election of the Arab Spring” has already led to the victory of the Islamists in secular Tunis, and that same Arab Spring is now well on its way to a suffocating Islamic summer. But the Western world, and its leader, President Obama, seem oblivious to the direction into which “the Arab Spring” is moving. Following the American treatment of Mubarak, and

the almost absent reaction to Assad, all friends of the West in the Arab world, headed by the Saudi leaders, are now maneuvering in order to distance themselves from the U.S. administration.

Does the Obama government not understand what is happening in the region, or does it understand and support it cheerfully? Both possibilities are mind boggling, and both endanger the entire free world. It is indeed impossible to believe either of these two hypotheses, but it is even more difficult to present a third alternative theory for the American view of evolving events.

When and if the Muslim Brothers win the first "democratic" election in Egypt, the largest Arab country, it is very likely that the "Arab Spring" will officially move into a long and dangerous dry summer, with a significant thirst, hopefully not for blood.

Haim Hariri was president of the Weizmann Institute for Science in Rehovot from 1988 to 2001 and is author A View From The Eye Of The Storm. This appeared in The Weizmann Institute International Policy Forum on November 01, 2011.

Condemned by Their Own Press Releases: Charles Jacobs vs ADL

Rael Jean Isaac

For many years, AFSI has been a sharp critic of the ADL under the leadership of Abraham Foxman, an unworthy replacement of Nathan Perlmutter, who provided the ADL with fine leadership until his untimely death in 1987. For example, in From the Editor, September 2010, we noted: "Unfortunately, the ADL shows no sign of withdrawal from its apparent mission: 'What friend of Israel can we attack today?'"

Now Charles Jacobs, aided by Ilya Feoktistov, has documented the ADL's dismal failure to fulfill its supposed mission to combat the chief sources of anti-Semitism. In November 2011 they released the results of a simple study, analyzing the 4,269 press releases archived on the ADL's website as of February 3, 2010. These spanned 15 years, beginning in 1995. This, Jacobs and Feoktistov note, is a reasonable way to measure the ADL's priorities. Press releases reveal the issues an organization most closely monitors, to which it most rapidly responds and to which it seeks to call public attention. Moreover in the case of the ADL, press releases are a huge portion of the organization's published material.

Feoktistov and Jacobs found that only 1.3% of the ADL's press releases focused on Islamic extremism and another 1.3% on Arab anti-Semitism. Most remarkable of all, of the 57 press releases devoted to Islamic extremism, 22 were issued in 1996, with only 13 issued in the ten years since September 11, 2001, this in the years when the threat to Jews from Islamic extremism dramatically increased. Indeed, in 2011, up to the time the study was released, the ADL had issued not a single press release on Islamic extremism.

An additional 5% of the ADL's press releases were on "terrorism" but that didn't necessarily mean anti-Jewish or anti-Western terrorism. Included in this category were denunciations of Jewish "terrorists" (e.g. ADL Applauds FBI for Arrest of JDL Leader Irv Rubin for Alleged Acts of Terrorism") and press releases expressing concern over a possible backlash against Muslims due to Islamic terrorism.

If Arab anti-Semitism and Islamic extremism were of trivial concern, what did the Anti Defamation League believe were the really important issues for an organization concerned with combating defamation of Jews? Of the ADL's press releases, 30.5% were devoted to social justice, as defined of course by the "progressive left." That included gay rights ("ADL Dismayed at Supreme Court Decision Allowing Boy Scouts to Discriminate Against Gays), abortion rights ("ADL Disappointed with Supreme Court Ruling on Partial Birth Abortion Act"), gun control ("ADL Disappointed in Supreme Court

Decision on Gun Rights", even rights for Guantanamo Bay terror detainees (ADL Urges Supreme Court to Preserve Due Process Rights of Guantanamo Bay Detainees"). A whopping 37.8% of press releases were devoted to the traditional sources of anti-Semitism, Nazism and Christian theology. Satirist Mark Steyn is particularly scathing on the preoccupation of people like Foxman with the occasional neo-Nazi, what Steyn calls "some schlub in a basement who has a blog with a swastika on it," while failing to confront "the real sources of anti-Semitism in the world today, which is an alliance between psychotic Islamists and the college left, the polytechnic left, the educated left in the United States and in the broader Western world."



While Israel, the UN and the Middle East conflict account for 24% of ADL's press releases, no less than 11% of press releases on Israel are devoted to condemning so called Jewish right wing extremists! The ADL also promotes the left's anti-settlement policies in Israel e.g. "ADL Calls Israeli Settlement Freeze Courageous and Unprecedented."

In an interview with *Frontpage*, Jacobs outlines both the reasons ADL has been able to escape criticism (apart from that of AFSI) for so long and why it avoids the issue of Islamic anti-Semitism and defamation, which even Foxman has publicly conceded is the most important challenge to Jews today. As for the absence of criticism, Jacobs cites a gentleman's agreement among Jewish leaders not to condemn each other in public. Jacobs says that behind the scenes he knows—from talking to them—that many Jewish leaders agree with him "110%" but they will not speak out—nor did Jacobs himself, he acknowledges, feel free to speak out until he left the David Project, a Jewish organization he had long headed. As for why Foxman avoids addressing the threat posed by Islamic hatred, Jacobs has a series of explanations: Foxman is afraid of alienating his politically correct liberal funders; he is afraid of U.S. Islamic organizations which are quick to sue for "defamation" when anyone holds their activities up to public scrutiny; he is afraid of being accused of Islamophobia; and finally, he doesn't know what to do about the problem.

On the last score, Jacobs has four excellent suggestions.

- Issue a wake-up call. World Jewry needs to be educated about the threat and respond with focus, energy and Jewish creativity. A new kind of leadership, willing to speak honestly, is needed to rally the Jewish people.
- Develop alliances. Islamic anti-Semitism is part of a more general attack on the West. Anti-jihadist alliances are already emerging in the United States, such as New York's Human Rights Coalition Against Radical Islam which is holding rallies and protests against Islamist assaults on targeted peoples around the world.
- Analyze religious texts and teachings. The huge, life-saving reversals in Christian theological teachings about Jews could not have been achieved without years of intensive Jewish critique of Christian Biblical texts and traditions. It was the sensitive sharing of these studies with Christians of good will that turned the tide. If the Muslim world is ever to reinterpret its "teachings of contempt" Jews will have to confront, study and speak about the theological anti-Semitism embedded in Muslim holy books.
- Activism on behalf of the community. Jewish activists seem to prefer every cause in the world to their own community's interest. Talented people need to be enlisted to sponsor conferences on Islamic anti-Semitism and Islamist penetration of American society; to expose the Saudi lobby and its impact on silencing criticism; to lobby our elected officials about the dangers; and to campaign for sensitivity training for university students from lands with anti-Semitic cultures.

Unfortunately it will take another organization to displace ADL to follow these suggestions.

Norway Embraces Islamist Tyranny

Bruce Bawer

Anti-Semitism in Norway, where I have lived for twelve years, is over the top. I have never quite gotten used to it. Every now and then I hear or read something that reminds me that I am living in Europe, in a country that was occupied by the Nazis, and where a lot of people were perfectly okay with that. I think it is fair to say that anti-Semitism in Norway is most virulent among the cultural elite—the academics, intellectuals, writers, journalists, politicians, and technocrats—although thanks to the media and schools, it has trickled down to many ordinary Norwegians, some of whom may never even have met a Jewish person.



Kare Willoch

This anti-Semitism manifests itself in various ways. When Obama became president, former Norwegian prime minister Kåre Willoch said things did not look promising because Obama had "chosen a Jew as chief of staff." The chief rabbi of the Oslo synagogue reportedly receives a pile of hate mail every day. During the Gaza War, a major Norwegian newspaper had trouble finding Norwegian Jews who were willing to comment on the record about the war: they said they were scared of repercussions. Norwegian academics have sought to ban contacts with Israeli universities. Norwegian activists have encouraged boycotts of Israeli products. There is terrible anti-Semitic bullying in the schools. Every so often, a high-profile professor or activist or famous author will write a virulent op-ed or give an angry speech denouncing Israel and insulting Jews.

Nothing could be safer for them to say; no one will seek to harm them physically or otherwise—as opposed to what would happen if, say, they made certain public statements about Islam. And they know this. Norway's most respected newspaper cartoonist, Finn Graff, who has admitted that he never draws cartoons about Islam because he is scared for his life, has frequently drawn cartoons comparing Israelis to Nazis; he knows Jews will never harm him. These anti-Semitic op-eds and speeches and cartoons are never remotely fresh, witty, or original; all they ever do is recycle tired cultural-elite clichés. And their creators get nothing but praise from their colleagues, who celebrate them as courageous truth-tellers. It is much more acceptable to scream "kill the Jews" at an anti-Israeli protest than it is to criticize Hamas.

The quintessential expression of Norwegian anti-Semitism during my time in Norway was an op-ed written by Jostein Gaarder, author of the international bestseller *Sophie's World*. It appeared on August 11, 2006, in *Aftenposten*, Norway's newspaper of record. I will quote from it just to give you a flavor of the kind of thing that is considered respectable discourse in Norway. "The state of Israel in its current form is history," wrote Gaarder. "We do not believe in the notion of God's chosen people....To act as God's chosen people is not only stupid and arrogant, but a crime against humanity....We acknowledge...Europe's deep responsibility for the fate of Jews....But the state of Israel...has massacred its own legitimacy....The State of Israel has seen its Soweto...." Gaarder went on to describe little Jewish girls writing hateful words on bombs to be dropped on civilian populations in Lebanon and Palestine — as if it were Israel that teaches its children to hate and kill. He wrote: "We do not recognize a state founded on anti-humanistic principles and the ruins of an archaic national religion and warrior religion." You might have thought he was talking about Saudi Arabia or Iran, but no; he was talking about Israel.

After reading Gaarder's op-ed, one of the leading members of Norway's tiny Jewish community, a writer named Mona Levin, said she had not read anything so disturbing since *Mein Kampf*. Many ordinary Norwegians agreed. Yet members of the cultural elite lined up to support Gaarder. As far as they were concerned he had struck a blow for truth and virtue.

What motivates this anti-Semitism? Several things. For one, the leading lights of Norway's cultural elite are overwhelmingly on the far left, and intensely hostile to the West, to capitalism, and

therefore to the U.S. and to Israel, which they see as America's puppet and vassal—a colonialist, imperialist outpost of Western capitalism in the heart of the Islamic world. Before the fall of the USSR, an extraordinary percentage of these Norwegian leftists were either Communists or very sympathetic to Communism. They have replaced their affinity to the Soviet Union with sympathy for the great totalitarian ideology of our time: Islamism. Thus they romanticize Palestinians and despise Israel.

Part of the motivation for this anti-Semitism is of course the influx into Norway in recent decades of masses of Muslims from Pakistan, Iraq, Somalia and elsewhere. Multiculturalism has taught Norway's cultural elite to take an uncritical, even obsequious, posture toward every aspect of Muslim culture and belief. When Muslim leaders rant against Israel and the Jews, the reflexive response of the multicultural elite is to join them in their rantings. This is called solidarity.

Then there is Norwegian history. Anti-Semitism has a long, deeply-rooted history in Norway, which was never a cosmopolitan country—no nation in Europe was less ethnically or religiously diverse. On the contrary, Norway was a remote, rural, mountainous land of pious Lutheran farmers whose early 19th-century constitution banned Jews from its territory. Then came World War II. With a few notable exceptions, Norwegians did not exactly cover themselves in glory during the Nazi occupation. Unlike their counterparts in Denmark, Norwegian gentiles made no major effort to protect their Jewish neighbors.

To be sure, in the decades after the war, Norway was a staunch ally of the U.S. and Israel; but the entrenched multicultural elite did its work through the schools, universities and media—producing a generation of Norwegians for whom being virtuous and intellectually sophisticated means, among other things, embracing the Muslim "victim," and despising the Israeli "bully," even though the "bully" in this case is a democratic country the size of the island of Vancouver and the "victim" is a group of immensely larger, unfree, and tirelessly aggressive nations dedicated to that tiny country's extermination.

On Oslo's version of Fleet Street there is a bar, a journalists' hangout, called Stopp Pressen (Stop the Presses). For years, there hung in its window a photograph of a smiling, beatific Yasser Arafat. From the way he was portrayed, you would have thought he was Albert Schweitzer. I walked by that picture almost every day for years. It was a good reminder of the sickness at the top ranks of Norwegian society.

I should add that part of the motivation for all this anti-Semitism is, I think, guilt. The very existence of Jews and of Israel today remind Norwegians of what their countrymen did and didn't do during the war. Norwegians cannot forgive the Jews for having been murdered as part of a horrendous program in which many of their own parents or grandparents played a role. I think it salves the conscience of many Norwegians about their parents' and grandparents' wartime moral choices to be able to tell themselves that, "well, that was long ago, and today Norway is a virtuous bringer of peace, and Israel is a bloodthirsty warmonger."

And what about Islam? When it comes to that subject, Norway is more or less a microcosm of what is happening elsewhere in Europe. Islam is not as far advanced in Norway as in, say, the Netherlands or Sweden, or in parts of Britain and France, but it is getting there, and you see the same things happening there now that happened in other places a few years ago. Largely Muslim neighborhoods are gradually turning into *sharia* enclaves—no-go zones—where the Muslim residents are feeling their power more and more and where certain kinds of people, certain behaviors, and certain ways of dressing are increasingly being ruled out of bounds. There comes a tipping point, in other words, at which you start hearing: "This is Muslim territory! That is not allowed." One summer gay couples can walk unmolested down a certain street, and the next summer you start hearing reports of local merchants standing outside their stores and saying: "No gays here! Get out!" And then there is a newspaper story about a gay couple being chased out of that neighborhood, or beaten up, and you know that things have moved another step along toward the inevitable end.

And what makes it all so dangerous is the eagerness of the cultural elite to cover it up, to whitewash it, to pretend that none of it is happening. The cultural elite has been forced to admit that

there are problems with immigration, but its mantra is still that the only, or at least the main, problem with Islam in Europe is not Islam itself but anti-Islamic prejudice. Also, pretty much any Muslim who is not an active terrorist is by definition a moderate. A few years ago I actually began hearing people in Norway talk about "moderate Islamists" and now this is an entirely familiar label. It is a perfect example of what Daniel Patrick Moynihan called "defining deviancy down."

These so-called "moderate Islamists," moreover, are routinely welcomed into the elite. In recent years, one high-profile young Islamist has become a columnist for *Aftenposten*, while another has become a leading member of one of the major political parties, and has established himself as an influential figure in Norwegian society, thanks in no small part to nearly reverential profiles in the media. These men enjoy friendly relations with top members of the Norwegian government and with members of the royal family, even though they refuse to say, for example, whether or not they support the death penalty for homosexuality. It is considered impolite to pressure them about such things. Meanwhile people from the Muslim community who object to the tyranny of imams and want to enjoy the same freedoms everyone else does get little support from the very authorities who should be their champions.



I might also mention Norway's resident terrorist, Mullah Krekar, and his family, who have long been the subjects of fawning newspaper and TV profiles in which they are depicted sympathetically as kind, gentle, suffering victims. (This is a man who founded the terrorist group *Ansar al-Islam*, and who is known to be guilty of murdering and torturing children, but whom Norway will not deport because they are worried more about his safety than about the security of their own country.)

Two years ago, supposedly in response to Israel's actions against Hamas, Muslims rioted in downtown Oslo, making a large area of the city look like Beirut or Sarajevo at their most violent moments in modern history. The violence was out of control, the damage extensive. Yet almost everyone got off scot-free. And the whole event was soon dropped down the memory hole. The media, the politicians, simply did not want to talk about it or address its implications for the future.

Early last year, in the same Oslo Square where Quisling and his henchman once held rallies, scores of radical Muslims gathered to hear a Nazi-like message of hate against Jews, gays, secular democracy, America, the West, Israel. The speeches were chilling. Yet many of the men who gave those speeches continue to be treated with respect by Norwegian authorities. One of them threatened a new 9/11 in Norway. A few weeks ago he flew to Saudi Arabia to resume his studies of the Koran. He was considered so radical and dangerous that Saudi Arabia actually arrested him at the airport and sent him back to Norway, where he is now once again moving around freely.

What can be done about all this madness? A few months ago I told an interviewer for *The Jerusalem Post* that in the next local elections, Norwegians need to vote for the Progress Party—the only one of Norway's several major parties that is truly friendly to Israel, and the only one that is remotely honest about the realities of Islam. A few months ago a big win for the Progress Party looked like a very strong possibility, because over the last decade there has, in fact, been a big sea change in Norway when it comes to Islam, immigration, and multiculturalism. Ten years ago there was barely any discussion of these issues; the cultural elite called the shots and pretty much nobody dissented. But over the years, there has been more and more open discussion and criticism of Norwegian immigration policy and even of Islam, and the once small Progress Party has grown in power and influence, much to the chagrin of the cultural elite. In recent months, the statements by Angela Merkel, Nicolas Sarkozy, and David Cameron that multiculturalism had failed made a strong impact across Europe. There was hope that Norwegian voters would take meaningful action—a prospect that sent a chill through the heart of the cultural elite.

Then something happened. On July 22 a man named Anders Behring Breivik murdered several dozen people in Oslo and on a nearby island. He was a terrorist but not a Muslim terrorist—he was an

anti-Muslim, anti-multiculturalist terrorist, who targeted that island because it was the site of a Labor Party youth camp, and he blamed the Labor Party for the multicultural philosophy that has led to the Islamization of Norway. The massacre was a horror for Norway, but it was a godsend for the Norwegian cultural elite. Having felt increasingly embattled in recent years, they quickly took to the media to spread the word that the lesson of this atrocity was that Norwegians need to respect Islam, embrace the idea of a multicultural Norway, and shun the critics of Islam. Those critics, they said, and I was among those whom they named most often, had infected the mind of Breivik with their poisonous hate and thus had blood on their hands. The cultural elite were quick to link Breivik to Christianity, to Israel, and to the Progress Party, and to call for new limits on freedom of speech, especially speech about Islam. They insisted that those who had criticized Islam and immigration in the past now owed it to the memories of the people Breivik had murdered to recant.

And it actually worked. Many critics of Islam were so intimidated by this vicious new atmosphere that they stepped forward and expressed regret for things they had said and written. Meanwhile leading politicians and the Norwegian Crown Prince visited mosques to show their solidarity with imams. Never mind that those imams' opinions were no different than they had been the day before the massacre. Suddenly all that was to be forgotten. Solidarity with Islam, shunning of Islam critics: this was – and is – the order of the day. In the local elections on September 10, the Labor Party received a huge sympathy vote, and the Progress Party suffered a disastrous setback. People were quite simply scared to vote for the party that had been linked, however unfairly, to the mass murderer.

Gro Harlem Brundtland, Norway's first female prime minister, who served three terms in that office between 1981 and 1996, once famously said: "It is typically Norwegian to be good." Indeed, Norwegians pride themselves more than anything else on being "good people." And many of them are very good people indeed. But how is the Norwegian cultural elite's endemic anti-Semitism and its ready appeasement of Islamist tyranny and intolerance consistent with the idea of being "good people"?

Bruce Bawer is the author of While Europe Slept. This article appeared on November 16 at <http://www.hudson-ny.org/>

More on AFSI Apate Awards, 2011

Steven Plaut

In the November 2011 *Outpost*, AFSI announced a new program to grant "Apate" awards to professors, reporters, columnists and commentators who have willfully vilified, libeled, and endangered Israel. The award is named "Apate" after the spirit of deceit, fraud and guile in Greek mythology.

In general, Apate Winners are not only collaborators in the new anti-Semitism, but are among its leaders. What distinguishes contemporary anti-Semitism from the movement of the 1930s in Hitler's Germany is that many of the most ferocious attacks against Israel and the Jews are now coming from anti-Israel Jews. These collaborators in the war against the Jews have become familiar fixtures in American universities, using their positions to turn logic, language, history, and simple decency upside down, as they lead the effort to brand Israel a Nazi state and portray the Palestinians as victims of a new, Jewish-inspired "genocide." They are joined by hundreds of tenured traitors employed by Israeli universities and newspapers.

"Jewish-anti-Semitism" may sound like a nasty oxymoron; but in fact it is a spreading intellectual plague. Unlike past outbreaks of Jew hatred, it is not most common among the unwashed lower classes, but rather among the intellectuals and educated elites in European and American society.

Jewish anti-Semites are at the forefront of every smear campaign against Israel and other Jews. They are leaders in the campaigns to boycott and divest from Israel. They pioneer the campaign of vilification that paints Israel as an apartheid regime and therefore a racist state. Their hatred is so great that they pledge solidarity with terrorists and make pilgrimages to the training terrorist camps of the Hamas and Hezbollah, where they endorse the prospect of atrocities against Jews. Many are tenured professors. And a shockingly large number of Jewish anti-Semites are Israelis or ex-Israelis. In some extreme cases they collaborate with neo-Nazis, Islamist terrorists, and even Holocaust deniers. Their slanderous pronouncements and support for terror put Jews everywhere in jeopardy

Most Jews have traditionally dismissed such people as “self-hating.” But that term is misleading. These people do not hate themselves; they hate *other Jews*, especially those in Israel, and they wish *them* harm. These Jewish anti Semites are not simply individuals who have chosen the path of secularity, sloughing off their interest in Jewish heritage or becoming indifferent towards Jewish history and Israel. Anti-Semitic Jews are intensely involved with their identity in a pathological way. They often make a point of waving about their own Jewish “roots” to give credence to their Jew hatred. “We are Jews too,” they defend their vile slanders, “so we cannot be called anti-Semitic.”

Leading Jewish anti-Semites tend to be concentrated in universities, although they can also be found elsewhere. We think that no one better epitomizes the plague of Jewish anti-Semitism than the MIT professor of linguistics, the “thinker” always ready to defend anti-American and anti-Jewish terrorism worldwide. Yes, the winner for the December 2011 AFSI Apaté Award is the Noam.



Chomsky, that is. Noam Chomsky, now that his linguistics theories have been largely debunked and dismissed by the academic world, is perhaps best remembered as cheer-leader for the Khmer Rouge when it was carrying out genocide of its own population. In the 1980s Chomsky signed a petition denying that the notorious French Holocaust denier Robert Faurisson was an anti-Semite at all and saluting him as a “respected professor.” This action was so outrageous that Chomsky was vehemently denounced for it by far-left French intellectuals, who otherwise make common cause with him in his anti-American political agenda.

Chomsky was not content with defending Faurisson’s freedom of speech (although later on, trying to explain this bizarre action, he would claim that this was *all* he did.) He also endorsed the content of the French anti-Semite’s work, going so far as to write a foreword to one of Faurisson’s Holocaust denial books. There Chomsky said: “Is it true that Faurisson is an anti-Semite or a neo-Nazi? As noted earlier, I do not know his work very well. But from what I have read—largely as a result of the nature of the attacks on him—I find no evidence to support either conclusion....As far as I can determine, he is a relatively apolitical liberal of some sort.”

As Professor Werner Cohn has shown, Chomsky not only defends the right of such Neo-Nazis to free speech but also endorses the contents of their speech. And in addition to defending Faurisson’s Holocaust-denial, Cohn’s investigation found Chomsky publishing his own books with neo-Nazi publishers, writing for a neo-Nazi journal, allowing his books and taped speeches to be promoted by neo-Nazis alongside the works of Joseph Goebbels. “It is this complex of anti-Semitic activities and neo-Nazi associations,” Cohn writes, “not his professed ideas alone, that constitutes the Chomsky phenomenon.”

Chomsky does not restrict himself to shilling for European Holocaust deniers. He has also held meetings with the leaders of Hezbollah and other genocidal terrorist groups. It was for this reason that Israel barred him from entering the country in May 2010. After dashing off some nasty letters to his groupies, Chomsky then went to Lebanon and attended there a Hezbollah rally. He also denounced Israel as displaying “Stalinist behavior” when it barred his entrance into the country. What confused us was that ordinarily Chomsky uses the term “Stalinist” as a compliment. Indeed, he cheers for virtually

every neo-Stalinist totalitarian group and "cause" on the planet. He considers both the United States and Israel to be more evil than Nazi Germany.

So how did such a critter evolve? Was he raised by Ku Klux Klanners in rural Mississippi in a barnyard? No, Noam was raised by devoted Jewish parents in a middle-class Zionist home in Philadelphia, not far from where I myself grew up. Noam's father, William Chomsky, was a Hebraist who taught at Gratz College, the Jewish school which I attended. He was the author of "Hebrew: The Eternal Language" (1957 JPS) which, ironically as things turned out, he dedicated "to my children." So what lay behind Noam's transformation into a bespectacled hater of Israel? Only his psychiatrist can tell us for sure. But in so many cases of Jewish anti-Semites, their political agenda seems to be largely chosen on grounds that the annihilation of Israel and the creation of a Second Holocaust would be so much fun because it would really, really make their mommies and daddies upset.

Noam is alive and kicking Israel, but in recent years a large number of radical Jewish anti-Semites have dropped dead. You are free to attribute this to random chance and not to intelligent design, but I think you should be tolerant of those who think otherwise.

They all deserve a posthumous Apate.

Steven Plaut is professor of Business Administration at the University of Haifa.

It's Highly Debatable

Ruth King

A debate should be a formal discussion in which arguments are put forward and each participant presents his reasons for or against a proposition or policy. It can be the basis for judging and evaluating candidates.

However, the recent televised debates among the candidates seeking the Republican nomination for the Presidential elections of 2012 fell short in arguments, substance and style. A one minute response to a serious question is impossible, but in any case many questions were ridiculous. For example, candidates were asked what they would bring to the White House if elected. I would have pledged the max to the person who answered "my cocker spaniel." Furthermore, instead of encouraging the candidates to present cogent arguments moderators fostered a circular firing squad by pitting candidates against each other.

There are many questions that impact America's national security that should be asked of all candidates for the Presidency—or Congress—regardless of political party. Here are a few:

IMMIGRATION:

Here are two questions: Please spare us the perfunctory response that the first priority is securing our borders.

1. How do you propose to deal with the millions of undocumented aliens already within our borders? Do you support a national identity card? Do you support any of the following? Temporary worker's visas. Amnesty. Deportation.

2. How would you deal with immigration from radical Moslem countries in view of the number of terrorist acts committed by naturalized citizens from those countries?

AFGHANISTAN:

The war in Afghanistan is now in its tenth year. American involvement in World War II on two major fronts started in December of 1941 and ended with unconditional surrender by the Germans in

May of 1945 and by the Japanese in September of that same year. As of October of this year, American forces are still fighting. The Taliban is resurgent. Two questions.

1. Please tell us what we have achieved and as commander in chief what would you do now? Would you call "nation building" a failure?

2. Would you overturn the Petraeus' Counter-Insurgency strategy known as COIN and the rules of engagement that demand utmost sensitivity to the religion and mores of local nationals while increasing the risk to our own troops?

THE WAR ON TERROR:

Who is the enemy? What is your understanding of the ideology of Jihad that supports and implements terror on every continent.

ENERGY INDEPENDENCE:

Do you consider energy independence to be a national security issue? Please explain why and what you as president would do about it? Do you favor domestic exploration and nuclear energy?

MILITARY SPENDING AND FOREIGN AID:

There have been many calls to reduce our military spending and foreign aid. Two Questions: What and how much can we cut from our military budget which has grown by more than \$1 trillion since 2001.

There is great pressure to reduce and even eliminate most of our foreign aid programs. Would you countenance adding military aid to certain dependable allies such as Taiwan and Israel as part of our defense budget?

EDUCATION:

Most of you agree that the Department of Education is a bloated behemoth that should be cut or dismantled. Here is a question on education that pertains to national security.

In 1966 the Foreign Agents Registration Act, known as FARA was passed to discourage contributions by foreign nationals to our elections on the grounds that they constituted an internal security problem. Today, an alarming amount of money from oil-rich Arab nations is funding Middle East Studies Centers in American universities and colleges throughout the nation. These centers all promote decidedly anti-Western, anti-Israel, and anti-Christian curricula.

If meddling in elections is proscribed, isn't education as important? What would you do to prevent this manipulation of our academic institutions?

AMERICA'S ALLIES:

Who are America's best allies in Eastern Europe?

Who are America's best allies in Asia? (psst.....Israel is in Asia)

THE MIDDLE EAST:

In terms of priority please rank the following as the most vexing problem.

1. The threat of a nuclear Iran.
2. The rising tide of radical Islam and Shariah Law.
3. The march of Jihad in Northern Africa.
4. The Hamas/Hezbollah axis.
5. The Israel/Arab conflict

ISRAEL:

Please spare us the perfunctory pledge of unstinting support for Israel and answer the following:

Do you believe that it is in the interest of the United States or the security of Israel or in the interest of world peace to encourage the creation of an Arab sovereignty in the 2000 square miles of land known as the "West Bank" between pre-1967 Israel and the Jordan River?

STATE DEPARTMENT:

Please describe the attributes you would seek in choosing a Secretary of State. Would your model candidate be most like Hillary Clinton or Condoleeza Rice or John Bolton?

These are questions that all candidates should answer.

On a personal note I would pledge the max to the candidate who would denounce the two state solution. However, since the government of Israel flunks on that answer how can we expect any candidate to "out-Zionist" the elected Prime Minister of Israel?

Would any candidate dare? It's highly debatable.

Outpost

Editor: Rael Jean Isaac
Editorial Board: 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 Street)
New York, NY 10128

Tel (212) 828-2424 / fax (212) 828-1717
Email: afsi@rcn.com website: <http://www.afsi.org>